There’s a New Kid in Town!

The Entertainment and Sports Law Emphasis Program Takes Over the School - and is the Focus of the Law Review Symposium

- Aleksandra Sarosiek

It’s not easy being the new kid in school. After all, the cliques have collated and the teachers have picked their pets. Even the term “new kid” has a stigma negative enough to send some people into panic mode. However, Chapman’s “new kid” this year is getting quite a warm welcome from both students and faculty. That “new kid” is the Entertainment Law Emphasis Program.

Although the program was just a twinkle in the Entertainment and Sports Law Society’s eye two years ago, today the program has become wildly popular. In fact, Chapman’s twenty courses, which focus on everything from the intricacies of intellectual property law to sports law, are often waitlisted by eager students. Several distinguished professionals have even joined the ranks of Chapman faculty such as Professors Steven Krone and Kathy Heller.

To help install the new program, and honor the field, the 2008 Law Review Symposium focuses on a perpetual hot topic in the field - publicity rights. The symposium has always been an exciting event with its honorable speakers, controversial subjects, and prestigious donors. However, this year could be the most exciting symposium in Chapman’s history as the focus shifts to Entertainment Law.

Cleverly titled, “Publicity Rights in Bytes: Contemporary Issues In Entertainment & Sports Law”, the symposium boasts keynote speaker Michael Flaherty, President and Co-founder of Walden Media and academics such as UC Irvine’s Law School Dean-elect Erwin Chemerinsky.

The topic was chosen in order to showcase Chapman and attract a wide audience - which it has clearly done already. In fact, the buzz around the symposium has sparked the interest of several media outlets as well as the Orange County Bar Association. The symposium is even screening a film at the Marion Knot Studios as a grand finale to the event.

Senior Symposium Editor Kenne Zielinski and his team have been working diligently to plan and execute the symposium since May of 2007. Although the February 8th event is still three months away, many challenges lie ahead. Zielinski noted that assembling MCLE materials and finalizing topics are two major pieces of the puzzle still unfinished. However, assembling a diverse group of highly qualified panelists, the biggest challenge, is close to being completed after many meetings and correspondence.

I guess if the school is willing to throw a big party in your name, being the new kid is really not that bad.

Dicta

“Jehovah’s Witnesses are trained in street theatre.” - Professor Hewitt (Constitutional Law)

“As long as you’re acting in good faith, you can act stupidly” - Professor Hickman (Community Property)

“Hello. You have the wrong number. Okay.” - Professor Howe (Criminal Procedure)

“This person’s going to be executed long before we ever get to broccoli bugs.” - Professor Fischer (California Civil Procedure)

“You know it’s a good question when you drove them all to urinate.” - Professor Fischer (California Civil Procedure)
Entertainment Law Emphasis Program Provides a Career Advantage for Students

- Tamara Bal

Chapman’s current visiting professor, Entertainment Law Professor Steve Krone, aspires to assist Chapman’s Entertainment Law Emphasis Program so that students have an advantage when competing in the entertainment industry. Professor Krone says “The entertainment industry is an enormously vital part of the economy and America’s most important export. Moreover, the practice has become more interesting and complex on a number of fronts: rapid changes in the media landscape, related innovations in Intellectual Property Law, increasingly complex financing structures, and more.” Chapman’s Entertainment Law Emphasis Program allows law students to take advantage of its Southern California location while having an opportunity to become certified in Entertainment Law.

Currently, Chapman’s Entertainment Law Emphasis Program requires students to receive a minimum of a 2.5 overall cumulative GPA and a minimum 2.8 cumulative GPA in the Entertainment Law Emphasis Program Courses.

Two core courses must be completed: Entertainment Law and Intellectual Property. Eight additional credit hours of entertainment law-related courses must be taken. However, six of these hours may come from an Entertainment Law-related externship. Some possible externships are Fox Cable Networks, MTV, Screen Actors Guild, and Warner Brothers. (Refer to the Externship listings on TWEN for more listings and details). Additionally, the Entertainment Law Emphasis Program requires an entertainment law-related writing requirement.

Professor Krone believes that having an actual Entertainment Law Certificate will be significantly important to potential employers. Professor Krone says, “Given the heated interest in the practice area, employers are looking for some way to differentiate applicants. A strong foundation in the relevant legal subjects is one way to stand apart.”

Professor Krone speaks from many years of experience. Before coming to Chapman University, Professor Krone attended film school at USC and later attended law school at the University of Chicago. After clerking for the D.C. Circuit and the Supreme Court (for Justices William J. Brennan, Jr. and David Souter), Professor Krone joined Gang, Tyre, Ramer & Brown, a talent boutique entertainment law firm in Los Angeles. He later joined Village Roadshow Pictures where he was able to co-produce and co-finance many movies, such as The Matrix trilogy, Ocean’s 11 and Ocean’s 12, and Training Day. Professor Krone left the Village Roadshow last year to start his own motion picture finance and consulting business.

Thus, Professor Krone understands that employers will seek students who have extensive knowledge and experience in the entertainment industry. In order to assist Chapman with its Entertainment Law Emphasis Program, Professor Krone is offering a class next semester entitled Lawyers, the Law and the Legal System.

He hopes to incorporate both law and film students so that literary aspects as well as legal dilemmas can be discussed. Topics will range from cinematography to lawyer-character archetypes. Some other approved electives to be on the lookout for are: Copyright Law, Film and Television Law, Internet Law, Patents and Trade Secrets, Video Games and the Law, among others.
“I’m Just a Law Student, But...”

- Scott Ashby

No sooner had I started law school than the legal questions started pouring in. First, there were questions from a friend about fighting a traffic ticket he got for passing a school bus while the red lights were flashing.

Next was the problem my uncle faced when the builder of his backyard patio cover misplaced a light fixture, leaving a big, ugly hole in the patio cover. Then there was the problem my friend ran into when he promised to sell his airplane to one person, then sold it to someone else.

Most recently, a good friend of mine was involved in a multi-car accident and was contacted by a sleazy personal injury attorney representing another victim. Once he discovered that my friend was the first car hit, he started making all kinds of crazy representations about how much money he could get her. I am still unsure of the ethical implications of that one.

I have no doubt that many, if not all of you have been confronted with similar situations. So what should you do? First and foremost, remember that you are not an attorney.

As such, you are not licensed to practice law in the State of California (or any state for that matter). Practicing law at this point in your career would be very bad. Once you have resigned yourself to this fact, you can formulate standardized responses to your friends’ and loved ones’ legal inquiries. Here are some suggestions:

“I’m not a lawyer, so I can’t give you any legal advice.” This is a great standard response if you don’t want anything to do with this person’s problems and just want them to go away. Works great on ex-boyfriends and ex-girlfriends.

“My advice to you is to talk to an attorney.” This phrase cuts both ways. On one hand, by suggesting that they talk to an attorney, you’re letting them know that you are not an attorney. This is good. On the other hand, they may think that you’re trying to tell them that they’re screwed. Again, good phrase to use on the ex.

“I know just enough to get both of us in a lot of trouble.” My personal favorite. This works very well if you don’t want to sound ignorant. It says “I know a lot about this, but not quite enough.” You’re telling them you’re smart, but just a little unsure. “I don’t know.” This is perhaps the perfect response. It can be augmented with various facial expressions to convey regret, sadness, confusion, etc. This phrase works great on that dead-beat friend who is only looking for some sort of legal loophole in order to get away with something.

Whatever you decide to say, remember that as your legal education continues your opinion is likely to carry more and more weight. Choose your words carefully lest you wind up asking others for advice about your legal problems.
A Quick Look at the Contenders for the 2008 Presidential Election

- Darren Case

With fall final exams right around the corner, not many of us are thinking about anything besides studying. Law students often forget that the world continues to turn even though we are engulfed in our legal studies. However, with each passing day, we inch closer to the 2008 election; when many of us who have not put much thought into which candidate will get our vote, actually vote. Thus, I thought it would be a good idea to write an article informing the unaware and confused of who the contenders for the 2008 presidential election are.

So far, it looks as if there are only nine true contenders left in the field (my apologies to all of you zany Ron Paul supporters). This article is intended to give everyone a quick snapshot of each contender with links to their campaign websites so you can find out more during your study breaks.

In the blue corner, there are four viable candidates currently in the running for the Democratic Nomination: Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, John Edwards, and Bill Richardson. Certainly former vice president Al Gore would be on this list, but for whatever reason, he has repeatedly stated that he has no interest in the Oval Office. Thus, he is omitted from the discussion.

THE DEMOCRATS

Hillary Clinton
DOB: October 26, 1947
Education: Wellesley College; Yale Law School
Experience: Attorney; Law Professor; First Lady; U.S. Senator of New York
Random Fact: Clinton is the first “First Lady” elected to the United States Senate and the first woman elected statewide in New York. Also, Hillary Clinton met her husband, Bill, while in law school (so ladies, take a good look around, because you might just meet your future husband at Chapman!).

Barack Obama
DOB: August 4, 1961
Education: Columbia University; Harvard Law School
Experience: Attorney; Law Professor; State Senator of Illinois; U.S. Senator of Illinois

John Edwards
DOB: June 10, 1953
Education: North Carolina State University; University of North Carolina
Experience: Clerk for a Federal Judge; Attorney; U.S. Senator of North Carolina
Random Fact: Edwards met his wife, Elizabeth, while in law school (so gentlemen, take a good look around, because you might just meet your future wife at Chapman!).

Bill Richardson
DOB: November 15, 1947
Education: Tufts University; Tufts University (MBA)
Experience: Secretary of Energy; U.S. Representative, Ambassador to the United Nations; Governor of New Mexico
Random Fact: Richardson, born in Pasadena, CA, has nine siblings.

THE REPUBLICANS

Rudy Guiliani
DOB: May 28, 1944
Education: Manhattan College; NYU Law School
Experience: U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York; Associate Attorney General; Mayor of the City of New York; law firm partner
Random Fact: Five notorious New York mafia bosses voted on whether to kill Guiliani in the 1980s while he was a narcotics prosecutor. The final vote was 3 to 2 in favor of not killing him.

Fred Thompson
DOB: August 19, 1942
Education: University of Memphis (former Memphis State); Vanderbilt Law School
Experience: Assistant U.S. Attorney;
Serious minds on the right have spent years advocating free markets and limited government as the bedrock of a prosperous, free society. Unfortunately, these ideas are not well received when people like Ann Coulter are recklessly convincing moderates that conservatives are spiteful, mean-spirited bigots.

A casual viewer could mesh Coulter’s comments over the past year into a single odious epithet: “The Jewish widows running for President need to be perfected because they are celebrating the deaths of their husbands—and they’re fags.” Coulter obviously did not say that, but let’s look at what she did say:

First, Coulter attacked the Sept. 11 widows critical of the Bush administration when she wrote, “I’ve never seen people enjoying their husbands’ deaths so much.”

She defended this comment-published in “Godless: The Church of Liberalism”-by arguing the widows would not be receiving media attention but for their husbands’ deaths, and they are immune from criticism because America sympathizes with their tragic plight. Fair enough.

Second, Coulter told a large, televised audience at the Conservative Political Action Conference that she could not discuss Sen. John Edwards because “it turns out you have to go into rehab if you use the word faggot.” She defended this comment by claiming there should be a discussion of whether faggot is just a juvenile expression or a forbidden word resulting in sensitivity training if uttered, as was the case with “Grey’s Anatomy” star Isaiah Washington.

Finally, on live television Coulter told talk-show host Donnie Deutsch that Christians “just want Jews to be perfected.” She defended her latest statement by noting that Jewish and Christian doctrines are based on the same Old Testament premise, but Christians are essentially Jews whose faith was “perfected” by belief in Christ. Okay then.

Coulter has established a crystal clear modus operandi: (1) Devise an argument; (2) State your argument in the most offensive manner possible; (3) Play the victim while mocking your overly sensitive critics; and (4) Make a killing from enhanced book sales and public appearances.

Some people think Coulter is simply a clueless talking head who is unaware of the backlash her statements will cause. I don’t believe that for a second. She earned her bachelor’s at Cornell, and she clerked for a federal circuit court judge after earning her J.D. at the University of Michigan. She clearly has the mental faculty to statements.

Therefore, the only rational conclusion is that she intentionally seeks to offend people. I must know-what purpose is served simply by offending people? Being rude and obnoxious has never been a viable strategy for courting undecided voters. I suppose one could argue that her offensive style is redeemed by its humorous value, but that simply downgrades Coulter to an unholy chimera mixing John Stewart with Howard Stern. Ultimately, only one person truly benefits from Coulter’s remarks: Ann Coulter.

Coulter makes a killing off her book

Continued on page 12
On Thursday, October 18th, Entertainment and Sports Law Society members Lara Drew, Kristin Houg and Courtney Lewis attended the annual Sports and Entertainment Law Symposium hosted by the Sandra Day O'Connor School of Law at Arizona State University.

The topic of the symposium was ‘The Art of Representation,’ with a focus on the relationship between talent and agency. Panelists included many distinguished attorneys and an athlete.

For example, Mike Kennedy, Chairman of the 2008 Super Bowl Host Committee and Co-Founding Partner of Gallagher and Kennedy, P.A., as well as Jim Kuzmich, Vice President and General Counsel of Gaames Sports Agency, and Nona Lee, Vice President and General Counsel of the Arizona Diamondbacks, were all there to answer questions and host the discussion.

Tim Salmon, Major League Baseball Player for the Anaheim Angels from 1993-2006, Rookie of the Year in 1993 and World Series Champion in 2002 was also present to provide some insights into his career.

The presentation began with Key Note Speaker Mike Kennedy describing the process of presenting, and being awarded, a Superbowl bid. This was more of a political than legal discussion as Kennedy explained the series of ballot measures that had to be passed and tax increases that had to be implemented in the city of Glendale before the construction of a stadium which could host the Superbowl could begin.

Once the construction began, the city submitted bids for several Superbowls and was eventually awarded the 2008 Superbowl.

Kennedy says the city of Glendale hopes to establish itself as a ‘Superbowl City’ and looks forward to the increased revenue and tourism that such an event will bring to the city in the future.

Jim Kuzmich described how his agency ‘Gaames’ differs from typical Sports Agencies. Unlike other agencies, Gaames is not a ‘full service agency’ in that it does not provide its players limo rides to the airport, backstage passes to concerts, or VIP room access at popular clubs.

Kuzmich says that athletes pay a premium for such services, often increasing the agent’s percentage anywhere from 5-10%.

However, Kuzmich says his agency chooses instead to focus on negotiating contracts which, Kuzmich believes is, and should remain, an agent’s primary focus.

Finally, Tim Salmon was surprisingly knowledgeable about the specifics of both his player and agent contracts.

He attributed this to 17 years of experience playing professional baseball.

Salmon said that toward the end of his career with the Angels he was doing much of the negotiating himself and that, as a result, his agent agreed to accept a lower percentage.

Tim announced that he is currently completing his B.S. at Grand Canyon University in Phoenix but joked that, as of yet, he has no plans to earn his J.D.

Chapman’s Entertainment and Sports Law Society is planning to host a sports panel, similar to the one hosted by ASU, in the spring.

If you have suggestions for speakers or want to be involved in the planning and implementation of the event please contact Lara Drew at ellledee@yahoo.com or Courtney Lewis at court.b.lewis@gmail.com.
Queen’s Bench Networking Event

Queen’s Bench would like to thank everyone who participated in making the Fall Wine Tasting & Networking Event another smashing success! A great time was had by all and we look forward to more networking events in the future!
Life as a 1L: For Better or Worse

- Mike Razavi

When The Courier asked me to write about the 1L experience, I could not refuse because the talented Ashley Case asked me while I was stuffing a tasty slice of pepperoni pizza in my face and I thought, “I don’t want to be known as the guy that just goes to random meetings for free food.” So I took on the daunting task of providing my reflections as a 1L.

I should let you know that I am probably not the best person to present the life of a 1L. I have been out of the educational plantation for nearly three years and I recently returned from Thailand, where I taught SAT classes for The Princeton Review Bangkok. I enjoyed earning a western gorgeous neighbors.

Unfortunately, the little voice in my head told me that my life wasn’t on the right track and I did what anybody does when the voice says “get it together,” I applied to law school. I returned to my parent’s home and my awesome twin bed with Lion King sheets and I facetiously thought, “Now the girls will know who the king of the jungle is”. Two days after I returned, I attended orientation.

At orientation, I was jet lagged and I could not fully appreciate the words of encouragement, the gist of which was: eat lots of peanut butter and jelly sandwiches so you don’t go broke, be nice to your peers because they may have power over you some day, and lift the giant $800 stack of books with your legs, not with your back because the school is not liable for your injuries.

We also learned that law school will probably be the three most hellish years of our lives and that some lucky bloke to our left or right will probably have the opportunity to live the rest of his life as a normal person, instead of counting tortuous acts while watching whichever shoddy Van Damme movie it is that I’m watching as I write this.

My anxieties were not alleviated during orientation, but I did get a feel for speaking in front of 600 people when I got up to answer a question during the prosecution v. defense simulation.

I don’t remember exactly what I said, only that it had something to do with overweight drunk women on boats with sub-standard metal poles. The rush I felt from speaking in front of over 600 of my fellow students was uncanny and it actually made me look forward to my first day of law school.

The first day of law school was just like the first day of high school, we came into class filled with excitement and curiosity while we checked out our classmates and picked out the ones that were super hot. We took our desired seats, and thanks to the advice of some wise 2Ls, I avoided sitting in spots certain professors are known to call on.

I think the first week of class was the only class in which we actually briefed every case for every class because as time progressed, I noticed more and more students pulling briefs from the internet or reading from High Courts. I opted to take on book briefing and typing out rule statements with some assistance from supplements.

On the first day we were all grunting like monkeys to catch the attention of our beloved professors; we desperately wanted to impress them with our knowledge. It was an amusing show of pedantry that we couldn’t help engage in because we wanted to play the game of “show up your fellow students” and more importantly, we wanted our participation points.

What are my overall impressions of law school? (I hate rhetorical questions, but I have 300 pages of reading to attend to with some intense flash carding to work on). Law school has killed my libido and made me feel out of shape and unhealthy. I tried to maintain my regular work-out routine, but the work load just became more and more cumbersome and I had to scrap my Friday bike treks to the beach.

I have experienced nights with few hours of sleep trying to figure out personal jurisdiction and days that have killed any sense of pride after being patronized by professors.

On the other hand, I’ve met some great new friends and hard working people who are truly inspirational. Free lunches offer opportunities to network and meet future job prospects.

I’m fortunate to have Property with Professor Parlow, whose attention and care for his students is unlike any other and his love for his job keeps me motivated to work harder. I could have the big deluxe apartment in the skies of Bangkok, but I feel a greater sense of accomplishment knowing that 5 year olds can be sued for battery and that a contract made under the influence of alcohol is still a valid contract.

I’m sure I haven’t encapsulated the life of the general 1L population, but there is a great video on www.youtube.com entitled “Law School Musical” which epitomizes our experiences and struggles. I close this article urging all of you to take 3 minutes out of your busy schedules to watch this video.

Good night and Godspeed.
The next social tort to be discussed is something that has happened to all of us at least once. It happens when you’re talking to that cutie you’ve had your eye on for awhile, things are going fabulously, and suddenly someone else enters the picture.

It doesn’t matter who the person is, all that matters is that this third wheel has done or said something that completely killed the moment for you, and the only thing going through your mind at that instant is, “WHY IS THIS PERSON SALTING MY GAME?!?”

I’m sure some of you first heard of game salting/throwing salt/salting [another’s] game on “The O.C.,” however, the term was in use long before Seth Cohen came around.

It is believed to have originated in Sir-Mix-A-Lot’s song, “You Can Have Her,” and it is one of the most pervasive social torts.

**LUSIO SALSURA (“GAME SALT-ING”)**

1) Generally: The doctrine of lusio salsura gives the plaintiff the chance to prove that they were unable to seal the deal with someone they were attempting to spit game at. The doctrine also creates the inference that, even without a precise showing of how the defendant behaved, the defendant was probably throwing salt in their game, and this game salting resulted in the plaintiff being unable to seal the deal with the third party.

2) Requirements:
   a) Seldom occurring without salt throwing: P has the burden of demonstrating that the lack of deal sealing does not normally occur except through the throwing of salt by another.
   b) Exclusive control of D: P must demonstrate that the thrown salt, which caused the harm, was within the exclusive control of D (i.e., P must prove that D is the person who salted P’s game).
   c) Not due to P: P must establish that the lack of deal sealing was probably not due to P’s own conduct.
   d) Effect of lusio salsura: Usually, the effect of lusio salsura is to permit an inference that D was throwing salt in P’s game - even though there is no direct evidence of intentional salt throwing. When lusio salsura is used, P has met his burden of production and the issue may go to the jury.

4) “But For” Salt Throwing Premise: Lusio salsura creates a presumption that but for D’s salt throwing, P would have sealed the deal with the third party.
   a) Therefore, if D can prove that P had no game, P’s lusio salsura claim is lost since the salting of nonexistent game is impossible,
   b) Irrelevant Salt Throwing: If D can prove that regardless of D’s actions, P still would not have sealed the deal with the third party, P’s claim is lost.
   i) Third Party Testimony: If D asserts the defense that P would not have sealed the deal with the third party regardless of D’s actions, some jurisdictions may require that the third party, or person at whom salt was being thrown, be called to testify about the possible deal sealing or lack thereof.
Attending a professional school involves not only the task of learning the various subjects’ substantive information, but also affords us the opportunity to develop our interpersonal skills and professional acumen. As aspiring lawyers we already face an uphill battle with respect to the public’s perception of our profession and its practitioners. Moral turpitude and ethics aside, as law students, our job is to build a foundation for not only our knowledge, but our professional reputations as well. There is every chance that the person sitting across the aisle from you in class today will be a future partner, associate, adversary or judge. Therefore, the manner in which you conduct yourself today may well have repercussions well into your future.

As a qualifier, we exist in a diverse community here at Chapman Law, and all of us bring our own unique experiences and understanding of what constitutes professional conduct.

Common courtesy goes a long way. Your bad day is not everyone else’s problem. The law school experience requires us to work amongst our peers in many ways. Group projects, common spaces and finite research source materials force us to interact with not only the familiar faces, but the strangers as well.

When you find yourself interacting with students or staff unfamiliar to you, remember the trite yet valid golden rule. Treat others the way you yourself would like to be treated. Your professors may be boring, but they did not get to be a professor by winning the lottery.

Having published, or distinguished themselves in a field of practice, they have earned the right to be spoken to with deference, so do so. Our facilities are among the finest in the nation. It would be great if we treated them that way. Leave the common areas the way you would like to find them (yes, I am talking about the refrigerators). If you spill something, it is your job to clean it up. Trash belongs in the trash cans, not the tables, sinks, counters or the floor. Now that we have mastered the basics, it is time for the tough stuff. Professional conduct means more than suits and ties. You may have been the superstar on the debate team, the 4.2 valedictorian, or captain of every club on your undergrad campus, but that is not license to be the center of universe.

When you interact with others, remember, they have earned the right to be here just as you did. It is your duty to listen when others speak, to show respect and sensitivity to what others have to say (even if it is the stupidest thing you have ever heard).

If you choose to distinguish yourself by participating in a club or serving on a board, please remember that your actions are in a representative capacity. You are not the center of everyone else’s universe, and we are not all interested in the vagaries of your personality.

If you choose to distinguish yourself through board membership, note that certain duties are inextricably linked with that position. For example, playing well with others is not an option - it is a requirement. Now is the time to practice the basics. Introduce yourself at every opportunity. “Thank you”, “please” and “you’re welcome” are timeless classics. Use them and flourish. Again, the reputation you establish today may save your rear or your career tomorrow.

---

**The Law Counselor: Serving up the Truth with a Side of Sass**

The Law Counselor answers your love, life, and law school questions in each edition of the Courier. If you are in need of wisdom and sage advice, email the Counselor at dearcounseloradvice@gmail.com. All question submissions will be posted anonymously.

Dear Counselor,

Two years ago, I had a summer fling with a guy I met out of state. After I returned home, he called and emailed me many times, but I never returned his calls or emails. I didn’t think much of it until I saw him in my Torts class, my Contracts class, my Property class… What should I do, it’s so awkward!!?

Sincerely,

Majorly Mortified

Dear Majorly Mortified,

I think you should go out with him. He’s really a sweet guy with a big heart, and that time you spent together meant a lot to him. He doesn’t understand why you never returned his calls. You obviously had a good time with him, so what’s the deal?

And don’t start calling him a stalker or anything because if you remember, it was HIM that told YOU about HIS PLANS to go to law school at Chapman. So if anyone is the stalker it’s YOU.

But forget all of that. He’ll call you tomorrow to talk about it. You should definitely go out with him. His mom really wants to meet you.

XOXO,

The Counselor
Grad watch 2007: A Campus in Turmoil!

-- By Scott Ashby and Avi Phillips

May 17, 2008: disaster waiting to happen...or happiest day of our lives? With the law school campus firmly entrenched in non-stop partying, one subject remains at the front of the minds of an entire one-third of Chapman Law students: what will come of their graduation? A one-day event, capping off three years of dedication and hard work, has turned into a maelstrom of thinly-veiled threats and outrage. The battle lines have clearly been drawn.

Opponents of the Saturday night ceremony point to frigid mid-May temperatures. Indeed, according to Weather Underground (www.wunderground.com), May 17th can be extremely cruel. The statistics don’t lie: the average low is a bone-chilling 56 degrees. Add to that precipitation averaging 0.01 inches, and the truth becomes clear - historically, May 17th is an angry day.

Others point to the disastrous traffic that holding back-to-back ceremonies would create. Campus-crippling gridlock seems inevitable as cars and human bodies will collide in a cacophony of crowding the likes of which the city of Orange has never seen. Nothing short of a complete revolt and refusal to graduate appears to be the likely outcome.

Still others have no complaints at all. One unnamed student posited the age-old question, “Who cares?” This sentiment seems to be shared by more than a few. A recent impromptu poll of a segment of the 3L population revealed that 75% will be “happy just to be graduating.”

Solutions have been proposed, but little headway has been made between the warring factions. It is uncertain at this point what the future will hold. However, one thing is for sure in the Battle of the Ceremony: we will all be happy when it is over.

Update: As of this publication, the date, time and place of graduation have been elected based on both popular and electoral vote (so any appeal would be moot) - Saturday, May 17, 2008, at 7:30 p.m. in the stadium on main campus. Let the countdown begin!

Investing Your Money the Smart and Profitable Way

-- By Matthew Holm

Are you going to be an attorney? If so, you’re probably going to be generating a substantial income. With great income comes great responsibility, including a proper investment strategy.

No matter what your investment experience, following a few simple rules can put you ahead of the pack. Whether you’re Warren Buffett managing Berkshire Hathaway Inc. or Gary Coleman calling 1-800-CASH-NOW, you can devise an investment plan to put you on the road to success!

The first step is to determine your short- and long-term financial goals. This includes consistently reviewing your goals for any changes.

The second step is to ask yourself whether you are saving and investing sufficient sums to fund your short- and long-term goals.

By defining goals that are time and dollar specific, you can regularly assess if you are on the right track to reaching them.

Once you develop a plan, you must have discipline. You must remove your emotions when it comes to your stock portfolio.

A Chapman University School of Law student who has had experience as a financial advisor (we won’t reveal the identity of this student, we’ll just call him Pegan Rederson) said, “People called up to buy stocks on an impulse all the time. I had to talk them out of buying some random stock they overheard was going to shoot through the roof the next day. Basically, people are stupid.”

According to another student whom we’ll call “Habe Gousto,” who has been in the thick of things, it couldn’t be more important to stick to your plan and not get caught up with emotions. Gousto said, “I did really well in the trading pits, but I saw one guy who lost on a trade after waving his ticket, then he had a heart attack. He died right there on the trading floor.”

Everyone wants to know how to invest their money correctly; a question I once posed to an old, mega-successful, grey haired, financial advisor. He looked over both shoulders to see if anyone was looking, then he put his hand next to his mouth so no one could hear and whispered the secret to investing; “Buy low, sell high.”
**Send Holiday Care Packages to our Troops Overseas**

The Chapman Law Courier is looking for donations and/or sponsorship from both individuals and groups to send care packages to our troops overseas.

If you are donating items, please include items that our troops may want/need (for example, food, games, personal items, etc.)

- Please be aware that all items sent must be of a non-perishable nature that will not be damaged by heat, as packages may take over 2 weeks to reach the troops and could be in temperatures in excess of 100 Degrees.
- Furthermore, the United States Postal Service prohibits mailing the following items:
  - Obscene articles (pictures, paintings, cards, films, videotapes, etc.)
  - Any matter depicting nude or seminude persons, pornographic or sexual items, or non-authorized political materials
  - Bulk quantities of religious materials contrary to the Islamic faith.
  - Items for the personal use of the recipient are permissible
  - Pork or pork by-products

Donations will be accepted through November 29. Care packages will be assembled on November 30. Contact Ashley Case at ashleycase1982@gmail.com for further details.

Finally, if you have family or friends that are currently serving in the Armed Forces overseas, please let us know so that we can send them a package too!

---

**Ann Coulter, continued from page 5**

sales and public appearances. She even earns upwards of $50,000 per speech.

The reason she is in such high demand is because she is always in the media spotlight, and she would not be there if not for her inflammatory statements. People buy Coulter’s books and watch her on television for the same reason they listen to Howard Stern on the radio: they want to hear what she’ll say next. Again-more like a shock jock than a legitimate pundit.

Coulter may gain infamy and fortune through her remarks, but she does incalculable damage to the credibility of the conservative movement. For better or worse, Coulter is widely perceived as a symbol of conservatism. Unfortunately, rather than representing the best conservatism has to offer, she (intentionally) reinforces all the negative stereotypes about conservatives. If we are in the business of advocating our ideas, then Coulter is unequivocally bad for business.

Some argue that the negative public reaction to her comments is irrelevant because people judge ideas on their merits, rather than on the merits of their messenger. The problem is that if the messenger is perceived as lacking credibility (or likeability), then no one is going to listen to the message or give it any credence.

Imagine being approached at the mall by a vendor with rotten teeth and tattered clothes; he could be selling the product of your dreams, but you would never know that because you probably wouldn’t give him the time of day.

Consequently, if young people and other political novices, who are forming their ideologies, read about the latest statement made by the so-called “conservative diva,” they are probably not going to give conservative ideas much of a chance.

Therefore, those who defend Coulter encounter a glaring contradiction: they praise Coulter’s latest commentary and laugh about how many people she’s offended . . . and then they wonder why mainstream America doesn’t give conservatism its due credit.

Well, folks, if we want people to take our ideas seriously, then why don’t we support more credible messengers? Let’s support people who clearly and thoughtfully explain our ideas to the masses, rather than those who unleash vitriolic sound bites about John Edwards or the Sept. 11 widows.

Conservatism is a commendable ideology, and it deserves its day in the court of public opinion. However, so long as Coulter symbolizes the conservative movement, she will always hinder its efforts.

Therefore, let’s treat Coulter not as a diva, but as the pariah she deserves to be. She is like a narcotic: pleasurable to the conservative base, but detrimental to the health of the movement. I think it’s about time for conservatives to kick the addiction and prove to the country that conservatism deserves respect.