

Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 31 Md. L. Rev. 189 (1971)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol31/iss3/2>

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

ANN F. HOFFMAN

Managing Editor

ANTHONY H. GAMBOA

Articles Editors

DAVID R. BURKE
EZRA YEHUDAH SIFF

Notes and Comments Editors

JAMES E. CARBINE
GARY F. FLORENCE
WILLIAM D. LEVINE

Research Editor

SONDRA HARANS

Associate Editors

DAVID A. LEVIN

SANFORD D. SCHREIBER

Staff

EDWARD J. ADKINS
WILLIAM E. KNIGHT
JAMES K. LIGON

WILLIAM M. PIERSON
ARVIN E. ROSEN
SHARON K. TUCKER

Faculty Advisor

HAL M. SMITH

Ass't Faculty Advisor

LAURENCE M. KATZ

EDITOR'S NOTE

"Sex change" operations were the subject of bad jokes and good cocktail party conversation when Christine Jorgensen's story first appeared in American newspapers in 1953. Gender correction has since become an accepted, if not routine, surgical procedure but the law has not provided the means to make the transsexual's conversion complete. It is appropriate that one of the pioneering studies of the legal status of transsexuals is being published in the city occupied by the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, whose Gender Identity Clinic was a pioneer in the study and treatment of transsexuals. The student comment, *Transsexuals in Limbo: The Search for a Legal Definition of Sex*, suggests that the postoperative transsexual should be allowed to assume in law the sex he has assumed by surgery.

A second student work analyzes the recent Supreme Court decision of *Griggs v. Duke Power Company*, and finds that the burden is now on business in the use of employment tests which produce different results for blacks and whites: either stop using the test in question or prove that it tests for a characteristic necessary to the job involved.

The Supreme Court is presently considering a problem discussed in our lead article — the extent to which a transferor may retain an interest in a closely-held corporation without having included in his estate the value of stock in the corporation transferred to another prior to his death. The article by Professor Alice A. Soled should be of great assistance to attorneys in the field of estate taxation.

This issue of the *Review* concludes with an unusual book review by an unusually qualified reviewer. Stanley Mazaroff was a member of the staff of Senator Joseph D. Tydings when the Senate voted to reject the nomination of G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court. His review of Richard Harris' *Decision* includes both personal and historical perspectives on the relative powers of the Senate and the President in the nominating process.

The *Review* welcomes five new members to the Law School faculty: James P. Chandler, Oscar S. Gray, Michael J. Kelly, John J. Regan and William L. Reynolds II. Joining the part-time faculty this year are John F. Davis, Thomas J. Miller and JoAnn S. Raphael.