CONTENTS

SYMPOSIUM

INTRODUCTION ................................................................. 1519

TAKING CRITICAL TAX THEORY SERIOUSLY .... Lawrence Zelenak 1521

TAX THEORY AND "MERE CRITIQUE": A
REPLY TO PROFESSOR ZELENAK ....................... Nancy C. Staudt 1581

THE ILLOGICAL AND SEXIST QTIP
PROVISIONS: I JUST CAN'T SAY IT AIN'T
SO ................................................................. Wendy C. Gerzog 1597

THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS WITH ALICE
AND LARRY: THE NATURE OF
SCHOLARSHIP........................................ Marjorie E. Kornhauser 1609

EXPLORING THE MYSTERIES: CAN WE
EVER KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT RACE
AND TAX? ............................................. Beverly I. Moran 1629

REMARKABLE .................................................. William C. Whitford 1639

WHOSE PENSION IS IT ANYWAY?
PROTECTING SPOUSAL RIGHTS IN A
PRIVATIZED SOCIAL SECURITY
SYSTEM ....................................................... Jonathan Barry Forman 1653

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE TAX
CRITS .......................................................... James D. Bryce 1687

A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE ON THE QTIP
TRUST AND THE UNLIMITED MARITAL
DEDUCTION .................................................. Joseph M. Dodge 1729

TAKING CRITICAL TAX THEORY
SERIOUSLY—A COMMENT ......................... Charles O. Galvin 1749

CRITICAL THEORY AND THE LONELINESS OF
THE TAX PROF ........................................... Erik M. Jensen 1753
TARGETS MISSED AND TARGETS HIT:
CRITICAL TAX STUDIES AND EFFECTIVE
TAX REFORM ...........................................Steve R. Johnson  1771

RADICAL SCHOLARS, CONSERVATIVE
FIELD: PUTTING “CRITICAL TAX
SCHOLARSHIP” IN PERSPECTIVE ..........Michael A. Livingston  1791

RACE AND THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX:
HAS A DISPARATE IMPACT CASE BEEN
MADE? .....................................................Richard Schmalbeck  1817

CRITICAL TAX THEORY: STILL NOT TAKEN
SERIOUSLY ..............................................Nancy E. Shurtz  1837

NOTES

THE SUPREME COURT GIVES AN
ENDANGERED ACT NEW LIFE:
BENNETT V. SPEAR AND ITS EFFECT ON
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REFORM .......Deanne M. Barney  1889

CLOSE ONLY COUNTS IN HORSESHOES,
HAND GRENADES, AND . . . PATENTS?:
The SUPREME COURT Upholds the
EACH-ELEMENT TEST OF THE
DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS AND
“CLARIFIES” THE ROLE OF
PROSECUTION HISTORY ESTOPPEL IN
WARNER-JENKINSON Co. v. HILTON
DAVIS CHEMICAL Co. .......................... Charles Robert Lewis  1936

KANSAS V. HENDRICKS: THE SUPREME
COURT’S ENDORSEMENT OF SEXUALLY
VIOLENT PREDATOR STATUTES
UNNECESSARILY EXPANDS STATE CIVIL
COMMITMENT POWER ..............................Beverly Pearman  1973