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Jackson attempts escape

By Christopher Friedenberg

On April 24, former C-M student Stephen Jackson escaped from Ashtabula County Jail. Two Ashtabula corrections officers were attacked and overpowered by Jackson and fellow inmate Michael Hegyi, according to the Ashtabula sheriff’s office. Both prisoners were recaptured later that afternoon. Jackson is awaiting trial in the U.S. Northern District Court of Ohio on several charges of armed bank robberies committed between May and August against Charter One Bank, Huntington National Bank and Fifth Third Bank in the Cleveland area.

An engaging endeavor

Paying tribute to Dean Steinglass, who is stepping down as dean after nine years

By Eric Doeh

Come June 2005, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law’s Dean Steve Steinglass will embark on yet another path. After nine years of faithfully serving C-M, Steinglass will officially step down as dean and become a member of the faculty beginning July 1, 2005.

The Cleveland State University President’s Office announced the designation of Dean Emeritus to Steinglass.

According to Steinglass, “After nine years, I am going to do something that has not happened in the recent history of this law school. I am returning to the position that I held when I first came to Cleveland in 1980, a member of the law faculty.”

When asked as to whether he enjoyed his tenure as dean, Steinglass responded with a satisfactory smile and said, “Yes.”

Bar exam workshop wins ABA approval

By Amanda Paar

Recently, C-M’s Bar Preparation Workshop received approval from the American Bar Association to be offered for credit. Students may now enroll in Ohio Bar Exam Strategies and Tactics for three hours of elective credit.

The course’s curriculum includes a substantive review of torts, property and contracts, and simultaneously teaches the best approaches to both bar essay and multiple choice questions.

Bar Exam the first time. Dean Gary Williams realized participation is essential to the workshop and began taking steps toward ABA accreditation.

The workshop was offered again this spring on a non-credit basis. The class meets for three hours on either Saturdays or Sundays, depending on which session a student is enrolled in.

According to Williams, the course was “advertised” more than the previous year. Consequently, more students enrolled and more students ultimately completed the course.

There are three main goals of the course, said Williams. First, to “tell students what is expected of them on the Bar Exam and the general structure of the exam.”

Second, the workshop is intended to “give students the basic skills training that the bar examiners look for,” said Williams.

Third, Williams said the workshop gives students a head start substantively in reviewing the first-year courses.

The workshop is not intended to replace a commercial bar review course, said Williams. Rather, the workshop is “prep for bar prep,” he said. However, the workshop offers more personal feedback than standard prep courses, said Williams.

The workshop is recommended to other students. Consistently in the workshop and recommended to other students.

February 2005 Bar Results

1st Time (%) Overall (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1st Time</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRU</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Northern</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 519 applicants, 321 (62 percent) received passing scores; out of 219 first time applicants, 74 percent received passing scores. For the 2004 February Bar Exam, 58 percent of C-M first-time takers passed with an overall passage rate of 43 percent.
Goodbye, good luck
By Steven Steinglass
This is my final Gavel column as Dean of C-M. During the past nine years, I have addressed a broad range of issues affecting the law school. Through leading the law school’s history, the Bar Exam, pro bono and community service, the curriculum, networking, and our evening program. I came to Cleveland in 1980 as a clinical professor after a decade of practice as an attorney in Wisconsin. C-M was an attractive destination for me because the law school was committed to bridging the gap between theory and practice, and Cleveland was a solid Midwestern city that suited me and my family. It was the city in which I lived and practiced in the early years of my legal career. And though I did not fully understand it at the time, Cleveland was a great law town and C-M was in many ways the foundation of this legal community.

In Wisconsin, I served as director of the state’s largest legal services program, a program that employed 40 attorneys in 11 counties in Southeastern Wisconsin. I left a great job, which included serving as the state’s legal director, when I was “at the top of my game,” but I had experienced enough law school and other teaching to whet my appetite. And I have not been disappointed by the opportunities that C-M afforded me—teaching clinical and traditional courses, mentoring countless students, writing two books, and many law review articles and participating in professional and academic conferences and programs in more than 20 states throughout the country.

When my predecessor, Dean Steven R. Smith, asked me to become associate dean in 1994 after Professor and Associate Dean Solomon Oliver left the law school for the federal bench, I had no idea that my two year “tour” in administration would be followed by a year as interim dean and eight years as dean. Nor did I realize how personally rewarding I would find my experience as dean of this important institution. I have described in other places the highlights of my nine years as dean and my decision to step down as dean and return to the faculty. I was fortunate to become dean when we were preparing to open our new law library and celebrate our centennial, defining moments in the history of the law school. As I look back on the last decade, the initiatives that stand out include the following.

The undertaking of a strong pro bono program that recognized the special role this law school has played as the foundation of the legal community in Northeast Ohio and that harnessed the energies of the law school community. The strengthening of the faculty through the hiring of 13 faculty members from throughout the country, and the appointment of three faculty members to named professorships. The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.

The undertaking of efforts to strengthen C-M’s reputation and influence regionally and nationally through the expansion of our public lecture series, the increase in student participation in workshops with alumni and friends throughout the country (including Letter of the Law) and the creation of our National Advisory Council.

The launching of a strong pro bono program that has given our students the opportunity to engage in community and pro bono service; the expansion of the legal writing and research program, clearly one of the finest in the nation; the increased use of technology in the classroom and the academic assistance available to all students.

The creation of a mature development program that raised more than $20 million in gifts and pledges, that created a planned giving society in memory of Dean Wilson G. Stapleton ’34 and that engaged volunteers from the Law Alumni Association, the National Advisory Council, the Visiting Committee and the Cleveland legal community. The future for the law school is bright. With an excellent and engaged faculty, a creative and hard-working administrative staff, an academically strong and talented student body, a loyal and generous alumni network, a maturing university and an excellent and supportive legal community, there is no limit to where C-M can go.
The U.S. Marshalls Service reported an increased number of threats over the past two decades, an average of 700 threats against federal judicial officials per year in the past decade contrasting to approximately 240 threats per year.

It is a common myth that judges are threatened most by criminal defendants, but criminal defendants are the least likely to engage in an act of violence against a judge. People engaged in highly emotional family disputes are more likely to threaten judges than a criminal defendant who, as Judge Russo commented, knows that “if they kill a judge, they’re going to go to another judge.”

Following previous acts of terrorism in Oklahoma, Washington D.C. and New York, many courts have stepped up security measures. Courts have done so by limiting entry access to one or two entries that are guarded by deputies, security or local law enforcement.

All federal courts are protected by the U.S. Service and have high measures of security for those entering the court, including judges and lawyers going through metal detectors. Security in state, county and municipal courts varies depending on location, local politics and financial ability.

The Justice Center located in downtown Cleveland has large metal detectors entering in and out of the building every day. Metal detectors, wands, video surveillance and deputies are steps taken to make the courts a safe environment in place. However, the building, which was designed long before violence against judges, became a public concern, and there are still a number of changes that could be made to improve the safety of the facility. Such improvements include bullet proof benches and more accessible egress and ingress routes within the courtrooms.

The main concern Russo has regarding the safety issues at the Justice Center is that the court employees, staff, lawyers and judges are not required to go through the metal detectors. There have been several instances where defense lawyers and plaintiff’s lawyers have been so emotional that they have made threats themselves, and some lawyers even pride themselves on carrying concealed weapons.

Again, the pertinent question remains whether the public is in danger and whether the courts become virtual fortresses when the risk of harm although very real is statistically minimal and the result may only be a false sense of security. Although the threats against federal judges have not occurred but two write-in officer candidates have been targeted by an individual breaking into her garage. A Los Angeles court ordered an unknown individual.

The most important concern is the safety of judges when they leave the courtroom. Most of the murders of judges have been outside of the courtroom, specifically in or outside their own homes. Four years ago, Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas Judge Kathleen Sutula was not at home when her residence was sprayed with gunfire from a machine gun.

It is statistically minimal and the result may only be a false sense of security. Although the threats against federal judges have not occurred but two write-in officer candidates have been targeted by an individual breaking into her garage. A Los Angeles court ordered an unknown individual.
CSU health insurance gives student nightmares

By Kathleen Locke

By Kathleen Locke

START WRITER

FALL S'05

Venturing outside of Ohio proves difficult

My tale has all the trappings of a classic Shakespearean tragedy: adventure, comedy, pain, heartache, deceit, hope and betrayal. Oh yeah, and a bit of contracts for good measure.

As I'm sure many of you are well aware, CSU offers an insurance plan to its students. The plan is reasonably priced, and for young students who aren’t eligible for insurance through work or their parents' insurance anymore, it is an attractive offer for a little added peace of mind. That’s what I thought, anyway, when I enrolled.

In the spring of 2004, I was diagnosed with cancer. I knew I was going to have a long, hard road ahead of me, but at least I had my trusty student insurance policy to take care of the costs. Sure, it wasn’t the best policy around, but it was at least something to offset those massive medical bills. That’s why we have insurance, right?

I spent the summer in and out of the hospital, radiation, chemotherapy, you know, normal cancer treatment stuff. My timeline had been delayed, so as it turned out, I was scheduled for surgery the first week of fall semester 2004.

CSU switched its insurance carriers from Mega Health and Life to Aetna’s Chickering Group. One policy was supposed to pick up where the other left off. I was in the hospital the day that this happened. No one explained to me the information about the policy. You can pay for things online with the click of a mouse, why can’t I renew my insurance from the hospital? That’s exactly what I thought.

Twenty-four hours prior to these proceedings, I was on an operating table, airing out my entrails, so my mother didn’t have to spend the rest of the leg work. She contacted a person at CSU, told her that I desired to switch my policy over to the new plan and got her to fax over the wrong form. My mom filled everything out, and I read it, but I was on some combination of morphine, percocet andutorid at the time, so it probably could have said I was donating a kidney, and I wouldn’t have noticed.

I didn’t come to find out until seven months later that the woman actually faxed over, and what I actually signed was a non-renewable insurance extension for exiting students who were no longer eligible for coverage under the CSU plan. I talked to a dean at C-M, who assured me I could still get insurance, but it would not disqualify me. I was able to register for classes the next semester without a hitch. So why did I get form for exit steps, knowing that I wasn’t eligible? I sure found out. It makes no sense that I would be even able to sign up for this extension plan when it’s clearly not applicable to me.

Better yet, I never got any notice that the extension was terminating. I discovered on Mar. 24, 2005 that I hadn’t had insurance since Feb. 22, (exactly six months after the plan changed) because a pharmacy wouldn’t fill a prescription. According to Chickering, there is no reason to notify recipients of the extension plan of its termination because they can’t renew it anyway (because they are no longer students and ineligible for student insurance).

Dandy. Since I was a student (I still am) and was eligible to renew my insurance this spring, I could have done that, but I didn’t. I didn’t know I was uninsured, and I am always paying attention to what you are signing and don’t sign anything if you’re currently on any combination of pain killers. Another piece of advice: don’t get cancer. Okay, so you can’t control that. But something you can control is your own finances. One certainty in a world of uncertainty is that if it’s easier in control is your own finances. One certainty in a world of uncertainty is that if it’s easier...

Mail

Pail

Victor Nolan, 3L
Judicial interpretation: activist vs. originalist?

Question: Should federal judges be required to have their decisions grounded in constitutional or statutory law, or is it appropriate for a judge to rest his or her opinion on outside authority?

One is easy to address. The easy one is that not all law is based on statutory law. My point here is simply that common law exists. I think this judicial power has been abused at times, but generally common law still serves a valid purpose. The second part isn't so easy – constitutional interpretation. The reason it's not so easy is because there has been a recent push to utilize alien law within our jurisprudence. A perfect example is Roper v. Simmons, decided in March, which up-rooted the Constitution and ruled execution of minors is “cruel and unusual.” Aside from legislating from the bench of states (in an absurd statement, Justice Kennedy states, “[a] majority have rejected the imposition of the death penalty on juvenile offenders under 18, and we now hold this is required by the Eighth Amendment”), the Court perversely cites international standards.

Through double talk, Kennedy first says the United States is the only nation remaining which allows capital punishment of minors, but then dictates international law doesn’t control saying, “[this reality does not become controlling, for the task of interpreting the Eighth Amendment remains our responsibility.” As much as Kennedy tries, he cannot have it both ways. You either do or don’t consider international standards. If they are not controlling, why even tread into murky waters? As Kennedy is often one of two deciding votes for many close opinions, his reliance particularly worries me.

But, use of alien law, I believe, is a subset of the heart of this conflict – the battle between originalists and everyone else. Justice Ginsberg recently gave a speech on the use of alien law, citing a number of bogus reasons why its integration into our constitutional system is appropriate. Ginsburg used the opportunity to attack originalist thought as “frozen in time” (for a great article on why Ginsburg’s use of Dred Scott to attack originalism is “cruze,” see http://national-review.com/ COMMENT/WHEN). The basis of Ginsburg’s argument rests on the idea that “evolving standards” change and so must the Constitution. So you can see how use of foreign law is so delightful to her. It opens up all kinds of rhetoric from progressive, international groups.

If the Founding Fathers designed a document to change with judicial whims, why did they include an amendment process? Roper is the perfect example. Kennedy reasons since enough states now outlaw minor execution, the Eighth Amendment demands its prohibition. But change in popular opinion is not constitutionally binding. Point in fact-gay marriage. Popular support is against it, but for many reasons, there isn’t enough support (I call it lack of backbone) to actually amend the Constitution. While I seriously doubt the Court would consider outlawing marriage based on popular opinion, this is essentially exactly what it did in Roper. The intrusion of international standards just muddies an already uneven application of interpretation standards.

In fact, the use of foreign references is frighteningly increasing, having been used in part to justify both the Michigan racial cases in 2003 and Lawrence v. Texas, the “my constitutional right to sodomy” case. The use of foreign law in Lawrence is particularly chilling because that case overruled the Court’s previous decision from just 1986, which is equivalent to last week in the Constitutional precedent timeline. So one can see the potential impact foreign law can have on our constitutional jurisprudence.

With my last words, I’d like to say it’s been an honor to write for the Gavel, and I appreciate the editors’ support for this column.

By Benjamin Zober

The bottom line is that Zober and those who also have a “contemporary understanding” do not truly believe in constitutionalism. They believe in collectivism. And that’s scary. I’ll be the first to admit not every issue today can be pegged into a hole in the Constitution. But the Zobers of this country don’t even pretend they care to try. And why should they when activist judges like those in Massachusetts push their liberal agenda. After 200 plus years, how does the Massachusetts Constitution now say guys have the right to marry? I realize it’s a state constitution, but the parallel remains.

The point is Zober can’t provide us with a sound reason for collectivism, other than ramblings about the Founding Fathers being racist and sophomoric metaphors about Play-skoel. His column contains not one logical reason to support his view of constitutional interpretation should be based on whatever today’s societal opinions hold. I simply fail to see the relevance of Tivo in our constitutional system. Collecting outside information from somewhere else is built on – the rule of law. It’s axiomatic the words chosen for our Constitution had meaning, and just because almost 250 years have gone by doesn’t mean those meanings have changed.

By Steve Latkovic

There are two pieces of this question. One is easy to address. The easy one is that not all law is based on statutory law. My point here is simply that common law exists. I think this judicial power has been abused at times, but generally common law still serves a valid purpose. The second part isn’t so easy – constitutional interpretation. The reason it’s not so easy is because there has been a recent push to utilize alien law within our jurisprudence. A perfect example is Roper v. Simmons, decided in March, which up-rooted the Constitution and ruled execution of minors is “cruel and unusual.” Aside from legislating from the bench of states (in an absurd statement, Justice Kennedy states, “[a] majority have rejected the imposition of the death penalty on juvenile offenders under 18, and we now hold this is required by the Eighth Amendment”), the Court perversely cites international standards.

Through double talk, Kennedy first says the United States is the only nation remaining which allows capital punishment of minors, but then dictates international law doesn’t control saying, “[this reality does not become controlling, for the task of interpreting the Eighth Amendment remains our responsibility.” As much as Kennedy tries, he cannot have it both ways. You either do or don’t consider international standards. If they are not controlling, why even tread into murky waters? As Kennedy is often one of two deciding votes for many close opinions, his reliance particularly worries me.

But, use of alien law, I believe, is a subset of the heart of this conflict – the battle between originalists and everyone else. Justice Ginsberg recently gave a speech on the use of alien law, citing a number of bogus reasons why its integration into our constitutional system is appropriate. Ginsburg used the opportunity to attack originalist thought as “frozen in time” (for a great article on why Ginsburg’s use of Dred Scott to attack originalism is “cruze,” see http://national-review.com/ COMMENT/WHEN). The basis of Ginsburg’s argument rests on the idea that “evolving standards” change and so must the Constitution. So you can see how use of foreign law is so delightful to her. It opens up all kinds of rhetoric from progressive, international groups.

If the Founding Fathers designed a document to change with judicial whims, why did they include an amendment process? Roper is the perfect example. Kennedy reasons since enough states now outlaw minor execution, the Eighth Amendment demands its prohibition. But change in popular opinion is not constitutionally binding. Point in fact-gay marriage. Popular support is against it, but for many reasons, there isn’t enough support (I call it lack of backbone) to actually amend the Constitution. While I seriously doubt the Court would consider outlawing marriage based on popular opinion, this is essentially exactly what it did in Roper. The intrusion of international standards just muddies an already uneven application of interpretation standards.

In fact, the use of foreign references is frighteningly increasing, having been used in part to justify both the Michigan racial cases in 2003 and Lawrence v. Texas, the “my constitutional right to sodomy” case. The use of foreign law in Lawrence is particularly chilling because that case overruled the Court’s previous decision from just 1986, which is equivalent to last week in the Constitutional precedent timeline. So one can see the potential impact foreign law can have on our constitutional jurisprudence.

With my last words, I’d like to say it’s been an honor to write for the Gavel, and I appreciate the editors’ support for this column.

Conservative rebuttal...

I’m sorry you are filled with so much hate and intolerance. You don’t have to like people’s lifestyles to acknowledge that they should be free to live the life they choose. Nor do you have to like minorities to admit that they have been shortchanged throughout history, and until they are rewarded solely on their merits, we should find some way to level the field. I’m also sorry that you have no understanding of suffering. I don’t want you to suffer. In fact, I hope you never know the anguish of prejudice. However, if you had one shred of human compassion, perhaps you would feel differently about laws that fail to accommodate people’s basic humanity.

These Founding Fathers are the laws that endure; the sort of laws that existed throughout the world while we still had slavery. Maybe it’s “chilling” that emancipation came after Dred Scott in even less time on your “precedent timeline.”

For the persecuted, relief can’t come soon enough. When we torture and humiliate human beings apart from the rest of the world respects humanity, it reminds us that we do not have a monopoly on morality. The Constitution can handle the progress of morality and right. Can you?
Democracy triumphs over tyranny

After the Japanese surrendered in 1945, some so-called experts asserted that democracy in that far-off empire would “never work.” The same was said in post-Hitler Germany. So much for that.

No one said that it would be easy. But a million nations, both individually and collectively, are willing to stand up for democracy rather than succumb to the status quo.

Critics would argue, why not spread democracy in Durfur, Benin, Syria and Saudi Arabia? The answer is simple. A greater evil exists: Hussein’s dictatorship. Allowing Hussein to remain in power would have been equivalent to the world standing by as Hitler invaded France and Poland.

As noted by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, “When people decided not to confront fascism, they were doing the popular thing. They were doing it for good reasons and they were good people. But they were wrong.”

In order to sustain democracy, do not forget that what it meant in 1776 must mean today. Democracy cannot only be a “concept” unique to Western civilization. It is indeed a way of life that ought to be common-place to the world.

President elect sets agenda

By Brenda Healy

SBA PRESIDENT ELECTION

First and foremost, I would like to thank you all for giving me the opportunity to serve as your SBA President. You have elected a very ambitious group of officers who are committed to improving your law school experience.

The largest of these acts is post- punk stalwarts the Pixies, who have reveled in underground attention to emerging artists. This June, this diminished status is due as a music town. The Rock Hall will be the host to the CMJ Rock Fest in its inaugural year.

This past year, SBA worked diligently with career services, CSU, Aramark and the C-M faculty and staff to improve the quality of life for C-M’s students. However, further change is necessary.

Some of our objectives include improving common areas in the law school, improving communication between SBA and other law student organizations, continuing to work with Aramark and the university to ensure that we have adequate food service and ensuring that our current student body is well represented and not overlooked in C-M’s long-term plans.

The growth of SBA and Law Review will have a social – time and place yet to be determined – on May 19. I invite you all to come out and meet your incoming SBA officers and thank the out-going officers for their hard-work and dedication this past academic year.

Finally, I will be around all summer, so please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail if you have any suggestions or comments. I wish you all good luck on your final exams and to the graduates, good luck on the bar.

The Gavel

Editor-in-Chief

Opinion

By Ryan Harrell

Managing/News Editor
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Cleveland venues host inaugural rock fest

By Brenda Healy

SBA PRESIDENT ELECTION

Cleveland venues host inaugural rock fest

By Ryan Harrell

Staff Writer

Cleveland doesn’t seem to get its due as a music town. The Rock Hall’s annual induction ceremony is held in New York, and the last big act to come out of this town was Bones Thugs-n-Harmony. This June, this diminished status may change as our city is playing host to the CMJ Rock Fest in its inaugural year.

The festival is a joint venture between the College Music Journal (CMJ) and the Rock Hall. CMJ is well known among audiophiles for tracking the eclectic playlists of college and small independent radio stations, as well as bringing attention to emerging artists. In this spirit, it is not surprising that the line-up for this festival features a diverse range of acts that are playing in underground rock culture, but rather mainstream prominence.

In addition to these national acts, the festival will also feature 30 regional and local bands. From noon to 6 p.m., Thursday through Saturday, $10 will buy admission to the festival village, where these groups will be playing consecutive sets on two stages. These bands were selected from over 1,100 submissions and, for many, this will be the largest crowd to which they have played. Because this festival will attract people from out of town, and because these performances won’t conflict with the headlining acts, local musicians will have the opportunity to expand their bases outside of the Cleveland area.

Finally, for those more interested in hearing about the music than actually bearing it, the Rock Hall will be offering speaking engagements. On Thursday, industry legend Seymour Stein, who signed the Ramones, Talking Heads and Madonna, will be speaking, as will old school rapper Grandmaster Flash.

In the short term, this event is a chance to showcase downtown and the venues involved. As for the future, this might be the event to make one declare “Cleveland Rocks!” without the subsequent giggling.
Pull the wheelchair over

Judge’s discretion trumps overzealous prosecutor in absurd case

By Josh Dolesh
GAVEL COLUMNIST

My three years are over. I have done the time, but still, I have not figured out the crime. I guess this is the time in my law school career when I should be pondering about the law and all its virtues, but the end of my school career seems so anticlimactic. What is there to be happy about? A 100-hour work week? Chronic dyspepsia? At least law school has given me the chance to learn how to decide the tough legal questions. Recently, I came across an interesting case. According to the St. Petersburg Times, a woman was charged with driving under the influence (DUI) after she ran into a van while leaving her driveway. The woman subsequently gave a blood test to the police and registered a 0.12 blood alcohol content (BAC), well above the legal limit of 0.08. She said she did not recall if she took painkillers that morning. Now comes the tricky part. The woman with the DUI was not even in her car, she was not on her bike or even a skateboard. She was in her motorized wheelchair. According to the woman, she does not even drive a car. My first thought was how could this even happen. My second thought was what was the prosecutor thinking. I could anybody bring this case before a judge with a straight face? They must be running out of drug dealers to prosecute in Florida. I would expect this type of claim out of a tort defense lawyer, but a prosecutor? Whatever happened to prosecutorial discretion? When the case came before Judge Peyton Hyslop, it was dismissed. The judge analogized the wheelchair to a person’s legs. In his ruling, he stated that if allowed the prosecution to continue, the police would then be able to give a DUI to anyone who was drunk and standing up. Perhaps this case reflects one of the most important aspects of our legal system that is forever being eroded by strict positivists. It is debatable whether a motorized wheelchair would fall under Florida’s DUI statute, but what is not debatable is this ridiculous charge. Before I came to law school, I never realized that there was a movement to limit judges’ discretion in cases like this. What would have happened if this woman was convicted? I do not know. But what worries me is that there could be a law somewhere that would require mandatory penalties in a case like this. The absurdities aside, I would like to thank my readers for taking the time to read my rants over the past two years. I would also like to thank my staff and professors who gave me the encouragement and confidence to write for The Gavel. I would especially like to thank the legal writing department in particular, Carolyn Brook-Jacobs and Barbara Tyler, for giving me some of the best overall writing instruction I have ever received. Farewell C-M.

I got by with a little help from my friends

By Michael Brown
GAVEL COLUMNIST

The following is the final of a six-part series following a first year C-M student from orientation to spring exams. I don’t believe that this year is almost over. In a lot of ways, it doesn’t seem like that long ago when I was sitting in orientation wondering what the heck I was doing here, wondering what this year was going to be like, wondering whether this was going to be the life-changing experience everyone said the first year was usually. Unfortunately, nine months later it’s hard for me to believe that there’s life outside of law school, so trying to look back on all of this is somewhat surprising. Probably the best advice I received before beginning this year was to find a study group. In a lot of ways, my daily study partners have been my law school saviors, especially right before and right after exams. And I’m not just that they helped me learn the concepts and get ready for classes (which they certainly did), but perhaps the most valuable thing was the support and encouragement they provided, even if it was just taking a break to talk about the weather, politics, sports or anything else not law-related. The one thing I heard coming in was that law school was more about changing the way you think and less about what you learn while you’re in it. In that regard, I’m probably not a law school “success” story. Based upon my experience so far, it just seems like the “legal mindset” is a little too desanchnancing for me to buy into. I don’t want to see all of my daily interactions as questions of economic liability or legal theory. I just feels like the “legal mindset” ignores the pragmatic human consequences too often and focuses discussion solely on the “context” between plaintiff and defendant (as legal parties) and not between Mr. Smith and Mrs. Jones (as people). Perhaps this is something dealt with more in the second or third year and I’m jumping the gun, but this just doesn’t seem right to me. Regardless, a lot of what I’ve been going through this year has changed my daily life profoundly. I’ve often found it difficult to discuss school with non-law-related professionals or non-law students, probably because of all the jargon I’ve picked up and because they often don’t realize everything that the legal system encompasses and where it came from. And I definitely have a new respect for many of the oft-criticized aspects of our legal system; despite what I think about the “legal mindset,” I’ve been struck by how a lot of judges and lawyers work to try to make legal decisions both legally sustainable and pragmatically fair. I guess I wrap things up, I’m certainly not going to be this way forever. Everyone warned me about how exhausting and pressure-filled the first year was going to be, but having someone else describe it can never replace experiencing it. I’m still trying to digest a lot of what I’ve gone through and learned. But I think that surviving this summer is going to give a lot of the “book-learning” from this semester a pragmatic foothold. But in the end, I’m sure I’ll be thankful for having gone through all of this, and that will make it all worthwhile.
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