A MESSAGE FROM YOUR PRESIDENT

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for electing me your new SBA President for the 2003-2004 year. It was a class election and every vote counted. I would like to thank the student organizations who endorsed my candidacy: The National Italian American Bar Association, The Irish Law Students Association, DeNovo, The Corporate & Business Law Society, The Latino Law Students Association, Amnesty International, The Criminal Law Society, The Unemployment Action Center.

I ran this campaign on a platform to make the SBA more accessible to the Student Body, and to use the SBA to help increase the status & ranking of New York Law School. I hope to accomplish these goals with the help my new executive board and newly elected Senate. However, in addition to them, I look forward to hearing the ideas and concerns from the entire student body. Anyone who wants to speak with me should feel free to do so.

Thank you all once again, and congratulations to everyone else who was elected. Good luck on your upcoming finals, have a great summer, and I will see you in the fall.

Yours truly,
Brian J. Kaszuba
SBA President
EASTER RAMBLINGS

We are almost at the end of another semester. Although I intend on returning for CLE classes if possible, that's it for me. (No doubt, I plan on Iraq might go on. But those years are finally about to run. However, reality has started to kick in.

Summer is fast approaching.

Many of us have yet to find positions - summer and permanent. If you are a law school student, contact Professor Pieper and the BAR. If you are a 1L, you might want to just take the summer off or find a job. But you might as well try to salvage any chance of getting someone other than what you end up summer off for a very long time.

Then of course there are the exams in May. Yes they too are around the corner.

We have a new SBA President who has some great ideas. I wish him and the rest of the newly elected SBA well. I hope the incoming SBA succeeds.

The NYLS community.

May 1998

WHERE IS THE INSPIRATION?

Sometime on interviews you get asked, "What is your biggest weakness?" It's a good question to ask the interviewee to consider. I always answer this question with 'better than one other that the side other is bound to ask. Law school requires matters of all kinds: time management, study habits, break time activities, future life as a lawyer, areas of specialization and shortcomings just to name a few. Sometime the SBA was considered a safe school. I wish him and the rest of the NYLS community. Please include your name, telephone number and e-mail address with your submission.

The SBA has the voice of the New York Law School community. We know the content of the newspaper. All inquiries or comments should be directed to the address below. The SBA has the voice of the New York Law School community. We know the content of the newspaper. All inquiries or comments should be directed to the address below. The SBA has the voice of the New York Law School community. Weknow the content of the newspaper. All inquiries or comments should be directed to the address below.

Please address all submissions, letters, and other correspondence to: Editors-in-Chief
De Novo, c/o New York Law School
43 Worth Street, room L2
New York, NY 10013

Phone: 212.431.2988 x4202
Fax: 212.302.6632
E-mail: editors@denovopaper.com

Visit us on the web: www.denovopaper.com

Editors-in-Chief
Lisa Pettito
Dwight Day
David Steineland

Copy Editor
Dena Opperman

Staff Writers
David Frenklikman
Mandle Forman
Mr. P
Frank Raphael

Int. Staff Writer of Mystery
Martin Morris
Omotolu O. Idowu
Tammy Fastman

Photographs By
Tammy Fastman
Lisa Pettito

Printed By
Vanguard Printing

Design and Layout
David Steineland

Business Manager
Lisa Pettito

Business Assistant
Eva Ogorek

Founding Editors
Lisa Pettito
Dwight Day
David Steineland

De Novo is the voice of the New York Law School community. We know the content of the newspaper. All inquiries or comments should be directed to the address below. The SBA has the voice of the New York Law School community. We know the content of the newspaper. All inquiries or comments should be directed to the address below.

Please address all submissions, letters, and other correspondence to: Editors-in-Chief
De Novo, c/o New York Law School
43 Worth Street, room L2
New York, NY 10013

Phone: 212.431.2988 x4202
Fax: 212.302.6632
E-mail: editors@denovopaper.com

Visit us on the web: www.denovopaper.com

CORRECTLY COMPLETE DE NOVO'S CROSSWORD AND WIN LUNCH FOR TWO VALUED AT $40 AT ANY RESTAURANT OF YOUR CHOICE. IF MORE THAN ONE ENTRY, THEN A RAFFLE WILL BE HELD ON DE NOVO'S OFFICE, OPENED TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE NYLS COMMUNITY INCLUDING DE NOVO'S STAFF EXCEPT FOR THE EDITORS/NCHIEF.
THANK YOU TO ALL THE BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN RISKING THEIR LIVES TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE FREEDOM FOR ALL.

OUR THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS ARE WITH YOU

THANK YOU FOR YOUR DEDICATION.
LIVING HEALTHIER
FEELING LIGHTER,
LOOKING BETTER

By De Novo Staff

Let me ask you this: which is worse?

A. The engine on your Lexus freezes up at 160,000 miles instead of 300,000. You take a financial hit and you are forced to buy a Camry this time.

B. You start bleeding during bowel movements. You go to the doctor and get poked, prodded, X-ray’d, biopsied, etc. 3 days later you get a call and the doctor informs you that you have advanced colon cancer at 45 years old. You have anywhere from 6 months to 5 years left to live. He tells you it’s time to get your house in order because you’ll be checking out soon. Chemotherapy starts today.

The typical situation is that a family member or dear friend who has a budding career, in the prime of his life, will have to say goodbye and leave behind spouse and children who wonder what just hit them. Why? Because daddy, mommy or hubby just died of colon cancer at age 42.

Why do you brush your teeth? Are your teeth falling out right now? Most of us do it so we won’t need false teeth and Fixodent down the road... right? We want to be able to eat apples. Hey, I agree with that. Natural teeth are great.

But have you ever seen someone who was forced to endure a colonoscopy? Someone who will now spend the rest of his life carrying a bag around?

Incredibly, this is an area where even the staunchest MDs AGREE. It’s a great idea to get your colon checked. NO. I’m not kidding... Better yet, just have it cleansed. The subject is not even up for debate. It’s a proven fact. The problem is most people are not doing anything about it. Please don’t be one of them.

***WARNING*** The next section of this article contains graphic material which may not be suitable for squeamish individuals.

Let’s talk stools.

Stool tells you a lot about the health of your colon. If it’s dark brown in color and it sinks and stinks, that’s not good. Don’t feel bad, that’s the way most people are. What you want to see is light brown color. That means it’s full of fresh bile from the liver. You also want very mild odor and a stool that floats. Fresh, mild odor means one of them: Because daddy, mommy or hubby just died of colon cancer at age 42.

The first few days following your cleanse, you’ll know it’s working when you see the above good stuff happening and you are eliminating at least 2-3 times per day.

You may be very surprised at some of the benefits you will receive besides just losing 1-5 lbs of crap from your body and brightening your future health. People have reported more energy, less allergies, clearing of acne, cessation of migraines and many other effects (not to mention restored regularity). When your body is void of old, poisonous toxins that are constantly being reabsorbed through the colon walls, it can begin to heal again. The colon walls are clear, the good nutrients from your food and supplements can be absorbed again. You will be thrilled with the results.

At this point you are either nauseated thinking about what is inside your own colon, or you’re ready to do something about cleaning it out.

Want more info? Consult your medical doctor as soon as possible.

HOW TO RAISE YOUR SCORES ON THE BAR EXAM

You DON’T WANT TO FAIL THE BAR EXAM. Too much depends on it, your job, your family’s pride, your investment of three or even four years of your life.

HOW TO PREPARE? Our supplemental "Boot Camp" takes the mystery out of the bar exam. As a student in our Essay-Intensive/Retaker School you will receive special substantive bar exam materials for every day you are present. And the book Scoring High on Bar Exam Essays, by Mary Campbell Gallagher, J.D., Ph.D., will be part of your materials. The St. John’s Law School Forum called Scoring High "the best [money] you can spend on bar exam preparation."

1. SYSTEMS FOR THE BAR EXAM ESSAYS. Many bar candidates say they don’t know where to begin on the essays. All too often, they run out of time. The LTS-seven day Essay-Intensive/Retaker School teaches you systems for the bar exam essays that the bar review courses don’t teach. And you will learn the key law that is most frequently tested on the New York bar exam. OUR GUARANTEE: Our Teaching Assistants will return your papers the same day you hand them in.

2. SYSTEMS FOR THE MPT. The MPT is even harder to organize than the essays. A huge task of reading and organizing and writing, but only 90 minutes to do it in. Our 7-Day School teaches you our MPT-GRID™ system for outlining the MPT problem.

3. SYSTEMS FOR STUDYING FOR THE MBE. What can we say. The MBE is hard: In our 7-Day School you will learn systems for studying for the Multistate Bar Exam (MBE) that will help you raise your score by 10 to 20 questions. As NYLS grad Genauna Waananen says, “Dr. Gallagher’s systems changed my life.”

LTS/Gallagher New York Bar Exam Essay-Intensive/Retaker School

Starts June 14, 2003
LTS/Law Training Schools ** Mary Campbell Gallagher & Co., Inc.
For information and to sign up for our courses visit
www.BarWrite.com

EASTER RAMBLINGS
CONT.

Hardwick: Should the court want to leave Bowers intact then it could invalidate the Texas sodomy laws on equal protection grounds.

These are interesting cases for all of us. Professors Teitel and Schoenbrad, my con law professors would be proud of me. I did not understand Constitutional Law until way after their classes ended. Only afterwards, I realized that the problem was not the teaching but the ‘abstractness’ of the class. In any event, I learned more than I realized.

The 14th Amendment, “fundamental rights,” “equal protection,” are now all part of my lexicon. The whole notion that states can’t promulgate laws discriminating against certain classes of people unless there is some “rational basis” for the law and a “legitimate governmental purpose” now all makes sense. That was not the case when I was writing in my Con Law blue books a year ago.

But that’s all part of the law school growth process. Poco a poco se va lejos! Little by little one goes a long way. By the end of our law school journey it all comes together.

As we part for our Easter break, let’s keep in mind that once we get back, everything will go rather quickly. So my advice to you is do not just sit back. It’s still not too late to increase the chances of getting a better grade.

Peace!
SHOCK AND AWE OR SHOCKING AND AWFUL? By Mr. P

Taking the biggest gamble of his presidency, President George Bush gave the order and since then we have been at war. He ordered Saddam and his sons to leave Iraq or face the consequences. According to a significant majority (more than 70%) of Americans now believe that there should be war and back the President.

As I correctly noted last time, it was definitely not a matter of if but when we would go to war. President Bush was not going to hear otherwise from anyone. No matter what Saddam did it would not have been enough for President Bush.

Expressions such as "shock and awe," "route hurricane" and "Operation Iraqi Freedom" are the latest terms to be added to our vocabulary. Now that we are at war, we have to support the troops. However, supporting our troops does not mean that those of us against the war can no longer voice our opinion. It also does not mean that we support President Bush's decision. And it certainly does not mean that we are unpatriotic.

I recently came across an article in the Washington Post where the President's bully tactics were examined. I was not surprised. President Bush is the COMMANDER IN CHIEF and does no one but bow to his way. His presidency troubles me. The way he came to power bothers me. His style of governing bothers me. The way he talks bothers me. His words bother me.

This administration seems to silence all opposition. It is not uncommon to be frozen out if you dare say anything contrary to the administration's view. But I have come to realize that many people like, no sorry, love President Bush. They say he is HONEST. He does not lie to the American people. He is not like former President Bill Clinton. When I hear that argument I can see where they are coming from. They agree that the economy was better during the Clinton years but that they just couldn't stand our former Pres. Then many of the war supporters do not have the facts right. They believe that Saddam is responsible for 9/11. They believe that Saddam and Osama are friends. They believe all sorts of things.

In any event, I will borrow the words of a poster that sums it up best for me. I would best anything that had former President Clinton done for a full-scale war in 1999 and asked for approval from the U.N. he would have gotten it. Expressions such as "route hurricane" would have been on board. Simply put, the world's perception of him as well as his motives would be different. Bush's arrogant cowboy attitude has left American foreign policy in shambles. From the moment he was selected, he made it clear that he was reluctantly pulling out of troubles even his father honored. The lame John Wayne attitude may work on a ranch in Texas, but it will not fly with the rest of the world. I guess his daddy didn't tell him he can catch more flies with honey (and a killer smile) than you can with vinegar (and cowboy boots).

Then we are bombarded with the WAR movies on every T.V. channel. The war is beamed right into our living rooms and bedrooms 24/7. What the **** is it. We have had enough already. Everything has obviously changed: The two sides to this part of the war could be that the U.S. is glorifying this war or maybe the U.S. just wants to convince the rest of the world that this is a JUST and FAIR war.

One thing is certain and that is the U.S.A. cannot boast of its prowess. To do so would be false. After all, we are fighting people in pick-up trucks. We have sent an entire army, the most powerful army on earth for one man. At this moment the only country with weapons of mass destruction and the only country using them seems to be the United States.

What past American presidents, past European leaders and other world leaders took over half a century to build, George Bush has undone in less than three years. Now the United Nations is left as a joke. It might no longer be a viable international organization. Maybe the fundamental flaw with the organization is the U.N.'s arrangement. N.A.T.O. might also have been damaged. One just has to hope that the damage is not irreparable.

We will have to wait and see if billions of dollars and years later we won't regret this time in our history. I hope the United States can mend its trans-Atlantic relationship with its European friends. I also hope that the Iraqi people will be "liberated" and not be ruled by the U.S.A.

Mr. P CONVERTED

No, I am not smoking and neither am I sniffing. However, I am fair-minded. I will admit that I did not like the war or rather I did not like the way we went to war. However, with the U.S.-led coalition of the willing (really just the U.S. and Great Britain), President Bush is closer to making Iraq a better place, freeing the Iraqi people from the grip of their Tyrant leader while at the same time making America safer. Also American companies are guaranteed a stake in the rebuilding of that country.

The might be the beginning of things to come. Of all the Middle Eastern countries, Iraq has all the elements of potential success. It has brainpower, water, oil and a secular society.

Like many others around the globe, I sat and watched that historic moment when the statue of Saddam in the center of Baghdad came tumbling down. It was exactly 11:13 a.m. We can never forget the dancing and clapping of the people in the streets.

President Bush stuck with his conviction, and against the odds went by what he truly believed. His style of governing is different. I do not think we have ever had a president like him before. In his own right, he might very well be remembered as one of America's best presidents. (Did I really say that?) The history books will tell how President George W. Bush defied the odds, shrugged off his allies and the United Nations and brought change to an entire region. This will be part of his legacy.

What seemed to be a Presidency of mishaps has turned President Bush into PRESIDENT Bush.

Now everyone knows that the President will not hesitate to use American power even preemptively to remove tyrants.

Nevertheless, I hope the President remembers that there is a need to reconcile what he does abroad with domestic demands. History has taught us that a president can have a 90% approval rating, but that when it comes to election if the economy is lagging he just might be defeated.

God bless President Bush. God bless America.
Achieving Peace in Our Time: (By ripping Hussein's body to shreds)

I was in “shock and awe” when filmmaker Michael Moore whipped up the crowd at the Academy Awards. On live television, he went on a tirade about how it should be a National Monument. He predicted it around in front of the cameras and undergraduate wannabe hippies everywhere got so excited they took all their hair out of their dorm rooms. At this moment, men and women are fighting and dying for our country and punks like Moore are trying to get attention by making asses out of themselves. They think that being free means thumbing their noses at the sacrifices others are making in these times. Their argument is predictable and reducing to social commentary of our economic structure and values, and somewhere Saddam Hussein became the victim in their warped little minds: “No Blood for Oil. No Racista War”. They think exclusively in little minds: “No Blood for Oil. No Racista War”. They think exclusively in

Portrait of the Artist as a Gothic School Girl: Teenage angst filled ramblings from the diary of Martin Morris

in 50,000-100,000 deaths throughout northern Iraq. Iraq uses chemical weapons, mass executions and forced relocation to terrorize the area.

March 16, 1988 - Iraq attacks the Kurdish town of Hadishah with mix of poison gas and nerve agents.

August 20, 1988 - The Iran-Iraq war ends in stalemate. An estimated 1 million soldiers are killed in eight years of fighting. A ceasefire comes into effect to be monitored by the UN Iraq-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIMOG).

August 2, 1990 - Iraq invades Kuwait and is condemned by United Nations Security Council Resolution 660, which calls for full withdrawal.

August 6, 1990 - UNCS Resolution 661 imposes economic sanctions on Iraq.

August 8, 1990 - Iraq appoints puppet regime in Kuwait that declares a merger with Iraq.

November 29, 1990 - UNSC Resolution 678 authorizes state cooperation with Kuwait to use “all available means” to uphold UNCS Resolution 660. The UN orders Iraq to withdraw. The UN orders Iraq to withdraw by January 15, 1991.


February 24, 1991 - A ground operation begins resulting in the liberation of Kuwait on February 27.

March 3, 1991 - Iraq accepts the terms of the ceasefire. The ceasefire resolution is UNSC 678, requiring Iraq to end its weapons of mass destruction programs and not commit or support terrorism, or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. One week later, Iraq accepts Resolution 678. Its provisions were reiterated and reinforced in subsequent action by the United Nations in June and August of 1991.

April 5, 1991 - UN Security Council Resolution 687 condemns repression of Iraqi civilian population, “the consequences of which threaten international peace and security”.

Iraq must adopt Resolution 715, which requires UNSCOM and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) plans for ongoing monitoring and verification. The council establishes that Iraq shall “accept unconditionally the Inspectors and all other personnel designated by the Security Council to conduct inspections”.

Oct. 1991 - Iraq states it will continue the ongoing Monitoring and Verification program by Resolution 715 to be unlawful and that it is not ready to comply with said resolution.

Feb. 1992 - Iraq refuses to comply with an UNSCOM/IAEA decision to destroy certain facilities used in prohibited programs and related items.

April 1992 - Iraq calls for a halt to inspections, claiming the aircraft and its pilot might be endangered. The President of the Security Council described a statement received by UNSCOM’s right to conduct such flights. Iraq says it does not intend to carry out any new activity aimed at UNSCOM’s aerial flights.

July 6-29, 1992 - Iraq refuses an inspection team access to the Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture. UNSCOM said it had reliable information that the site contained archives related to prohibited activity. Inspectors gained access only after members of the Council threatened enforcement actions. January 1993 - Iraq refuses to allow UNSCOM to use its own aircraft to fly into Iraq. June-July 1993 - Iraq refuses to allow UNSCOM inspectors to install remote-controlled monitoring equipment at two missile engine test stands.

Nov. 26, 1993 - Iraq accepts Resolution 715 and the plans for ongoing monitoring and verification.

Oct. 15, 1994 - The Security Council adopts Resolution 905 requiring Iraq to cooperate fully with UNSCOM and that it withdraw all military forces deployed to southern Iraq to its original positions, Iraq withdraws its forces and resumes working with UNSCOM. March 1995 - Iraq security forces refuse UNSCOM teams access to five sites designated for inspection. The teams enter the sites after delays of up to 17 hours. March 19, 1996 - The Security Council adopts Resolution 1051, which demands that Iraq “cooperate fully” with UNSCOM and that it withdraw all military forces deployed to southern Iraq to its original positions.

May 1991 - Iraq accepts the regulations and immunities of the Special Commission (UNSCOM) and its personnel. These guarantees include the right of “unrestricted freedom of entry and exit without delay or hindrance of its personnel, property, supplies and equipment.”

June 1991 - Iraqi personnel fire on the inspection teams to prevent them from approaching vehicles. September 1991 - Iraqi officials confiscate documents from inspectors. The inspectors refuse to yield a second set of documents. In response, Iraq refuses to allow the team to do remote-controlled monitoring with these documents. A four-day standoff ensues, but Iraq permits the team to do remote-controlled monitoring with these documents after a statement from the Security Council threatens enforcement actions.

Oct. 11, 1991 - The Security Council immediately and unconditionally establishes that Iraq shall accept unconditionally the Inspectors and all other personnel designated by the Security Council to conduct inspections. The council establishes that Iraq shall “accept unconditionally the Inspectors and all other personnel designated by the Security Council to conduct inspections”. The council establishes that Iraq shall “accept unconditionally the Inspectors and all other personnel designated by the Security Council to conduct inspections.”

June 1996 - Iraq denies UNSCOM continued on next page
teams access to sites under investigation for their involvement in the ‘concealment mechanism’ for prohibited items. June 12, 1996—The Security Council adopts Resolution 1040, which terms Iraq’s actions a clear violation of under provisions of the council’s earlier resolutions. It also demands that Iraq grant ‘immediate and unrestricted access’ to all sites designated for inspection by UNSCOM. June 13, 1996—Despite the adoption of Resolution 1040, Iraq once again denies access to inspection teams. Nov. 9, 1996—Iraq blocks UNSCOM from removing remnants of missile engines for in-depth analysis outside Iraq. June 1997—Iraq escorts on board an UNSCOM helicopter try to physically prevent the UNSCOM pilot from flying the helicopter in the direction of its intended destination. June 21, 1997—The Security Council adopts Resolution 1115, which condemns Iraq’s actions. It further demands that Iraq allow UNSCOM’s team immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any sites for inspection and officials for interviews. Sept. 13, 1997—An Iraqi officer attacks an UNSCOM inspector on board an UNSCOM helicopter while the inspector is attempting to take photographs of unauthorized movement of Iraqi vehicles inside a site designated for inspection. Sept. 17, 1997—While seeking access to a site declared by Iraq to be “sensitive,” UNSCOM inspectors witness and videotape Iraqi guards moving files, burning documents and dumping ash-filled waste cans into a nearby river. Nov. 12, 1997—The Security Council adopts Resolution 1137, condemning Iraq for continually violating its obligations. This includes an Iraqi decision to seek to impose conditions for cooperation with UNSCOM. The resolution also imposes a travel restriction on Iraqi officials who are responsible for or participated in instances of noncompliance.

Nov. 5, 1997—Iraq demands that U.S. citizens working for UNSCOM leave Iraq immediately. Dec. 22, 1997—The Security Council issues a statement calling on the government of Iraq to cooperate fully with the commission. It stresses that failure by Iraq to provide immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any site is an unacceptable and clear violation of Security Council resolutions. Feb. 20-23, 1998—Iraq signs a Memorandum of Understanding with the United Nations on February 23, 1998. Iraq pledges to accept all relevant Security Council resolutions, to cooperate fully with UNSCOM and the IAEA and to grant to UNSCOM and the IAEA “immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access” for their inspections. Aug. 5, 1998—The Revolutionary Command Council and the Ba’ath Party Command decide to stop cooperating with UNSCOM and the IAEA until the Security Council is dissolved. Nov. 8, 2002—UNSC adopts RES 1441 outlining provisions for enhanced weapons inspections. Iraq has been and remains in material breach of prior Security Council resolutions. The resolution gave Iraq a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations and obliged them to deliver a currently accurate, full, and complete declaration of all aspects of its programs to develop weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems within 30 days. It further stated that false statements or omissions in declarations and failure by Iraq to comply and cooperate fully in the implementation of the resolution shall constitute a further material breach of Iraq’s obligations. Dec. 7, 2002—Dr. Mohammad El-Baradei reports to the Security Counsel that Iraq’s declaration “did not provide any new information relevant to certain aspects of Iraq’s declared activities.” Jan. 27, 2003—Dr. Hans Blix reports to the Security Counsel that “Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament which was demanded of it.”

Now, I like peace as much as the next guy and am probably just as anxious as we all are. I’m just saying that we passed the point of no return a while ago. Peace will be at hand when our troops get the job done and can come home. I think we should do all we can to support both them and their families. The Hussein guy cannot be reasoned with. You are not going to impress him with some sort of appeal to intrinsic goodness or some similar hippie crap. The same is true for the Hussein regime. History will be the judge of us all.

With the hindsight of history, we can see Gandhi’s fallacy. Fundamental goodness, love or publicity stunts didn’t defeat Hitler. We settled that one for the ages. With the hindsight of history, we can see that the Hussein regime is an ancient manifestation of a form of totalitarianism that was instilled in the world by the German Jews. With the hindsight of history, we can see that there is no way that the German Jews would be able to defeat the rise of the German gentiles in the sense that they will have converted the latter to an appreciation of human dignity.

---

as if you don’t have enough to read!!
by Lisa Pittto

"Girl’s Poker Night" by Jill A. Davis is a very entertaining book because it is broken up into very short chapters and makes for a very quick and easy read. It’s the story of a group of six girlfriends who get together every Wednesday night to play poker. It’s told through the narration of Ruby Capote, the host of Wednesday night poker. Each of the six girls has their own unique story. Skorla is a Russian model who is having an affair with a married man. Jenna works for a tycoon, she has no self-esteem and has never had a boyfriend. Lily is a lesbian but refuses to accept it. Danielle has been divorced several times and now changes men like she changes her clothes. Meg has the most normal life—a house in the suburbs, great husband and a child, but starts to doubt that is what she really wants. Ruby had her own problems, refuses to admit to any of them. She listens to her friends’ problems and helps them, but never confides her inner thoughts to anyone. As the story unfolds everyone seems to accept their problems, and deal with them in a more positive way. Even Ruby’s life turns out to have a happy ending.

Overall I think it was an entertaining book. It’s about real life, real problems and how friends can help you overcome life’s challenges.

---

BRAIN FEED

1. What is the most popular mechanical means of transportation used by New Yorkers?
2. What is the capital of Senegal?
3. What are you afraid of if you have alliumphobia?
4. What is the largest body of fresh water in the world?
5. How many sides does a dodecahedron have?
Meteora hit the shelves March 25 and I had mixed hopes about it mainly due to how much I enjoyed the first and how disappointing the remix release was. The album thoroughly let me down. Lack-luster, mundane, and average seem to quantify my review; disheartened, dejected, and let down describe my feelings for the 36 unremarkable minutes I subjected myself to, in hopes of finding but one song to win me over. Unfortunately nothing won me over, and I haven’t even been able to listen to it since. My only hope is that it will somehow grow on me, but right now I’m focused on not letting it change my love for their debut.

With the fate of a musical genre resting atop their sophomore shoulders, Linkin Park buckled. Late in 2000 I heard the first single off Hybrid Theory, “One Step Closer” and an interest was more than peaked, within days I had hunted down the “proper” spelling that eluded me and within minutes the music director had requested a copy of the album from Warner brothers (I used to be General Manager of a small college radio station). After a few days of sifting through CD’s from bands I could care less about, (sorry, I was on a mission) it finally came. Track after track I was thoroughly enjoying every minute, putting aside my “musical-o.d.d.” and keeping my finger away from the skip button.

While Meteora solidifies the death of rap-metal, a drop in sales or change in sound of bands such as Korn, Papa Roach, Crazytown, Disturbed, P.O.D., and Limp Bizkit (irrelevant album due out this summer), had the genre on the ropes. However, the knockout resulted not solely from the floundering of rap-metal alums; the rise of pop-punk was also a key contributor. Good Charlotte, New Found Glory, Simple Plan, Bowling for Soup, and Unwritten Law among others are selling like hotcakes, and dominate playlists and charts, perhaps even more so than their rap-metal predecessors. So as rap-metal joins the proud tradition of grunge and hair bands try not to think of it as a funeral, but more like your favorite player’s jersey being raised to the rafters. You may still see him at an old timers game, but it will never be the same.

And then, from the same speakers that so many times before had induced merely a yawn, the same CD-player that read discs whose only air-time would be its flight to the trashcan, came the heavily echoed and distorted keyboard intro that has become all too familiar. Track 8, “In The End” would be played over and over again, as it unveiled in the harmonics, beats, and the overall depth of feeling that poured out of the stereo. “I tried so hard, and got so far, and in the end it doesn’t even matter”, became a lyric that would follow me to law school, applying every time the mailman delivered my GPA. Hybrid Theory took its place among the select few albums that I listen to from beginning to end.

Less than 2 years later came Reanimation, an album of remixes. I was not a fan of this release to say the least, but I grew to respect it somewhat, and rationalized that they must be trying to work their way out of a not-so-favorable record deal.
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ANOTHER SATISFIED CUSTOMER
CONT.

Grading within the writing program is atrocious. The opportunity for biases to EASILY play a significant role in the grading of papers under the current system is too great of a detrimental issue not to be addressed. There is no clear standard for grading whatsoever, and it is left completely to the discretion of "practicing attorneys" who have no experience teaching in such a competitive law school environment. Their concerns undoubtedly lie only with obtaining their CLE credits. It seems to be the consensus of many students that no matter what they do from one assignment to the next, their grades will never change. To quote one student, "I went to see my professor and asked him why the G was erased from my paper and replaced with an S." According to that student "professor" simply replied, "I read your paper first and didn't want to set the standard for the rest of the class high." Why do these professors keep the curve in their minds at all times? They shouldn't even be considering the curve when they grade papers. The curve is something that he supposed to affect everyone evenly at the end of the course, is it not? Another example is when they claim that, "you're all improving." This sort of favoritism should have absolutely no effect on our papers. Favoritism also occurs when errors that are verbally addressed by professors during class are not marked and put on the "G" papers. "I read your paper first and didn't want to set the standard for the rest of the class high." When the grade is improved, the comment that "you're all improving" is complete bullshit. While collectively, all the papers have gone up one grading range, individually, students grades, as compared to their peers, have not. This sort of grading does nothing to help the student understand why they received the grades they did. It gives these practicing attorneys more control in their grading whether they realize it or not. What curve is on his mind, and two papers are "qualitatively" the same, his decision on which paper to bump up to the higher letter grade (G to a VG) will "subconsciously" be affected. In class, it is not a conscious decision, it is a subconscious, or even worse, how that person scored on their previous assignment. This sort favoritism should have absolutely no effect on our papers. Favoritism also occurs when errors that are verbally addressed by professors during class are not marked and put on the "G" papers. "I read your paper first and didn't want to set the standard for the rest of the class high." When the grade is improved, the comment that "you're all improving" is complete bullshit. While collectively, all the papers have gone up one grading range, individually, students grades, as compared to their peers, have not. If a suggestion for resolving this grading issue is in order then I suggest that grading be done numerically. For example, when papers are reviewed and graded, the writer is given their grades. The people reviewing these papers are given the information by offering 20 categories to consider when evaluating papers. Instead of using the PQ - Range, which as it stands, makes things much more difficult and leaves so much room for many inconsistencies and biases, I suggest a change in the overall grading range to a numerical point system. (ie: 1 to 100) Each of the 20 categories can be worth 5 points, and the students can be evaluated 1 - 5 for each. Add the points for all the categories, and grade according: 100 - 90 = A, 90 - 80 = B, 80 - 70 = C, etc. etc. even when the number for the highest grade for consecutive papers can always change numerically, the range of grades will always remain the same and will not be at the discretion of the "professor." Professors will not be inclined to think about the curving before grading. They shouldn't be in the first place. Everything is done numerically and essentially should make the professor's job easier. This would, at the very least, minimize the subconscious biases that can easily come into play in the absence of anonymous grading. It will also give the student better feedback on his/her performance from one paper to the next, and will give more value to the student-teacher interaction when reviewing papers. Also, the curve will properly serve its purpose at the end of the course, not prior to reading papers. Under the proposed method telling the students, "you're all improving" will finally have some sense of veracity. In their policy, the program explains that, "anonymous grading would be impossible for it would severely impede the student-teacher interaction." This is an outrage. To me this means, "we're too damn lazy to actually make it work for our students." Brooklyn Law School has made anonymous grading work. One student was shocked when he was told that his grades didn't work that way at NYLS. He told me that every time they hand in their papers they are allowed to make up dynouns. The professors never have any idea whose paper they are grading on. The student-teacher relationship is not impeded, because students can still see who their professors about their papers. I'm not exactly sure the intricacies of how this works at Brooklyn Law School; all I know is that he was happy with his writing program and that anonymous grading, when legitimately thought out, continued on p.11

ACROSS
1 To form a legal corporation. (11)
2 The determination of what constitutes a fair price. (9)
3 Legally amenable to a lien. (9)
4 A person who commits arson. (8)
5 A disagreement with a majority opinion. (7)
6 A note, that instead of normal pleading, use a French "fair pleading") (8)
7 Protection of usu. political services from the donee <usu. the donor's daughter> (5)
8 A person connected with the organization's estimated revenues and expenses for a specified period. (6)
9 Common to or shared by two or more persons or entities. (5)
10 The party against whom a libel has been filed in admiralty or ecclesiastical court. (7)
11 Protection of usu. political services from the donee <usu. the donor's daughter> (5)
12 Advantage or profit, esp. of a financial nature. (8)
13 The illegal taking of property from the person of another, or in the person's presence, by violence or intimidation. (7)
14 To inhibit or discourage. (5)
15 To form a legal corporation. (11)
16 The chance of injury, damage, or loss. (4)
17 To cause; to bring about. (8)
18 To form a legal corporation. (11)
19 From now on. (9)
20 The illegal taking of property from the person of another, or in the person's presence, by violence or intimidation. (7)
21 To inhibit or discourage. (5)
22 One who commits arson. (8)
23 To cause; to bring about. (8)
24 A person who keeps official records; esp., a school official who maintains academic and enrollment records, (9)
25 A person connected with another by blood or affinity. (8)
26 A petty thief; pickpocket. (6)
27 French "fair pleading") A fine imposed for bad or unfair pleading. (11)
28 A person who commits arson. (8)
29 A group of people, things, qualities, or activities that have common characteristics or attributes. (5)
30 A market in which long-term futures or options contracts sell at a premium over short-term contracts. (8)
31 To treat (as laws or court orders) with contemptuous disregard (7)

DOWN
2 To inhibit or discourage. (5)
3 The daughter of a person's brother or sister. (5)
4 To give; to deliver. (4)
5 The chance of injury, damage, or loss. (4)
6 The application of force to another, resulting in harmful or offensive contact. (7)
7 The time from sunset to sunrise. (5)
8 An entailed estate in which the donor retains control of the land by refusing to accept feudal services from the donee <usu. the donor's daughter> for three generations. (13)
9 From now on. (9)
10 A account of an organization's estimated revenues and expenses for a specified period. (6)
11 Common to or shared by two or more persons or entities. (5)
12 The party against whom a libel has been filed in admiralty or ecclesiastical court. (7)
13 Protection of usu. political services from the donee <usu. the donor's daughter> (5)
14 Advantage or profit, esp. of a financial nature. (8)
15 The illegal taking of property from the person of another, or in the person's presence, by violence or intimidation. (7)
16 Good's that after being abandoned at sea, sink and remain underwater. (6)
17 A person, usu. a woman, who solicits customers for a prostitute; a madam. (4)

continued on p.11
UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

BY JOHN MAULDIN

CAN IT GET WORSE?

WHY THE MARKET RALLIED

WHAT WILL Go WRONG?

IT IS THE FLEA WHICH WORRIES ME.

The contest for this week's thoughts was provided to me by Art Cashin, head floor trader at UBS Warburg and also of CNBC fame. He writes a privately circulated and brilliant daily letter which is absolutely one of the most fun and informative tomes I read every day, without fail. My reading this week has brought to my attention a wide variety of unintended consequences. But first, Art's story:

"On this day (approximately) in 1349, in the midst of the infamous Black Plague epidemic, the forces of government, science and academia came together with a plan to save the people. As you recall from earlier episodes, the Black Plague had spread from the eastern Mediterranean throughout most of Europe killing millions over the preceding three years. People searched everywhere for the source of the plague...a heavenly curse, a burden of iniquity, the result of spices in the food. It was tough to figure, however, since whenever they held a conference either the host area caught the plague or the visitors did...so, not too many conferences."

"Then in the six months preceding this date the death rate leveled off...or seemed to. So in castles and universities and town halls across Europe, great numbers of people gathered in the square, and exalted their wisdom. One of the things that concerned me was not the ones most discussed in the media. I am not worried about a break in US European relationships. If you count US French French relationship jealousy was not a very serious concern.

"What Will Go Wrong?"

"The things that concern me are not the ones most discussed in the media. I am not worried about a break in US European relationships. If you count US French relationship jealousy was not a very serious concern.

"This president was profoundly animated by 9/11. He does not want another event like that to happen on his watch, or because he left a problem to the next generation. It is as simple as that."

"Let us make no mistake, for good or ill, Bush is going to remove Saddam. US polls (Fox News) show a growing 71% behind the war (this probably means that 71% of my U.S. readers are behind the war and 29% are not, with the reverse of these percentages for my European readers) with a growing percentage wanting it done now. Polls show Bush would lose a significant percentage of his support if he does not act soon. He will. The war may start before next weekly letters reach your email box, or shortly thereafter.

"In polls in the US, people overwhelmingly think the US education system is bad, but their schools are good. The medical system needs reform, but their doctor is just fine, thank you.

"In Europe, the Iraq war is not something that will change the lives of most citizens. While the average voter is against the US war, they are far more concerned about how a French and German led Europe might force their nations to adhere to rules which would not be good for their countries, could hurt their opportunities for growth and limit their freedoms."

continued on p. 14
The professor and I were on our second date. He was a professor in a restaurant in Brooklyn. He said he wanted to go on a date some place different, so I suggested Brooklyn. We had never been there. I didn't know why I never go there, I just never make it to the borough, unless I'm going to JFK and drive through it.

We took the subway: that magical underground train that I swore I would never take again once I got some money together. I would get a good job, or a rich husband, and the subway would descend into the seedy depths of the subway. Ten years later, I'm still unclean, bare dag and dread, but the subway will soon cost upwards of two dollars.

"Do you really think the subway is really worth two bucks?" I asked my date. The professor has this annoying habit of never having an opinion. I think it's because on the first date he doesn't want to have any "unconventional" viewpoints because this is his first date with a redhead. He asked: "Tell me, who are you?" I said, "Tell me, what is this really happening?"

"I teach the chicken constitutional law. I look at her real close, and I don't even recognize her face. I even make a slight hand gesture like who the hell are you and why are you wearing that stupid costume."

"Do you even know my name?" she clucked.

"My name is Suzanne," she said.

"Oh, you think this is funny?" The professor asked.

"Yes, and tomorrow we will march into class to protest your support of the cruel treatment of animals!"

"I thought for a moment, "what was your name again?" I asked.

"Suzanne Manser," she said.

"Okay, now you know who I am."

"Feathers..."

"Why yes," he says somewhat surprised. Then back to Celine. "I love this song," he says as that god dam song from Titanic came on.

"Do you even know who I am?"

"I don't know," I said. "Easy isn't always better." He looked into my scared eyes for a moment before I kiss him. His lips are rubbery and cold, so I quickly pulled away.

"What's wrong?" he asks.

"Um, nothing. I say as I walk to the other side of my apartment. Would you like a drink?"

"No thanks, he says, "I don't like to drink."

"But I do," I think. I sat down and poured myself a drink as he took his clothes off and said, "I would like to put some music on." He speaks in a low whisper, very quiet and frightened.

"Go ahead," I reply in the same soft tone, now he's got me speaking that way! What are we planning a costume party?"

"Oh I'm so glad you have this CD!" he says as he takes out a CD from my very small collection.

"Which CD is that?" I ask as I walk over and look at it. It's Celine Dion! Is he kidding me? I refuse to have sex over Celine's twenty-minute high notes. The only reason I have that stupid CD is because my sister bought it for me. If she doesn't see it on the shelf she freaks out! Like if I don't play Celine I am somehow grateful.

"Do you lose a lot of weight recently?" I asked him.

"Why yes," he says somewhat surprised. Then back to Celine. "I love this song," he says as that god dam song from Titanic came on.

"Okay, you know what. I am suddenly very sleepy," I said, as I pretended to yawn. Of course I am wide-awake, but enough is enough.

"What, what do you mean? he protests.

"I know that I shouldn't be honest with him, because we work together, but the hell with it. This is too important for us. Now please turn off Celine and leave," After some more arguing he leaves.

I take a good look behind me and breathed a sigh of relief. When someone makes you laugh once or twice and then asks you out, and your desperate, you said sure. After all no one's perfect you figure. And I was just tiered of ebbing alone, but I made a mistake: it's nice to be with someone, to be in a relationship, but if there's no spark, no attraction, then it's just not going to work. Should I have sex with a pompous law professor that will annoy me with his legal theories and love of Celine Dion, just because he's easy to be with? Easier isn't always better.

I'm glad I threw him out, and I'm even happier I'm alone. Now where's that doorman I had sex with a while ago?"
THE SUPREME COURT TRIES SODOMY AND DISCOVERS THAT TEXAS IS CONFUSED ABOUT IT TOO.

By Dahlia Lithwick

Before we get hung up in the nuts and bolts of Lawrence v. Texas, let’s be clear: There are two kinds of homophobia, at least in Texas. This first is a hatred of all things homosexual. That’s bad, the other involves a certain fondness for api lubly of gun-toting people in love which are A-OK, so long as they don’t commit any of those sex acts they’re inclined toward. This sort of Hill & Grace ("gay sex is cute, but don’t show me what they do in bed") homophobia seems not only to be defensible according to the state of Texas; it also appears to be the linchpin of their argument in today’s long-awaited gay sodomy case.

The facts of Lawrence are straightforward and mostly undisputed: Texas police entered the apartment of Houston resident John Lawrence in response to a neighbor’s fabricated claim that a man in there with a gun was “going crazy.” What the cops actually found was Lawrence and Tyrone Garner having and sex, for which they were promptly arrested under a Texas law prohibiting “deviate sexual behavior” (i.e., oral or anal sex) between persons of the same gender.

Pause here to consider that bestiality is not considered “deviate” under Texas law.

Lawrence and Garner were jailed, prosecuted, and fined over $200 each. They challenged the law, arguing that it was unconstitutional. The 14th Amendment’s guaranty of privacy in intimate sexual matters and its guarantee of equal protection under the law. They prevailed in the Court of Appeals for the 14th District of Texas, but lost, 7-2, when the court reheard the case en banc. So they appealed to Texas’ highest appellate court, which declined to hear it, and on to the U.S. Supreme Court, where their argument was heard this morning.

Lawrence and Garner have two possible routes to invalidating the Texas law, and today they press both. The “fundamental rights” argument tracks a line of contraception and abortion cases holding that certain intimate, private, family-related choices may be protected from state interference. This was the basis of Roe v. Wade. The “equal protection” argument holds that states can’t promulgate laws discriminating against certain classes of people unless there is some "rational basis" for the law and a “legitimate government purpose” behind it. Since the Supreme Court decided their last homosexual sodomy case, Bowers v. Hardwick, in 1986 on the grounds that the first theory (privacy and fundamental rights) didn’t apply to gay sodomy, they could overturn the Texas law on equal protection grounds without throwing out the Bowers precedent. So confusing is the argument as it ping-pongs back and forth between due process and equal protection analysis, that at some point Justice Antonin Scalia asks Paul Smith, who represents Lawrence and Garner, to raise his left hand while arguing one track and his right while arguing the other.

Chief Justice William Rehnquist immediately challenges Smith on the claim that there is some longstanding privacy right to commit gay sodomy. This was the basis of the Bowers decision—a decision in which Rehnquist was in the majority. "The right has to have been recognized for a long time,” he argues. Smith responds that laws banning homosexual conduct didn’t even exist until the 19th century. Scalia argues that sodomy laws have been on the books from the beginning of the republic, they just included heterosexuals and married couples.

"It is conceded by the state of Texas that married couples can’t be regulated in their private sexual decisions,” says Smith. To which Scalia retorts, "They may have conceded it, but I haven’t." Scalia insists that a liberty interest (under the fundamental-rights theory) needs to be "deeply rooted in tradition," and the mere fact that some of those state anti-gay laws have since been repealed doesn’t guarantee a fundamental right. He suggests that even if all states had "repealed their laws against flagpole- sitting," there would not necessarily be a fundamental right to flagpole-sitting.

("Flagpole-sitting is not a crime in Texas, by the way, unless said pole has been very strategically placed on your partner’s anatomy.")

Smith explains that fundamental rights are understood to apply to decisions about "sexual relations in the home" and decisions about "procreation and non-procreation," Rehnquist interjects that the laws at issue have little to do with "non-procreation." Smith says these laws say "you can’t have sexual activity at all" if you are gay and Scalia objects: "They just say you can’t have sexual intimacy with a person of the same sex." See? No problem.

Homosexuals remain perfectly at liberty to have heterosexual sex in Texas.

Justice Sandra Day O’Connor—who speaks very little this morning—asks Smith whether he objects to laws criminalizing heterosexual sodomy. (Nine states currently have such laws on the books; four others—Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri—proscribe only gay sodomy.) Smith responds that all 13 state laws are unconstitutional under his first (fundamental privacy) point. Then Scalia wonders whether state statutes that criminalize rape or adultery only among opposite sexes are similarly unconstitutional. Smith argues that this is quite different from "giving all people free rein to make sexual decisions except one small group of people." Scalia retorts, "You can put it that way. You can make it sound puritanical. But lots of laws make moral judgments. What about the laws against bigamy?"

Smith argues that there are neutral justifications for bigamy laws—but none for homosexual sodomy laws. And Rehnquist, in an odd little celebration of the narrow-minded and the judgmental, offers: “Almost all laws are based on disapproval of some people or some conduct. That’s why people regulate.”

Smith explains that the anti-sodomy laws have pernicious secondary effects—keeping gay parents from gaining child custody or providing for their children—and Rehnquist wonders whether—if these laws are struck down, states can have laws "preferring non-homosexuals to homosexuals as kindergarten teachers." Smith replies that there would need to be some showing that gay kindergarten teachers produce harm to children. Scalia offers one: "Only that children might be induced to follow this path to homosociality.”

Charles A. Rosenthal Jr. is the district attorney from Harris County, Texas, and it falls upon him to produce some rational reason for the Texas anti-sodomy law.
"Race" has been used in every way imaginable to systematically limit the participation of people of color. Until "the playing field is leveled," race will need to be a factor that is used to systematically include people of color. Unfortunately, at this time, so-called race-neutral policies "just won't cut it."

Robert W. McRitchie, Ph.D.
President, American Association for Affirmative Action

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

by DeNovo Staff Writer

President Bush has chosen to take in the debate on affirmative action. Specifically, the President has announced the program as nothing more than an illegal "quota" system. He has been systematically discriminated his case in order to influence the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices, before they heard arguments in the University of Michigan cases. President Bush is knowingly, (or, perhaps even more alarming) unknowingly, playing the "race card" because he is aware that using race as one of the factors in an admission decision was declared Constitutional in 1978 when the Bakke Case was decided.

Affirmative action is the nation's most ambitious attempt to redress its long history of racial and sexual discrimination. But these days it seems to incline, rather than ease, the nation's internal divisions. An increasingly assertive opposition argues that the battle to guarantee equal rights for all citizens has been fought and won - and that favoring some over others for the sake of better in a meritocracy may not only undo the gains of the civil rights movement, but also set back the cause of equality. "Race neutral" policies are seen as a "compromise" because they are based on race, but not on race. But defenders of affirmative action say that the playing field is not yet level - and that granting modest advantages to minorities and women is more than deserved.

In its modern form, affirmative action can call for an admissions officer faced with two similarly qualified applicants to choose the minority over the white, or for a manager to recruit and hire a qualified woman for a job instead of a man. Affirmative action decisions are generally not supposed to be based on quotas, nor are they supposed to give any preference to unqualified candidates. And they are not supposed to harm anyone through "reverse discrimination."

President Clinton, asserting that the job of ending discrimination remains unfinished, strongly defended affirmative action. "Mend it, but don't end it," he said.

Conservatives, however, see ending affirmative action as a powerful political issue. Hurtened by recent Supreme Court decisions that have limited affirmative action - and by the passage in 1996 of a California ballot initiative abolishing sexual and racial preferences - Republicans are taking up the battle wherever they can.

The debate over affirmative action takes on a particularly bitter tenor in the trenches. "Angry white men" blame affirmative action for robbing them of promotions and other opportunities. And while many minorities and women support affirmative action, a growing number say its benefits are no longer worth its side effect: the perception that their success is unearned.

Judging simply by the results, the playing field would appear to still be tilted very much in favor of white men. Overall, minorities and women are in vastly different situations, and still face active discrimination in some sectors. At this point in our nation's history, does affirmative action make things better or worse? The debate rages on.

An example of the efforts to influence the decisions of the Court is the reference to a 1978 case that was heard during the Clinton era. In that "reverse discrimination" case, a white high school teacher alleged that she was laid off of her job and an African American teacher was retained. She claimed that the only reason she was laid off (and the African American teacher was retained) was because of the school district's desire to maintain its racial composition. Clearly, that school district could have handled the case differently if attention had been paid to the needs of both. Instead of making a decision based on race, the district went in a different way of life. The existence of a critical mass of students of color has a similar impact on the culture of a campus. Additionally, the opportunities to interact with students who are different are at the very root of a liberal education.
SODOMY CASE cont.

SODOMY CASE cont.

He runs aground when he tries to argue that the two homosexuals caught doing homosexual things in this case may not actually be homosexual. “I don’t understand what that means,” says Scalia.

“You are not homosexual if you commit one homosexual act,” replies Rosenthal. Everyone is promptly confused.

In response to a question from Justice Anthony Kennedy as to whether Bowers is still good law, Rosenthal replies that mores have changed and that “physical homosexual intimacy is now more acceptable.” Since he suddenly seems to be arguing the wrong side of the case, an astonished Scalia steps in to say, “You think there is public approval of homosexuality?”

Rosenthal catches his pass, then runs the wrong way down the field: “There is approval of homosexuality. But not of homosexual activity.” Scalia wonders how there can be such widespread “approval” if Congress still refuses to add homosexuals to classes of citizens protected by the civil rights laws. “You’re saying there’s no disapproval of homosexual acts. But you can’t ... say that,” he sputters.

Justice Stephen Breyer asks one of his famed three-part questions and, when Rosenthal doesn’t answer immediately, Breyer interrupts: “That’s not my question. I’d like to hear your straight answer.” The gallery busts up. Rosenthal says there’s a good place to draw the line of privacy and fundamental rights, and that line is “at the bedroom door.”

“But the line is at the bedroom door in this case!” yells Breyer. To which Rosenthal says something suggesting that the two co-plaintiffs (who have been fighting this case together since 1998) may not have been having consensual sex.

Breyer, quoting shamed Oxonian Tom Brown, adds that the whole justification for this law can be reduced to: “I do not like thee, Dr. Fell/ The reason why I cannot tell.” Breyer asks whether Texas could make it against the law to “tell really serious lies” at the dinner table, and when Rosenthal sounds like he’s about to say Texas can, Scalia interrupts to say, “Don’t you think what laws a state can constitutionally pass has something to do with the sorts of laws that have a long tradition of being passed?”

“Certainly,” says Rosenthal.

Justice David Souter asks whether Texas really has a 200-year tradition of criminalizing gay sodomy. “Was this law on the books in 1803?” he asks.

In response to a question from Justice Anthony Kennedy as to whether Bowers is still good law, Rosenthal replies that mores have changed and that “physical homosexual intimacy is now more acceptable.” Since he suddenly seems to be arguing the wrong side of the case, an astonished Scalia steps in to say, “You think there is public approval of homosexuality?”

Rosenthal closes by telling the court that Texas is not reglly homophobic.

The things which worry me are the negative unintended consequences that we cannot even imagine. Churchill would hot have created Iraq, and the European politicians know that the Iraq war will be forgotten soon. The issue in the next round of elections will be who will run the European Union and how it will affect their country.

I can see the large dollar costs of the Iraq war. I can see a possible increase in terrorism. I can also see a possible growth in democracy in the region. I can see good outcomes and bad outcomes.

The things which worry me are the negative unintended consequences that we cannot even imagine. Churchill would not have created Iraq, and the French would not have installed the Saudi tribes, if they could have foreseen today.

If it is the flea which worries me.

A powerful US who would only like to do business is far less a personal threat than a French hegemony which would like everyone to conform to their work rules, tariffs and economic plans and lessen competition from other countries.

European politicians know that the Iraq war will be forgotten soon. The issue in the next round of elections will be who will run the European Union and how it will affect their country.

I can see the large dollar costs of the Iraq war. I can see a possible increase in terrorism. I can also see a possible growth in democracy in the region. I can see good outcomes and bad outcomes.

The things which worry me are the negative unintended consequences that we cannot even imagine. Churchill would not have created Iraq, and the French would not have installed the Saudi tribes, if they could have foreseen today.

It is the flea which worries me.

Christopher Amberger wrote an essay for the Daily Reckoning yesterday which was absolutely brilliant. Amberger was born in Berlin and remembers another cowboy American president coming to Germany, where there were protests from the same people who march today and oppose American power.

But Reagan persevered, and the Berlin Wall came down. Those who opposed America at that point were wrong. You can read his moving essay at http://www.dailyreckoning.com/sub/Mwave2.cfm. This link will also give you an opportunity to subscribe to the free Daily Reckoning e-letter. You can get to Christoph’s essay by scrolling about halfway down.

It is approaching 5:30 and I must go. My sons are waiting. I have to fly for a quick meeting in DC on Monday but will return the next day. I will be in Austin on Monday of the following week speaking at the Texas Public Pension fund conference.

I leave you with this quote dug up by Bill Reckenstein:

“It is very rare that you can be as unqualifiedly bullish as you can be right now.” Alan Greenspan on January 7, 1973, two days after the market peaked on its way to declining 50% over two years as we endured the worst recession since the depression.

Your rushing out the door analyst,

John Mauldin
JohnMauldin@investorsinsight.com

Copyright 2003 John Mauldin. All Rights Reserved.
Q: Why doesn’t Saddam go out drinking?
A: Why should he go out when he can get bombed at home!

The recent referendum in Iraq has confirmed Saddam Hussein as president for another seven-year term with 100% support.

An old man voted No at the first instance but was so worried about the consequences. He therefore went back to the voting station and told the administrator: “Look, I am such an old man and probably made a mistake by putting the X in the wrong position. I beg you not to punish me and wish to correct my mistake”. The administrator said to him: “Don’t worry, we have already corrected it for you”.

He said She said

He said... I don’t know why you wear a bra; you’ve got nothing to put in it.
She said... You wear briefs, don’t you?

He said... Do you love me just because my father left me a fortune?
She said... Not at all honey, I would love you no matter who left you the money.

She said... What do you mean by coming home half drunk?
He said... It’s not my fault... I ran out of money.

He said... Since I first laid eyes on you, I’ve wanted to make love to you in the worst way.
She said... Well, you succeeded.

He said... ‘Two inches more, and I would be king’
She said... ‘Two inches less, and you’d be queen’

Heard this on the radio:
You know it’s a strange time in this world when:
1) The #1 rapper is white.
2) The #1 golfer is black.
3) The Germans do not want to go to war.
Go figure!

What’s the shortest book ever written?
French War Heroes.

From Texas, USA: I read this on the back of a public restroom door. "Here I sit with my buns a’clenchin, giving birth to another Frenchman.

What did the Mayor of Paris say to the German Army as they entered during WWII?
"Table for One Hundred Thousand?"

Why don’t they have fireworks at Euro Disney?
Because every time they shoot them off, the French try to surrender.

Why did the French plant trees along the Champs Elysees?
So the Germans could march in the shade.

What is the most useful thing in the French Army?
A rearview mirror, so they can see the war.

Why does Nike like the French Army?
Because, in wartime, they are the biggest buyers of running shoes.

Why did the French celebrate their World Cup Championship in 2000 so wildly?
It was the first time they won anything without the help of the U.S.

Four men were out golfing and discussing how each convinced their wife to let them play golf every morning.

1st guy: I had to buy my wife a BMW to let me play golf daily.
2nd guy: You got off cheap! I had to buy my wife a BMW and a mink coat.
3rd guy: You both got off dirt-cheap! I had to buy my wife the BMW, mink coat and a diamond necklace.
4th guy: Ha! I didn’t have to buy my wife a single thing! Every morning when I wake up, I lean over in bed, nudge my wife and ask, “Intercourse or golf course?” She instantly replies, “Don’t forget to take your sweater.”
"In The Words Of Yogi Berra: It Was Deja Vu All Over Again"

April 7, 2001

Dear PMBR,

Please be advised that you have my permission to publish this letter. And, you may rest assured that I am not asking for anything in return.

During the morning session of the MBE I found myself thinking, "I know that one. That was a PMBR question!" In the words of Yogi Berra: "It was deja vu all over again." I was amazed how on-target you guys were. When we stopped for the lunch break I was a little nervous because it seemed like the MBE questions were very similar to the practice questions from PMBR. Although I was confident when I left the exam, I never imagined I would score in 97th percentile nationwide. I am thrilled to report that I scored a 170 on the MBE, thanks to PMBR!

I have to say, I cannot imagine taking the MBE without your course. In my opinion, attendance at your course is not optional; it is mandatory. The "key" to the MBE is doing as many questions as possible from PMBR books and reviewing the answers.

Best regards,

Mark Green

"I Was Amazed How Similar The Actual MBE Was To PMBR!"