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A recent Supreme Court decision, Suburban New Jersey v. Ten Sex-starved Matrons, illustrates the crying need today’s world has for a new perspective on Women’s Rights. Not too long ago the term “Women’s Rights” might have been used to distinguish “Women’s Lefts,” but an entirely new meaning has emerged from that term. What exactly that meaning might be is unclear. This landmark decision, while effectively setting new guidelines for Constitutionally-proper bedroom demeanor, leaves many questions unanswered.

The historic decision results from a joinder of ten apparently unrelated New Jersey cases, which were heard together because the underlying theme was not altogether clear, and because it was Monday. Among the specific issues to be litigated in the lower courts were: 1. an injunction to force firemen to use panty hose; 2. a suit to stop a husband’s daydreams of sodomy; 3. a class action on behalf of all uncastrated male dogs in Newark, to change the legislative terminology on a dog population-control statute from “fixed” to “broken;” 4. a suit to force male nurses to shave their legs; 5. an action for specific performance against an obscene phone caller; 6. a challenge to a state rape statute by a feminist group which wants the statute declared unconstitutional because under it no woman can become a rapist, even if she wants to; 7. a girl scout troop’s suit to have the age of puberty lowered; 8. a challenge to an injunction, the terms of which force black, female job applicants to interview with one arm tied behind their backs; 9. a suit to have the term “Peeping Tom” changed to “Peeping Tom or Alice;” and, finally, 10. a motion to quash legislation requiring all New Jersey penes to be tatooed with the following warning: “Caution: The Surgeon-General Has Determined That Penes May Be A Major Cause Of Many Pregnancies, According To Laboratory Tests On Rats.”

The legislation is attached as being vague, overbroad, and too damned long.

The Chief Justice, on behalf of the Minority (Puerto Ricans), treated the sex cases lightly, and said, tongue in cheek, “Myf Rqgtrqpr. Qaniktropp oorp fopfl!” The conservative element carried the majority, which ruled that sexual discrimination does not mean good taste in partners:

“Sex without love always alienates anyone who altruistically approaches another with anything other than anatomy in mind, any time the advance awkwardly, and inevitably, arrives at an altercation, Americans appreciate an antiseptic analysis of the atypical awareness which all anticipate this Court can provide. Of course, alphabetically, sex is low on our list, but, physically, it is close to our hearts. Personally, sex gets an ‘A’ in my book.”

After citing the famed case of The Cleveland Indians v. The Memory of Lewis and Clark, 43 Ind. R. 647 (1847), the Court goes on to establish guidelines upon which sexuality can be judged in the future, including a condemnation of citizens who are disloyal enough to sue the United States on a “Deep Throat — Deeper Pocket” theory. Recalling the essence of the Memory case, which held that since sex is often taxing, then sex can be taxed validly by Congress under the Intercourse section of the Commerce Clause, the Court establishes four important guidelines for sexual behavior:

1. **Equal Pay for Equal Work.** Prostitution is unconstitutional, because, historically, there has never been equal pay for equal work.
2. **Tadpoles Grow up to be Guppies.** This obviously allegorical pronouncement will have to stand the test of time, and the careful scrutiny of lower courts before ultimate affirmation.
3. **It Takes One to Know One.** By far the most liberal and advanced stand on homosexuality the Court has ever taken.
4. **You Never Miss the Water Till the Well Runs Dry.** The most important advance of the year, this principle applies the Parol Evidence Rule to bridge contracts, affirming the common law rule of “Finders Keepers, Losers Weepers.”

Interestingly enough, there is dicta which hints at the Majority’s unanimous lament of lost youth. “Being Old Stinks” say the Justices. Referring to days gone by, when men wore pants and women wore dresses, the opinion goes on, “Sexual practices of today leave a bad taste in my mouth.”

---

**Organized Murder in a Box: Wargaming**

by Edward Lulie III

At 4517 Harford Road, within sight of the University of Baltimore, is a grey building which houses the Avalon Hill Company. The building looks like an old factory but the name of the company inside is familiar to Pentagonal NATO planners as well as to tens of thousands of “wargamers.” Wargaming is the name of a form of gameplaying which is descended from Chess and while it is often a complex and difficult sport (if you can consider gameplaying a sport), it has a growing popularity. A wargaming fan-