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YOU ARE THE BEST OF THE PRESS CONTRIBUTE

DAVID PAUL BLESTEIN ('96)

We, the Editors at The Loyola Reporter want your submissions! Students, staff and faculty members or even family members are welcome to submit.

It is true that we, the Editors, love our own material. But we're really here to enlighten and entertain the entire LLS community. Without you, what's the point of being here?

In the event some people may have contemplated submissions but aren't sure what we like, here are some guidelines. 1) We love anything relevant to the school, faculty and the students. These are general guidelines to aid the indecisive and the undecided.

2. If you took a great trip, write about it (pictures, too)!

3. If you took in a great show, write about it.

4. The real biggie (blare of trumpets, roll of tympani)...

WORK EXPERIENCES!

If you had or have a legal or quasi-legal job, any job, paying or not, WRITE ABOUT IT.

Tell us all what's GOOD, GREAT, WONDERFUL: the pay, the hours, the location, the clients, the people you worked with. If this job is the culmination of a lifelong dream, tell us about it. What issues did you deal with and why did they matter? If you liked this job better than a former one, tell why.

Tell us what's BAD, LOUSY, NASTY. If the position or some materially important aspect of it warrants an exposé, plainly state it.

"sucks worse than death.") Then tell why. What did you hope to get that you didn't get? Did the bosses make promises they later broke without a good reason? Did the job cause you to suffer deep ethical dilemmas? If the position would be great for someone other than yourself, state why.

We realize that writing about unpleasant experiences is itself unpleasant. But you may save someone else from equal misery. Since almost no one goes here with the intention of being miserable, the warning will be greatly appreciated. If there were warning signs that should have tipped you off, tell us. We all want to help.

If your experience was really foul, you can remain anonymous (if you're anon, the employer will be too.) If you can, please submit on a WordPerfect compatible disk. Muchas gracias, danke schon, thanks a whole heapin' lot!

GARY PFISTER ('95)

CREATING A COMMUNITY

When I came here in the evening division in 1990 there was a certain negative tension. It started to dissipate when Dean Gerald McLaughlin came on board. Signs went up on the Buildings to identify them and access to the administration had been made available and the administration had to scramble for parking, security, buses and how to pay for it.

IMPROVING THE SCHOOL

The Princeton Review, THE BEST LAW SCHOOLS 1995, gave Loyola Law School a good overall review but also said "Loyola law students voice strong criticism, however, of the law school's administration which many consider unresponsive to student needs." and "Most college administrators now offer credit for the success of the law school's reputation to the Loyola Faculty. 'Loyola is a better school than its reputation. It has the second highest bar passage rate in California'. The Princeton Review is the newest of the three main Law School survey books. Barron's Guide and the LSAT's own book are number driven and have little editorial comment other than what is given them by the schools. The Princeton Review is not run by Princeton University but is published by a LSAT prep course company. These reviews are major marketing tools for the school. We need to have the students feel that the administration does listen to them and does not ignore what it hears by having the administration listen and not ignore what it hears.

Before Dean McLaughlin arrived at Loyola there weren't even signs on the buildings to show which was Burns, Rains, or Donovan. An attitude of "If you don't know where it is, it's your problem" was an unfortunate tone in parts of the school administration. With a legal job
Domestic violence is the number one public health issue facing women and children in the U.S. today. It is within all our power to help victims of domestic violence. As law students, we are in a special position to assist women by providing free legal services. By now, nearly all first years are aware of the 40 hour pro bono requirement. The Battered Women's Project, sponsored by the Women's Law Association and the Domestic Violence Awareness Campaign, is a great opportunity to get some legal experience while providing a much needed legal service for someone.

The Battered Women's Project has already started work on this venture. Allison Regan was elected to be our official chairperson and Professor Pond was enlisted as our faculty advisor. We have set up a project where law students can volunteer at the Los Angeles County Bar Association's Barristers Domestic Violence Project. Students will assist clients in obtaining a temporary restraining order, one of the first steps in preventing further physical harm. The Project also organized last month's food and clothing drive in honor of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. All the items were donated to a shelter the Project adopted. We would like to thank the Loyola community for its support.

If you have any questions or would like to help out, please contact Allison Regan at (818) 242-9327 or Professor Sande Pond at (213) 736-1031. You can also stop by the Women's Law Association office. We look forward to helping you fulfill your pro bono requirement and providing a valuable service for the community.

SPECIAL OFFER!

Loyola Law Students & Staff
FREE COFFEE AND WALNUT CAKE WITH PURCHASE OF LUNCH AND DINNER ITEMS

BREAKFAST $2.50
BAGLE WITH CREAM CHEESE COFFEE OR NATURAL JUICE

LUNCH AVERAGE $4.99
UDONG - RAMEN - HOT RAMEN MORISABA - SALAD - SANDWICHES

Enjoy!
Pasquini Cappuccino
MON.-SAT. 9:00 am - 10:00 pm

HOUSE DINNER $12.99
213-389-9696
1543 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., L.A. (OLYMPIC AND UNION CORNER)
PARKING FREE

VERMONT LAW SCHOOL (in Vermont) wants law students who want ENVIRONMENTAL EXPERIENCE to participate in their Environmental Semester in Washington, D.C. in the spring of 1995. This is a 14 credit externship. Students interface with various U.S. government agencies, environmental groups, House and Senate Environmental committees and law firms. VLS has been ranked number one in environmental law programs for four years running by the revered-yet-sacred U.S. News and World Report survey. Interested students may call Martha Judy or Liz Ryan at (800) 227-1398 or (802) 763-8303.

ENJOY THANKSGIVING DINNER IN THE NUDE
The Happy Tanner Inn is a "naturist" resort in Palm Springs. They offer holiday rates from $85. This includes a full Thanksgiving dinner, full breakfast, sodas, beer and a complimentary barbecue. For more information call (619) 320-6984.

December 31, 1994, the software will be sold for the introductory price of $995 (U.S.). Interested persons can obtain LawTALK software through KOLVOX dealers and WESTLA W Publishing. We don't have a number for KOLVOX at this time, but you can call Dorothy Molstad at West Publishing at (800) 778-8090 ext. 77617 for more information.

YOU CAN HELP FIGHT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE BATTERED WOMEN'S PROJECT

VANESSA SHINMOTO (97) She is a neighbor, a classmate, a close friend or a distant stranger. She is your sister or mother or aunt or grandmother. She shares an intimate relationship with her husband, boyfriend or lover. It is the relationship which is supposed to nurture and help her live up to her fullest potential. Instead, she constantly fears for her personal safety and most likely, her life.

Domestic violence is the number one public health issue facing women and children in the U.S. today. These women come from all cultures, races, occupations, income levels and ages. People often wonder aloud why women in such relationships do not leave their abusers. We believe this is what the reasonable person would do if she experienced such abuse. In reality, everyone is a potential victim or abuser. The best way to understand domestic violence is to realize that violence against women is a widespread problem within our culture. From verbal harassment on public streets and wage discrimination in the workplace to sexual assault and rape, domestic violence fits into a continuum of physical and spiritual violence women experience in our society.

Yet, many women do leave. Often, though, women may not have the economic resources essential for survival. This, along with low self esteem and lack of social support, drives them back to the abusive partner. Although battered women's shelters provide a safe place to stay for victims, there is not enough space to accommodate all the women needing help. For example, in the San Fernando Valley, Betty Fisher, director of Haven Hills Shelter, estimates that the shelter receives over 400 calls per month. But the shelter has about 30 beds, many of which are taken up by children.

It is within all our power to help victims of domestic violence. As law students, we are in a special position to assist women by providing
PILF wishes to thank all of you for making it possible for us to attend last weekend's National Association for Public Interest Law Conference. The following is a brief summary of the conference highlights:

Loyola PILF Honored at Awards Banquet

Five members from Loyola's Public Interest Law Foundation (PILF) attended the National Association for Public Interest Law (NAPIL) Conference in Washington, D.C. NAPIL is a national coalition of law student organizations that offer grants and other forms of assistance to students and recent graduates engaged in public interest work. NAPIL is the nation's largest organization devoted to supporting the next generation of public interest attorneys. More than 1,000 students, attorneys, and activists attended this year's conference and awards banquet. Loyola's PILF received the award for the "Most Growth by a NAPIL Member School" for their outstanding fundraising efforts during the 1993-1994 academic year. Loyola's PILF was honored for raising over $40,000 to fund seven student public interest fellowships as well as contributing $5,000 to the Center for Conflict Resolution and $10,000 to the Loyola Public Interest Loan Assistance Program. PILF was one of only three schools honored at this national awards ceremony. Accepting the award on behalf of PILF were Carla Taylor (Carly Hall '96 (PILF Co-Chair), Katie Martin '96 (Secretary), John Klings '96 (Treasurer), Dana Butler '95, and Colleen Cox '96. Most recently, PILF raised more than $31,000 at its Second Annual Fall Festival & Auction, held October 8, 1994 (almost $10,000 more than that raised at 1993's auction!). Also honored at the awards ceremony was Brooklynn Born (founder of the Women's Law Center and former Clinton Attorney General "short list" candidate) and Clinton Lyons (Executive Director of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association) for their outstanding public interest advocacy.

SUMMER '94 AT THE NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER CENTER IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

R.J. COMER ('96)

Up and down the wrought iron steps of a clean, but nondescript row house in a rough D.C. neighborhood, lawyers and legal interns in shorts and sneakers hustle heavy briefcases, chasing case law on behalf of employee whistleblowers. This is the office of The National Whistleblower Center (NWC), where law/author/historian Stephen Kohn (the modern guru of whistleblower representation) is chief counsel. He's the short, stout guy in his early forties with wild black curls dressed like Bart Simpson. He does not look like a man who has published five books and won cases before the United States Supreme Court. When I met him, the near-manic glee of purpose in his eyes met the second-nature cynicism and anguish on his face. I knew two things: 1) he and I will either hate each other or love each other before this Summer ends; and 2) either way, I will learn more from this than I could ever have imagined.

NWC is a non-profit law firm and public interest organization which has argued and won many of the landmark cases regarding employment discrimination of federal, state and nuclear and environmental whistleblowers employed by public utilities and government licensees. Like many non-profits, NWC is not advertising for a position. Nevertheless, I inquired, found them interested and sent them the requisite resume and writing sample. Once I got an offer from Applied, I completed the PILF fellowship grant application. A few weeks later, I was awarded a grant. Excitement was my middle name.

HOW TO GET A PUBLIC INTEREST CLERKSHIP

DAVID BLEISTEIN ('96)

In the September issue of THE LOYOLA REPORTER, I described my experiences clerking for the Appalachian Legal Research and Defense Fund (Applied) in Somerset, Kentucky during the summer of 1994. Here I'd like to describe how I got the position, and then lay out a strategy for you to follow if you would like to do the same.

I began looking for a position in January of 1994. The Career Services office has a binder that contains information about public interest law firms. Applied was there, though they were not advertising for a position. Nevertheless, I inquired, found them interested and sent them the requisite resume and writing sample. I wrote to my friends back in L.A. "they work me like I know what I'm doing." I hadn't talked to them in months, but I knew they'd appreciate how I'd been treated. They told me to apply for Applied. I did, and the rest is history.

In general, public interest firms are not grade fetishists. If you are interested in public interest law, this is the best time of the year to begin inquiring about and applying for positions in January. Though I got away with applying in late February, I don't recommend waiting that long. Why? Deadlines for

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NATIONAL PUBLIC INTEREST LAW CONFERENCE

Workshops and Panels and Career Fair

PILF members attended workshops and panels on topics ranging from environmental justice to civil rights to successful fundraising strategies. PILF members not only attended workshops, but helped lead them as well. More than sixty schools attended a panel on which Cary Hall spoke, discussing successful organizational strategies and fundraising tips for other PILF's to follow. Pat Abracina (Office of Career Services Special Projects Coordinator / Public Interest Advisor) also attended the conference and spoke at panels on career services public interest ideas, projects and coordination. Those with questions about possible careers in public interest law are encouraged to see Pat. Additionally, all students attended a Career Fair where more than 100 public interest legal services providers presented information and prospective employment opportunities.

Keynote Speaker Ralph Nader

Ralph Nader, the renowned consumer advocate, gave the conference's closing keynote address on "Law Students as a Power for Systemic Change in America." In addition, emotional speeches on how innocent people can be sentenced to death were given by Stephen Bright and Rubin "Hurricane" Carter. Mr. Carter is the former Number 1-ranked middleweight fighter who lost his career and many years of his life when he was arrested on the charge of murder in June 1966. After spending 18 years in prison, Carter was acquitted of all charges. PILF is in the process of getting a tape of these remarkable speeches to show to its members and anyone else who is interested (future prosecutors and public defenders are especially advised to watch these speeches).

PILF thanks again all of those who made it possible for us to attend the conference including the SBA, the Dean's Office, and Pat Abracina.
LLS PROFESSOR AND STUDENT OPPOSITES IN ASSEMBLY RACE

LLS PROFESSOR WILL FIGHT FOR CONSTITUENTS

DAVID BLEINSTEIN (’96)

Two people from the same law school running opposite each other from the same law school for a non-school related office is an unusual event. As everyone should know, both professors and students have considerable demands made upon their time. The obvious question then is why run? Why go to the hassle and heartache of running for office when the rest of the world is increasingly cynical about the political, i.e., democratic process? However you feel about either of these candidates, their statements here can provide some answers.

GOOD LUCK TO YOU BOTH

DAVID BLEINSTEIN (’96)

Professor Shilia Kuehl is not pining away for lack of things to keep her busy these days. Aside from being an adjunct professor at LLS, she is running for the state Assembly. In a phone interview, I asked her what she wanted to accomplish if elected. Like her opponent, Michael Meehan, she is concerned about the quality of life of the residents of her district. Unlike him, she shuns a hammer down approach to dealing with crime, she is opposed to proposition 187. She identified four areas of particular importance to her constituents that she wanted to focus on: crime, education, the local economy and the environment.

CRIME Kuehl is and has long been an advocate for changes in the justice system’s treatment of domestic violence, sex crimes and juveniles. She has authored over 40 pieces of legislation. She authored a bill that made domestic violence a crime. Another bill eliminated mutual restraining orders. Another changed the evidence code to permit the admission of prior sex crimes against accused rapists. Kuehl’s aim is to make laws that will cause us to take such crimes more seriously, rather than blaming the victim.

Such laws will focus on and reduce the violence that is now a warp thread of our culture. Instead of simply punishing offenders, Kuehl advocates “prevention, intervention, treatment and punishment.” She wants to deal with offenders “before strike one and strike two.”

Instead of simply punishing offenders, Kuehl advocates “prevention, intervention, treatment and punishment.” She wants to deal with offenders “before strike one and strike two.”

CANDIDATE WANTS TO “CHANGE THE DIRECTION OF OUR STATE”

MICHAEL T. MEEHAN (’95)

Many people have asked me why I would run for office while I am still in my third year at Loyola. Well, let me tell you.

I am running for State Assembly because California is my home and California is my future. I grew up in the San Fernando Valley, and have lived in the 41st District since graduating from UCLA. For the past for years I have worked as a Reserve Deputy Sheriff in Lennox and I have seen over and over again that the criminals no longer fear the criminal justice system in our State. The experience has convinced me that something is terribly wrong in our State—something I want to fix.

My brothers have both left this State to start families elsewhere. Many people in our generation plan their lives around when they can move out of California.

The criminals no longer fear the criminal justice system in our State. The experience has convinced me that something is terribly wrong in our State—something I want to fix.

My brothers have both left this State to start families elsewhere. Many people in our generation plan their lives around when they can move out of California. We see that our streets and homes are less safe than before and we see our public system of education failing to educate many of our children. This is not the California in which I was reared,

I decided it was time for me to get involved and change the direction of our State. I cannot just stand by and inherit the problems created by the previous generation – the generation of my opponent. The State now has a budget deficit of more than $6 billion dollars — yes, billion with a “B”.

cont’d on page 7
PROP. 181 NO
This will authorize millions of dollars in debt to finance a massive boondoggle of a mass-transit scheme. Electric trains are sleek, futuristic even sexy. They're way cooler than buses. And far more expensive. And far less reliable.

I know from firsthand experience. In the fall of 1993, I lived in Long Beach and took the Blue Line back and forth every day. It "fainted" – stopped dead – in the middle of South Central six times in three months, with me aboard. What fun.

Buses are ugly. They make diesel fumes. They have a low-life connotation about them. But they go wherever roads go. And best of all, they're reliable. In the year I spent riding buses all over Los Angeles, many buses obviously could stand more care than they're getting.

But the money that would be spent on trains under 181 could be better spent on more buses, better maintenance and even psychiatric care for the drivers.

PROP. 183 NO
This measure will allow recall elections to be consolidated with regularly scheduled elections. Recall elections can now be held 60 to 80 days after the Secretary of State certifies the petitions. The idea is to save money and ensure greater voter participation.

But how much money are we really going to save? Do we recall elected officials that often that it should make a difference? It seems like a much better idea to be able to use the extraordinarily remedy of recall as soon as possible after its need becomes manifest.

PROP. 184 NO
This is the famous "three strikes and you're out" measure. It will create an enormous balloon in our already swollen prison population.

This measure will make money for prison contractors, prison guards and the assorted agencies and bureaus that back them up. It will cost the rest of us a fortune. Do we want prisons full of lifers who are in there for non-violent offenses? I don't. And you can bet that there will be a flood tide of litigation.

PROP. 185 NO
This measure authorizes a 4-cent per-gallon increase in gasoline taxes that will be used to fund clean-air buses and electric light rail systems. I don't care about a small increase in the gas tax, since our passionate love of cars is at the root of our transportation woes. The solution is to get people out of their cars.

But I'd like this better if the money would not be wasted on something that has a way of developing into giant pork barrel projects. (See also PROP. 181 above.) Bus systems as they are will work just fine if they cease to be the poor stepchildren of transportation planning. Why not urge us to what we have for less money? For a third of the cost of the Hollywood Underground Railroad we could buy new buses for the entire MTA.

PROP. 186 YES
This will create a Canadian style single-payer health insurance program for all Californians. A majority of people who do not now have insurance will have it. It will increase access to healthcare for millions of uninsured Californians.

There is the inevitable bleating about the evils of government involvement where there was none before. But there's an abundance of evil in the present scheme of things. A healthier population will benefit all of us. Emergencies are expensive and unnecessary. A large proportion of ailments can be treated much better if dealt with before they become emergencies. We are now experiencing a rise in certain infectious diseases, including wholly preventable "childhood diseases" like measles, whooping cough and pertussis. There is no excuse for this.

I have no health insurance.

PROP. 188 NO
This is a "get tough on smoking" initiative sponsored by the tobacco lobby. Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

Proposition 188 is a "get tough on smoking" initiative sponsored by the tobacco lobby. Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

PROP. 188's backers claim it will increase penalties for selling cigarettes to minors, while its opponents think it's just a smoke screen (excuse the pun). Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

Proposition 188 is a "get tough on smoking" initiative sponsored by the tobacco lobby. Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

PROP. 188's backers claim it will increase penalties for selling cigarettes to minors, while its opponents think it's just a smoke screen (excuse the pun). Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

PROP. 188's backers claim it will increase penalties for selling cigarettes to minors, while its opponents think it's just a smoke screen (excuse the pun). Proposition 188's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.

HUFFINGTON DESERVES YOUR SUPPORT

As I look at my sample ballot, it is clear to me that the most important race we Californians will decide this November is the Senate race between Dianne Feinstein and Mike Huffington. The clear defining characteristic between Huffington and Feinstein is not based on any one particular issue. It is based on their Weltanschauung. Weltanschauung is a German word used to describe one's philosophy of life. For Mike Huffington, he sees the individual spirit as the guiding force in our national discourse. TR called this "rugged individualism." Dianna Feinstein does not trust the ability of people to control their own destiny. For Feinstein, only the State can save humanity from certain disaster.

Huffington rightly sees the State, on its present statist course, as the true disaster that we face. This is why he is calling for the end of welfare as we know it today.

Feinstein is content to tinkering with our welfare system to "reform" it. Sadly, her idea of reform is to make it worse -- with the 1994 midterm elections only days off, we are looking at perhaps the most radical electorate since the election of 1860. Indeed, this election has the potential of returning two-party rule to Congress. It promises to provide challenges and opportunities to the Republican Party, which has been heavily outnumbered in Congress for the past 40 years. In California, we are presented with several radical ballot measures. Among these are Proposition 184, which if passed, might mandate a life sentence for a petty two-bit crook whose third felony is stealing a Ding Dong from the corner 7-11. Proposition 186 would hand over California's health care system to the very same people that brought us the D.M.V. Proposition 187 stands for the positively outlandish notion that lawmakers are not entitled to free education, health care, and welfare benefits.

Among the less radical measures on the ballot is Proposition 185. Proposition 185's backers would have us believe that the disastrous subway boondoggle in L.A. needs even more money -- money in the form of yet another highly regressive gas tax hike.
Dear Sandra,

I have a question for you. How do you address someone's hermaphroditic spouse? It is so hard to tell what's correct these days. You just never know when someone is going to get very angry over a perfectly innocent mistake of etiquette that the person has invented on the spot. I lay awake nights wondering about, say, misintroducing a senior partner's indeterminate significant other and having it adversely affect my career prospects.

(initials withheld by request)

Dear Sandra,

I am deeply flattered that you trust me, Sandra, to guide you in an area that is so far beyond my expertise. I'm not Emily Post the arbiter of manners.

But I also find myself thinking, "You're Maria, what were the drugs?" as I did when I first visited the LLS campus and saw the buildings and sculptures. But, because I'm deeply touched and honored, I will answer your question, strange and disturbed as it is.

My research shows that hermaphrodites are not obvious. That is, they are not the half-man/half-woman freaks you might see in circuses or on "Flintstones" reruns. Rather, such people usually elect to assume either a male or a female identity early in life along with the appropriate surgery to avoid the kind of bizarre, awkward and improbable situation you posit. Not, mind you, that I worry too much about such things or that I'd want to inquire too closely in any event. As far as I know, no state has ever required anyone to put "H" in that little box marked "SEX" on their driver's license.

I dearly hope that I've relieved your anxiety and that you don't know where I live.

A female the last time I looked, 7

Sandra

Cheers to the Registrar
and Dean of Academic Affairs
for early registration. We still hope Law of Politics will be offered.

Cheers to facilities for the Kiosk for notice posting. Let's face it, with the parking lot we are focused that way. Check out the coming events without the hypnotic charm of the TV. The postings are for meetings and activities. Not ads for products, reviews, or 1985 copies of text books. Thank you for your support.

Cheers to the Administration
for getting the Credit Union on campus. You should really look into this before graduating. Having an extra account-stop commingling before you have funds to commingle.

Cheers To whoever put the ATM on campus. Now you can go to an ATM without worry. 8

Justice Ruth Ginsberg, DISSENTING and CONCURRING
Dear (initials withheld by request),

Bubby, darling, baby, sweet-thing, sugar-pie, listen to your aunt Ruth.

It is wonderful that you are concerned about the feelings of others. I think that kindness has become a dying art, being replaced by "honesty." At the same time, it certainly is getting harder and harder all the time to figure out the proper mode of formal address, given the current attention being paid to people's unknown, unknowable and sometimes bizarre preferences. And the competition in the job market is sharper than my dear, beloved and cherished colleague's tongue (or pen).

But I must concur with Sandra regarding as it is well settled that your question suggests a far deeper malaise than a mere matter of manners. An inquiry like yours is not unusual on the eve of exams, but that is quite a while off at this point. And, OCI has been over for over a month. I suspect that this law school thing is getting to you, dear.

I therefore suggest that you IMMEDIATELY cancel your study sessions, lock away your outlines and tell someone you trust to hide the key for a weekend. Then, locate the loudest, wildest,

Cheers to the wonderful people who gave over $31,000 to PILF at the 1994 PILF auction and party on October 8.

JEERS to those of you who didn't come to the auction. It was only $8.00, and the food was great, prepared by LLS students. Besides, you can always tape those "LaVerne and Shirley" reruns.

Cheers to the wonderful people who gave over $31,000 to PILF at the 1994 PILF auction and party on October 8.

JEERS to those of you who didn't come to the auction. It was only $8.00, and the food was great, prepared by LLS students. Besides, you can always tape those "LaVerne and Shirley" reruns.

Dear Sandra,

Settle a major bet. Does anyone on the Court go, you know, NAKED under their robes?

An Inquiring Mind

Dear I.M.,

First, zip it up.

Second, the answer is, you know, NO. Those solemn black robes we wear are made of this tacky rayon acetate material that feels like a plastic bag against the bare skin. Naked? Under those robes? UGH!

Third, you're lucky to be anonymous; otherwise I'd tell your mom and she'd make you see a shrink.

CASE DISSESS

No nudes is good nudes Sandra

Respect!

Cheers to the Administration for getting the Credit Union on campus. You should really look into this before graduating. Having an extra account-stop commingling before you have funds to commingle.

Cheers to whoever put the ATM on campus. Now you can go to an ATM without worry. 8

Justice Ruth Ginsberg, DISSENTING and CONCURRING
Dear (initials withheld by request),

Bubby, darling, baby, sweet-thing, sugar-pie, listen to your aunt Ruth.

It is wonderful that you are concerned about the feelings of others. I think that kindness has become a dying art, being replaced by "honesty." At the same time, it certainly is getting harder and harder all the time to figure out the proper mode of formal address, given the current attention being paid to people's unknown, unknowable and sometimes bizarre preferences. And the competition in the job market is sharper than my dear, beloved and cherished colleague's tongue (or pen).

But I must concur with Sandra regarding as it is well settled that your question suggests a far deeper malaise than a mere matter of manners. An inquiry like yours is not unusual on the eve of exams, but that is quite a while off at this point. And, OCI has been over for over a month. I suspect that this law school thing is getting to you, dear.

I therefore suggest that you IMMEDIATELY cancel your study sessions, lock away your outlines and tell someone you trust to hide the key for a weekend. Then, locate the loudest, wildest,

Cheers to the wonderful people who gave over $31,000 to PILF at the 1994 PILF auction and party on October 8.

JEERS to those of you who didn't come to the auction. It was only $8.00, and the food was great, prepared by LLS students. Besides, you can always tape those "LaVerne and Shirley" reruns.

Cheers to the wonderful people who gave over $31,000 to PILF at the 1994 PILF auction and party on October 8.

JEERS to those of you who didn't come to the auction. It was only $8.00, and the food was great, prepared by LLS students. Besides, you can always tape those "LaVerne and Shirley" reruns.
 Businesses are streaming out of the State while illegal aliens are streaming in and while criminals appear to have the upper hand in designing our communities. This is not the California I love.

After graduating LA public schools I went to UCLA where I became very involved in student activities and in student government. In my senior year I was elected Student Body President by virtue of holding that office I became the Chair of the Board of Directors of a $70 million dollar business - the Associated Students of UCLA (ASUCLA). As Student Body President I was able to focus the government on the needs of the students at UCLA. After all, the students had fees collected to support the student government and I believed that the government had to be responsive to them directly. My experience in student government taught me that a government can be a positive source of change in society.

I decided to run for the State Assembly, voluntarily because I felt it was the right time to get involved and make a difference. The seat was open, and with term limits that will only happen every six years, I won my primary with 63% of the vote and continue to run a grassroots, volunteer-intensive campaign. I have had help from a lot of my friends, including a number of Loyola Law Students.

In this campaign I am running against a left-wing Democrat who has described herself to an author this way: "My life is much better not acting and being a radical feminist activist attorney," (Signorile, Queer in America, Random House, 1993, pg. 322). She was the only woman in her primary and defeated her six male opponents by spending $400,000. She's almost exclusively to female Democrats - this got her 41% of the vote in an easy win. The L.A. Times calls her a "Child of the Sixties" and she is enthusiastically endorsed by the penultimate politician of the Sixties, Tom Hayden.

Ms. Kuehl opposes the "Three Strikes and You're Out" initiative, she supports the "Single Payer Health Care Initiative," and she opposes 187 the Save Our State measure. I hold the opposite positions on each measure.

My campaign is focused on the need for change in California. If elected I will seek a seat on the Criminal Justice Committee in the Assembly. I intend to work for "Truth in Sentencing" laws. It is ridiculous that felons serve much less than their full sentence. I have personally had the experience of arresting criminals that I had arrested and seen convicted within the year before.

I believe we need to break up the LA Unified School District so that we can restore community based schools in Los Angeles. I will seek a seat on the Education Committee to work on this issue and to get a law passed to require that core curriculum be taught in English.

We do a great disservice to our young people to allow them to hobble through school learning academic subjects in languages other than English. These students should be immersed in English, put in intensive English-as-a-Second-Language classes so that they can be moved quickly into regular academic classes and be prepared for a successful graduation.

If the federal government wants the states to provide health and education to those persons who are here illegally, then the federal government should pay the cost of those services. I am opposed to further increasing costs to legal California residents (such as the tuition at UC and Cal State campuses). Funds that are currently spent on illegal aliens must be spent on the needs of legal residents.

My campaign is focused on the need for change in the way our State is run. My experience policing the streets of the county, my experience as Chairman of the Board of ASUCLA, and the knowledge gained from living and working in Southern California have prepared me to work for change in Sacramento. If the voters of the 41st Assembly District like the way the State is now, if they are happy with our State legislature and feel safe on our streets then they should vote for my opponent. A vote for Ms. Kuehl is a vote for more of the same style of government we have had for the past twenty years. If the voters of the 41st Assembly District believe it is time for a change, if they want a legislator who will be tough on crime then, clearly, they should vote for me.

The L.A. Times calls (my opponent) a "Child of the Sixties" and she is enthusiastically endorsed by the penultimate politician of the Sixties, Tom Hayden.

Outlaw the phrase "We don't have to spoon feed it to them" because it usually means "I don't have the time to do my job right."
This summer was an experience, in the fullest and richest sense of the word. To see how it goes...

As I wrote to my friends back in L.A.: "they work me like I know what I'm doing. I do not, at least not at first. On one assignment, given to me during a staff meeting, I was asked to draft a response to opponent's motion to suppress surreptitiously tape recorded conversations between our client and the opponent. Stephen asked me to find a way to get it submitted. I did not see that we "do not have a best evidence rule problem." Not yet having enjoyed the benefit of Professor Gold's Evidence lectures, I raised my hand sort of sheepishly and asked: "What's the best evidence rule?" After the snickering died down, Stephen said "I guess I better let you out of the meeting early so you can go find it." So it was that I swim or play plastic diving man on the lake. I blamed a catfish on the bottom of the murky fish tank/graveyard called the Potomac. And that is what I did the Summer great, that qauntlet, that urgency, that relentless demand to produce your best because there is no time & mediocrity. It wasn't about this specific question of law or that list of helpful authorities anymore. It was about doing what I had committed three years to learn to do, and finding a way to do it. It was also about making a great balance between the public interests at stake, and 2) how to interpret the respective statutory roles of the Secretary of Labor and the NRC in the whistleblower settlement process. Arguably, an NRC licensee will be less inclined to commit a whistleblower discrimination case if settling does not ensure confidentiality. If the licensee must be subject to public and agency scrutiny, the licensee may well choose to litigate the matter in the hopes of winning the case, thereby discouraging the whistleblower. Thus, on one hand, the policy against confidentiality provisions runs contrary to the well-established public interest favoring settlement agreements. On the other hand, the public interest in safe, properly operated nuclear power stations depends upon the freedom of nuclear employees to notify the regulatory agencies and the public of safety concerns. Allowing confidentiality provisions would therefore provide a tool for incrementally silencing a crucial source of information on which the public's safety depends. Watch for Colorado Power & Light Co. v. Secretary of Labor in the Fourth Circuit and Porter v. Power & Light in the Fifth Circuit.
I don't care how rich they are. I don't care what religions the candidates' respective spouses embrace. I don't care if one or the other has sold some handcuffs to thugs. I don't care how much one or the other spends on getting elected relative to the other. Hell, if they want to dance naked in the Senate once in a while, it's fine with me as long as they're effective.

But I do care what they have done before. Mr. Huffman advertises himself as a political outsider. He certainly acts like an outsider. (From space, maybe?) Huffman has spent most of his time in Congress avoiding interviews and shredding documents. His pledge not to be a career politician may be fulfilled whether he likes it or not.

Feinstein, by contrast, has been busy. Among other things, she has fought for health care for all of us, and appropriated the money that helped us deal with the earthquake. Career politician or not, she manages to avoid sounding like Forrest Gump. She will represent us in the Senate, not just sit there saying 'I'll only run for two terms. If an employee's effective, you want to keep them, don't you?'

GOVERNOR

BROWN V. WILSON

Sneaky Pete is a marvelous panderer. He seems to know just how to push a lot of mean-ass buttons in many white middle-class voters.

I'm not as certain as I'd like to be that Ms. Brown isn't simply a less effective panderer than Mr. Wilson. But anyone who shows such obvious hostility to immigrants by backing PROP 187 as Wilson has is not fit to be governor of a state population by the large proportion of immigrants in the U.S. Therefore I vote for Brown.

Then they had to deal with all those problems we got from the Fall of 1991 through June this year. The feeling of improved atmosphere dissipated. I noted it at the time and, having been out of school for a year, came back to a less positive campus when then when I had left. I thought it was just a bit slide to what was before.

I now think the negative feelings came out because of the necessary diversion of administration's attention from its original path to meeting the crises of park- ing, riots, the delinquents and the problems of being in Los Angeles. Students were irritated by the inconvenience, job market and the legal community problems we saw on TV each day.

The closure of the parking structure did more than divert progress; it broke community. It broke it by making it harder to park, harder to go back to your car to get your books, harder to want to be on campus, harder to want to come to campus, and harder to want to be a part of the school. It also broke community by dividing people into Beacon Street (Graun by the Union garage people in the shuttle) Union, and Columbia parking lots.

We now have a new parking structure, a new focus for the community of Loyola Law School, and a new start back on the road we started in Spring of 1991.

The statement that illegal aliens pay no taxes is out and out nonsense.

When one looks at Feinstein's 'successes' it has to give one pause. She has repeatedly used the Crime Bill as a success. Among its crime-fighting measures is funding for gymnasiums and sports fitness centers - basically a place for hoodlums to hang out between drive-by shootings. It also creates 60 new crimes eligible for the death penalty. What's wrong with this is not just creating countless new crimes eligible for the death penalty (which will never be enforced anyway). The outrage here is the nearly unprecedented federalization of common street crime. Somebody has to stop this, and Huffman deserves a chance to do just that.

The statement that illegal aliens pay no taxes is out and out nonsense.
First, Kuehl noted that there already are laws on the books that will act to discourage illegal immigration if they were enforced, such as fining employers for hiring undocumented workers. It is abundantly clear that illegals are finding work here in large numbers which is their reason for coming in the first place. Therefore, Kuehl believes that anyone "really serious" about controlling illegal immigration will simply step up enforcement of existing laws that allow for the fining of employers who hire illegals. Kuehl also feels that 187 will cause many more problems than it will solve.

Kuehl notes that a number of industries are ripe with possibility on both counts. These are: alternative (non-petroleum) fueled vehicles, telecommunications, interactive technology and the manufacture of vehicles for mass transit.

Kuehl feels that the reason the reality of these businesses is not living up to their bountiful promise is not enough is being done to create a congenial business environment. She says that "nothing is being done to attract them." She feels that tax abatements and other measures can be combined in a government-private "Silicon Valley approach" that will create zones of creative enterprise.

I also asked Kuehl about Proposition 187. She said simply, "It is not a solution" to the problems caused by illegal immigrants and is concerned that it will "create public ignorance."

Illegal immigrant children who are evicted from the public schools "will not simply go away and disappear." 187 will also add to health problems because sick people will not seek treatment for diseases illegal immigrants are required to act as spies for the INS. This in turn raises the horrible specter of an epidemic of virulent infectious disease that could otherwise be detected and contained. Simply stopping illegal immigration will not solve this problem. Illegal immigrants have no monopoly on infectious disease; illegal immigrants and American nationals can carry disease, too. (For example, bubonic plague is endemic to the western U.S.; a number of people die of it every year. Editor's note.) Crime will rise because people will be less likely to call the police if they are the victims of crime if they feel they will end up being deported.

WHISTLEBLOWER

R.J. Comer was nominated for a 1994 Outstanding Student Achievement Award by the National Association for Public Interest Law for his work at the National Whistleblower Center in Washington, D.C. Students interested in more information about summer internships and post-graduate fellowships at the National Whistleblower Center in Washington, D.C. should contact the Office of Career Services.

YES ON 187 from page 4

Free schooling for the illegals.

California cannot afford to provide for all of those in the world who wish to come here. My ancestors came to this country legally, through Ellis Island. They waited in line, they followed the rules and they worked hard once they were allowed in. I have the greatest respect for the courage and hard work and commitment of the people who immigrate to the USA legally - it is a difficult process and we demean their adherence to the laws of this country if we simply roll over and provide services to those who sneak across the border in violation of the law.

HUFFINGTON from page 9

Feinstein also touts her "Desert Protection Act" as one of her successes. A more apt name for this is the "Desert Land Grab Act." When Bill Clinton signs this bill into law, 800,000 acres of land which had previously been in private hands will be handed over to Big Brother. Nowhere in the bill is there any allocation of funds to compensate the people who have had their land stolen from them. I can only conclude from this that Feinstein holds the Just Compensation Clause with as much contempt as she holds the Second Amendment. Can we trust someone who is so eager to abrogate our Constitution for cheap political gain?

Huffington's charge that Feinstein is a career politician who will say or do anything to stay in office is proven by her conduct throughout this campaign. It began with her campaign manager sending letters to Jewish contributors stating that Huffington was anti-Semitic. Feinstein denied knowledge of this attack. Her denials are not credible when viewed in the light of repeated race-baiting on her part. She is willing to do this because she cannot win without the overwhelming support of the African-American community.

Her race-baiting was most evident when she upheld the issue of a racial covenant on a home previously owned by Huffington. To achieve her divisive aims, she plucked Tom Bradley out of his corporate law firm in order to declare that the covenant showed Huffington to be a shameless racist on the level of a David Duke.

Only days after this assault occurred, it was revealed that Feinstein had the very same racial covenant on her own palatial estate! Politicians are well known for their hypocrisy, but Feinstein has to be the World Champion. The hypocrisy is not nearly as bad as her unforgivable inquisition of race in the contest. With our state already deeply divided, why does she find it necessary to divide it even further? Perhaps it is because she is a career politician who will say or do anything to stay in office.

Mike Huffington deserves the chance to represent California in the United States Senate. He has run on his ideas to bring California into the next century. Dianne Feinstein violently clings to the past. This is why the only way she can win is to viciously attack Huffington, in the hopes of making the electorate so fearful and uncertain, she will win another six years on the public dole.

There is reason to believe her tactics are succeeding; Huffman is trailing her in all recent polls. Still, though, the entire weight of history is going against her. Her ideas are as dead as the doo-doo - and come this November 8th she too might join the ranks of the extinct.
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