

## "We Shall Not Be Moved!"

By Rich Wareing '93

RECORD Columnist



**I** like graffiti. You get about four words to express yourself on any subject you like, which is enough to say what's on your mind, but not enough to hedge and qualify with disclaimers and exceptions. It's poor man's Haiku, only you get to use spray paint.

Needless to say, as soon as I found out about the Sojourner Truth Squad graffiti, I ran down to the tunnels. Quite frankly, I was disappointed. There was the standard stuff about the make-up of the faculty and the usual sloganeering, but there was nothing new to give you pause to stop and think. Plus, a lot of the stuff was way too long for graffiti — remember, four words, tops.

There was one thing which did catch my eye, however. Way down at the bottom, there was something about a committee to silence student protest. A couple of things about this struck me as odd.

First, having known a good many of the big radicals around here, I can say with some certainty that the only time they'd ever be quiet is when they don't want to talk. Plain and simple, this campus is quiet because certain people have chosen for it to be that way, not because of any administrative manipulation or machinations.

Second, this seemed to be the year when CCR et al. appeared to be going mainstream.

This fall, after that horrific Law School Council meeting, about which I will not comment, Marie-Louise Ramsdale '93, former member of the Griswold Nine

**Having known a good many of the big radicals around here, I can say with some certainty that the only time they'd ever be quiet is when they don't want to talk.**

and current Law School Council President, was more than eager to foster cooperation and initiate a whole series of reforms designed to make constructive dialogue possible.

Then, there were all the appointments to student-faculty committees, after which Raul Perez '94 (Fried Hour), Julie Su '94 (Griswold Nine), and Camille Holmes '93 (CCR activist) all ended up on some committee having to do with the faculty. Plus, there was the new "Building a Community Committee" which was stocked with three students personally recommended to me by Marie-Louise. Now, I hope I don't have to spell it out for you, but if they got ML's endorsement, they probably aren't members of the Bob Clark Fan Club.

Needless to say, I was pretty surprised at this sudden denunciation of the regular political process by people who had so heavily invested themselves in it. Think about it, if they're part of the process, and the process isn't working, shouldn't they be shouldering some of the blame? The way I see it, you can either go up into the hills, rattle your sword, and lob grenades, or you can come down and negotiate with the government. The one thing you can't do, though, is have it both ways.

Then again, I guess internal inconsistency and self-contradiction are nothing new around here. Take for instance the departure of Kathleen Sullivan. Despite Sullivan's statements to the contrary, my old section-mate Jeff Lubell '93, another CCR activist, knew false consciousness when he saw it, and insisted that "her departure says something about the atmosphere here. . . [A] more accepting and nurturing environment might have convinced her to stay."

A more nurturing and accepting environment, I like that. 3Ls, of course, will remember that two years ago CCR picketed inside Kathleen Sullivan's 1L Crim class on Strike Day because she refused to tow the PC line and cancel. Physician, heal thyself.

More recently, we have the appointment of Liz Warren, probably the leading scholar on Commercial Law in the country, and by everybody's account a great teacher. You'd think that CCR would be thrilled to have such an outstanding woman coming to Harvard.

You might think that, but you'd be wrong. After the obligatory, "we're thrilled," Julie Su, see above for appropriate leftist credential, and Lucy Koh '93, also of Griswold Nine fame, groused in the Crimson that tenure offers "tended to be right of center" and complained about the need for "ideological diversity."

Now let me get this straight: Liz Warren doesn't count as a woman because she doesn't think like a woman is supposed to think, while Jon Hansen and Joe Singer '81, both of "Four White Men" fame and hardly conservative, don't count towards ideological diversity because they're straight white men. Interesting.

Whenever I think about this stuff, I find myself coming back to last year's sit-in. It was about 4:30 and the Harvard Police were herding the non-hard-core protesters out of Griswold. As they were leaving, so as to avoid any possible disciplinary sanctions, they were chanting defiantly, "We shall not be moved! We shall not be moved!"

## Making Elite Lawyers

continued from ELITE, page 1

what it was like to be at HLS and on these students' life histories.

The following year Granfield returned to the Law School with a questionnaire he'd developed about student attitudes, career intentions, and perceptions. Granfield explained that these were randomly distributed to 800 students. After statistically analyzing the 400 that were returned, Granfield conducted several more interviews. In all, Granfield talked with more than 100 students, many of whom were active in various HLS organizations.

During the final stages of his research, Granfield returned to Northeastern, a law school quite different from HLS — particularly because of its co-op program and its public-interest and feminist character.

After explaining his methods, Granfield went on to explore one of many themes in the book. Summarizing that "it's hard to be politically conscious and upwardly mobile at the same time," Granfield went on to discuss the "fate of idealism" that he found at HLS. Emphatically stating that he didn't see going to a firm as "copping out," Granfield went on to explain that he sees these choices as rationalizations, or as ideological compromises people make.

Granfield asserted that "it's somewhat erroneous to think students are feigning idealistic goals," even though he found that the majority turned away from their original career paths and chose to enter big firms. Granfield compared the problems idealistic law students face now to what the new left students faced in the '60s — a dilemma of "making history" versus making every day life — and contended that the concept of "selling out" comes from these '60s students becoming neutral professionals.

Granfield explained that "it was this concern with selling out that preoccupied the students I studied." As students gravitated towards the big firms, they felt a discomfort which needed to be resolved. Granfield found that to solve the contradictions, students offered several motives for their eventual job choice. He continued that "in order for these justifications to work, students had to make it appear that under other

circumstances, they would have chosen something different." Granfield saw these students trying to differentiate themselves from those who "willingly" went to the big firms, "to take away the culpability." He pointed out that students helped resolve their inner conflicts by distancing themselves from the "corporate tools preparing themselves to be soldiers of capitalism . . . the Arnie Becker type." Granfield concluded that it therefore wasn't necessary for students to abandon their idealism, because they had redefined the situation in a way that enabled them to establish consistency.

Granfield said students used several strategies to explain away this seeming contradiction, the most common being: 1) loan debt, 2) they had come to believe that "social change could be sponsored from the plush area of a corporate law firm," a redefinition which Granfield asserted was done with the complicity of large firm recruiters, despite the fact that in today's business-law firm atmosphere, these opportunities are far less than students believed; 3) they had chosen a "good" firm, which Granfield found interesting since often students knew very little about what they'd actually be doing; and 4) they had effectively redefined the definition of public interest law, and "some even said that anything paying less than \$50,000 per year was public interest."

Granfield's final topic was the future of idealism in the legal profession and the role law schools might play in bringing idealism and ethics to the forefront. He views the growth of loan forgiveness programs, changing curriculums and increasing *pro bono* programs at law schools as positive signs. He also would like to see legal ethics become a more integral part of law school education, and commended Professor David Wilkins' efforts in this arena.

Robert Granfield is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Denver where he teaches courses in law, drug policy, professions and research methods. He is currently working on a second book, tentatively titled *Failed Promises: Commitment and Betrayal in the American Legal Profession*, which is the study of the ethical orientations of recent law school graduates.

## Tribe, Edley Up for DC Jobs

continued from DC, page 1

of South Dakota over hunting and fishing lands.

When asked if he was interested in the position, Tribe told the *Globe*: "Having learned I was under consideration, I could have taken myself out and I haven't done that." But he added that he had "no idea what the prospects are" for his appointment. "The fact that I decided I couldn't argue today's case doesn't mean I have inside knowledge I am likely to be selected."

Edley is an Administrative Law scholar. He served as issues director for the 1988 presidential campaign of Michael S. Dukakis '60 and was assistant director of the White House domestic policy staff during the Carter Administration. His wish to return to Washington seems to have come true.

Tribe is a Constitutional Law scholar.

His departure would further diminish the stature of the Con Law faculty, whose ranks have been reduced by Derrick Bell's dismissal earlier this year and Kathleen Sullivan's '81 impending departure.

Neither Edley nor Tribe could be reached for comment.

### Harvard University VP Picked

In addition to the two Law School professors, University Vice President John H. Shattuck, who holds the position of vice president for government, community and public affairs, has been nominated to be assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor.

Shattuck has been a volunteer leader for Amnesty International in the United States and has served on the boards of the National Security Archive, the Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts, the Petra Foundation, the Fund for Peace, and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Shattuck is an old F. O. B. (Friend of Bill), having met Clinton in the late 1960s while on a fellowship at Cambridge University in England. Clinton was attending Oxford on a Rhodes Scholarship at the time. Shattuck's wife, Ellen Hume, is senior fellow and adjunct lecturer at the Joan Shorestein Barone Center on Press, Politics and Public Policy at the Kennedy School.



John Shattuck



**Don't let this fabulous journalistic endeavor go to waste. RECYCLE!**