Nationally Recognized Jurists to Judge 8th Annual Sygert Moot Court Competition

By Thomas Kingston
Managing Editor

The eighth annual Luther M. Sygert Memorial Moot Court Competition is scheduled for final rounds on January 23, 1996. This year's final arguments will be heard before several of the nation's leading appellate court justices, and will serve as an opportunity to raise money for VU. Scheduled to appear as a judge at the competition is Justice Antonin Scalia of the United States Supreme Court. Also appearing as judges are Judge Guido Calabresi of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Frank Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Chief Justice Randall Shepard of the Indiana Supreme Court, and Justice Myra Selby of the Indiana Supreme Court.

The final round of the competition will be held in the Fine Arts Building on the main campus at 11:00 a.m. Four VU law students will be competing for cash prizes for Best Team and Best Brief. The final round of the Sygert Competition is open only to VU law students who are active in the Competition, which begins judging appellate briefs written last semester by twenty-six students. Six student judges will narrow the field to the semi-finalists. Those briefs will be judged by a faculty panel, which will choose the four best to be argued before the distinguished panel of Supreme Court and Appellate Court Justices.

The Sygert Moot Court Competition is named after Justice Luther M. Sygert, a federal judge from 1943 to 1987. He was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Valparaiso University during the dedication ceremony for the first Wesemann Hall School of Law in 1963. He was the first Jurist-In-Residence at the Valpo, and in 1984 he taught a seminar entitled, 'Language and the Law.' His son, Michael, graduated from Valpo School of Law in 1967, and was a member of the board which inaugu rated the Valparaiso University Law Review. In memory of the late Judge Luther M. Sygert, his wife and son established an endowment at the School of Law for the creation of the Judge Luther M. Sygert Memorial Moot Court Competition.

The Fine Arts Building has been chosen to host the final round of the Competition because of the large number of spectators expected that day. "The Fine Arts Department is building us a stage for the arguments," says Doug Fahl from the Moot Court Society. "Two hundred eighty people should be able to view the judges," says Fahl, "more than would be accommodated in Stride Court Room at the law school." The final round will be held on a Tuesday, without regard to law school courses.

Justice Scalia will arrive in Valparaiso the day before the Competition, and will be the guest of honor at a fundraising dinner Monday night. The proceeds of the dinner will benefit the University.

After the Competition, Justice Scalia will present a lecture at the Chapel of the Resurrection beginning at 4:00 p.m. The lecture will be open to the public, and may include a question and answer session afterwards.

For more information about the Sygert Competition, contact the Moot Court Society at 465-7894.

The Honorable Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia

Indiana Bar Requirements Amended By An Indiana Supreme Court Order

By Thomas Kingston
Managing Editor

An amendment to Indian Supreme Court's Rule 13, which sets the requirements for admission to the Indiana Bar, was filed December 18, 1995 by the state's highest court. Chief Justice Randall T. Shepard of the Indiana Supreme Court signed the amendment which is to take effect February 1, 1996.

Prior to the amendment, Rule 13 required more than a dozen law courses for admission to the Indiana Bar.

"Rule 13 hamstrung legal educators in this state," says Dean Gaffney. "The amendment allows much greater flexibility in the choice of courses a student makes." The Rule 13 requirements were logical choices for those interested in generalized private practice. But students seeking to channel their education in a certain direction were disadvantaged by the requirements. After the amendment, the only requirement is that students graduate from an accredited law school with at least two hours of professional responsibility. Dropped from the requirements of the Rule are courses in administrative law, business organizations, civil procedure, commercial law/contracts, constitutional law, criminal law, criminal procedure, evidence, legal ethics, legal reasoning and writing, property, tax, and torts.

Of course, though these courses are not required for admission to the Bar, many will remain requirements for graduation from law school.

"The law school's graduation requirements are not going to change," says Joanne Albers, the law school's Registrar. But students intending to practice in Indiana are no longer required to take courses in tax, business, and administrative law.

Courses that are not required for graduation, and have been dropped from Rule 13, may have a difficult time finding students to attend. Many students were quick to drop tax courses after hearing about the amendment. On the first day of classes, nine students filed drop cards with the registrar.

"Students should not be quick to drop a course because of the amendment," says Dean Gaffney. The amendment gives students and faculty more choice in their selection of courses. Students are advised that this freedom should be used wisely.

See Dean Gaffney's Column for a related discussion.
From the Dean's Desk
By Edward M. Gaffney, Jr.

Musings on the Court's law school requirements

Happy New Year! I hope you all had a restful break and are all charged up to have a terrific semester.

I know that marketing types like to dress up a product with the word "NEW" whenever they can, perhaps on the mistaken belief that change always represents progress. But the merely new does not always mean better.

Before I get too curmudgeonly in this new year, let me focus on one innovation or novelty that makes me happy. On December 18, 1995, the Supreme Court of Indiana issued an order amending two of its rules relating to admission to the bar. Rule 2.1 governs legal internships and Rule 13 states the educational requirements for admission to the bar examination. The story by Tom Kingston in this issue of the Forum sets forth the details. It would be a mistake to view these two changes in Indiana rules as affecting only students planning to take the Indiana bar. Any significant change in student choice is bound to change in student choice is bound to

One of the hallmarks of the Valparaiso University School of Law has been our ability to grasp the importance of connecting theory and practice. The one without the other is pretty shortsighted. The whole point of theory is to be able to understand something at a very profound, deep level, so that we can then grasp the applicability of a concept or principle to dozens, if not hundreds, of specific, concrete human persons whom we may be called to serve as lawyers. And the whole point of practice is to do the intelligent thing, not to blunder about in dumb mistakes without any theoretical appreciation of the law in its breadth and depth.

The change in Rule 2.1 would allow students to engage in internships (sometimes known as externships) if they have completed one half of the academic requirements for the J.D. degree and have committed or are enrolled in a course in legal ethics or professional responsibility. This rule change will probably not have much immediate practical effect this year at Valpo, since there are only so many placements as legal interns available at the moment. I am nonetheless happy for this change in rule 2.1 because it may facilitate further discussion of the value of internships in the broader context of the growing movement among legal educators to connect legal theory with the practice of law.

One of the hallmarks of the Valparaiso University School of Law has been our ability to grasp the importance of connecting theory and practice. The one without the other is pretty shortsighted. The whole point of theory is to be able to understand something at a very profound, deep level, so that we can then grasp the applicability of a concept or principle to dozens, if not hundreds, of specific, concrete human persons whom we may be called to serve as lawyers. And the whole point of practice is to do the intelligent thing, not to blunder about in dumb mistakes without any theoretical appreciation of the law in its breadth and depth.

So the modest change in Rule 2.1 is not hundreds, of specific, concrete human persons whom we may be called to serve as lawyers. And the whole point of practice is to do the intelligent thing, not to blunder about in dumb mistakes without any theoretical appreciation of the law in its breadth and depth.

Please see Requirements, page 3

Letters to the Editor

Legal Services Corporation Needs to be Eliminated
From Daniel Buksa
Editor Emeritus
Class of '93

One item that our national legislators and president are fighting about is the continued existence of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). Hopefully, funding for the LSC will be eliminated and the program terminated because LSC is a waste of taxpayer's money and disservice to the poor.

Established in 1974 as a quasi-governmental agency, the idea for Legal Services Corporation first arose out of Lydon Johnson's abysmal "war on poverty" in 1965. It currently has a 400 million dollar budget, which is distributed to 323 separately incorporated private non-profit grantees. However, not all of that 400 million is spent of services for the poor. At least 16 of the grantees engage in almost exclusive class-warfare litigation, suing governmental entities in order to expand the welfare state. It is indeed ironic that the taxpayers are having their taxes utilized as an instrument to further increase their taxes.

Prior to the LSC spawning, the indigent were assisted by private legal aid societies. With the exception of a few metropolitan areas, the attorneys of these organizations volunteered their services for the benefit of society's less fortunate. Unfortunately, the influx of federal dollars co-opted, corrupted, or killed most of these benevolent associations.

Indianapolis Legal Aid Society (ILAS) is one association that still exists independently of the government. ILAS spent $458,000 (received from donations, largely from the United Way) last year to handle 6,079 cases ($75 per case). In contrast, the taxpayers forked over $4.5 million to Legal Services Organization of Indiana (LSOI) to handle 12,347 cases ($367 per case). Taxpayers had to spend ten times the amount of money for LSOI to handle half these cases! Kenneth Boehm, Chairman of the National Legal and Policy Center, reports that the disparity is even greater. While all of the ILAS's cases were contested, only 1,273 of LSOI's cases were actually litigated. Furthermore, LSOI uses your tax money to employ a full time lobbyist and has even sued Governor Bayh to block his attempts to reform our broken welfare system.

Legal services should be available to those who cannot afford to pay regular attorney fees. However, the government should not be involved in a "robbing Peter to serve Paul" scheme. The legal profession has consistently demonstrated that it is willing, able, and capable of providing pro bono publico services to those in need. The government has conclusively demonstrated that it is incapable of curing the ills of society. It should be the province of the individual to extend his or her hand to their neighbors. We can end the fleecing of the taxpayer and encourage civic virtue by simply eliminating the Legal Services Corporation.
New requirements for law students

Continued from page 2

2.1 is most welcome to the students about this matter to the stu­
dents, representatives, or to the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Professor David Myers.

Although Rule 13 governs only those who intend to take the Indiana bar exam, its amendment by the Court is much more dramatic than the change in Rule 2.1, which applies to all students at law schools in Indiana, whether they intend to practice in Indiana or not. The change in Rule 13 signals a greater measure of judicial confidence both in the ability of accredited law schools to provide a sound balance of courses in their curricular offerings, and in the ability of law students to select wisely the kind of courses that they think will most adequately equip them for the particular kinds of law they may wish to practice.

For several decades any student who intended to take the Indiana bar was required to take the four courses mentioned in Rule 13 (one of the perspective courses (Legal Process, American Legal History, Comparative Law, Legislation, and Law & Economics), a seminar, Jurisprudence, and the completion of the pro bono requirement. The four courses that are no longer required — either by the Indiana Supreme Court or by our faculty — are Administrative Law, Business Organizations, Commercial Law, and Taxation.

I welcome the flexibility that the Supreme Court has shown in amending Rule 13, but at the same time I would like to stress that just because a course is not required does not mean that it would not be a good idea to take that course. A sound argument can be made for taking all of the other courses that used to be required under Rule 13, especially for general practitioners who will serve clients who brush up against government agencies of all sorts, who conduct a host or business affairs complicated enough to trigger consideration of the corporate form or partnership, and who must pay increasingly complicated taxes to the federal, state and local governments. These courses, in short, are valuable not just to a specialist in that particular field. For that reason I suggest that you consult with your faculty advisor and discuss your own career goals before dropping any of these four courses.

A Former Prosecutor Remembers 'Crime of the Century'

By Robert Sech
Contributor

On the humid, summer morning of Thursday, July 14, 1966, Chicagoans awoke to frantic news reports that eight young student nurses had been brutally murdered on the city’s southeast side. The early morn­ning killings, which occurred in a townhouse about 60 miles from Valparaiso, stunned a country which was still enduring the emotional trau­ma of President John Kennedy’s 1963 assassination. As curious onlookers gathered in the front yard of the crime scene, located just south of South Chicago Community Hospital, TV cameras rolled as the bodies of the eight victims were removed from the residence. At a subsequent press con­ference, Cook County Coroner Andrew Toman told a contingent of reporters “It is the crime of the centu­ry.”

Though little was known about the murders initially, investiga­tions by police and detectives would later bring the horrific details of the crime to light. The killer had confined the nurses to one bedroom in the townhouse. There, most of them were bound and gagged, having been frightened into helpless submission by the sight of the killer’s shiny switchblade knife and his black .22 caliber pistol. Each student nurse was then led from the room and stabbed or strangled to death. Despite the bruta­lity of the slayings, a combination of the killer’s carelessness and the steely determination of one young woman helped the police crack the case.

Corazon Amurao, a Filipino exchange nurse, had been one of the nine nurses in the townhouse when the killing spree began. Bound and gagged, she had managed to crawl under a bunk bed in the room where the nurses were being held captive. During his repeated trips into and out of the bedroom, the killer had lost count of the nurses and departed the townhouse unaware that he had left a survivor. Amurao, having avoided death by the narrowest of chances, was able to give a description of the murderer to police later that morning.

continued on p. 6

Crime of the Century

Cartoon Commentary

Let your voice rise across the land!

Write a letter to the editor or an opinion piece. All viewpoints of interest to law students welcome.

Deadline:
Jan. 25, 1996 at 5 p.m.

For more information, contact The Forum via email.
MLK Day Celebration
To Examine Freedom
Valpo News Report

Valparaiso University's 1996 Martin Luther King Day observance will be held on Monday, Jan. 15, with a theme of "Counting the Cost: The Price of Freedom." To prepare for the celebration, the MLK Day Committee is bringing to campus a Chicago artist who has helped the community create a "performance work" in exploring the theme. The performance will take place at a 10:30 a.m. convocation in the Chapel of the Resurrection.

Tsehaye Herber, the creative force behind this year's special convocation performance work, is a multi-artist whose writing, dance, and performance work uses images, ritual, dream work, social and political issues, and personal geography to create performances that celebrate wholeness and community.

In a series of four meetings, Herber and members of the campus community have developed the commissioned work. Herbert said, "In the context of Dr. King's vision, community is not a theoretical construct. It is active, dynamically involved, and meaningfully engaged in the process of social change. It is hoped that by dynamically involving the VU community in the creation of this work, a rich, meaningful performance will be experienced by all."

The MLK Day Celebration will begin on Sunday, Jan. 14, from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. in the University Theatre, VUCA, with The Music of Freedom: A Tribute to the African-American Spiritual Tradition. "Songs My Grandmama Sang" will feature Raybon Myers in a vocal-theatrical concert.

The following morning will focus on Freedom in Community: Creating Art and Life. This will include a breakfast workshop in the Union Great Hall from 7:00 to 8:30 a.m., where Herbert will discuss the relationship between community and freedom in her artwork.

The gathering of the people will be held in the VUCA lobby at 10:00 a.m. with the opening convocation to follow in the chapel from 10:30 to 11:45 a.m. The convocation will feature a performance work created by members of the VU community under the direction of Herbert.

Focus sessions dealing with this year's topic, "Counting the Cost: The Price of Freedom," will be held at various locations on campus from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. and 2:30 to 3:30 p.m.

The MLK Day Celebration will end with a covenant closing in the Union Great Hall at 4:00 p.m. Theology Professor Joh Pahl and VU sophomore Patilla Woods will present a dramatic presentation of "The Conversion of Paul," written by Professor Pahl. The VU Gospel Choir will also perform.
Star Gazing Opportunity at Valparaiso University

Valpo News Report

The Valparaiso University observatory will be open to the public, weather permitting, on eight evenings during spring semester. There is no admission charge.

The observatory will be open on January 12 and 26, February 9 and 23, and March 29 from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m. and on April 12 and 26 and May 3 from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m.

Interested persons are encouraged to come to the observatory and enjoy the views of the moon, planets, star clusters, and galaxies through the University's computer-controlled telescope. Also available will be descriptions of the observed objects. All are welcome, but groups are asked to make advance arrangements by calling 464-5379.

Call 464-5202 after 5 p.m. on the dates listed to confirm if the weather is clear enough for the observatory to open. It is located on the southeast corner of campus, between Gelissers Center and U.S. 30.

Books and Coffee Series Schedule Announced

Valpo News Report

The schedule for the annual Books and Coffee Series, sponsored by the Valparaiso University Department of English, has been announced for this spring. The series is invited to attend the popular series without charge. Each group is asked to make advance arrangements by calling 464-5379.

The schedule is as follows:

Jan. 11 The Horse Whisperer, Nicholas Evans, reviewed by Fred Niedner, Theology.

Jan. 18 A long Fatal Love Chase, Louisa May Alcott, reviewed by Jennifer Thomas, English.

Jan. 25 "L" is for Lawless, Susan Graffon, reviewed by Mary Persyn, School of Law.

Feb. 1 My Old Man and the Sea, David and Daniel Hays, reviewed by Norm Amundsen, Athletics.

Feb. 8 The Unconsoled, Kazuha Ishiguro, reviewed by Peter Mercer-Taylor, Lilly Fellows Program.

Feb. 15 An Italian Education, Tim Parks, reviewed by John Ruff, English.

Feb. 22 My American Journey, Colin Powell, reviewed by Roy Austensen, Provost.


Get well soon, Paul Lawson.
From all of your friends!
Crime of the Century continued from p. 3.

The man who had extinguished the life of her companions and friends had, according to his family, a balding head, a Southern drawl, and wanted money to go to New Orleans.

With this information, police began to zero in on a 24-year-old suspect named Richard Speck. A drifter with several tattoos, a pockmarked complexion, and a fondness for liquor, Speck had come to the area seeking work on a cargo ship as a merchant seaman. A maritime hiring hall was on the southeast side of Chicago, and in 1966, the area was a major shipping and steel production center. Having failed to find work on a ship, Speck was now the prime suspect in one of the most violent criminal episodes in Chicago's history.

Through a bizarre turn of events, Speck was eventually arrested after he had slashed his arms and wrists in a futile suicide attempt.

The suspect the police had typed out Speck's arrest warrant, and who would later be the chief prosecutor in The People of the State of Illinois vs. Richard J. Speck, was 39-year-old William J. Martin. A graduate of the Loyola University School of Law, Martin was one of many Assistant State's Attorneys in Cook County State's Attorney Daniel Patrick Ward (Ward would become a judge on the Illinois Supreme Court before the Speck case went to trial, leaving the top post to John J. Stamos, Ward's First Assistant). A prosecutor since passing the bar in 1962, Martin was, by 1966, an adept and quietly tenacious veteran of the courtroom. Having failed to secure a position with the Illinois Public Defender's Office, Martin took a job with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office with the reasoning that it would be the perfect second chair to his mentor, a better criminal defense lawyer.

Speck was convicted for each of the murders in a trial which gained national attention. Assisted by three other prosecutors, Martin, nevertheless remained in charge and present throughout the overwhelming evidence against Speck. Despite being an eerie and macabre trial, Martin recalls that it strengthened the prosecution's determination to have Speck convicted.

"I was gavaging an experience," he recalled. "We went at midnight one night shortly after the mur­ders. It was pitch black because we wanted to see how the natural lighting affected the place. It was probably the only time in the course of the job that I'd felt any sense of physical fear." Remnants of the crime were still present, and the utter brutality of the crime was something that Martin box, walked toward the defense table, and pointed her finger to within inches of Speck's face. "This is the man!" she exclaimed. Pandemonium ensued as reporters rushed to the two available telephone booths to file their stories of Amurao's remarkable identification of the killer.

Martin was composed on the outside, but on the inside he was amazed at what he had just seen. "I had no idea she and he were going to leave the witness box. I didn't think she would. I expected her to just stand up and point. That's what I would have done." Nevertheless, Amurao's actions, being completely natural and unrehearsed, were devastatingly effective. Was it the defining moment of the trial? "To a witness, yes... it was," replied Martin.

The prosecution's presenta­tion of witnesses and evidence was difficult to overlook. Despite being up against a wall, Public Defender Gerald Getty would not give up. Choosing not to present an insanity defense, Getty called to the stand the owners of a restaurant and bar located in the vicinity of the murders. The witnesses claimed that Speck was in their employ. Photographs of the "murders" were committed. Although Speck now had an alibi, the prosecution's case was simply too strong.

After a fiery, aggressive clos­ing statement by former assistant prosecutor George Murtaugh, a defense closing statement by Getty, and a rebuttal argument by Martin, the jury found Speck guilty. Murtaugh's closing argument was something which Martin has not expected. It was anything but low key. "It was a reflection of how George felt about the case," said Martin. "He knocked them [the defenses] so far back with that opening that I didn't have much to do on my rebuttal."

The guilty verdict was returned on April 15, 1967. A month after the trial, Richard Speck was sentenced to die in the electric chair. After the U.S. Supreme Court's rejection of death penalty statutes in 1971, Speck was subsequently resentenced to eight consecutive sentences of 50 to 100 years. Though Martin was a liberal and believed firmly in the rights of the accused (he had once refused to charge a black youth with murder which the comic Lenny Bruce had been convicted on obscenity charges), he obviously didn't have any doubt that he did think we [the prosecution] had a job to do. We were in the manner of Murtaugh's closing argument can rejoice when the criminal law sentences a person to death."

The man who had extinguished the life of her companions and friends has died in prison in November of 1993 as a result of natural causes. Speck had been convicted on July 14, 1966 in the courtroom of the Illinois Supreme Court overturned death penalty laws. Martin implored her to point him out. Standing a diminutive four feet ten inches tall, Amurao left the witness box, walked toward the defense table, and pointed her finger to within inches of Speck's face. "This is the man!" she exclaimed. Pandemonium ensued as reporters rushed to the two available telephone booths to file their stories of Amurao's remarkable identification of the killer.

Martin was composed on the outside, but on the inside he was amazed at what he had just seen. "I had no idea she and he were going to leave the witness box. I didn't think she would. I expected her to just stand up and point. That's what I would have done." Nevertheless, Amurao's actions, being completely natural and unrehearsed, were devastatingly effective. Was it the defining moment of the trial? "To a witness, yes... it was," replied Martin.

The prosecution's presenta­tion of witnesses and evidence was difficult to overlook. Despite being up against a wall, Public Defender Gerald Getty would not give up. Choosing not to present an insanity defense, Getty called to the stand the owners of a restaurant and bar located in the vicinity of the murders. The witnesses claimed that Speck was in their employ. Photographs of the "murders" were committed. Although Speck now had an alibi, the prosecution's case was simply too strong.

After a fiery, aggressive clos­ing statement by former assistant prosecutor George Murtaugh, a defense closing statement by Getty, and a rebuttal argument by Martin, the jury found Speck guilty. Murtaugh's closing argument was something which Martin has not expected. It was anything but low key. "It was a reflection of how George felt about the case," said Martin. "He knocked them [the defenses] so far back with that opening that I didn't have much to do on my rebuttal."

The guilty verdict was returned on April 15, 1967. A month after the trial, Richard Speck was sentenced to die in the electric chair. After the U.S. Supreme Court's rejection of death penalty statutes in 1971, Speck was subsequently resentenced to eight consecutive sentences of 50 to 100 years. Though Martin was a liberal and believed firmly in the rights of the accused (he had once refused to charge a black youth with murder which the comic Lenny Bruce had been convicted on obscenity charges), he obviously didn't have any doubt that he did.
Humor

Excerpts from court reporter Mary Louise Gilman’s books, Humor in the Court, and More Humor in the Court...

Q: What is your brother-in-law’s name?
A: Rifkin.
Q: What’s his first name?
A: I can’t remember.
Q: He’s been your brother-in-law for years, and you can’t remember his first name?
A: No. I tell you, I’m too excited. [rising from his chair and pointing at Rifkin] Murray, for God’s sake, tell them your first name.

Witness aren’t always the problem. Most lawyers aren’t exactly brilliant questions reveal:

Q: Did you ever stay all night with this man in New York?
A: No.
Q: Did you ever stay all night with this man in Chicago?
A: No.
Q: Did you ever stay all night with this man in Miami?
A: No.
Q: Did he pick the dog up by the ears?
A: No.
Q: What was he doing with the dog’s ears?
A: Picking them up in the air.
Q: Where was the dog at this time?
A: Attached to the ears.

By Marianne Manheim and Malini Goel

Here’s a little story I put together and it is dedicated to anyone who has finally gone over the edge and needs some sleep.

I guess everyone qualifies. Only then can you possibly understand where this came from. By the way, you can also try this scenario out as you study for exams later this semester.

If you can identify every possible legal issue involved, you are not only ready, you may need help!

Once upon a time there was a chicken named Friggy who tried to cross the road. Unfortunately, a Greyhound bus came by and ran Friggy over. (Cases, issues?) Then, an employee of Shammy’s Restaurant was riding by the accident and thought the remains of Friggy would make a great new item as a bacon substitute at the local restaurant. Sadly, he never made it because a valve on his motorcycle exploded leaving him dead as well.

Before dying, he admitted to leaving his little son X at home in the microwave, and assaulted Friggy for not being microwavable like his son.

Meanwhile, at Wally’s Department Story, a man dressed up in Lucy, Lady-Duffy Gordon exclusive fashions and Elizabeth Arden cosmetics ran down the pet aisle with a garden hose and a bottle of “Rust-Raze” screaming “Save the fish from toxic water.” In the process, he hit a customer in the head, knocking her into the pharmacy area where they were fixing a prescription which fell out of the pharmacist’s hands and into her mouth. It was a high dosage of antacids and required a trip to the hospital.

The man ran out of the store, took the pharmacist’s hands and into her mouth. It was a high dosage of antacids and required a trip to the hospital.

The man ran out of the store, took the pharmacist’s hands and into her mouth. It was a high dosage of antacids and required a trip to the hospital.

His new destination: Scotland. (He was fond of kilts as you probably guessed.)

The drug-overdosed customer never made it to the hospital. Miraculously, from out of the sky, Santa Claus came flying down, riding on a 500 pound cow and landed on top of her. All died, or so they thought! As it turns out, Rose, the cow, was pregnant and gave birth to a little Rose.

The man in the Piper never made it to Scotland.

He crashed into a car containing a show salesman on his way to Washington and died.

Of all of them (Friggy, Santa Claus, the Squashed Customer, the Man who liked women’s clothing, and the Shammy’s employee) were taken to their final resting place, OUR FINALS, via the ship, Peerless -- you decide which one.

Enough of this insanity! Hope you did well on your finals and had a good vacation!
News

NLA starts new bar association

National Lawyers Association (NLA), an alternative to the American Bar Association, held its Inaugural Meeting and First Annual Convention at the Adams Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri.

Over 80 attorneys, representing 25 different states, met to lay the initial foundation for the legal sections and committees for NLA.

In addition, NLA unveiled its initial package of benefits and services, including major medical and health insurance benefits, life and disability insurance, Section 125 administrative services, qualified retirement plans and other major benefits.

Since its inception in October 1993, NLA has grown from 9 members representing six different states to over 1,050 members representing all 50 states, District of Columbia and the Federated States of Micronesia.

The NLA’s president, Mario Mandina, in his opening address in October, 1995, announced that it was the Board of Directors’ and Honorary Trustees’ goal for the NLA to become the world’s preeminent bar association.

As he described the vision of the Board of Directors, Mr. Mandina called upon the members to assist in the construction of this “great edifice of NLA” by laying a solid foundation for legal sections and committees.

Mr. Mandina also stressed the fact that National Lawyers Association is a true professional trade association and not an advocacy group for any special interest or point of view.

In his opening address, Mr. Mandina described NLA as “a new kind of professional association which will usher in a Renaissance for the legal community.”

Mandina said the NLA was “a new kind of bar association where dignity and discipline, honor and integrity are paramount characteristics of its members. Where more than lip service is paid to the guarantees of life, liberty, pursuit of happiness and sanctity of life, especially for the unborn.”

Mandina noted that over 60 percent of the attorneys in the US do not belong to the ABA and that NLA plans to reach out to them and to all attorneys.

“There is a vacuum of principles in the legal profession which only NLA can fill and the ABA can’t,” said Mandina. “There is a window of opportunity for an organization such as NLA to fill that void,” Mandina said.

“With sufficient resources, NLA can achieve a majority of its goals within a very short period of time,” said Mandina.

Throughout his address, Mandina noted that leadership of NLA was abundantly aware of the size and scope of the task before it. Later on in the convention, this task would be compared to that of David facing Goliath by Mr. Ed Hearn, the keynote speaker at Sunday’s brunch on October 29 and former player on the 1986 World Champion New York Mets.

On Saturday, October 28, meetings were held to establish legal sections and committees. At a luncheon, the Honorable Pasco Bowman, U.S. Judge with the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, delivered the keynote address to the membership. Judge Bowman dealt with the crisis facing the federal judiciary as a result of the tremendous increasing of cases filed each year in the federal court system. Judge Bowman offered several solutions, including limiting the court's original jurisdiction.

For more information, contact the NLA at 1-800-471-2994.

Want to contribute? Write for The Forum -- Call 465-7831 for more info.