

7-1-2003

Foreword

Douglas Redden

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.uchastings.edu/hwlj>

Recommended Citation

Douglas Redden, *Foreword*, 14 *Hastings Women's L. R.* i (2003).
Available at: <http://repository.uchastings.edu/hwlj/vol14/iss2/1>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Hastings Women's Law Journal* by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

Foreword

I am happy to present the final issue of Volume 14 of the *Hastings Women's Law Journal*. The summer issue traditionally encompasses pieces of progressive and critical legal discourse.

This issue begins with a piece by Blythe Leszkay, *Feminism on the Front Lines*. Leszkay weighs in on the combat exclusion debate with this provocative piece. *Feminism on the Front Lines* is particularly notable given that Leszkay, with significant military training, speaks from a perspective that few participants in the debate regarding women in the military share. Additionally, Leszkay's discussion of the link between the combat exclusion and women's second class citizenship is thought provoking. This piece is particularly relevant given the recent conflict in Iraq and the capture and death of several United States women soldiers

Professor David Vikram Amar has written a thoughtful review of Professor Ian Ayres' new book, *Pervasive Prejudice?* Professor Amar notes that Professor Ayres' work is compelling, both in the forms of discrimination recognized and in its methodology in highlighting discriminatory practices and outcomes. In his review, Professor Amar includes a discussion of the effects of affirmative action, and considers the University of Michigan cases pending before the Supreme Court.¹

Justyn Lezin's Note addresses the discrimination that legally unmarried women face when they attempt to use assisted reproductive technology. The challenges these women confront are particularly significant when the women have chosen to use known sperm donors.² Lezin concludes that state legislatures should adopt statutes similar to California's regarding donor parentage,³ and should create and enforce public accommodations laws to keep narrow-minded physicians from dictating the reproductive rights of legally unmarried women.

Finally, Susan Isard's Note, *Stock Options and Child Support: The Price of Accuracy*, considers the difficult questions regarding valuing stock options for the purposes of child support. Isard surveys the various means

1. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 288 F.3d 732 (6th Cir.), cert. granted 123 S. Ct. 617 (2002); *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 122 F. Supp. 2d 811 (E.D. Mich. 2000), cert. granted 123 S. Ct. 602 (2002).

2. Justyn Lezin, *(Mis)Conceptions: Unjust Limitations on Legally Unmarried Women's Access to Reproductive Technology and Their Use of Known Donors*, 14 HASTINGS WOMEN'S L.J. 185, 195-97 (2003).

3. CAL. FAM. CODE § 7613 (West 2001).

courts across the country have used in valuing stock options. The Note raises an important question – Is it really in the child's best interests for parents to return to court when stock values fluctuate?

As always, the opinions expressed by the authors published in the *Hastings Women's Law Journal* do not reflect those of the *Journal*, its members, or the University of California.

I would like to conclude by extending my thanks to Justyn Lezin, Dena Roche, Shannon Renton Wolf, and Tom McCarthy, each of whom were instrumental in the production of Volume 14.

Douglas Redden
Editor-in-Chief, 2002-2003