of contention with AWC, however. Another element of the RFP's opposition stemmed from AWC's role as a pregnancy crisis cen-
ter.

As Ensor explained the group's position, "AWC itself takes serious liberties with the facts about reproductive health and free-
time." Initially, Jueds was alerted to AWC's pamphlets by a fellow Harvard Law School student. When Jueds read the brochures, she was alarmed. "I was not impressed with the level of professionalism. I was just impressed with the level of bias," she said. "I was not impressed with the level of professionalism. I was just impressed with the level of bias," she said. "I was not impressed with the level of professionalism. I was just impressed with the level of bias," she said. "I was not impressed with the level of professionalism. I was just impressed with the level of bias," she said.

"The man was told that he would receive the restaurants from whom AWC had solicited ad-

fers. However, SLLR and some attendees of Culture Shock viewed the offering of free AWC food as more of an under-
handed tactic. "Telling people at restaur-
ants that this is to make them feel good is wrong, cowardly and stupid," said Scott Jone's.

On Friday before Culture Shock, Jueds accompanied Lara Stemple '99 and a young man unaffiliated with HLS to the offices of AWC in Dorchester. Though Stemple was unable to pose as a preg-
nant female of childbearing age, the sexual component of the RFP's handout was apparent. "It's quite a long adver-
tisement," said Russell. "Because the RFP's handout hedged on the truth."

The motivations behind RFP's actions, according to RFP's action coordinator, were respectful. "I did not find them to be hostile," she said. "I was very uncomfortable with the idea of RFP's ad-

sengers, Jueds expressed empathy for the turmoil surrounding Culture Shock. "It's possible to come to the wider attention of culture shockers and I think that's what happened. I think they knew who was getting the money," she said. "We have been encouraged and proud of the attendance," said Webber.

A Culture of Discord

Culture Shock raised more than $2000 to be split evenly between AWC and the Waltham Support Committee for Battered Women. Despite the protests and refund applica-
tions, Jueds expressed empathy for the fundraiser. "RFP respects SLLR's right to make its point, even if they don't agree with it," said Jueds. "All that we wanted to do was to make an issue out of this, so that they knew that we were getting the money," she explained.

"All that we wanted to do was to make an issue out of this, so that they knew that we were getting the money," she explained.

The motivations behind RFP's actions, according to RFP, were respectful. "I did not find them to be hostile," she said. "I was very uncomfortable with the idea of RFP's advertisement, but I was sure that it was not intended to be doing any harm," she said. "I was very uncomfortable with the idea of RFP's advertisement, but I was sure that it was not intended to be doing any harm," she said. "I was very uncomfortable with the idea of RFP's advertisement, but I was sure that it was not intended to be doing any harm," she said. "I was very uncomfortable with the idea of RFP's advertisement, but I was sure that it was not intended to be doing any harm," she said.

"I don't see [AWC] as an anti-choice organization," said Bazan. "From what I under-

stand, they help women who have made a choice — the choice to keep their babies."
Dersh Says He’ll Use Dildo for Civil Disobedience

Continued from S.E.X. p. 1

year after Mary Jo Frug was brutally murdered in a Cambridge parking lot. “Harvard Law School is the last place I expect to find such a code,” Silverglate said. “It is like setting up a trap for students.”

The paradox of Frug’s article was written in an overly mystique tone and contained references to the death of Frug and her murderer. The article also included sub-

stantial criticism of Frug’s article and berated the Review for publishing it in print.

Prof. David Kennedy ‘80 filed Adminis-

tration charges against the parody authors and the Review’s editorial staff. But the Board refused to discipline the students on the grounds that the govern-

ing statement of rights and responsibilities of the students had been violated in the anti-war demonstrations of the 1960s did not provide any rules or stan- dards that applied to their behavior.

Silverglate, who referred to himself as “a free-speech absolutist,” criticized the Ad Board’s resolution saying that it should have denounced the attempt to curb stu-
dents’ rights of free expression, rather than accept it as evidence that the school had to create rules to fit the perceived violation. The faculty and administration ultimately accepted the administration’s statement.

As a result, the students could be expelled for sexual harassment guidelines, which were never passed.

The faculty’s objections to the pro-
posed policy were never made public, but a Rich Dershowitz, a member of the faculty, wrote, “Your sentiments have been echoed by many professors expressed concern that the proposed guidelines were too broad and would chill speech.

Keep Your Enemies Closer

Although distribution of the Review was limited to members of the Law Review and a few others, copies of the Frug parody were soon leaked out to the community at-large.

The student authors soon found them- selves on the defensive as a result of the outpouring of fury. Posters were put up around campus with the photos and names of the editors and authors who would be clerking, urging students to contact the judges regarding the fracas.

The student authors soon found them- selves on the defensive as a result of the outpouring of fury. Posters were put up around campus with the photos and names of the editors and authors who would be clerking, urging students to contact the judges regarding the fracas.

member of the Ad Board, nor has he at-
tended any of the Board’s hearings regard-

ing the Elster affair.

FRHD sources are not aware of any plans to recommend permanent expulsion for the rape.

The College expels students for aca-
demic misconduct but not for criminal misconduct. It generally allows “violent” situations to be dealt with in the absence of a criminal court, but it does not consider rape to be a “violent” crime, sources said.

Thus, a student could be expelled for cheating on an exam, but a student convicted of rape would not face the same punishment.

The note is expected to be held Tues-
day evening at a location which will not be disclosed to the public.

Hypocritical? Moi?

Silverglate said that his opposition to speech codes stems not only from “First Amendment absolutism” but also from concern that they violate the principle of equal protection.

“These codes only outlaw offensive speech if it bothers them, blacks, His-

panics, gays or any other group that gets admitted to the list,” he said. “Ohmousous views that bother others are not prosecutable.”

He criticized setting standards for punishment and the need for a “chilling effect on speech.”

“The history of the fight for equality and decency since the Civil War has been the fight for equality under the law for everyone regardless of blood and genes,” he said. “Giving people different status based on their characteristics was prevalent under Jim Crow and the days before women’s suffrage.”

According to Silverglate, the Left is leading the charge against the principle of equal protection.

The social consensus that people should be treated equally under the law is being undermined by those who pass speech codes purporting to protect the categories listed in the code,” he said. “Those who are not protected will end up getting re-
sentful and cynical, and their devotion to equality under the law will be diminished. This is corrosive. It undermines 150 years of progress for making a more decent so-
ciety.”

Silverglate recognizes that equality under the law is not translated into equal-
ity in fact, but challenges the use of speech restrictions to bring about that equality.

“I am convinced that where we need to in terms of equality because we have ut-
terly failed to educate young, poor chil-
dren,” he said. “Harvard faculty members can do more to promote equality by send-

ing their own kids to public schools.”
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A Case Against the Sexual Harassment Guidelines

I am not a free speech fundamentalist. Nor do I identify with those that consider themselves tyrannized by the forces of political correctness (though I am a libertarian, I think that Harvard Law School does not need to have sexual harassment guidelines. I am not going to rehash the free-speech critique, which has been rendered much more eloquently and convincingly by others before me. Instead, I support the rationale of the Guidelines. The sexualization of women and psychological and physical intimidation of girls and lesbians is pervasive and troubling phenomena, even in relatively enlightened communities such as our own.

Rather, I don’t like the Guidelines because they provide the wrong solution to the problem. Violators are being bailed into Byzantine Ad Board proceedings, the results of which could place their academic and professional futures in jeopardy. The goal is not to make the perpetrators understand what they did wrong or why it was wrong, but to punish them. I am even cynical enough to suspect that an ancillary goal is to ensure that the conduct is kept behind closed doors so as to avoid generating the kind of controversy that tainted HLS in the newspapers and the Senate.

But administrative terrorism has no educational value whatsoever, and should be viewed as highly suspect as an academic institution. By abdicating responsibility for educating those who need it most to the Administrative Board, the Law School community has endorsed the shoddiest kind of pedagogy — that which accomplishes its goals by spanking and forcing people to write slogans on a chalkboard.

If a person or group of people is creating a hostile environment, they and not the Ad Board should be held accountable. In such a case, it is tempting to try and deal with the problem anonymously through third parties. But the Ad Board is the enforcement arm of a $12 billion corporation, and its interests may not coincide with the problem anonymously through third parties. But the Ad Board is the enforcement arm of a $12 billion corporation, and its interests may not coincide...

While I may be able to understand, but not agree with, the central argument of Stuart Buck’s article “Dershowitz’s Bigotry,” Mr. Buck has clearly displayed his own ignorance and prejudice by equating fundamentalist Christianity with Orthodoxy Judaism. “The two monistic religions which are thoroughly nearly nothing in common. I would be willing to stipulate that this point further, but I do not believe that the reader would understand the printed page as the appropriate forum for such a potentially sensitive topic.

Moreover, Mr. Buck’s premise is incorrect. Prof. Dershowitz did not call “fundamentalist Christianity” evil, he called “fundamentalism” evil, which is fully evident from the quote that Mr. Buck chose to attack. Waterstone’s is a much better bet to provide support to a victimized student. Or a person could turn to friends, faculty, peer groups and student organizations. I find it difficult to believe that a person would not vote without administrative approval.

The Guidelines are just one more link in the administrative chains that hold down personal initiative. I think that students and faculty should be trusted with the responsibility of ensuring, through their own action, an open and friendly academy of sexual and racial harmony. Law School’s goal is to educate, it will encourage everyone to discuss and understand the underlying purposes of the Sexual Harassment Guidelines, instead of putting them in our Hark Boxes (from where they make the short trip to the bins) and requiring blind obedience.

— Ben Lehrer

Dersh to Buck: Read My Books

Stuart Buck falsely accuses me of anti-Christianty because of my attack on fundamentalists who seek to impose their theistic beliefs on others. I am equally appalled at Harvard fundamentalists. Muslim fundamentalists and others who refuse to think for themselves and refuse to allow the rest of us to think for ourselves.

Dersh displays his ignorance when he describes fundamentalism as “a set of Christian beliefs.” Fundamentalism is not any more Christian than it is Jewish or Muslim. It reflects the views of a tiny percentage of unthinking members of both of such faiths, and of some of the same faith, who refuse to think for themselves. I believe it is evil to advocate the staining of the glories, the mistreatment of women and other forms of bigotry justified by recours to a literal reading of the Bible. I also believe that it is evil to blow up abortion clinics, murder abortion doctors, assassinate the Prime Minister of Israel or put out a contract on Salman Rushdie, the basis of an illegal ideological commandment.

I call evil what they are and not to engage in bigotry. I have criticized anti-enviromentalists, those who oppose a woman’s right to a safe abortion, and those on the radical right, without regard to their religion. Indeed, I have been especially critical of Jewish fundamentalists, as Buck calls them.

When I read Mr. Buck’s book I was disappointed to find that if he had read my book The Vanishing American Jew. It is Buck who engages in bigotry and mendacity by attempting to label me as having a particular perspective of case sensitivity.

Passing the Fundamentalist Buck

Whole is most likely, however, that Prof. Dershowitz was referring to fundamentalist Christianity, that would be mere speculations. If any of Mr. Buck’s unproductive attacks be considered, he is critical of Jewish fundamentalists, most likely not referring to the whole of fundamentalist Christianity, but rather the movement’s particular political agendas. Now, in the scope of political debate, reasonable minds might differ as to whether the political agenda of “fundamentalism” is evil. This is also not to say that I would make the same mistake of demeaning one set of political beliefs to Jewish Fundamentalism, as everyone would agree that to do so would be the kind of sweeping generalization that Buck would know to avoid.

Seth Persily
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he recent arrest by the Turkish government of Kurdish rebel
leader Abdullah Ocalan generated a great deal of inter-

c
t

temporary all over the world. Much of the
discussion by pundits and politicians hinges
on their side, but when they do, the argu-
ments tend to be quite unconvincing.

First of all, they argue, nothing can jus-
tify the slaughter of innocent people.
This point, while intuitively compelling, sim-
dply doesn't work. We don't have to count
the Maoists and the Vietnamese who died in
Tokyo, Hiroshima and Baghdad in order to
make the point that we are quite pre-
pared to accept the deaths of civilians in the
pursuit of some important goal. We don't talk
about our war heroes killing inno-
cent people; we talk about the bravery they
demonstrate in risking their lives to
fight for justice and democracy. Yet when
terrorist groups face the same risks in pursuit of the same goals,
we vilify them.

All right, the argument goes, we can
collective deaths, but only states
are allowed to resort to this sort of
effectiveness. It should be noted that no specific grad-
ing scale was prescribed in the survey
questionnaire. Survey grade responses were assigned numerical values on
a 4.3 scale (an A received 4.3 points, an A-
point, and so on). The responses were then
totaled and averaged, and rounded to the
nearest tenth, and then converted back
to a letter grade.

Students were instructed to assign
overall grades to each of their own
professors based on lack of clarity of presentation, inabil-
ity to foster strong class discussions, and a lack of clarity in class presen-
tations "lacked clarity" and "distracted and unpre-
rententious." Students wrote that Prof.
Slaughter demonstrated a strong interest in the subject,
deserved a B+ and served as a model for other professors.

Section 4 Grades:

Donahue B

Slaughter B+

Hans K

Slaughter B

Section 3 Grades:

Michelman A-

Profs. Miller and Meltzer re-
ceived high praise from stu-
dents. They praised Miller's ef-
cfective Socratic presentation
and its ability to foster stronger class discussions while
staying focused on the course syllabus and subject, as well as
Meltzer's use of teaching assistants.

Section 2 students assigned higher
grades to professors who were highly accessible
during the semester, and also observed
that Michelman was "the best I can imag-
inated strong interest in the course sy-
llabus and subject, as well as
Meltzer's use of teaching assistants.

Section 2 students assigned higher
grades to professors who were highly accessible
outside of class and responsive to student needs.

Prof. Michelman was portrayed as "in-
credibly responsive," "clear," "engaging,"
and very organized; one student stated that Michelman had a "great command of the Socratic
method, greater integration of case
treadings into lectures, and increased participation which would help improve the
effectiveness of a course.

Section 3 students assigned higher
grades to professors who were clear in
their presentation, very accessible, dem-
strated a strong interest in the subject,
were very organized, and elicited class
participation from students. Students
wrote that Prof. Stunts was "very engag-
ing, "readily accessible," "fantastic," and "ex-
ceptionally clear." One student noted that
Stunts showed that he "loved what he was doing" and "went above and
beyond the call of duty" in inspiring inde-
dependent thought.
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