Hofstra Played Host to Fifth Bi-Annual Legal Ethics Conference in November

By Alyssa Litman
Editor-In-Chief

Alan Dershowitz, Stephen Gillers, Monroe Freedman, Lisa Lerman. Anyone in the field of legal ethics would be quite familiar with these names and hard pressed to find them all assembled in one place at one time.

From Oct. 30 through Nov. 1, 2005, Hofstra played host to its bi-annual Legal Ethics Conference, bringing together numerous experts and scholars in the field of ethics for a brief time. The conference, organized by Professors Roy Simon and Monroe Freedman, was characterized as the most successful one to date since Hofstra began hosting and organizing the event in 1996.

“What always strikes myself and Monroe is that any school would be happy to have these people speak,” Simon said. “To have all of them on the same conference program is just extraordinary.”

The first such legal ethics conference was first held in 1996 after Monroe Freedman approached Simon when he first came to Hofstra in the early 1990s. In 1995, there was a secretary strike at the school so the conference was postponed another year. Since then, it has become a huge bi-annual event for the law school.

“The reason we only do it every two years is because we can essentially devote double the resources,” Simon noted. “It takes a long time to plan—some of the speakers have busy calendars.”

The conference kicked off on Sunday morning with a brunch and welcoming remarks by Law School Dean Aaron Twerski, Hofstra University Provost Herman Berliner and Simon, the conference coordinator and Director of the Institute for the Study of Legal Ethics. Some of the highlights of the first day included a speech by Alan Dershowitz, entitled “Lawyers’ Ethics in a Constitutionalized Adversary System.”

Law School Embarks on Ambitious Journey, Curriculum with Twerski

By Deanna Lucci
Assistant Editor

Anyone who walks into Room 238 on a Wednesday morning can tell you they know the man who wrote the Restatement on Products Liability—since he is standing at the front of the room and is often found in the hallways of the law school.

After spending nearly 40 years in the legal profession, Aaron Twerski has returned to Hofstra as Dean of the Law School, to the place where he was a professor from 1972 to 1986. After leaving Hofstra over 19 years ago, Twerski went to teach at Brooklyn Law School, where he remained until last spring.
Letter from the Editor

After being dormant for several years, I am pleased to announce the re-emergence of the new and improved Conscience, Hofstra Law School’s student legal newspaper. Last year was a rebuilding year, and we hope that you will find that this issue is a step in the right direction toward recapturing the Conscience’s good reputation and prominence among law school newspapers.

I want to thank all those people who have contributed to this issue and thank you to the faculty, administration and student body during this rebuilding process. We hope the Conscience will continue to be around for many years to come.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Litman
Editor-In-Chief

Upper Class Course Conflicts & Scheduling: A Response from Vice Dean Tracht

The last issue of the Conscience carried an article that criticized the Law School for the number of upper class course conflicts, saying that “[i]t seems as if the law school is not interested in student convenience or preference.” I am glad that Conscience ran an article on this important topic—one that consumes many, many hours of our attention and efforts each year. I was disappointed however, that the author of that article never spoke to me or to former Dean Marjorie Daniels, the two people who do most of the course scheduling, to learn about what we actually do.

We understand the frustration it creates when two courses that are important to a student conflict with each other, and we take extensive steps—indeed, far more than most law schools—to enable students to get the courses they most prefer. So let me explain how we go about scheduling courses. It may not enable you to take every course you want, but at least you should understand why conflicts exist and what we do to try to help.

First, of course, courses must conflict. We generally work within the schedule of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., five days per week, less common hours. When we offer elective courses on Friday it dramatically hurts the enrollment, so Fridays are generally not used for elective courses. (Similarly, courses that start at 8 a.m. or 8:30 a.m. tend to have low enrollments, so we try not to put too many courses at those times.) So, we have roughly 37 hours to work with each week. We offer 65-75 upper level courses per semester (with multiple sections of(588,919),(973,996)some of these), or roughly 200 hours of elective classes every semester. So there is no way to avoid conflicts—on average, about six upper level courses must be taking place during a given hour. What we try to do is reduce the importance of these conflicts to most students, and we work hard to do that.

So how do we draft a schedule?

First, we put together the first-year schedule—those students have no options, and we have to be sure to arrange workable schedules for every section (for example, trying to avoid stretches with four hours of continuous class or days when the only two classes are early in the morning and at the end of the day).

Second, we deal with the “core” courses such as Business Organizations, Criminal Procedure, Evidence, Federal Income Taxation of Individuals, Real Estate Transactions, and Wills, Trusts & Estates. It is important for second-year students to be able to take several of these courses each semester because they are prerequisites for many upper level offerings. Also, third-year students who want several of these courses should be able get them without facing conflicts. For these reasons, we spread out these core courses throughout the week, and you will rarely see conflicts among these essential offerings. In addition, we often try to offer extra sections of core courses. For example, this fall have two separate sections of Evidence. Finally, we also spread out the Constitutional Law sections so that second-year students
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Later on, a banquet honoring Monroe Freedman was held at the Garden City Hotel as part of the conference.

On the second day of the event, over 200 people attended the morning sessions, which included speeches by Stephen Saltzburg, Stephen Gillers and Lisa Lerman, all experts in the field of legal ethics. Professor Gillers, who co-authored a book with Simon, engaged in a mini-debate with Freedman over what action a lawyer is bound to take under Rule 3.3 of the ABA’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct if a criminal defendant perjures himself. Gillers argued that a lawyer has no right to argue perjury testimony and despite Freedman’s contention there is such a right, there is no case law to back it up. Freedman then stood up and began to challenge Gillers’ arguments.

“The problem with [Rule] 3.3 is that every lawyer who knew the client was perjuring himself is either court appointed or a public defender representing the minority interest,” Freedman said. “The Rule is a de facto double standard.”

Following the lively discussion, Lisa Lerman, an expert on lawyer fraud and a professor at Columbia Law School, spoke about lawyer dishonesty.

“Like Monroe, I worry about the problems in the disciplinary system, especially in [Washington] D.C. and the disciplinary system’s tendency to go after the wrong people,” Lerman noted.

Sessions continued into the afternoon and all day Tuesday, with speakers discussing various subjects, from the corporate attorney-client privilege to secret evidence. The conference concluded on Tuesday with a roundtable discussion featuring several professors, including Hofstra’s Laura Appleman and Linda Galler.

Simon seemed quite pleased with the outcome of the three-day event.

“I thought the quality of the speeches was very high,” Simon said. “We have opened a window—that otherwise students might not be able to explore.”

Timmy and Flurry By Elias Khalife

Twerski from Page 1

When Hofstra first offered Twerski the post of Dean, he was skeptical.

“My first reaction was ‘No,’” Twerski said. “I had a terrific career at Brooklyn…I couldn’t have wanted better.”

But Twerski said what ultimately lured him back to Hofstra was that the position would be a challenge.

“This is a school I thought could take off,” Twerski said, “I am exhilarated to see it take off.”

Twerski does have big plans to ensure that Hofstra Law “takes off.” One of his main objectives is to enhance the school’s reputation, branding and publicity in the greater law school community. “As the school does better, so do you [as alumni],” he said.

When asked how he thinks that will affect the law school rankings, he said it is “beyond our control.”

Of the law school rankings in general, Twerski said, “It’s fair to say that most people in the law school community are displeased with the rankings [system]. They are trying to measure intangibles.”

So Twerski has decided to focus on what he can control—like curriculum changes. As a result of his collaboration with a faculty committee chaired by Professor Richard Neumann, Twerski is making big changes to the 1L curriculum. Beginning with next year’s entering class, Torts and Property will become one-semester, four-credit courses, and Legal Writing will be moved to the fall semester. Lawmaking Institutions course will be removed to make way for a newly-required Introduction to International and Comparative Law course.

Continued on Page 5
Parking Problems Plague Campus, Anger Students

By Gil Pinsberg 
Assistant Editor

This academic year heralded the creation of a new commuter-only parking lot around the law school, designed to alleviate the perceived parking shortage and make it easier for students to park quickly and go to class. But with the addition of a faculty parking area and the loss of other spots to new construction behind Memorial Hall, most law students believe they have gained little more than additional stickers for their cars.

Determined to communicate the concerns of students to the administration, the Student Bar Association organized a Parking Task Force in hopes of working with the school to implement changes. The group began in September by conducting open meetings at the law school and drafting a letter to Hofstra University President Stuart Rabinowitz, calling for fundamental changes in the way Hofstra views student parking.

While some complain about the stickers that “deface” more surface area of their cars this year (proposing rearview mirror hanging tags instead), the most important issue for law students remains the inconvenience and time spent circling around looking for places to park.

“It seems ridiculous that for all the money we spend, we still have to get there at 8 a.m. in the morning if we really want to find parking anywhere near the law school,” 2L Kim Oberhauser said. “Otherwise, the undergrads come in and take all the spots.”

Director of Public Safety Edward Bracht concedes that arriving early helps students get the best parking spots, but maintains that there are plenty of spots for all drivers. According to Bracht, “It’s just that they’re not all centrally located.”

“If any student comes to see me, I can show them 500 empty spots any time of any day,” Bracht said. He said that perhaps students just don’t have reasonable expectations of how far they should be walking to their cars, citing many open spaces on the North Campus across Hempstead Turnpike.

Continued on Page 8

Former Attorney General Gives Advice to Future Lawyers

By Alyssa Litman 
Editor-In-Chief

“Believe in yourselves; believe in what you can do.”

This is the advice former U.S. Attorney General had for the women in the audience at the law school during the university-wide Bill Clinton presidential conference entitled, The “New Democrat” From Hope.

On Fri., Nov. 12, 2005, Janet Reno addressed an audience of about 200, including Hofstra Law students, alumni and other guests following a brief lunch with administrators and four law students.

The Miami native discussed the need for better education, health care and the role of the U.S. Attorney General in domestic and international affairs. Reno served as Attorney General from 1993-2000. However, she still plays an active role in the national political scene and voiced some concerns about the current presidency and their methods.

When a student asked what she would say to the Department of Justice and the current leadership she replied, “I would lecture the Vice President on why we shouldn’t have torture allowed,” Reno said. “[And I] would lecture them that they will not get passed such a Patriot Act.”

Reno also talked about reforms needed to improve the juvenile justice system and spoke out against the death penalty.

“If I was in the legislature, I would vote against it. The point of the justice system is to protect life.”

The former attorney general also criticized education in this country.

“We should make sure every child in this country has the opportunity for excellent education. Something is wrong when football players get six figures, and teachers get what they get,” said Reno.

Reno emphasized the important role lawyers can play and her experiences as both a lawyer and attorney general, characterizing the post as an “advocate for the people.”

“[It] has been the greatest opportunity anybody could have,” Reno noted.
“We will be almost the first in the pack,” Twerski said about the International Law requirement—something he predicts will become a major trend among American law schools within the next five years.

“Every law student should come out with an understanding about human rights and what makes this world run,” he said. “[Graduates need] some aspect of comparative law, [to know] that we’re not the only legal system in the world.”

Fay Rosenfeld, Senior Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Executive Director of International and Comparative Law Programs, fully supports the changes Twerski has made in the areas of international law. “He has been thoughtful, innovative in his thinking and eager to do whatever he can to raise Hofstra’s profile in the international arena,” Rosenfeld said.

Other plans in the works include the addition of a Family Law L.L.M. program, and two new clinics: Securities Arbitration and Non-Profit.

“Dean Twerski is not a ‘hands-off’ dean,” Rosenfeld noted. “He is busy, but available and accessible to everyone in the law school.”

While the Hofstra community has embraced Twerski with open arms, he hasn’t always experienced this kind of acceptance. After graduating from Marquette Law School in 1965 and working for the Department of Justice during the Civil Rights Movement, Twerski accepted a teaching fellowship at Harvard Law School. Despite becoming a “star teaching fellow” with “stellar recommendations,” Twerski was discouraged from finding a teaching job.

When he began looking for jobs, one of Twerski’s professors at Harvard said to him, “Aaron, go back to the Justice Department, you’ll never get a teaching job.” The professor was referring to what Twerski calls his “getup.” Twerski is a Hasidic Jew, which is signified by his long beard, long coat and the yarmulke he wears on his head.

Twerski explained that there is a lot of discrimination against Orthodox and Hasidic Jews in the legal profession, as well as other professions, such as accounting. He said the discrimination against Jews in the legal profession is sometimes “more sound and more hideous” even than other types of discrimination. Twerski said he hopes his deanship will allow him to affect change in this area. Luckily, he said, “It’s not a problem in this school.”

Fortunately, Twerski did get his first teaching job, at Duquesne University’s law school in Pittsburgh. He taught there from 1967 until he came to Hofstra in 1972.

Twerski is happy to say that he has returned to teaching at Hofstra, as well as performing his duties as dean. He is currently teaching a products liability course this semester, and if he has time, he will also teach Torts in the future. He hopes to teach as much as possible, but his responsibilities as dean are very demanding. “Teaching is my first love,” Twerski said.

Twerski is considered an expert in the areas of products liability and tort law. He spent six years co-authoring the American Law Institute’s Restatement of the Law (Third) Torts: Products Liability, which was published in 1998. He has published voluminously on products liability and torts in many of the country’s top law reviews, such as Yale and Cornell. Twerski has an article coming out in the Michigan Law Review, entitled “Uncertainty and Informed Choice: Unmaking Daubert.”

Although he’s new to the dean post at Hofstra, the faculty seems to be impressed with what he’s done so far.

“Dean Twerski is an excellent dean,” said Professor Neumann. He added that the overall changes to the curriculum will help students be better prepared for the practice of law. Neumann said the first-year International Law requirement “will be setting an example for other law schools.”

Dean Rosenfeld also offered praise for the new dean.

“I have found him to be unfailingly compassionate, respectful of students and their concerns, thoughtful, and decisive – all the qualities that, I think, make for an effective leader. Of course, it helps that he is also very, very smart,” Rosenfeld said.
OCS Signs onto TWEN to Reduce E-mail Clutter

By Caroline Levy

On Wed. Aug. 31, 2005, I met with the representatives of more than 20 student organizations to discuss various ways the Office of Career Services (OCS) can work with the student body to enhance the services provided. Some of the topics covered included: the fall programs OCS has scheduled and how to encourage student participation and the new externship program established with the Nassau County Bar Association as part of Career Services’ continued efforts to ensure that students have opportunities to obtain substantive work experience.

There were many excellent suggestions from the student leaders, including a request for a program featuring litigation attorneys and a request that OCS repeat the bar association fair where representatives from the local and statewide bar associations were invited to campus.

But the biggest reaction from the student leaders came during a discussion of e-mails students receive on a daily basis. The student leaders were unanimous in the concern that there is a deluge of e-mail, and anything that could be done to decrease the number of e-mails students receive would be of great service. In response to those concerns, I have decided that OCS will now use the TWEN system as the primary means of contact with students. All events, special job opportunities, bar association events, Career Connections and any other OCS information will be posted on TWEN. It also means that you will need to check TWEN regularly to make sure you do not miss out on OCS happenings and events. However, OCS will continue to use Emplawyer-net for job postings. Please read below to find out about all the job programs for the spring.

OCS Schedule for Spring 2006
Funding for Summer Jobs
Monday, February 27, 2006, 5 p.m., Room 206
Information session with respect to summer work-study and the Public Justice Foundation (PJF) Fellowship application process.

Continued on Page 9

New Mock Trial Enrichment Program A Success for Both Hofstra and Sixth Graders

By Amanda Silverstein
Contributing Writer

Professor Barbara Barron and myself, her law student coordinator, put together a mock trial enrichment program for sixth graders in the Elmont School District. Over 40 law students from 1Ls to 3Ls signed on to participate in the three-week program that ran the weeks of October 17th, 24th and 31st. Each law student worked either individually or in pairs to teach in the 25 sixth grade classes in the Elmont district.

The first week of the program was a legal primer session where the sixth graders learned about the legal system, the way a trial is conducted, and the role of the prosecutor and the defense attorney in the courtroom. During the second week, they were presented with a fact pattern of a crime that was committed, and they were assigned roles such as the prosecutor, defense attorney, judge and jury. In the final week, they had the opportunity to carry out their own mock trial. This program is an invaluable experience to both the law students and the sixth graders involved. If it is as successful as anticipated, we hope to expand it to other districts on Long Island. The fact pattern that the students were presented with was a criminal felony-murder case. The students learned about the relevant rules of law for the jurisdiction of “the state of Elmont,” and then were divided up into a prosecution team, a defense team, witnesses to the crime, a judge and the jury. Together, we discussed the relevant factual and legal theories that each side should bring up in their mock trial. They learned what evidence would be relevant to help prove their case, and that the prosecution had the higher burden to overcome.

All the law students involved in the program agree that the response of the sixth graders was overwhelming. They were eagerly asking questions, preparing for trial and even got dressed up for the big day. At the end of the last session, many of them said that because of this program, they want to go to law school. Overall, it was just an incredible experience and Professor Barron should be commended for instituting such a program at Hofstra.
Courses from Page 2

will not be precluded from taking any other specific courses by the need to take Constitutional Law.

Third, we try to arrange that these core courses not overlap with Appellate Advocacy, again to enable 2Ls to get the courses they most want. Instead, we try to put upper level courses, mostly taken by 3Ls, at the same time as Appellate Advocacy sections.

Fourth, we spread out certain other types of classes. For example, our LL.M. students need to be able to take numerous international law courses (often 3, 4 or 5) in the same semester, so we spread these offerings out throughout the schedule.

Fifth, we try to keep courses in a given subject matter from conflicting. For example, we try to avoid having courses in the corporate and securities law area conflict with each other, since a 3L interested in one may well be interested in others. The same for other subject matters like International Law, Family Law, Litigation Skills, and so forth.

Obviously, not all of these objectives can be achieved all the time, but we do have a carefully considered system in place that we use to try to enable most students to get most of the courses that they want.

Several other matters lead to course conflicts. One big factor has been the expansion of our offerings. Five years ago, we offered 104 different course titles beyond the 1L curriculum—by last year, that had increased to 123 (and of course, many of these courses are offered several times during the year).

So, yes there are more conflicts—because we are offering more choices for you to pursue specific areas of interest. And there are other constraints, primarily room availability and the need not to put a faculty member's classes back-to-back (faculty members need to prepare for class too!). Faculty preferences also play a role—some faculty like early morning classes, for example, and others do not. However, faculty preferences play only a minor role in the overall process, and are accommodated only to the extent they are consistent with the Law School’s scheduling needs.

Finally, I should point out that we do something in our registration process that very few schools do. We allow students to Registration Priority (RP) specific courses that they most want to take, reducing the odds that students will be closed out those courses they feel are most important. Most schools have no such process, and your odds of being closed out your most important course are the same as the odds of being closed out of anything else. Why don’t other schools do this? Because it creates a tremendous amount of additional work for the Registrar’s office; we view that as worth the cost, but most schools don’t agree. (If you doubt this, ask your friends at other law schools!)

Course scheduling is a very complex and difficult process, and the results obviously will not please everybody. But while the system is imperfect, student convenience is, in fact, the single most important criteria that we use in scheduling our courses.

If you have suggestions on how we can further improve this system, I would be very happy to hear them—just e-mail me at: lawmet@hofstra.edu.

**SBA Announcements**

The Student Bar Association meets every other week on Mondays from 5-6pm. We always meet in room 243. Our meetings are March 6, March 20, April 3, and April 17.

If interested in running for a 2006-07 SBA position, general elections will be held the month of March. Students will elect the new Executive Board, including President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer, and class representatives. All students are encouraged to get involved and run!
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“There are enough spots; it’s just our own perception of how far we walk,” Bracht said.

Some students have called for all parking south of Hempstead Turnpike to be commuter-only, reasoning that this will keep the dormitory residents and many undergraduates on the north side and help free up many parking spots for those commuting to school. Others want the university to institute ‘zone’ parking, leaving the area around the law school for law students, the area near the business school for business students, etc., an idea supported by the SBA Parking Task Force.

While some students believe that a multi-level parking garage would solve all major problems, such a project would be extremely costly, would take an extremely long time to build, and the central issue remains the same—where would you put it? Building such a structure over an existing parking lot would put that lot out of use for a year or more, only compounding the problem in the short term.

Bracht believes that it’s a question of allocating limited resources. He says that Hofstra is looking at perhaps building a new law library or a new science building, and that a new parking garage would be expensive and remains unnecessary.

Instead, the school encourages more students to park on the North Campus and either walk across Hempstead Turnpike or take the shuttles.

“Having to park across the turnpike is not a solution,” 2L Marni Schlesinger said. “We need to have parking near the law school. For undergrads, who have classes in many different buildings, it maybe makes sense for them to walk or drive from place to place, but all of our classes are in the law school building.”

This year also marked the end of a Hofstra parking lot tradition: stalking parking spots and slowly inching up behind people leaving buildings and following them back to their cars. Instead, Public Safety officials now monitor the entrance to the commuter lot and keep cars out when they determine that it’s full, resulting in gridlock on California Avenue as cars line up along the side waiting to get in.

Residents of Twin Oaks and New Complex are troubled by the commuter lot near the law school for a different reason— even though they on campus, they are technically classified as residential students and not commuters. By this rationale, a student who lives in a house right across California Avenue from the law school is a commuter while Twin Oaks dwellers have to park over by the Hofstra sports complex or walk the quarter mile from home.

Law school students from both dorms cannot use the commuter lots and instead must park far away or walk to school during the rain and snow.

Despite these problems, Public Safety officials say they are responsive to students’ needs and have tried to find additional parking spots where possible. But as the University considers long-term plans to alleviate parking concerns, Hofstra law school students remain frustrated, with patience running on empty.

“There are enough spots; it’s just our own perception of how far we walk.”

—Edward Bracht

Director of Public Safety
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Post-Graduate Judicial Clerkships Info Session
Monday, March 6, 2006, 5 p.m., Room 206
This program is aimed at 2Ls, who will learn the benefits of clerking, how to direct the search, the qualities sought by judges, when to apply, and the nuts and bolts of the application process.

OCS/SBA Career Fair
Monday, March 20, 2006, 5 p.m., Atrium
Employers from many different legal concentrations will speak with students on an informal basis about their fields of law, the best ways to break into the fields, what courses would be most helpful for students intending to practice in particular areas of law, etc.

Opinion: Teaching Evolution in the Classroom
by Fotina Mamos

Since the publication of Charles Darwin’s On the Origin of Species in 1859, several religious sects have attacked the fact and theory of evolution. And recently in Georgia, the District Court heard arguments in a case brought by six parents who challenged a sticker on science textbooks that says, “Evolution is a theory, not a fact,” as being an unlawful promotion of religion.

These stickers were adopted after thousands of people signed a petition opposing the biology texts because they did not discuss alternative theories, such as creationism. School officials claim that the stickers encourage students to keep an open mind, but those bringing this lawsuit claim that these stickers promote the teaching of creationism and therefore discriminate against other religions.

The Georgia District Court ruled earlier this year that the stickers violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment and ordered that the stickers be immediately removed from all science textbooks into which they had been placed.

The controversy over teaching evolution and creationism in public schools is often cast as the product of a broader ideological warfare between science and religion. Creationism is a religious position, as the U.S. Supreme Court declared in 1987. In Edwards v. Aguillard, 428 U.S. 578 (1987), the Court said the Louisiana Balanced Treatment for Creation-Science and Evolution-Science in the Public School Instruction Act was unconstitutional because it served no secular purpose, and it promoted particular religious beliefs.

The primary motivations for supporting the introduction of creationism into classrooms are to get God back into the curriculum and oppose the metaphysical implications of evolution. In order for the U.S. to remain competitive, students must have knowledge of the principles applied by the global scientific community. Introducing creationism into the classroom will only spoil that purpose.

And while the U.S. Constitution permits public schools to teach various explanations for the origins of life, such instruction is only appropriate in the context of a religion, social studies, or literature classroom. The context of a science classroom requires the presentation of only genuinely scientific positions regarding such issues. Other prevailing scientific theories are permitted, so long as they stem from a genuine scientific standpoint.

Simply stated, current law requires that the fields of science and religion may not be entangled with one another in a public school. To do otherwise would undermine the notion of separation between church and state required by the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, which in turn would diminish the basic freedoms we Americans enjoy under the U.S. Constitution.

So perhaps it is time for those who object to the teaching of evolution to be more open minded and keep their beliefs away from the children in our public schools who are trying to learn why frogs have four legs.
Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity Chapter Honors Local Congresswoman in Small Ceremony

By Alyssa Litman
Editor-In-Chief

Congresswoman Carolyn McCarthy was inducted into the John F. Kennedy Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International at a ceremony in Hofstra Law School on Mon. Oct. 24, 2005. McCarthy was chosen as an honorary initiate for her dedication to eliminating gun violence, improving education and health care.

McCarthy is in her fifth term representing Long Island’s 4th Congressional District. She was a nurse for over 30 years and was thrust into the spotlight on December 7, 1993 when her husband was killed and her son injured when a crazed gunman randomly shot into a rush hour commuter train returning to Long Island from New York City. Rather than allow this tragedy to defeat her, McCarthy ran for U.S. Congress and won, turning the incident into a public campaign against gun violence.

The Congresswoman was inducted alongside Professor Alafair Burke and 15 new PAD members. McCarthy was presented with a plaque and a key from the law fraternity. Members from the Long Island and New York District, as well as several alumni, were on hand to witness the initiation. Following the ceremony, McCarthy gave some brief remarks on her experiences since entering Congress and discussed current political issues.

Professor Burke was inducted as the new faculty advisor of Hofstra’s PAD chapter and will serve in this position along with Professor Roy Simon.