



THE COMMENTATOR

Vol. XLII, No. 6

The Student Newspaper of the New York University School of Law

December 3, 2008

Moot Court Gets a Foot in the Door, Can't Close the Deal on National Finals

By MELISA GERECCI '09

High drama filled the second floor of the New York City Bar Association on November 19th, as NYU achieved victory over the law schools at both Cardozo and Cornell in the regional rounds of the 59th Annual National Moot Court Competition before losing to Brooklyn Law School in the semifinal round. Two members

and spanned two nights (and one afternoon tie-breaker round) of competitions. The remaining teams were then paired off on Thursday, November 20th, in a final four-match elimination round. The afternoon of the 20th marked the team's final victory before their ultimate loss that evening.

"Even though we didn't end up prevailing in the competition, one thing we will all leave with is

Your Love Children's Academy v. Town of San Teresa and *Cormac T. v. Town of San Teresa*, a complex fact pattern involved both issues. Cormac T. sought to enroll his son with a learning disability in Your Love Children's Academy (YLCA) without having him first attend a San Teresa public school. Simultaneously, YLCA was facing local criticism for its affiliation with the controversial Your Love Church and charges of sexual misconduct brought against the school's principal. The San Teresa Zoning Board had just denied the school permission to construct a new annex as part of an expansion project, and the San Teresa Board of Education had meanwhile refused to modify its standard Individualized Education Program to accommodate requests made by Cormac T. The posture of the case as presented to competitors was an appeal from a district court decision upholding the RLUIPA and declaring the Zoning Board's denial of YLCA's application unlawful, and holding that the IDEA did not require a student to use the public school system to trigger the state's reimbursement remedy.

Two students argued each round: one covered the RLUIPA issue while the other one handled IDEA. The team switched between petitioner and respondent each round, so team members had to know both sets of arguments—even though they wrote their appellate brief for only one of the parties.

A large part of preparing to compete occurs in the months leading up to the oral advocacy. NYU's Nationals team submitted their appellate brief—worth 40% of their final score—for the Petitioners YLCA and Cormac T. in mid-October before oral arguments began in November. Researching and writing are as important to excelling at a

new friends," said Renk. "Cheesy, I know, but it's true! Sydney and Lisa are awesome and I'm so glad I got to know them."

This year's competition centered on two timely issues: whether section 2 of the RLUIPA exceeds Congress's enforcement power under the 14th Amendment or violates the 1st Amendment's Establishment Clause, and whether IDEA limits tuition reimbursement to children who first receive special education services by attending public school.

In the consolidated cases developed for the competition,

of NYU's three-person Nationals team, Lisa Debin '09 and Kim Renk '09, gave oral arguments defending the constitutionality of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) against 14th Amendment and 1st Amendment challenges; Sydney Nash '09, the third member, argued that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) did not restrict tuition reimbursement when a child had not previously received special education services in the public school system.

The regional rounds started on Wednesday, November 19th



From left, Lisa Debin '09, Sydney Nash '09, and Kim Renk '09 sit at their counsel table in a "courtroom" in the New York City Bar Association building. The three students represented NYU Law at the regional round of the Annual National Moot Court Competition.

Unstoppable Unstopped, Suck My Dicta Crushed by No Man in SLAP Finals



The Student Lawyer Athletic Program (SLAP) ended its flag-football season the weekend before Thanksgiving. The light contact finals saw Unstoppable triumph over Ben Schaefer's Team, 13-7. Suck My Dicta eked out a victory over Man Crush in double overtime, 6-0, to claim the full contact title.

competition as top-notch oral advocacy skills.

"To really be a good advocate, you need to know your stuff," Renk advised. "The best advocates are not just good speakers; they know the law inside and out." NYU's Nationals team demonstrated these qualities throughout the competition, including during their unfortunate loss to Brooklyn Law School. "The judges couldn't get over a member of their team with a British-Indian accent named 'Sparkle,'" Nash explained. "What could we do? They said she simply... sparkled."

From being defeated by a Brooklynite with an unusual moniker to deciding how to pronounce the acronym "RLUIPA" (the team chose "ar-loop-a," casting aside both the "ra-loop-a" and the "ar-loop-ip-ah" pronunciations), several aspects of this year's competition posed problems for NYU's team. The problem to be argued was not released until several weeks after the planned release date, and the rules advanced teams by point differential and not raw score, impeding the NYU team's progress despite their garnering one of the highest brief scores.

NYU's Moot Court Board internally selects three third-year students for the Nationals team and also chooses a 3L team for the annual Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition. Students join Moot Court through the brief-writing competition held after finals,

alongside the regular journal write-on. The Board also invites the student who scores the highest in NYU's intra-school fall Marden Competition to join either the Nationals or the Jessup Team. As 2Ls, Debin and Renk had served in NYU's Moot Court Competitions Division; Renk was a semi-finalist at the Vanderbilt First Amendment Competition. Nash accepted an invitation to join the Nationals team after winning Best Oralist in the 2007 fall Marden Competition, which she competed in while serving as a Problem Author on the Moot Court Casebook Staff.

The American College of Trial Lawyers and the NYC Bar Association's Committee on Young Lawyers sponsor the National Moot Court Competition. Fourteen regional tournaments take place across the country, and the NYC Bar Association invites both the first- and second-place teams from each region to the final rounds in New York.

Participating in Nationals gives students excellent practice in appellant writing and public speaking, but they're also supposed to have fun—clerks yell out "oyez, oyez, oyez" before the final rounds, and judging lawyers often get feisty as they get into character. "If you can't think on your feet, well, you oughta do wills and estates or something," one judge advised. "I tried to be hostile and cold," another judge added. "Could you tell?"

Legal Briefs

Professor Richard Epstein will be joining the Law School's faculty full-time in the fall of 2010. Technically, Epstein will be retiring from his current position at the University of Chicago Law School, though he will continue teaching there during semesters that he is not teaching at NYU.

Lori Drew, the MySpace "cyber-bully," was convicted of three misdemeanor counts of accessing a computer without authorization—but acquitted of the felony charge that adds "to inflict emotional distress" to the minor offenses—for her role in the 2006 suicide of 13-year-old Megan Meier. Drew, 49, had pretended to be a 16-year-old boy and formed a relationship with Meier via MySpace; their breakup led to Meier's suicide.



Infra

Wunderkind Barak Obama can't always please everyone—especially as he sets dangerous precedents.

page 2

Misery loves company, which is why we have two whole columns dissecting the law school finals process.

page 3

Need to verify your completed Schudoku (from page 3) before it goes on your fridge?

page 4

Too Soon to Lift Coke Ban: Truly Independent Investigation Needed First

By Law Students for Economic Justice

The NYU Senate banned the sale of Coca-Cola products on campus in 2005 after Coke prevented an independent investigation into its role in the assassinations of union leaders in its plants in Colombia. Last semester, Coca-Cola asked NYU to lift the ban, claiming that it had agreed to an investigation. Now Coke’s investigation has been conducted, but it does not even purport to investigate the assassinations.

In the final presidential debate, President-Elect Barack Obama noted that Colombian “labor leaders have been targeted for assassination on a fairly consistent basis... [for] just trying to organize for their rights.” Eight leaders of the union SINALTRAINAL who worked at Coke’s bottling plants have been assassinated by paramilitaries, and many other workers have been tortured, kidnapped, threatened, and/or illegally detained. This year, more union leaders at Coke’s bottling plants have received death threats.

A New York City fact-finding mission, which included City Council Member Hiram Monserrate, concluded, “The physical access that paramilitaries have

had to Coca-Cola bottling plants is impossible without knowledge and/or tacit approval.... The conclusion that Coca-Cola bears responsibility for the campaign of terror leveled at its workers is unavoidable.” Yet Coke refuses to admit wrongdoing or change its policies.

Coke’s abuses are not limited to Colombia, and its environmental practices are also under scrutiny. In India, for example, one community shut down a Coke plant that had polluted neighborhoods and removed water, rendering farmers’ fields uncultivable.

The NYU Senate resolution adopted in December 2005 demanded an “independent investigation into allegations of the Coca-Cola Company’s complicity in human rights violations” in Colombia. A letter that NYU sent to Coke specifically demanded that the company submit to an investigation by the Workers Rights Consortium, a global non-profit organization created by labor rights experts, workers, and students, of which NYU is a member. Coke refused, citing a prior investigation that it claimed was independent, but which the Senate did not find credible.

Coca-Cola is again requesting that NYU lift its ban, claim-

ing that a report released by the International Labor Organization (ILO) meets the requirements of NYU’s resolution. However, Coke’s reliance on ILO’s report is faulty in three important ways.

First and foremost, the ILO only assessed certain specific current working conditions. ILO never intended to investigate past human rights abuses. Until an investigation examines Coke’s complicity in the assassinations and torture of bottling plant workers, NYU should uphold its commitment to the ban.

Second, the ILO’s methodology does not reflect an independent investigation. The ILO team pre-announced its visits to factories, lacked the power to demand evidence, and interviewed workers inside the plants and in the presence of “interested parties.” This may be because Ed Potter, Coke’s Director of Global Labor Relations, has held the powerful post of U.S. business representative to the ILO for over 15 years and was instrumental in Coke’s selection of the ILO as its monitor of choice.

Third, the ILO reports allegations of ongoing abuses. These problems include threats, assaults, harassment at work and at home, directions not to join unions, termination, withholding of pay, and outsourcing of jobs to subcontractors that do not permit unionization.

None of this is to impugn the ILO. It simply did not set out to conduct the type of investigation necessary to answer the primary question asked by NYU and the more than 50 other universities that have banned the sale of Coca-Cola products: Was Coke complicit in the assassinations, torture, and threats affecting workers in its Colombian bottling plants? That these human rights abuses occurred is not disputed; at issue is Coke’s level of responsibility. The ILO did not try to answer this question and never stated that it would. Coke is merely arguing *post facto* that an “independent investigation into allegations of... complicity in human rights violations” does not require that this question be addressed.

Coke’s requests to lift the ban show that the company feels its impact. As the largest private university in the U.S., NYU has valuable purchasing power and serves as an example for others. NYU students have a unique opportunity to continue to make a difference on this issue, and they should not stop now.

If Coke wants NYU’s business, the company should agree to a truly independent investigation and respect the rights of its workers.

Documents referenced in this article can be found in the documents section of the Law Students for Economic Justice website: <http://www.law.nyu.edu/student-organizations/lawsej>.

Too Much Change for Change?

By Joseph Jerome ’11

My team won! Hope and change is on the way! I should be happy, ready to head to Washington with Barry, Nancy, and Harry to change the world and bring about world peace, but in the weeks since the election, I continue to have grave concerns about the state of our politics. Surveying the post-election landscape, covered with discarded “Country First” placards and an abundance of Obama ’08 t-shirts, I am mortified by the amount of resources wasted in this election and scared of the precedent the Obama campaign has set for political campaigns.

Despite a looming recession, our national politicians managed to amass over \$2 billion in campaign contributions this past cycle. And that number doesn’t include the resources spent by local politicians, outside organizations, or Mormons. Even accounting for inflation, we’re spending more on elections than ever before. President-elect Obama and Senator McCain raised roughly twice as much money as Messrs. Bush and Kerry did in 2004, and what did all their extra money get them?

Aside from allowing the Obama campaign to put on a half-hour primetime infomercial, the two candidates managed to increase voter turnout by a whole 7 percent. Some might argue that getting over 60 percent of eligible voters to the polls suggests a triumph of popular democracy, but what happens when the next go-around costs even more and not even that many people show up? What will that say about the state of our democracy?

History suggests that our current electoral system, skewed as it is against the lower classes, pretty much peaks at a 60 percent turnout. It’s highly unlikely that doubling down will get voter turnout up over 70 percent, so our money isn’t subsidizing participation in our democracy. That said, I’d put good money on the total price tag of our next electoral cycle costing even more than this one.

There’s no question that Obama successfully leveraged the power of the internet to fuel his presidential run, but I wonder if he hasn’t ripped open a proverbial Pandora’s box? Future campaigns will emulate his approach—Rudy Giuliani is already accepting donations for 2012—but the internet strikes me less as a tool to organize the grassroots and more of a mechanism to keep the money flowing in. BarackObama.com opens with a splash page requesting yet more money, and that’s after his campaign sent out emails asking for contributions to help the DNC “recover.” Where does this stop? If I shell out a couple hundred, I think I might demand a vote on the Obama puppy.

Money always has been the political lifeblood, so maybe I should bury my anxiety and be content with my \$100 claim to Obama’s soul. I don’t feel that way though, and I don’t think any of my fellow rookie political donors should either. Part of my rationale for contributing to the \$2 billion money pile was the hope of overthrowing the current system and getting somebody new in.

Both political parties have become beholden to the same small economic elite, and those elite have reciprocated by feeding our politicians more and more money. The result: substantive policies that could help real Americans have been swept under the rug for the past quarter century. However truthful Number 44 has been about his rejection of lobbyists, he owes his political ascendancy to no one in the Beltway establishment.

If Obama can’t bring about world peace, maybe he can bring a modicum of transparency and accountability to our politics. He received his campaign money from newbies like me, and I hope he remembers that. We gave what small sums we could in the hope that this man could bring about some real change, but I know I did it on the condition I wouldn’t have to plunk down even more money next time.

THE COMMENTATOR

*The Student Newspaper of
New York University School of Law*

Editor-in-Chief
Andrew Gehring

Senior Managing Editor
Robert Gerrity

Managing Editors
Joseph Jerome
Michael Mix

Senior Staff Editors
Roberto Reyes-Gaskin
Andrew Simon

Staff Editors
Ashok Ayyar
Melisa Gerecci
Stephanie Herbert
Gavin Kovite
Mitali Mody
Ben Peacock
Jennifer Rodriguez
Molly Wallace

Web Editor
Jason Law

The Commentator serves as a forum for news, opinions and ideas of members of the Law School community. The Editorial Board consists of the Editor-in-Chief and the Managing Editor. Only editorials and policies developed by the Editorial Board reflect the opinion of the Editorial Board. All other opinions expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of *The Commentator*. *The Commentator* is issued on alternate Thursdays during the academic year except during vacations and examination periods. Advertising rates are available on request. Subscriptions are also available at a rate of \$15 per year. Letters to the Editor should be sent to the following address, either on paper or via e-mail.

240 Mercer Street
New York, NY 10012
212.998.6080 (phone)
law.commentator@nyu.edu

All submissions become property of *The Commentator*.

Copyright 2008 New York University

Need a New Year’s
resolution? Here’s one:

Write a Letter to the Editor.

Contact law.commentator@nyu.edu.
Make your voice heard, through print media.

Quantum of Solace: A Very Humanizing Look at the Quintessential Super-Human Spy



By Jennifer Rodriguez '11

Jet-setting and womanizing amount to pyrotechnics in *Quantum of Solace*, a sequel that illuminates the darkest elements of the human condition: vengeance, betrayal, and lost love. The film finds James Bond (Daniel Craig) traversing the world in pursuit of the villains who blackmailed and killed Vesper Lynd, the woman he loved, in *Casino Royale*. His search leads him to Haiti and to the group Quantum, which secretly controls the country's natural resources, headed up by slimy Dominic Greene (Mathieu Amalric). Greene dupes the American government into colluding in a profitable coup, with the plan of installing a dictator. Bond ends up on America's hit list for trying to stop him. In cooperation with the States, the British intelligence organization turns against him. Only his current Bond Girl, Camille (Olga Kurylenko) stands by him.

Quantum of Solace is filled with panoramic shots of landscapes across Europe and the Americas. Glittering coastlines, romantic castles, and limitless deserts provide a sense of place that is aesthetically intoxicating. More than that, the landscapes communicate something essential about the life of this international spy. As I watched Bond's private plane fly back and forth across continents, I felt that he engaged in mysterious and fantastical affairs that were literally over my head, and over the head

of the average citizen. The movie makes us feel that there is a secret world, both glamorous and powerful, above the prosaic one most of us inhabit. Involvement in this world has its privileges. But Bond's separation from the real world also contains a sinister element.

Although Bond navigates this other-world with daring competence, I couldn't help but notice how small his plane was in the open sky, closer in scope to a winged insect than a hawk. I wonder, if Bond is removed from the real-world already, who would miss him if the powers that be in the other-world swiped him away? And more: where in this world of illusion does Bond's sincere yearning for moral restitution fit? Suddenly, our secret agent's life seems precarious to the extent that it was grand. And his mission seems all but impossible. In this installment of the series, it is Bond's humanity that makes him remarkable.

This observation cuts to the center of what is unique about Daniel Craig's James Bond. There is something of fierce vulnerability to him; he is not Pierce Brosnan's carefree playboy. This effect is heightened as one by one his allies lose faith in him. It becomes pointed when there is a "capture or kill" order put out on him. Eventually even M (Judi Dench), Bond's quasi-parental boss at MI6, begins to doubt her agent's professional competence. "When you can't tell your friends from your enemies, it's time to go," she scolds him. By

the middle of the film Bond is more vigilante than international servant. Craig's character turns the paradigm of the secret agent story on its head. Everything that was great about previous Bond incarnations—the intrigue, the fantasy, the freedom—has the opposite value in this incarnation; everything that is human attains the value of rubies, by virtue of its scarcity. This inversion comes to light as Bond finds an unlikely ally in Camille, Greene's exotic lover. At first, she seems a creature of the other-world. But things are not as they appear. She, too, has a personal vendetta to go with a political cause against Greene and his ilk. Her entire family was killed by the very man her former lover seeks to install as dictator. She is driven by a motive as forbidden as Bond's: the hunger to avenge her loved ones. Rogues in an ethereal world, Bond and Camille develop an intimate friendship throughout the film. Their relationship is both subtle and intense, as they rely on each other for the fulfillment of a mortal desire they can admit to no one else.

The tenderness between them becomes a distinctive feature of the film and contrasts with the frivolous conquests that have marked Bond's previous encounters with the fairer sex. Despite the seductiveness of the landscape, the most sexually charged moment of the film consists only of a kiss. Before they part for the final time, a disheveled Bond pulls Camille toward him. It is a moment driven by conflicting feelings of gratitude and passion, want and need. There is a hint of loneliness in his eyes as he lets go of his confidant, and she leaves him for the last time.

In other words, go see this movie. The cinematography is beautiful, the luxury is palpable, and the characters are as intense as the chase scenes. This is an excellent follow-up to *Casino Royale* and solidifies Craig's position as the new James Bond.

Finals: I'm So... Unprepared? Amazing? Adequate?

The conclusion to "Growing Up Law School," a Commentator series on the life of a 1L

By Michael Mix '11

It's most certainly not the most wonderful time of the year. For law students everywhere, the next two weeks comprise the hellacious period known as "finals." And 1Ls have the worst of it. Until finals are over, 1L lives basically revolve around outlining and studying. But while most of us have been taking some variation of finals since middle school, law school exams are just a different experience.

In college, with a couple of exceptions, I could get away with putting off studying for finals until a few days before the exam. Finals were important, but they were usually only about a quarter of the final grade in the class, so every student had a pretty good idea of where they stood going into the test. And many finals weren't cumulative, so they only encompassed maybe about a month and a half of material. Therefore, a few days of studying—at most—would certainly suffice.

Law school is clearly different. It doesn't matter how much you paid attention in class, how much supplemental reading you did, or how many times you raised your hand to ask the professor about a random hypothetical situation. Every student is starting from scratch with no previous grades under his or her belt. And on the final, we must know an entire semester's worth of material.

The exams are daunting, but they have a useful characteristic that makes them a little easier to swallow: they're open-note! I'm not used to this feature; college was about rote memorization and then dumping your knowledge on the test. The pros of that system are that I still remember random facts to this day. (Did you know, for instance, that the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed in 1948, ending the Mexican War?) However, those random facts are the exception, not the rule. Usually, I forgot everything the minute I walked out of the exam room.

With most law school exams open-book (including two of my three tests), students turn to a time-honored jurisprudential tradition:

outlining. I've never been big on outlines. When I was younger, I didn't like it when teachers forced me to write outlines for my essays. I usually just wrote the essay, and then—after the fact—took five minutes to write an outline right before class.

Now things are significantly different, however. Law school outlines are like traditional outlines on steroids. Condensing almost 1000 pages of reading per class into one Word document is a herculean task that takes weeks to accomplish. It's gotten to the point where all I want to do is outline, and actual reading for class has become an annoyance.

Outlining has also sparked competition among students to see who gets their outlines done the quickest. In class, I frequently hear conversations about where everyone is on their outlines: "I have two classes outlined, how about you?" "I've only done an outline for half a class, but I'm going to lock myself in a dungeon like Clubber Lang and bang out the other two." "I haven't done anything, I'm so screwed!"

Studying for finals and making outlines are easier when you have people to lean on, and these people come in the form of study groups. Apparently, years ago, study groups would meet very often and go over the material in depth. The study group format seems to have changed in recent years, however. Many people have just formed study groups over the last few weeks, and those who had ones all semester met fairly infrequently. Most of us would rather watch *The Office* than meet to discuss how awesome that lecture on the *Erie* doctrine was.

In order to allay our fears and prevent undue stress, NYU does a pretty good job of telling us about the relative unimportance of grades. However, in a class of competitive people who all did well in college, it's against everyone's nature to not care about finals. Furthermore, the amount of advice we're receiving from the university about what to expect probably hurts as much as it helps. I feel like everyone just needs to experience finals for themselves and see what works and what doesn't. Until then, if you have all of your outlines done, have taken three practice exams, and know more about product liability than Ralph Nader, please don't tell the rest of us.

SCHUDOKU!

To the right you'll find a variation on a standard sudoku grid. Fill in the missing boxes such that each row, column, and three-by-three box contains one of each of the following letters:

NYU LAW SCH

One of the rows or columns will contain the preceding letters in the proper order, spelling "NYU LAW SCH."

Solution on page 4.

W							A	
	C			N				
			C		L	N		
		W	A		C	L	U	
C	U						Y	A
	N	L	H					
		U			W			
				Y			L	
	W							Y

Not spending enough time staring blankly at your computer screen? Read The Commentator online.

<http://www.law.nyu.edu/studentorganizations/thecommentator>

Thunder Jackson’s: Decent Burgers Spoiled by Popped Collars and B&T Folk



By BEN PEACOCK '09

Thunder Jackson’s Urban Roadhouse (on Bleeker at Sullivan) just opened in the neighborhood last spring. Now that it’s had time to get the kinks worked out of its system, is it worth your while?

No. Skip it. There are simply too many other—more authentic—burger and beer joints in the Village to justify spending time or money at TJ’s. TJ’s burger, admittedly, is not half bad. The beef is mixed with honey and a few other things before grilling, which gives the burger a fairly interesting sweet flavor, and that sweetness is counterbalanced by TJ’s slightly spicy “special sauce.” While fairly tasty, the burger is definitely on the small side, despite checking in at twice the price of the larger, juicier, tastier Crow Burger at The Stoned Crow (on Washington Place, east of Sixth Avenue).

Sadly, the not-bad burger marks the high point of the Roadhouse experience, and it must be consumed in a setting that’s conducive to neither digestion nor self-respect. A quick survey of the surroundings confirms that TJ’s is unlike any other roadhouse, urban or otherwise, currently in operation. Whereas a real roadhouse would be loathe even to have windows, for fear that chairs might be thrown out or police might look in, TJ’s is comfortable featuring six high-definition televisions (two of which play slideshows of people eating and drinking at Thunder Jackson’s!). Whereas a real roadhouse would be afraid to play anything other than blues early in the evening, for fear that up-tempo music might incite the surly clientele into brawling before the liquor had gripped them tightly enough for the bouncers to break it up, TJ’s plays Britney Spears. And they aren’t doing it ironically. But at least TJ’s remains true to

roadhouse form in serving its french fries with truffled mayonnaise. And the french fries come wrapped in newspaper! Well, fake newspaper, since the ink might rub off of real newspaper and that would be, you know, unhealthy. I’m pretty sure even bouncer/“cooler” James Dalton, Patrick Swayze’s character in the movie *Roadhouse*, would concede that one...

To make matters worse, TJ’s has so much goofy crap on their walls that it would turn the stomachs of even such restaurateurs as Col. Theodore Gandolfo Ignatius Friday and Viscount Theophilus Justinian Applebee. Say what you want about the “flair” that’s sprinkled liberally throughout their franchises, but at least acknowledge that those men understand how to straddle the line between camp and kitsch. The same cannot be said of Thunder Jackson, who has tacked so many incongruous elements to every flat surface that we must question his sanity and quietly hope that he isn’t let anywhere near the food.

So what kind of folks would go to a so-called “roadhouse” that plays Britney Spears, puts honey in their meat, and has a french fry condiment that features both truffle oil and mayonnaise? If the night that I went is representative, the answer is people from New Jersey, and the drink menu quietly tips its hat to this demographic. Heineken is served in everything from a normal sized green bottle to a gigantic green bottle. You could order a round of Jägerbombs for you and your boys in TJ’s and no one would say anything; they wouldn’t even *think* anything! If you’re looking to pop your collar and show off your new haircut, give TJ’s UR a try this Friday before heading over to The Fat Black Pussycat (on West Third, east of Sixth Avenue). Otherwise, you’re better off at Stoned Crow.

Bar Review: Happy Hour Round-Up

Part of The Commentator’s New Student Guide to the Village

By ROBERT GERRITY '09

Fat Black Pussycat:
Third St. between Macdougall and Sixth Ave.

Happy Hour:
Monday–Thursday
4:00 PM–8:00 PM
Entire bar half-price
Friday 4:00 PM–8:00 PM
\$4 beers
\$4 well drinks

Kenny’s Castaways
Bleeker St. between Thompson and Sullivan

Happy Hour:
Everyday until 7:00 PM
\$1 off everything

Nightly Specials vary.

Shade
Corner of Third St. and Sullivan

Happy Hour:
Monday–Friday
12:00 PM–7:00 PM
\$4 Drafts
\$4 Well Drinks

Lunch Special:
12:00 PM–3:00 PM
\$10 crepe or sandwich with salad

The Pinch
Sullivan St. between Bleecker St. and Third St.

Happy Hour:
Monday–Friday until 7:00 PM
\$3 Well drinks
\$4 Bottled beer
\$5 Drafts

Thunder Jackson’s Urban Roadhouse
Corner of Bleecker St. and Sullivan

Happy Hour:
Everyday 12:00 PM–7:00 PM
\$3 Domestic drafts and bottles
\$3 Sangria
\$3 Well drinks

Macdougall Street Ale House
Macdougall between Third St. and Bleecker St.

Happy Hour:
Everyday 12:00 PM–7:00 PM
\$3 Well drinks
\$3 Pints

Nightly Specials:
7:00 PM– 4:00 AM
Sunday: \$3 Sierra Nevada; \$3 Soco-lime
Monday: \$3 Sam Adams & Sam Seasonal; \$3 Kamikazi shots
Tuesday: \$3 Killigans Red & Yuengling
Wednesday: \$3 Magic Hat #9; \$4 shots of Jaeger
Thursday: \$3 Bud & Bud Light



Town Tavern
Third St. between Macdougall and Sixth Ave.

Happy Hour:
Friday–Sunday 3:00 PM–6:00 PM
\$2 Miller Light, Coors Light, and Bud Light; \$3 Well drinks;
Half-priced burgers and fries

Nightly Specials:
Thursday 6:00 PM–10:00 PM: \$20 cover for unlimited Coors Light, Sam Adams, and well drinks.
Friday 5:00 PM–8:00 PM: Half-priced drinks for NYU Law and Graduate Students.
Saturday 5:00 PM–9:00 PM: \$5 pitchers of Coors Light

SCHUDOKU!

Solution

See puzzle page 3.

Λ	N	∩	H	∪	S	∇	M	∟
M	∟	∇	∩	Λ	N	∪	S	H
H	∪	S	M	∇	∟	∩	Λ	N
S	M	∪	Λ	∩	H	∟	N	∇
∇	Λ	H	N	∟	M	S	∩	∪
N	∩	∟	∪	S	∇	M	H	Λ
∩	H	N	∟	M	∪	Λ	∇	S
∟	S	M	∇	N	Λ	H	∪	∩
∪	∇	Λ	S	H	∩	N	∟	M