

exhaustive treatment of this topic in Randy Shilts' *And the Band Played On*.¹ How can one ignore the fact that the federal and state governments' original indifference, coupled with the gay community's treatment of the matter as a mere public relations problem, led tens of thousands to their deaths?

Although several of the authors dance around the sociophilosophical implications of dread diseases the cause of which is—or was once—unknown, no one directly addresses the issue. Readers would benefit from a discussion akin to that in Susan Sontag's *Illness as Metaphor*,² which now contains a valuable postscript on AIDS.

Turning to the book's errors of commission, one can quibble only with minor points. Attorney Mark S. Senak, in the generally good chapter entitled "The Lesbian and Gay Community," rather anachronistically treats the closing of gay baths in various cities as a political setback for gays rather than as a measure invoked for the public health. At least in the opinion of this reviewer, such a position, resting as it does upon a view that the baths would somehow evolve into educational forums, is naive.

Daniel M. Fox (State University of New York at Stony Brook) contributes a thought-provoking article called "Physicians Versus Lawyers: A Conflict of Cultures." Fox posits the view that physicians who have involved themselves with AIDS are "marginal within medicine" because they include public-health doctors, "liberally educated intellectuals" (whatever that may mean), and openly gay physicians. This is nonsense. One doubts that Jonas Salk or Robert Gallo, for example, consider themselves "marginal" or are so considered by anyone else.

These small difficulties indicate the need for an updated second edition of *AIDS and the Law*. Although the editors spent only eighteen months in assembling this excellent book, that is a long time in a world made more frightening by the spectre of AIDS.

1. Randy Shilts, *And the Band Played On: Politics, People, and the AIDS Epidemic* (New York, 1987).
2. Susan Sontag, *Illness as Metaphor*, 2d ed. (New York, 1988).

Mark H. McCormack, *The Terrible Truth about Lawyers: How Lawyers Really Work and How to Deal with Them Successfully*. New York: Beech Tree Books, 1987. Pp. 256. \$ 16.95.

Reviewed by Edmund F. Byrne

For those who like story after story after story about interesting/successful/astounding/incredibly profitable deals-I-have-made-in-my-years-at-my-trade (which, by the way, I just happen to have invented), this is truly the book for them. For up-and-coming young athletes and old established sportsworld institutions either of whom might like to have a lot more

Edmund F. Byrne is Professor of Philosophy, Indiana University.

money than is now coming in, this extended advertisement is clearly targeted at them. For those who are accustomed to paying for the privilege of wearing somebody's advertisement on their sweatshirt, this may also be—and for a comparable price—just the book for them. For anyone who is seriously interested in learning “how lawyers really work and how to deal with them successfully,” a random perusal of a library card catalogue would be more helpful.

Mark McCormack's message to a waiting world is as direct and uncomplicated as a twenty-second television commercial: namely, that Mark McCormack is one of the fairest, most ingenious, and most successful self-made businessmen in the modern world—or at least that part of it inhabited by athletes. This groundbreaking maker of mighty sportsworld deals is, he suggests, at the very pinnacle of success. How did he get there? He got there without benefit of business school. (See, if you must, his *What They Don't Teach You at Harvard Business School*). And, what is more (enter this glib tome), he got there mostly in spite of law school and the products thereof. McCormack himself, you see, passed through a law school and briefly practiced this vastly overrated profession on his legendary way to real American success in Business.

Lest the bookstore browser be misled by the snappy title, this book has about as much to do with lawyers as a Lone Ranger epic had to do with Tonto's horse (Paint, wasn't it?). They're there (as was the faithful Indian's no less faithful steed); but they're just not where the action is. The action, sports fans, is in doing deals, deals of all kinds: little deals, at times, but especially great big world-impacting deals that involve keeping as many sports personalities and sports institutions as financially well-off as a clever, insightful guy such as Mark can effect. In the process, incidentally, he garners a bit of spare change for his agency and—not to be overlooked—himself.

Tangential to this high-rolling world (because they really know next to nothing about it) are attorneys. Here, as in other lines of business, they are by training (specifics not provided) tempted to express an opinion on a subject quite beyond their competence. But a deal-doer such as Mark can keep them in their rightful place: somewhere out back, with a phone that can receive but cannot send messages (except when there is a news release from legaldom that “the boss” might appreciate knowing about). The terrible truth about lawyers, in so many words, is that they want to be—and think they have some ability to be—hyperactive participants in their clients' affairs. Yet, as a general rule, about all they can do for said client is to put into legalese (and even here you have to keep them from going overboard) a semblance of the ongoing organic process the businessman has brought into being: *The Deal*.

P.S. One sign of how clever this author really is: Alert to the law of libel and the possibility of litigation, he has assiduously avoided naming any of those back-room barristers who generate his nasty-but-necessary pastiches of legality. On the other hand, there are proper names galore of individual and institutional sports stars, who, we presume, have used McCormack's

ever
P.1
(but
Dece

everyone-gains-and-nobody's-a-loser service and found it deeply satisfying.

P.P.S. For anyone who likes reviewers to take a book a bit more seriously (but only a bit), there is James C. Freund's more detailed decimation in the December 14, 1987, issue of *National Law Journal*.

it is clearly
he privilege
ay also be—
one who is
how to deal
ogue would

nd uncom-
that Mark
successful
t part of it
portsworld
get there?
it, his *What*
ore (enter
e products
school and
ary way to

s book has
to do with
il Indian's
he action,
times, but
as many
s a clever,
ntally, he
looked—

w next to
, they are
ion on a
Mark can
one that
s release
ut). The
be—and
r clients'
is to put
erboard)
brought

of libel
g any of
astiches
dividual
rmack's

