
LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Readers:

The *Richmond Journal of Law and the Public Interest* is proud to present the winter issue of Volume XVI. The issue examines two areas of the law: the impact of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act ("RLUIPA") and controversial issues on the outer edges of evidence law. Overall, the issue analyzes the difficulty that occurs when these laws meet practical realities.

In *The Right to Enforce: Why RLUIPA's Land Use Provision is a Constitutional Federal Enforcement Power*, author Qasim Rashid examines RLUIPA through the lens of the federal law's impact on Muslim Americans in post-9/11 America. Rashid argues that, despite arguments to the contrary, Congress may validly use RLUIPA to help protect religious equality in our country.

Authors Roman P. Storzer and Blair Lazarus Storzer provide an in-depth discussion of the often confused elements of RLUIPA Nondiscrimination claims in their piece, *Christian Parking, Hindu Parking: Applying Established Civil Rights Principles to RLUIPA's Nondiscrimination Provision*. Ultimately, the authors argue that a new burden-shifting scheme, similar to those used in civil rights litigation, should require the government entity to provide evidence of nondiscriminatory intent. The authors hope this requirement would encourage the courts to consider a wide variety of contexts in which discrimination can occur.

The third piece, *Quarreling Over Quarles: Limiting the Extension of the Public Safety Exception*, written by Andrew T. Winkler, analyzes the shadowy edges of the public safety exception to the Fifth Amendment right to counsel. Winkler highlights the questions left unanswered in *New York v. Quarles*, 467 U.S. 649 (1984), and *Edwards v. Arizona*, 451 U.S. 477 (1981). Ultimately, the rights of defendants rest in an uneasy balance with the safety of the general public.

Finally, in *The "Mosaic Theory" in Individual Rights Litigation: On the Genealogy and Expansion of a Concept*, author Robert M. Pallitto examines the "mosaic theory" of evidence, used most commonly by the gov-

ernment to protect state secrets and to defeat habeas petitions. The author warns that, because the government uses the theory both expansively and restrictively, the theory leads to cases being quashed prematurely, both with or without good cause.

Volume XVI's fall issue examines a variety of contexts in which laws are tested by the complications of the real world. The laws discussed in this issue are intended to protect, and this issue's authors argue that they still have the potential to do so, given the appropriate improvements or when viewed in the appropriate light. We hope you are enriched by these pieces, and we look forward to bringing you forthcoming publications.

Sincerely,

Rachel W. Logan

Editor-in-Chief