

ARIZONA LAW REVIEW

VOLUME 25

1983

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
A TRIBUTE TO STUDENT-EDITED LAW	
REVIEWS	<i>Roger C. Henderson</i> 1
<i>Article</i>	
CLASS ACTIONS: THE RIGHT TO	
OPT OUT	<i>John E. Kennedy</i> 3
Three recent class actions involving mass accident, <i>Kansas City Skywalk</i> , product liability, <i>Dalkon Shield</i> , and consumer fraud, <i>Miner v. Gillette Co.</i> , are the media for the author's portrait of the right to opt out as the maverick of the class action family.	
<i>Essay</i>	
SUPREME COURT RHETORIC	<i>Robert A. Prentice</i> 85
The author examines the role rhetoric plays in the writing of United States Supreme Court opinions and discusses how specific rhetorical strategies can shape the content of an important decision.	
<i>Notes</i>	
STATE REGULATION OF PRIVATE RELIGIOUS	
SCHOOLS AND THE STATE'S INTEREST IN	
EDUCATION	<i>Denise M. Bainton</i> 123
The author examines state regulation of private religious schools under the <i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> free exercise balancing test. The author also explores the use of standardized achievement testing as an alternative to direct state regulation of private religious schools.	
SECTION 1983—A CHANGE IN THE MEANING	
OF "UNDER COLOR OF LAW":	
POLK COUNTY v. DODSON	<i>Mary Jean Wardell</i> 151
The author examines a new test announced by the United States Supreme Court to determine when action is taken "under color of law" within 42 U.S.C. section 1983. The author suggests that a grant of qualified immunity would have been a better approach rather than creating a new test of "under color of law."	

APPELLATE DECISIONS 1981-82

I.	CONSTITUTIONAL LAW	
	TAHTINEN V. SUPERIOR COURT: ARIZONA'S CIVIL COURTS REMAIN CLOSED TO THE INDIGENT	
	<i>Tahtinen v. Superior Court</i>	177
II.	CRIMINAL PROCEDURE	
	A. COMPULSORY PROCESS AND THE SCOPE OF THE GOVERN- MENT'S DUTY TO AID IN THE AVAILABILITY OF DEFENSE WITNESSES	
	<i>State v. Stewart</i>	192
	B. DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND CONSECUTIVE SENTENCING: WHAT DOES IT MEAN IN ARIZONA?	
	<i>State v. Rumsey</i>	202
III.	DEFAMATION	
	THE SUBJECTIVE DOUBT REQUIREMENT FOR RECKLESS DISRE- GARD: MISAPPLICATION OF THE ACTUAL MALICE STAN- DARD IN <i>HANSEN v. STOLL</i>	
	<i>Hansen v. Stoll</i>	211
IV.	INDIAN LAW	
	TRIBAL TAXATION OF MINERAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT: AN ANALYSIS OF <i>MERRION V. JICARILLA APACHE TRIBE</i>	
	<i>Merrion v. Jicarilla Apache Tribe</i>	220
V.	TAX	
	UNVERT AND THE ERRONEOUS DEDUCTION EXCEPTION TO THE TAX BENEFIT RULE	
	<i>Unvert v. Commissioner</i>	230
VI.	TORTS	
	A. LIMITATIONS ON THE INVITEE'S PREFERRED STATUS: AN ANALYSIS OF <i>NICOLETTI V. WESTCOR</i>	
	<i>Nicoletti v. Westcor</i>	244
	B. SCOPE OF EMPLOYMENT: AN EMPLOYER'S LIABILITY TO PERSONS INJURED BY EMPLOYEES WHO ARE RENUMERATED FOR TRAVEL	
	<i>Robarge v. Bechtel Power Corp.</i>	254