



# FRATERNAL LAW™

A fraternity law periodical  
published by Manley, Burke & Fischer,  
A Legal Professional Association

November 1988

Number 26

## DEALING WITH EATING DISORDERS

**B**etween five and ten percent of adolescent and young women suffer some form of eating disorder. The rate at which the medical profession has failed to cure eating disorders and the death rate caused by eating disorders are among the highest of all psychiatric disorders. It is a problem that virtually every chapter of a women's group must recognize and understand.

An excellent monograph, "Focus on Eating Disorders," by David B. Herzog, M.D., Director, Eating Disorders Unit, Massachusetts General Hospital, and Associate Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, has been published by Park Row Publishers (1987).

Anorexia is literally "a nervous loss of appetite." Young women who suffer from this are threatened with grave health damage from failure to receive enough nourishment through normal consumption of food. Their weight loss is literally life threatening. For mysterious reasons, perhaps because of the strong cultural influence on slimness, victims of this disease perceive themselves as being obese when they are grossly undernourished and underweight. Their friends see them as emaciated, frail and bizarrely skinny. They see themselves as fat and sloppy.

---

**It totally disregards the fact that the member of the chapter is the victim of a very serious and mysterious disease.**

---

The bulimia victim engages in binge eating, followed regularly by self-induced vomiting, the inordinate use of laxatives, strict dieting or fasting, or vigorous exercise in order to prevent weight gain.

Both of these diseases are primarily diseases of young women, but various estimates have suggested that between four and fourteen percent of the anorectic population is male.

The member of the fraternity chapter who suffers from either of these ailments (or from both of these ailments at the same time) can be a disruptive influence in a chapter house. This disruption can manifest itself in several ways:

- Victims of eating disorders often have difficulties in relationships with their families and their close friends.
- Bulimics may steal food from a house kitchen, disrupting the food budget and the kitchen management.

- A bulimic's self-induced vomiting does not always happen in the bathroom, but elsewhere.

- People whose health is severely jeopardized by excessive dieting often lack the energy to perform their academic responsibilities or their responsibilities to the chapter.

How does a chapter deal with someone who has an eating disorder? Several approaches have been tried. None has been satisfactory. Before evaluating these approaches it is important to focus on the reality that the medical profession has been notably unsuccessful in its efforts to treat people suffering from either of these diseases.

The following approaches have been tried: the hard-nosed approach; loving support; quasi-guardianship; probation induced self-reliance.

The *hard-nosed approach* treats the chapter member as though she were not suffering from a medical problem. If she steals food from the kitchen, treat it like any other disciplinary problem of theft in the house. If she makes a mess in an area of the house through self-induced vomiting, treat it like any other violation of house rules. If normal disciplinary proceedings call for expulsion from the chapter or expulsion from the fraternity, do it. Ignore the medical problem. This approach is cruel, inhuman and probably no chapter has the fortitude to use it. It also totally disregards the fact that the member of the chapter is the victim of a very serious and mysterious disease.

*Loving support* is an approach that is diametrically opposed to the previous one. In this situation the chapter rallies around the member who has the eating disorder and provides her with reassurance and support, nursing care and coddling. This makes some people feel good and others feel resentful. It does not solve the problem; it may even make it easier for the victim of the disease to continue to fail to deal with the problem. With the high mortality rate for victims of anorexia, this can be a dangerous and even life-threatening approach.

*Quasi-guardianship* is an approach whereby the chapter meets with the victim and informs her of the disruptive nature of her behavior. It is explained that the behavior would normally lead to prompt disciplinary action, but because the chapter leadership recognizes that she is the victim of a serious disease a decision has been made to forego normal disciplinary procedures until after a fair opportunity has been provided for supervised medical-psychiatric care. The plan is that the chapter member with the eating disorder must agree to attend regular sessions with a psychiatrist

or a clinical psychologist who specializes in eating disorders. In order to make sure that she attends, another member of the chapter agrees to escort her to and from each of the sessions. She will have a fixed period of time to solve her problem, perhaps three months. At the end of this time, the matter will be evaluated. If her conduct has changed, then the matter will be closed. If not, the chapter will proceed with appropriate disciplinary action, terminating her residence in the house and perhaps her membership in the fraternity. The problem with this approach is that it never works. Any psychiatrist who receives mandated referrals from the courts or from any other agency knows by experience that psychiatric treatment under those conditions simply is ineffective.

*Probation induced self-reliance* is the approach that has more promise of success than the others. It is a combination of the desirable elements of the other three approaches in such a way as to avoid some deficiencies of the other approaches. It involves a confrontation with the victim of the eating disorder and an explanation that her behavior is disruptive to the house and could lead to termination of her residence in the house and perhaps termination of her membership in the fraternity. The member is then given a list of agencies and professionals specializing in eating disorders from whom she can obtain help. It is explained that the chapter does not want to intervene in her personal affairs, but the chapter cannot have disruptive conduct in the house. She is then given a period of time to find a solution to the problem.

Recently the definition of eating disorders in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (American Psychiatric Ass'n., 3d Edition, 1980, pp. 69-71) has been revised. The draft revision is as follows:

## EATING DISORDERS OF ADOLESCENCE AND ADULTHOOD

### 307.10 ANOREXIA NERVOSA

A. Refusal to maintain body weight over a minimal normal weight for age and height, e.g., weight loss leading to maintenance of body weight 15% below expected; failure to make expected weight gain during period of growth, leading to body weight 15% below expected.

B. Intense fear of becoming obese, even when underweight.

C. Disturbance in the way in which one's body weight, size, or shape is experienced, e.g., the individual claims to "feel fat" even when emaciated, believes that one area of the body is "too fat" even when obviously underweight.

D. In females, absence of at least three consecutive menstrual cycles when otherwise expected to occur (primary or secondary amenorrhea). (A woman is considered to have amenorrhea if her periods occur only following hormone, e.g., estrogen, administration.)

### 307.51 BULIMIA NERVOSA

A. Recurrent episodes of binge eating (rapid consumption of a large amount of food in a discrete period of time).

B. During the eating binges there is a feeling of lack of control over the eating behavior.

C. The individual regularly engages in either self-induced vomiting, use of laxatives, strict dieting, fasting, or vigorous exercise in order to prevent weight gain.

D. A minimum average of two binge-eating episodes per week for at least three months.

E. Persistent overconcern with body shape and weight.

### 307.50 EATING DISORDER NOS

This is a residual category for eating disorders that do not meet the criteria for a specific eating disorder.

As far as the chapter is concerned, the problem is her disruptive conduct, not her medical disorder. One approach she may undertake to solve that problem is to seek and utilize effective medical care. By placing the burden on her, the patient is forced to recognize that there is a problem and that there are dire consequences of failure to deal with it.

The member is given a time limit within which to straighten out her disruptive behavior. It is strongly suggested that without medical care she will never meet the time limit. Three months is probably a fair time limit. It can be broken up into phases. For example, a scheduled conference with her could be arranged every two weeks to review the progress in terms of her conduct in the house. This could carry with it the understanding that if there is absolutely no improvement in six weeks, the probationary period will terminate after six weeks, rather than three months.

Obviously, caution must be taken to avoid invading the privacy of an eating disorder victim. Most college students are legally adults and the fraternity does not have the privilege to disclose private information to others, even if the purpose is to be helpful. The others to whom disclosure may be a violation of the member's right to privacy include parents, faculty and administration. However, awareness and involvement by parents and other family members is essential in the process of successful treatment.

As with every situation where expulsion from the house or expulsion from the fraternity is being considered it is important to remember the obligation to follow the requirements of due process. The accused must be given notice and an opportunity for a hearing. As far as the fraternity is concerned, the problem is not the disease. The problem is the disruptive behavior in the house that may or may not be related to the disease. The fraternity cannot deal with the disease. The fraternity can deal with the disruptive behavior by simply refusing to tolerate it.

Before any probationary period is commenced, all the necessary disciplinary formalities should be completed so that if the probation fails the disruptive member can be summarily removed from the house or from the fraternity depending on the rules of the individual organization.

Since medical science has had such a conspicuous record of failure in this area, there is probably a great deal to be learned from the experience of Alcoholics Anonymous. Dr. Herzog's excellent monograph does not deal with this aspect of the problem, but common sense would suggest that in addition to normal clinical resources, the list of resources should include someone who is familiar with the approach of Alcoholics Anonymous so that the victim can consider the adaptation of its approach to her problem.

The eating disorder victim should be encouraged to seek treatment in a hopeful manner, and she must be aware that this problem can be overcome. Most patients in the early stages of the disease who seek medical-psychiatric treatment do get better. Treatment can reduce the seriousness of the disease even though it may not eradicate the illness.

● Robert E. Manley

## TAX MATTERS: COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

The following are some of the more common misconceptions frequently voiced about the tax matters of fraternal organizations, together with an assessment of the current tax rules on each subject. Each misconception is treated briefly and in general terms. An organization having a problem in one or more of these areas should seek guidance from its own tax counsel.

- **Misconception:** House Corporations Generally Qualify for Tax Exemption Under Code Section 501(c)(2).

Revenue Ruling 64-118 and Technical Advice Memorandum No. 8207007 strongly support the view that aside from a very few house corporations which may operate in accordance with the strict requirements of Code Section 501(c)(2), most house corporations operating in the fraternal world today should qualify for exemption under Code Section 501(c)(7) as social clubs in the same manner as their affiliated chapters and national organizations. This misconception probably arises in part because there are certain Internal Revenue Service Districts that are also confused about this matter, and may grant Section 501(c)(7) status to house corporations reluctantly, or may be entirely unwilling to do so. Currently, there is at least one case pending in the National Office of the Internal Revenue Service on this issue, which hopefully will serve as a vehicle to clear up this continuing problem.

---

**It is risky for a fraternity foundation to fund any written materials that are not clearly educational in content, for example, alcohol abuse manuals.**

---

- **Misconception:** A Set Aside Fund or Fraternity Foundation May Safely Pay for a Fraternity Magazine.

At one time, it was considered reasonably safe for a set aside fund or fraternity foundation to pay for a fraternity magazine, at least on an allocated basis keyed to the pages of the material that were educational in content. However, in at least two actual cases, the Internal Revenue Service has taken an extremely strong position that a set aside fund may not fund a fraternity magazine without incurring unrelated business income tax thereon. The United States Tax Court has approved this position in one case, which is currently on appeal. The other case probably will be tried in the Tax Court later this year. Because of the present situation, it appears extremely risky at this time for a set aside fund or fraternity foundation to fund any written materials that are not 100% clearly educational in content—for example, alcohol abuse manuals.

- **Misconception:** It is Dangerous to Request a Private Letter Ruling from the IRS on a Tax Subject Affecting a Fraternity or Fraternal Foundation for this will Result in an Audit of the Organization.

Again, the actual situation is quite different. While it is not always advisable to seek a private letter ruling from the Internal Revenue Service, there are times when it is desirable and indeed unavoidable. For example, if a fraternity foundation wishes to enter into a substantial new program on which the law is somewhat unclear, but tax counsel believes it likely that the IRS will issue a favorable ruling, it is usually advisable to seek such a ruling to protect the organization's tax exempt status as it enters into the program. A favorable private letter ruling from the Internal Revenue Service is an organization's best insurance as to a question being raised on audit. There appears to be little or no basis in most cases for the widespread belief that a requested private letter ruling will trigger an audit by the local Internal Revenue Service District.

---

**There is little basis for the belief that a requested private letter ruling will trigger an audit by the IRS.**

---

- **Misconception:** The IRS Does Not Allow the Same Persons to Serve on Both a Fraternity and its Related Foundation's Boards of Trustees.

Even though there is concern about complete overlay on boards of this kind and that such a practice may create a situation giving rise to potential conflicts of interest and requirements for very strict bookkeeping, there appear to be no precedents which would support the IRS's revoking the exemption of an exempt organization on this basis alone. (However, in certain states, there may be prohibitions against this type of arrangement, or such arrangements may trigger other undesirable consequences under state law.) Nevertheless, although some overlap on such boards is desirable for communication and liaison purposes, many organizations prefer to have the majority of their foundation board composed of different persons from those serving on the fraternity's governing body. A practical reason for this is that running two such organizations simply may be too much work for any one group of people.

- **Misconception:** When Loans are Made From Set Aside Funds for Local Chapter Housing, and Principal Repayments are Made, Those Principal Repayments Do Not Have to be Returned to Set Aside Funds.

This question appeared open until very recently, and various fraternal organizations handled the issue in different ways. However, the IRS has now ruled (in Private Letter Ruling No. 8832084), that loans for local chapter housing made from set aside funds require that principal payments thereon be returned to set aside funds. If not, un-

related business income tax will be due thereon. (See *Fraternal Law*, September 1988, Number 25, for a more extensive discussion of this subject.)

- **Misconception:** There is No Way That a Fraternity Foundation Can Participate in Fund Raising for a Grant to Build a Local Fraternity Chapter House.

There is good news on this subject. The foregoing misconception was true for a period of about five years when the IRS had suspended ruling favorably on a foundation's participation in such projects, primarily because of abuses that had allegedly occurred in this area. Now, in appropriate situations, with careful documentation it is possible for a fraternity foundation to assist in the building or major renovation of a local chapter house, so that donors can have at least a partial tax deduction for the portions of their gift that correspond to the strictly educational portions of a chapter house. However, it is strongly recommended that this type of project be undertaken only with careful consultation with tax counsel, either pursuant to a private letter ruling from the Internal Revenue Service or a written opinion from counsel, depending upon the circumstances, in order to protect the foundation's tax exempt status. While many exciting projects have been accomplished using these new rules, this still remains a very sensitive area of concern with the IRS and therefore must be approached carefully.

These are just a few of some of the common tax misconceptions you may encounter in your role as a fraternity leader or adviser. As in all tax matters, it is always wise to follow the general principle: "If something sounds too good to be true, it probably is." Be sure to consult your own tax adviser so as to avoid running afoul of the myriad of tax rules which surround fraternities and their foundations.

- **Barbara Schwartz Bromberg**

## DOCUMENT INDEX

*Fraternal Law* maintains a Document Index consisting of a variety of material relating to the legal problems of fraternities. A list of the items in the Document Index is available by writing to *Fraternal Law*. The cost is one dollar to cover reproduction, postage and handling.

Readers are encouraged to contribute items for addition to the Document Index, so that the material can be available to any of the 9,000 subscribers to *Fraternal Law*.

## DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS AT MICHIGAN STATE

A recent disciplinary proceeding at Michigan State University involving a fraternity chapter and two of its members highlights a pair of persistent concerns about such proceedings: (1) the due process accorded the accused is often suspect or even patently inadequate; and (2) chapters are held responsible for acts by members, often without any reasonable or even reasoned basis.

Early in the morning of Tuesday, April 19, 1988, a few members of the Michigan State Chapter of The Delta Chi Fraternity set out for campus. The morning's edition of the campus daily, the *State News*, carried on its first page a picture the members considered uncomplimentary to the chapter. They proceeded to collect thousands of copies of the edition, taking them from classroom buildings and dormitories where they are normally distributed free of charge. Two of the members were caught with several thousand newspapers by the campus police and arrested on a felony larceny charge.

---

**"Sentence first, verdict afterwards!"**

---

While the prosecutor's decision on the charges against the two members was pending, the campus newspaper pressed disciplinary charges against the chapter in the IFC Judiciary, invoking a clause in the IFC bylaws which provided that a chapter could be held responsible for the actions of its members.

After a hearing, the IFC Judiciary imposed on the chapter a year's warning probation and 300 hours of service to a specified community facility. The decision set a deadline of less than four weeks from its date for completion of the community service. One of the grounds for appeal by the chapter was that the deadline coupled with the approach of the end of spring term imposed too severe a burden on the chapter. Meanwhile, the county prosecutor announced that there would be no prosecution of the two members by campus police.

The University Student Appeals Board, which acted on the chapter's appeal, extended the deadline for completion of the community service to the end of the 1988 fall term, but otherwise affirmed the decision of the IFC Judiciary. In addition, in an unexplained and inexplicable affront to due process, the Board imposed a requirement that the two members who had been arrested each perform an additional 75 hours of community service during the ensuing year. The two members had not been notified of any charges against them nor had they been afforded a hearing before the sentence was imposed on them.

The action of the Appeals Board brought to life the famed suggestion in *Through the Looking Glass* by Lewis Carroll: "Sentence first, verdict afterwards!" The administrator over whose signature the appellate decision

had been released declined to comment on the Board's ruling for this article.

Three recent federal court decisions (see note at end of article) established the extent to which due process must be accorded at a state college or university. The cases clearly show that the actions taken by the Student Appeals Board at Michigan State were unconstitutional.

---

**The decision raises a second issue of when a fraternity can be held responsible for acts of its members.**

---

It is clear that the due process guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution apply to disciplinary proceedings at a public educational institution such as Michigan State University. (Private colleges and universities present an entirely different situation beyond the scope of this article.) Indeed, as an earlier decision noted: "disciplinary proceedings require more stringent procedural protection than academic evaluations, even though the effects of an adverse decision on the student may be the same." *Henson v. Honor Committee of the University of Virginia*, 719 F.2d 69, 74 (4th Cir. 1983). The courts have cautioned against the "judicialization" of administrative hearings, especially in an academic environment, and explicitly held that students do not have the same rights as criminal defendants or even civil litigants. However, a state university must treat its students with "fundamental fairness" because they have a constitutionally protected interest in their standing in the educational community, in continuing their education, and in access to future opportunities for further education and employment.

Courts have been unanimous in holding that students are guaranteed the right to notice of the charges against them and a hearing—rights denied the two students at Michigan State. In determining the nature of the notice and hearing and the extent of the additional due process required, there are three important factors: (1) the private interest involved; (2) the risk of erroneous deprivation of the interest through the procedures used and the possible value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and (3) the institution's interest, including the function involved and the burden that the additional or substitute procedures would entail.

Broadly speaking, the notice should apprise the student of the accusations against him and afford him an opportunity to present his objections at a hearing, which can come as soon as only a few days later. The notice need not contain a summary of the evidence against the student if he has an opportunity at the hearing to hear that evidence. The hearing should allow an opportunity for all sides to be heard in considerable detail and, more specifically, allow the student the opportunity to respond, explain, and defend.

Beyond this, the courts have varied in the additional safeguards they have required. There may be no right to cross-examine accusers and adverse witnesses, or it may be limited; an accuser may even remain anonymous. There is

disagreement on whether a student has a right to be represented or assisted by counsel or anyone else at the hearing. A student is guaranteed an impartial tribunal but bears the burden of showing bias or prejudice, and the hearing panel may include the person who investigated the matter or someone who is familiar with previous proceedings against the student. There is no need to follow formal rules of evidence. Most courts have required some sort of record of the hearing, but only a few have required that it be verbatim or that the student be allowed to tape-record the hearing.

The courts have also split on whether due process requires an institution to adhere to its own procedures if they go beyond the minimum guarantees required under the circumstances. The authority must base its decision on substantial evidence, but need not give a detailed statement of reasons explaining the decision.

Since the two students at Michigan State University were never afforded notice or a hearing, there is little basis on which to consider whether they may have been deprived of other due process rights.

The decision against the chapter raises a second issue of when a fraternity chapter can be held responsible for acts of its members. One federal court, in a civil commercial litigation, has held that for an association to be liable for conduct of individual members, "it must be shown that the members were acting with apparent authority conferred upon them by the association." *Federal Prescription Service v. American Pharmaceutical Association*, 663 F.2d 253, 265-66 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 928 (1981). As already noted, a disciplinary decision such as that against the chapter at Michigan State must be based on substantial evidence. The decision may not be arbitrary.

---

**Unfortunately, students often choose not to pursue their rights.**

---

In his keynote address to the 1988 NIC Legal Seminar, Indiana State Senator Edward A. Pease suggested that factors to consider in deciding whether to hold a chapter responsible for acts of its members could include the proportion of the chapter membership involved in the activity and whether the officers of the chapter were aware of the activity in advance or were themselves involved in the activity.

Other factors could include widespread awareness of the activity in the chapter, whether it had occurred before, and whether chapter officers and other members cooperate in the investigation following the incident.

In the hearing at Michigan State, the only evidence presented on the chapter's culpability was: (a) the admission that the two arrested students were members of the chapter; and (b) copies of the minutes from the chapter meeting the night before the incident and all previous meetings of the term showing that there had been no consideration of the activity in advance. (Indeed, this prior planning of these actions would have been impossible since the knowledge that the picture would be published came only after the meeting and a few hours before the newspapers were taken.) There was no evidence that the

incident had involved any more than a very small number of the over one hundred member active chapter, that there had been informal consideration much less endorsement of the activity by the chapter, or that any of the officers had notice of the activity. In fact, following the incident, the chapter officers organized a group of members to redistribute the newspapers and the chapter subsequently disciplined the members involved in taking the newspapers. The evidence was clearly not substantial enough to support the decision by the Michigan State authorities to discipline the chapter. Indeed, there was substantial evidence that the chapter should not have been held responsible. The decisions by the IFC Judiciary and the Appeals Board were arbitrary and thus improper.

Unfortunately, in situations such as the one at Michigan State, students often choose not to pursue their rights, especially if the sentence involves less than suspension, expulsion or loss of recognition, because of a number of factors: (a) the fear of retribution or increase in the punishment, such as happened at Michigan State; (b) a desire to put the incident behind them and to get on with their education and other activities; (c) the time involved in pursuing the appeals process or an action in federal court with uncertainty hanging over their heads all the while; and (d) the potential expense of a court action.

Thus, students' rights and the U.S. Constitution often remain trammled, dishonored and unvindicated by the very institutions on which we rely to teach the obligations of law-abiding citizenship.

Possible solutions to the problem could include a concerted effort by fraternities to educate their members at state universities about students' due process rights and to encourage and support appeals and even lawsuits to establish precedents and to educate the educators who are either woefully or willfully ignorant of their legal obligations. The persistence of these problems evidenced by recurring reports of their occurrence suggests that serious consideration be given in the fraternity movement to measures to protect our members and chapters.

#### ● Gregory Hauser

Mr. Hauser, a member of the Delta Chi Fraternity and of the Law Committee of the National Interfraternity Conference, is an attorney practicing with Walter, Conston, Alexander & Green, P.C., in New York City.

See: *Gorman v. University of Rhode Island*, 837 F.2d 7 (1st Cir. 1988); *Nash v. Auburn University*, 812 F.2d 615 (11th Cir. 1987); *Jaska v. Regents of the University of Michigan*, 597 F. Supp. 1245 (E.D. Mich. 1984), *aff'd*, 787 F.2d 590 (6th Cir. 1986).

© 1988 Manley, Burke and Fischer

## FRATERNAL LAW CONFERENCE

November 4-5, 1988

The third national Fraternal Law Conference, sponsored by the editors of *Fraternal Law*, will be held in Cincinnati, Ohio, beginning Friday, November 4, and ending at noon on Saturday, November 5.

This year's conference affords the participant the opportunity to interact with several nationally prominent speakers:

**Eileen Stevens** is nationally known for her efforts to eliminate hazing from college campuses. Ms. Stevens, whose son died as the result of hazing, has spoken on college campuses throughout the country and on national television. She recently appeared on the TODAY show to discuss the recent death of a Rutgers University student from alcohol abuse.

**George W. Spasyk**, executive director of Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity, also knows about the Rutgers University tragedy. The young man who died belonged to this fraternity and the incident took place at the Lambda Chi Alpha house on campus. Mr. Spasyk will share his views on how the fraternity is coping with the current problem and offer practical suggestions as to what the fraternity can do to prevent similar occurrences from taking place.

**James R. Favor** and **Donald P. Bennett** will address the myriad of questions which always surround the insurance issue. Mr. Favor's company is a current provider of insurance to fraternities; Mr. Bennett is an attorney who will speak to the legal aspects of the fraternity insurance situation.

**Earl H. Smith**, Dean of the College at Colby College, thinks the fraternity is going the way of the dinosaur. It already has at Colby. He will explain why he believes fraternities are no longer appropriate in the liberal arts setting and offer tell-tale signs which, he says, signal their demise.

**Payton Smith**, a member of Chi Omega at Louisiana State University, and **Doug Firestone**, a member of Lambda Chi Alpha at Florida Southern College, will share the successes and failures of fraternities in hosting the inevitable weekend party or special event. These affairs affect not only the actives, but the university and its neighbors as well. Gary Powell, Assistant Editor of *Fraternal Law*, will moderate this session.

**Barbara Schwartz Bromberg**, nationally known for her tax work with nonprofit entities, and specifically with fraternities, will provide up-to-date practical tax information.

**Donald F. Frei** knows firsthand that fraternities who violate copyright laws can find themselves in trouble. Protect your material from copyright infringement and beware of the penalties of infringing from others.

In addition to our outside speakers, Sally L. Cremeens-Strong and Andrew S. Lipton will keep you abreast of current legal developments; Robert E. Manley will advise you how to prepare for the inevitable emergency situation; and Timothy M. Burke will involve the audience in a special two-hour case study presentation. The case study session offers the opportunity for you to present and discuss your efforts in dealing with a particular situation, or you may simply reap the benefit of learning how others would react in situations familiar to you. For further information on the 1988 Fraternal Law Conference, call Barbara Ferguson, managing editor of *Fraternal Law* at (513) 721-5525.

The goal of *Fraternal Law* is to provide a discussion of fraternity law, but its contents are not intended to provide legal advice for individual problems of Greek organizations. The latter should be obtained from your attorney.

*Fraternal Law* is published four times yearly as a non-profit service of Manley, Burke & Fischer, A Legal Professional Association, 4100 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 U.S.A. (513) 721-5525. Please address all editorial inquiries and all subscription correspondence to this address. Individual subscriptions by first class mail are available at \$10.00 per year. Bulk subscriptions are available upon request at reduced rates. Second class postage paid at Cincinnati, Ohio.

Printed in U.S.A.