

Catholic University Law Review

Volume 46
Issue 4 *Summer 1997*

Article 11

1997

Index - Comments/Notes

Catholic University Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/lawreview>

Recommended Citation

Catholic University Law Review, *Index - Comments/Notes*, 46 Cath. U. L. Rev. 1389 (1997).
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/lawreview/vol46/iss4/11>

This Index is brought to you for free and open access by CUA Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Catholic University Law Review by an authorized editor of CUA Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact edinger@law.edu.

COMMENTS

BETWEEN THE DEVIL AND THE DEEP BLUE SEA: COURTS, LEGISLATURES, AND MAJORITY-MINORITY DISTRICTS	1299
CONFUSINGLY DISSIMILAR APPLICATIONS OF TRADEMARK LAW TO VANITY TELEPHONE NUMBERS	1199
A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE ADMISSIBILITY OF POLYGRAPH EVIDENCE IN THE WAKE OF <i>DAUBERT</i> : THE LIE DETECTOR FAILS THE TEST	1247
DUE PROCESS AND TRUE CONFLICTS: THE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ON EXTRATERRITORIAL FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND THE CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT OF 1996	907
“FACE”-ING THE CONSTITUTION: THE BATTLE OVER THE FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO CLINIC ENTRANCES SHIFTS FROM REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH FACILITIES TO THE FEDERAL COURTS	165
WHOSE STATUTE IS IT ANYWAY?: WHY AND HOW COURTS SHOULD USE PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING STATEMENTS WHEN INTERPRETING FEDERAL STATUTES	475
THE WORK FOR HIRE DOCTRINE UNDER <i>COMMUNITY FOR CREATIVE NON-VIOLENCE V. REID</i> : AN ARTIST’S FAIR WEATHER FRIEND	119

NOTES

BROADENING THE STATES’ POWER TO TAX FOREIGN MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS: <i>BARCLAYS BANK V. FRANCHISE TAX BOARD</i>	243
<i>CAPITOL SQUARE REVIEW AND ADVISORY BOARD V. PINETTE</i> : A SIGN FROM ABOVE IN ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE JURISPRUDENCE	285
CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSE TO <i>HUBBARD V. UNITED STATES</i> : RESTORING THE SCOPE OF 18 U.S.C. § 1001 AND CODIFYING THE “JUDICIAL FUNCTION” EXCEPTION	523
<i>LEWIS V. UNITED STATES</i> : A REQUIEM FOR AGGREGATION	1057
<i>MCINTYRE V. OHIO ELECTIONS COMMISSION</i> : PROTECTING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR DAMAGING THE ELECTORAL PROCESS?	565
<i>MONTANA V. EGELHOFF</i> : ABANDONING A DEFENDANT’S FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO PRESENT A DEFENSE	1349
PROTECTING CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN A PSYCHOTHERAPIST AND PATIENT: <i>JAFFEE V. REDMOND</i>	963
STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: MYTH OR REALITY AFTER <i>SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA V. FLORIDA</i>	1005

