Election Provokes Passionate Responses

By Karen Lockman

As the country held its breath on Wednesday morning, weary of an unbearable repeat of the 2000 elections, news came in that Kerry would concede. President George W. Bush had won both the electoral and popular vote and would remain our commander-in-chief for the next four years. Students held passionate emotions with regard to his victory and the various other election results.

“There are two Americas, but they are not the rich and the poor. They are the Bush supporters, and the rest of us,” stated Noel Egatios, a 1L summer starter. “The former tends to be white, religious, and from less-populated areas including most of the South, whereas the latter tend to be of all colors, not-so-religious, from cities and the coasts.”

2L Lisa Vara-Gulmez said, “We have a lot of misinformed and confused people out there that lack a basic understanding about the world. I’m shocked that so many people shot themselves in the foot.”

3L Ken Parsons agreed: “Apparently, if one does not live near a large body of water, insufficient oxygen enters the brain, and impairs one’s ability to properly think through today’s issues.”

On the other hand, 2L Philip Maxwell felt the election results reflected the country’s desire for “strong leadership and good policies from a President. We’re not as liberal as the media and Michael Moore like to think, and that’s okay.”

Many students were disgusted that Bush gained support from individuals voting against gay rights. “There are more bigoted people in this country than I had ever imagined,” said 2L Damon Lewis. “Apparently, people hate gays more than they hate losing their jobs to overseas markets, and apparently people hate gays more than they hate the idea of looking for Osama bin Laden in Iraq.”

In 11 states, including Michigan, voters approved constitutional amendments defining marriage as between “a man and a woman.” These amendments will likely hinder opportunities for civil unions and may preclude benefits to unmarried couples.

In response to these results, Lewis expressed, “this country has sunk to a new low. For the first time in history, these states have written hate into their constitutions.”

2L Anna Haac concurred: “For all our Christian ‘morality,’ we sure are haters.”

As 3L John Marfoe illustrated, however, there were other reasons that people voted for Bush: “I’ve always considered myself very libertarian; pro-choice, pro gay rights and very fiscally conservative. Bush got my vote simply because I agree with his vision for the world and winning the greater war on terror.”

1L Erik Seidel, a former security professional, disagreed that Bush was the better choice for winning the war on terror. He said, “I think a lot of people voted for Bush because of his ‘tough’ stance on terrorism, which shows me that the vast majority of us have no idea what terrorists are actually like, what they want, or how they operate, including Bush himself.”

Still, students on both sides of the political spectrum remain cautiously optimistic about the country’s future.
Editorial: School Should Save Students Seats

Last Thursday, October 28, was a busy day at the Law School. The "Illegal but Legitimate: A Dubious Doctrine for the Times" lecture, given by political commentator Noam Chomsky, drew extremely large crowds to Hutchins Hall. 100 Hutchins Hall, the venue for the lecture, was filled to capacity more than a half-hour before the speech started. The designated overflow room, 150 Hutchins, filled immediately thereafter. From that point, long lines formed throughout the halls of Hutchins and out each exit door, extending at one point far across the quad, nearly to South University, merely to get into the building and sit in one of the hastily arranged overflow classrooms. During the lecture, interested attendees looked in the open windows of 100 just to get a peek at the speech.

The safety concerns of having the entire first floor of Hutchins almost impassably blocked with people are obvious. Given the scrambling to open up more overflow classrooms, the long lines and large numbers of frustrated attendees, it is safe to say that the turnout for this lecture was critically underestimated. This was not a law school event, however; the lecture was sponsored by several campus organizations who used Hutchins as an available venue. Making that even more clear in terms of blame-placement: the law school had little to no input in the planning process of the Chomsky lecture specifically. And its own large lecture, with Justice Scalia, will be in a larger auditorium. Nevertheless, many law students—especially those who had classes that ended at 3:30 p.m. and wanted to attend the 4 p.m. lecture—felt left out in the cold, literally, by the large crowds.

Frustrated students said that they wished the school had reserved them a section of seats, since the facility that they pay so much for was essentially taken over for a public lecture.

On one hand, it seems elitist. On the other hand, this is an idea that's already implemented in the Law Library which is closed to outsiders during finals, and in the Reading Room, half of which is reserved for law students. A section of 100HH reserved for MI Law students for any lecture held at the law school is a way to give preferential treatment to a section of interested lecture attendees who, frankly, deserve a slight bump in treatment over the general public. It’s understandable that the school wants to show off its events and contribute to the academic, legal and social community by opening events up to the public. But it's important to remember that these same law school events are primarily intended to benefit our legal education, and funded by the tuition money we spend to purchase it.

Reserving any section of any public venue suggests the inclusion of ushers, house managers, and other peace-keeping personnel. But that, likely, will not be necessary. Signs posted on rows or seats
Career Services Grows, Gives 1L Job Advice

By Erick Ong

The November 1st date rolled around and with it came the first official contact between the Office of Career Services and Office of Public Service and the Law School’s First-Year students. The Law School ushered in this momentous occasion with a seminar titled, “Career Resources for First-Year Law Students” held in 100 HH.

The seminar was co-moderated by Susan Guindi, Director of the Office of Career Services, and Mary Ann Sarosi, the Director of the Office of Public Service.

The first-year summer is a great time to experiment and venture into the world of law. A breakdown of last year’s class reveals that 28% worked in law firms, 15% clerked for judges, 7% worked in corporations, 39% were engaged in public service/government, and 11% in "other" (including at least one student who studied law aboard a cruise ship).

Nearly two-fifths of last year’s first-years participated in public interest programs and many qualified for the Student Funded Fellowship (SFF) program. SFF is a program that provides funds to students who choose to work for non-profit organizations in the summer. This program has funded as many as 80-90 students per year for amounts up to $3,000 per student. More information about this program can be seen at: http://www.law.umich.edu/JournalsandOrgs/sff/.

It should be noted that there are strict NALP guidelines when it comes to your first contact with legal employers. December 1 is the first date of contact or correspondence with legal employers, although the date still puzzles this 2L. Does this allow you to mail your letter on November 29 so it reaches them on December 1 and so that is the date of your first contact? Or does the letter need to be postmarked on December 1 or later? Hmm. Anyhow, Susan commented that many past students used the winter break for interviews and to attend receptions. Second- and third-year peers present a great resource that first-years should tap into to find out what options they have for their first summer since firm jobs may be difficult to obtain. During the meeting, a few 3Ls spoke of their experiences during their 1L summers and presented the diverse array of jobs to which UMich law students are privy.

Important dates and meetings to keep in mind include resume workshops, which first-years may sign up for outside of 210 Hutchins, a presentation from alumni about interviewing tips in one week, and a talk about judicial internships scheduled for November 22. Also, be on the look-out for career panels sponsored by many on-campus law organizations.

Christine Gregory, '96 Brings Diverse Background to Office of Career Services

The Office of Career Services recently ushered in a new member to join its esteemed ranks; University of Michigan Law School '96 graduate, Christine Gregory. Gregory has had a very interesting and fruitful career after her graduation from the Law School and will be a welcome addition to the Law School community.

In Law School, Gregory split her first summer as a clerk for President Clinton and at a firm in Maryland. Following graduation, Gregory worked as a legal services staff lawyer in Washington, D.C. where she played a large and integral role in not only providing legal advice and public benefits to low-income families, but in enriching their lives and helping them better themselves.

She was a director of Urban Alliance, a non-profit organization in Washington, D.C. that provided an educational enrichment program. While there she helped high school urban youths get gainful employment in such prestigious law firms as Covington & Burling and Kirkland & Ellis. The immense enjoyment she received in this position plays a large part in why she chose this position at the Law School.

Gregory moved back to Michigan a little over a year ago and worked in a small firm where she also maintained time for public interest and other work. She jumped at the opportunity to return to the Law School.

Gregory’s background is well-suited for our law school. She has worked with people from a variety of backgrounds, from low-income families to top political figures. For many law students it requires a bit of creativity and responsibility to find that coveted job, and she hopes to serve as a guide during that process.

Her most important advice to law students was to “be true to ourselves”. There are so many different options and avenues that students can take besides working at a law firm, that it would be a disservice to ourselves if we closed our minds to other possibilities.
Take it Back on America Recycles Day

By Jeremy Hutton

On November 15, the Environmental Law Society will join groups across the University of Michigan to celebrate America Recycles Day. Observed since 1997, America Recycles Day is part of a national campaign to raise awareness of the social, environmental and economic benefits of recycling and buying recycled products. This year's campaign is expected to involve millions of people in towns and cities across the United States.

"Recycling is a simple way in which all Americans can make a difference in our environment, preserve our resources and contribute to the economic well-being of the country," explained Kate Krebs, the national spokesperson for this year's campaign. "We have found each year that people want to do something and just need to be reminded and shown how easy it is to do their part."

At the University of Michigan, it's especially easy to become involved. During the weeks leading up to November 15th, for example, Waste Management Services will be sponsoring a collection program for small electronics such as cell phones and pagers. Drop-off locations can be found at the Graduate Library, Law Library and elsewhere. In addition, information booths will be set up at Michigan Stadium during the November 13th football game against Northwestern. Fans will be able to pick up pencils and key chains made from recycled materials, learn about recycling initiatives at the University, and pledge to recycle more and to buy more recycled-content products.

As November 15th approaches, law students in particular should remember to make an extra effort to use the recycling stations located across the hall from the Snack Bar, outside of Rooms 120 and 220, in Rooms 100 and 150 and near the Office of Career Services. The Environmental Law Society is also working to add new recycling stations in the Reading Room and Law Library and to improve recycling efforts in the Lawyers Club. Students interested in learning more about recycling at the Law School should feel free to stop by the Environmental Law Society's office in Room 114 of the Legal Research Building.

America Recycles Day occurs only once annually, but the importance of recycling is ongoing. Fortunately, many groups at the University remain committed to recycling throughout the year. Still, the ultimate success of any recycling campaign lies with the individual consumer. As you travel through the halls of the Law School, remember to recycle—not just on America Recycles Day, but every day.

Orange Alert

Submitted by Bayrex Marti and Eunice Rho

Introduction: On November 3, 49% of America were seeking solace and meaning. Some turned to alcohol; others turned to recreational drugs. Some others turned to food. But most Americans knew that they'd only find true comfort on Thursday night at 8pm on FOX.

Welcome to the OC, bitch.

Disclaimer: This is a post-hoc analysis. We did not watch the program together.

Bayrex: I own the DVD to the first season, so I prepared for tonight by watching last season's finale. Which is to say that I cried twice. It was a very special episode.

Eunice: So since it's so fresh in your memory, do you think the transition was seamless?

B: I was surprised she could lift that lounge chair. Let's see Mary-Kate try that.

E: As a resident Puerto Rican, what is your opinion on the pool boy? Or is he a gardener?

B: More importantly, as a pop culture journalist AND resident Puerto Rican, I was pleasantly surprised...and deeply offended.

E: I mean seriously. What's next, a piano-playing Asian math tutor?

B&E: According to our sources (Us Weekly), the pool boy/gardener is going to hook up with Marissa.

E: I think Marissa is trying to bridge the class/race gap.

Continued on Page 19
On Barack Obama:  
The Colors and Layers of Blackness

Submitted By Abam Mambo

I am not a US citizen. I cannot vote. But that does not preclude me from having a valid opinion about American politics; after all, it affects the taxes and tuition I pay. For the purposes of this article, pretend that I am a citizen and that I voted in the 2004 elections. Now that you’ve done that, this is what I have to say.

While Barack Obama’s election as a U.S. senator from Illinois was hardly a surprise to anyone, even non-Illinoisans who have followed him from the DNC until the elections, I was thrilled with his win especially after the GOP’s handling of its candidate, Alan Keyes. Due to the manner in which the GOP and Keyes conducted themselves in that race, I had to take a step back and ponder a somewhat fresh issue affecting contemporary Black America.

Why did the GOP look mostly (if not exclusively) for a black candidate to run against Obama? Was it an attempt to racialize a political race? Of course, the GOP wanted people to believe Keyes was the finest candidate for the job, but that would besaying two things about Illinois politics: First, there was not a single fully competent Republican to take on Obama in a state where he became a darling among moderate and even some conservative voters. Next, Illinoisans, especially Black Illinoisans, vote exclusively on a race card. I don’t believe either of these to be true, but it is the sense I got from following what I could of Keyes’s run in that race.

Some say it was the GOP’s way of attracting black voters because many moderate and conservative Blacks would vote for a lone Black candidate because being Black means championing the Black cause. That is, if you believe there is such a thing. It is fallacious to think Blacks would vote for a Black candidate just because s/he is Black. I even snicker thinking of whether, if there were an electoral process for judges, Blacks would have voted for Justice Clarence Thomas. In any case, this strategy denigrates Blacks as a whole. What it says to me foremost is that Blacks cannot see beyond the race horizon. And it dares to proclaim the heyday of American politics when two Blacks contend for a seat in the US Senate. Any way I look at this, it is very disquieting.

Keyes was quick to declare that while he was the descendant of a slave, Obama was only the son of an African. Not only that, but he was a biracial kid with a white mother, as if to say the Black community perceives biracial people as taboo. Am I the only one who hears questions of racial, or more aptly, ethnic authenticity in that kind of view? Are Blacks forced to read ballots through a racial lens? And as if that is not enough, were Illinoisans to vote (with their race spectacles on, of course) a ‘Black’ or a ‘Blacker’ senator? (I do not speak here of skin tone - I refer to the degree of African-ness that, had Keyes had his way, decidedly should have worked against the ‘African’ Obama.) I do not know what yardstick is used to measure the Blackness of two African Americans who proclaim a genuine interest in the political affairs of their state, and a great love and commitment not just to Blacks but to their constituents as a whole. That should be posed to Keyes himself.

Obama is said to be only the third "African American" in the Senate since Reconstruction, and the first “African American” President of the Harvard Law Review. However, come time for elections, Black voters especially are forced to witness his American-ness dissolve in the face of an “authentic” ‘African American’ contender, leaving behind a vestige, a mere skeleton of the man now defined entirely by his African-ness. Is this African-ness meant to frighten African American voters? Or what exactly were Keyes and the GOP getting at?

The next time the GOP decides to do what it tried in Illinois, it should rethink the idea. As a Black person, I feel insulted and belittled; I now assume that to the GOP, all I see is Black. It seems to purport that my perspective on political and socioeconomic issues are contrived because I cannot see beyond my own race. The only thing worse than that is the attempt to make me see different layers of Blackness, measured by whose ancestor was a slave and whose ancestor sold a slave. If either Obama or Keyes was driving down a Cincinnati highway only a few years back, he could have been pulled aside à la racial profiling, and no one would have gone digging in their backyards to see who had an artifact of the Underground Railroad and who did not. Outwardly, I assume I look no different from my African American counterparts. I am black and that is how I am perceived until I open my mouth and little bits of a blended Cameroonian, Maryland, Minnesotan and soon Michigan accent comes a-flowing!

But so long as my mouth is shut, I am Black for statistical and other purposes, as are both Obama and Keyes. Obama will not go down in history as the first, second or third biracial or African senator in the US Senate. What Black people do not need is an attempt to divide this community, which has been fighting for centuries to assert itself prominently in a nation many argue still perceives them as alien.

Adam Mambo is a 1L. Send comments about this article to rg@umich.edu.
All Things Considered:
An Interview with Professor Primus

Submitted by Richard Primus

Professor Richard Primus teaches Constitutional Law and Labor & Employment Law at Michigan, but is currently a visiting professor at the Columbia Law School. He has written on democratic theory, jury decision making, equal protection, and the role of dissent within the American legal system. After graduating from law school, Primus clerked for Judge Guido Calabresi on the Second Circuit and for U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. He then practiced law at the Washington, D.C., office of Jenner & Block, where his work included voting rights litigation.

What do these results say about our country?

That it is still divided in almost exactly the same way that it was four years ago. There was a little bit of shift in the popular vote, of course, but barely. Bush now has a popular majority, which will be good for his legitimacy, but he was in fact reelected by the smallest reelection margin of any President in American history. His popular vote total was about 6% more than Kerry’s. By comparison, Clinton got 21% more votes than Dole in 1996; Reagan got 45% more than Mondale in 1984.

Even Truman’s margin over Dewey in 1948, which is remembered as razor-thin, was about 10% of Dewey’s vote, substantially more than Bush’s margin this time. It is the narrowest reelection ever, going back all the way to the first time that there was a popular vote at all. (In the Republic’s first several elections, there wasn’t anything that we’d recognize as a popular vote. State legislatures just chose the electors.) Bush won, of course. A narrow win is still a win. But fundamentally, the electorate was extraordinarily close to even. People will see the win as a mandate, but it’s actually a squeaker, and it looks larger than that only by comparison with 2000.

The same is true when you look at the electoral map: Almost no change in four years. 48 of 51 jurisdictions went exactly the same way they did in 2000, and the only three that changed—Iowa and New Mexico from the Democrats to the Republicans, New Hampshire from the Republicans to the Democrats—were small to medium-sized states that were extremely close last time and also extremely close this time, just a little bit on the other side of the line.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about how little the electorate changed is that the set of issues on which people were supposed to be voting was so different from what it was in 2000. Think about how much the hot issues that this year’s election was supposed to be about are new products of the last four years. Four years ago, we had not experienced September 11. We had no global war on terrorism and no war with Iraq, and indeed President Bush had campaigned against the idea of “nation-building.” We had an extremely different fiscal and budgetary situation than we have today. Same-sex marriage was not a serious political issue for the national stage. All of these large, animating issues are new. And yet, the electoral division in the country is almost exactly what it was before. That suggests that the real forces that drive people to vote for one party or the other are not products of the issues themselves. It’s something else.

What was the biggest issue to you in this election?

America’s place in the world. In the last four years, we have recklessly wasted enormous amounts of American power and goodwill around the globe.

I’m a hawk: I believe in the projection of American power abroad as a force for good. And I know that in the twenty-first century, as at the end of the twentieth, military power is only one piece of how international power is successfully deployed. A great deal of it is what international relations experts call “soft power.” It’s about using the influence of our culture and our economy and our educational institutions and many other things to get people in other countries to see that their interests align withours and that our values are values worth having.

Today, we do not have the level of global influence we used to have, because we have acted recklessly. The goodwill we had all through the 1990s—to say nothing of the extraordinary goodwill we enjoyed on September 12—has been completely dissipated. Nothing is being done to persuade people around the world that we are the good guys. This is already hurting us in many ways. It means that we are less successful than we should be in fighting terrorism, because people in other countries whose cooperation we need are less than enthusiastic about cooperating. It will hurt us in many other ways as well. European countries will look less to us for leadership, and countries elsewhere around the world will look to Europe rather than to America as a model to emulate. It’s harder to call the tune when people don’t want to listen to your music.

Much of the problem stems from our having failed to think seriously about how other people may view our actions. In the end, we always need to do what we think is right, even if others disagree. But in figuring out a smart course of action to accomplish what we think is
right—that is, in order to figure out what means will help attain our ends—we need to consider how other people will react to us, just a chess player or a football coach or, for that matter, a litigator needs to anticipate the other side’s reactions when planning a strategy. We haven’t done that, and as a result we’ve alienated a lot of people in a lot of countries and left ourselves much weaker than we used to be. We need to take this very seriously.

This is not to say that several other issues are not also extremely important. They are. But you asked for just one.

Predications about the Supreme Court?

I don’t like making Court predictions. Supreme Court vacancies and Supreme Court decisions are highly contingent events. But of course it seems likely that there will be more than one vacancy during the coming administration and that Bush, claiming a mandate, will want to appoint justices with right-wing views on contested social issues. If that happens, I don’t know how to predict whether the Democrats will permit such an appointment to go through.

I wonder, though, whether there will be a struggle within the Administration over just how much to push. For those elements within the Administration that are actually committed to undoing decisions like Lawrence or Roe because they believe that homosexuality and abortion are simply evil, the imperative will be strong. But there are others who may be less interested in those results than they are in building a long-term Republican electoral majority, and for them, Lawrence and Roe are much better alive than dead. Actually reversing Roe would be a political disaster for the Republicans, and I’m confident that Karl Rove knows it. He’s very good at his job, after all. What is better for the Republicans, on this pragmatic view, would be to engage in grand symbolic politics but keep the need to reverse Lawrence and Roe alive so as to continue motivating the right-wing religious vote.

That might mean elevating a hard-right social conservative to the Chief’s chair but not pushing for more than one new justice who would really go all the way to reversing what Republican justices like O’Connor and Kennedy have decided in cases like Lawrence and Casey.

I’m not predicting that anything will actually play out this way, of course. I’m just pointing it out as a possibility that may not yet have occurred to a lot of people.

Where did the Democrats go wrong? What should they do better next time?

The first thing to note here is that in the Presidential race, the Democrats didn’t do so terribly. They lost, of course, and nobody likes losing. But as I said before, the margin was smaller than any previous reelection margin in American history, ever. This wasn’t 1984 with Mondale or even 1988 with Dukakis. This was an election in which a Massachusetts liberal got 48% of the popular vote. If twenty thousand voters had changed their minds in Nevada, New Mexico, and Iowa, the electoral college would have been deadlocked at 269. None of this means that there isn’t cause for some change in the party, of course: there is. But people shouldn’t jump to the conclusion that the Democrats are somehow out of the mainstream and need serious retooling. They almost won—and they almost won against an incumbent President who is in some sense a wartime President, and who has a very effective and disciplined political team.

I’m confident that the Democrats would have won with a better candidate—Bill Clinton would have wiped the floor with all the competition in this cycle and walked away with 350 electoral votes—so one place where the Democrats went wrong was in selecting Kerry. I like a lot of things about him, but he wasn’t a great Presidential candidate. For one thing, it’s not clear why an electability calculus should lead the party to nominate a Senator from Massachusetts who didn’t inspire a tremendous amount of personal excitement and loyalty. If I were to recommend some reforms, I would probably include changing how the early set of primaries are conducted.

More broadly, I think that the Democrats have lacked the courage to stand on important convictions and make the case for them to the political center. I’m not saying that those convictions are so far from where the center is: again, 48% of the vote did go for Kerry, and that Bush’s reelection margin was the smallest in history. Democrats need to find ways to address the middle twenty percent of the electorate and articulate values of fairness, equality, openness, and smart national power in language that resonates with working-class and business-oriented Americans in Missouri and North Carolina and Colorado. It can be done.

I should also say that I’m entirely confident that on some of the big divisive social issues, the Democrats are clearly going to win in the end. If the politically most important day of the last four years was September 11, 2001, the second most important day was November 18, 2003—the day when the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts issued its same-sex marriage decision. That decision was an electoral boon to the Bush Administration, because it called forth a set of anti-same-sex-marriage referenda on this year’s ballots and helped motivate untold numbers of voters from the religious right to turn out and vote for Bush. I think it likely that without the same-sex marriage issue, Kerry could have won Ohio. But within a couple of decades, this issue will be transformed. Think of how far acceptance of gays and lesbians has come in America in the last twenty years, and ask whether there’s any reason to think that it won’t continue to advance. Millions of people under thirty—including millions of mainstream Republicans under thirty—simply don’t connect anymore with the homophobia of their parents’ generation. I’m not saying that homophobia will completely die out any more than other forms of hatred have. But I am saying I believe a day will come, and soon, when it will be not much more
Seeing Red, Feeling Blue

Submitted By Ali H. Shah

Enter the gates of the All-England Lawn and Tennis Club at Wimbledon, and you'll see a sign that reads "If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster, and treat those two imposters just the same," a bit of verse borrowed from Rudyard Kipling's poem "If...", which this author quoted a few weeks ago to describe President Bush's neo-conservative adventure in Iraq. "If..." also speaks to more than a few Democrats and left-leaning Blue-with-a-capital-B types, who by Wednesday morning had stepped up and given a hearty handshake to Disaster when we were fully expecting to have morning coffee and bagels with Triumph. The Greek gods condemned Sisyphus to an eternal punishment of pushing a boulder up a mountain, only to have it roll back into the valley every time he reached the top. Four years of pushing this boulder, only to see it roll back down, has many of us feeling like Edvard Munch's The Scream.

But funny things happen on the road to despair, in between the declarations of impending moves to Canada or, at the least, confining your job search to Blue states and not the Red ones. Take a look at the map, say hello to Red America, and don't take the intellectually lazy way out by claiming this only proves there are a minimum of 58 million unthinking, uninformed, unenlightened Americans with voter ID cards. Take a closer look. There is something to be learned. The most important lesson is that reasonable people can disagree on most things. There are certain things we should argue but not lose sleep over, and there are a few things that should cut us so deeply that we scream, cry and work like hell to change them.

The Environment. Reds believe, generally, that the federal government ought to regulate industry less, because regulation stifles economic growth. Some of us think the EPA should crack down harder on industrial pollution, because we value the environment over jobs (as long as they're not our jobs).

Foreign Affairs. Blues want the United States to be a partner in the world community, not the bully that everyone loves to hate. Reds see a world in which American power is projected by military means such that foreign threats are less likely to become domestic ones. Blues realize that an America that only projects its influence and advances its interests through military means bears the hallmarks of a weak nation rather than a strong one. Reds discount the cost of being despised abroad with a shrug.

Affirmative action. Let's allow for the fact it's not unreasonable for someone to believe that individual admissions to universities should be color blind, even if the result is a homogenous collective environment. Blues rightfully argue that diversity benefits everyone, particularly in law school, where input of different perspectives is critical to the learning mission. I fall in with this reasoning, but I do admit, the Reds have a case.

Abortion. Now things begin to deteriorate rapidly, the stakes rise and voices get louder. It is a failing of the Blues that we rarely recognize that there is a good faith argument in Red America against the right to choose. The most intellectually consistent argument against abortion is made by those who oppose it even in cases of rape or incest, and incidentally, those same people often break with the Red position on the death penalty. We Blues may often be most taken aback by that position, but let's admit at least it has a steady logic to it.

Eventually, though, Red America manages to go off the deep end on an issue and runs out of excuses and arguments. That issue is gay rights. The question is: what does it say about Red America that so many care so deeply about taking rights away from their fellow citizens? Even in the Blue state of Michigan, Proposition 2 passed easily, though evidently it failed to draw enough social conservatives to paint the entire state Red. The instinctive Blue response is that the success of the anti-gay amendments means that Red America simply wants to spread its moral values as though everyone should believe likewise. Wrong. The success of the anti-gay amendments represents only a failure of Blue America to spread its moral values as though everyone should believe likewise. That is not to say that promotion of a particular lifestyle is a moral value, not at all; rather, the value and accompanying political position here is that equal rights for gays is the only ethical option, there is simply no other morally reasonable alternative.

Do not be fooled, much less discouraged, by the state amendments attacking gay rights. They do not represent a validation of traditional moral values any more than segregation or disenfranchisement of women represented traditional values in the past. Rather, they represent the final throes of a slow, creeping death, the ebbing of a peculiar intolerance, the convulsions of body ready to pass on into twilight.

The encouraging characteristic of human decency is that, unlike prejudice, it spreads laterally within the same generation, and inevitably builds momentum, though often more slowly than we'd like. Prejudice, conversely, spreads vertically to younger generations taught by their elders, but never as deeply as the previous generation. Theirs is a discredited, rapidly aging philosophy that will spasm and flare from time to time but never build upon itself.

The poet Rainer Maria Rilke suggests "perhaps all dragons in our lives are really princesses, waiting to see us, just once, be beautiful and courageous." Take heart that Red America will come around. What I see in this little Blue corner of our country, among the students at the University of

Continued on Page 19
On the Mortality of Minority Morality

Submitted by David McGee

It was early in the morning on November 3, and Ohio was about to go to Bush. I was ready to spend the rest of the night sobbing in my bathtub, like that guy at the end of “The Crying Game.”

Between dry heaves, I heard NBC’s Brian Williams dig a little deeper into the exit polls. He said: “People who thought moral values were important voted for George W. Bush.” Hey, I thought, wait a minute. I think moral values are important too, but I didn’t vote for Bush. What gives?

If you must know, I actually think of myself as a very moral person. In fact, I voted against Bush specifically because I find many of his decisions to be morally dubious.

Others obviously disagree, and believe Bush to be an impeccable moral leader. So what does Williams mean? Whose moral values is he talking about? If he means to suggest that my sense of morality doesn’t consist of real moral values, simply because more people than not disagree with me, well then, to quote Dick Cheney (our vice-moral leader), he can go fuck himself. That’s what I yelled at my TV, at least.
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The trouble, of course, is that opponents of the legislation are driven by an equally deep sense of morality. They believe in tolerance and diversity, and that nothing should stand between two people who love each other, no matter who they are.

Proponents and opponents can debate gay marriage until they’re blue in the face. They can discuss the nuances of Loving v. Virginia and Lawrence v. Texas, and they can try to decide just what the hell the “sanctity of marriage” really is. But they’ll never convince each other of anything, because it’s all a cover. It’s all an external justification for an internal morality that can’t be swayed by case law or political buzzwords.

It’s a battle of two moralities, both claiming to be more moral than the other, but both using a slightly different definition of what morality really is. It’s hard to see how either one can rightfully tell the other who’s right and who’s wrong.

So how does morality fit into our legal structure? Obviously, it’s everywhere. Our entire legal system, in one way or another, is built on some common sense of morality. There are some things, it appears, that we can all agree on.

Free speech, good. Murder, bad. It’s simple, right?
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Back by Popular Demand:
Fall Semester 2003 Grade Curves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Curves</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Number receiving each grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>4.7 4.0 3.7 3.5 3.2 3.0 2.8 2.5 2.3 2.1 2.0 1.8 1.5 1.3 1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>4.7 4.0 3.7 3.5 3.2 3.0 2.8 2.5 2.3 2.1 2.0 1.8 1.5 1.3 1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>4.7 4.0 3.7 3.5 3.2 3.0 2.8 2.5 2.3 2.1 2.0 1.8 1.5 1.3 1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>4.7 4.0 3.7 3.5 3.2 3.0 2.8 2.5 2.3 2.1 2.0 1.8 1.5 1.3 1.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
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</table>

THESE GRADE CURVES PREVIOUSLY APPEARED IN THE MARCH 9, 2004 RG.
### Grade Summary - Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Grade Distribution</th>
<th>Deviation from Grade Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>Upperclass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets for class mean:**
- minimum: 3.13
- target: 3.19
- maximum: 3.25

**Key Notes:**
- Good - the number of students in the class, according to the grade
- Average - the number of students in the class, according to the grade
- Fail - the number of students in the class, according to the grade

**Revisions from Grade Guidelines:**
- blank - the number of students receiving an average grade within the target range

---
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Ghoul's Night Out:
Law School Halloween Party 2004
It's Not an Offer, It's an Invitation to Bid: The Law School Date Auction
Win or Lose, Happy or Sad, Home is Where You Make It

By Mike Murphy

Between the outcome of the game and of the general election, the level of gloating and whining I've heard has reached almost epidemic proportions. Like most people around here, I'm a bit hungover from the general election, and before that, The-Best-Michigan-Home-Football-Game-Ever-From-Which-My-Dumbass-Friends-Left-With-8-Minutes-Left-Because-They-Were-Cold-Ha-Ha-Losers! (Hereinafter “Best Game Ever”). You only wonder what would have happened had Braylon Edwards been on the Democratic ticket. Could Braylon have circus caught a few hundred thousand votes in Ohio? (Well, maybe not Columbus.)

(And say what you will about the election’s results, but to say this—don’t you think Bush’s comments about “earning political capital” are from the Office of Delusional Grandeur? He did win, that’s not openly questionable — this time — but let me put it this way: if Bush actually earned a non-negligible amount of “political capital” just now, then Ronald Reagan should have been El Presidente and Dictator-For-Life from 1984 onward if he’d felt like it. That’s all I’ll say.)

I can say that the Best Game Ever was so because I've been watching Michigan football my whole life—I grew up here. See, I had moved 600 miles away from home when I decided to go to law school, and thanks to the aggressive ego stroking of the Admissions Office (damn that CD-ROM), I ended up moving almost all the way back home for law school.

Not that I ever go there. Except to do laundry, because the dryer in my apartment building apparently has as much desire to dry clothes as I have to read for class and as the UPS guy has to deliver packages—not a whole lot.

About the UPS guy—the upside is, that I can also have packages delivered to my parents’ house. This is advantageous since it gives me a reason to visit them, and because the UPS guy apparently watches my apartment, waits for me to go to the bathroom, and runs by with a “We missed you” tag. What his problem is with actually delivering a package, I don’t know. We even caught him leaving a “Final Delivery” attempt notice after only two delivery attempts. Which is illegal or something.

I enjoy going home because my mother, who is actively teased by relatives for still having a child in school who comes home to do laundry, is insane. Like most insane people, she’s fun to be around. For example I have to fight my mother to keep her from obsessively (some would say compulsively) doing my laundry. Besides, my independence (some would say, my masculinity) is at stake. Next time, I will stun my mother by the shocking admission that my roommate’s lasagna is actually better than hers. I may get disowned for that. At the very least, I’ll hear the story of my two-month premature, several-hour labor, incompatible blood type, caesarian section birth (before which my mother actively told the doctors to save the baby at her own risk) — you can tell I’ve heard this story once or twice, right? It’s like a Lifetime Movie, only real, and it’s even funnier if it weren’t true. And really, my roommate’s pizza is almost on par, too, but Mom’s pizza is Mom’s pizza, and that has a place in my heart that surpasses taste. Forty years from now, if I’m still around and she’s not, I’m going to miss that pizza more than I’m comfortable expressing in print. Y’know?

That aside, it’s nice having packages delivered to my house since I know they’ll be signed for. But it leads to some fairly interesting exchanges. Like when my Halloween costume arrived:

Mom: Your costume showed up in the mail. It’s a big brown robe-thing, and there’s a halo. Are you some sort of monk?

Me: No, mom. It’s “Holy Shit.” Get it?

Mom: Oh, Goddamn it, Michael.

(Uncomfortable pause)

Me: Mom, sometimes I drink. And I go on eBay.

That’s just the sort of interaction I’d otherwise only be able to get at Thanksgiving and Christmas. Seeing close family only on holidays is a reality for a lot of us here, since Ann Arbor is, constructively, the middle of nowhere. Depending on how the job thing shapes out, it may soon be that way for me too. So I’m flagellating myself publicly (that means beating “up”, people, and shame on you) in a way that, hopefully, will help me appreciate having my parents around before I’m away again and start to miss them.

So as I was screaming and hugging my friends in triple overtime and late into election night, as both Jim Brandstatter and Dan Rather were reduced to babbling idiots, I realized that the people around me were just about as close to family as we get during this time. Even through all the good and bad times, and with all the whining and gloating. And appreciating that before we start to miss each other after The Big Dance at Hill Auditorium? Definitely worthwhile.

Mike Murphy is a 2L and the Editor-in-Chief of Res Gestae. E-mail Mike at murphym@umich.edu.
Ford's Freestyle is Not a Wack Jam

By Steve Boender

Until fairly recently, people with children faced an unappealing decision: sell out and buy a minivan or blow a huge chunk of change on a gaudy, gas-fiend SUV. Without much choice in the station wagon market, you needed either a minivan or an SUV to fit the family. However, several automakers have risen to the occasion and produced car-based SUVs that carry all the best traits of that genre (size, winter traction and non-minivan-ness) with the ride quality, lower price and fuel consumption of a regular old car.

The latest entry in this "not a car, not quite a truck and sure as hell not a minivan" category is the unfortunately-named Ford Freestyle. Ford has high hopes for the Freestyle, projecting up to 120,000 units sold in the first year. Our first look at the Freestyle showed that Ford execs weren't high on fumes from the Dow Chemical plant when they made that projection. In short, the all-wheel-drive Freestyle is Detroit's best effort at competing in that category thus far (Buick Rendezvous, eat your angioplasty out).

For the base platform, Ford searched its global design bin and pulled a winner with the Volvo P2 platform (featured in the S60 and XC-90, among others). Not content with off-the-shelf design, Ford engineers took the platform and tweaked it to meet their exact needs. The only parts actually shared with the Volvos are the components of the all-wheel-drive system, which is optional across the Freestyle line.

For inertial motivation, Ford threw in a 3.0 liter Duratec V-6 putting out about 200 horsepower and 200 pound-feet of torque. Those underwhelming numbers are bolstered by the Freestyle's most noticeable technical marvel, the continuously-variable transmission (or "CVT" if you're into the whole brevity thing). A CVT is essentially a transmission without any gears, or with an infinite number of gears, depending on your point of view. The ultimate effect is that the transmission doesn't ever shift, which is slightly unnerving at first drive. But you won't mind so much when you give the accelerator a generous push in highway merging situations and you find that you don't have to wait for the transmission to kick down into a lower gear, which can be interminable with some automatics. The CVT has a bit of a lag, but it's much quicker and smoother in most cases, and according to Ford, leads to better fuel economy (19/24 for models with AWD).

The ride quality is markedly smoother than most SUVs, lacking the creaks and rattles that Ford has been known for in the past. While the cornering ability and acceleration aren't anything to waste ink over, they also aren't value drivers for the Freestyle's intended segment. With a ride height between a sedan and SUV, overall visibility is great, given the length of the vehicle. Finally, the four-wheel disc breaks with ABS provide plenty of stopping power in chaotic metro Detroit highway driving.

While evaluating a vehicle's performance is all fine and good, the people-hauling utility of the vehicle is what most of the Freestyle's targeted buyers will be interested in, and for the most part they should be happy with it. With three rows of seats, the Freestyle fairly comfortably seats seven adults, as I learned whilst fulfilling designated-driver duties on a trip to Detroit for a concert. While the third row was a bit cramped, kids should have no problem fitting back there. Need room for cargo? Second and third-row seats fold down easily, instantly turning the area behind the driver into a wide open cargo hold. I was able to fit all the equipment for a three-person band back there with minimal effort. Ford also continues its recent renaissance in interior fit and finish - from top to bottom the Freestyle's cabin is rock-solid, if not terribly visually exciting.

While the car-ute category has a few tough contenders to challenge the Freestyle - the Honda Pilot and Toyota Highlander immediately come to mind - Ford has reason to have confidence in the Freestyle. With it's newfangled transmission, fuel economy, and mass-transit capabilities, the Freestyle has all the markings of a winner in an era where SUVs are increasingly seen as gaudy and minivans are seen as an irreversible thrust into maturity.
Why a Nation Divided?

By Matt Nolan

The tone has to change. The two major political parties have legitimate differences over important policies, yet rhetoric again dominated the campaigns this fall. This is dangerous.

Republicans believe generally in an economic policy that allows the free market to be primary in jobs, that imposing less tax burden on businesses allows them to hire more workers and provide better conditions, and that allowing people to have more money encourages them to spend more, boosting the economy. Democrats, on the other hand, foster a belief that business cannot be trusted to take care of the American worker, and that government programs generally need to be larger and more hands-on to provide both jobs and benefits to Americans.

This is an honest disagreement over economic philosophies, and both sides have valid points – so the question then becomes, why don’t we admit so?

John Kerry alleged in the presidential debates that President Bush’s tax cut was “only for the wealthy” and “hurt the middle class.” I don’t know about you, but when the 1st tax cut went through I was working at Meijer and making $7.31/hour, and dropping my federal taxes from 15% to 10% certainly made a difference for me. Every bracket’s taxes were lowered, meaning every American had their tax burden lowered instantly (other than those already not paying any).

John Kerry opposed the Bush tax cut, because he believed in a system in which the higher, Clinton-level taxes were necessary to meet burdens of society. His argument against the cut was very well-founded; deficit spending has skyrocketed under the supposedly fiscally “conservative” Bush and no end to its increase is in clear sight. Did he make this argument, though?

No. John Kerry instead argued that the tax cut for the majority of Americans was fine, but that the uber-rich needed to have theirs rescinded. He didn’t articulate his argument that the tax cut was generally wrong, and instead argued for an increased middle class tax cut while simultaneously arguing that we had to stop cutting taxes in order to decrease the deficit.

Ladies and Gentlemen, where I come from, we call this pandering. By telling the vast majority of Americans that they can have lower taxes (and even going further than Bush would go, and proposing an ADDITIONAL tax cut for the middle class) and the only cost to do it is to tax the heck out of a small subset of the population, Kerry could promise benefit to 95% while only hurting 5%. Is this smart fiscal policy? No. Smart campaigning? If you can get away with it.

I heard John Kerry during the campaign promise that if he were elected president, he would stop corporations from sending our manufacturing jobs overseas. Even the ultra-liberal Michigan Daily ran an article quoting a bevy of economics professors debunking this theory, pointing out that the American economy is in the middle of a fundamental shift away from manufacturing and toward jobs that require more education and are service-oriented. Promising auto-workers they can get their jobs back is like Teddy Roosevelt promising farmers in 1904 that they wouldn’t lose their farms to the expansion of factories. It’s just not true, and it shouldn’t be used as campaign rhetoric if it’s not.

I’m a Republican, and damned proud of it. I’m not a Republican because I agree with the party on all of the issues, though – far from it. I’m a Republican largely because I feel that the Democratic party has given up making genuine arguments for their policy preferences in favor of pandering to fears and ignorance.

The Republicans won the ideological battle of the last 20 years of the 20th century, guys. When Bill Clinton signed NAFTA and John Kerry’s acceptance speech included a call for extra troops in the military, a tax cut, and a focus on the importance of family values, what was happening was an acceptance of the ideological victory of the right. Americans believe government is best when it is smaller and more local; they believe that a strong military is extremely important, and that social values are at the center of our national fabric. These things weren’t valued as highly thirty years ago as they are today, and I believe that is because of the ability of the right to articulate their point and the reluctance of the left to articulate theirs.

Democrats have EXTREMELY potent arguments to make against Republican policy, but rather than fighting them out, the last 15 years have seen the party concede on the issues and attempt to battle on the personal level. Rather than criticizing George Bush’s vision of preemptive striking, the left claims he “lied” to take us to war and “rushed” into it. If John Kerry doesn’t think the tax cut was smart, why doesn’t he call for a repeal of ALL of it? The answer from my Democratic friends, of course, is that, “if he called for a tax increase he’d lose.” Well, probably, yes – but if he thinks it’s right, and believes it’s what he should do if elected, then he needs to make THAT CASE to the American people – to fuzz the issue and get elected as something you’re not is underhanded and hurts our democracy.

President Bush has more room to operate post-election than John Kerry would have had because he told the American people EXACTLY what he was, EXACTLY what his preferences were and
“If Kerry had won and had to face a Senate with 54 or 55 Republicans, he would have gotten nothing done. At least now, the GOP can’t blame us for a thing,” said LL Oz Vazquez.

Marfoe stated, “We are all united on the need to win the war, and I believe eventually we will all be united behind Bush’s vision once it begins to bear fruit.”

Perhaps, as LL Donald Badaczewski opined, “In the end, it really doesn’t matter who is President. America’s economy is totally invincible and can only be compromised by the fear, ignorance and superstition of her citizens.”

Author’s Note: I apologize for my mistake in emailing the survey multiple times last week. I sincerely appreciate the large number of responses that I received, and I am sorry that, due to space constraints, I could not include more of your opinions.
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acceptable to run against gays than it is today acceptable to run against blacks or Jews or women. Especially women, because the gay issue is, at root, fundamentally an issue about gender roles. All the right-wing evangelists that Karl Rove (to his great tactical credit) can mobilize will not prevent the advancing equality of women and the social acceptance of gays.

One day, the Republican Party will have to reckon with having been the party that tried to keep gay people down. That will be a hard thing to do when it becomes generally recognized that that position is a moral evil comparable to some kinds of racial discrimination that are now recognized as evil by a very broad consensus of Americans. God is merciful, and on the day of judgment he will forgive many people for having used religion as a political tool to sanction fear and hatred of their fellow men and women. But in the court of history, the group that did this is going to look pretty bad.

The hard project for the Democrats is to figure out how, in the interim, to prevent the Republican Party from mobilizing the remaining powerful anxiety about changing gender roles in ways that allow it to do terrible damage on issues like taxes, the environment, and America’s place in the world. And the hard project for intelligent and good-hearted Republicans is to face up to the fact that there is now a struggle for their party’s identity. There are lots of respectable reasons to be a Republican. To the extent that the party is driven by an ugly agenda, the people who are Republicans for more respectable reasons will have to search their souls.

Do you see a change in the election process?

No. If Kerry had eked out a win in Ohio and won the electoral college without the popular vote, then perhaps there would have been a change. If that scenario, each party would have had the recent experience of losing the Presidency while winning the popular vote, and maybe that would have provoked reform.

But as things stand, there will be little impetus among Republicans for reform, so it won’t happen.

Did anything bizarre happen to you while voting?

I voted absentee, so the most bizarre thing that happened is that my ballot was returned to me three days after I mailed it and I had to mail it a second time. (I think the post office mistook the voter ID label for the address the first time.)

I spent Election Day and the whole previous week in a windowless bunker in Florida, helping coordinate a team of Kerry Campaign lawyers trying to protect the vote in that state. We did a pretty good job, I think. We just didn’t have enough votes.

MORALITIES, from Page 9

because there can only be one answer: Smith or Jones, park or no park.

The same can’t be said for a vote between moralities, because there doesn’t have to be just one. This country is founded on the idea that the populace can pursue more than one sense of morality, as long as it does not risk harm to person or property. There is no such risk here.

I’m not here to say that opponents of gay marriage are necessarily wrong or proponents are necessarily right. My point is that a simple yes/no, majority wins vote is not the right way to reconcile a clash in moralities. These clashes should be reconciled somehow, but there has to be a better way. As we learned in Brown v. Board of Education, the popular majority shouldn’t always win.

Dave McGee is a 2L. E-mail comments about this article to rg@umich.edu.
why, and EXACTLY what he intended to do after being elected. At his first post-election press conference a reporter asked what Bush intended to work on during his 2nd term now that he was elected. The response was, "Haven't you been following my campaign for the past two years? I have told the American people what I intend to do, and I intend to do it."

When a person advocates what they believe in and sticks to what they say, they have more leeway to operate and more legitimacy as a politician in most Americans' minds. None of us can say what John Kerry would have done had he been elected, but I think that simple fact was reason enough not to vote for him.

I’ve talked with many of you about the Kerry candidacy, and if you’re honest with yourself right now as you were with me when we spoke you’ll admit that you didn’t agree with many positions he staked publicly, or many of the ways he campaigned. You said, “He just has to say that to get elected.” That mentality is dangerous for the future of American democracy.

If we get to the point where we don’t trust the American people to make the right decision based upon months of free and open debate and discussion of policy preferences and justifications, then we are admitting that democracy does not work. I refuse to ever give in to that notion, and believe that if you feel strongly about your convictions, whether on the right or the left, you should openly and honestly tell people why you believe in them and allow voters to decide.

We do this with each other in law school, and I’ve heard from many of you before, “Well, you’re ok, because you’re not one of THOSE Republicans.” When we talk to each other about the root of ideas, most Americans either can find common ground or understand why we differ. If we can understand why we differ and agree to disagree, we can continue to engage in fervent debate over what direction our country should take. The minute we resort to generalizations and fear-mongering, we hurt that which we fight to protect.

When John Kerry said, “I would prosecute the war on terror much differently than President Bush,” I just wanted him to tell me one thing he’d have done differently. I wasn’t locked into President Bush, but as the campaign continued, I detected one man who had a vision of America and was willing to articulate that vision openly and honestly to the people, and one man who would say whatever it took to get elected.

In his acceptance speech Wednesday, President Bush said, “Today I want to speak to every person who voted for my opponent....I need your support....I will do all that I can do to earn your trust. .... We have one country, one Constitution, and one future that binds us.”

It’s on both sides, and we need to eliminate the playing to the media and engage in some thoughtful and insightful debate over how best to lead our nation. Our generation faces many monumental challenges, and our ability to change this discourse will determine our success in meeting them.

Our nation and process are still young and rare in the history of the world—we must continually find new ways to sustain them both, because they won’t do so on their own. Thank goodness for Democracy, and thank goodness for the United States of America.

Matt Nolan is the Executive Editor of the RG, and recognizes many of you find some of his articles controversial and inflammatory. Good. He feels that means he’s saying something worth saying. Any and all thoughts on this can be sent to m Nolan@umich.edu.

B: Justice O’Connor would be proud.
B: Do you think Teresa’s going to have an abortion or will she keep the baby and just not tell Ryan?
E: She better get in that abortion before Rehnquist retires. After that, who knows. She may just have to keep the baby regardless.
B: Now that we’re discussing hot button issues, when are Seth and Ryan gonna make out? Even ESPN.com picked up on the homoeroticism.
E: You read ESPN.com?
B: No, of course not. Someone told me.
E: So after watching this first episode, what’s your prediction for the upcoming season?
B: Rumors of J T guest starring are a positive sign.
E: Can we discuss how I’m unable to separate Marissa from Mischa? I mean, as I was watching her scream, all I could think was, “How can she be so depressed when her boyfriend is a billionaire?” And is Ryan sad about John Kerry’s loss, since he stumped for Kerry all summer?
B: All good questions.
Bayrex Marti and Eunice Rho are 2Ls E-mail comments about this article to rg@umich.edu.
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Michigan Law School, is a great deal of passion and commitment to the ideas of a just world. That is beautiful, courageous, and ultimately, the dearest of all things.

Ali H. Shah is a 3L. E-mail comments about this article to rg@umich.edu.
The University of Michigan Women Law Students Association is proud to announce its annual

**Jenny Runkles Banquet and Fall Formal**

Friday, November 12th, 6:00 - 10:00pm at The Gandy Dancer

Keynote Speaker: Dianne Byrum, Minority Leader, Michigan House of Representatives

Tickets are on sale now

All are welcome!
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**HENRY HANSMANN**

*Legal Entities, Asset Partitioning and the Evolution of Organizations*

John M. Olin Lecture for 2004

Thursday, November 11

4:00 - 5:15 p.m. 116 HH
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**Which UM law school faculty member left the UM vs. MSU game with 8:58 left?**

Submit guesses/answers to jjwhite@umich.edu
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**Send Your Student Organization Announcements to rg@umich.edu**
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**Danny Heumann**

Philanthropist, athlete and lawyer, will present a talk entitled

*“Using Your Law Degree to be an Advocate for Change”*

Thursday, November 11,

12:15 - 1:15 pm, 150 HH

*Pizza will be served*