Down-to-earth talk

Eleanor the movement.

GULC More feminism: continuation:

students that: ra: x-

students and employers received memoranda from Lammert-Reeves last week advising them of the changes.

In addition to the changes this semester and this summer, fewer students will be awarded work-

study in the coming year.

In the past, the federal government covered 60 percent of work-study payments. Now, because the program is being terminated one pay period early, each department will be billed for 100 percent of their student workers' hours.

Although some departments will be able to withstand this change, others, like the Department of Residence Life, have had to make significant cuts in order to accommodate the new policy.

Please see WORK-STUDY, page 3

PUBLIC INTEREST

Public interest an unrealistic option?
Restrictive loan repayment program makes practice burdensome

by Ladd Cahoon
and Susan Hays

ANALYSIS

Did you know that 69 percent of GULC students say they are considering public interest law, but only 1.5 percent actually do so after graduation?

Why this astounding drop in commitment to altruistic goals? The most-cited reason is high loan payments.

In a survey conducted by the Equal Justice Foundation last year, 63 percent fear that debt will be a barrier to practicing public interest law.

Help, however, is available from the Loan Repayment Assistance Program, which is designed to make loan repayment easier for students who work in low-paying public interest jobs.

The class of 1995 will be faced with an average debt of $45,000 upon graduation, some graduates will have as much as $100,000 in law school debt. For program applicants the average debt is even higher—$67,000. Such debt will result in monthly payments of roughly $850 on the suggested 10-year repayment plan, or $540 on a 30-year plan, assuming a 9 percent interest rate.

Consolidation to 30 years will add $91,227 in interest and 20 more years of payments. (And these figures do not even consider undergraduate loans.) With these debt levels, it's nearly impossible for students to afford to work in low-paying public interest jobs.

A $25,000-a-year public interest job offers $1,715 in monthly take home pay, but loan payments can cut that nearly in half. Living in Washington on $850 a month, or even $1175 a month with consolidated loans, is difficult if not impossible.

Loan repayment assistance is considered absolutely necessary in the era of $20,000 law school tuitions. The rate of tuition increases in the 1980s exceeded the rate of inflation. Legal salaries by and large kept the pace—except in the public interest sector.

Law schools can safely raise tuition if their graduates can afford to pay off the loans necessary to finance their legal education. This affordability assumption does not hold for public interest practitioners.

Many students say that LRAP was one of the primary reasons that they chose Georgetown over cheaper state schools.

"I wanted to attend a top-quality law school, but I knew that I couldn't afford loan payments of $1,000 per month working in a legal services office. When I learned about the LRAP, I decided that Georgetown was the best choice," said Amanda Hendricks, second-year.

"I spent the summer before law school agonizing over whether to attend GULC," said Melissa

Student revives Native American group at GULC

SBA debates student report on computers

GULC softball teams wins co-championship in area tournament

Comfort women exhibit opens at D.C. church

Law Weekly editor emeritus bids farewell

Please see LRAP, page 4

Please see WLA, page 3
Crossword 101

"My Kind of Town"

By Gerry Frey

ACROSS
1. Foot digits
2. Touches
3. Follows eye or low
4. Reply initials
5. Note
6. Helper
7. Butter sub.
8. Florida town
9. Amer cars
10. New York town
11. Incline town
12. Evacuated
13. Sourdough for one
14. Lying down
15. To's companion
16. Evaluated
17. Get up
18. Greek letter
19. Go out with again
20. Occupation: Abr
21. Texas town
22. ___ Ami
23. Sewed together
24. Make lace
25. Swindles
26. Mistletoe
27. Round rod
28. Caesar's seven
29. Arizona town
30. Nebraska town
31. Baseball units
32. Former actor David
33. Region
34. Inclusion
35. Word with Indian or line
36. Group of hoodlums
37. Tortilla sandwich
38. Board game
39. Amer car
40. Down
41. New York town
42. Norwegian town
43. Odd's companion
44. Washington town
45. Seed
46. Tulip
47. Santa winds
48. Spanish dance
49. Outdated
50. Iraq town
51. Actress Moreno
52. Small
53. Gold rush direction
54. French summer
55. Songster Carpenter
56. Connecticut town
57. Not verse
58. Kitchen tool
59. Hollywood trophy
60. Tallahassee Univ.
61. Unmentionable
62. Collar types
63. Thick
64. Seed vessel
65. Dey
66. Wading bird
67. ___ Ami

DOWN
1. ___ M.D.
2. Find
3. ___ Abr
4. ___ Abr
5. ___ Abr
6. ___ Abr
7. ___ Abr
8. ___ Abr
9. ___ Abr
10. ___ Abr
11. ___ Abr
12. ___ Abr
13. ___ Abr
14. ___ Abr
15. ___ Abr
16. ___ Abr
17. ___ Abr
18. ___ Abr
19. ___ Abr
20. ___ Abr
21. ___ Abr
22. ___ Abr
23. ___ Abr
24. ___ Abr
25. ___ Abr
26. ___ Abr
27. ___ Abr
28. ___ Abr
29. ___ Abr
30. ___ Abr
31. ___ Abr
32. ___ Abr
33. ___ Abr
34. ___ Abr
35. ___ Abr
36. ___ Abr
37. ___ Abr
38. ___ Abr
39. ___ Abr
40. ___ Abr
41. ___ Abr
42. ___ Abr
43. ___ Abr
44. ___ Abr
45. ___ Abr
46. ___ Abr
47. ___ Abr
48. ___ Abr
49. ___ Abr
50. ___ Abr
51. ___ Abr
52. ___ Abr
53. ___ Abr
54. ___ Abr
55. ___ Abr
56. ___ Abr
57. ___ Abr
58. ___ Abr
59. ___ Abr
60. ___ Abr
61. ___ Abr
62. ___ Abr
63. ___ Abr
64. ___ Abr
65. ___ Abr
66. ___ Abr
67. ___ Abr
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Quotable Quote

"A car is useless in New York. Essential everywhere else. The same with good manners."

-Mignon McLaughlin
GULC team wins law softball tournament

by Jeffrey Burk
Law Weekly staff

Despite the fact that only a few students took time off from studying for final exams to come out and play, the GULC softball team won a co-championship in the First Annual D.C. Area Law Schools Softball Tournament on Saturday.

The tournament, held at Catholic University, was sponsored by the student bar associations of the law schools at American, Catholic, Georgetown, and George Washington universities.

Georgetown defeated American, Catholic I and Catholic II in its first three games and a shot at the championship. Meanwhile, the Catholic I and Catholic II teams finished at the top of the losers’ bracket.

The GULC squad lost to a combined Catholic team in a championship game, seeing their winning streak broken. Because the tournament was double elimination, though, the Hoya Lawyers still had a game left to play.

Georgetown and Catholic, both with 3-1 records, agreed to cancel the final championship game, however, making them co-champions.

Next semester, the student bar associations will co-sponsor a fall league for teams from Georgetown and other area law schools.

SBA debates computer report

by Taa Grays
Law Weekly staff

Don Graves officially became president emeritus of the Student Bar Association. On April 19, he passed the gavel to Donna Henry, the SBA president for the 1995-1996 school year.

The two major items debated were the adoption of Gary Zeiss’s Student Technology Planning Committee report and a resolution to recommend to the administration a more careful examination of work-study funding.

The report urges the administration to “move to the forefront of legal practice technology.” With the increasing use of computers by practitioners, the report states, it is imperative that the administration take immediate action to ensure that students are able to use computer effectively.

The committee also calls for the creation of a technology center to provide students with access to the latest technology.

Georgetown has a “golden opportunity” to lead other law schools in improving the technology infrastructure available to law students, according to the report.

The SBA adopted the committee report as its official policy recommendation on this issue, however, the section of the report endorsing the technology center was not included.

The second item adopted was a resolution advocating a careful examination of work-study funding.

The administration has already cut the work-study program because it has spent all of its work-study funds. As the administration meets during the summer to determine its financial aid budget, the SBA delegates want the concern and disappointment of the student body reflected in the budget decision-making process.

The SBA ad hoc financial aid committee will implement this resolution when it meets during the summer with the administration.

The new SBA will resume business in September.

WORK-STUDY: Summer positions eliminated

Continued from page 1

Katherine Hall, director of the Office of Residence Life, and Carol Walsh, assistant director, expressed regret that they were forced to reduce some student workers’ hours. One student was terminated entirely.

Julie Gable, a work-study student in the Office of Residence Life, lost several hours as a result of the cut. She said that had it happened earlier in the semes- ter, she would have been upset, but she actually found having fewer hours more convenient since finals are right around the corner.

“I do have a problem, however, with them giving you something in your financial aid package and then taking it away,” Gable said.

According to Lammert-Reeves, in her memorandum, the changes affecting summer work-study positions will have a limited effect on students, since the bulk of summer jobs are research assistantships with faculty members.

Faculty members are eligible to hire summer assistants regardless of their work-study eligibility. She encourages students to continue to apply for sumer positions based on the listings in “What’s Happening.”

In addition, there might be a limited number of off-campus work-study slots available with existing off-campus work-study employers. Students are advised to contact the Office of Financial Aid in mid-May to find out whether there will be positions available for the summer.

Funding for next year’s program will be tight, and in an effort to keep expenses on target, fewer students will be awarded work-study jobs next year.

Students who filed timely Federal Application for Student Aid and GULC financial aid application forms will have a better chance of being awarded work-study positions than those who were late in applying for these funds.

“Although all of these changes were deemed necessary to reduce what could have turned out to be a $55,000 deficit by the end of this semester.”

Student revitalizes GULC Native American group

by Taa Grays
Law Weekly staff

Johnson vs. McIntosh is the first and last time many law students read about the effects of American law on the rights of Native Americans.

Although the law was effectively used to extinguish most Native Americans’ claims to land and to marginalize their interests, Georgetown offers few courses examining this process.

Staci Coleman is going to change that. This semester, Coleman, a first year student, resurrected the Georgetown chapter of the Native American Law Students Association.

Coleman started the club to educate the GULC community about Native American legal issues. Native American issues are found in constitutional law, environmental law, property law, and family law issues. Law students, unfortunately, are not getting this information, she criticized.

“Basically,” Coleman explained, “I started NALSA to educate myself, educate the GULC community and to provide the basis to ask Georgetown for classes.”

Next year NALSA will be co-sponsoring a symposium on current issues affecting Native Americans.

In addition, it will begin a campaign to encourage professors to include Native American issues in their courses.

Native Americans occupy a unique position in American history and American politics. Tribal nations are sovereign entities. Yet tribal nations are also important political groups within American government.

“Georgetown graduates should not be ignorant of these issues,” Coleman said.

WLA: Feminist lawyers key

Continued from page 1

Predicting that the affirmative action issue will be one of the main issues of the 1996 elections, Smeak said women should not consider affirmative action only a race issue, but should remember it is also very much a gender issue and should vote against any candidate who does not support affirmative action.

Smeak said that her leadership in the National Organization for Women. She served as president for three terms, longer than any other person as president of NOW.

Under her leadership, from 1975 to 1982 and from 1985 to 1987, NOW became the pre-eminent feminist organization in the nation. She directed a total administrative and ideological restructuring of the organization, taking it from a small membership base to a mass membership base, and from a catalytic approach to political action.

In 1987 Smeak co-founded and became president of the Feminist Majority and Feminist Majority Foundation. The Feminist Majority sponsors the Feminization of Power Campaign, the largest state and national campaign to focus on recruiting record numbers of feminists to run for public office.

The Feminist Majority also works for passage of gender balance laws requiring governors and mayors to appoint equal numbers of women and men to boards and commissions.

Georgetown has a “golden opportunity” to lead other law schools in improving the technology infrastructure available to law students, according to the report.

The SBA adopted the committee report as its official policy recommendation on this issue, however, the section of the report endorsing the computer requirement was omitted.

The second item adopted was a resolution advocating a careful examination of work-study funding.

The administration has already cut the work-study program because it has spent all of its work-study funds. As the administration meets during the summer to determine its financial aid budget, the SBA delegates want the concern and disappointment of the student body reflected in the budget decision-making process.

The SBA ad hoc financial aid committee will implement this resolution when it meets during the summer with the administration.

The new SBA will resume business in September.
Continued from page 1

Jurgens, second-year.

"George-town offers better courses and clinics for a public interest career, but it’s so expensive. I could have gone to a state law school and paid a fraction of the the Law Center’s $20,000 tuition. But LRAP tipped the balance for GULC," she said.

But the program is not without critics. Many potential recipients believe the program does not go far enough, and demand for the program is increasing.

This year the number of new applicants exceeded the total number of current participants. As more GULC graduates take public interest jobs, the necessity of LRAP increases.

SECURITY NEEDS AND COMMERCIAL LOANS

For Georgetown students, counting on loan repayment assistance to make them to have a public interest career can be a perilous business. A few years ago a GULC committee expanded LRAP to cover commercial as well as federal loans.

This is a welcome improvement, as the current federal loan cap of $18,500 per year doesn’t cover the annual estimated expenses of $33,000. However, in December, current recipients and new applicants faced a shocking surprise: GULC rescinded LRAP’s coverage of commercial loans due to budget shortfalls.

Covering commercial loans

However, in December, current recipients and new applicants faced a shocking surprise: GULC rescinded LRAP’s coverage of commercial loans due to budget shortfalls.

DEFINITION OF QUALIFYING EMPLOYMENT TOO NARROW

The most fundamental criticism is that the program covers only a small portion of public interest legal work. Eighty-four percent of students surveyed who fear loan debt will prevent their practicing public interest law say that the current definition of qualifying employment is too narrow.

"I’m not in the courtroom doing traditional legal work," said Sarah Craven, a 1992 graduate who works for the Center for Development and Population Activities. "Initially, advocating for low-income women around the world was not ‘public interest’ to the Law Center.

"It took me two years to convince them otherwise," she said.

How LRAP works

To be eligible for the Loan Repayment Assistance Program, student loans must be "law-related," be self-employed, on a full-time basis, in a law-related capacity by an entity that has one of its primary purposes the rendering of legal services to or on behalf of persons or organizations which could not otherwise obtain such services.

The program does cover those working for legal aid, public defenders and the American Civil Liberties Union. It does not cover government employment such as jobs with prosecutors and the military and policy work that is insufficiently law-related.

Applicants must enter qualifying employment within two years after graduating or directly following a judicial clerkship.

Through the program GULC will cover the loans necessary to cover loan payments. The loan is interest-free while graduates remain in qualifying employment.

If they leave qualifying employment, they must begin to repay the loan after a six-month grace period. However, interest begins to accrue at the rate of 10 percent — well above the 8.25 percent rate at which federal loans are capped.

For each year a graduate qualifies, 10 percent of the loans are converted into grants. For example, after six years, the ratio will be 60 percent grant and 40 percent loan.

The amount isn’t officially forgiven until the graduate leaves the program either by taking non-qualifying employment or by paying off all the loans. The forgiveness of LRAP loan counts as income for tax purposes.

Harvard’s loan repayment assistance program takes the additional tax liability into account. Georgetown’s does not.

Annual repayment loans are calculated according to the following rules:

- GULC assumes you consolidate your loans. So if you have $67,000 in debt, your annual loan liability is $6,480 a year, instead of the $10,080 it would actually be for a 10-year repayment.

- GULC then takes the average of your and your spouse’s adjusted gross income from your tax return.

- GULC then subtracts the standard maintenance allowance, which is currently $21,324. Graduates living in certain “high cost” urban areas have their allowance adjusted by $6 percent — to $30,591.

- The allowance will be indexed by percent annually to account for inflation. So if your adjusted gross income is $13,000, then subtracting the allowance for a high cost of living leaves you $2,409.

- If the allowance is greater than your adjusted gross income, GULC will loan you the funds equal to your full loan payments. If the difference is greater than your assumed loan payments, GULC will give you no LRAP benefits.

- If the difference is less than your assumed loan, you pay 50 percent of that difference. Using the example above, you would have to pay half of $2,409, which is $1,205. GULC would loan you the difference between your liability and the amount you are responsible for — thus, $6,480 less $1,205.

You get a loan of $5,275 through the program.

There are a few limited adjustments for child care and poor educational debt.

One idea that could decrease GULC’s loan repayment costs is the use of up-front conditional grants, which would be given to current law students who demonstrate a commitment to public interest work.

Restrictions as to the type of employment

LOANS INSTEAD OF GRANTS

Furthermore, the program is too dependent on loan relief rather than grant relief. Harvard, Duke and at least 20 other top law schools offer grants in addition to loans to help make a public interest career affordable. At GULC, the loans are converted to grants over a 10-year period.

This is administratively burdensome, inefficient and more costly than a simpler system.

GRANTS

条件性の補助金

Instead of making a legal education affordable to public interest practitioners from the beginning, the program creates additional interest costs to the school and the students.

One idea that could decrease
**LRAP: Number of students expanding yearly**

While $30,591 may seem like heaven to some students, it will not cover the expenses of living in a city like Washington while supporting a family.

NEW IDEAS FOR LRAP

**Exhibit honors ‘comfort women’**

Yesterday, on April 25, 1995, prominent human rights leaders will open a unique, month-long exhibit on Capitol Hill of rare photographs documenting the courage and dignity of ‘Comfort Women,’ who were raped and exploited for sexual services by Japanese troops during World War II. Many photographs have never been seen before in the United States.

Speakers at yesterday’s press conference included Dr. Mary Gray, chair of the Board of Directors of Amnesty International USA, Fr. Robert Drinan, professor of international human rights law at Georgetown University Law School and former Member of Congress, and Dr. Claudio Grossman, Dean of the Washington College of Law at American University and director of the Center for Human Rights and Humanitarian Law.

During World War II, Japan’s imperial army and navy tricked and coerced about 200,000 young women into military brothels for use as sexual slaves by their troops. Most of the women were from territories occupied by Japan -- Korea, the Philippines, Burma, China, and other Asian countries. Many were girls as young as 12 years old.

At the end of the war, retreating troops murdered many of the survivors of this ordeal; other Comfort Women were abandoned and denounced as prostitutes by postwar governments. Many of the survivors suffered from serious diseases, emotional trauma and humiliation, or from injuries due to beatings or torture.

Yesterday’s press conference and symposium, and the month-long exhibit of rare photographs tell the story of these women. The events have been organized by the Washington Coalition for Comfort Women Issues (WCCW), nonpartisan, educational organization specializing in research and teaching about Comfort Women. The exhibit will also visit Los Angeles and Toronto.

The exhibition will open to the public at the United Methodist Church building at 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, next door to the U.S. Supreme Court building and minutes from the U.S. Capitol. It can be reached conveniently from Metro stations at Union Station (red line) and Capitol South (blue and orange lines). It will be open from 9AM to 5PM, Monday through Saturday, through May 26. The display is best suited for young adults and adults, 12 years old and above.

The United Methodist Church on Capitol Hill hosts an exhibit on ‘comfort women’ through May 26.
Racial gerrymandering may be self-fulfilling

by Edwin M. Yoder, Jr.
SYNDICATED COLUMNIST

WASHINGTON — Fifty-two congressional districts (of 435) have now been deliberately shaped or misshaped — to produce black or Hispanic voting majorities.

These "majority-minority" districts are once again under Supreme Court scrutiny in cases arising from Georgia and Louisiana. They represent the most explicit official embrace of race-conscious political structures in half a century — or, to be specific, since the court outlawed the white primary in 1944.

That these districts are causing the justices visible unease was obvious when the cases were argued the other day. And no wonder. The premise of the 15th Amendment and the 1965 Voting Rights Act is equal access to the ballot, not assured outcomes.

You may wonder, in fact, how the Department of Justice has managed to use the Voting Rights Act, a long overdue enforcement of the right to vote, to force the creation of congressional districts of a predetermined racial complexion.

There is a perverse logic to the matter: The right to vote itself may, it is held, be rendered meaningless if the majority can by various devices dilute minority influence — for instance, by changing a ward-system city council into a body whose members are all elected at large.

For years, the Justice Department has monitored this kind of chicanery, and with justification. The new step in the logic, however, is that true "fairness" in representation can only be achieved if one is represented by someone of his own race.

Thus, those who defend the new majority-minority districts tirelessly reiterate that, before the 1992 gerrymanders took effect, not a single Southern congressional seat had been held by a black member since 1901.

That is a historical fact, and a regrettable one, but it is not a constitutional argument. And it seems to prove more than it actually does prove. Surveys of opinion uniformly suggest that there is no significant difference between the political aspirations of blacks and whites — no real distinction in the benefits they seek from American life. Why then should it matter what color your representative is?

There is, of course, a sense in which this racial gerrymandering serves other purposes — vanity or visibility, perhaps. Having approximately doubled after the 1992 election, the Congressional Black Caucus was quick to see that President Clinton needed its votes to pass some of his key legislation. The caucus chairman, Rep. Kweisi Mfume of Maryland, was not shy about rubbing the fact in, publicly and emphatically.

It was heady stuff while it lasted; but it didn’t last long. In 1994, hosts of Southern Democratic congressmen lost to Republican challengers — some because formerly biracial districts had been picked over for black precincts to enlarge the black vote in the majority-minority districts.

Net result: The designated black seats were held but, for the first time since Reconstruction, the GOP won a majority of Southern congressional seats. The Black Caucus, being almost exclusively Democratic, was quietly marginalized.

In retrospect, would it not have been a wiser strategy, even from the point of view of black interests, to resist the seductive argument that representation by someone of your own race is the only real representation?

Perhaps. But of course it isn’t the Supreme Court’s job to render political judgments. What the court must decide isn’t whether race-conscious districting is prudent or useful, but whether it is constitutional. And to that end it is groping for a judicially respectable analysis.

Justice Sandra Day O’Connor proposed such an analysis in an earlier North Carolina voting rights case when she wrote that the "irrational" shape of a racially gerrymandered district raised a presumption of illegal racial segregation. But proving that you suffer individually from such an arrangement may be as hard as proving that someone else benefits — the other side of the same coin.

Racially gerrymandered districts are clearly based on the assumption that white majorities won’t elect blacks and vice versa — an assumption that appears both gratuitous and insulting in the age of Doug Wilder and Colin Powell. And assuming it, as the law now does, maybe one way to make it come true.

(c) 1995, Washington Post Writers Group
MOURNING IN AMERICA

Until we meet again

by P.E. Brill
STAFF COLUMNIST

So. 'Tis the last issue of our publication, the last cry for this year from the mouthpiece of your friendly neighborhood law school.

Indeed, I've been writing for this rag for a whole year. And now it's all over. At least until September. (And you thought you'd have me out of your life forever, didn't you?)

In a week, the collective angst of the student body will be more than ordinary mortals should be forced to bear. Yet this is the plight, the state, of the law student.

They should make a "Wild Kingdom" episode about us. Something about being nocturnal, sleeping less than three hours a night, bearing a symbiotic relationship to caffeine.

Yeah, whatever.

Helpful hints for finals, then:

1. Stop complaining. A friend of mine wanted to write a book called "I'm Okay. You Suck!"

On the first page, it would simply say, "Get over it." I think this is a fine message.

We are, in case you hadn't noticed, all law students. Everyone else is doing the same thing you are, which is causing them great amounts of panic for reasons that bear little relationship to reality.

Indeed, it truly seems as though most of the anxiety around these parts is self-caused, sui generis in pretentious Latin legal-speak. So please stop whining. Do your work. Study.

Stop patronizing other people by writing for the school newspaper.

2. Relax. You could be working at 1-800-FLOWERS. Or Denny's.

But you're not. You're a law student, and you're at one of the top law schools in the nation. This is not pretentious; it is a fact, and I am merely pointing it out.

Unless you really, really truly, badly mess up around here, you're going to come out all right. And I hasten to say that there are not that many people who are going to truly mess up.

But, on the other hand, there can only be one third of the class in the top third. Do the math. Only ten percent will be in the top ten percent.

Yet somehow basic math is forgotten around the first week here. It seems to stay lost once lawyers become hiring partners.

Unless there are only 62.5 jobs available each year, each firm cannot only hire in the top ten percent.

So, yes, you're going to get a job if you get a B. Probably even if you get a C.

3. Practice safe sex. If you're going to be engaging in any consensual sexual activity outside of a long-term monogamous relationship, please be sure to protect yourself. Use a condom or a dental dam, both of which are available at your local drug store.

Do not engage in sexual activity when under the influence of drugs or alcohol, as these substances may impair your judgement and lead to an increased risk of contracting sexually-transmitted diseases (STDs). If you have any further questions, please contact your health care provider.

4. Grades and life are different things. I somehow doubt that the arbitrary grading decisions of a professor (who undoubtedly looks funny naked) are going to ruin your life forever.

Your self-worth, maybe. Your personal dignity, maybe. At least until you have great sex again. One way or the other (and I'm no different than the rest of you), it's going to happen. (Yes, the sex, too.)

It's just the effect of the family-type atmosphere fostered here at GULC. Besides, how many Supreme Court clerks can there be?

And who wants the stress? (Asks the columnist to discourage people from applying for his spot.)

5. A new Wal-Mart opens every 26 minutes. Blockbuster Video is booming. So there's always a great job in retail waiting for a person with good people skills and a persuasive manner. So who needs that legal job, anyway?

6. The Capitol is three blocks away. If you want an idea of the kind of people who make law school the overwhelming concern in their lives to the exclusion of anything enjoyable, take a walk over to the Capitol.

Watch Congress, in all its glory, go about its business. That should give you some perspective.

Fast.

6. It will all be over in three weeks. Of course then there's the summer job.


Hope that was helpful. See you next year.

And, of course, until we meet again, Happy trails ...

LETTERS

COURSE LIST BIZARRE

I find it truly bizarre that members of the administration of this law school have distributed a list of courses in which class, race, gender, and sexual orientation issues are mentioned or stressed. For students like myself, who came here to study law rather than sociology, it would have been extremely helpful to have a list of courses that do not focus on or mention these issues.

If the Administration is willing to waste its time, energy, and resources compiling the list that was distributed to first-years and second-years this past week, then it seems only fair also to let students know which courses they should choose for a traditional legal education.

As more people become aware of Georgetown's emphasis on race, gender, class, and sexual orientation issues, at the expense of traditional legal doctrines and black-letter law, the value of our degrees, for which we have each paid in excess of $60,000, is sinking.

If I had intended to study race, gender, class, and sexual orientation issues, I would not have chosen to attend law school.

Charlotte E. Giddings
Third-year day

SBA STORY INSUFFICIENT

Your lead story on the Law Center budget ("New SBA members hear about budget," April 12, 1995) was barely illuminating. It reported that Dean Aren told the SBA that tuition will rise 5.4 percent next year, the "lowest increase in 18 years."

Not mentioned in the article are several important questions. Did the dean explain to the SBA why tuition increases exceed the rate of inflation every year? Did SBA representatives ask her this question? Was the subject of ever-escalating tuition even discussed?

Surely these questions are more important — and worthy of attention — than the trivial issue of expanding the Speakers Committee.

Brian McKean
Fourth-year evening

LAW WEEKLY wishes to thank its readers this school year. Good luck on finals and look for Law Weekly next fall.
You read it here first...

Randy Furlong served as editor-in-chief and cartoonist for the Law Weekly. This is his final edition of "The Georgetown Law Review," a column he wrote for three years at the Law Center.

by Randy Furlong
Editor Emeritus

Howdy! Welcome to the 52nd (and last) issue of THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW. Vol. XIII, No. 4. THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW sincerely hopes everyone had a happy, and educationally fruitful, Spring semester.

Loyal readers (all two of you) may have noticed the conspicuous absence of THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW so far this semester, as well as the noteworthy absence of my name from the Staff Box of the esteemed Georgetown Law Weekly, although I was the Editor-in-Chief as recently as last semester.

The reason that THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW has not appeared this semester is that I’ve been too lazy to get around to doing one until now when it’s truly the last minute.

The reason that my name has not appeared in the Staff Box has more to do with my King Lear-like decision to hand over control of the Law Weekly at the end of last semester.

I must say that my successors-in-interest here at the Law Weekly have done a fantastic job of making the Law Weekly into a world-class paragon of journalistic excellence, without any help from me, I should add (actually I did type in an article once a few weeks ago, but mostly I’ve just used the Law Weekly office as a convenient place to store my Cafe O’Law coffee mug and my Sum Adams glass).

Fortunately, as I wrote at the end of last semester, the Law Weekly is indeed lucky to be under the very capable guidance and leadership of Editor-in-Chief, Rachel Head, and Managing Editor, Jeffrey Burk, who have done work above and beyond the call of duty, together with their growing and highly efficient staff -- the marked improvement in the quality and content of this year’s Law Weekly is principally due to their hard work and dedication.

I wish them all the best, and am totally confident that the proud traditions and noble heritage of the

GEORGETOWN LAW WEEKLY will continue far into the indefinite future.

As Editor-Emeritus of the Law Weekly, and as the Editor-in-Chief and Cartoonist-in-Chief of THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW, I direct your attention to the accompanying cartoon-in-chief, illustrating an important aspect in the proof of many crimes.

THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW proudly reprints the following award-winning Haiku Holdings:

Marbury v. Madison
Faced with a case
the Supreme Court decides
Constitutionality.

Pierson v. Post
Foxes chased across
waste and barren lands are
possessed by dominion.

For these last few years, writing for THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW has given me many seemingly endless hours of pleasure coupled with the satisfaction of seeing my thoughts and musings in print, a deliciously self-indulgent and delightfully megalomaniacal experience, second in importance only to all the wonderful friends I have made in the course of my brief sojourn here (and you all know who you are!).

As those few (those happy few) who have bothered to read these ramblings know well, I have felt free to write about whatever I wanted to write about, which more often than not has involved high-energy theoretical particle physics.

On these very pages, the stroll-few have been exposed to Nobel Prize-worthy revelations--almost exactly one year ago to the day, on April 26, 1994, THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW presciently predicted that the truth (top) quark would be found to have a mass of 175 GeV, about the mass of a gold atom, and that same day, an experimental team of around 400 physicists at Fermilab near Chicago, announced evidence for the existence of the truth (top) quark with a mass of 174 GeV (give or take 17 GeV).

More recently, on March 2, 1995, this Gang of 400, together with another group of 400 or so experimental physicists also at Fermilab, announced the definitive discovery of the truth (top) quark with a mass of 176 GeV (give or take 13 GeV). All in all, last year’s prediction, based on the unprecedentedly good, and extremely simple, Furlong’s Fabulous Fermion Formula for the masses of nearly all the known quarks and leptons (the basic building blocks of “all that matters” in the Universe), which was also first published in these very pages (in the form of a cartoon, no less), seems to have been overwhelmingly confirmed by the Supreme Court of Final Appeal in matters concerning the Laws of Nature, Mother Nature herself, and you were there!

Spanning the gap between the rational and irrational, THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW has often wondered whether there is any rational basis for the concept of rational basis review that is so familiar from Constitutional Law hermetics - - when a court tries to decide whether a law enacted by a legislature passes rational basis muster, it presumes that it can recognize and distinguish rationally enacted laws from their irrationally enacted brethren.


Clearly, a judicial lunacy commission’s judgment of Newt & Co.’s Third Wavy 100 Days can be no other than, “Guilty by reason of insanity!”

More generally, how is one to know, simply by looking at the laws passed by a legislature, whether or not the legislators were smoking dope (or were completely insane) at the time they considered these laws?

Furthermore, particularly if it is not possible to make such a determination, is it not possible that more coherent laws (especially those relating to drug decriminalization) that might be passed if the legislators were smoking more dope? Why do you think they call it Congress?

On the other hand, a more learned hand, of course, as some of the ancient Greek and Madhyamika Buddhist philosophers theologically and cynically realized, feathistic faith in overweening rationality and undue reliance on the putative powers of reason alone too often lead to unmitigated suffering and unwieldy despair, and are thus to be avoided at all costs, to the best of one’s abilities. Or maybe not, I don’t know!

There is, however, an end to suffering, and that comes right around the same time that one’s law school loans are just about paid off! Good luck and best wishes to all. Remember to wield those awesome legal powers that we have all been granted (“lawsome” powers) with a semblance of responsibility and wisdom leavened with a vestigial sense of compassion. The
Law is truly a seeming web. And don't forget to attend the Graduation Gala from 8 p.m. to midnight on Saturday, May 27, at the National Building Museum (a.k.a. the Pension Building), black-tie optional, open bar, ample buffet dinner (ambrosial cuisine served on elegant china), and live dance band, all for a mere two-score dollars per person or four-score dollars per couple (two-score-and-ten dollars per person or five-score dollars per couple at the door).

Tickets are available now at the Office of Student Affairs, Room 170. Commemorative embroidered Class of 1995 sweatshirts are also available for two-score-and-five dollars each (or four-score-and-ten dollars for two), also at the Office of Student Affairs.

By the way, as the name suggests, student affairs may also be arranged at the same office. Give generously to the class gift of your choice -- it's all borrowed money anyway, since ultimately we're all living on borrowed time, and Einstein once proved that time is money (at least according to Gary Larson). Coyote howls in the moonlight.

And now, for something completely different. Early on, the loyal undaunted reader (surely a fictitious character as the non-existent hypothetical "reasonable person") was exposed to the majesty of Euclid's Proof of the Infinity of Prime Numbers.

In a nutshell, this boils down to a proof by contradiction -- assume that there exists a largest prime number P (a prime number is any number larger than one that is only divisible by itself and one -- for example, 2 or 3 or 11 or 13, as opposed to composite numbers that have more than one prime divisor -- for example, 4 (which equals 2 times 2 as well as 1 times 4) or 6 (2 times 3) or 8 (2 times 3 times 2) and then consider the number Q that you get when you multiply all the numbers up to and including P together and then add one to the result (Q=P!+1). (For example, if we thought erroneously that 5 was the largest prime P, then Q would be 5 times 4 times 3 times 2 times one plus one, or 121.) Now Q is either prime or composite. (In our example, 121 equals 11 times 11, so it is composite.) If Q is prime, then we have a contradiction since Q is clearly larger than P (even P+1-P, so P!+1-P a fortiori), and thus P cannot be the largest prime we had assumed.

However, if Q is composite, then it must be divisible by another prime that is larger than P, for Q is patently not divisible by any number up to and including P (dividing Q by any number up to and including P always leaves a remainder of one -- in our example, Q goes into 121 a total of 24 times with one left over, 4 goes into 121 a total of 30 times with one left over, 3 goes into 121 a total of 40 times with one left over, and 2 goes into 121 a total of 60 times with one left over) and thus must be divisible by some number R that is less than Q and yet larger than P.

Now, either R is prime (in our example, R is 11, which is prime), in which case we have again reached the desired contradiction, having found another prime R larger than P, or R is composite, in which case R must be divisible by yet another number S, smaller than R, but larger than P. Once again, either S is prime or S is composite, and so forth and so on, until we have exhausted every number between P and Q.

In the "worst case scenario," all the numbers from P+1 to Q are supposedly composite divisors of Q, but this is simply absurd, since Q is obviously an even number (2 is the unique even prime) and hence divisible by 2 and by (P+1), 2, both of which are smaller than P, and yet neither of which can be divisors of Q because none of the numbers between 2 and P divide without remainder into Q by design, as it were.

Therefore, somewhere between P and Q, there lurks another prime larger than P, and since this is true for any and all Ps and Qs, there must be an infinity of prime numbers.

Here's in a different nutshell is yet another juicy tidbit from the annals of arcane mathematical trivia -- there are different types of infinity! This remarkable fact was discovered by Georg Cantor.

The "smallest" kind of infinity is known as a countable infinity, a denumerable infinity that can be put into a one-to-one correspondence with the whole numbers, 0, 1, 2, 3, ..., whereas a "larger" kind of infinity is known as an uncountable infinity, a nondenumerable infinity that cannot be put into a one-to-one correspondence with the whole numbers.

Cantor showed that the number of points on the line between 0 and 1 is nondenumerably infinite by trying to put all the points on the line between 0 and 1 into a one-to-one correspondence with the whole numbers -- in other words, he imagined trying to count the number of points on a line.

The trouble arises when one tries to count the "next" point that comes after 0, for example. Whereas everyone knows that the "next" number after 41 is 42 and that the next number after 42 is 43, and so on and so forth for ever and ever, nobody knows how to find any point that is "next" to any other point -- between any two given points on a line there is always another point between them, and so the number of points between any two points on a line is manifestly uncountably infinite.

Cantor went on to show that there are in fact definable sets of transfinite objects that are ever "more" infinite than the number of points between any two points on a line (or, equivalently, the number of parallel lines between any two parallel lines in a plane, or the number of parallel planes between any two parallel planes in a three-dimensional Euclidean space, or between any two "parallel" spaces in a four-dimensional Euclidean hyperspace, ...) and then proceeded to go crazy, not unlike the hapless (and possibly apocalyptic) early Greek mathematician who discovered irrational numbers like the square root of two that cannot be expressed as rational fractions of whole numbers. A cherry tree blooms in the void.
GULC and the Georgetown-Johns Hopkins Joint Degree Program in Law and Public Health present a symposium

“The Privatization of Health Care Reform”

Friday, April 28
9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Hart Moot Courtroom
R.S.V.P. (202) 662-9502

The Federalist Society invites first-years to an information session on the Journal write-on competition

Members from the Georgetown Law Journal, American Criminal Law Review, The Tax Lawyer, and Law and Policy in International Business will speak about and answer questions on how to succeed in the write-on competition

Wednesday, April 26
3:30 to 5:00 p.m. Room 140
RES PENDENS

OFFICE OF RESIDENCE LIFE

Summer Living in Washington, D.C.
Georgetown University Law Center invites interested law students who will be working or studying in Washington, D.C., to reside in its newly opened Gewirz Student Center.
Summer Residence Dates: June 4-August 13, 1995.
Short-term rates also available.
Furnished, air-conditioned apartments with private bedrooms and full kitchen. Local telephone service is included.
Walking distance to the U.S. Capitol, Supreme Court, Library of Congress, federal and District courts, Smithsonian museums, and Union Station shops and Metro.
Fitness center, including aerobic and weight-training rooms.
24-hour uniformed security and controlled building access.
Laundry facilities.
Lounges with wide-screen television. Parking available. Please contact the Office of Residence Life at (202) 662-9250 for further information and a Housing Application. Spaces will be assigned on a first-come, first-served basis, so please apply early to reserve your space.

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

Dates to Remember:
April 24, 1995 95-96 registration forms due to the Office of the Registrar.
April 26, 1995 Friday classes meet instead of Wednesday classes.
April 27, 1995 Last day of classes. No Thursday Classes, meet Saturday classes meet in the evening.
April 28, 1995 Anyone interested in working as an usher for the Law Center commencement should submit an application by Friday.
April 30, 1995 If you want to sit for the New Jersey bar exam in July of this year, you must file a written notice of intention by April 30. According to the New Jersey bar, notices postmarked after April 30 will not be accepted for processing.
Spring Exams:
1. Students should receive their exam numbers at their local address during the week of April 24th. Duplicate exam numbers will be available at the Office of the Registrar beginning May 1.
2. The Office of the Registrar will be open on the following Saturdays and Sundays from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. during the examination period for pick-up and return of take home exams: Saturday, May 6; Sunday, May 7; Saturday, May 13, and Sunday, May 14. Consult the exam schedule for due dates of individual take home exams.
3. Check the bulletin board outside Room 202 for important information regarding our exam deferral policy.
4. Students who wish to type their exams must have their typewriters approved by the audio visual department before the exam period. For details as to what kinds of typewriters are allowed, please see the policy posted on the bulletin board outside Room 202. Students are encouraged to have their typewriters approved as early as possible.
5. Exam conflicts: If you have not yet applied for exam conflict relief, please stop by the Office of the Registrar and complete an exam conflict form.
Graduation Information:
1. Graduation announcements (10 per student) are being distributed by the Office of Student Affairs through May 5. Announcements that have not been picked up by Friday, May 5, will be made available on a first-come, first-serve basis, at the Office of Student Affairs beginning Monday, May 2.
2. In the event of heavy rain the academic procession and ceremonies will be moved to McDonough gym and guests will have to present a rain ticket to be admitted. Two rain site tickets will be mailed directly to each graduating student in late April. You may also sign up at the Student Life Office for returned rain tickets, should any become available.
3. Diplomas are distributed at graduation according to first-year section (or graduate division). Please be certain to tell your family and friends your first-year section and distribution site so they will not miss seeing you receive your diploma. If you wish to receive your diploma with another section, please notify the Office of the Registrar.
4. If you feel we will have trouble pronouncing your name at graduation, please submit a phonetic pronunciation to the Office of the Registrar.
Bar Information:
1. The Office of the Registrar has compiled information on the various state bars. Information provided includes registration deadlines, required academic programs where appropriate, fees, etc. The information can be checked out by leaving a student ID. The Registrar’s Office also maintains a selection of bar surveys and other informative materials prepared by bar groups, bar review programs and accrediting associations.
2. Deadlines are coming up (and passing!) to make application to sit for bar exams this summer. If you have not already done so, you should contact the jurisdiction of your choice to request materials. Phone numbers and other information are available at the front counter of the Registrar’s Office. Please bring the documents to be certified to the Registrar’s Office now. They will be completed and mailed after graduation.

ATTENTION STUDENTS AND STAFF: Ushers are needed to work the 1995 Law Center commencement on Monday, May 29, from 7 a.m. to 1 p.m. Ushers should be familiar with the main campus grounds. For an application and more information contact Alison Herr in the Office of the Registrar (Room 315) or call 662-9238.

OFFICE OF CAREER SERVICES

Fall OCI Directory Distribution Schedule
5/195 - 9:00-12:00
Gewirz Conf. Rm.
5/195 - 1:30-4:30
Gewirz Conf. Rm.
5/29 - 9:00-12:00
Gewirz Conf. Rm.
5/29 - 1:30-4:30
Gewirz Conf. Rm.
5/3 - 5/5 - 9:00-12:00
Outside Rm. 325
5/3 - 5/5 - 1:30-4:30
Outside Rm. 325

“So You Want to Be a Law Professor” Wednesday, April 26 at 3:30 in Rm. 110, Professor Susan Bloch will moderate a panel of GULC alumni who are currently teaching. They will give advice to students who aspire to a future teaching position.


OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Graduation Gala tickets are now on sale in the Office of Student Affairs, Rm. 170. The Gala will be held on May 27, 1995 at the National Building Museum from 8:00 p.m. until midnight. Tickets are $40.00 each and include a buffet, open bar, and live dance band. Please make checks payable to GULC (no cash please).
Why do the Majority of law students across the nation choose to prepare for their bar exams with BAR/BRI?

1. Superior Lecturers - Recognized Experts in their Field
2. Comprehensive yet Concise Study Outlines
3. Highly Condensed "Last Minute" Final Review Outlines
4. Complete MBE/State Preparation in 46 States
5. Logical Course Format Specifically Tailored to each State
6. Step by Step Daily Study Schedules to Keep You Focused
7. Sophisticated Multistate Computer Software
8. BAR/BRI is the most Economical...

It includes The Gilbert Multistate Workshop!

Spring Discounts are in Effect Until March 31st for...
D.C., Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia

Sign Up with Your BAR/BRI Rep or call
The Supreme Course™ at (202) 833-3080