


2013

Supra Synopses

Ryan W. Dumm

Laura Turczanski

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sulr_supra

 Part of the [Admiralty Commons](#), [Commercial Law Commons](#), [Construction Law Commons](#), [Immigration Law Commons](#), [Indian and Aboriginal Law Commons](#), [Land Use Law Commons](#), [National Security Law Commons](#), [Other Law Commons](#), [Privacy Law Commons](#), [Property Law and Real Estate Commons](#), [Public Law and Legal Theory Commons](#), and the [Supreme Court of the United States Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dumm, Ryan W. and Turczanski, Laura, "Supra Synopses" (2013). *Seattle University Law Review SUPra*. 6.
https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sulr_supra/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications and Programs at Seattle University School of Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Seattle University Law Review SUPra by an authorized administrator of Seattle University School of Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact coteconor@seattleu.edu.

SUpra Synopses

Ryan W. Dumm & Laura Turczanski*

Volume thirty-six begins with *Misappropriating Women's History in the Law and Politics of Abortion*.¹ In this article, Professor Tracy Thomas examines prolife organizations' use of feminist icons to promote an antiabortion agenda.² She focuses on Feminists for Life, a group that touted Elizabeth Cady Stanton as a feminist against abortion.³ Professor Thomas's research into historical archives containing Stanton's original writing and speeches shows there is little evidence Stanton opposed abortion.⁴ Thus, the article concludes that groups like Feminists for Life not only distorted Stanton's work to support a partisan message, but also misattributed other authors' writing to Stanton.⁵

In *Maritime Piracy: Changes in U.S. Law Needed to Combat This Critical National Security Concern*, Daniel Pines explores the threat that maritime piracy poses to U.S. national security and commerce.⁶ Though Americans may be familiar with incidents that have captivated the national media, such as the hostile takeover and subsequent Navy SEAL rescue of the MV *Maersk Alabama*, Pines emphasizes the disconcerting regularity of piracy in the Gulf of Aden.⁷ He then examines both international⁸ and U.S. law⁹ to determine whether the United States has ade-

* Ryan W. Dumm is the Executive Editor for Lead Articles at the *Seattle University Law Review*; Laura Turczanski is the Executive Editor for Notes and Comments at the *Seattle University Law Review*.

1. Tracy A. Thomas, *Misappropriating Women's History in the Law and Politics of Abortion*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 1 (2012). This article augments Professor Thomas's forthcoming scholarship on Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a heroine of the American feminist movement. *See, e.g.*, TRACY A. THOMAS, *ELIZABETH CADY STANTON AND THE FEMINIST FOUNDATIONS OF FAMILY LAW* (forthcoming NYU Press).

2. Thomas, *supra* note 1, at 7–16.

3. *See id.* at 2.

4. *See id.* at 30–53.

5. *Id.* at 54–63.

6. Daniel Pines, *Maritime Piracy: Changes in U.S. Law Needed to Combat This Critical National Security Concern*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 69 (2012).

7. *Id.* at 1–2, 80–83.

8. *Id.* at 88–99.

9. *Id.* at 99–106.

quate legal mechanisms to combat piracy. Although he finds that avenues for prosecuting maritime pirates exist, changes in U.S. law are needed to better combat this threat.¹⁰ In addition to advocating for increased prosecutions of pirates, Pines argues for reduced legal impediments on U.S.-flagged vessels' ability to defend themselves, and an expansion of the military's authority to pursue and interdict pirates on the open seas.¹¹

Professor Ann Tweedy's article, *Unjustifiable Expectations: Laying to Rest the Ghosts of Allotment-Era Settlers*, challenges courts' rationales for permitting encroachment on tribal lands.¹² Specifically, she argues that supposed "justifiable expectations" of settlers fail to substantiate present-day claims of the settlers' successors to Indian lands.¹³ She examines newspaper articles from the allotment era and concludes that many settlers were on notice that the tribes rightfully objected to the opening of reservation lands.¹⁴ Further, the articles show that settlers were often complicit in seizing these lands, even urging the government to abrogate the tribes' treaty rights.¹⁵ Accordingly, Tweedy argues that courts must abandon the theory of "justifiable expectations" when adjudicating modern tribal property claims.¹⁶

Professor Nancy Zisk writes on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and its ability to protect patients from physicians with a direct financial interest in medical procedures and services.¹⁷ Her article, *Investing in Healthcare: What Happens When Physicians Invest and Why the Recent Changes in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Fail to Protect Patients from Their Physicians' Self Interest*, notes that the recent healthcare legislation strengthens disclosure rules.¹⁸ But, she concludes, the Act ultimately fails to protect patients, who actually feel more pressured to aid physicians if they are aware of the physicians'

10. *Id.* at 106–118.

11. *Id.* at 118–26.

12. Ann E. Tweedy, *Unjustifiable Expectations: Laying to Rest the Ghosts of Allotment-Era Settlers*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 129 (2012).

13. *Id.* at 130.

14. *See id. passim.*

15. *Id.* at 149.

16. *Id.* at 187–88.

17. Nancy L. Zisk, *Investing in Healthcare: What Happens When Physicians Invest and Why the Recent Changes in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Fail to Protect Patients from Their Physicians' Self Interest*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 189 (2012). Professor Zisk previously authored an article examining statutory damages caps in medical malpractice actions and proposing alternatives to control the costs of malpractice suits. *See* Nancy L. Zisk, *The Limitations of Legislatively Imposed Damages Caps: Proposing a Better Way to Control the Costs of Medical Malpractice*, 30 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 119 (2006).

18. *Id.* at 188.

conflicting financial interests.¹⁹ Professor Zisk suggests a flat-fee billing model to eliminate any incentive a physician may have to prescribe or recommend treatments using diagnostic tools for the physician's own financial benefit.²⁰

In a case note, Aubrey Hicks argues for the Washington legislature to protect the continuation of publicity rights after death.²¹ In *The Right to Publicity after Death: Post-Mortem Personality Rights in Washington in the Wake of Experience Hendrix v. HendrixLicensing.com*, Hicks traces a district court's 2011 decision that the Washington Personality Rights Act (WPRA) was unconstitutional under the dormant Commerce Clause and Due Process Clause.²² She proposes an amendment to WPRA that would require a significant nexus between the commercial use of a celebrity's likeness and the State of Washington.²³ Hicks argues that such an amendment would sufficiently narrow the scope of the WPRA to avoid a constitutional violation.²⁴

The two student comments in volume thirty-six focus on social justice topics in immigration law. First, Kiran Griffith discusses the current circuit split in the application of the fugitive disentitlement doctrine to immigration cases.²⁵ In *Fugitives in Immigration: A Call for Legislative Guidelines on Disentitlement*, she argues that Congress should enact a disentitlement provision that addresses the unique issues arising in the immigration context.²⁶ Specifically, Griffith calls for Congress to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include a disentitlement provision limiting the situations under which an alien petitioner will be subject to disentitlement.²⁷

Finally, Elliot Watson argues that principles of fairness militate against courts applying a law retroactively in immigration cases.²⁸ In *The Revival of Reliance and Prospectivity: Chevron Oil in the Immigration Context*, Watson addresses immigrants' substantial reliance interests

19. *Id.* at 204.

20. *Id.* at 208.

21. Aubrie Hicks, Note, *The Right to Publicity after Death: Post-Mortem Personality Rights in Washington in the Wake of Experience Hendrix v. HendrixLicensing.com*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 275 (2012).

22. *Id.* at 291.

23. *Id.* at 294–97.

24. *Id.* at 297.

25. Kiran Griffith, Comment, *Fugitives in Immigration: A Call for Legislative Guidelines on Disentitlement*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 209 (2012).

26. *Id.* at 212.

27. *Id.* at 237–42.

28. Elliot Watson, Comment, *The Revival of Reliance and Prospectivity: Chevron Oil in the Immigration Context*, 36 SEATTLE U. L. REV. 245 (2012).

in long-standing rules.²⁹ He concludes that retroactive application of a new rule should be limited in the immigration context as it could result in harsh civil sanctions including deportation.³⁰

29. *Id.* at 248, 261–64.

30. *Id.* at 246–47.