



UNC  
SCHOOL OF LAW

## NORTH CAROLINA LAW REVIEW

---

Volume 71 | Number 1

Article 3

---

11-1-1992

### Errata

North Carolina Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

North Carolina Law Review, *Errata*, 71 N.C. L. REV. (1992).

Available at: <http://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol71/iss1/3>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by Carolina Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Carolina Law Review by an authorized editor of Carolina Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [law\\_repository@unc.edu](mailto:law_repository@unc.edu).

## VOLUME 71 ERRATA

### ARTICLE

Kevin R. Johnson, *Responding to the "Litigation Explosion": The Plain Meaning of Executive Branch Primacy Over Immigration*, 71 N.C. L. REV. 413 (1993).

1. p. 415, third sentence in first full paragraph: "because the Supreme Court decisions" should read "because Supreme Court decisions".
2. p. 416, last sentence of second paragraph in footnote 7: "in immigration matters, see Kevin P. Johnson" should read "in immigration matters, contributing to the Bush Administration's treatment of Haitians, see Kevin R. Johnson".
3. p. 417, second to last sentence of the first paragraph: "in violations of" should read "in violation of".
4. p. 441, first sentence in first full paragraph: "ideological tenants" should read "ideological tenets".
5. p. 453, footnote 189: "deference by the courts," should read "deference by the courts to executive branch asylum decisions,".
6. p. 466, second sentence in first full paragraph: "disputed" should read "dispositive".
7. p. 468, third sentence in third paragraph: "extrajudicial" should read "extratextual".
8. p. 474, footnote 294: "discussed the precedents set by INS" should read "discussed INS".
9. p. 475, footnote 297: "intended the Refugee Act" should read "designed the Refugee Act".
10. p. 477, footnote 310: "Joseph Patrick Doherty," Brief" should read "Joseph Patrick Doherty"; Brief". In addition, "Support of Respondent, *Doherty*" should read "Support of Respondent, *INS v. Doherty*".
11. p. 478, first sentence in first full paragraph: "to return Doherty." should read "to return Doherty there."
12. p. 485, first sentence in first full paragraph: "not even remote hinting" should read "not even remotely hinting".

13. p. 490, first two sentences in first full paragraph: “serious constitutional questions. From” should read “serious constitutional questions, from”.

#### ESSAY

Douglas O. Linder, *Journeying Through the Valley of Evil*, 71 N.C. L. REV. 1111 (1993).

1. p. 1126, subheading *a*: “Manditory” should read “Mandatory”.

#### RESPONSE

Raoul Berger, *Original Intent: The Rage of Hans Baade*, 71 N.C. L. REV. 1151 (1993).

1. p. 1153 *et seq.*, running head: “Orignial” should read “Original”.

#### NOTE

Lisa L. Frye, *Suter v. Artist M. and Statutory Remedies Under Section 1983: Alteration Without Justification*, 71 N.C. L. REV. 1171 (1993).

1. p. 1205, first full sentence: “*Artist M.* remains to be seen.” should read “*Artist M.*”



