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**Global Terrorism and its Impact on Sustainable Development**

by Nick Heiderstadt, D.G. Judy, and Jennifer Rinker, with contributions by Ashley Edwards.

Beginning Feb. 4, 2005, William & Mary’s Environmental Law and Policy Review held a two-day symposium that Dean Taylor Reveley suspects may be one of the best-attended symposiums he has witnessed at the law school. With approximately 120 total audience members packing the McGlothlin Courtroom, Reveley commended, “Whatever ELPR did, bottle it!” “The Symposium was both intellectually stimulating and genuinely entertaining,” said ELPR Editor-in-Chief Shannon West. “The event was such a success because every member of the Editorial Board contributed above and beyond” added West.

Ten distinguished panelists addressed national and international issues relating to scientific and economic premises for sustainable growth strategies, the positive and negative results of current environmental policies on communities and individuals, the impact of recent terrorist attacks on growth policies, and improvements to existing environmental and sustainable development policies. Delivering environmentally friendly development is vital for building a stable world, and, as Colin Powell once said, “poverty, environmental degradation and despair are destroyers of people, of societies, and nations.”

**Panel 1: Homeland Security and Information Issues Post 9/11**

Edward Ziegler (Professor of Law, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law) presented a paper entitled Urban Sprawl and Sustainable Development in the Age of Global Terrorism: Some Thoughts on the Potential for Defensive Dispersal II. Professor Ziegler explained that Defensive Dispersal I was an early population reorganization away from city centers in response to the threat of nuclear war. Ziegler wondered whether the fear of terrorist attacks on urban centers would prompt a second residential and commercial redistribution.

Suburbanization and sprawl have the ultimate effect of increasing dependence upon automobiles, Ziegler said, resulting in impacts to air quality that may be as devastating as what was once feared from a nuclear winter. The biggest impact on sustainable development is a deficient infrastructure our children must pay to improve. Ziegler concluded that a kind of N.I.M.B.Y.ism (Not In My Back Yard) is guiding our settlement and zoning regulations.

Patricia Salkin (Associate Dean and Director of the Government Law Center of Albany Law School) presented a synopsis of her paper entitled GIS in an Age of Homeland Security: Accessing [Public] Information to Ensure a Sustainable Environment. Building keenly off of Ziegler’s discussion, Dean Salkin postulated that we are now experiencing a N.I.M.T.O.O.ism phase of government (Not in My Term of Office).

GIS is an electronic planning tool displaying information overlays such as soils, population, buildings, and myriad physical and infrastructure features on the landscape. GIS can provide zones of injury for spills from chemical plants, for example, and has historically been available on the Internet. Public availability of this information is critical, Salkin says, to full and informed citizen participation, to creating accountability and transparency in government, and to improving efficiency and community strategic planning.

Despite the RAND Corporation’s conclusion that less than 1% of 465 sample data sources contained information useful to terrorists that was also uniquely available, the continued on page 2
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government focus has been to drastically curtail public access to GIS. Prior to September 11th, Salkin says, government policy was to release information first unless a good reason could be found to withhold it. Now the policy is to withhold information unless a good reason can be found to release it. Salkin concluded that government is not following the “back to business as usual” directive given after September 11th.

Charles Howland (Senior Assistant Regional Counsel, EPA Region III) helped stress issues presented in both Ziegler and Salkin’s presentations in The Fight Against Terrorism Takes on the Rights To Know: How Limiting the Public Availability of Facility-Specific Environmental Information Harms the Promotion of Sustainable Development.

Beginning with powerful photographs of an environmental disaster in Toulouse, France, Howland pointed out that a chemical plant—whose accidental release caused an explosion in the city—was once located a significant distance from residential population. But, because of urban sprawl, high-rise apartment buildings now adjacent to the plant were impacted.

Howland stressed that public availability of information about environmental hazards would better inform decisions. A proponent of Second Generation environmental law moving away from command and control regulation, Howland says industry is encouraged to inform the public about potential dangers. However, those who at one time supported Second Gen., Howland said, are now the entities and individuals who in a post-9/11 world are calling for decreased public disclosure of critical infrastructure and environmental hazard information.

Panel 2: Select Biotech and Bioterrorism Issues

David Pimentel (Professor of Ecology and Agricultural Sciences, Cornell University) discussed Bioweapon Impacts on Public Health and the Environment, and Michael S. Baram (Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law and Professor of Health Law, Boston University School of Public Health) followed with a presentation on Security, Secrecy and Safe Conduct of Biotech Research.

Professor Pimentel recited a litany of pathogens that were possible bioweapons, including anthrax, botulism, Ebola, Hepatitis C, plague, tuberculosis, hemorrhagic fever, cholera, West Nile virus, and influenza. Infectious human pathogens are both airborne and found in water supplies, he said. For example, 36,000 people die in the United States each year from the flu. Bioterrorists need not directly attack human health, Pimental said.

He cited threats to the food chain, noting that we have accidentally threatened our own resources by introducing foreign organisms such as the chestnut blight and the Asian Emerald Beetle. Pimental noted that pesticides and other chemicals, incidents of our need to secure the food chain, present other dangers, such as the floods in Bhopal, India in 1984.

Professor Baram moved the panel’s focus to the issue of bio-sensitive research labs. With future security from bioterror in mind, the government has proposed raising our number of BSL-4 labs (the most restricted labs, handling the most deadly organisms) from 2 to 11. Universities will administer the remaining labs, Baram said, which raises serious concerns.

For one, the labs’ security and emergency preparedness plans are not closely coordinated with local authorities. Also, the labs receive a blanket exemption from NEPA’s biohazard-reporting requirements.

Baram said the result—a storehouse of the most deadly organisms known to man, kept secret from the people living nearby, with no insufficient emergency planning—makes the potential for “a perfect storm.” Baram regretted that the best remedy he could propose was a “prophylactic” one, i.e., a planning process that better balances all security concerns—those of the national security apparatus and those of the communities in which these labs will exist.

Panel 3: United States Government Policy

Stephen Dycus (Professor of Law, Vermont Law School) began the Saturday morning discussion with a panel entitled Osawago’s Submarine: National Security and Environmental Protection After 9/11. Professor Dycus began his “melancholy topic” by defining terrorism as “an act of violence designed to evoke a change in a government’s policy.” Under that definition, he continued, terrorists have achieved their objectives, because part of the U.S. government’s response to the attacks of September 11th has been to seek the relaxation of environmental laws and “do some of Osama’s work for him.”

While rhetoric suggests that environmental protections and national defense are mutually exclusive propositions, said Dycus, impairments to national defense as environmental protections have been “trivial.” Yet, he noted, through its Readiness and Range Prevention Initiative, the Department of Defense had requested military exemptions from environmental statutes.

Wednesday, February 23, 2005 Changes adopted by Congress included an amendment to the Endangered Species Act removing the opportunity for public comment or challenge to military land use plans. The Marine Mammal Protection Act’s definition of the “taking” of marine mammals by the Navy could deploy a sonar system shown to cause “devastating injuries to marine mammals.” The Migratory Bird Treaty Act was also amended to allow take of migratory birds on military ranges, possibly in violation of international treaties, Dycus noted.

Dycus closed by calling for a wider use of existing provisions for case-by-case exemptions to environmental statutes.

Jeffrey Rudd (Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Montana Law School) presented a discussion entitled Restructuring America’s Government to Create Sustainable Development. Professor Rudd stated that while fighting terror being may take money and priority away from environmental initiatives, this is not the greatest problem facing environmental regulation today.

Under the current system, said Rudd, politically appointed agency administrators are given too much discretion to ignore the recommendations of scientific experts. Even when courts attempt to curb agency actions that differ from agency policy, said Rudd, agencies have the discretion to simply change that policy.

Rudd recommended changing the structure of the government to serve environmental protection. Environmental agencies must be separated from the government to free them from political influence. We must, Rudd said, “draw socio-ecological lines in the sand,” defining unacceptable environmental damage.

Rudd called upon the government to “accept the fact that we cannot balance” national security and environmental concerns, and to “stop lying to the American people” that such compromises are acceptable or even possible. He said that the government must instead “use law to curb the economic appetite” that drives the desire for relaxed environmental protections.

Panel 4: International Issues

Sanford Gaines (Law Foundation Professor of Law, University of Houston Law Center and Visiting Professor, Lewis & Clark School of Law) described his lecture, Sustainable Development and National Security, as an “intellectual journey” to address the symposium’s topic.
Enlightening Symposium on Women and War

by Nicole Travers

On Saturday, February 12, the William & Mary Journal of Women and the Law and the Human Rights National Security Law Program co-hosted a symposium on the issue of Women in War. The symposium featured four guest speakers whose lectures focused on the many roles of women during both combat situations and peacekeeping efforts.

Professor Naomi Cahn teaches at George Washington University. She has vast experience working on issues of feminist jurisprudence, women's rights, and international development. She began the symposium with a lecture focused on women's struggles in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In the course of the conflict that began there in 1996 and escalated to international levels, Cahn estimated that as many as 100,000 women, girls, and infants have been subjected to some kind of sexual violence—a practice that is still ongoing.

Sexual violence is not the only effect of war on the female population of the DRC. Women serve in armed conflict, both willingly and unwillingly, alongside male combatants. They serve as soldiers, doctors, cooks, and domestic laborers. In addition, war creates a “gender dividend,” the practice of women taking roles that are traditionally considered “male” when the males in their community leave to become combatants.

But what happens to these women and girls when the conflict in their country ends, and their communities take steps to resolve peace? Both national and international organizations have programs known as “DDRs”: Disarmament (the collection of weapons), Demobilization (disbandment of military structures), and Reintegration (facilitation of combatant reentry into civilian life). Cahn pointed out that these programs tend to overlook the needs of women, both as combatants and as civilians.

Cahn suggested that DDR programs be reconstructed to provide women with female-centered and maternal-focused health care, trauma centers, and a greater emphasis on justice for women in domestic law. Such changes would include new rape statutes, as well as more programs for rehabilitating the victims of sexual abuse rather than merely punishing the perpetrator. In addition, she said, women in these areas need training in teaching and counseling skills in order to help their fellows rebuild their lives after conflict.

The Symposium's second speaker, Alice “Tally” Parham, brought the issue of women in war closer to home. Parham is an attorney in Columbia, SC, and is also an F-16 fighter pilot with the South Carolina Air National Guard's 157th Fighter Squadron at McEntire ANGS. She spoke of the changes in the U.S. Armed Forces in the 12 years after Congress allowed women into fighter aircraft and naval warships.

Women’s service in fighter planes is not new—women from the U.S., Europe, and the former Soviet Union flew airplanes in battle as early as World War II. But in the U.S., the Armed Forces are still struggling with the idea of women as inherently unfit for combat. Parham spent time debunking several assumptions about women in the Armed Forces, for instance that the public has a more difficult time viewing women as part of the Armed Forces, even when the males should not be put into battle, and that women are more prone to be subject to sexual violence in combat situations.

Parham claimed that it is very beneficial to include women in the Armed Forces. Combat, she said, allows men and women to see each other as teammates, and facilitates a greater working relationship between genders. Also, women fight like men to save their lives, and thus more effective than any conscripted force. Finally, she spoke of the specific standards of combat in the Air Force that are gender-neutral, such as centrifugal training (testing personal reactions to g-forces), and in which women tend to perform better than men. Women, said Parham, are still barred from serving in infantry situations, but she hopes that this will soon change as this country’s view of women combatants evolves.

Professor Connie de la Vega has taught at the University of San Francisco for the past 14 years. She is an expert on international human rights law and its applications in U.S. courts. She spoke about human trafficking and forced prostitution in combat regions.

Trafficking of women and children tends to occur in the wake of armed conflict and natural disasters, when international borders are blurred, and security tends to be overlooked. Women and children are kidnapped from their communities, transported over international borders, and forced into domestic labor and prostitution. The greatest offenders in trafficking tend to be armies stationed within the area, as armies create a greater demand for inexpensive sexual services.

Both the U.S. and the United Nations have adopted a zero-tolerance policy towards trafficking. However, the effectiveness of these polices is not yet known. In fact, UN peacekeeping personnel may enable a greater amount of trafficking, as they tend to escape liability for any criminal actions they may take during their peacekeeping duties.
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Gaines said that environmental degradation “deeps poverty and engenders conflict, which is dangerous.”

While terrorism itself is motivated more by historical grievances and sectarian animosities than environmental degradation, said Gaines, poor environmental conditions may create a pool of willing recruits for terrorist causes.

National security, he said, is a concept that necessarily focuses on individual states. Environmentalism, by contrast, must include a view toward the security of both the people and the planet, and includes the security of “such of us.”

Gaines concluded that any successful plan for managing the environment must include equity not just for future generations, but also among all members of the current generation. We must, he said, remove “unsustainable patterns of production and consumption” and rethink our values by studying what has caused the collapse of past civilizations.

Paulette Stenzel (Professor of International Business Law, Michigan State University, Eli Broad College of Business) gave a presentation entitled Plan Puebla Panama—An Economic Development Tool That Ignores Sustainable Development While Providing Potential Assistance for Terrorists.

Stenzel said that the disadvantages of Plan Puebla Panama (PPP) far outweigh its benefits. PPP, she said, would facilitate the movement of terrorists and drugs through Central America and across the U.S. border. It would destroy natural resources under the guise of development, creating a “bioserve” that, while sounding ecologically friendly, would actually be an area of “bio-prospecting” by drug, chemical and seed manufacturers.

PPP would not create the economic benefits its proponents tout, said Stenzel. While it would initially create jobs by providing cheap labor, these jobs would continue moving to other areas. Stenzel recommended that countries participating in PPP concentrate on solutions involving sustainable development, focusing on people’s “needs” rather than business’ bottom lines.

“When citizens are ignored and basic human needs are unmet,” she said, “conditions are ripe for terrorism.”

Sumudu Attapattu (Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka, Adjunct Faculty, University of Wisconsin Law School) discussed Sustainable Development and Terrorism: International linkages and a case study of Sri Lanka.

Attapattu noted that war creates a cycle of environmental degradation, which in turn exacerbates conflict. International law, she said, often contains not only obligations to fight terrorism, but to fight that war and all others in an environmentally responsible manner. She quoted Al Gore to make the point that “no amount of weaponry will protect against environmental degradation.”

Attapattu noted that war creates a cycle of environmental degradation, which in turn exacerbates conflict. International law, she said, often contains not only obligations to fight terrorism, but to fight that war and all others in an environmentally responsible manner. She quoted Al Gore to make the point that “no amount of weaponry will protect against environmental degradation.”

Many thanks to all who participated for making this year’s ELPR symposium a resounding success. Student organizers, led by Executive Editor Ashley Edwards (3L), Editor-in-Chief Shannon West (3L), and Symposium Editors Erin McCool (2L), Chris Supino (2L), and Danny Ramish (2L), facilitated every aspect of the symposium from setting the topic to securing panelists to making travel, dinner and hotel arrangements. Other assistance was provided by all students pictured in the group photo. Sincere thanks also to faculty moderators Linda Malone, Erin Ryan and Mark Newcomb, faculty advisor Dean Butler, and Deans Revely and Shealy.
Sex, Politics & The Constitution: The Cutler Lecture

by David Byassee

Professor Edward L. Rubin is a professor of law at U. Penn. and Dean-Elect of Vanderbilt’s Law School, a position he will assume in July. His philosophy, however, clearly comes from the 16 years he spent teaching law at U.C. Berkeley.

On February 17, Rubin presented a lecture titled Sex, Politics, and the Constitution. “I don’t know how we could ask for more,” said Dean Reveley while introducing him. Rubin began by noting that exit polls from the 2004 presidential election found moral values to be the decisive issue of the election during a time of war, economic failure, increasing public debt and crisis in education and healthcare. The lecture focused on America’s collective sense of morality.

Morality is a means of regulating human conduct. The sexual revolution of our age has ushered in a change of morality, not a decline. The Christian morality of America’s forefathers that centered upon rules of religious dogma is being replaced with a morality centered upon self-fulfillment. “What are the limits to such a morality?” a student asked following the lecture. Limits must be drawn where one’s pursuit of self fulfillment infringes upon another’s, said Rubin. Like the golden rule—treat others as you would have them treat you—this new morality focuses on human interaction. Rubin attributes much of this change to Freudian philosophy.

Changes in morality are bound to cause conflict, said Rubin. Moral differences in America provide a distinct topography for American politics—both liberal and conservative.

The U.S. Constitution gives Americans a set of principles around which government legislation. Those principles are subject to interpretation. As a general rule those who subscribe to a morality of self-fulfillment strongly embrace the notion of Liberty found within the Constitution, and interpret it liberally. Those who do not subscribe to the morality of self-fulfillment find themselves couched as Conservatives, explained Rubin.

Who is this man, you ask? Why it’s none other than Kevin Abley, co-owner of the Green Leafe Cafe and self-proclaimed most dangerous man in Williamsburg. Kevin, a transplant from Montana, is the Leafe’s resident guru of all things aquavitae. Stop by the Leafe on Thursday and Saturday nights for a lesson in mixology by Kevin and his minions.

"Saddam’s Lawyer"

by Yuval Rubenstein

Now that the Iraqi Special Tribunal is proceeding with its case against Saddam Hussein, there lies the unenviable task of defending Hussein in court. Although Hussein will have a team of lawyers representing him, the most well-known attorney working on his behalf is none other than Ramsey Clark. Although Clark is most widely known as the son of Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, and Attorney General for the Johnson administration in 1967 and 1968, his advocacy on behalf of sundry dictators and other miscreants throughout the past thirty years has garnered him a great deal of notoriety, almost overwhelmingly negative.

Indeed, Clark’s list of clients reads as a “who’s who” of Certifiable Bad Guys, including Elizabeth Ntakirutimana, the Rwandan pastor who is accused of telling Tutsis to hide in his church and then summoning Hutus to massacre them, Karl Linnas, an ex-Nazi concentration camp guard in Estonia, and Bosnian Serb war criminal Radovan Karadzic. In addition, Clark has a penchant for popping up in the company of our enemies during U.S. military operations, such as his meeting with Moammar Qadafi after the US bombing of Libya in 1986, and his 1999 visit to Belgrade during the NATO bombing campaign. Most bizarrely, Clark has defended conspiracy-monger Lyndon Larouche on conspiracy and mail-fraud charges, and is the titular head of the International Action Center (IAC), which in reality is a front group for the Workers World Party (WWP), a Stalinist extremist group.

Given this dubious resume, Clark’s eagerness to defend Hussein seems logical. In a recent Los Angeles Times editorial, Clark explained his decision: “The defense of such a case is a challenge of great importance to truth, the rule of law and peace. A lawyer qualified for the task and able to undertake it, if chosen, should accept such service as his highest duty.” While this justification seems innocuous, and even laudatory, many critics argue that Clark’s motives are far more sinister, calling into question his competence as an attorney.

Certainly, many lawyers make their living by representing perennially unpopular clients; for example, Clarence Darrow was referred to as an “attorney for the damned” for Continued on page 7
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Construction Underway for New Library

by Mark Sapirie

This February, engineers are preparing to extend the library south between the parking lot and the Gradplex. Architect firms HSMH of Roanoke, Virginia and RCG of Baltimore, Maryland are directing the project, and the law school expects they will begin construction this summer. Building planners anticipate that the new section of the library will be complete by the summer of 2006. At that time, the law school will move into the new section so that the old section can be completely renovated. After this renovation, the two sections will be joined, and a fully integrated library should be operational by the beginning of classes in August 2007.

Its designers seek to create a light and open atmosphere in the library, including a range of study spaces to accommodate the solitary as well as the more social. All study spaces will be exposed to natural light. The most distinctive feature of the new building will be a broad 80-foot arc window looking east over a ravine with study tables and lounge space. The number of seating spaces in the library will increase from 427 to approximately 500.

The existing library will be completely gutted and redesigned so that only the elevator shaft and spine of the building will remain. The circulation desk will move to where the stairs are now, and visitors at the entrance will be able to look down the full length of the library through to windows facing south. A new reference desk will be situated along the central corridor toward the back of the existing library, adjacent to a new central staircase. Cork tiles will cover the floors in the lobby and some hallways.

The new library will also feature a public rare book room to display the law school’s collection of historic texts. This room will be open with twelve seating spaces during weekday hours. In addition, the new library will house twelve group study rooms, nine of which will be on the lower level. The law schools and student organizations will also have new space on the lower level. In conjunction with this project, the existing rare book room will become the faculty library.

A library building committee has been in place for several years. Members from the last two years’ committees include Professor Alvaro Molinero, Hardy, and Stein, Dean Jackson, students Kristina Rozek, Laura Mangel, and Steve Cobb, and from the library Shelley Dowling and Jim Heller. The law school expects the entire project to cost $16.8 million.
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role in the peacemaking process, rather than restricting power to the mainly male leaders of warring factions. This would provide a greater focus on the needs of women in post-combat areas. She expressed the opinion that UN immunity arrangements be lifted, so that if a UN peacekeeping official is discovered committing a crime against women, he or she can be punished accordingly. Proper training of military personnel, she said, would also be advantageous, and would allow soldiers to identify areas in which trafficking was likely to have taken place. Reducing the demand for trafficked women by providing this training would give traffickers less incentive to kidnap these women and children in the first place.

The symposium’s final speaker was Marshall-Wythe Foundation Professor Linda Malone. Professor Malone, who is the co-director of the Ethics, Peace, and Global Affairs Program, compared the criminal tribunals of Yugoslavia, where the conflict became one of international focus. Both tribunals incorporated rape as a crime against humanity, but by the time the Rwandan tribunal had been established, they had also incorporated ‘‘outrages upon personal dignity’’ as a crime.

This expansion, explained Malone, must be both domesticated and internationalized, so that future crime tribunals are able to deal with internal and international conflicts, and the resultant sexual crimes. Definitions of sexual violence, she explained, must include overlooked topics such as sexual slavery, forced prostitution, and forced pregnancy, as well as the symbolic recognition of systematic rape as one of the greatest crimes resulting from war.

Professor Malone queried: ‘‘Where do we go from here?’’ In this age of redevelopment in the Middle East and in Africa, Malone again emphasized the importance of women in a formal role in reconstruction and peacemaking, as they can aid the definition of social norms which can lead to a more equitable justice system for both genders. She agreed that one of the best services an international organization could provide in a post-conflict situation would be training for the women of that region so they may take on the task of generating a more equitable political situation for themselves.

All of the symposium’s speakers shared a hope that the role of women in war can change for the better with help from the international community, public awareness of gender issues, and their own perseverance. Indeed, it appears that with such knowledgeable and passionate women already working towards this goal, a change for the better is on the way.

Advocating Human Rights

by Yuval Rubinstein

What does it mean to be a human rights activist in an age of extreme American exceptionalism? Beginning with this provocative question, professor Julie Mertus delivered the third Distinguished Lecture for the Human Rights and National Security Law Program on February 10th. Mertus, who is the co-director of American University’s Ethics, Peace and Global Affairs Program, published a book last year entitled Bait and Switch: Human Rights & U.S. Foreign Policy, which was also the title of her lecture.

Professor Mertus began her presentation by describing what she terms the ‘‘dire present’’ resulting from the government’s assault on human rights in the post-9/11 era. This era has ushered in new laws infringing on civil liberties, such as the USA PATRIOT Act, and increased pressure on immigrants and refugees. Professor Mertus also noted the government’s efforts to strong-arm human rights advocates into staying in line. For example, the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC), a major source of funding for human rights organizations, has revised its guidelines so that recipients must first verify that no employee is on a government blacklist. Furthermore, the government has also pressured the Ford Foundation and other large foundations to insert a provision in their grant proposals stating that the grant recipients will not associate with terrorist groups.

The second part of the presentation dealt with what Professor Mertus characterized as the ‘‘underachieving human rights movement.’’ Human rights organizations have developed more sophisticated methods than ‘‘public shaming,’’ such as working behind the scenes in the government. According to Professor Mertus, however, the dark side to working within the government structure is the risk of being co-opted. Human rights advocates have been frustrated by the lack of transparency within the government, and similarly disappointed with the little evidence that insider efforts actually affect human rights behavior. The end result of such efforts is often what Professor Mertus terms ‘‘bait and switch.’’ A situation in which activists see their words coming out of someone else’s mouth and being used to justify actions they fervently disapprove. For example, the Bush administration expresses support for universal human rights, yet it has refused to apply those same standards domestically.

How should the human rights community respond to this bait and switch? Professor Mertus discussed the international relations theory of ‘‘norm diffusion,’’ a socialization approach aimed at promoting human rights by changing the behavior of nations. Human rights activists, however, have shifted their approach from changing the minds of national leaders to leveraging public pressure in order to make it harder for these leaders to pursue certain policy options. The key to accomplishing this goal is creating a ‘‘human rights culture.’’ Professor Mertus pointed out a number of examples of this ongoing effort, such as integrating international human rights into the law of local communities, expanding the human rights agenda to include economic and social rights, and engaging in technical assistance projects within developing countries. Human rights activists, therefore, must reclaim human rights to stop the bait-and-switch. Professor Mertus believes, this is a reason to be optimistic.
Most law students don’t get to spend a large part of their summers in jail, but I was fortunate enough to have the chance. I spent my summer at the Office of the Federal Public Defender in Richmond, and had the opportunity to participate in every step of a criminal case.

Many of my classmates spent their summers at law firms, and their days were marked by meetings, enjoyable by fancy meals and elaborate firm social activities. Although working for the government does not include these kinds of perks, I got to have fun every day that I showed up at the office. My typical day included everything from meeting with new clients and doing initial interviews, to representing clients at court proceedings in front of federal judges (with my third-year practice certificate), to talking to witnesses in “the field,” to writing appellate briefs. When I was really lucky, I got away from my work and went with the investigators to investigate cases, including a visit to a murder scene.

The Office of the Federal Public Defender in Richmond (one of three such offices in the Eastern District of Virginia) is appointed by the court to represent criminal defendants who are indigent. The caseload for the Richmond office usually totals more than 50 new cases a month. Many of the defendants’ charges involve guns or drugs, often both. The U.S. Sentencing Guidelines dictated sentencing decisions (they have since been found by the Supreme Court to be discriminatory), and the federal system is known for its extremely harsh penalties and the absence of parole. Many clients of the Federal Public Defender face sentences with mandatory minimums of ten years or more, and maximum penalties of 20 years to life.

Public defenders work hard: the attorneys at the office work long days and frequent weekend hours to diligently and zealously represent their numerous clients. In addition, clients are housed in jails all over Virginia, from Orange to Northern Neck, so meeting with one client can include an entire day of travel and travel time. The work, however, can also be extremely rewarding. Criminal defendants, even the ones who are guilty (and this is not always the case), need adequate representation for the criminal justice system to work, and it is extremely gratifying to see the results of your efforts on a daily basis. In one case, locating one witness with whom the police and the prosecutors had not followed up led to the dismissal of all charges against an innocent client. Also, most clients of the Federal Public Defender are extremely appreciative and thankful for attorneys’ work and attention. These factors make it easy to see how the motion you spent hours researching and writing can have a huge effect on someone’s life.

I gained an amazing amount of experience working at the Federal Public Defender, learning more in one summer about practicing law than I have learned from all of my classroom time and studying. I spent a great deal of time in court, and had opportunities to argue motions in front of federal judges, contribute to the defense team for a capital case, and write briefs for the Circuit Court of Appeals. And, of course, I spent a significant amount of my summer in jail.
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Saddam, Continued from pg. 4 representing social pariahs in court. Even today, attorneys like David Baugh, an African-American attorney who has represented Ku Klux Klansmen in cross-burning cases, have gained acclaim for their willingness to provide legal representation for unpopular clients. Of course, it’s one thing to defend individuals with a fondness for burning crosses and wearing white satin sheets over their heads; it’s another thing to represent tyrants and mass murderers. The case of Saddam Hussein is not a criticism of Clark; after all, somebody has to represent these defendants accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity. The problem with Clark’s activities, however, is his longstanding eagerness to cross the line between being a legal advocate and being a political advocate and apologist.

For example, when Clark flew to Belgrade in 1999 in support of Milosevic, he told his hosts, “It will be a great struggle, but a glorious victory. You can be victorious.” Even more appalling are the IAC leaflets parroting the WWF’s line that reports of Serb ethnic cleansing and rape cases are lies perpetrated by an imperialist conspiracy. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that Clark has steadfastly refused to acknowledge the atrocities Hussein committed, choosing instead to rail instead against the legal system that he considers unjust. Of course, the legal system that Clark considers unjust is the very system that is responsible for comforting the victims of Saddam Hussein and destroying the government it now intends to condemn by law.

In Legal Skills class, we are constantly told to zealously represent our clients. Clark has taken this advice in a disturbing direction, however, by politically justifying the actions of his clients. Whether Clark is merely a dupe or simply a person who believes his own rhetoric, his actions have led him to advocate for his clients in a way that is not consistent with the role of a legal advocate. He has been criticized for his advocacy of Saddam Hussein, and his role in the legal defense of the Iraqi dictator has been seen as a conflict of interest.

The incorporation, which was the legitimate operation, and it was part of the legal system to facilitate the process of incorporation. Without the proper incorporation, a nonprofit organization would be considered an illegal occupying power under international law.
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Hiding in Plain Sight; or, How To Blend into Polite Society

by D.G. Judy

Over two nights several weeks ago (I don’t know exactly when; calendars offend me), OCS and the Williamsburg Inn graciously hosted a horde of law students anxious to learn a little etiquette and acquire perhaps a thin veneer of social grace.

Neither born nor bred to movement in the right circles, I found myself attracted to the idea: they were dishing out five courses with wine for $20. Besides, word had it the tutelage would make us all fine gilded candidates for a business luncheon or cocktail party. And, you know, law students are peacocks; any old excuse to throw on the jacket and tie.

Arrival at the Inn, with its copious leather upholstery and various Rockefeller portraits, had me silently asking my ancestors for an unlikely burst of politesse (they obliged by reminding me in a spectral chorus to knock on the outhouse door before entry).

After learning how to exude mild charm over drinks before dinner (don’t spit; don’t spill; don’t talk about politics, religion, or hygiene), we proceeded to our dinner tables, and to a healthy session of instruction in manners, interrupted by brief, surreptitious bouts of actual dining. (I suppose this is the right time to say my hopes of free-flowing wine were cruelly dashed. It seems the previous night’s delegation—all you know who you are—indulged gushingly enough to prompt a thrifty TAURUS (April 20-May 20): You will find a nice spot on the second floor of the library, right near the windows. That’s right kiddies, it’s Round 58 of Moot Court. Will it ever end?

GEMINI (May 21-June 21): You’re still angry over the fact that while everyone else got a nice romantic movie quote for the Valentines Horoscopes you got stuck with a bizarre nonsense quote from Mappets From Space. Well, tough—it’s the fave movie of the Horoscope Staff’s girlfriend. Admit it, deep down you are a bit hurt.

CANCER (June 22-July 22): You decide to use the remote region of your plate, while blithely resuming conversation. This procedure seemed to me the height of conspicuousness. I suppose the trick’s secret is misdirection. Maybe, at a key moment, a wiggle of the eyebrow or a flourish of the water glass. David Blaine could probably pull it off with no trouble; or else he’d lie motionless and starving under the table ‘til everyone got tired and went home, then spit it out. There were lots more fun rules like that one, but let me put aside my precious wit for a moment, and say sincerely that the whole affair was vastly instructive, especially to one such as me. Napkins, knives, big forks and little forks, servers, sommeliers, glasses and corks: all these things have their proper rules and roles, and we learned them all—at least enough to fake it. I urge one and all to give it a go next time around.

An added treat: we were joined by the fellow who impersonates Thomas Jefferson at Colonial Williamsburg for a living (I want his job). He gave us a good ten minutes’ impromptu speech about the British and Continental dining styles and their place in the White Houses of yore. It was hella cool.

Spring Break-o-Scopes

by the Advocate Horoscopes Staff (edited by Rob Eingurt)

Did that February warm snap put you in the mood for a bit of R&R?

We can tell you’re jonesing for spring break (oh wait, sorry, if the films of the 1980s taught us anything, we are supposed to say that as “SPRING BREAK!!!”), and nothing can get it here fast enough. Fortunately, we pondered upon the subject a bit and come up with some helpful suggestions, predictions, and even a warning or two.

ARIES (March 21-April 19): While browsing in the bookstore at the South Padre Island School of Law you will be lucky enough to find a rare copy of Examples & Explanations: SPRING BREAK!!! Use it wisely, especially Chapter 12—“Rum, Sodomy, and the Lack: Can You Ever Purge Last Night From Your Memory?”

TAURUS (April 20-May 20): You will find a nice spot on the second floor of the library, right near the windows. That’s right kiddies, it’s Round 58 of Moot Court. Will it ever end?

GEMINI (May 21-June 21): You’re still angry over the fact that while everyone else got a nice romantic movie quote for the Valentines Horoscopes you got stuck with a bizarre nonsense quote from Mappets From Space. Well, tough—it’s the fave movie of the Horoscope Staff’s girlfriend. Admit it, deep down you are a bit hurt.

CANCER (June 22-July 22): You decide to use the spring time to develop your recipe for the upcoming Law School Brownie Bakeoff Challenge against Maryann Nolan (LL). Unfortunately we can tell you now that she’ll be sabotaging your batch on the day of said bakeoff. We hate it when our Honor Council members go bad... tsk, tsk, tsk.

LEO (July 23-Aug 22): You are really pissed that there is no such thing as a Law School Brownie Bakeoff Challenge. You spend all SPRING BREAK!!! plotting your revenge. Somehow your diabolical plans will involve a catapult, lighter fluid, and the guy who played Skippy on Family Ties. BRING IT ON!

VIRGO (Aug 23-Sept 22): Spend the week planning your schedule for watching the NHL Playoffs. It’s been a great season so far and the race for the Stanley Cup promises to one of the best ever. Get Cup Crazy! Woo-hoo! Yee-ha! Oh, forget it—has baseball started up yet?

LIBRA (Sept 23-Oct 23): So you’re stuck in the ’Burg for Break. No worries. The time is perfect for you and your new digital camcorder to hit DoG Street in search of “Colonists Gone Wild.” Yeah, Snoop Dogg hasn’t replied to your requests for him to be host—but he hasn’t said “No” either.

SCORPIO (Oct 24-Nov 21): You will see a commercial for a colonial reenactment park in South Carolina and think: “What an original idea! Should I go during SPRING BREAK!!! and see what it’s like—it must be a once in a lifetime experience. I must go forthwith.” Then you will remember that you’ve already been to one in Pennsylvania. What are the odds?

SAGITTARIUS (Nov 22-Dec 21): Order the CookiePuss cake now because on March 8 you will be celebrating the birthdays of both Freddie Prinze, Jr. and James Van Der Beek. Why is this day not a national holiday? Oh, right—it’s Freddie Prinze, Jr. and James Van Der Beek— that’s why. Enjoy the cake.

CAPRICORN (Dec 22-Jan 19): Fly to Vegas to attend the National Demolition Association convention at the Mirage. You’ll have a hang up time. We hear that keynote speaker Mark Shields of CNN will bring down the house. Rumor is that their equal opportunity committee is breaking down barriers in the field. Oh, wait...we think we’ve got one more...um...the...presentation “Identifying Radioactive Sources at the Demolition Site” is sure to raise the roof. Man, stop us now because we are en fuego!

AQUARIUS (Jan 20-Feb 18): Face it, that’s the week they’re releasing the Felicity—Senior Year Collection DVD box set and you’re not getting off the couch that week. Are you? You so have a crush on Ben.

PISCES (Feb 19-March 20): Steal ARIES’ copy of E& E: SPRING BREAK!!! Turn to Chapter 21—“Checking Your Date’s ID: Avoiding Major, MAJOR Trouble.” Where was this book back in ’98?

Crap.
A Rejection of Religious Exclusivity

by Rajdeep Singh Jolly

I am alarmed by the acrality with which human beings will condemn each other to hell. Consider the following statement of faith, which I found on the website of a local church: “We believe...[in] the salvation of all who trust the Lord Jesus Christ and the just condemnation of all who reject Him.” With respect to reality, heaven and hell are analogous to Santa’s workshop and a pot of gold at the base of a rainbow; accordingly, I am not bothered by threats of eternal damnation. I am bothered, however, by the popularity of faith-based chauvinism. I am bothered by the willingness of millions of people to not only wear blinders but also encourage others to do the same.

A belief in the just condemnation of all who reject X is akin to a belief in the blameworthiness of all who reject X. We ordinarily blame people for doing the wrong thing. Accordingly, rejecting X is wrong. Crucially, our imputation of blame is appropriate—or just—only if we know that the “wrong thing” is actually wrong.

Suppose that X is something uncontroversial—say, the principle that it is wrong to gratuitously torture puppies. Is someone blameworthy for gratuitously torturing puppies? We ordinarily blame people for doing the wrong thing, and our imputation of blame is appropriate only if we know that the “wrong thing” is actually wrong. For torturing puppies “really wrong?” It certainly feels blindingly obvious that torturing a baby dog is immoral. There are other emotionless ways to arrive at the pain on pain-receptive organisms; same conclusion: it is always wrong to impose unwanted treatment on others when such treatment is undeserved.

Suppose now that X is something controversial—say, Jesus Christ. Is someone blameworthy for rejecting the divinity of Christ? We ordinarily blame people for doing the wrong thing, and our imputation of blame is appropriate only if we know that the “wrong thing” is really wrong. Is rejecting the divinity of Christ “really wrong?” I think not. There is no evidence that an activist God of the sort that Christ embodied really exists. Notwithstanding this fundamental problem, ancient testimony about the divinity of Christ is not unique; there are similar accounts of the divinity of other prophets throughout the world.

Ascriptions of divinity have a self-serving tendency to arise within the confines of particular religions; accordingly, such ascriptions do not strike me as being disinterested determinations; they strike me as being highly un sweetheart.

At best, a belief in the divinity of Christ is rooted in faith. From a scientific standpoint, faith is not an appropriate ground for affirming the purported power of a certain medicine. Would you ingest a pill three times a day for the rest of your life if I merely told you that I had tremendous faith in its power to make you immortal? From an evidentiary standpoint, faith is not an appropriate ground for condemning others. We do not execute people because of a deeply felt faith in their guilt; we would probably regard faith-based executions as immoral or perhaps misguidedly uncivilized.

Given that faith is a shaky ground for supporting our beliefs, how can anyone justifiably condemn the entire non-Christian world for refusing to share the Christian faith?

Only in Virginia

by David Byassee

As a non-Virginian living in good ol’ Virginia, there are times when I find myself wondering what happened to the civil liberties guaranteed in the state I left behind. When describing Virginia to friends back home, I often use the word “conservative.” Invariably, what follows is a question asking what I mean. The following commentary is an example of that Virginia conservatism.

Algie T. Howell Jr. owns a barbershop in Norfolk, Virginia. Howell is an active barbershop owner who frequents his shop and keeps himself in-tune with the sentiment and values of the community. He’s a Democrat.

In February, Howell was elected by the people of Norfolk to serve as their delegate in the Virginia House. On February 4, 2005, Delegate Howell proposed House Bill 1981, a bill relating to indecent display of undergarments. It read: Any person who, while in a public place, intentionally wears and displays his undergarments, intended to cover a person’s intimate parts, in a lewd or indecent manner, shall be subject to a civil penalty of no more than $50.

In other words, Delegate Howell wants to tell Virginians how to dress, i.e., without sagging your pants, boys, and not wearing low cut bottoms, girls; and he wants to make it illegal to disobey him. God forbid you have your own sense of fashion, silly Virginians.

New for the truly Virginian part of this story: Delegate Howell said that his constituents are offended by exposed underwear, and on February 8 the Virginia House of Delegates voted to approve the undergarments bill (60-34).

Word of the bill spread like wildfire, prompting disdain far and wide. On February 10 the Virginia Senate was faced with the embarrassment of acknowledging the state’s desire to police fashion and unanimously rejected the bill. Commenting on the Senate’s action, Virginia Senator Thomas K. Norment Jr. (R-James City) said, “I would find this bill humorous or tolerable...but for the indignity of the, no pun intended, international exposure. That this is what is being associated with the Commonwealth of Virginia is unacceptable.”

So shame is the key to acquiring and maintaining civil liberties in Virginia, huh?
Sex and the Law: Breaking Up? Doesn't Have to be Hard to Do.

by Nicole Travers

We’ve gone on many journeys over the past year, kids. We’ve learned how to pick out our interview underwear, how to deal with fetish discrimination, and why cheating is addictive behavior. But now it’s time for us to come to the proverbial “end of the relationship road”—the breakup.

Breakups are not the end of the world. They’re the end of a world, even if that world consisted of two dinner dates and a week of sitting by the phone waiting for it to ring. And sure, they can be messy, arduous, and difficult to deal with, but they can also be roads that take you to a new and better world. 1 But when you get there, it can be difficult to know where to begin. That’s why I am here to help. If you follow these simple steps, then your breakup can be, at the very least, less angst-y and time consuming.

First, I am going to assume that, as a law student, you are the victim or “dumppee” of the breakup. This is because, as future citizen-lawyers, we are clearly morally and ethically superior to all other forms of people. 2 We would never lie or cheat, and always treated our significant others with the love and respect that (now that they have dumped us) they clearly never deserved. 3 Breakups for the dumpees are usually the hardest. Dumpees are left feeling worthless and replaceable, not to mention gullible and naïve. But this is usually not true. Relationships are funny things, and tend to make even the cleverest of us forget the basic rule of dealing with other people: everyone lies. 4 Put those negative thoughts out of your head, and let the healing process begin.

Step 1: Assemble your Ass-Kicking Brigade

Your ass-kicking brigade consists of those tried-and-true friends who, no matter how supportive of your relationship they once were, will whip around with a snappy “you’re too good for him/her anyway!” and immediately attempt to challenge the ex to hand-to-hand combat. Though it may be tortious to actually unleash your ass-kicking brigade upon your ex, they are an invaluable resource to your healing process. These good people will buy you alcohol and chocolate, and listen to you for hours as you wall that you will never love again. And just in case your ex tries to stalk you after your breakup, it is always good to have at least two members of your ass-kicking brigade with you at all times. 5

Step 2: Cleanse Your Space

If you have broken from any of your things. This is both functional and symbolic. There is nothing more pathetic than sitting on your bathroom floor, crying over a strand of hair you found near the shower drain that might have belonged to your ex. And it symbolizes your active role in removing all the bad memories from your present ex-free life. Take a minute to survey your sparkly clean kingdom before you burst into tears.

During the process of cleansing your space, you may run into the **ass-kicking brigade** of that person’s presence. Now is the time to rid yourself of this evidence. Completely overhaul your space, throwing away the nasty boy spray-deodorant or those tampons that always embarrassed you when someone else entered your bathroom. Then scrub and wash every surface, so no stray molecules of your ex remain on any of your things. This is both functional and symbolic. There is nothing more pathetic than sitting on your bathroom floor, crying over a strand of hair you found near the shower drain that might have belonged to your ex. And it symbolizes your active role in removing all the bad memories from your present ex-free life. 
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1 Nobody else has to take an entire class in ethics at 8:30 on Wednesday morning.
2 This assumption does not, however, include those law students foolish enough to ignore my advice and to date their fellow law students. You kids deserve whatever you get.
3 Except us.
Lincoln Willis (2L) has sold cars from duck blinds. His family has been in the car business since 1948, and he is an avid hunter. Thanks to the "advent of the modern cell phone," he is able to do both at the same time. Not exactly sure how that conversation might go, but maybe something like, "The MSRP on that Corvette convertible is $55,000, but I can give you a great deal. Can you hold on a second? There's a green head. BANG! Got him! Now then, what's it gonna take for me to put YOU, in THIS car by 5:00?"

While leading a church camping trip in Shenandoah, Lincoln came across a large black bear. All of his 12-year-old campers froze. He had to pull them back one by one, and, by the time the last camper was out of the way, Lincoln was about six feet away from the bear. Then, Lincoln had to carry one kid's pack in addition to his own. I'm not feeling sorry for him because he's a big guy, and how much stuff can a 12-year-old have anyway? His family owns 600 acres in Delaware. They've built ponds, farm roads, and restored a 250-year-old brick building—the "Brick Store"—into a hunting lodge. If you stop by, he'll treat you to some local favorites, including sangria (what's left AFTEr sausage is made — mmm, yummy), muskrat, Delaware blue crabs, and, of course, Brick Store duck.

Amanda Kutz (3L) was a vocal performance minor and has sung in Europe, Canada, and the US as a soloist and as part of a choir. Amanda even lit herself on fire while singing Silent Night during the procession at a candlelight service. Amanda's candle toppled over and ignited her robe and hair (which smells lovely by the way). The congregation members were reverently whispering "Hey, you're on fire." They WERE in church after all!

Amanda comes from a diverse family. Her great-grandmother was a Seneca Indian, and her dad's side has prominent Native American features. Her sister is married to a Turkish-American, and her aunt married a man who escaped communist Czechoslovakia. Amanda, mom, and sister are the only blondes, so Amanda decided to marry a blonde herself to increase the recessive genes in the pool. The family diversity produces an incredibly interesting dynamic—her sister's Baptist-Muslim wedding was eye-opening for both cultures.

Amanda is a self-taught mechanic. She has added Freon, power steering fluid, and oil; changed belts, tires, and turn signal and headlight lamps; refinshed the spoiler; and started to fix the speedometer until she realized that doing so was illegal. Amanda was the first one in her family to shoot a gun but has only killed spiders and cockroaches.

Alexis McLeod (1L) started working for Planned Parenthood at the age of 16. She conducted HIV counseling, gave AID$ education speeches to high school students, and gave fundraising speeches to the community. Alexis taught a class about HIV/AIDS at her university, and will work with the AIDS Legal Referral Panel in San Francisco this summer.

"Alexis' ultimate goal is to become President of the Make-a-Wish Foundation. She loves kids and wants to be in an organization where the primary objective is to give kids a message of hope. Children facing terminal illness—even the youngest ones—have a sense of maturity that is beyond their years; "Their outlook on life is so optimistic it is inspiring."

Alexis has worked with many children and their families. She was the Wish Granter for a 16-year-old girl, who looked like she was trapped in the body of an eight-year-old. The girl's wish was to go on a shopping spree, and Alexis had a wonderful time running through the mall. The girl wanted to have her room made over like a princess' castle. It was an "enchanted" experience for Alexis and really demonstrated how much a wish can contribute to someone's hope and health.

I didn't ask Alexis whether she has ever shot a gun or killed anything. I'm pretty certain the answer to the second question is "no."

Any story about Justin Hargrove (3L) begins in Big Stone Gap, Virginia—a coal mining town in south Virginia where his daddy works in the mines designing ventilation and his mommy is a bartender and Youth Director. Go figure.

Where he grew up, your manhood would be called into question if you didn't hunt or shoot skeet. He's not a hunter, so he had to be a really good shot at skeet. He actually had a double whammy—he didn't dip snuff OR hunt, so he had to be a really, really good shot. Justin was Captain of the Senior Football team and won the state championship two out of his three years in Varsity Division IAA. The sign at the city limits reads "Welcome to Big Stone Gap: Home of the State Champion Powell Valley Vikings!"

Justin would like to point out for the record that he blows Theo out of the water with extreme activities. "Has Theo been shark diving? I think not. Has Theo jumped off the highest bungee in the world? I think not. Has Theo run with the bulls? I think not. Has Theo rafted the wildest river that can be rafted? I think not. Has Theo gone glacier hiking in New Zealand? I think not."

Justin has never moved a house like Theo, but he's built them for Habitat for Humanity: a "much nobler cause," Justin says.

Jennifer Evans (2L) has been on Rick Steves' Europe Through the Back Door II Tour with her boyfriend, but not before striking out on their own in Wales to see a Van Morrison concert. Rick Steves puts a lot of work into finding out-of-the-way restaurants, good places to buy cheese, the best little pensions for your four-family vacation, smart tips for the Alps hiker, and good shopping spots for those rainy day afternoons, and Rick Steves' Tours really cover a lot of ground! Jennifer and Collin were guided through London, Belgium, Brugge, the Moselle River Valley, Munich, a fantastic hike in the Dolomites of Italy (where they saw free range cattle, but Jen was frightened of the bulls so didn't take pictures), Monaco, the Provence of France, and the location of the last insane asylum that Vincent Van Gogh called home. Jennifer admitted to also owning a pair of zip-off pants; they made her feel right at home with the 50-year-old couples on the tour bus who also apparently shopped at REI to prepare for the trip.

Jennifer has fired a shotgun once at a target, but it was a terrible experience. She witnessed a rabbit shooting. (It wasn't killed instantly, and they screeched and screamed like people—horrible!).

Rock and Roll band: Captain Jackass

From left to right: DG Judy—Rhythm Guitar, Backup Vocals, Clubhouse Dancer; John Cox—Bass, Shot Gun Owner; Evan Wooten—Lead Vocals, General Prima Donna; Patrick Speice—Lead Guitar, Beer Provider; Josh Baker—Manager and Chief Leader.

The band formed on election day. According to front man Wooten, he was reading Evidence when Speice walked in with his guitar and a case list includes: Betterman—Pearl Jam; Under the Bridge—Chili Peppers; Brian Wilson—BNL; Interstate Love Song—STP; Runaway Train—Soul Asylum; and Any Way You Want It—Journey.
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issue of leftover ex stuff. I'm not talking about the disposable razors he/she left in your shower. This is about the GameCube she brought over so the two of you could bond over Super Monkey Ball, or the suit he left in your closet in case you decided to treat the cheap bastard to a nice dinner. If your ex is reasonable, he/she will come pick these things up without a lot of drama. However, the chances of rational behavior from an ex are about as good as the chances of the state of Georgia teaching the theory of evolution in its science classes. So you are left with a pile of stuff that you can’t stand to look at, and don’t wish to use, but have nowhere to put. But don’t despair! You have several options:

1. E-Bay. E-bay is the most glorious invention known to man. With E-bay you can get rid of his band t-shirts or her ten pairs of strappy sandals at a nice profit, giving you the ability to buy yourself something shiny, like an Intellectual Property statute book.

2. Bonfires. A very therapeutic way of getting rid of your ex’s stuff. Check into your local fire ordinances before delving into this option.

3. Experimental sculpture. Nothing says “I’m over you” like creating an installation piece out of his/her god-awful CD collection and barbed wire.

And if you really feel the need to get rid of your ex’s stuff by sending it back to him/her, don’t forget the three magic letters: C, O, D.

Step 3: Distract yourself

Once you are out of a relationship, a good deal of your social life has naturally disappeared. Do not waste any time; fill this hole with anything you can find, as long as it’s not along the lines of sitting in your room crying and listening to Celine Dion. Join a club, go to the gym, pick up a book, or learn to cook.

Step 4: The Rebound

This step is a tricky one, as you run the risk that your rebound will quickly turn around and break your heart too, causing you twice the pain that your first ex did. But sometimes this is a necessary means of moving on. For one thing, it provides confirmation that despite how badly you were treated by your ex, you can get a new date about as quickly as you can get seconds from the Nawab lunch buffet. For another, once your rebound does break your heart, you can focus all your energy on being mad at the rebound instead of the original ex, whose conduct was likely more painful. It’s a nice distraction.

By the time you get through all four of these steps, you should be well on your way to mending your broken heart in preparation for it to be broken all over again by your next significant other. This isn’t to say that I am pessimistic about human relations—heaven forbid! All I’m saying is that this is a column you might want to clip and save for future reference.

On second thought, Mr. Darcy is mine. You can’t have him.

I won’t make the obvious pun about your new date being “hotter.” That would just cheapen me.

And trust me, he/she will.