The Gavel

garners gold again

By Gavel Staff

The Gavel, the Student Newspaper at Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, was recently bestowed with the Columbia University School of Journalism’s Scholastic Press Association Gold Medal.

The award was based on a national juryed competition with a total of 1000 possible points for: Concept, Presentation and General Operations. The Gavel received a total score of 995, garnering “All Columbian” honors in all three categories.

The competition fielded entries from across the nation and included papers from graduate and undergraduate institutions. A jury of New York journalists and Columbia University journalism faculty reviewed and judged the entries.

The awards were by The Gavel were conferred at a banquet at the Roosevelt Hotel in Manhattan on March 16, 2002.

C-M makes Final Four

By Gavel Staff

A Cleveland-Marshall Moot Court team finished in the final four in the country for the first time in C-M history. The team of Peter Traska, Denise Salerno and Nancy Berardinelli (shown above in a C-M Moot Court intramural tuneup) took the coveted spot in this year’s nationals competition in New York City. The “nationals” is the oldest moot competition in the United States.

The Moot Court night at C-M was attended by over 300 people and was judged by U.S. District Court Judge Edmond J. Sargus, former U.S. Congressman Louis Stokes and C-M law professor and former Moot Court advisor, Stephen Werber.

Resnick recalls Court campaign

No control over anonymous mudslinging in campaign advertising, Justice says.

By Ed Pekarek

Both opposing candidates in one of the most controversial Ohio Supreme Court Justice elections in history appeared at the Judicial Independence Public Forum at Cleveland-Marshall recently. One judge was expected to appear, the other was not.

The event, sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Cleveland, featured Justice Alice Robie Resnick in a discussion exploring campaign finance policy tensions.

Resnick’s opponent in the big budget 2000 campaign, Judge Terrence O’Donnell, Eighth Appellate District, viewed Resnick’s remarks quietly from the back row of the Moot Court Room.

Alum, architects, faculty and students focus on revamping C-M

By Colin Moeller

A recent donation from Bert L. “Bart” Wolstein ’53 prompted C-M’s enlisting a local architectural firm to examine ways to update and renovate the law building.

While the initial allocation of funds is geared solely to completing the study, Steven Steinglass, dean of C-M, said he hopes future grants and donations will allow the results of the study to take shape into actual renovations in the future.

Steinglass, along with Associate Dean Jack Guttenberg and Professor Thomas Buckley announced the renovation study to leaders of C-M student organizations at a Dean’s breakfast held Feb. 7. “The goal of the project is... the most functional and aesthetic plan accepted by most people,” said Steinglass.

Akron based Brown & Steidel was selected by C-M from a pool of 20 candidates to complete the study. “What’s exciting about these architects is they like to listen,” said Steinglass.

The study is expected to consider concerns and suggestions of C-M students and faculty. “What’s exciting about this project is we are looking at everything. Everything is on the table, from the air to lighting to the flow of people,” Steinglass said.

“This study will have a major impact on what the school will look like in the next ten to twenty years,” said Steinglass. Steinglass acknowledged that while future renovations will not have a direct impact on current students, their input is important because students use the building on a daily basis.

Steinglass also said that any improvements to the school will enhance the value of a C-M degree.

Furthering the objective of including student input in the study, Brown & Steidel conducted focus groups with students and faculty Feb. 14. The architects centered the discussion around questions on the building’s functionality, quality upgrading, enhancing the C-M image and practical educational necessities.

Comments offered by focus group participants ranged from a desire to make the law building brighter to updating the school’s technology resources. 3L Sarah Lally said she would like to see the main entrance area at the building’s entrance.

Another suggestion focused on establishing a “general store” where students could buy newspapers and school supplies, mail letters and send faxes. Personal safety was a significant concern expressed by many students. Students urged for more lighting on the path from the parking garage in addition to increased security and lighting in the garage itself.

Steinglass, Guttenberg, Buckley, Associate Dean Michael Slinger and Budget Director Vicki Plata visited Washington, D.C. campuses to learn how recent renovations improved those schools’ space, traffic flow and aesthetics. The renovation study is scheduled to be completed in June, although according to Steinglass there is no “per se” deadline.

Moeller is a IL.
By Steven H. Steinglass

In 1977 when the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, newly merged with Cleveland State University, moved onto the corner of East 18 and Euclid Avenue, its new home was a campus showpiece. Over the past three decades, however, our building has begun to show its age. So, it is a great pleasure to announce that we have received a generous gift from our alumnus Bert L. Williams, allowing us to hire an architectural firm to consider ways of updating the building. Recently, members of the firm held focus groups allowing students, faculty and staff to tell the planners what they would like to see altered in the law school’s interior.

A few general comments seemed to emerge from all the meetings. The need to incorporate technology in classrooms and throughout the building was a consistent theme throughout the meetings. Many people mentioned the absence of light in the atrium; many commented on the gray stone wall staircase leading from the ground floor up to the atrium; many also voiced displeasure with the air quality in the classrooms and offices—excessively hot or cold or just plain stuffy. Some mentioned the difficulty of securing handicapped parking in the Moot Court Room; some suggested recapturing the Moot Court and the “Garden Ter- rain.” The administrators hoped rooms could be reconfigured to create a conference room with advanced technology and a sizable kitchen, and faculty expressed a wish for a larger, more usable lounge. Students faulted the small lockers and the narrow space between the rows of lockers. Others hoped the plans would include a modern trial court room, and many commented on how recent art acquisitions in the Attrium and the mural in the students services area brightened those areas and spaces—a trend they hoped would continue.

The Dean's Column

By Colvin Moeller

News Editor

The intersection of Hough and East 75th Street, an obelisk emerges from the ground. Etched into its stone is the name of the neighborhood it represents; Hough.

For the residents of Hough, the obelisk was erected as a symbol of renaissance. It stands as a symbol of movement back to the pride and neighborhood in its infancy and a movement away from the days of neglect, crime and abuse of civil rights, leading to the Hough Riots of 1967 which left four dead, 30 injured, and Ohio's to comment on judicial appointments and apart ment complexes are

also additions to redevelopment- ment bo- bun to in the early 90s.

There developments point to a re-emergence of the middle class in the neighborhood; the middle class abandoned the area by the late 1970s, taking with it, Hough’s economic sta- bility.

With the departure of the middle class, concern surrounds the neighborhood, growing more and more in the early 90s. The neighborhood is a symbol of renaissance.

A visit to the Hough clearly indicates that attempts have been made to reinvent the neighborhood. On East 75th Street and Euclid Avenue sits Church Square shopping cen ter; a recent addition to the neighborhood. Half-million dollar town homes, rehabbed homes and apart ment complexes are
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Steinglass: tales from the U.S. Supreme Court

By David Milite

Widely recognized and respected in the legal profession, Dean Steinglass displays a multitude of significant professional accomplishments which have enabled him to lead our law school into the 21st century.

His curricula vitae is filled with accolades as a student, practitioner, professor and chief administrator of C-M. In 1964, Steinglass graduated from the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania. Three years later, he graduated from the California University School of Law and began practicing law in Wisconsin shortly thereafter.

As a Reginald Heber Smith Fellow he served as a staff attorney and eventually directed the state’s largest legal services program known as Legal Action of Wisconsin. While practicing in Wisconsin, Steinglass also lectured at the University of Wisconsin School of Law and later joined the C-M faculty in 1980. The focus of his teaching specialties included civil procedure, federal jurisdiction, section 1983 litigation and state constitutional law.

Steinglass is a nationally known expert in section 1983 civil rights litigation and continues to lecture throughout the country at CLE and judicial education programs. Steinglass has authored numerous articles, book chapters and perhaps most significantly, Section 1983 Litigation in State Courts, a leading treatise on civil rights litigation. Moreover, Steinglass has also appeared twice before the U.S. Supreme Court, Board of Regents v. Roth (1972) and Felder v. Casey, (1988). He was Associate Dean of the College of Law beginning in 1994 and was later appointed Interim Dean in 1996. The next year Steinglass was appointed as the twelfth dean of C-M. 1983 expert: Steinglass.

The Gavel spoke with Steinglass about his experiences as a litigator prior to joining the C-M faculty and eventually becoming dean of C-M.

Q: What inspired you to become a lawyer?
A: It was something that developed. During the latter part of undergraduate school, although I had a business background, I viewed law as a public, respectable and prestigious profession and wanted to pursue a career in public service. As a result, I gravitated into the law school and the legal profession.

Q: What is section 1983 litigation?
A: Section 1983 of Title 42, which has its origins in the Civil Rights Act of 1871, is the most important of the surviving Reconstruction-era civil rights statutes. Under section 1983, plaintiffs may bring damage and injunction suits against defendants who act under “color of state law” in violation of federal constitutional and (some federal statutory) provisions. Once largely ignored, by 1993, 14% of all federal filed district court civil suits were section 1983 actions. Section 1983 is available in a wide range of cases, involving policy brutality, public employment, and takings (i.e., just compensations).

Q: What would you characterize as your most significant litigation experience with reference to Section 1983 litigation?
A: I have participated in numerous section 1983 cases but the two most significant are: Felder v. Casey, (1988), and Board of Regents v. Roth, (1972).

Steinglass was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court with a small litigation team of lawyers when he was twenty nine years old.

Q: What inspired you to become C-M’s Dean?
A: Prior to becoming Dean, I served previously in the law school administration as an Associate Dean and was very committed to the institution, alumni, faculty and the overall legal community. I am very honored to serve as the Dean of Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, and have just completed my fifth enjoyable year.

Q: What do you enjoy doing in your spare time?
A: I really enjoy spending my spare time with my wife and kids (as was evident by the family pictures that line his crowded bookshelves). Steinglass also enjoys vacationing at his lake cabin in Northern Michigan and continues to lecture and is putting the finishing touches on his latest book that focuses on the Ohio Constitution.

Steinglass is a 3L.

Nike strikes up a revolution

By David E. Long

The Beatles are suing to keep Nike, Inc., from using the infamous “Revolution” to Nike. Apple Corp. LTD names Apple Records and EMI Records, Inc. as defendants. The advertising campaign began in March and the suit was filed on July 29, 1987 in a New York State Court.

From examining a July 30, 1987 article in the Daily News Record it appears that Apple, one of the Beatles’ companies, is pleading in the alternative. First apple alleges that Capitol Records and EMI have no right to license Beatles’ songs in commercials. Apple further alleges that it has not received royalties that it was entitled to from the $250,000 plus that Nikepaid Capitol and EMI Records for the right to use “Revolution” in their campaign. In the suit Apple also accuses Nike of deliberately exploiting the good name and good will of the Beatles in the advertising campaign entitled “Revolution in Motion.” Nike representatives argue that Nike purchased the license to use “Revolution” legally from Capitol and EMI and Michael Jackson, who owns the company handling John Lennon and Paul McCartney.
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David E. Long was a Gavel contributing writer in 1987. This article first appeared in the Sept. ’87 issue of the Gavel. It is part of an ongoing series featuring Gavel articles from the past five decades to celebrate the Gavel’s 50 years.

Nike wants to end the campaign and seeks $10 million in damages and $5 million in punitive damages from the defendants according to the article in the Daily News Record. There are conflicting statements in regard to Capitol’s obtaining consent to license “Revolution” to Nike. A Capitol representative states that Yoko Ono, a director of Apple, gave Capitol her consent for the company to license the song to Nike even though that consent is not mandated by law.
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What to do after less than stellar first semester grades

By Karen Mika

Q: My first-year midterm grades were substantially worse than I expected. Is there any hope to do better?

A: Preparing for your first posted grades in law school is unlike few other academic experiences. Professors can tell you that law school grading is different, and you can tell yourself that, but it never quite prepares a student for the “C” (or worse) he might see, especially after a distinguished academic career.

The answer is, of course, there is hope that things will get better. How much generally depends upon what the student takes away from the grades received. Clearly, if the grades are all D’s and F’s, the student should reach the conclusion that something major is not happening and that there needs to be serious revamping of all techniques and study habits.

If the grades are mostly C’s with maybe one B, the student should think that he has the general idea, but maybe needs to do something different – perhaps in the realm of exam taking techniques. If the student receives mostly grades above a C, but with one “flake” lower grade, the student should feel confident that he probably knows what’s going on, and that the one exam was, in fact, an aberration.

In all cases, students should take the opportunity to review their exams with their professors. The purpose of this review should not be to tell the professor why the exam should have received a higher grade, but to understand why the exam received the grade it did – even if the grade is perceived to be unfair, or even if the student thinks the professor’s preferences seem absurd. (Does the professor test any reference to the Hand Formula?)

If the student leaves that meeting feeling that he did exactly as the professor wanted and performed equally as well in comparison to exams graded higher, then it is unlikely that there will be any improvement the next time around.

Don’t get buried by bar exam urban legends

By Marc D. Rossen

into your head. However, when you look at the answer choices, more often than not you will not see a perfect answer among the choices. Instead, you will be faced with imperfect answers and your job is to select the “best answer.” This requires critical reasoning and analytical skills developed by a significant amount of practice testing.

Fact #2: If you do well on the MBE portion of the exam, you do not need to worry about the essays.

Years ago, Ohio had a system whereby if your MBE score was high, they would pull two of your essays at random and if you scored well on those essays they would let you read the rest. However, this system was abolished long ago.

Fact #3: The written portions count for two-thirds of your total score in Ohio. The MBE counts for the remaining third.

Given the increased score requirements in Ohio, you cannot afford to blow any section of the exam. Nonetheless, if the written portions account for twice as much of your score as the multiple-choice, then you must allocate your preparation time accordingly.

Misconception #1: You can blow one or two essays.

This had its origins when there were 24 essays, covering a wider range of topics. Fact: Today there are only 12 essay questions covering a smaller set of topics. Therefore, each essay counts for a greater percentage of your overall score.

You must know enough to write about every bar exam subject area. You are expected to be able to fill a half to two pages on each essay question.

Misconception #4: You can only sit for the Ohio Bar Exam three times and then you are barred from taking it again.

Fact: There is currently no limit to the number of times that one can sit for the Ohio Bar Examination.

Fact #5: You can study for the bar without taking a bar review course if you borrow someone else’s materials.

A bar review course will tell you which areas of the law are most likely to appear on the test and teach you areas of law you did not study in law school. It will keep your studying on schedule and give you valuable feedback when you practice test.

Do yourself a favor and take a review course. Otherwise, tell your friends and family that the bar exam is given in two parts, the first part is in July, the second part is in February. Remember, the money saved from not taking a course will be offset by the additional expense and loss of income resulting from re-taking the exam.

By Frank Scialdone

Beneficial articles written by C-M students are finding their way into law reviews across the country.

Non-C-M journals published at least seven student-written articles since 1999, according to Barbara J. Tyler, director of the legal writing department at C-M. Topics ranging from immigration law to sports law, Tyler said students published articles in the University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy, All-Brown University Law Review, University of Technology, Ohio Northern University Law Review and Capital University Law Review.

Tyler, a proponent of getting students published and teacher of advanced scholarly writing, said law reviews and specialty journals are clamoring for well-written legal scholarship.

“Faculty want to get their work in the most highly placed journals as they can. So they want to be in the upper tiers. Fourth-tier law schools get few submissions, so those schools will take a really well written student article. If you’ve done a good job, there is almost no doubt that you will find someone to take it,” said Tyler.

Tyler said articles not selected for publication in the Cleveland-Marshall Law Review and Journal of Law and Health are excellent materials for publication elsewhere.

The White, a former student of Tyler’s, wrote an article on patient care as it related to nursing and unions as part of Tyler’s advanced legal writing class. Two days after sending her work to 10 journals, White accepted an offer from the Ohio Northern University Law Review which published her article in its Spring 2001 issue.

White’s article tapped into her 18-year career as an urgent care nurse before law school. “It’s important to pick something you are passionate about or have some experience with, because it’s more fun to write about it,” said White.

White said the experience has given her confidence in her writing ability. “You don’t have to be in the top 10 percent of the class to get published,” she said. “Have the confidence and wherewithal to go and try.”

Don Ressiegel, 4L, wrote an article on asymptomatic HIV patients and disability discrimination under the Americans With Disabilities Act as part of an independent study. Ressiegel helped to found a local AIDS service organization and used this background to craft an article. His article will appear this spring in the University of Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy.

Ressiegel said targeting submissions to journals catering to an article’s topic saves time and money.

Ressiegel used the Anderson Publishing Company’s directory of law reviews at: http://www.andersonpublishing.com/lawschool/directory, to identify matches with his article.

Tyler said having a good cover letter emphasizing professional or personal experience is important. Articles should be timely, grammatically flawless, and well cited. Tyler has partial suggestions, as well as sample cover letters, on C-M’s legal writing web site at: http://www.jWnd.com/legal_writing-publishing.html.

Tyler said U.S. News and World Report is helpful in locating lower-tier schools that want to see student-written articles.

Editor’s Note: Scialdone’s article on employment discrimination is slated to be published this spring in Tulane Law School’s Journal of Law and Sexuality. Scialdone is a 4L.
Waging one war too many

By Mathew Reiger

While prematurely revealing in my column before the third quarter of the Super Bowl, I was alarmed at one of the most blatant pieces of propaganda I have witnessed in my 30 years.

An advertisement portraying a bunch of teenagers admitting they fandettorship operations caught me as odd. At the end, a message declaring that anyone purchasing drugs funds terrorist operations appeared on screen. I was disgusted and disturbed by the fact that someone would use tragedy to push political and moral views, forgetting that two million bucks for a 30 second spot.

I figured some right wing group of angry young parents paid for it. I let it pass despite being disgusted. Until, that is, I heard our wonderfully airbrushed president reiterate that very message last week. This time, I could not let it pass.

What a pitiful statement it makes about this country when our leaders manipulate the events of our past to fight this ridiculous “War on Drugs,” which failed miserably over the last 20 years. What troubles me more, is the possibility that the suspenion of civil liberties, to fight the “War on Terrorism," will slowly but surely leak its way over to fight the “War on Drugs.”

It seems like George W. is trying to tell us, the “War on Drugs” and the “War on Terror” are one in the same. If that is the case, a suggestion that the same rules should apply to fight both seems likely. All George W. will have to do is get five Supreme Court Justices to agree with him, which is probable.

What is next? Maybe we will start gathering up people for smoking marijuana in the privacy of their own homes and charge them with complicity in the Dept. 11 attacks. Maybe we will funnel them through military tribunals.

I hope the anti-drug lords get their heads screwed on straight and realize one war is one more than we need. If our nature is at risk of terrorist attacks, perhaps it is not wise for our government to wage war against American citizens. It is my mistake about it, the “War on Drugs” is a war against Americans. May this sounds paranoid, but if our nature is at risk of terrorist attacks, perhaps it is not wise for our government to wage war against American citizens.

By Paul Petrus

COLUMNS

If you were planning to visit a foreign country and came across reliable information that the country regularly arrests and detains foreigners while failing to make the charges public, monitors certain attorney-client conversations, uses military tribunals, has an executive not popularly elected, and implements the death penalty for certain non-violent offenses, most Americans would call you crazy.

Now, that is America. We are told over and over again that we are at war. It is amazing how Sept. 11 can be used to justify anything. While watching the Super Bowl, I witnessed an ad by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy wanting again the “War on Drugs” using illegal drugs because the drug trade supports terrorism. After reading accounts of the administration’s war policies and listening to Bush’s State of the Union address, Americans are called to fight terrorism by staying sober. I feel now, more than ever, that I need a drink.

The problem with this war is the means. The ends of this war are just; stopping terrorism is right. But, it is also basic Christian dogma and a common philosophy of many other world religions that the ends do not justify the means. Our government, however, operates in violation of the spirit of the Geneva Convention, violating its way around the responsibilities we share with the convention.

The world is told that the people in Camp X-Ray are not “soldiers,” but rather “unlawful combatants.” They are not “prisoners of war,” but “detrainees.” The government may label the condemned whatever it likes, but the rest of the world is not buying into this jabberwocky. Saudi Arabia, France and Great Britain, our allies, have nationals “detrained” in Guantanamo Bay, and do not trust us with their people. Each requested their people be returned home to face trial.

The government attempts to convince the American people that the detainees face tough but humane conditions because they are “the worst of the worst.” Talk about a eliche rationalization for abuse. Every government planning on killing people labels its targets, “the worst of the worst.” This is because no government kills who laugh, love and are human; governments kill evildoers and stereotypes. Moreover, governments lie during times of war.

Americans should expect more from our government, if only because we want to treat other nations as we would like to be treated and because we are more humane than al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Diplomacy and negotiations should carry the day, with war as the last resort. The Taliban was toppled. Why pick fights with Iran, Iraq and North Korea while we are hunting down Mullah Omar and Osama bin Laden?

Like a man possessed, Bush II, perhaps intoxicated by an approval rating rivaling Jesus Christ’s, speaks in war tongues first, and reasons second. What is needed from our leader for the remainder of the war, is the opposite: a cowboy who asks questions first and shoots later.

Petrus is a 4L.
The shoppe here...

An hypnotic look at quitting

By Ed Pekarek

New Year's resolutions are usually empty promises, taunting jokes we play on our- selves to remind us of our flaws. We all recognize the personal habits we dislike and want to change. But for the top entries is smoking. Something I had banished but law school brought back into my life.

It's like that crazy ex that somehow always manages to pull you back in for one last seduction — again, and again and again. It feels good at first, but you know what you're doing will eventually lead to ruin. I know her all too well.

I resolved myself that before I embarked on the next leg of my professional journey that was not coming with me. I knew once and for all that we had to break up for good. She did nothing positive for me. She wanted to see me dead, she took my money and made me stink. She didn't love me, she was sick of it. We broke up twice before for stretches well over a year each.

Like so many others, I ignored all the warnings and experi- mented at parties, but didn't get hooked for years. I still played varsity sports in high school and part of college. But it wasn't until I quit playing college football that I really resigned myself to becoming a highly skilled smoker. In fact, I got so good, I thought about turning pro. But, instead of being en- papered by a career as a professional athlete, I ended up as a law student.

And so the story of drive-in theaters in the 1950s tells us. A hostess at a suburban restaurant who gets a backlog of orders. She decides to work the drive-ins instead of the restaurant. She gets a promotion and becomes a successful business owner.

The Wrigley family has to be pleased to have discovered this trend. For them, it was an excellent way to use some of the unused retail space they had in their factories. And it was a great way for them to market their products to a new audience.

Nicotine levels with acid aldehyde making its addictive properties 40 times, more than any other drug known to man.

By now, you are repulsed by smoking.

By now, you are in control of your mind and body.

By now, you are confident that you are a non-smoker.

By now, you trust my voice and feel a deep sense of relaxation.


I got it way down low now, near the edge of delta waves.

And then he starts saying: "By now, you are vomitingrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr."

He does this for about another 10 minutes or so and then "wakes up" the room.

The lights come on and his assistant proceeds to shill over- priced vitamins for the next hour. The "doctor" talks about the evils of non-consensual sublimi- nal advertising, relating the story of drive-in theaters in the 1950s, where the popcorn was replace with a vitamin that caused the customers to spend more money at the theaters.

Tobacco didn't have its American legacy, someone try- ing to start a cigarette company today would need the approval of at least nine federal agencies.

As a matter of fact, I think that the U.S. government should ban smoking completely. It is a health hazard and should be regulated like any other drug. The benefits of quitting smoking are well-documented and widely known.

A 1L’s Perspective

By Nancy Biddell

We’ve attained a new status they call it 1L, and to all our friends told us, it’s gonna be hell.

We all seem to share the same inner fear: is this too tough? Should I really be here?

Still, we all walk together “en banc” to our classes, Praying that our profes- sors won’t make us look like asses.

There’s something familiar in this helladodo we’ve already been through this in junior high school.

Remember how we sat in our assigned places

so the teachers could put a last name to our faces.

We learned how to find books on our library tour, now we just have strange names like CJS and AM JURS.

In our classes we’re learning lots of new stuff, now to find time fast for homework can really get tough.

We have no real math class that we must attend we will learn about damages when we get to the end.

Our English class is now called legal writing

that’s where we will perfect our case law citing.

For all of our classes, we have the same grief, What in the hell should I put in this brief?

Our Civics class goes now by the name of Forts, we learn about social behaviors and infactions of all sorts, Though the rules of mens rea still have me confused, For I am still glad my application wasn’t refused.

Biddell is now a 3L.

Corporatizing America misses the bottom line

By Renzi Zifferblatt

While the Enron fiasco fostered lively political debate over corporate ethics, some- thing more sinister than the nation’s new financial regulation has occurred. The Enron scandal, which more closely resembles the accounting fraud of the corporate world of the 1980s, has been quietly but effectively replaced with a new brand of corporate ethics.

Today, freedom is equated with enriched bank accounts and material possessions. Gone, are the collective tru- ths that brought this young nation together.

Tragically, cardholders multi-ply card items that require customers to take back the items they have purchased, because they cannot afford to pay for them.

We need local regulations to barter extended credit to those suffering financial strife, today we have interest plus credit cards, extinguish- ing faith for debt penalties.

As to the political debate, while the present bill pending before the House, promises to address soft money election campaigns, it fails to recog- nize that the few desiring “public servant” positions must collect millions, merely to win.

The Ahn Chao piece of the past, derived from humble beginnings, is a distant and foreclosed possibility in today’s election process, absent political connections and even more pronounced corpo- rate purse strings.

All of this leads to the ultimate question, why do we buy into a system that is will- ing to sacrifice human life or balance sheets? While our leaders proclaim us to be “freedom-loving,” it seems that we are captives of grow- ing artificial identities that monopolize on our naive and willful blindness. I would like to suggest that the Enron situation is not a time for blame-game rhetoric, but rather a unique opportunity to re-evaluate our notions of freedom and quality of life.