

Faculty Articles

Faculty Law Review Articles

1894-2017

By

Kenneth Graham¹

Index Page 2

A Authors. Page 19

B Authors. Page 28

C Authors. Page 47

D Authors. Page 62

E Authors. Page 69

F Authors. Page 72

G Authors. Page 82

H Authors. Page 95

I Authors. Page 106

J Authors. Page 127

K Authors. Page 130

L Authors. Page 138

M Authors. Page 150

N Authors. Page 169

O Authors. Page 173

¹ Professor of Law (Emeritus) UCLA Law School

Faculty Articles

P & Q Authors. Page 176

R Authors. Page 183

S Authors. Page 195

T Authors. Page 214

U & V Authors. Page 220

W Authors. Page 222

Y & Z Authors. Page 232

Index: The letter indicates the author section; the number indicates the item number within that section.

Rule 102: Theory and Interpretation:

Interpretation: N-11; S-40; S-41; C-144; I-94; I-161; J-30; J-39; L-60.

Erie & Choice of Law: F-123; H-100; M-72; M-117; V-13; W-71; W-92.

Theory: A-2 (The Principles of Evidence); A-34(proposal for evidence rules); A-35 (the complexity of legal knowledge); A-43(the Narrative Fallacy); A-46 (judicial management of factual uncertainty) ; A-49 (the myth of the law-fact distinction) ; A-50(naturalized epistemology); A-52(common sense, rationality, and the legal process); A-54(two aspects of law and theory); A-55 (truth and its rivals); A-57 (factual ambiguity and a theory of evidence); A-61(the nature of juridical proof); A-66 (reconceptualization of civil trials); A-77(analyzing codifications); A-78(doctrine and rationality in the Supreme Court) ; A-79(the process of proof); A-80(rationality, mythology, and the acceptance of jury verdicts); A-81(theory of the right to jury trial); A-83 (state of mind needed for juridical verdicts); A-89(rules, logic, and judgment); A-90(probability and proof); B-89; (oral versus textual reasoning); B-134(the modern trial and evidence law); B-136 (why evidence law lacks credibility); B-139 (ethics, evidence, and the modern adversary system); B-202 (Catholic legal thought and legal realism); B-206 (an empirical study of the psychology of the rules of evidence); B-254 (learning the wrong lessons from *An American Tragedy*); C-91(detection and correction of case publication bias); C-100 (forensics, meteorites, and chicken soup); C-129(the Nuremberg trials, American jurisprudence, legal realism, and natural law); E-13 (unnecessary problems of proof); F-87(the nature of legal evidence) ; G-87 (the three commandments of amending the Federal Rules of Evidence); G-147 (What's the matter with evidence); H-108(It will be pleasanter to tell you a story); I-34 (how to read the Federal Rules of Evidence); I-73(the search for substantive accuracy); I-103 (the relativity of reliability); I-186 (the Worst Evidence Principle); J-31(biased evidence rules); J-35(making the law matter); L-1(relationship between evidentiary principles and the problem of proof); L-28(are the Federal Rules of evidence dynamite?); L-29 (the rules of evidence and the jury); L-31(the reconceptualization of evidence law); L-34(the decline of the adversary system

Faculty Articles

and the rules of evidence); L-76 (The New Evidence Scholarship); L-78 (comparative study of Austrian and New York law); L-97 (presuppositions of evidence law); M-142 (tools or obstacles?); M-151 (beyond the Rules); M-160 (mapping rules); M-180 (basic concepts); M-193 (and Rationality); M-197 (choice of law); M-201 (the jury and the rules); M-252 (popular justice); N-5 (epistemology); N-26 (acceptability of verdicts); N-40 (juries and evidence); N-44 (epistemology); N-46 (theory); P-10 (perspectives on evidence); P-14 (an outsider's view); P-87 (and language); R-12 (Innocence and rationality); R-33 (rationality and rationalism); R-84 (rationality and reform); R-125 (Critical Race Theory of evidence); S-36 (amending the Rules); S-38 (evidence as pragmatic rhetoric); S-42 (and legal rhetoric); S-47 (jury as cause of rules); S-85 (*Erie*); S-110 (economic analysis); S-217 (*Erie*); S-222 (The New Doctrinalism); S-223 (refoundation of); S-256 (and the decline of jury trial); S-264 (and extra-legal materials); S-268 (truth and proof); S-273; S-289 (aspirational optimism); S-290 (rival claims to truth); S-292 (does it matter who runs evidence law?); T-15 (and feminism); T-50 (sports and war metaphors matter); T-53 (and intellectual history); T-57 (and new theories of mind); W-139 (invasion of the jury); W-142 (practical evidence); W-144 (the future);

Rule 103 Objections and Offers of Proof: A-118; B-28; B-153; B-154; B-157; B-261; C-2; C-88; C-89; C-106; C-109; C-110; C-148; C-155; D-20; D-45; E-35; G-3; G-9; G-64; G-90; G-140; G-145; H-62; H-127; I-62; I-80; I-121; I-149; I-151; J-5; J-23; L-6; L-15; L-16; L-22; L-95; M-10; M-13; M-52; M-89; M-277; N-35; P-46; P-74; P-80; R-81; R-150; S-19; S-26; S-138; S-203; T-67; V-12; W-19; W-66; W-86; W-111; W-137; W-141;

Rule 104: Preliminary Facts: A-60; B-18; B-32; C-7; E-15; F-31; G-22; I-91; I-145; I-227; L-52; M-6; M-7; M-13; M-199; N-8; S-22; S-93; T-33; W-16; W-17;

Rule 105: Limited Admissibility: B-145; C-12; G-12; G-29; G-33; H-2; H-3; I-216; M-13; M-22; M-140;

Rule 106: Completeness: C-183; M-13; N-6; N-7;

Comment & Summing Up: F-96; F-48; L-100; L-172;

Rule 201: Judicial Notice: A-107; B-63; B-273; C-201; C-181; C-224; D-17; D-24; D-26; D-27; D-28; D-53; E-16; F-46; F-100; G-38; G-148; H-50; H-53; H-69; I-249; J-20; L-42; L-54; L-107; M-11; M-12; M-15; M-62; M-107; M-121; M-150; M-153; M-155; M-207; N-47; N-48; O-17; P-47; R-100; R-105; R-108; R-109; R-171; S-67; S-68; S-73; S-109; S-168; S-265; T-36; T-83; W-1; W-28; W-44; W-65; W-133; Y-6;

Rule 301: Burden of Proof and Presumptions: A-1; A-3; A-28; A-36; A-45; A-48; A-51; A-53; A-74; A-86; A-92; A-120; A-124; B-17; B-33; B-39; B-40; B-67; B-85; B-108; B-127; B-160; B-201; B-212; B-216; B-218; B-222; C-53; C-82; C-92; C-93; C-99; C-101; C-138; C-153; C-182; D-46; D-95; D-104; E-10; F-20; F-42; F-43; F-50; F-71; F-88; F-146; G-28; G-31; G-32; G-40; G-152; G-173; H-8; H-9; H-24; H-39; H-49;

Faculty Articles

H-66; H-76; H-118; H-129; H-148; J-8; J-11; J-19; J-20. L-5; L-35; L-41; L-53; L-55; L-61; L-96; L-104; L-126; L-150; L-160; M-30; M-59; M-60; M-61; M-65; M-79; M-85; M-106; M-140; M-189; M-190; M-200; M-203, M-204; M-205; M-206; M-210; M-213; M-215; M-217; M-264; N-4; N-9; N-32; N-43; O-31; O-36; O-37; P-4; P-36; P-88; R-27; R-29; R-31; R-96; R-107; R-148; R-162; S-10; S-49; S-108; S-131; S-133; S-136; S-168; S-180; S-188; S-231; S-239; S-253; S-276; S-278; S-280; T-5; T-34; T-35; T-77; U-6; W-14; W-15; W-97; W-102; W-108;

Rule 303*: Criminal Presumptions: A-12; A-29; A-44; A-68; A-71; A-72; A-75; A-82; B-99; C-73; C-74; C-124; D-103; F-98; F-131; G-21; G-150; H-44; H-88; H-126; H-143; I-112; L-169; L-171; M-44; M-102; M-281; N-27; N-28; N-31; O-42; O-47; P-73; R-19; R-90; R-98; S-7; S-58; S-69; S-117; S-187; S-192; T-47; T-85; U-5; W-5; W-40; W-121; Y-14;

Rule 401: Relevance: A-62(evidence, inference, and rules in constitutional adjudication); A-95 (beyond King Solomon's harlots; misogyny in relevance) ; A-102 (; B-152 (narrative relevance); B-189 (Mississippi law); B-237; C-6 (negative evidence); C-13 (undisputed evidence); C-57; C-214 (irrelevant evidence); F-105 (relevance theory); F-116 (relevance theory); G-96 (inferential error); G-168 (generally); H-73 (and cognitive psychology); H-84 (Texas law); H-99 (in labor arbitration); H-138 (meaning of "evidence"); J-12 (and probability); L-11 (how determined); L-44 (stories v. Theories); O-34 (in federal common law): R-14 (subjectivity of); S-55 (As a dual concept); S-156 (unraveled); S-178 (Financial Privacy Act): S-246 (and probability); T-68 (logical or legal?); T-69 (how determined); W-91 (ritual and relevance); and

Absence of Evidence: I-59; N-10; S-16; T-44;

Accident Reconstruction Testimony: I-146;

Animal Behavior: I-8;

Arson Cases: I-182; I-185;

Bite-mark evidence: C-114; I-6;

Blood Tests: E-22; I-30; I-61;

Blood Spatter Evidence: I-123;

Bullet Lead Identification: F-55; I-107;

Circumstantial Evidence: S-114; W-124; Z-5;

Comparison Evidence in Obscenity Trials: L-79;

Computers: G-5; H-80; I-13; I-24; I-31; I-41; J-15; J-23; M-120;

Faculty Articles

R-48; R-106; S-119; S-140; S-173; S-208; T-32;

CSI syndrome: I-54;

Customary Political Practices: I-192;

Demeanor Evidence: I-220; S-6; W-64;

Demonstrative evidence: B-59; B-60; B-61; B-164; B-188; C-2; D-70; E-24; F-147; G-107; G-127; H-38; H-68; M-97; M-157; M-183; P-42; S-106; S-195; T-1; T-56;

Dog Evidence: G-30; O-49; T-21;

Double Counting: M-244;

DNA evidence: A-7; C-86; C-102; C-112; C-113; I-119; I-124; L-177; R-146; W-82; W-117;

Dreams: S-163;

Drug Evidence: I-72; I-215; I-223;

Etiology: I-99;

Explosives: I-22;

Extrapolation Testimony in DUI cases: I-141;

Eye-witness Identification: M-105;

Fingerprints: C-114; C-158, C-160; C-161; E-34; I-50; I-67; I-81; I-82; J-40; J-44; L-177; M-55;

Forensic Entomology: I-69;

Forensic Pathology: I-94 (cause of death);

Glass evidence: I-102;

Government Evidence: M-235;

Hair Analysis: I-193; I-230;

Handwriting Comparison: I-137; I-243; R-95;

Faculty Articles

High-tech evidence: A-126;

Hypnotism: A-31; B-22; B-228; D-9; D-57; H-86; L-18; L-105; L-116; S-196; T-25; T-28; W-24;

Intoxication tests: I-52; T-30; W-27;

Judicial admissions: W-9;

“Junk Science”: H-114; I-97;

Jury Views: H-33; H-34; W-78;

Law Enforcement Sponsored Research: R-82;

Lie detectors: A-4; A-10; A-114; B-29; B-46; B-66; B-174; B-184; B-193; B-225; B-236; B-241; C-3; C-66; C-177; C-221; D-1; D-52; F-10; F-45; F-85; F-86; F-148; G-57; G-171; H-35; H-40; H-43; H-97; H-134; H-135; H-136; I-106; I-148; I-240; I-241; I-242; L-24; L-63; L-92; L-114; M-80; M-130; O-6; P-39; P-56; R-1; R-22; R-44; R-49; R-149; S-8; S-46; S-98; S-103; S-132; S-149; S-183; S-229; S-238; S-281; T-13; T-75; W-107; W-114;

Math & statistics: A-42; A-91; B-31; B-54; B-87; B-190; B-211; B-224; C-79; C-155; C-225; D-29; E-9; E-29; F-8; F-53; H-15; I-74; J-4; L-127; M-71; S-54; S-209; S-271; T-73; W-116; W-136;

Medical Imaging Technology: J-9;

Non-Expert Scientific Testimony: I-159;

Other Incidents: F-117; H-36; H-37; I-207; S-2;

Paint Evidence: I-138;

Paternity Tests: J-6; L-44; I-75;

Palynology: I-89;

Persuasion Science: S-212;

Photographs: M-164;

Plant and Water Analysis: I-95;

Profiles and Syndrome Evidence: M-75; M-182; M-252; P-77;

PSA evidence: I-71;

Punitive damages: C-213;

Real Proof: G-151; I-51; I-90; I-238; L-62; M-136;

Safety History: M-222;

Scanning Electron Microscopy: I-172;

Scientific evidence: B-74; B-107; B-116; B-128; B-178; B-245; B-258; B-259; B-262; B-264; B-269; C-47; C-84; C-94; C-96; C-98; C-103, C-104; C-105; C-107; C-108; C-111; C-117; D-47; D-48; F-6; F-29; F-51; F-59; G-52; G-56; G-59; G-60; G-62; G-122; H-27; H-29; H-31; H-41; H-114; I-3; I-4; I-5; I-11; I-15; I-23; I-42; I-44; I-46; I-77; I-79; I-125; I-157; I-180; I-203; I-209; I-211; I-213; I-229; I-232; J-2; L-2; L-58; L-144; M-42; M-47; M-77; M-165; M-170; M-273; O-38; R-99; R-122; R-173; S-217; S-275; T-6; T-17; W-105;

Shaken baby syndrome: I-58;

Spoilation: D-8; G-181; H-65; H-79; I-96; M-9; S-189; W-79;

Sports violence prosecutions: L-93;

Stipulations: I-228; M-64.

Survey Evidence: Z-9;

Suspect categories: C-189 (wealth or poverty);

Thermography: P-48;

Third-party perpetrator evidence: I-14; M-68;

Tort claim “racket”: M-175;

Toxicology: I-173 (poisons);

Time of Death Determinations: I-174;

Voiceprints: D-40; W-60;

Rule 402: Constitutional, statutory, or exceptions found in other rules:
Compulsory Process: H-113; W-87; W-88.

Faculty Articles

Due Process; A-16; A-58; A-67A-69; A-70; A-96
Double Jeopardy: A-84.
Fifth Amendment: B-1; B-2; B-232; C-130; G-27; H-70;
Separation of Powers: B-111 (in rule-making);
Sixth Amendment: C-132; C-147; I-195; I-201; I-202; I-237;
Right to Public Trial: R-2.
California's "Truth-in-Evidence" Constitutional Amendment: F-111;
The Uniform Commercial Code: A-67;
State Statutes in Federal Courts: H-101.
Conditional regulation of forensic evidence: G-25;
Administrative Law: G-82.
Victims' Rights Provisions: M-250.
Defense Witness Immunity: T-23.
Constitution Law and Evidence: G-26.
Constitutional Limits on Privileges: S-167:
Right to Introduce Exculpatory Evidence: I-88; I-155; I-214: W-85.
Uncodified rules:L-27.
Corporate Personality:R-3

Rule 403: Discretionary Exclusion: A-76; A-129; B-20; C-125; C-203; D-15; F-80;
G-91; G-94; G-95; G-97; G-98; G-136; H-82; H-96; H-149; I-196; I-212; J-3; L-85;
L-87; M-41; M-73; M-129; N-37; O-25; P-54; R-71; R-129; R-169; S-9; S-62; S-107;
T-7; T-27; W-6; W-18; W-37;

Rule 404: Character:: A-105; B-11; B-38; B-133; B-165; B-170; B-195; C-46; C-83;
C-123; C-154; C-194; C-215; D-14; D-37; E-11; F-115; G-71; G-78; G-118; G-141;
H-7; H-109; H-150; I-64; I-75; I-87; I-108; I-192; I-204; L-8; L-64; L-84; L-86; L-89;
M-20; M-116; M-126; M-128; M-139; M-219; N-36; O-33; P-3; P-12; P-21; P-32; P-37;
P-85; P-90; R-36; R-37; R-41; R-58; R-60; R-83; R-87; R-128; R-139; S-24; S-27;
S-82; T-11; T-19; T-44; U-8; W-57; W-59; W-115;

Rule 404(b): Uncharged Misconduct: A-39; B-122; B-178; B-192; B-205; B-230;
C-55; C-121; C-163; C-205; C-211; D-38; D-49; E-21; F-22; F-27; F-101; G-88; G-114;
G-119; G-129; G-133; G-169; H-85; H-117; I-2; I-12; I-56; I-126; I-163; I-171; I-179;
I-189; I-200;I-208; I-217; I-219; I-222; I-224; I-225; I-226; L-3; L-48; L-81; L-83; M-99;
M-159; M-220; M-269; M-285; O-6; O-19; P-22; P-31; R-38; R-39; R-40; R-54; R-79;
R-147; S-65; S-113; S-147; S-155; S-157; S-158; S-172; S-255; T-9; T-26; T-43;
W-113; Z-12;

Rule 405: Character Procedure: C-223; F-14; G-2; I-221; M-50; O-7;

Quasi-Privileges:

Rule 406: Habit and Routine Practice; F-12; G-75; G-139; L-116; M-35; S-66;

Faculty Articles

Rule 407: Subsequent Remedial Measures: A-103; B-182; C-58; C-190; D-19; G-8; H-5; H-78; L-130; L-149; M-4; M-92; M-169; R-61; R-167; S-78; S-232; T-86; W-38;

Rule 408: Compromise Offers: B-58; B-194; C-165; C-180; C-184; E-31; H-47; L-130; R-18; V-10; W-21;

Rule 409: Humanitarian Gestures: G-144;

Rule 410: Guilty Pleas: B-6; B-275; C-36; F-28; G-137; G-138; L-80; M-149; O-32; S-84; W-30; W-75;

Rule 411: Insurance: A-32; B-56; F-23; G-161; N-20; P-59; R-24; S-88; W-8; W-123;

Rule 412: Rape Victims: A-19; A-24; A-100; B-21; B-70; B-81; B-163; B-176; B-210; B-229; B-244; C-62; C-64; C-65; C-77; C-219; E-19; E-33; F-26; F-35; F-36; F-52; F-69; G-6; G-12; G-35; G-49; G-100; G-134; H-87; H-95; I-9; I-156; I-245; L-73; L-153; M-86; M-158; O-11; O-15; O-20; O-24; P-68; P-86; R-128; R-164; S-51; S-71; S-79; S-199; S-227; T-8; T-58; T-78; U-4; W-25; W-33; W-131; W-135; Y-15;

Rule 413-415: Other Crimes in Sex Cases: A-22; A-23; A-88; A-128; B-48; B-115; B-162; B-233; D-34; E-1; F-38; F-54; H-125; H-156; I-136; I-165; I-174; I-184; L-128; L-147; N-15; O-26; P-33; S-116;

Rule 501: Privileges Generally and Novel Privileges: A-110 (Sexual Assault Counsellor); A-133 (lie detector privilege); B-26 (proposed in New York); B-30 (in the Uniform Rules); B-69 (corporate privilege); B-169 (common law privileges before Congress); B-226 (pharmacist-patient privilege); a C-133 (Canadian privileges); D-77 (privacy and privilege); F-81 (Louisiana privileges); F-104 (plea for fewer privileges); F-109 (computers & privileges); G-160 (mediation privilege); G-170 (tenure committee privilege); G-183 (theory); H-13 (labor union privilege); H-20 (comparative law); H-102 (and fair trial); I-21 (and e-mails); I-47 (meaning of “confidentiality”); I-86 (alienability of privileges); I-100 (psychological critique); I-101 (Wigmore’s behavioral assumptions); I-111 (Wigmore’s foundations); I-114 (instrumentalist v. Humanism); I-175 (Hegelian analysis); I-248 (Ombudsman Privilege); L-1 (patent agent privilege); L-20 (under the F.R.E.); L-82 (Federal privileges); L-113 (and friendship); M-100 (confidential communications); M-119 (privilege against self-incrimination); M-171 (and administrative judges); M-228 (in international arbitration); M-241 (fruits of breached privileges); M-245 (differing notions of confidentiality); N-1 (two-faced privileges); N-14 (and immunity); P-34 (why?); R-28 (Texas law); R-35 (compulsory disclosure to Alcoholics Anonymous); R-43 (conflict of laws); R-63 (do not codify); R-131 (and juvenile offenders); R-132 (on a collateral matter); R-133 (and perjury); S-92 (choice of law); S-118 (and defamation cases); S-226 (privacy privilege); S-234 (choice of law); S-236 (battered women intake papers privilege); W-42 (choice of law); W-83 (and fair trial);

Generally: D-99; G-142; L-158; L-159; S-74;

Faculty Articles

Erie and Choice of Law: A-104; B-85; D-96; E-25;

Academic Privilege: M-168; O-14;

Accountants' Privilege: C-150; C-172; F-4; J-17; L-43; R-111;

Banker and Brokers' Privilege: L-134;

Environmental Audit Privilege: E-20; F-49; L-155; M-232; O-41; S-279;

Mediation Privilege: S-37;

Peer Review Privilege: B-276; B-277; F-141; G-102; H-12; H-122; L-23;

Rape Victim Counsellor Privilege: R-110;

Reporters' Privilege: B-34; B-43; B-50 B-80; B-103; B-104; B-105; B-126; B-173; C-1; C-10; C-40 (Mississippi); C-56; C-61; D-2; D-4; D-50; D-65; D-66; E-5; E-6; E-7; E-17; F-25; F-106; G-4; G-68; G-104; G-109; G-110; G-125; G-185; H-51; H-72; L-25; L-69; L-70; L-108; L-122; L-123; M-23; M-113; M-161; M-176; M-273; N-23; O-42; P-50; P-77; R-51; R-121; R-123; R-134; R-163; S-4; S-59; S-100; S-134; S-179; S-201; S-242; S-249; T-24; T-84; U-2; V-5; W-26; W-53; W-74; Y-2; Y-8;

Research Privilege: C-199; H-77; N-21; O-13; W-109;

School Guidance Counsellor Privilege: R-112;

Self-Critical Analysis Privilege: B-4; F-75; L-88; M-275; P-71; V-1;

Social Worker Privilege: L-152;

Tax Practitioner-Client Privilege: G-70;

Tax Return Privilege: B-47; B-68;

Rule 502: Privilege Waiver: B-80; B-103; B-223; C-34; C-90; D-10; I-39; I-55; I-93; M-21; M-135; N-46; T-64;

Rule 503*: Attorney-Client Privilege: A-6; A-11; A-15; A-20; A-27; A-64; A-65; A-73; A-97; A-130; A-131; B-15; B-23; B-35; B-53; B-72; B-77; B-96; B-118; B-148; B-149; B-149; B-150; B-158; B-172; B-197; B-198; B-200; B-208; B-213; B-220; B-227; B-240; B-242; B-243; B-271; C-8; C-21; C-49; C-52; C-76; C-87; C-119; C-126; C-151; C-154; C-162; C-164; C-185; C-198; C-200; C-207; C-216; C-217; D-3; D-10; D-54; D-58; D-69; D-98; E-3; E-8; E-18; E-30; F-24; F-30; F-33; F-37; F-64; F-65; F-83;

Faculty Articles

F-89; F-108; F-110; F-120; F-121; F-122; F-125; F-138; F-139; G-37; G-39; G-41; G-42; G-43; G-44; G-45; G-46; G-47; G-65; G-69; G-77; G-79; G-84; G-85; G-86; G-106; G-111; G-143; G-155; G-157; G-175; H-6; H-17; H-18; H-23; H-42; H-61; H-63; H-71; H-89; H-90; H-92; H-94; H-98; H-107; H-116; H-133; I-20; I-38; I-48; I-203; J-46; L-26; L-46; L-47; L-50; L-66; L-71; L-72; L-90; L-91; L-99; L-110; L-118; L-120; L-129; L-139; L-140; L-143; L-151; L-156; L-170; L-178; M-1; M-2; M-16; M-18; M-24; M-29; M-31; M-33; M-46; M-58; M-67; M-103; M-104; M-118; M-131; M-137; M-146; M-147; M-148; M-152; M-260, M-261; M-274; M-283; N-17; N-19; N-24; N-33; N-39; N-41; O-10; O-45; O-46; P-1; P-27; P-35; P-51; P-60; P-64; P-66; P-67; P-75; P-81; P-83; P-94; R-4; R-66; R-67; R-70; R-72; R-73; R-74; R-77; R-78; R-80; R-118; R-130; R-153; S-5; S-11; S-14; S-15; S-16; S-20; S-33; S-43; S-44; S-61; S-84; S-86; S-94; S-96; S-104; S-112; S-129; S-130; S-137; S-139; S-142; S-143; S-181; S-190; S-204; S-207; S-212; S-218; S-224; S-235; S-237; S-260; S-262; S-266; S-282; T-14; T-42; T-49; T-51; T-71; V-14; V-17; W-4; W-22; W-39; W-58; W-63; W-72; W-99; W-120; W-122; W-128; W-129; W-134; Z-2; Z-13;

Rule 504*²: Therapist-Patient Privilege: A-9; A-94; A-109; A-11; A-112; A-123; A-132; B-3; B-14; B-15; B-76; B-129; B-130; B-131; B-147; B-183; B-221; C-70; C-72; C-145; C-164; C-187; C-206; C-220; D-39; D-55; D-60; D-101; E-27; F-57; F-67; F-68; F-76; F-77; F-93; F-95; F-97; F-119; G-15; G-16; G-17; G-18; G-19; G-20; G-103; G-117; G-179; G-184; G-187; H-55; H-58; H-74; H-112; H-120; I-142; I-147; J-21; J-41; L-37; L-141; L-154; L-162; L-163; L-164; M-16; M-36; M-48; M-53; M-94; M-98; M-110; M-177; M-276; N-22; O-9; O-16; P-29; P-43; P-44; P-45; P-52; P-96; P-93; Q-5; R-20; R-21; R-46; R-104; R-115; R-116; R-141; R-161; R-168; S-25; S-35; S-121; S-122; S-123; S-124; S-125; S-126; S-150; S-162; S-163; S-164; S-165; S-169; S-174; S-177; S-206; S-240; S-244; S-251; T-2; T-12; T-48; W-36; W-51; W-52; W-62; W-95; W-96; W-103; W-125; W-126; W-127; Z-6;

Rule 505*: Family Privileges:

Husband and wife: B-42; B-185; B-215; B-272; C-60; C-175; D-94; G-83; G-123; G-149; G-182; H-26; H-104; H-145; H-152; L-77; M-16; M-112; M-227; O-30; P-40; P-91; R-45; R-55; R-57; R-155; S-105; S-259; W-50;

--Parent-Child: B-42; C-149; R-138; S-53; S-214; W-29;

Rule 506*: Priest-Penitent Privilege: A-101; B-121; B-199; C-4; C-59; C-75; C-165; D-5; D-63; G-34; H-119; L-145; M-16; M-54; M-156; M-163; O-1; P-7; P-70; R-42; R-69; S-120; S-211; S-261; W-13; W-106; Y-4;

Rule 507*: Voters Privilege: N-49;

² Asterisks indicate that these privileges were not included in the Federal Rules of Evidence, though some states adopted them.

Faculty Articles

Rule 508*: Trade Secrets Privilege: A-14; A-93; A-115; B-19; B-37; B-191; B-238; B-270; C-85; C-173; C-218; D-68; D-93; D-100; F-9; F-79; G-10; H-57; H-83; L-39; L-109; M-40; M-91; P-38; P-57; P-84; R-113; R-124; R-159; S-70; S-219; S-223; S-283; V-6; V-7; V-16;

Rule 509*: Government Privilege: A-5; A-13; A-26; A-121; B-13; B-45; B-57; B-82; B-84; B-89; B-112; B-159; B-166; B-186; B-187; C-18; C-51; C-63; C-67; C-120; C-135; C-159; C-169; C-195; C-196; C-201; D-18; D-30; D-32; D-79; D-82; D-91; E-2; E-14; E-23; E-26; E-36; E-37; F-21; F-48; F-119; F-124; F-144; F-145; G-13; G-131; G-177; H-11; H-16; H-32; H-59; H-81; H-130; H-540; H-542; H-144; H-147; I-10; I-25; I-247; J-7; L-39; L-67; L-102; L-111; L-131; L-142; L-146; L-174; M-26; M-28; M-37; M-51; M-57; M-63; M-95; M-162; M-174; M-188; M-230; N-2; N-11; N-18; N-30; O-3; O-12; O-18; O-21; O-48; P-26; P-28; P-62; R-47; R-52; R-119; R-157; R-160; S-1; S-3; S-23; S-32; S-76; S-77; S-81; S-111; S-127; S-135; S-170; S-175; S-184; S-185; S-215; S-222; S-248; S-250; S-254; S-267; S-269; S-277; S-298; T-22; T-29; T-52; T-59; T-60; T-82; V-11; W-31; W-32; W-61; W-73; W-89; W-92; W-104; W-130; Y-1; Y-11; Z-2;

Rule 510*: Informer's Privilege: B-27; B-196; C-208; F-1; F-70; G-186; H-54; H-60; M-34; M-38; M-247; N-3; N-16; O-43; Q-3; R-9; R-14; R-23; R-145; S-252;

Rule 511*: Privilege Waiver: G-72; O-4; R-25; S-193;

Article VI: Witnesses

Rule 601: Competency: A-21; B-25; D-31; G-92; H-154; I-140; L-21; L-33; M-177; T-41; W-35;

Rule 602: Personal Knowledge: B-171; B-268; F-56; F-58; R-17; S-228;

Rule 606: Competency of Jurors: H-146;

Rule 607: Who May Impeach: G-153; G-154; L-12; S-64;

Rule 608: Character Impeachment: B-73; B-113; C-176; C-222; F-13; G-74; I-18; I-143; J-43; J-48; L-61; L-74; M-27; M-231; R-117; R-151; S-45; S-132; S-164; T-28; T-76; U-7; Y-10;

Rule 609: Prior Convictions to Impeach: C-152; D-67; D-80; G-80; G-89; L-94; L-169; M-96; R-62; R-101; R-102; R-103; S-197; S-200;

Rule 611: Form and Mode of Interrogation: C-45; D-41; F-102; H-75; M-25; R-97;

Rule 612: Writing Used to Refresh: B-65; D-9; D-51; D-57; F-91; H-56; H-86; H-153; L-105; L-116; M-202; S-198; T-25;

Faculty Articles

Rule 613: Prior Statements of Witnesses: L-14;

Rule 614: Calling and Interrogating Witnesses by The Judge: S-21;

Article VII: Opinions and Experts.

Rule 701: Lay opinions: B-9; F-63; I-16; I-17; L-9; M-81; M-186; P-25; S-32; S-166; S-205; T-87;

Rule 702: Expert opinions: A-47; A-56; A-85; B-75; B-235; B-252; B-257; B-263; C-42; C-50; C-115; C-146; C-179; C-192; C-197; D-49; D-56; D-71; D-90; E-4; F-3; F-5; F-78; F-84; F-94; F-103; F-126; F-140; G-48; G-54; G-108; G-159; G-178; G-189; H-25; I-1; I-29; I-32; I-49; I-53; I-60; I-70; I-76; I-92; I-105; I-109; I-127; I-168; I-176; I-187; J-33; L-13; L-161; L-177; M-32; M-55; M-83; M-84; M-163; M-165; M-185; M-191; M-211; M-224; M-225; M-255; O-5; O-39; O-40; P-23; P-41; P-63; P-79; R-64; R-89; R-93; R-114; R-127; S-30; S-34; S-80; S-151; S-153; S-154; S-171; S-297; S-299; T-16; V-6; Y-13;

Rule 703: *Daubert* and bases of opinion: A-40; A-87; B-36; B-55; B-83; B-97; B-98; B-109; B-135; B-137; B-140; B-144; B-248; B-249; B-250; B-251; B-253; B-255; B-256; B-264; B-265; B-266; B-267; C-38; C-43; C-93; C-97; C-118; C-212; D-6; D-36; D-62; F-2; F-40; F-99; F-137; G-51; G-53; G-55; G-58; G-67; G-124; G-126; G-146; G-180; H-1; I-22; I-33; I-35; I-37; I-65; I-84; I-110; I-113; I-129; I-130; I-131; I-132; I-133; I-134; I-139; I-150; I-153; I-158; I-160; I-164; I-166; I-167; I-169; I-177; I-181; I-183; I-188; I-197; I-198; J-29; J-45; M-76; M-90; M-272; R-59; R-85; R-86; R-88; R-91; R-92; R-94; R-172; S-28; S-29; S-63; S-87; S-152; S-176; T-18; T-60; T-62; V-15; V-18;

Rule 704: Opinion on Ultimate Issue: S-245;

Rule 705: Disclosure of Basis of Expert Opinion: C-186; M-8; is

Rule 706: Court-Appointed Experts: B-102; B-207; C-78; C-116; F-82; G-172; G-188; I-206; L-115; M-286; P-72; S-95; S-141; S-225; T-70; V-3; Z-8.

Article VIII: Hearsay Evidence

Rule 801: Hearsay defined: A-8 (hearsay and accused terrorists); A-25(self-exculpatory statements); A-33 (as a rule of admission); A-59(evolution of rule); B-16(conduct as hearsay); B-62(electronic Hearsay); B-90(ambiguity as a hearsay danger); B-92 (substantive influences on exceptions); B-124 (Oklahoma Evidence Code) ; B-151 (public opinion polls); B-167 (public opinion polls); B-168 (history); C-9 (and cognition); C-19 (electronic communications); C-137 (U.K. Law); D-22 (in court trials); D-78 (generally); D-81 (hearsay hazards); F-15 (in the Federal Rules); F-16 (conduct as hearsay); F-17 (“indirect” hearsay); F-41 (generally); F-61 (implied assertions); G-23 (and relevance); G-66 (generally); G-35 (simplified); H-21

Faculty Articles

(comparative law); H-106 (changes); J-1 (and doctrine of recent possession); I-210 (memory); I-244 (witness recollection theory); I-246 (in Europe); J-10 (role in rational scheme of evidence); J-15 (defined); L-133 (logical view); M-5 (explanation); M-14 (in Nebraska); M-126 (California); M-138 (juror evaluation); M-191 (hearsay dangers); M-195 (generally); M-258 (interpretation); M-279 (reform); M-284 (of Child Abuse Victims); P-8 (exporting the FRE); P-13 (applying the scientific method to); P-15 (implied assertions); P-16 (subject matter approach to reform); P-19 (and stability of verdicts); P-20 (McCormick on); P-78 (Posner on); R-78 (more Posner); R-144 (machine “testimony”); S-12 (rethinking rationale); S-97 (best evidence theory); S-102 (triangular analysis); S-241 (and memory and perception); S-293 (de facto abolition); S-294 (foundational fact approach); S-295 (theory); S-296 (theory); T-74 (triangle theory); V-4 (and the adversary system); W-45 (probative force); W-46 (alternatives); W-67 (definition); W-70 (Texas version); W-93 (what is); W-101 (right to introduce evidence); W-110 (history of); W-188 (proposals for); Z-7 (New York courts reform);

Rule 801(d): Generally: B-91; C-14; C-24; L-19; M-196; M-221; S-257; S-263;

Rule 801(d)(1)(A): Prior Inconsistent Statement: B-93; B-132; C-41; D-33; G-128; M-270; R-54; S-13; T-65;

Rule 801(d)(1)(B): Prior Consistent Statement: F-135; L-119; M-66;

Rule 801(d)(1)(C): Prior Identification: M-49;

Rule 801(d)(2): Statement by Party Opponent: H-52; H-91; U-1;

Rule 801(d)(2)(A): Party Admission: C-32; C-134; I-176; P-17;

Rule 801(d)(2)(C): Authorized Admission: B-180; F-18;

Rule 801(d)(2)(D): Vicarious Admission: I-218; L-98; M-209;

Rule 801(d)(2)(E): Co-conspirators: G-24; L-103; M-265;

Rule 803: Exceptions: declarant need not be unavailable:

Generally: A-113 (801(b)(6)); A-117; (marital discord exception); R-75 (proposal to modify).

Rule 803(1): Present Sense Impression: C-27; F-92; H-151; I-7; I-63; L-51; M-194; W-20;

Rule 803(3): Exited Utterances: M-142; O-27; Q-1; S-157; S-286; S-287; S-288; T-37; W-56 W-81; W-112;

Faculty Articles

Rule 803(4): Statements for Medical Diagnosis or Treatment: C-16; M-184; M-242; M-254; M-258; T-39; W-80;

Rule 803(5); Recorded Recollection: S-243;

Rule 803(6): Business Records: B-24; C-174; E-27; F-143; G-167; H-14; L-56; L-68; M-17; P-2; R-8;

Rule 803(8):Government Records: I-19; I-66; J-13; M-78; M-111; M-278; R-8; W-11;

Rule 803(16): Ancient Documents: C-26;

Rule 803(17) Market Reports: B-246;

Rule 803(18): Learned Treatises: I-45; I-131; R-165;

Rule 803(22): Prior Convictions: C-193; H-105; M-262;

Rule 804: Exceptions: declarant unavailable:

Rule 804(b)(1): Former Testimony: M-43; W-119;

Rule 804(b)(2): Dying Declaration: C-68; L-124; L-125; W-12;

Rule 804(b)(3): Statements Against Interest: C-17; C-20; C-33; C-202; I-68; I-162; M-198; T-3;

Rule 804(b)(4); Personal or Family History:

Rule 804(b)(6): Forfeiture by Wrongdoing: C-169; F-73; F-74;

Rule 806: Attacking Credibility of Declarant: C-188; G-74; G-99; H-131;

Rule 807: Residual exception: C-22; D-35; I-234; J-36; M-101; M-108; S-148; Y-3;

Confrontation: A-41; A-98; A-99; B-5; B-7; B-8; B-10; B-12; B-51; B-64; B-71; B-101; B-105; B-181; B-239; B-274; C-25; C-31; C-37; C-44; C-80; C-81; C-127; C-128; C-171; C-191; D-7; D-11; D-12; D-13; D-61; D-72; D-73; D-74; D-75; D-84; D-85; D-86; D-87; D-88; D-89; D-92; D-105; E-31; E-32; F-34; F-39; F-60; F-66; F-72; F-107; F-112; F-113; F-114; F-127; F-128; F-129; F-130; F-132; F-133; F-134; F-136; F-142; G-50; G-61; G-73; G-76; G-105; G-115; G-120; G-121; G-130; G-132; G-153; G-158; G-174; G-176; H-4; H-22; H-28; H-30; H-45; H-110; H-123; H-124; H-155; I-190; I-233; I-239; J-14; J-22; J-24; J-25; J-26; J-27; J-32; J-34; J-37; J-38; L-40; L-49; L-101; L-112; L-121; L-132; L-135; L-136; L-137; L-138; L-157; L-166; L-167; L-173; M-3; M-19;

Faculty Articles

M-45; M-56; M-69; M-70; M-93; M-127; M-132; M-133; M-143; M-166; M-172; M-174; M-178; M-181; M-223; M-233; M-234; M-236; M-237; M-239; M-240; M-241; M-246; M-248; M-249; M-256; M-257; M-259; M-263; M-267; M-268; M-282; N-13; N-25; N-29; N-34; N-42; O-2; O-22; O-23; P-5; P-9; P-11; P-23; P-30; P-53; P-55; P-58; P-65; P-69; R-5; R-6; R-7; R-10; R-15; R-30; R-34; R-68; R-135; R-136; R-137; R-140; R-152; R-158; R-166; S-48; S-52; S-72; S-83; S-89; S-90; S-99; S-128; S-144; S-145; S-146; S-181; S-186; S-202; S-247; S-270; S-280; S-291; T-10; T-20; T-40; T-46; T-54; T-79; T-80; T-81; U-3; V-2; V-9; W-2; W-3; W-23; W-34; W-84; W-98; W-100; Y-5; Y-7; Y-9; Y-12; Z-11.

Article X: Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs

Rule 901: Authentication: A-108; B-110; B-146; B-219; C-23; H-103; J-47; R-174; S-273; T-66; W-28; W-69;

Rule 1001: The Best Evidence Rule: B-95; B-278; C-143; I-98; R-120; W-68;

Rule 1006: Summaries: I-43;

Article XI: Miscellaneous Rules

Rule 1101: Scope and Applicability of Rules: B-231 (workers' compensation); C-5; D-21 (court trials); F-7 (capital sentencing); G-7 (statutory rules v. Evidence Rules); G-36 (class actions); I-191 (pretrial); L-106 (court trials); L-165 (court trials); P-61 (administrative agencies); R-13 (same rules for civil and criminal cases); R-55 (labor arbitration); R-170 (bankruptcy); S-230 (administrative agencies);

History of and Subsequent Developments of Rules:

Generally: A-30 (Roscoe Pound's speech that launched Progressive Proceduralism); B-106 (bibliography of legal history articles); B-155 (history of hearsay reform) ; B-247(remaining issues in evidence law); B-260(the breast implant fiasco); D-76 (the role of rules of evidence) ; D-97 (law, war, and history); G-113(changing approaches to the law of evidence); H-46(evidence and inference in law) ; N-38(codification in common law countries); R-175(can the states adapt the Federal Rules?); T-38 (Thayer;s Observations on the law of evidence);

International Law: H-67;

United States: A-37; A-38; A-106; A-116; B-44; B-88; B-131; B-138; B-143; B-209; C-30; C-71; C-140; C-141; C-178; D-43; F-11; G-162; H-121; H-137; H-139; I-36; I-118; I-120; I-199; L-32; L-66; M-208; M-212; M-218; P-89; R-50; R-143; R-154; S-232; S-285; W-138;

Federal Rules of Evidence: A-127; B-52; B-79; B-100; B-119; B-217; C-28; C-29; C-35; C-39; C-142; D-44; D-64; F-90; G-93; G-101; G-164; G-165; G-156; I-40; I-85;

Faculty Articles

I-120; L-7; L-17; M-88; M-109; M-187; O-28; O-29; P-6; P-49; P-82; R-32; R-65; R-142; R-156; S-17; S-39; S-57; S-75; S-91; S-101; S-115; S-194; S-213; S-272; T-31; T-61; W-43; W-47; W-48; W-54; W-55; W-90;

Fifth Circuit: A-22;

Seventh Circuit: C-172;

Eleventh Circuit: B-41;

Military Rules of Evidence: G-163; I-236; M-154; S-50; W-132; Z-10;

Model Code of Evidence: M-212; M-214;

The Uniform Rules: B-49; F-19; G-14; M-82; M-280; Q-2; R-11; S-258; W-143;

Administrative Law: D-23; D-25;

Evidentiary Scholarship: P-18; T-55; W-41;

United Kingdom: B-94; B-204; C-204; L-30; L-36; M-226;

Medieval Proof: H-111; U-3;

Australia: H-93;

Canada: B-214; C-122; J-18;

Israel: L-148;

Italy: H-19;

Alabama: H-10; H-115;

Arkansas: F-47;

California: C-69; G-1; G-116; G156; M-87; M-122; M-123; M-124; M-125;

Colorado: Q-4;

Connecticut: T-4;

Florida: E-12;

Idaho: C-136;

Faculty Articles

Illinois: B-203; C-209; C-210;

Indiana: B-156; D-102; S-284;

Georgia: M-141; T-72;

Hawaii: B-175;

Illinois: R-165;

Kansas: D-116;

Kentucky: D-83;

Louisiana: A-125; R-26;

Maryland: H-132;

Massachusetts: H-64;

Michigan: L-59; M-114; M-115; S-54; S-60;

Missouri: C-48;

New York: B-78; C-11; F-62; L-175; L-176; M-39; M-74; M-134;

North Carolina: M-238; M-243;

North Dakota: B-234;

Ohio: B-120; B-123; G-63; M-145; W-7; W-49;

Oklahoma: B-125;

Oregon: J-42; L-4;

South Dakota: A-17; A-18;

Texas: B-114; B-117; C-15; G-112; M-229; W-10; W-76; W-77; Z-3; Z-4;

Utah: B-177;

Washington: A-119; O-35;

Wyoming: M-266;

A

[1] Abbott, Degree of Proof, and Burdens of Proof. 2 Univ.L.Rev. 59 (1894) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[2] Abbott, The Principles of Evidence, 1 Univ.L.Rev. 25 (1893) [Rule 402]

[3] Abbott, Two Burdens of Proof, 6 Harv.L.Rev. 125 (1882) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[4] Abbell, Polygraph Evidence: The Case Against Admissibility in Federal Criminal Trials, 15 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 27 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[5] Abel, Do You Have To Keep The Government's Secrets?: Retroactively Classified Documents, The First Amendment, and The Power to Make Secrets Out of Public Records, 163 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1037 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[6] Abramovsky, Confidentiality: The Future Crime—-Contraband Dilemmas, 85 W.Va.L.Rev. 921 (1983) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[7] Abrams, DNA and Distrust, 91 Notre Dame L.Rev. 757 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[8] Abrams, Confrontation and Hearsay Issues in Federal Court Terrorism Prosecutions of Gitmo Detainees: *Moussui* and *Paracha* as Harbingers?, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1067 (2010) [F.R.Ev. 801]

[9] Abrams, Unpacking the Power of An Anti-Litigation Limitation on Consultation-for-Advice/Treatment Evidentiary Privileges, 21 Quin.L.Rev. 1089 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[10] Abrams, Polygraph Validity and Reliability: A Review, 18 J.Foren.Sci 313 (1972) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[11] Abrams, Corporate Clients: Entitled to Privilege, 3 Litigation 39 (1977) [Rej.F.R.Ev. 503]

[12] Abrams, Statutory Presumptions and The Federal Criminal Law: A Suggested Analysis. 22 Vand.L.Rev. 1135 (1969) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[13] Abramson, Should A Clerk Ever Reveal Confidential Information? 63 Judicature 361 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 509]

[14] Abramson, Confidential Business Information Versus The Public's Right to Disclosure, 34 U.Kan.L.Rev. 681 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 508]

[15] Abramson, Attorneys, Clients, "Ethics", 52 Notre Dame L.Rev. 797 (1977).

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 503]

[16] Abramson & Lindeman, Entrapment and Due Process in The Federal Courts. Am.J.Crim.L. 139 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 402]

[17] Adams, The South Dakota Evidence Code . . . A Giant Step?, 24 So.Dak.L.Rev. (1979). [History]

[18] Adams, Twin Codes of Evidence: Just What The System Ordered, 20 So.Dak.L.Rev. 228 (1975) [History]

[19] Adler, The Relevance of Sexual History Evidence in Rape: Problems of Subjective Interpretation, 1985 Crim.L.Rev. 769. [F.R.Ev. 412]

[20] Adzhemyan & Marcella, "Better Call Saul" If You Want Discoverable Communications: The Misrepresentation of The Attorney-Client Privilege on Breaking Bad, 45 N.M.L.Rev. 477 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[21] Ahrens, Scientific Evidence and The Law: Identification Verification of Verbal Testimony and Physiological Proof, 13 N.Y.L.Forum 612 (1968) [F.R.Ev. 601]

[22] Aiken, Protecting Plaintiffs' Sexual Pasts: Coping With Preconceptions Through Discretion, 51 Emory L.J. 559 (2002) [F.R.Ev. 415]

[23] Aiken, Sexual Character Evidence in Civil Actions: Refining The Propensity Rule, 1997 Wis.L.Rev. 1221. [F.R.Ev. 415]

[24] Aitken, Rape Prosecutions, 60 Women Lawyers J. 192 (1974) [F.R.Ev. 412]

[25] Aitken, The Admissibility of Self-Exculpatory Statements, 15 Crim.L.J. 42 (1991) [F.R.Ev. 801]

[26] Albert & Simon, Enforcing Subpoenas Against The President: The Question of Mr. Jaworski's Authority, 74 Colum.L.Rev. 545 (1974) [F.R.Ev. 509]

[27] Alexander, The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege: A Study of The Participants, 63 St.John's L.Rev. 191 (1989).[F.R.Ev. 503]

[28] Alexander, Presumptions: Their Use And Abuse, 17 Miss.L.J. 1 (1945) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[29] Alexander, Presumptions in Criminal Cases, 17 Miss.L.J. 45 (1945) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[30] Affini, Centennial Reflections of Roscoe Pound's 1906 Address to The American Bar Association: Fanning The Spark That Kindled the White Flame of Progress, 48 S.Tex.L.Rev. 849 (2007). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [31] Allen, Hypnotism and Its Legal Import, 12 Can.B.Rev. 22 (1934) [F.R.Ev.612]
- [32] Allen, Why Do Courts Coddle Automobile indemnity Companies?, 61 Amer.L.Rev. 77 (1927) [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [33] Allen, The Hearsay Rule as A Rule of Admission Revisited, 84 Ford.L.Rev. 1395 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [34] Allen, A Proposed Evidence Law, 33 B.U.Int'l.L.J. 359 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [35] Allen, Complexity, the Generation of Legal Knowledge and the Future of Litigation, 60 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. (2013) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [36] Allen & Stein, Evidence, Probability, and the Burden of Proof 55 Arizona L. Rev. 557 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [37] Allen, American Exclusionary Rule(s), 20 Evidence Science 112 (2012) [History]
- [38] Allen, Difficulties with Exclusionary Rules, 24 Evidence Science 758(2012).
- [39] Allen & Laudan, The Devastating Impact of Prior Crimes Evidence And Other Myths of the Criminal Justice Process, 101 J. Crim. L. & Crim. 493-528 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [40] Allen & Nafisi, *Daubert* And Its Discontents, 76 Brook.L.Rev. 131 (2010) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [41] Allen, From The Enlightenment to *Crawford* to *Holmes*, 34 Seton Hall L.Rev. 1 (2009).[Confrontation]
- [42] Allen & Pardo, The Problematic Value of Mathematical Models of Evidence, 36 j. Legal Stud. 107 (2007) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [43] Allen, The Narrative Fallacy, The Relative Plausibility Theory, and A Theory of the Trial, 3 Int. Commentary on Evidence 30 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [44] Allen, From *Winship* to *Apprendi* to *Booker*: Constitutional Command or Constitutional Blunder?, 58 Stanford L. Rev. 195-215 (2005).[F.R.Ev. 303]
- [45] Allen & Lively, Burdens of Persuasion in Civil Cases: Algorithms v. Explanations, 2003 MSU L. Rev. 893 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [46] Allen & Callen, The Juridical Management of Factual Uncertainty, 7 Int. J. of Evidence and Proof (2003). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

- [47] Allen, Expertise and the Supreme Court: What is the Problem?, 34 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1(2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [48] Allen & Callen, Teaching Bloody Instructions:@ Civil Presumptions and the Lessons of Isomorphism 18 Quinipiac L. Rev. 933-960 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [49] Allen & Pardo, The Myth of the Law-Fact Distinction, 97 Nw. U. L. Rev. 1769-1807 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [50] Allen & Leiter, Naturalized Epistemology and The Law of Evidence: Reply to Redmayne, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 885. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [51] Allen & Jeld, Burdens of Persuasion in Civil Cases: Algorithms and Explanations, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 893. [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [52] Allen, Common Sense, Rationality, and the Legal Process, 22 Cardozo L. Rev.1417 (2001) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [53] Allen, Clarifying the Burden of Persuasion and Bayesian Decision Rules: A Response to Professor Kaye, 4 Int. J. of Evidence and Proof 246 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [54] Allen, Two Aspects of Law and Theory, 37 U. San Diego L. Rev.743 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [55] Allen, Truth and Its Rivals, 49 Hastings Law Journal 309-319 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [56] Allen, Expertise and The *Daubert* Decision, 84 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 1157 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [57] Allen, Factual Ambiguity and A Theory of Evidence, 88 Nw.U.L.Rev. 604 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [58] Allen, Constitutional Adjudication, The Demands of Knowledge, and Epistemological Modesty, 88 Nw.U.L.Rev. 436 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [59] Allen, The Evolution of The Hearsay Rule to A Rule of Admission, 76 Minn.L.Rev. 797 (1992).[F.R.Ev. 801]
- [60] Allen, The Myth of Conditional Relevancy, 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 871 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [61] Allen, The Nature of Juridical Proof, 13 Cardozo L.Rev. 373 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

[62] Allen, Evidence, Inference, Rules, and Judgment in Constitutional Adjudication: The Intriguing Case of *Walton v. Arizona*, 81 J.Crim.Law & Crim. 727 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[63] Allen, The Nature of Juridical Proof, 13 Cardozo L.Rev. 373 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[64] Allen, Grady, Polsby & Yashko, A Positive Theory of The Attorney-Client Privilege and The Work Product Doctrine, 19 J.Leg.Stud. 359 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[65] Allen & Hazelwood, Preserving The Confidentiality of Internal Corporate Investigations, 31 Corp.Prac.Comm. 76 (1989) [F.R.E. 503]

[66] Allen, A Reconceptualization of Civil Trials, 66 B.U.L.Rev. 401 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[67] Allen & Hillman, Evidentiary Problems In —-And Solutions For—The Uniform Commercial Code, 1984 Duke L.J. 92 [Rule 402]

[68] Allen, Rationality and Accuracy in The Criminal Process: A Discordant Note on The Harmonizing of The Justices' Views of Burdens of Persuasion in Criminal Cases, 74 J.Crim.L. & Crim. 1147 (1983) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[69] Allen, More on Constitutional Process-of-Proof Problems in Criminal Cases, 94 Harv.L.Rev. 1795 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[70] Allen, Structuring Jury Decisionmaking in Criminal Cases: A Unified Constitutional Approach to Evidentiary Devices, 94 Harv.L.Rev. 321 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[71] Allen, The Restoration of *In re Winship*: a comment on Burdens of Persuasion After *Patterson v. New York*, 76 Mich.L.Rev. 30 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[72] Allen, *Mullaney v. Wilbur*, The Supreme Court, and The Substantive Criminal Law —-An Examination of The Limits of Legitimate Intervention, 55 Texas L.Rev. 269 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[73] Allen, Limitations on Prosecutorial Discovery of The Defense Case in Federal Courts: The Shield of Confidentiality, 50 So.Calif.L.Rev. 461 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[74] Allen, Presumptions, Inferences and Burden of Proof in Federal Civil Actions--An Anatomy of Unnecessary Ambiguity and a Proposal for Reform, 76 Northwestern Law Review 892-912 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[75] Allen & DeGrazia, The Constitutional Requirement of Proof Beyond Reasonable Doubt in Criminal Cases: A Comment Upon Incipient Chaos in the Lower Courts, 20 American Criminal Law Rev. 332 (1984) [F.R.Ev. 303]

Faculty Articles

- [76] Allen, The Nature of Discretion, 47 L.& Contemp. Prob. 1(1984) [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [77] Allen, The Explanatory Value of Analyzing Codifications by Reference to Organizing Principles Other Than Those Employed in the Codification, 79 Northwestern Law Review 1080 (1984-85).
- [78] Allen & Ratnaswamy, Heath v. Alabama: A Case Study of Doctrine and Rationality in the Supreme Court, 76 Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 801-831 (1985) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [79] Allen, Analyzing the Process of Proof: A Brief Rejoinder, 66 Boston University Law Review 479-486 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [80] Allen, Rationality, Mythology, and the "Acceptability of Verdicts" Thesis, 66 Boston University Law Review 541-562 (1986).
- [81] Allen, Unexplored Aspects of the Theory of the Right to Trial by Jury, 66 Washington Law Quarterly 33-45 (1988). [F.R.E. 102]
- [82] Allen, On the Significance of Batting Averages and Strikeout Totals: A Clarification of the "Naked Statistical Evidence" Debate, the Meaning of "Evidence," and the Requirement of Proof Beyond Reasonable Doubt, 65 Tulane Law Review 1093-1110 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [83] Allen, The State of Mind Necessary for a Juridical Verdict, 13 Cardozo Law Review 485-493 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [84] Allen, The Double Jeopardy Clause, Constitutional Interpretation, and the Limits of Formal Logic, 26 Valparaiso Law Review 281-310 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [85] Allen & Miller, The Common Law Theory of Experts: Deference or Education?, 87 Northwestern Law Review 1131-1147 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [86] Allen, Burdens of Proof, Uncertainty and Ambiguity in Modern Legal Discourse, 17 Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy 627-646 (1994).
- [87] Allen, Expertise and *Daubert*, 84 Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology 1157-85 (1994).

Faculty Articles

- [88] Allen & Miller, The Expert as Educator: Enhancing the Rationality of Verdicts in Child Sex Abuse Prosecutions, 1 *Psychology, Public Policy and Law* 323-338 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 414]
- [89] Allen, Rules, Logic, and Judgment, 16 *Mississippi College Law Rev.* 61-75 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [90] Allen, Probability and Proof in *State v. Skipper*, 35 *Jurimetrics* 277 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [91] Allen & Carriquiry, Factual Ambiguity and a Theory of Evidence Reconsidered: A Dialogue Between Statistician and a Law Professor, 31 *Israel L. Rev.* 464-505 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [92] Allen, Presumptions in Civil Actions Reconsidered, 66 *Iowa Law Review* 843-867 (1981) [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [93] Almeling, et al., A Statistical Analysis of Trade Secrets Litigation in State Courts, 46 *Gonz.L.Rev.* 57 (2010) [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [94] Anderson, The Psychotherapist Privilege: Privacy and “Garden Variety” Emotional Distress, 21 *Geo.Mason L.Rev.* 117 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [95] Althouse, Beyond King Solomon’s Harlots: Women in Evidence, 65 *So.Call.L.Rev.* 1265 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [96] Amar, Foreword: Sixth Amendment First Principles, 84 *Geo.L.J.* 641 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [97] Ameringer, Attorney-Client Privilege: Preserving The Confidentiality of Vidotaped Statements, 5 *J.Prod.Liab.* 23 (1982) [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [98] A.M. Panel, *Crawford, Davis* & The Right of Confrontation: Where Do We Go From Here? 19 *Regent U.L.Rev.* 499 (2006-2007).
- [99] P.M. Panel, *Crawford, Davis* & The Right of Confrontation: Where Do We Go From Here? 19 *Regent U.L.Rev.* 507 (2006-2007).
- [100] Anderson, From Chastity Requirement to Sexuality License: Sexual Consent And A New Rape Shield Law, 70 *Geo.Wash.L.Rev.* 51 (2002) [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [101] Anderson, The Priest-Penitent Privilege: A Mormon Perspective, 41 *Idaho L.Rev.* 55 (2004) [F.R.Ev. 506]

Faculty Articles

- [102] Anderson, The Freedom to Speak and The Freedom to Listen: The Admissibility of The Criminal Defendant's Taste in Entertainment, 83 Ore.L.Rev. 899 (2004) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [103] Anderson, Subsequent Remedial Conduct and Strict Liability in Tort, 56 Wis.B.Bull. 20 (June, 1983) [F.R.Ev. 407].
- [104] Anderton, The Constitutional and Erie Implications For Federal Diversity Cases of The Privilege Provisions of The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 8 Linc.L.Rev. 151 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [105] Angel, The Myth of The Battered Woman Syndrome, 24 Temp.Pol.& Civ.Rts L.Rev. 301 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [106] Angel, Criminal Law and Women Giving The Abused Woman Who Kills *A Jury of Her Peers* Who Appreciate *Trifles*, 13 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 229 (1996). [History]
- [107] Anstott, Judicial Notice and The Law's Tentative Search for Truth, 40 Akron L.Rev. 465 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [108] Appel, Advances in The Analysis of Questioned Documents, 58 Geo.L.J. 385 (1950) [F.R.Ev. 901(b)(3)]
- [109] Appellbaum, et al., Confidentiality: An Empirical Test of The Utilitarian Perspective, 12 Bull.Am.Acad.Psych.& L.109 (1984) [F.R.Ev. 504].
- [110] Arabian, The Sexual Assault Counsellor-Victim Privilege: Jurisdiction Delay Into Unclaimed Sanctuary, 27 Pepp.L.Rev. 89 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [111] Aranoff & Hirsch, Confidential Communications Between Physician and Patient in Judicial and Administrative Proceedings, 1983 Med.Tr.Tech.Q. 331 [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [112] Aronson, The Mental Health Provider Privilege in The Wake of *Jaffe v. Redmond*, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 591 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [113] Aliens, A Short History of Hearsay Reform, With Particular Reference to *Palmer v. Hoffman*, Eddie Morgan, and Jerome Frank, 28 Ind.L.Rev. 183 (1995) [F.R.Ev. 801(b)(6)]
- [114] Aliens & Meadow, Psycholinguistics and The Confession Dilemma, 56 Colum.L.Rev. 19 (1956). [Lie Detectors]
- [115] Almeling, Seven Reasons Why Trade Secrets are Increasingly Important, 25 Berk.Tech.L.J. 1091 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [116] Aranella, Foreword: O.J. Lessons, 69 So.Calif.L.Rev. 1233 (1996). [History]

Faculty Articles

[117] Arguello, The Marital Discord Exemption to Hearsay: Fact or Judicially Legislated Fiction, 46 U.Kan.L.Rev. 63 (1997) [F.R.Ev. 801(b)]

[118] Armstrong, Objections to Evidence in Jury Trials: A Multiple Review, 23 Tenn.L.Rev. 943 (1955) [F.R.Ev. 103]

[119] Aronson, The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Model for Improved Evidentiary Decision-making in Washington, 54 Wash.L.Rev. 31 (1978). [History]

[120] Arsenault, Start With The Presumption She Doesn't Want To Be Dead: Fatal Flaws in Guardianships of Individuals with Intellectual Disability, 35 Law & Ineq. 21 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[121] Asbill & Snell, Scope of Discovery Against The United States, 7 Vand.L.Rev. 582 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[122] Ashby & Kratovil, Fifth Circuit Survey: Evidence, 42 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 749 (2010). [History]

[123] Asher, Glaser & Erard, Ex Parte Interviews With Plaintiff's Treating Physician — The Offensive Use of The Physician-Patient Privilege, 67 U.Det.L.Rev. 501 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[124] Ashford & Risinger, Presumptions, Assumptions, and Due Process in Criminal Cases: A Theoretical Overview, 79 Yale L.J. 165 (1969) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[125] Appellund, Louisiana Evidence: Relevant and Material Aspects, 21 Loyola (N.O.) L.Rev. 476 (1973). [History]

[126] Aronson & McMurtrie, The Use and Misuse of High-Tech Evidence by Prosecutors: Ethical and Evidentiary Issues, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1453 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[127] Atkins, Significant Changes in Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 9 Forum 175 (1973) [History]

[128] Avery, The Child Abuse Witness: Potential for Secondary Victimization, 7 Crim.Just.J.1(1983). [F.R.Ev. 414]

[129] Avery, Prejudice v. Probative Value v. Prejudice, Philadelphia Style, 50 St.Louis U.L.J. 1147 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 403]

[130] August, The Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine in Federal Tax Controversies, 83 J.Tax. 197 (1995) [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

[131] Austern, Corporate Counsel Communications: Is Anybody Listening? 17 Bus.Law. 868 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[132] Ayer, "I Persuaded A Judge to Protect My Patient's Secret", 7 Leg.Aspects Med.Prac. 41 (1979) [F.R.Ev.504]

[133] Axelrod, The Need For An Evidentiary Privilege for The Use of Lie Detectors in Criminal Cases: Investigations at Risk, 31 So.Car.LRev. 469 (1986) [F.R.Ev. 501]

B

[1] Baade, Illegally Obtained Evidence in Criminal and Civil Cases: A Comparative Survey of A Classical Mismatch: Part I, 51 Texas L.Rev. 1325 (1973). [F.R.Ev.402]

[2] Baade, Illegally Obtained Evidence in Criminal and Civil Cases: A Comparative Survey of A Classical Mismatch: Part II, 52 Texas L.Rev. 621 (1973). [F.R.Ev.402]

[3] Bach, The Medico-Legal Aspect of Privileged Communications, 10 Medico-Leg.J. 33 (1982) [F.R.Ev. 504]

[4] Bacon, The Privilege of Self-Critical Analysis: Encouraging Recognition of The Misunderstood Privilege, 8 Kan.J.L. & Pub.Pol'y 221 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[5] Baer, Who Is The Witness to An Internet Crime?: The Confrontation Clause, Digital Forensics and Child Pornography, Santa Clara High Tech L.J. 31 (2013). [Confrontation]

[6] Bagley, Improvident Guilty Pleas and Related Statements: Inadmissible at Later Trial.6 Crim.L.Bull. 3 (1970) [F.R.Ev. 410]

[7] Bailey, The Aftermath of *Crawford* and *Davis*: Deconstructing the Sound of Silence, 2009 B.Y.U.L.Rev. 1. [Confrontation]

[8] Bailey, The Aftermath of *Crawford* and *Davis*: Domestication of The Sound of Silence, 2009 B.Y.U.L.Rev. 1.

[9] Bailey, Opinions and Expert Testimony Under Article VII of The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 46 Okla.B.J.Supp.Q. 237 (1975) [F.R.Ev. 701]

[10] Baird, The Confrontation Clause: Why *Crawford v. Washington* Does Nothing More Than Maintain the Status Quo, 47 S.Tex.L.Rev. 305 (2005). [Confrontation]

[11] Baker, Once A Rapist? Motivational Evidence and Relevancy in Rape Law, 110 Harv.L.Rev. 563 (1997) [F.R.Ev. 404]

Faculty Articles

[12] Baker, The Right to Confrontation, The Hearsay Rules, and Due Process—-A Proposal For Determining When Hearsay May Be Used in Criminal Trials, 6 Conn.L.Rev. 529 (1974).

[13] Baldwin, The Foreign Affairs Advice Privilege, 1976 Wis.L.Rev. 16. [F.R.Ev. 509]

[14] Baldwin, Confidentiality Between Physician and Patient, 22 Md.L.Rev. 181 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 504]

[15] Ball. Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege and Physician-Patient Privileges, 14 Ohio St.L.J. (1953). [503 and 504]

[16] Ball, Conduct as Hearsay, 41 L.A.Bar Bull. 558 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 801 (a)]

[17] Ball, The Moment of Truth: Probability Theory and Standards of Proof, 14 Vand.I.Rev. 807 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[18] Ball, The Myth of Conditional Relevance, 14 Ga.L.Rev. 435 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 104] (this is the approved version; a disapproved version appears at 1977 Ariz.St.L.J.295). [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]

[19] Bambauer, Secrecy is Dead—-Long Live Trade Secrets, 93 Denv.L.Rev. 833 (2016).[F.R.Ev. 508]

[20] Banes & Salerno, Emotion, Proof, and Prejudice: The Cognitive Science of Gruesome Photos and Victim Statements, 40 Ariz.St.L.J. 127 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[21] Barclays, Shielded From The Feds: An Analysis of Proposed Federal Shield Laws, 1 Fla.Ent.L.Rev. 43 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 412]

[22] Bannister, Hypnotic Influence in Criminal Cases, 51 Alb.L.J. 87 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 612]

[23] Barker, May A Law Firm Have Privileged Communications with Its Own In-House Counsel Regarding A Current Client?, 51 Tort Trial & Ins.Prac.L.J. 777 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[24] Barker, Admissibility of Investigational Reports Under Business Records Statutes, 33 Alb.L.Rev. 251 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(6)]

[25] Barker, Did Angela Davis Testify?, 37 Alb.L.Rev.1 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 601]

[26] Barker, Toward A New York Evidence Code: Some Notes on The Privileges, 19 N.Y.L.F. 191 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [27] Barker, Codification of Government Privilege in New York: Official Information and The Identity of Informers, 44 Alb.L.Rev. 279 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [28] Barker, Evidentiary Aspects of New York Criminal Procedural Law, 38 Brook.L.Rev. 307 (1971) [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [29] BarInd, Standards for Admissibility of Polygraph Results As Evidence, 16 U.W.L.A.L.Rev. 37 (1984).
- [30] Barnhart, Privileges in The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 24 Ohio St.L.J. 131 (1963) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [31] Barnes, A Common Sense Approach to Understanding Statistical Evidence, 21 San Diego L.Rev. 809 (1984) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [32] Barnhart, The Determination of Facts Preliminary to The Admission of Evidence in Arkansas Court, 2 Ark.L.Rev. 1 (1949) [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [33] Barnhart, Use of Presumptions in Arkansas, 4 Ark.L.Rev. 128 (1950) [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [34] Barron, The Rise and Fall of A Doctrine of Editorial Privilege: Reflections on *Herbert v. Lando*, 47 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1002 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [35] Bartel, Reconceptualizing The Joint Defense Doctrine, 65 Ford.L.Re. 871 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [36] Bartholomew, Death by *Daubert*: The Continued Attack on Private Antitrust, 35 Cardozo L.Rev. 2147 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [37] Barton, A Study of The Law of Trade Secrets, 13 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 507 (1989) [Rej.F/R.Ev. 508]
- [38] Bates, Psychiatric Evidence of Character, 5 Anglo-Amer.L.Rev. 99 (1976) [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [39] Bates, The Assumption of Legitimacy: A Comparative Analysis of Its Modern Operation, 12 Anglo-Amer.L.Rev. 768 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [40] Bates, The Presumption of Marriage in Canada: Its Past, Present, and Future, 17 U.West Ont.L.Rev. 169 (1978-1979). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [41] Bassett, Leppert & McCullers, Eleventh Circuit Survey: Evidence, 68 Mercer L.Rev. 1019 (2017). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [42] Bauer, Recognition of A Parent-Child Testimonial Privilege, 23 St.Lou.L.J. 676 (1989) [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [43] Bayh, Congressional Response to *Zurcher v. Stanford Daily*, 13 Ind.L.Rev. 835 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [44] Baylor, Position Paper on Proposed Rules, 37 Ins.Coun.J. 312 (1970). [History]
- [45] Bazzle, Shutting the Courthouse Doors: Invoking the State Secrets Privilege to Thwart Judicial Review in The Age of Terror, 23 Geo.Mason U.Civ.Rts.L.J. 29 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [46] Beaber, Not Guilty By Reason of Polygraph, 16 U.W.L.A.L.Rev. 27 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [47] Beale, Tax Advice Before The Return: The Case For Raising Standards and Denying Evidentiary Privilege, 25 Va.Tax.Rev. 583 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [48] Beale, Prior Similar Acts in Prosecutions For Rape and Sex Abuse, 4 Crim.L.F. 307 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [49] Beam & Whinery, Uniform Rules of Evidence, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 449 (2001). [History]
- [50] Beaver, The Newsman's Code, The Claim of Privilege, and Everyman's Right to Evidence, 47 Ore.L.Rev. 243 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [51] Becker, Insuring Reliable Fact Finding in Guidelines Sentencing: Must The Guarantees of Confrontation and Due Process Be Applied?, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 1 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [52] Becker & Orenstein, The Federal Rules of Evidence After Sixteen Years—The Effect of "Plain Meaning" Jurisprudence, The Need For An Advisory Committee on Rules of Evidence, and Suggestions For Selective Revision of The Rules, 60 Geo.Wash.L.Rev.857 (1992). [History]
- [53] Bednar, Potential Abrogation of Attorney-Client Privilege in Oklahoma As a Result of H.I.P.P.A., 57 Oklahoma.L.Rev. 813 (2004) [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [54] Beecher-Monas, Lost in Translation: Statistical Inference in Court, 46 Ariz.St.L.J. 1057 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [55] Beecher-Monas, Heuristics, Biases, and The Importance of Gatekeeping, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 987. [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

- [56] Beghtol, The Present Rule As to Disclosure of Insurance in Personal Injury Cases, 15 Neb.L.Rev. 327 (1937) [F.R.Ev. 411].
- [57] Belazis, The Government's Commercial Information Privilege: Technical Information and The F.O.I.A.'s Exemption 5, 33 Ad.L.Rev. 415 (1981) [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [58] Bell, Admissions Arising Out of Compromise—Are They Irrelevant? 31 Texas L.Rev. 239 (1953) [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [59] Belli, An Introduction to Demonstrative Evidence, 8 J.Foren.Sci. 355 (1963) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [60] Belli, Demonstrative Evidence and The Adequate Award, 22 Miss.L.J. 284 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [61] Belli, Demonstrative Evidence, 10 Wyo.L.Rev. 15 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401].
- [62] Bellin, The Case for *eHearsay*, 83 Ford.L.Rev. 1317 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [63] Bellin & Ferguson, Trial by Google: Judicial Notice in The Information Age, 108 Nw.U.L.Rev. 1137 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [64] Bellin, Applying *Crawford's* Confrontation Right in A Digital Age, 45 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 33 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [65] Bellvure, Use It And Lose It—Privileged Documents, Preparing Witnesses, and Rule 612 of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 31 Fed.B.J. 171 (1984) [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [66] Belt, Rappaport & Holden, The Pitfalls of Lie Detection in Commercial Banking, 96 Bank.L.J. 313 (1979) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [67] Belton, Burdens of Pleading and Proof in Discrimination Cases: Toward A Theory of Procedural Justice, 34 Vand.L.Rev. 1205 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [68] Benedict & Lupert, Federal Income Tax Returns—The Tension Between Government Access and Confidentiality, 64 Corn.L.Rev. 940 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [69] Benedict & O'Connor, The Need for Legislation in The Wake of *Chrysler Corporation v. Brown*, 4 Corp.L.Rev. 43 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [70] Bennett, Rape, Truth, and Hearsay, 40 Harv.J.L.& Gender 183 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [71] Bennett, After *White v. Illinois*: Fundamental Guarantees to A Hollow Right To Confront Witnesses, 40 Wayne L.Rev. 159 (1994). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [72]** Berg, The Attorney-Client Privilege: Friend or Foe? 6 *Litigation* 24 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [73]** Berger, The Ethical Limits of Discrediting The Truthful Witness: How Modern Ethical Rules Fail to Prevent Truthful Witnesses from Being Discredited by Unethical Means, 99 *Marq.L.Rev.* 283 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [74]** Berger, Science For Judges, 6 *J.L. & Pol'y* 13 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [75]** Berger, When Is Clinical Psychology Like Astrology?, 33 *Ariz.St.L.J.* 75 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [76]** Berger, Expert Clinical Testimony and Professional Ethics, 7 *J.Psych. & L.* 347 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [77]** Berger, The Attorney-Client Privilege and Corporate Clients, 47 *N.Y.St.B.J.* 274 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [78]** Berger, Commentary: The Privileges Article in The New York Proposed Code of Evidence, 47 *Brook.L.Rev.* 1405 (1981). [History]
- [79]** Berger, Federal Rules of Evidence: Defining and Refining The Goals of Codification, 12 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 255 (1984). [History]
- [80]** Berger, Shielding The Unmedia; Using The Process of Journalism to Protect The Journalist's Privilege in An Infinite Universe of Publication, 39 *Hous.L.Rev.* 1371 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 501].
- [81]** Berger, Man's Trial, Women's Tribulation: Rape Cases in The Courtroom, 77 *Colum.L.Rev.* 1 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [82]** Berger, The President, Congress, and The Courts, 83 *Yale.L.J.* 1111 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [83]** Berger, Procedural Paradigms for Applying The *Daubert* Test, 78 *Minn.L.Rev.* 1345 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [84]** Berger, Has The Privilege for Governmental Information Met Its Watergate?, 25 *CaseWes.Res.L.Rev.* 747 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [85]** Berger, Privileges, Presumptions, and Competency of Witnesses in The Federal Court: A Federal Choice-of-Law Rule, 42 *Brook.L.Rev.* 417 (1976).
- [86]** Berger & Crash, Government Immunity From Discovery, 59 *Yale L.J.* 1451 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

- [87] Bergman & Moore, Mistrial by Likelihood Ratio: Bayesian Analysis Meets The F-Word, 13 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 589 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [88] Bergman, Of Bentham, Wigmore, and Little Bo Peep: Where Evidence Lost Its Way, and A Map for Scholars to Find It, 66 *Notre Dame L.Rev.* 949 (1991). [History]
- [89] Bergman, The War Between The States (of Mind): Oral versus Textual Reasoning, 40 *Ark.L.Rev.* 505 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [90] Bergman, Ambiguity: The Hidden Hearsay Danger Almost Nobody Talks About, 75 *Ky.L.J.* 841 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [91] Bein, Parties' Admissions, Agents' Admissions: Hearsay Wolves in Sheep's Clothing, 12 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 393 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)]
- [92] Bein, Substantive Influences on The Use of Exceptions to The Hearsay Rules, 23 *B.C.L.Rev.* 855 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [93] Bein, Prior Inconsistent Statements: The Hearsay Rule, 801(d)(1)(A) and 803(24), 26 *U.C.L.A.L.Rev.* 967 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]
- [94] Berman & Reid, The Transformation of English Legal Science: From Hale to Blackstone, 45 *Emory L.J.* 437 (1996). [History]
- [95] Bernacchi & Larsen, Philosophy, Data Processing, and The Rules of Evidence, *L.A.Bar Bull.* 374 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 1001]
- [96] Bernardo, At Issue Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege in Illinois: An Exception in Need of Standards, 20 *No.Ill.L.Rev.* 553 (2010), [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [97] Bernstein, What to Do About Federal Agency Science; Some Doubts About Regulatory *Daubert*, 22 *Geo.Mason L.Rev.* 549 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [98] Bernstein & Lasker, Defending *Daubert*: It's Time to Amend Federal Rule of Evidence 702, 57 *Wm.& Mary L.Rev.* 1 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [99] Berry, Eighth Amendment Presumptions: A Constitutional Framework for Curbing Mass Incarceration, 59 *So.Calif.L.Rev.* 67 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [100] Bertelsman, That You Think You Know (But Probably Don't) About The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Little Knowledge Can Be A Dangerous Thing, 8 *N.Ky.L.Rev.* 81 (1981). [History]

Faculty Articles

[101] Best, To Be Or Not To Be Testimonial?: That is The Question: 2004 Developments in The Sixth Amendment, 2005 Army Law. 65. [Confrontation]

[102] Beuscher, The Use of Experts By The Courts, 54 Harv.LRev. 1105 (1941)
[F.R.Ev. 706]

[103] Bevier, The Journalist's Privilege—A Skeptic's View, Ohio No.L.Rev. 467 (2006).
[F.R.Ev. 501]

[104] Bezanson, *Herbert v. Lando*, Editorial Judgment, and Freedom of The Press: An Essay, 1978 U.Ill.L.F. 605. [F.R.Ev. 501]

[105] Bibas, The Limits of Textualism in Interpreting The Confrontation Clause 37 Harv.J.L.& Pub.Pol'y 737 (2014). [Confrontation]

[106] Bibliography of Legal History Articles Appearing in Law Library Journal, Vols. 1-94 (1908-2002), 95 Law Lib.J. 217 (2003). [History]

[107] Bienen, A Question of Credibility: John Henry Wigmore's Use of Scientific Authority in Section 924a of The Treatise of Evidence, 19 Cal.West.L.Rev. 235 (1983).
[F.R.Ev. 401]

[108] Bigham, Presumptions, Burden of Proof and The Uniform Commercial Code, 21 Vand.L.Rev 177 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[109] Billings, Expert Testimony to Accommodate the *Frye*, *Daubert*, and *Kumho Tire* Standards, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 613 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[110] Birch, The Criminal Justice Act 1988: Documentary Evidence, 1089 Crim.L.Rev. 15. [F.R.Ev. 901]

[111] Bishop, Evidence Rulemaking: Balancing The Separation of Powers, 43 Conn.L.Rev. 265 (2010). [F.R.E. 402]

[112] Bishop, The Executive's Right of Privacy: An Unresolved Constitutional Question, 66 Yale L.J. 477 (1957) [F.R.Ev. 509].

[113] Bishop, Impeachment and Rehabilitation of Witnesses By Character Evidence in Missouri, 20 Mo.L.Rev. 142, 273 (1955). [F.R.Ev, 608]

[114] Bishop, International Litigation in Texas: Texas Rules of Evidence and Recent Changes in Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, 36 Baylor L.Rev. 131 (1984). [History]

[115] Bjerregard, Televised Testimony As An Alternative in Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 25 Crim.L.Bull. 164 (1989) [F.R.Ev. 414]

Faculty Articles

[116] Black, A Unified Theory of Scientific Evidence, 56 Ford.I.Rev. 595 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[117] Black, The Texas Rules of Evidence—A Proposed Codification, 31 Sw.L.J. 969 (1977). [History]

[118] Black & Barton, Internal Corporate Investigations: Maintaining The Confidentiality of a Corporate Client's Communications With Investigative Counsel, 35 Bus.Law. 5 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[119] Blackmar, The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence—How Will They Affect The Trial of Cases? 27 Wash. & Lee L.Rev. 17 (1970). [History]

[120] Blackmar, The Ohio Evidence Rules: 150 Years of Heritage and Dilemma, 6 Cap.U.L.Rev. 533 (1977). [History]

[121] Blaes, Penitent Privilege Under The New Code, Kans.B.Assoc.J. 279 (1964) [F..Ev 506]

[122] Blair, Let's Say Good-Bye to Res Gestae, 33 Tulsa L.Rev. 349 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[123] Blakey, A Short Introduction to The Ohio Rules of Evidence, 10 Cap.U.L.Rev. 237 (1980). [History]

[124] Blakey, An Introduction to the Oklahoma Evidence Code: Hearsay, 14 Tulsa L.J. 635 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[125] Blakey, An Introduction to The Oklahoma Evidence Code: Relevancy, Competency, Privileges, Witnesses, Opinion, and Expert Testimony, 19 U. Tulsa L.J. 229 (1978). [History]

[126] Blasi, The Newsman's Privilege: An Empirical Study, 70 Mich.L.Rev. 229 (1971) [F.R.Ev. 501]

[127] Blavi & Vial, The Burden of Proof in International Commercial Arbitration: Are We Allowed to Adjust The Scales?, 39 Hast.Int'l & Comp.L.Rev. 41 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[128] Bleil, Evidence of Syndromes: No Need of a "Better Mousetrap". 32 So.Tex.L.Rev. 37 (1990). [FR.Ev. 401].

[129] Blinder, Understanding Psychiatric Testimony, 57 Judicature 308 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]]

Faculty Articles

- [130] Nietzel, Psychiatric Expertise In and Out of Court: A Reply to Blinder, 58 *Judicature* 39 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [131] Blinder, A Response to Nietzel, 58 *Judicature* 41 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [132] Blinka, Prior Inconsistent Statements: The Simple Virtues of The Original Federal Rule, 84 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1407 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]
- [133] Blinka, Character, Liberalism, and The Protean Culture of Evidence Law, 37 *Seattle U.L.Rev.* 87 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [134] Blinka, The Modern Trial and Evidence Law: Has the "Rambling Altercation" Become a Pedantic Joust? 47 *Georgia L. Rev.* 666 (Spring 2013). [F.R.Ev.102]
- [135] Blinka, The Daubert Standard in Wisconsin: A Primer, 84 *Wisconsin Lawyer* 14 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [136] Blinka, Why Modern Evidence Law Lacks Credibility, 58 *Buff.L.Rev.* 357 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [137] Blinka, Ethical Firewalls, Limited Admissibility and Rule 703, 76 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1229 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [138] Blinka, The Roots of the Modern Trial: Greenleaf's Testimony to the Harmony of Christianity, Science, and Law in Antebellum America, 27 *Journal of the Early Republic* 293 (Summer 2007). [History]
- [139] Blinka. Ethics, Evidence, and The Modern Adversary System, 19 *Geo.J.Leg. Ethics* 1 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [140] Blinka, Expert Testimony and The Relevancy Rule in The Age of *Daubert*. 90 *Marq.L.Rev.* 173 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [141] Blinka, Jefferson and Juries: The Problem of Law, Reason, and Politics in the New Republic, *XLVII Am. J. Legal Hist.* 35 (2005). [History]
- [142] Blinka, "This Germ of Rottenness"; Federal Trials in The New Republic. 1789-1807, 36 *Creighton L.Rev.* 135 (2003). [History]
- [143] Blinka, Trial by Jury on the Eve of Revolution: The Virginia Experience, 71 *UMKC L. Rev.* 529 (2003). [History]
- [144] Blinka, Scientific Evidence in Wisconsin After *Daubert*, 66 *Wis.Law.* 10 (Nov. 1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

- [145] Blinka, Delusion or Despair: The Concept of Limited Admissibility in The Law of Evidence, 13 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 781 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [146] Bloch, The Direction and Presentation of A "Day In The Life" Film, 53 Wis.B.Bull. 20 (Sept. 1980). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [147] Bloche, Law, Theory, and Politics: The Dilemma of Soviet Psychiatry, 11 Yale J.Int.L. 297 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [148] Block & Barton, Internal Corporate Investigations: Maintaining The Confidentiality of A Corporate Client's Communications With Investigative Counsel, 33 Bus.Law. 5 (1980).[F.R.Ev. 503]
- [149] Block & Ostapuk, Attorney-Client Privilege for Corporate Counsel. 8 Barrister 25 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [150] Bloom, The Law Office Search: An Emerging Problem and Some Suggested Solutions, 69 Geo.L.J. 1 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [151] Blum, et al., The Art of Opinion Research: A Lawyer's Appraisal of An Emerging Service, 24 U.Chi.L.Rev. 1 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [152] Blum, et al., Every Juror Wants a Story; Narrative Relevance, Third Party Guilt, and The Right to Present A Defense, 44 Am,Crim.L.Rev. 1069 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [153] Blume, Problem of Preserving Excluded Evidence in The Appellate Record, 13 Minn.L.Rev. 169 (1929) [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [154] Blumenkopf, The Motion in Limine: An Effective Procedural Device With No Material Downside Risk, 16 N.Eng.L.Rev. 171 (1980-1981). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [155] Blumenthal, Shedding Some Light on Calls for Hearsay Reform: Civil Law Hearsay Rules in Historical and Modern Perspective, 13 Pace Int'l L.Rev. 93 (2001). [History]
- [156] Bodensteiner, Indiana Rules of Evidence, 27 Ind.L.Rev. 1063 (1994).
- [157] Boder & Gunderson, A Judge's Perspective on The Presentation of Evidence in A Black Lung Hearing, 50 Tenn.L.Rev. 491 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [158] Boettcher & Tuccirne, Concerns Over Attorney-Client Communications Through E-Mail: Is The Sky Really Falling? 2002 L.Rev.Mich.St.U.-Det.C.L. 127. [Rej.F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

[159] Boeving, The Right To Be Present Before Military Commissions and Federal Courts; Protecting National Security in An Age of Classified Information, 20 Harv.J.L.& Pub.Pol'y 463 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[160] Bohlen, The Effect of Rebuttable Presumptions of Law Upon The Burden of Proof, 68 U.Pa.L.Rev. 307 (1920). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[162] Bohlman, The High Costs of Constitutional Rights in Child Abuse Cases— -Is The Price Worth Paying? 66 No.Dak.L.Rev. 579 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 414].

[163] Bohmer & Blumberg, Twice Traumatized: The Rape Victim and The Court, 58 Judicature 391 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[164] Bolen, The Blackboard Jungle of Demonstrative Evidence: View of A Defense Attorney, 48 Va.L.Rev. 913 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[165] Boller, Proof of A Defendant's Character, 64 Milit.L.Rev. 37 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 404].

[166] Bolton, Vanderstar & Baldwin, The Legislator's Shield: Speech or Debate Clause Protection Against State Interrogatories, 62 Marq.L.Rev. 351 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[167] Bonyge, Trademark Surveys and Techniques and Their Use in Litigation, 48 A.B.A.J. 329 (1962) [F.R.Ev.801]

[168] Booker & Morton, The Hearsay Rule, The St. George Plays, and The Road to The Year Twenty-Fifty, 44 Notre Dame Law. 7 (1969). [FR.Ev. 801]

[169] Bopp & Lay, The Availability of Common Law Privileges for Witnesses in Congressional Investigations, 15 Harv.J.L. & Pub.Pol'y 897 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[170] Borgida, Character Proof and The Fireside Induction, 3 Law & Hum.Behav. 189 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[171] Borgida & White, The Social Perception of Rape Victims: The Impact of Legal Reform, 2 Law & Hum.Beah. 339 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 602]

[172] Borow, The Attorney-Client Privilege and The Work Product Doctrine in The Corporate Context, 36 Bus.Law. 1863 (1981) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[173] Bortz & Bortz, "Pressing" Out The Wrinkles in Maryland's Shield Law for Journalists, 8 U.Balt.L.Rev. 461 (1979) [FREv. 501]

[174] Bottoms, The Use of A Lie Detector in Marriage Trials. 16 The Jurist 242 (1956) [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [175] Bowman, The Hawaii Rules of Evidence, 2 U.Ha.L.Rev. 431 (1980-1981) [History]
- [176] Boux & Daum, At The Intersection of Social Media and Rape Culture: How Facebook Postings, Texting, and Other Personal Communications Challenge The “Real” Rape Myth in The Criminal Justice System, 2015 U.Ill.J.L.Tech,&Pol’y 149. [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [177] Boyce & Kimball, Utah Rules of Evidence 1983, 1984 Utah L.Rev. 63. [History]
- [178] Boyce, Evidence of Other Crimes or Wrongdoing, 5 Utah B.J. 31 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 504(b)]
- [179] Boyce, Judicial Recognition of Scientific Evidence in Criminal Trials, 8 Utah L.Rev. 313 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [180] Boyce, Rule 63(a) of Uniform Rules of Evidence—-A Vector Analysis, 5 Utah L.Rev. 311 (1957) [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(c)]
- [181] Boyer, The Trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, The Law of Treason, The Trial of Treason, and The Origins of The Confrontation Clause, 74 MissL.J. 869 (2005) [Confrontation]
- [182] Boyko & Vaca, Who Knew? The Admissibility of Subsequent Remedial Measures When Defendants Are Without Knowledge of The Injuries, 38 McGorge L.Rev. 653 (2001) [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [183] Boyle, Medical Confidence—-Civil Liability for Breach, 25 No.Ire.Leg.Q. 19 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [184] Boyle, A Bar Association’s Viewpoint Regarding The Lie Detector Technique, 50 J.Crim.L. Crim. & P.S. 99 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [185] Burden, In Defense of The Privilege for Confidential Marital Communications, 39 Ala.Law. 575 (1978) [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [186] Btrachtenbach, The Privilege Against Revealing Military Secrets, 29 Wash.L.Rev. 59 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [187] Bradley, The Speech or Debate Clause: Bastion of Congressional Independence or Haven for Corruption?, 57 N.C.L.Rev. 197 (1979) [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [188] Brain & Broderick, The Derivative Relevance of Demonstrative Evidence: Charting Its Proper Evidentiary Status, 25 U.C.Davis L.Rev. 957 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [189] Brand & Palmer, Symposium on Mississippi Evidence: Relevancy and Its Limits, 48 Miss.L.J. 935 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[190] Braun, Statistics and The Law: Hypothesis Testing and Its Application to Title VII Cases, 32 *Hat.L.J.* 59 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[191] Braverman, *Chrysler Corporation v. Brown*: Protecting Business Secrets in The '80s, 4 *Corp.L.Rev.* 23 (1981) [F.R.Ev. 508]

[192] Bray, Evidence of Prior Uncharged Offenses and The Growth of Constitutional Restraints, 28 *U.Miami L.Rev.* 489 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[193] Brayley, *R. v. Phillion*,: An Intelligent Canadian Decision on The Admissibility of Polygraph Evidence? 13 *U.B.C.L.Rev.* 307 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[194] Brazil, Protecting The Confidentiality of Settlement Negotiations, 39 *Hast.L.J.* 955 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 408]

[195] Brazy, Character Evidence; Habit and Custom; Reputation as To Character, 1945 *Wis.L.Rev.* 392. [F.R.Ev. 404]

[196] Brenner, In Camera Hearings on Informant Disclosure: A Criticism, 15 *Santa Clara L.Rev.* 326 (1975) [F.R.Ev. 510]

[197] Brereton, Abrogation of The Corporate Privilege in Stockholder Suits, 15 *Prac.Law.* 24 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[198] Bresnahan & Pera, The Impact of Technological Developments on The Rules of Attorney Ethics Regarding Attorney-Client Privilege, Confidentiality, and Social Media, 7 *St. Mary's J.Leg.Mal. & Ethics* 2 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[199] Brewer, The Right of A Penitent to Release the Confessor From The Seal: Considerations in Canon Law and American Law, 54 *The Jurist* 424 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[200] Bricker, Revisiting The Crime-Fraud Exception to The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Proposal to Remedy The Disparity in Protection for Civil and Criminal Privilege Holders, 86 *Temp.L.Rev.* 149 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[201] Bridge, Presumptions and Burdens, 12 *Mod.L.Rev.* 273 (1949) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[202] Breen & Strang, The Forgotten Jurisprudential Debate: Catholic Legal Thought's Response to Legal Realism, 98 *Marq.L.Rev.* 1203 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[203] Brinton, The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence: Pointing The Way To Needed Changes in Illinois, 5 *J.Marsh.J.Prac.& Proc.* 242 (1972). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [204]** Brodin, The British Experience With Hearsay Reform: A Cautionary Tale, 84 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1417 (2016). [History]
- [205]** Brook & Nelson, The Time is Right to Amend Rule 404(b), 45 *U.Mem.L.Rev.* 149 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [206]** Britt, The Rules of Evidence—An Empirical Study in Psychology and Law, 25 *Corn.L.Q.* 556 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [207]** Broderick, The Physician as An Expert Witness—some Psychological Aspects, 34 *Notre Dame L.* (1981). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [208]** Brodsky, The “Zone of Darkness”: Special Counsel Investigations and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 8 *Sec.Reg.J.* 123 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [209]** Broder, The University of Chicago Jury Project, 38 *Neb.L.Rev.* 744 (1954). [History]
- [210]** Bronitt & McSherry, The Use and Abuse of Counselling Records in Sexual Assault Trials: Reconsidering the “Rape Shield”? 8 *Crim.L.F.* 259 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [211]** Brook, The Use of Statistical Evidence of Identification in Civil Litigation: Well-worn Hypotheticals, Real Cases, and Controversy, 29 *St.Louis L.J.* 293 (1987). [Rule 401]
- [212]** Brook, Inevitable Errors: The Preponderance of Evidence Standard in Civil Litigation, 18 *Tulsa L.J.* 79 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [213]** Brooks, A Double-Edged Sword Cuts Both Ways: How Clients of Dual Capacity Practitioners Often Lose Their Evidentiary Privileges, 35 *TexTech.L.Rev.* 1069 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [214]** Brooks, The Law Reform Commission of Canada’s Evidence Code, 16 *Osgoode H.L.J.* 241 (1971). [History]
- [215]** Brosman, Edward Livingston and Spousal Testimony in Louisiana, 11 *Tul.L.Rev.* 243 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [216]** Brosman, The Statutory Presumption, 5 *Tul.L.Rev.* 17 (1930) [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [217]** Brosnahan, Criminal Trials Under The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 22 *Prac.Law.* 27 (1976). [History]
- [218]** Brown, Daubert Objections to Public Records: Who Bears The Burden of Proof? 39 *Hous.L.Rev.* 413 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

- [219]** Brown, Authentication and Contents of Writings. 1969 Law & Soc.Order 611 [F.R.Ev.901]
- [220]** Brown & Hyman, The Scope of The Attorney-Client Privilege in Corporate Decision Making, 26 Bus.Law. 1145 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [221]** Broun, The Medical Privilege in The Federal Courts—-Should It Matter Whether Your Ego or Your Elbow Hurts, 38 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 657 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [222]** Broun, The Unfulfillable Promise of One Rule for All Presumptions, 62 No.Car.L.Rev. 697 (1984) [FR.Ev. 301]
- [223]** Broun & Capra, Getting Control of Waiver of Privilege in Federal Courts: A Proposal For a Federal Rule of Evidence 502, 58 SC.L.Rev. 211 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [224]** Brown & Reilly, Playing The Percentages and The Law of Evidence, 1970 Ill.L.F. 23. [Rule 401]
- [225]** Brown & Murphy, Through A Scanner Darkly: Functional Nueroimaging As Evidence of A Criminal Defendant's Past Mental States, 62 Stn.L.Rev. 1119 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [226]** Brushwood, Is There a Pharmacist-Patient Privilege? 12 Law, Med. & Health Care 63 (1984) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [227]** Bryans, Employed Lawyers and The Attorney-Client Privilege—-Parsing the Trade-Offs, 47 U.Tol.L.Rev. 109 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [228]** Bryan, Hypnosis And Hypnotic Techniques, 1967 Trial and Tort Trends 207. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [229]** Bryden & Lengnick, Rape in The Criminal Justice System, 87 J.Crim.L. & Crim. 1194 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [230]** Bryden & Park, "Other Crimes" Evidence in Sex Offense Cases, 78 Minn.L.Rev. 529 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [231]** Buchanan, Evidence in Workmen's Compensation Cases, 54 No.Dak.L.Rev. 171 (1977).
- [232]** Buck, Self-Incrimination in Civil Litigation: The Evolution of California's Judicially Created Immunities From *Murphy v. Waterfront Commission*, 9 Hast.Const.L.Q. 351 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 402]

Faculty Articles

- [233]** Buckley, Evidentiary and Procedural Trends in State Legislation and Other Emerging Legal Issues in Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 89 Dick.L.Rev. 645 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 414]
- [234]** Buckling, A North Dakota Commentary on The Federal Rules of Evidence, 52 No.Dak.L.Rev. 13 (1975). [History]
- [235]** Bullen, The Rule of Literary Experts in Plagiarism Cases, 7 Am.U.L.Rev. 55 (1958) [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [236]** Barack, Theory, Method, And Limitations of The Lie Detector, 46 J.Crim.L. Crim. & P.S. 414 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [237]** Burgess-Jackson, An Epistemic Approach to Legal Relevance, 18 St. Mary's L.J. 463 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [238]** Burgman, The Adoption of The Uniform Trade Secrets Act: How Uniform is Uniform? 27 Idea 73 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [239]** Burke, The Test Results Said What? The Post-*Crawford* Admissibility of Hearsay Forensic Evidence, 53 So.Dak.L.Rev. 1 (2002). [Confrontation]
- [240]** Burke, The Price of Cooperating With The Government; Possible Waiver of Attorney-Client and Work Product Privileges, 49 Baylor L.Rev. 33 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [241]** Burkey, The Case Against The Polygraph, 51 A.B.A.J. 855 (1965) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [242]** Burnham, The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Corporate Arena, 24 Bus.Law. 901 (1969).[F.R.Ev. 503]
- [243]** Burnham, Confidentiality and The Corporate Lawyer: The Attorney-Client Privilege and "Work Product" in Illinois, 56 Ill.B.J. 542 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [244]** Burnim, Massachusetts Rape Shield Law— -An Over-step in The Right Direction, 64 Mass.L.Rev.61 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [245]** Burns, Experimental Law?: Lessons From Experimental Economics on Applying Psychological Research to The Law, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 955. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [246]** Burns, Over The Counter Market Quotations: Pink, Yellow, Green, and White Sheets— -A Grey Area in The Law of Evidence, 52 Corn.L.Q. 262 (1967) [F.R.Ev. 803(17)]
- [247]** Burns, A Short Meditation on Some Remaining Issues in Evidence Law, 38 Seton Hall L.Rev. 1435 (2008).

Faculty Articles

- [248] Bernstein & Lasker, Defending Daubert: It's Time to Amend Federal Rule of Evidence 702, 57 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1 (2015) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [249] Bernstein, What to do about Federal Agency Science: Some Doubts about Regulatory Daubert, 22 George Mason L. Rev. 549 (2015) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [250] Bernstein, The Misbegotten Judicial Resistance to the Daubert Revolution, 89 Notre Dame L. Rev. 27 (2014) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [251] Bernstein, The Unfinished Daubert Revolution, Engage: Journal of the Federalist Society Practice Groups, Feb. 2009, at 35. [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [252] Bernstein, Getting to Causation in Toxic Tort Cases, 74 Brooklyn L. Rev. 51 (2008) [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [253] Bernstein, Expert Witnesses, Adversarial Bias, and the (Partial) Failure of the Daubert Revolution, 93 Iowa L. Rev. 451 (2008) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [254] Bernstein, Learning the Wrong Lessons from "An American Tragedy," 104 Mich. L. Rev. 1961 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [255] The Daubert Trilogy in the States, 44 Jurimetrics J. 351 (Spring 2004) (with Jeffrey Jackson) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [256] Bernstein, Keeping Junk Science Out of the Asbestos Litigation, 31 Pepp. L. Rev. 11 (2003) [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [257] Bernstein, Improving the Qualifications of Experts in Medical Malpractice Cases, 1 Law, Probability & Risk (2002) [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [258] Bernstein, Frye, Frye, Again: The Past, Present, and Future of the General Acceptance Test, 41 Jurimetrics J. 385 (2001) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [259] Bernstein, Foster & Huber, Assessing the Social and Legal Consequences of Scientific Ambiguity, in Cutting Green Tape: Tort Law, Bureaucracy and the Environment (Meiners & Stroup eds., Independent Institute 2000) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [260] Bernstein, The Breast Implant Fiasco, 87 Cal. L. Rev. 457 (1999) [History]
- [261] Bernstein, The Abuse of Opening Statements and Closing Arguments in Civil Litigation, Court Rev.: Journal of the American Judges' Association, Fall/Winter 1997 16.
- [262] Bernstein, Junk Science in the United States and the Commonwealth, 21 Yale J. Int'l L. 123 (1996) [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[263] Bernstein, Leading Expert Evidence: A U.S. Perspective, 3 James Cook U. L. Rev. 170 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[264] Bernstein, The Science of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology, 2 Psychology, Psychiatry & L. 75 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[265] Bernstein, The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence after Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 15 Cardozo L. Rev. 2139 (1994) [F.R.Ev. 703]

[266] Bernstein, Scientific Evidence after Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Health & Environment Digest, April 1994, at 3 [F.R.Ev. 703]

[267] Bernstein & Charrow, Scientific Evidence in the Courtroom: Admissibility and Statistical Significance after Daubert, Washington Legal Foundation (1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[268] Bernstein, From Pest Houses to AIDS Clinics: Neighbors' Irrational Fears of Treatment Centers for Contagious Diseases, 23 Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev. 1 (1990) [F.R.Ev. 602]

[269] Bernstein, Note, Out of the Fryeing Pan and into the Fire: The Expert Witness Problem in Toxic Tort Litigation, 10 Rev. Litig. 117 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[270] Bernstein, Trade Secrecy As An Instrument of National Security? Rethinking The Foundations of Economic Espionage, 41 Ariz.St.L.J. 933 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 508]

[271] Burroughs, Attorney-Client Privilege: How Far Can an Attorney Go in Protecting His Client? 23 J.Tax. 248 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[272] Burt, The Missouri Law of Marital Communications: Inconsistency Between Property and Divorce Cases, 1 St.Louis U.L.J. 117 (1950).[F.R.Ev. 505]

[273] Burtzos, Effective Use of Judicial Notice, 32 Colo.Law. 47 (2003) [F.R.Ev. 201]

[274] Busching, Rethinking Strategies for Prosecution of Domestic Violence in Wake of *Crawford*, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 391 (2003). [Confrontation]

[275] Bush, Criminal Convictions As Evidence in Civil Proceedings, 29 Miss.L.J. 276 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 410]

[276] Butler, Records and Proceedings of Hospital Committee's Privileged Against Discovery, 28 So.Tex.L.Rev. 97 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[277] Butler, Hospital Peer Review Committees; Privileges of Confidentiality and Immunity, 23 So.Tex.L.Rev. 95 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

[278] Birdseye, Degrees of Secondary Evidence, 6 Wash.L.Rev. 21 (1931).
[F.R.Ev. 1004]

C

[1] Cades, The Power of The Courts to Protect Journalists Confidential Sources of Information: An Examination of Proposed Shield Legislation, 11 Haw.B.J. 35 (1984).
[F.R.Ev. 501]

[2] Cady, Objections to Demonstrative Evidence, 32 Mo.L.Rev. 333 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[3] Call, Polygraph Regulations: A Trend Toward Tougher Standards, 11 Emp.Rel.L.J. 585 (1986) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[4] Callahan, Historical Inquiry Into The Priest-Penitent Privilege, 36 The Jurist 328 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[5] Callahan & Ferguson, Evidence and The New Rules of Federal Procedure (Part I), 45 Yale L.J. 562 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[6] Caldwell & Frost, Pricking Boils and Other Lessons Not Learned on Law & Order: Mitigating and Overcoming Negative Evidence at Trial, 30 AmJ.Trial Advoc. 27 (2006)
[F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Callen, Rationality and Relevancy: Conditional Relevancy and Constrained Resources, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1243. [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]

[8] Callen & David, Professional Responsibility and The Duty of Confidentiality: Disclosure of Client Misconduct in An Adversary System, 29 Rutgers L.R.Rev. 332 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[9] Callen, Cognition and Hearsay: A Response to Professor Friedman, 49 Hast.L.J. 599 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[10] Calvert, And You Call Yourself A Journalist? Wrestling With a Definition of "Journalist" in The Law, 103 Dick.L.Rev. 441 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[11] Canndo & Korn, Proposal For Codification of The New York Law of Evidence, 45 N.Y.St.B.J. 527 (1973) [History]

[12] Calo, Joint Trials, Spillover Prejudice, and The Ineffectiveness of A Bare Limiting Instruction, 9 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 21 (1985) [F.R.Ev. 105]

[13] Cammack, Admissibility of Evidence To Prove Undisputed Facts. 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 879 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [14] Capra, Prior Statements of Testifying Witnesses: Drafting Choices to Eliminate or Loosen The Strictures of The Hearsay Rule, 84 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1429 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)]
- [15] Caperton & McGee, Background, Scope, and Applicability of The Texas Rules of Evidence, 20 *Hous.L.Rev.* 49 (1983). [History]
- [16] Capowski, An Interdisciplinary Analysis of Statements to Mental Health Professionals Under The Diagnosis or Treatment Exception to The Hearsay Rule, 33 *Ga.L.Rev.* 353 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 803((a)(4)]
- [17] Capowski, Statements Against Interest, Reliability, and The Constitution, 28 *Seton H.L.Rev.* 471 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(3)].
- [18] Cappelletti & Golden, Crown Privilege and Executive Privilege: A British Response to An American Controversy, 25 *Stan.L.Rev.* 876 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [19] Capra, Memorandum: Hearsay Exception for Electronic Communications of Recent Perception, 83 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1337 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]
- [20] Capra, Amending The Hearsay Rule for Declarations Against Penal Interest in The Wake of *Crawford*, 105 *Colum.L.Rev.* 2409 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(3)]
- [21] Capra, The Attorney-Client Privilege in Common Representations: Information-Pooling and Professional Responsibility, 33 *Tr.Law.Guide.* 20 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [22] Capra, Expanding (or Just Fixing) the Residual Exception to the Hearsay Rule, 85 *Fordham Law Review* 1577 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [23] Capra, Authenticating Digital Evidence, 69 *Baylor L.Rev.* 1 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [24] Capra, Prior Statements of Testifying Witnesses: Drafting Choices to Eliminate or Loosen the Strictures of the Hearsay Rule, 84 *Fordham Law Review* 1429 (2016) [F.R.Ev. 801(d)]
- [25] Capra & Tartakovsky, Autopsy Reports and the Confrontation Clause: A Presumption of Admissibility, 99 *Judicature* 61 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [26] Capra, Electronically Stored Information and the Ancient Documents Exception to the Hearsay Rule: Fix it Before Someone Finds Out About It," 17 *Yale J. Law & Tech.* 1 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 803(16)]
- [27] Capra, Hearsay Exception for Electronic Communications of Recent Perception, 83 *Fordham Law Review* 1337 (2014). [F.E.Ev. 803(1)]

Faculty Articles

- [28] Capra, Symposium on Reinvigorating the Federal Rules of Evidence, 81 Fordham L. Rev. 1533 (2013).
- [29] Capra, Symposium on Restyled Rule of Evidence, 53 William and Mary L. Rev. 1435, 1528-43 (2012).
- [30] Capra, The Restyled Federal Rules of Evidence, 2011 LexisNexis Emerging Issues 5875.
- [31] Capra & Saltzburg, Expert Testimony and Confrontation: Bullcoming v. New Mexico, 2011 Lexis Emerging Issues 5495. [Confrontation]
- [32] Capra & Saltzburg, "The Unrecognized Right of Criminal Defendants to Admit Their Own Pretrial Statements," 49 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1991 2008) [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(A)]
- [33] Capra, "Amending the Hearsay Exceptions for Declarations Against Penal Interest in the Wake of Crawford" 105 Columbia L. Rev. 2409 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(3)]
- [34] Capra & Broun, "Getting Control of Waiver in the Federal Courts: A Proposal for a Federal Rule of Evidence 502" 58 South Carolina L. Rev. 211 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [35] Capra, "A Recipe for Confusion: Congress and the Federal Rules of Evidence," 55 U. Miami L. Rev. 691 (2001). [History]
- [36] Capra, "Admissibility of Plea Agreements on Direct Examination: The Limits Vanish," 55 U. Miami L. Rev. 751 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [37] Capra, "Out of Court Accusations Offered For 'Background': A Measured Response From the Federal Courts," 55 U. Miami L. Rev. 803 (2001). [Confrontation]
- [38] Capra, "The Daubert Puzzle," 32 Georgia Law Review 699 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [39] Capra, "Advisory Committee Notes to the Federal Rules of Evidence That May Require Clarification," 182 F.R.D. 268 (1998). [History]
- [40] Caraway & Currie, Privileges, 48 Miss.L.J. 989 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [41] Carey, Charles Laughton, Marlene Dietrich, and The Prior Inconsistent Statement, 30 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 433 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)]
- [42] Carlson, Navigating the Nuances of Modern Expert Witness Law: How to Teach About Experts, 50 St.Louis U.L.J. 1115 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [43] Carlson, Collision Course in Expert Testimony: Limitations on Affirmative Introduction of Underlying Data, 36 U.Fla.L.Rev. 234 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

[44] Carlson, Argument to The Jury and The Constitutional Right to Confrontation, 9 *Crim.L.Bull.* 293 (1973). [Confrontation]

[45] Carlson, Cross-Examination of The Accused, 52 *Corn.L.Q.* 705 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 611(b)]

[46] Carodine, Contemporary Issues in Critical Race Theory: The Implications of Race As Character Evidence in Recent High Profile Cases, 75 *U.Pitt.L.Rev.* 679 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[47] Carper & McCamney, Gaze Nystagmus: Scientific Proof of DUI? 77 *Ill.B.J.* 198 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[48] Carr, The Proposed Missouri Evidence Code, 29 *Tex.L.Rev.* 627 (1951). [History]

[49] Carroll, Attorney May Be Able to Testify About Will He Prepared Despite Attorney-Client Privilege, 8 *Estate Planning* 34 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[50] Carrington & Jones, Reluctant Experts, 29 *L.&Contemp.Prob.* 51 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[51] Carrow, Governmental Nondisclosure in Judicial Proceedings, 107 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 166 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[52] Carson, Privilege and Work-Product Rule in Corporate Law Departments, 14 *Bus.Law.* 771 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[53] Carstensen, The *Philadelphia National Bank* Presumption: Merger Analysis in An Uncertain World, 80 *Antitrust L.J.* 219 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[54] Carter, "Trust Me, I'm a Judge": Why Binding Judicial Notice of Jurisdictional Facts Violates the Right to Jury Trial, 68 *Mo.L.Rev.* 649 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[55] Carter, Forbidden Reasoning Permissible: Similar Fact Evidence a Decade After *Boardman*, 48 *Mod.L.Rev.* 329 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[56] Carter, The Journalist, His Informant and Testimonial Privilege, 35 *N.Y.U.L.Rev.* 1111 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[57] Cartoland & Dennison, The *Hustler* Trial, Two Opinions on The Use of Comparative Evidence in Determining Community Standards in Obscenity Litigation, 4 *No.Ky.L.Rev.* 195 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 401].

[58] Carver, Subsequent Remedial Measures 2000 and Beyond, 27 *Wm.Mitch.L.Rev.* 583 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 407]

Faculty Articles

- [59]** Cassidy, Sharing Sacred Secrets: Is It (Paste) Time For a Dangerous Patient Exception to The Clergy-Penitent Privileged, 44 Wm. & Mary L.Rev. 1627 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [60]** Cassidy, Reconsidering Spousal Privileges After *Crawford*, 33 Am.J.Crim.L. 339 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [61]** Castiglione, A Structuralist Critique of The Journalist Privilege, 23 J.L.& Pol'y 115 (2007). [F.R.Ev.501]
- [62]** Catton, Evidence Regarding The Prior Sexual History of An Rape Victim—Its Effect on The Perceived Guilt of The Accused, 33 U.Toronto L.Rev. 165 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [63]** Catz & Lange, Judicial Privilege, 22 Ga.L.Rev. 89 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [64]** Caulfield, The New Oregon Sexual Offenses Evidence Law: An Evaluation, 55 Ore.L.Rev. 493 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 412].
- [65]** Cavanagh, “A Little Dearer Than His Horse”: Legal Stereotypes and The Feminine Personality, 6 Harv.Civ.Rts.-Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 260 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [66]** Cavoukian & Heslegrave, The Admissibility of Polygraph Evidence in Court: Some Empirical Findings, 4 Law & Hum.Behav. 113 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [67]** Cella, The Doctrine of Legislative Freedom of Speech and Debate, Its Past, Present, and Future As a Bar To Criminal Prosecutions in The Courts, 2 Suff.U.L.Rev. 1 (1968).[F.R.Ev. 509]
- [68]** Chadbourn, Bentham and The Hearsay Rule—A Benthamite View of Rule 63(4)(i) of The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 75 Harv.L.Rev. 932 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(2)]
- [69]** Chadburne, The Uniform Rules and The California Law of Evidence, 2 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 1 (1954). [History]
- [70]** Chafee, Privileged Communications: Is Justice Served or Obstructed by Closing The Doctor’s Mouth on The Witness Stand? 52 Yale L.J. 607 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [71]** Chafee, The Progress of The Law, 1919-1921: Evidence, 35 Harv.L.Rev. 302, 428, 673 (1922). [History]
- [72]** Challenger, The Doctor-Patient Relationship and The Right of Privacy, 11 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 624 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 504]

Faculty Articles

- [73]** Chamberlain, Legislative Correction in Criminal Procedure, 13 A.B.A.J. 703 (1927). [F.R.Rv. 303]
- [74]** Chamberlain, Presumptions As First Aid to The District Attorney, 14 A.B.A.J. 287 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [75]** Chambers & McInness, Priests, Penitents, and The Privilege: *R. v. Church of Scientology of Toronto and Zaharia*, 45 The Advocate 855 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [76]** Chambliss, The Scope of In-Firm Privilege, 80 Notre Dame L.Rev. 1721 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [77]** Chappell, Forcible Rape and The Criminal Justice System, 22 Crime & Delinq. 125 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [78]** Charles, Rule 706: An Underutilized Tool to Be Used When Partisan Experts Become “Hired Guns”, 60 Vill.L.Rev. 941 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [79]** Charrow & Smith, A Conversation About “A Conversation About *Collins*” 64 Geo.L.J. 669 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [80]** Chase, The Five Faces of The Confrontation Clause, 40 Hous.L.Rev. 1003 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [81]** Chase, Is *Crawford* a “Get Out of Jail Free” Card for Batterers and Abusers? An Argument for A Narrow Definition of “Testimonial.”, 84 Ore.L.Rev. 1093 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [82]** Chase, The Premature Demise of Irrebuttable Presumptions, 47 Colo.L.Rev. 653 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [83]** Chasse, Exclusion of Certain Circumstantial Evidence: Character and Other Exclusionary Rules, 18 Osgoode H.L.J. 445 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [84]** Cheesbro, Galileo’s Retort: Peter Huber’s Junk Scholarship, 42 Am.U.L.Rev. 1637 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [85]** Chow, Navigating the Minefield of Trade Secret Protection in China, 47 Vand.J.Transn’l.L. 1007 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [86]** Cino, Tackling Technical Debt: Managing Advances in DNA Technology That Outpace the Evolution of Law, 56 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 373 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [87]** Clyne & Conser, Attorney-Client Privilege and The Admiralty Practitioner in The Twenty-First Century, 89 Tul.L.Rev. 1179 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [88] Coale, Five Years after *Mohawk*: Interlocutory Review of Key Pre-trial Rulings, 34 *Rev.Litig.* 1 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [89] Colquitt, Evidence and Ethics: Litigating in The Shadows of The Rules, 76 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1641 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [90] Correll, The Troubling Ambition of Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), 77 *Mo.L.Rev.* 1031 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 502(d)]
- [91] Cook, Detection and Correction of Case Publication Bias, ____ *J.Leg.Stud.* ____ (2018). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [92] Cook & Pardo, Accuracy, Optimality, and The Preponderance Standard, 14 *L.Prob.& Risk* 193 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [93] Cook, Reconceptualizing the Burden of Proof, 122 *Yale L.J.* 1254 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [94] Cook, When 10 Trials Are Better Than 1000: An Evidentiary Perspective on Trial Sampling, 160 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 955 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [95] Cook, Independent Judicial Research in The *Daubert* Age, 56 *Duke L.J.* 1263 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [96] Cook, Same Old, Same Old: Scientific Evidence Past and Present, 104 *Mich.L.Rev.* 1387 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [97] Cook & Yoon, Does *Frye* or *Daubert* Matter?: A Study of Scientific Admissibility Standards, 91 *Va.L.Rev.* 471 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [98] Cook, Changing Scientific Evidence, 88 *Minn.L.Rev.* 315 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [99] Cook & Ginther, Surprise vs. Probability as a Metric for Proof, 48 *Seton H.L.Rev.* ____ (2018). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [100] Cook, Forensics, Chicken Soup, and Meteorites: A Tribute to Michael Risinger, 48 *Seton H.L.Rev.* ____ (2018). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [101] Cook, The Burden of Proof and The Presentation of Forensic Evidence, 130 *Harv.L.Rev.F.* (2017). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [102] Cook & Nunn, DNA, Blue Bus, and Phase Changes, 20 *Int'l J.Evid.&Proof* 112 (2016).[F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [103] Cook, A Bayesian Look at the Baby Annie Case, 29 *Chance* 27 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [104] Cook, Fighting Legal Innumeracy, 17 *Green Bag 2d* 271 (2014).
- [105] Cook, Being Pragmatic About Forensic Linguistics, 21 *J.L. & Pol'y* 541 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [106] Cook, Erie and The Rules of Evidence, 65 *Vand.L.Rev. En Banc* 231 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [107] Cook, Scientific Evidence as Foreign Law, 75 *Brook.L.Rev.* 1095 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [108] Cook, Law Statistics, and the Reference Class Problem, 109 *Colum.L.Rev. Sidebar* 92 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [109] Cook, Response: Are Proffers of Inadmissible Evidence Wrongful?. 7 *Int'l Comment.Evid.* (2009). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [110] Cook, The Perils of Evidentiary Manipulation, 93 *Va.L.Rev.* 191 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [111] Cook, Should Judges Do Independent Research on Scientific Issues? 90 *Judicature* 58 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [112] Cook, Reenvisioning Law Through the DNA Lens, 60 *N.Y.U.Ann.Surv.Am.L.* 649 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [113] Cook, Mitochondrial DNA: Emerging Legal Issues, 13 *J.L. & Pol'y* 99 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [114] Chandler, The Reliability and Admissibility of Fingerprint and Bitemark Analyses, 32 *Buff.Pub.Int.L.J.* 41 (2013-2014). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [115] Champagne, Shuman & Whitaker, An Empirical Examination of The Use of Expert Witnesses in American Courts, 31 *Jurimetrics* 375 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [116] Charles, Rule 706: An Underutilized Tool to Be Used When Partisan Experts Become Hired Guns, 60 *Vill.L.Rev.* 941 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [117] Cheng, Changing Scientific Evidence, 88 *Minn.L.Rev.* 315 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [118] Cheng & Yoon, Does *Frye* or *Daubert* Matter? A Study of Scientific Admissibility Standards, 91 *Valpo.L.Rev.* 471 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

- [119] Cheslock, Rampant Confusion: Waiver of Attorney-Client Privilege . . . When Asserting An Advice of Counsel Defense to Willful Infringement, 10 Tul.J.Tech. & Intell.Prop. 111 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [120] Chesney, State Secrets and The Limits of National Security Litigation, 75 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1249 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [121] Chesnutt, The Admissibility of Other Crimes in Texas, 50 Texas L.Rev. 1409 (1972} [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [122] Chester, Systemic Change and Local Reform: Two Views of The Future of Canadian Evidence Law, 16 Osgoode H.L.J. 213 (1978). [History]
- [123] Ching, Would Jesus Kill Hitler?: Bonhoeffer, Church, and State, 11 Geo.J.L.& Pub.Pol'y 529 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [124] Christie & Pye, Presumptions and Assumptions in The Criminal Law: Another View, 1970 Duke L.J. 919. [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [125] Christie, An Essay on Discretion, 1986 Duke L.J. 747. [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [126] ChristoForou, Protection of Legal Privilege in E.E.C. Competition Law: The Imperfections of A Case, 9 Ford.Int.L.J. 1 (1985-1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [127] Cicchini, Judicial (In)Discretion: The Confrontation Clause Under *Crawford* and *Davis*, 75 Tenn.L.Rev. 753 (2008). [Confrontation]
- [128] Cicchinii & Rust, Confrontation After *Crawford v. Washington*: Defining "Testimonial". 10 Lewis & Clark L.Rev. 531 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [129] Citron, The Nuremberg Trials and American Jurisprudence: The Decline of Legal Realism, The Revival of Natural Law and The Development of Legal Process Theory, 2006 Mich.St.L.Rev. 385. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [130] Clapp, The Uniform Rules: Privilege Against Self-Incrimination, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 541 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [131] Chin, "A Chinaman's Chance" in Court: Asian Pacific Americans and Racial Rules of Evidence, 3 U.C.Irv.L.Rev. 965 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [132] Churchwell, The Constitutional Right to Present Evidence: Progeny of *Chambers v. Mississippi*, 19 Crim.L.Bull. 131 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 402]

Faculty Articles

- [133] Clapperton, Privilege on Discovery of Documents, 4 Can.B.Rev. 683 (1926). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [134] Clark, To Thine Own Self Be True: Enforcing Candor in Pleading Through Party Admissions Doctrine, 49 Hast.L.J. 565 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(A)]
- [135] Clark, The Last Word on The Last Word, 32 Mod.L.Rev. 142 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [136] Clark, Idaho Rule of Evidence: Their Effect on Idaho Evidence Law, 22 Idaho L.Rev. 1 (1985-1986). [History]
- [137] Clarke, The Changing Face of The Rule Against Hearsay in English Law, 21 Akron L.Rev. 67 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [138] Clarke, Statutory and Common Law Presumptions in Montana, 37 Mont.L.Rev. 91 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [140] Cleary, What's Wrong With The Rules of Evidence? 15 Ark.L.Rev. 11 (1960). [History]
- [141] Cleary, Evidence As a Problem of Communication, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 277 (1952) [History]
- [142] Cleary, Presuming and Pleading: An Essay on Juristic Immaturity, 12 Stan.L.Rev. 5 (1959). [History]
- [143] Cleary & Strong, The Best Evidence Rule: An Evaluation in Context, 51 Iowa L.Rev. 825 (1966) [F.R.Ev. 1001]
- [144] Cleary, Preliminary Notes on Reading The Rules of Evidence, 57 Neb.L.Rev. 908 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [145] Cleckley, A Modest Proposal: A Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege for West Virginia, 93 W.Va.L.Rev. 1 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [146] Clendenning, Expert Testimony, 9 Crim.L.Q. 415 (1967) [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [147] Clinton, The Right to Present A Defense: An Emergent Constitutional Guaranty in Criminal Trials, 9 Ind.L.Rev. 713 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [148] Coale, Five Years After *Mohawk*: Interlocutory Review of Key Pretrial Rulings, 34 Rev.Litig. 1 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [149] Coburn, Child-Parent Communications: Spare The Privilege and Spoil The Child, 74 Dick.L.Rev. 599 (1970) [F.R.Ev. 505]

Faculty Articles

- [150] Cohen, Accountants' Workpapers in Federal Tax Investigations, 21 Tax L.Rev. 183 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [151] Cohen, The Attorney-Client Privilege, Ethical Rules, and The Impaired Criminal Defendant, 52 U. Miami L.Rev. 529 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [152] Cohen, Impeachment of A Defendant-Witness By Prior Conviction, 6 Crim.L.Bull. 44 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [153] Cohen, Confidence in Probability: Burdens of Persuasion in A World of Imperfect Knowledge, 60 N.Y.U.L.Rev. 385 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [154] Cohn, The Evisceration of The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Wake of September 11, 2001, 71 Ford.L.Rev. 1223 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [155] Cohn, On The Use of Statistics in Employment Discrimination Cases, 55 Ind.L.Rev. 493 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [156] Colb, "Whodunnit" v. "What Was Done": When To Admit Character Evidence in Criminal Cases, 74 N.C.L.Rev. 939 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [157] Colbert, The Motion in Limine in Politically Sensitive Cases: Silencing The Defendant at Trial, 39 Stan.L.Rev. 1271 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [158] Cole, The Prevalence and Potential Causes of Wrongful Convictions by Fingerprint Evidence, 37 Golden Gate U.L.Rev. 39 (2006). [Rule 401]
- [159] Cole, Reviving The Nixon Doctrine: NSA Spying, The Commander-in-Chief, and Executive Power in The War on Terror, 13 Wash.& Lee J.Civ.Rts.& Soc.Just. 17 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [160] Cole, Does "Yes" Mean Yes? The Attempt To Close Debate on The Admissibility of Fingerprint Evidence, 45 Jurimetrics J. 449 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [161] Cole, Is Fingerprint Identification Evidence Valid? Rhetorics of Reliability in Fingerprint Proponents' Discourse, 28 Law & Pol'y 109 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [162] Cole, Revoking Our Privileges: Federal Law Enforcement's Multi-Front Assault on The Attorney-Client Privilege (And Why It is Misguided), 48 Vill.L.Rev. 469 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [163] Cole, Bad Acts Under Rule 404(b), 14 Litigation 8 (Spring 1988). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

Faculty Articles

- [164] Cole & Harold, On The Road to Recognition: Extending The Attorney-Client Privilege in Arkansas to Insured-Insurer Communications, 60 Ark.L.Rev. 407 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [165] Coleman, “Shrinking” The Clergy Exemption to Florida’s Mandatory Child Abuse Reporting Statute, 12 Nova L.Rev. 115 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [166] Collier, Waiver of Physician’s Incompetency to Testify, 77 Cent.L.J. 264 (1913). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [167] Collins & Halaby, Of Purposes Not Prohibited: New Federal Rule of Evidence 408(B), 40 Creighton L.Rev. 679 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [168] Collins, The Power of Congressional Committees of Investigation to Obtain Information From The Executive Branch, 39 Geo.L.J. 563 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [169] Comparet-Cassini, *Crawford* and The Forfeiture by Wrongdoing Exception, 42 San Diego L.Rev. 1185 (2005) [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(6)]
- [170] Comparet-Cassini, Balancing The Anonymity of Threatened Witnesses Versus A Defendant’s Right of Confrontation: The Waiver Doctrine After *Alvarado*, 39 San Diego L.Rev. 1165 (2002). [Confrontation]
- [171] Conklin, Production or Privilege: Income Tax Returns and The Federal Rules, 26 Trial Law. Guide 1 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [172] Conlon & O’Connor, Evidence: Recent Developments in The Seventh Circuit, 58 Chi.-Kent L.Rev. 417 (1982). [History]
- [173] Connelly, Secrets and Smokescreens: A Legal and Economic Analysis of Government Disclosures of Business Data, 1981 Wis.L.Rev. 207. [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [174] Connery & Levy, Computer Evidence in Federal Courts, 84 Comm’l L.Rev. 266 (1979). [F.R.E. 803(6)]
- [175] Connor, The Qualification of Defendant’s Spouse As a Witness in Criminal Cases, 9 Notre Dame Law. 272 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [176] Conrad, Mental Examination of Witnesses, 11 Syr.L.Rev.149 (1960) [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [177] Conrad, Psychiatric Lie Detection: The Federal Courts Break With Tradition, 21 F.R.D. 199 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [178] Conrad, Let’s Weigh Rule 43(a), 38 Va.L.Rev. 985 (1952). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [179] Cook, Speed Calculations and The Expert Witness, 42 Neb.L.Rev. 100 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [180] Cooper, Arson—-Relevancy of Prior Claims, 51 Ins.Coun.J. 178 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [181] Cooper, Judicial Notice in The Law of Illinois, 12 Ill.L.Rev. 260 (1917). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [182] Cooper, The Procedural Effect of A Rebuttable Presumption of Law, 23 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 685 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [183] Cooper, The Doctrine of Completeness—-A Sometimes Too Handy Tool, 14 Ala.L.Rev. 273 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 106]
- [184] Coote, “Without Prejudice” Communications—-Another Red Light for Practitioners, 1979 N.Z.L.Rev. 87. [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [185] Copeland, Preserving The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege, 78 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 1199 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [186] Corboy, Use of Written Authorities in Cross-Examination of Expert Witnesses, 10 Trial L. Guide 57 (1966) [F.R.Ev. 705]
- [187] Corcoran et.al., Absence of Privileged Communications and Its Impact on Air Force Officers, 19 A.F.L.Rev.51 (1977) [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [188] Cordray, Evidence Rule 806 and The Problem of Impeaching the Nontestifying Declarant, 56 Ohio St.L.J. 495 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 806]
- [189] Corley, Button, & Gamble, Evidence as To The Wealth or Poverty of Civil Litigants: The General Exclusionary Rule and Its Exceptions, 41 Ala.L.Rev. 493 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [190] Costello & Weinberger, The Subsequent Repair Doctrine and Products Liability, 51 N.Y.St.B.J. 463 (1979) [F.R.Ev. 407}
- [191] Counselor & Rickett, The Confrontation Clause After *Crawford v. Washington*: Smaller Mouth, Bigger Teeth, 57 Baylor L.Rev. 1 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [192] Cowan, Decision Theory in The Law, Science, and Technology, 17 Rutgers L.Rev. 699 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [193] Cowen, The Admissibility of Criminal Convictions in Subsequent Civil Litigation, 40 Calif.L.Rev. 225 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 603(22)]

Faculty Articles

[194] Cowen, The Entrapment Doctrine in Federal Courts and Some State Court Comparisons, 49 J.Crim.Law, Crim. & P.S. 447 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[195] Cox, Executive Privilege, 122 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1383 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[196] Cox, Watergate and The U.S. Constitution, 2 Brit.J. Law & Soc. 1 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[197] Cox, The Doctor in Court, 7 Tex.B.J. 141 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[198] Crabb, Child Victim, Adult Plaintiff; How Kansas Attorney-Client Privilege Law Can Help Teens and Their Parents, 18 Kan.L.& Pub.Pol'y, 73 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[199] Crabb, Judicially Compelled Disclosure or Researchers' Data: A Judge's Perspective, 59 L.& Contemp.Prob. 9 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[200] Crisman & Matthews, Limited Waiver of Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine in Internal Corporate Investigations: An Emerging Self-Evaluative Privilege, 21 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 123 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[201] Croof, From The Civil War to The War on Terror: The Evolution and Application of The State Secret Privilege, 72 Alb.L.Rev.57 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[202] Cronin, Do Statements Against Interests Exist: A Critique of The Reliability of Federal Rule of Evidence 804(ii)(3) and A Proposed Reformulation, 33 Seton H.L.Rev. 1 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 804(ii)(3)].

[203] Cross, Discretion and The Law of Evidence: When Comes to the "Forensic Crunch", 30 No.Ire.L.Q. 209 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[204] Cross, Some Proposals for Reform of The Law of Evidence, 24 Mod.L.Rev. 32 (1961). [History]

[205] Cross, Fourth Time Luck—-Similar Fact Evidence in The House of Lords, 1975 Crim.L.Rev. 62. [Fed.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[206] Cross, Privileged Communications Between Participants in Group Psychotherapy, 1970 Law & Soc.Ord. 191. [F.R.Ev. 504]

[207] Crouter, Development of The Attorney-Client Privilege in Tax Cases, 50 L.A.Bar Bull. 16 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[208] Crowley, Applicability of The Informer's Privilege in Anti-Surveillance Cases, 55 Det.J.Urb.L. 1063 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 510]

Faculty Articles

- [209] Crowley, Illinois Evidence—The Question of Codification, 14 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 193 (1979). [History]
- [210] Crowley, Modernizing and Urbanizing The Law of Evidence, 57 Chi-Kent L.Rev. 191 (1981). [History]
- [211] Crump, An Edifice of Misshapen Stones, Interpreting Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b), 43 Hofstra L.Rev. 667 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [212] Crump, The Trouble With *Daubert-Kumho*: Reconsidering The Supreme Court's Philosophy of Science, 68 Mo.L.Rev. 1 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [213] Crump, Evidence, Economics, and Ethics: What Information Should Jurors Be Given to Determine The Amount of Punitive Damages? 57 Md.L.Rev. 174 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [214] Crump, On The Uses of Irrelevant Evidence, 34 Hous.L.Rev. 6 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [215] Crump, How Should We Treat Character Evidence Offered to Prove Conduct?, 58 U.Colo.L.Rev. 219 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [216] Culvahouse, Has Attorney-Client Privilege Departed The White House?, 63 N.Y.U.Ann.Surv.Am.L. 139 (2007)[F.R.Ev. 503]
- [217] Cummings, Globalization and The Evisceration of The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege: A Re-Examination of the Privilege and A Proposal for Harmonization, 75 Tenn.L.Rev. 323 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [218] Cummings, Some Aspects of Trade Secrets and Their Protection: The Public Domain and The "Unified Description" Requirement, 54 Ky.L.J. 190 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [219] Curcio, Rule 412 Laid Bare: A Procedural Rule That Cannot Adequately Protect Sexual Harassment Plaintiffs From Embarrassing Exposure, 67 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 125 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [220] Curd, Privileged Communications Between The Doctor and His Patient—An Analysis of The Law, 44 West.Va.L.Q. 165 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [221] Cureton, A Consensus As To The Validity of Polygraph Procedures, 22 Tenn.L.Rev. 728 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [222] Curley, Reputation of A Witness for Truth and Veracity in Civil and Criminal Cases, 46 Marq.L.Rev. 353 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 608]

Faculty Articles

[223] Curran, Expert Psychiatric Evidence of Personality Traits, 103 U.Pa.L.Rev. 999 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 405]

[224] Currie, Appellate Court's Use of Facts Outside of The Record By Resort to Judicial Notice and Independent Investigation, 1960 Wis.L.Rev. 39. [F.R.Ev. 201]

[215] Curtis & Wilson, The Use of Statistics and Statisticians in The Litigation Process, 20 Jurimetrics J. 109 (1979) [F.R.Ev. 401]

D

[1] Dabrowsky, The Polygraph Revisited: An Argument For Admissibility, 6 Crim.L.Bull. 63 (1970) [F.R.Ev. 401].

[2] D'Alemberte, Journalists Under The Axe: Protection of Confidential Sources of Information 6 Harv.J.Legis. 307 (1969) [F.R.Ev. 501]

[3] Dale & Gould, Science, Mental Health Consultants, and Attorney Expert Relationships in Child Custody, 48 Fam.L.Q. 1 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[4] Dale & Dale, Full Court Press: The Imperial Judiciary vs. The Paranoid Press, 7 Pepp.L.Rev. 241 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 501]

[5] Dalton, The Priest-Penitent Privilege v. Child Abuse Reporting Statutes: How to Avoid The Conflict and Serve Society, 18 Widener L.Rev. 1 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[6] Damitrovich, Fulfilling *Daubert's* Gatekeeping Mandate Through Court-Appointed Experts, 106 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 35 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[7] Davenport, The Confrontation Clause and The Co-Conspirator Exception in Criminal Prosecutions: A Functional Analysis, 85 Harv.L.Rev. 1378 (1972). [Confrontation]

[8] Davidovitch, Why Rule 37(e) Does Not Create a New Safe Harbor for Electronic Evidence Spoliation, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 1131 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[9] Davidson, Refreshing The Memory of a Witness Through Hypnosis, 5 U.C.L.A. — Alaska L.Rev. 266 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 612]

[10] Davidson & Voth, Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege, 64 Ore.I.Rev. 637 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[11] Davies, Revisiting The Fictional Originalism in *Crawford's* Cross-Examination Rule: A Reply to Mr. Kry, 72 Brook.L.Rev. 557 (2007). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [12]** Davies, Not “The Framers’ Design: How the Framing-Era Ban Against Hearsay Refutes the *Crawford-Davis* “Testimonial” Formulation of The Scope of The Original Confrontation Clause, 15 J.L. & Pol’y 349 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [13]** Davies, What Did The Framers Know and When Did They Know It? Fictional Originalism in *Crawford v. Washington*, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 105 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [14]** Davies, Evidence of Character to Prove Conduct: A Reassessment of Relevancy, 27 Crim.L.Bull. 504 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [15]** Davis & Follette, Rethinking The Probative Value of Evidence: Bass Rates, Intuitive Profiling, and The “Post-Diction” of Behavior, 26 Law & Hum.Behav. 133 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [16]** Davis, A Quantitative and Descriptive Survey of Evidence Law in Kansas Appellate Courts, 37 U.Kans.L.Rev. 715 (1989). [History]
- [17]** Davis, “There Is A Book Out . . .”: An Analysis of Judicial Absorbtion of Legislative Facts, 100 Harv.L.Rev. 1539 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [18]** Davis, The Information Act: A Preliminary Analysis, 34 U.Chi.L.Rev. 761 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [19]** Davis, Evidence of Post-Accident Failures, Modifications, and Design Changes in Products Liability Litigation, 62 St.Mary’s L.J. 792 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [20]** Davis, The Motion in Limine— --A Neglected Trial Technique, 5 Washburn.L.J. 232 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [21]** Davis, An Approach to Rules of Evidence in Non-Jury Cases, 50 A.B.A.J. 723 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [22]** Davis, Hearsay in Nonjury Cases, 83 Harv.L.Rev. 1362 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [23]** Davis, Evidence Reform: The Administrative Process Leads The Way, 34 Minn.L.Rev. 581 (1950). [History]
- [24]** Davis, A System of Judicial Notice Based on Fairness and Convenience, Perspectives on Law 69 (Pound ed. 1964). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [25]** Davis, An Approach to Problems of Evidence in The Administrative Process, 55 Harv.L.Rev. 364 (1942). [History]
- [26]** Davis.Official Notice, 62 Harv.L.Rev. 537 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [27] Davis, Judicial Notice, 55 Colum.L.Rev. 945 (1955) [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [28] Davis, Judicial Notice, 1969 Law & Soc.Order 513. [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [29] Dawson, Are Statisticians Being Fair to Employment Discrimination Plaintiffs?, 21 Jurimetrics J. 1 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [30] Dratel, Sword or Shield? The Government's Selective Use of Its Declassification Authority For Tactical Advantage In Criminal Prosecutions, 5 Cardozo Pub.L.Pol'y & Ethics J. 189 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [31] Deaver, The Competency of Children, 4 Cooley L.Rev. 522 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [32] Dean, The Deliberative Privilege Under M.R.E. 509. 1981 Army Law. 1 [Rej.F.R.Ev. 509]
- [33] Debraccic, That's (Not) What She Said: The Case for Expanding Admission of Prior Inconsistent Statements in New York Criminal Trials, 78 Alb.L.Rev. 269 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]
- [34] DeCoux, Are The 2011 Changes to Federal Rules of Evidence 413-415 Invalid?: The Rules Enabling Act and The Drafters' Definition of "Stylistic", 34 N.C.Cent.L.Rev. 136 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 413-415]
- [35] DeCoux, Textual Limits on The Residual Exception to The Hearsay Rule; The "Near Miss" Debate and Beyond, 35 Sw.U.L.Rev. 99 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [36] DeCoux, The Admission of Unreliable Expert Testimony Offered By The Prosecution: What's Wrong With *Daubert* and How To Make It Right, 2007 Utah L.Rev. 131. [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [37] DeFeo, Entrapment As A Defense to Criminal Responsibility: Its History, Theory, and Application, 1 U.S.F.L.Rev. 243 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [38] De La Paz, Sacrificing The Whole Truth: Florida's Deteriorating Admissibility of Similar Fact Evidence in Cases of Child Sexual Abuse, 15 N.Y.L.Sch.J.Hum.Rts. 449 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [39] De La Vega, A View of The Psychiatrist and His Opinion in The Law, 13 N.Y.L.F. 659 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [40] Decker & Handler, Voiceprint Identification Evidence—Out of The *Frye* Pan and Into Admissibility, 26 Am.U.L.Rev. 314 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [41] Degnan, Non-Rules Evidence Law: Cross-Examination. 6 Utah L.Rev. 323 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 611]
- [42] Degnan, The Evidence Law of Discovery: Exclusion of Evidence Because of Fear of Perjury, 43 Texas L.Rev. 435 (1965). [History]
- [43] Degnan, The Law of Federal Evidence Reform, 76 Harv.L.Rev. 275 (1962). [History]
- [44] Degnan, The Feasibility of Rules of Evidence in Federal Courts, 24 F.R.D. 341 (1959). [History]
- [45] Denbeaux & Risinger, Questioning Questions: Objections to Form in The Interrogation of Witnesses, 33 Ark.L.Rev. 439 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [46] Denning, Presumptions and Burdens, 61 L.Q.Rev. 379 (1945). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [47] Denno, How Prosecutors and Defense Attorneys Differ in Their Use of Neuroscience Evidence, 85 Ford.L.Rev. 453 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [48] Denno, The Myth of The Double-Edged Sword, An Empirical Study of Neuroscience Evidence in Criminal Cases, 56 B.C.L.Rev. 493 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [49] DeParq, Law, Science, and The Expert Witness, 24 Tenn.L.Rev. 166 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [50] Desmond, The Newsmen's Privilege Bill, 13 Alb.L.Rev. 1 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [51] Despres, Legal Aspects of Drug-Induced Statements, 14 U.Chi.L.Rev. 601 (1947). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [52] Dery, Mouse Hunting With An Elephant Gun; The Supreme Court's Overkill in Upholding A Categorical Rejection of Polygraph Evidence in *United States v. Schaffer*, 26 Am.J.Crim.L. 227 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [53] Dession, The Trial of Economic and Technological Issues of Fact, 58 Yale L.J. 1019, 1242 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [54] Dewey, The Historic Background of Corporate Personality, 35 Yale L.J. 655 (1926). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [55] Dewitt, Privileged Communications Between Physician and Patient, 10 West.Res.L.Rev. 488 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [56] Diamond, How Jurors Deal With Expert Testimony and How Judges Can Help, 16 J.L.& Pol'y 47 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]

Faculty Articles

- [57]** Diamond, Inherent Problems in The Use of Pretrial Hypnosis of A Prospective Witness, 68 Calif.L.Rev. 313 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [58]** DiBiago, Federal Criminal Law and The Crime-Fraud Exception to Disclosure of Privileged Communications and Documents Without The Government's Factual Foundation Being Tested By The Crucible of Meaningful Adversarial Testing, 62 Md.L.Rev. 1 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [59]** DiBiago, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence in Federal Criminal Trials: Is The Admission of Collateral Other-Crimes Evidence Disconnected to The Fundamental Right to A Fair Trial? 47 Syr.L.Rev. 1229 (1977). {F.R.Ev. 404(b)}
- [60]** Dickevs, Legal Protection of Psychiatric Confidentiality, 1 Int.J.L.&Psych. 255 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [61]** Diehm, Protecting Criminal Defendants' Rights When the Government Adduces Scientific Evidence: The Confrontation Clause and Other Alternatives— -A Reply to Professor Gianelli, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 85 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [62]** DiFonzo, The Crimes of Crime Labs, 34 Hofstra L.Rev. 1 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [63]** Dillon, Confidentiality of Ecclesiastical Records, 30 Cath.Law. 177 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [64]** Discussion, Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence (Second Circuit Annual Judicial Conference, June 1969) 48 F.R.D. 79 (1970). [History]
- [65]** Dixon, Newsmen's Privilege by Federal Legislation: Within Congressional Power?, 1 Hast.Con.L.Q. 39 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [66]** Dixon, The Constitution is Shield Enough For Newsmen, 60 A.B.A.J. 707 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [67]** Dodson, What Went Wrong With F.R.E. 609: A Look At How Jurors Really Misuse Prior Conviction Evidence, 23 N.C.Cent.L.J. 14 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [68]** Doerfer, The Limits on Trade Secret Law Imposed by Federal Patent and Antitrust Suprema, 80 Harv. L.Rev. 1432 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [69]** Dolmans, Attorney-Client Privilege for In-House Counsel: A European Proposal, 4 Col.Euro.L. 125 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [70]** Dombroff, Innovative Developments in Demonstrative Evidence: Techniques and Associated Problems of Admissibility, 4 J.Air L. & Comm. 139 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [71] Donaher et al., The Technological Expert in Products Liability Litigation, 52 Texas L.Rev. 1303 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [72] Donaldson, A Reliable and Clear-Cut Determination: Is A Separate Hearing Required to Decide When Confrontation Forfeiture by Wrongdoing Applies?, 49 N.Eng.L.Rev. 167 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [73] Donaldson, Gradually Exploded: Confrontation v. The Former Testimony Rule, 49 St.Mary's L.J. 137 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [74] Donaldson, Keeping The Balance True: Proof Requirements for Confrontation Forfeiture by Wrongdoing, 37 T.M.Cooley L.Rev. 429 (2014). [Confrontation]
- [75] Donaldson, Combatting Victim/Witness Intimidation in Family Violence Cases: A Response to The "Forfeiture By Wrongdoing" Confrontation Exception Resurrected by The Supreme Court in *Crawford* and *Davis*, 44 Idaho L.Rev. 643 (2008). [Confrontation]
- [76] Donnelly, The Role of Rules of Evidence, 13 U.Chi.Conf.Ser. 39 (1953). [History]
- [77] Donnelly, The Law of Evidence: Privacy and Disclosure, 14 La.L.Rev. 361 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [78] Donnelly, The Hearsay Rule and Its Exceptions, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 455 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [79] Donohue, The Shadow of State Secrets, 159 U.Pa.L.Rev. 77 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [80] Doob & Kirschenbaum, Some Empirical Evidence of s. 12 of The Canada Evidence Act Upon The Accused, 15 Crim.L.Q. 88 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [81] Doran, A Comment on Gordon Van Koesel's Hearsay Hazards in American Criminal Trials: An Adversary-Oriented Approach, 49 Hast.L.J. 591 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [82] Dorsen & Shattuck, Executive Privilege, The Congress, and The Courts, 35 Ohio St.L.J. 1 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [83] Dosker, The Kentucky Rules of Evidence: Trojan Horse or Improvement Over Common Law?, 20 No.Ky.L.Rev. 701 (1993). [History]
- [84] Douglas, Confronting Death, Sixth Amendment At Capital Sentencing, 105 Colum.L.Rev. 1967 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [85] Douglas, Balancing Hearsay and Criminal Discovery, 68 Ford.L.Rev. 2097 (2000). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

[86] Douglas, Beyond Admissibility: Real Confrontation, Virtual Cross-Examination, and The Right to Confront Hearsay, 67 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 191 (1999). [Confrontation]

[87] Douglas, Virtual Cross-Examination: How Trial Lawyers Should Impeach Hearsay, 34 J.Marsh.L.Rev., 149 (2003). [Confrontation]

[88] Douglas, Confronting The Reluctant Accomplice, 101 Colum.L.Rev. 1797 (2001). [Confrontation]

[89] Dow, Criminal Hearsay Rules: Constitutional Issues, 53 Neb.L.Rev. 425 (1974). [Confrontation]

[90] Doyle, Applying Lawyers' Expertise to Scientific Experts: Some Thoughts About Trial Court Analysis of Prejudicial Effects of Admitting and Excluding Expert Scientific Testimony, 25 Wm.&Mary L.Rev. 619 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[91] Dratel, Ethical Issues in Defending a Terrorism Case: How Secrecy and Security Impair The Defense of A Terrorism Case, 2 Cardozo Pub.L.Pol'y & Ethics J. 81 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[92] Dreeben, The Confrontation Clause, The Law of Unintended Consequences, and The Structure of Sixth Amendment Analysis, 34 Geo.L.J. Ann.Rev.Crim.Proc. iii (2005). [Confrontation]

[93] Dreyfuss, Trade Secrets: How Well Should We Be Allowed to Hide Them? The Economic Espionage Act of 1996. 9 Ford.Intell.Prop., Media, & Ent.L.J. 1 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 508]

[94] Duane, The Bizarre Drafting Errors In Virginia State on Privileged Marital Communications, 12 Regent U.L.Rev. 91 (1999-2000). [F.R.Ev. 505]

[95] Duane, The Constitutionality of Irrebuttable Presumptions, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 149 (2006-2007). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[96] Dudley, Federalism and Federal Rules of Evidence: Privileges and Vertical Choice of Law, 82 Geo.L.J. 1781 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[97] Dudziak, Law, War, and The History of Time, 98 Calif.L.Rev. 1669 (2010). [History]

[98] Duggin, The Impact of The War Over Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege on The Business of American Health Care, 22 J.Comtemp.Health L.& Pol'y 301 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [99] Dunham, Testimonial Privileges in State and Federal Courts: A Suggested Approach, 9 Willam.L.J. 26 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [100] Dunleavy, Protection of The Inventor Outside The Patent System, 43 Calif.L.Rev. 457 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [101] Duque, Privileged Communications Between Patient and Physician, 1953 Ins.L.J. 19. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [102] Dutton, Recent Developments in Indiana Evidence Law, 48 Ind.L.Rev. 1273 (2015). [History]
- [103] Dutre, The Burden of Proof in Criminal Cases: A Comment on The *Mullaney-Patterson* Doctrine, 55 Notre Dame.L. 380 (1986). [F.R.Ev.303]
- [104] Dworkin, Easy Cases, Bad Law, and Burdens of Proof, 25 Vand.L.Rev. 1151 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [105] Dwyer, *Crawford's* "Testimonial Hearsay" Category: A Plain Limit on The Protections of The Confrontation Clause, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 275 (2005). [Confrontation]

E

- [1] Eads, Shuman & Lipsey, Getting It Right: The Trial of Sexual Assault and Child Molestation Cases Under Federal Rules of Evidence 413-415, 18 Behav.Sci.&L. 169 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 413-415]
- [2] Eagles, Cabinet Secrets as Evidence, 1980 Pub.L. 203. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [3] Easterbrook, Insider Trading, Secret Agents, Evidentiary Privileges, and The Production of Information, 1981 Sup.Ct.Rev. 309. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [4] Edwards, The National Academy of Sciences Report on Forensic Sciences: What It Means For Bench and Bar, 51 Jurimetrics J. 1 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [5] Eckhardt & McKey, Reporter's Privilege: An Update, 12 Conn.L.Rev. 435 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [6] Eckhardt & McKey, *Calderon v. Tribune Publishing Co.*: Substantive and Remedial Aspects of First Amendment Protection for A Reporter's Confidential Sources, 14 Idaho L.Rev. 21 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [7] Edelstein & LaDue, Journalist's Privilege and The Criminal Defendant, 47 Ford.L.Rev. 913 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [8]** Edwards, Hard Answers for Hard Questions: Dissenting in Part From Dean Freedman's Views on The Attorney-Client Privilege, 11 Crim.L.Bull. 478 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [9]** Eggleston, The Mathematics of Corroboration, 1985 Crim.L.Rev. 640. [F.R.Ev.401]
- [10]** Eggleston, The Probability Debate, 1980 Crim.L.Rev. 678. [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [11]** Ehrhardt, Reputation and Character in Defamation Actions, 64 Wash.U.L.Q. 867 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [12]** Ehrhardt, A Look At Florida's Proposed Code of Evidence, 2 Fla.St.U.L.Rev. 681 (1974). [History]
- [13]** Ehrich, Unnecessary Problems of Proof, 32 Yale L.J. 436 (1922). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [14]** Eisenberg, Graymail and Grayhairs: The Classified and Official Information Privileges Under The Military Rules of Evidence, 1981 Army Law 9. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [15]** Eichhorn, Social Science Findings and The Jury's Ability to Disregard Evidence Under The Federal Rules of Evidence, 52 Law & Contemp.Prob. 341 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [16]** Eldridge, Judicial Notice, 27 Ark.L.Rev. 171 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [17]** Eliason, Leakers, Bloggers, and Fourth Estate Inmates: The Disguised Pursuit of A Reporter's Privilege. 24 Cardozo Arts & Ent.L.J. 385 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [18]** Ellinwood. "In Light of Reason and Experience": The Case for A Strong Government Attorney-Client Privilege, 2001 Wis.L.Rev. 1291. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [19]** Elliott, Rape Complainant's Sexual Experience With Third Parties, 1984 Crim.L.Rev. 4. [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [20]** Elliot, Kentucky's Environmental Self-Audit Privilege: State Protection or Increased Federal Scrutiny?, 23 No.Ky.L.Rev. 1 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [21]** Elliot, The Young Person's Guide to Similar Fact Evidence, 1983 Crim.L.Rev. 284, 232. [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [22]** Ellman & Kaye, Probabilities and Proof: Can HLA and Blood Grouping Testing Prove Paternity? 54 N.Y.U.L.Rev. 1113 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [23]** Ellsworth, Amended Exemption 7 of The Freedom of Information Act, 25 Am.U.L.Rev. 37 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

- [24] Elman, The Use of Videotape Evidence in Civil Cases, 19 Alberta L.Rev. 215 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [25] Ely, The Irrepressible Myth of *Erie*, 87 Harv.L.Rev. 693 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [26] Emden, Documents Privileged in Public Interest, 39 Law Q.Rev. 476 (1923). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [27] Emerson, Business Entries: Their Status Under The Uniform Rules and Present Law, 26 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 591 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 803(a)(6)]
- [28] Emory, Waiver of Patient's Privileges, 6 Wash.L.Rev. 71 (1931). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [29] Enoch & Fischer, Sense and Sensitivity: Epistemic and Instrumental Approaches to Statistical Evidence, 67 Stan.L.Rev. 557 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [30] Enter, The Rationale of The Rule That Forbids A Lawyer to Be A Witness and Advocate in The Same Case, 1977 A.B.A.Res.J. 455. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [31] Entman, Mary Carter Agreements: An Assessment of Attempted Solutions, 38 U.Fla.L.Rev. 521 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [31] Epps, Passing The Confrontation Clause Stop Sign: Is All Hearsay Constitutionally Admissible? 77 Ky.L.J. 7 (1989). [Confrontation]
- [32] Epstein, Avoiding Trial By Rumor: Identifying The Due Process Threshold for Hearsay Evidence After The Demise of *Ohio v. Roberts* "Reliability" Standard, 77 UMKC L.Rev. 119 (2008). [Confrontation]
- [33] Epstein, True Lies: The Constitutionality and Evidentiary Bases For Admitting Prior False Accusations in Sexual Assault Prosecutions, 24 QLR 609 (2006) [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [34] Epstein, Fingerprints Meet *Daubert*: The Myth of Fingerprint "Science" Is Revealed, 75 So.Cal.L.Rev. 605 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [35] Epstein, Motions In Limine— -A Primer, 8 Litigation 4 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [36] Ervin, Controlling "Executive Privilege", 20 Loy.(N.O.)L.Rev. 11 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [37] Ervin, The *Gravel* and *Brewster* Cases: An Assault on Congressional Independence, 59 Va.L.Rev. 175 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- Ervin, In Pursuit of A Press Privilege, 11 Harv.J.Legis. 233 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

Esbeck, Tort Claims Against Churches and Ecclesiastical Officers: The First Amendment Considerations, 89 West Va.L.Rev. 1 (1986). [Rej.F.R.Ev. 506]

Estes. The Need For Uniform Rules of Evidence in Federal Courts, 24 F.R.D. 331 (1961). [History]

Evans, Article Eight of The Federal Rules of Evidence: The Hearsay Rule, 8 Valpo.L.Rev. 261 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Everhart, Putting A Burden of Production on The Defendant Before Admitting Evidence That Someone Else Committed The Crime Charged: Is It Constitutional? 76 Neb.L.Rev. 272 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

F

[1] Fabricant, Probable Cause and The Confidential Informant, 1 Crim.L.Bull. 1 (1965) [F.R.Ev. 510]

[2] Faigman & Imwinkelreid, Wading Into The *Daubert* Tide: *Sargon Enterprises, Inc. v. University of Southern California*, 64 Hast.L.J. 1665 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[3] Faigman, Evidentiary Incommensurability: A Preliminary Exploration of The Problem of Reasoning From General Scientific Data to Individualized Legal Decisionmaking, 75 Brok.L.Rev. 1115 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[4] Fahey, Testimonial Privilege of Accountants in Federal Tax Fraud Investigations, 17 Tax L.Rev. 491 (1962) [F.R.Ev. 501]

[5] Faigman, Slobogin & Monahan, Gatekeeping Science: Using The Structure of Scientific Research to Distinguish Between Admissibility and Weight in Expert Testimony, 110 Nw.U.L.Rev. 859 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[6] Faigman, Embracing the Darkness: *Logerquist v McVey* and The Doctrine of Ignorance of Science As An Excuse, 33 Ariz.St.L.J. 87 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Fairfax-Columbo & DeMatteo, Reducing The Danger of Future Dangerousness Testimony: Applying The Federal Rules of Evidence to Capital Sentencing, 25 Wm.& Mary Bill Rts.J. 1047 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[8] Fairley & Mosteller, A Conversation About *Collins*, 41 U.Chi.L.Rev. 242 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[9] Falce, Trade Secrets—Looking for (Full) Harmonization in The Innovation Union, 46 IIC: Int'l Rev.Intell.Prop.& Comp.L. 940 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 508]

Faculty Articles

- [10] Fallick, The Lie Detector and The Right to Privacy, 40 N.Y.St.B.J. 102 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [11] Falknor, Evidence, 1949 Ann.Surv.Am.L. 975. [History]
- [12] Falknor, Competency of Proof of “Customary” Negligence in Support of Charge of Specific Act of Negligence, 12 Wash.L.Rev. 35 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 406]
- [13] Falknor, *Hiss Case: Impeachment of Psychiatric Testimony of Expert*, 1950 Ann.Surv.Am.L. 804. [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [14] Falknor & Steffen, Evidence of Character: From The “Crucible of The Community” to The “Couch of The Psychiatrist”, 102 U.Pa.L.Rev. 980 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 405]
- [15] Falknor, Hearsay, 1969 Law & Soc.Ord. 591. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [16] Falknor, The “Hear-Say” Rule As a “See-Do” Rule: Evidence of Conduct, 33 Rocky Mt.L.Rev. 133 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [17] Falknor, “Indirect” Hearsay, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 3 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [18] Falknor, Vicarious Admissions and The Uniform Rules, 14 Vand.L.Rev. 855 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [19] Falknor, Uniform Rules of Evidence: Extrinsic Policies Affecting Admissibility, 10 Rutgers.L.Rev. 574 (1956). [History]
- [20] Falknor, Notes on Presumptions, 15 Wash.L.Rev. 71 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [21] Fallon, Executive Officials and Process of Subpeona to Testify, 2 Va.L.Rev. 270 (1914). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [22] Fallon & Bursell, Similar Fact Evidence and Corroboration. 1978 Crim.L.Rev. 185. [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [23] Fannon, Disclosure of Insurance in Negligence Trials—The Arizona Rule, 5 Ariz.L.Rev. 83 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [24] Farber, Do You Swear to Tell The Truth, The Whole Truth, and Nothing But The Truth Against Your Child?, 43 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 551 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [25] Fargo & McAdoo, Common Law or Shield Law? How Rule 501 Could Solve The Journalist’s Privilege Problem, 33 Wm.Mitch.L.Rev. 1347 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [26] Farhat & Krause, Michigan's "Rape Shield Statute": Questioning The Wisdom of Legislative Determination of Relevance, 4 Cooley L.Rev. 545 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [27] Farrell, Evidence Code Section 1101(b): The Ability to Present Evidence of Wrongful Acts Not Charged in The Indictment, 6 J.F.K.U.L.Rev. 39 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [28] Farsaad, The Use of Plea Statement Waivers in Pretrial Agreements, 217 Mil.L.Rev. 173 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [29] Faulk, The Unanswered Questions of *Christopherson v. Allied-Signal Corp.*, 4 Vill.Env.L.J. 21 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [30] Faull, In-House Lawyers and Legal Professional Privilege: A Problem Revisited, 4 Col.J.Euro.L. 139 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [31] Fayette & Bussallacci, "Letters I've Written, Never Meaning to Send . . ."; Conditional Relevance, Evidence Rule 104(b), and Mark Edwards' "Curious Murder Trial, 26 Alaska L.Rev. 171 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]
- [32] Fedders & Guttenplan, Document Retention and Destruction, Practical, Legal, and Ethical Considerations, 56 Notre Dame L. 5 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [34] Feher, The Alleged Molestation Victim, The Rules of Evidence, and The Constitution: Should Children Really Be Seen and Not Heard?, 14 Am.J.Crim.L. 227 (1988). [Confrontation]
- [35] Feild, Juror Background Characteristics and Attitudes Toward Rape: Correlates of Jurors' Decisions in Rape Trials, 2 Law & Hum.Behav. 73 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [36] Feild, Rape Trials and Jurors' Decisions: A Psychological Analysis of The Effects of Victim, Defendant, and Case Characteristics, 3 Law & Hum.Behav. 261 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [37] Feld, Supreme Court in *Upjohn* Protects Attorney-Client Privilege, Upholds The Work Product Doctrine, 15 J.Tax. 210 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [38] Feldmer, Close Enough for Government Work: An Examination of Congressional Efforts to Reduce The Government's Burden of Proof in Child Pornography Cases, 30 No.Ky.L.Rev. 205 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 414]
- [39] Fenner, Today's Confrontation Clause (After *Crawford* and *Melendez-Diaz*), 43 Creighton L.Rev. 35 (2009). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [40] Fenner, The *Daubert* Handbook: The Case, Its Essential Dilemma, and Its Progeny, 29 Creighton L.Rev. 941 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [41] Fenner, Law Professor Reveals Shocking Truth About Hearsay, 62 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 1 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [42] Fenner, Presumptions: 350 Years of Confusion And It Has Come To This, 25 Creighton L.Rev. 283 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [43] Fenner, About Presumptions in Civil Actions, 17 Creighton L.Rev. 307 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [45] Ferguson, Polygraphy v. Outdated Precedents, 35 Tex.B.J. 531 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [46] Field, Judicial Notice of Public Acts, 12 Minn.L.Rev. 434 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [47] Field, A Code of Evidence for Arkansas? 29 Ark.L.Rev. 1 (1975). [History]
- [48] Fielding & Tarbert, Principled Accommodation: The Bush Administrations Approach to Congressional Oversight and Executive Privilege, 32 J.L& Pol. 95 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [49] Fildes, Statutory Privileges and Immunities for Voluntarily Performed Environmental Audits; Should New York State Join The Race?, 5 Buff.Env.L.J. 257 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [50] Finan, Presumptions and Modal Logic: A Hohfeldian Approach, 13 Akron L.Rev. 197 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [51] Findley, Innocents at Risk: Adversary Imbalance, Forensic Science, and The Search for Truth, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 893 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [52] Findley, The Cultural Context of Rape, 60 Women Lawyers J. 199 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [53] Finrock & Spradlin, How To Organize and Present Statistical Evidence, 24 Prac.Law. 67 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [54] Finger, And Justice For All: The Admissibility of Uncharged Sexual Misconduct Evidence Under The Recent Amendment to The Federal Rules of Evidence, 5 S.C.Rev.L. & Woman's Stud. 501 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [55] Finkelstein & Levin, A Comment on Bullet-Lead Identification and Screening Searches, 47 Jurimetrics J. 89 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[56] Finkelstein & Fairly, A Bayesian Approach to Identification Evidence, 83 Harv.L.Rev. 489 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 602]

[57] Finlay, Confidentiality of Medical Disclosures—Looking Ahead, 1975 N.Z.L.J. 80. [F.R.Ev. 504]

[58] Findley, Implementing the Lesson From Wrongful Convictions: An Empirical Analysis of Eyewitness Identification Reform Strategies, 81 Mo.L.Rev. 377 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 602]

[59] Findley, Innocents At Risk: Adversary Imbalance, Forensic Science, and The Search for Truth, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 893 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[60] Fine, The Confrontation Clause and Expert Testimony: Recent Developments in The New York Supreme Court and The New York Court of Appeals, 20 J.L.& Pol'y 457 (2012). [Confrontation]

[61] Finman, Implied Assertions As Hearsay: Some Criticisms of The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 14 Stan.L.Rev. 682 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[62] Fisch, Study of The Feasibility of Formulating A Code of Evidence for The State of New York, 12 N.Y.Jud.Conf.Ann.Rep. 182 (1967). [History]

[63] Fisch, Lay Opinions in New York, 37 Corn.L.Q. 32 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 701]

[64] Fischer, Big Boss is Watching: Circumstances under Which Employees Waive the Attorney-Client Privilege by Using E-Mail at Work, 12 Colo.Tech.L.J. 365 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[65] Fischer, The Attorney-Client Privilege Meets The Common Arrangement: Protecting Confidences While Exchanging Information for Mutual Gain, 16 Rev.Litig. 601 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[66] Fisher, What Happened—And What Is Happening—To The Confrontation Clause?, 15 J.L. & Pol'y 587 (2007). [Confrontation]

[67] Fisher, The Psychotherapeutic Professions and The Law of Privileged Communications, 10 Wayne L.Rev. 609 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[68] Fishman, Defense Access To A Prosecution Witness's Psychotherapy or Counseling Records, 86 Or.L.Rev. 1 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[69] Fishman, Consent, Credibility, and The Constitution: Evidence Relating to A Sex Offense Complainant's Past Sexual Behavior, 44 Cath.L.Rev. 709 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 412]

Faculty Articles

[70] Fishman, Informant Credibility and Evidence of Cooperation in Other Cases, 26 Am.J.Tr.Ad. 363 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 510]

[71] Fisk, Burden of Proof, 1 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 257 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[72] Flannigan, Confrontation, Equity, and The Mis-Named Exception for “Forfeiture” By Wrongdoing, 14 Wm.& Mary Bill Rts.J. 1193 (2006). [Confrontation]

[73] Flannigan, Forfeiture By Wrongdoing and Those Who Acquiesce in Witness Intimidation: A Reach Exceeding Its Grasp and Other Problems With Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(6), 51 Drake L.Rev. 459 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(6)]

[74] Flannigan, Foreshadowing The Future of Forfeiture/Estoppel By Wrongdoing: *Davis v. Washington* and The Necessity of Defendant’s Intent to Intimidate The Witness, 15 J.L.& Pol’y 863 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(6)]

[75] Flannigan, Rejecting A Privilege for Self-Critical Analysis, 57 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 551 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[76] Fleming & Maximov, The Patient or His Victim: The Therapist’s Dilemma, 62 Calif.L.Rev. 1925 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[77] Flood, The Physician-Patient Privilege Under The New Code, 33 Kan.B.A.J. 100 (1964).[F.R.Ev. 504]

[78] Flores, Richardson & Merlino, Examining The Effect of The *Daubert* Trilogy On Expert Evidence Practices In Federal Civil Court: An Empirical Analysis, 34 S.Ill.U.L.J. 565 (2010). [F.R.E. 702]

[79] Foley, Keeping A Company’s Confidences Secret: Trade Secret Enforcement Under Iowa’s Uniform Trade Secrets Act, 54 DrakeL.Rev. 1 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 508]

[80] Forbes, Extent of The Judicial Discretion to Reject Prejudicial Evidence in Civil Cases, 62 Aust.L.J. 211 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[81] Fogue & Triche, The Current State of Evidentiary Privileges in Louisiana, 49 La.L.Rev. 733 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[82] Ford & Holmes, The Professional Medical Advocate, 17 Sw.L.J. 551 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 706]

[83] Forde, The White House Counsel and Whitewater: Government Lawyers and The Scope of Privileged communications, 16 Yale I. & Pol.Rev. 109 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [84] Foreman, Accident Reconstruction and The Use of Experts, 36 J.Air.L. 489 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [85] Forkosch, The Lie Detector and The Courts, 16 N.Y.U.L.Rev. 202 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [86] Forkosch, The Lie Detector and Mechanical Jurisprudence, 28 Okla.L.Rev. 288 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [87] Forkosch, The Nature of Legal Evidence, 59 Calif.L.Rev. 1536 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [88] Fornoff, Presumptions—The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 29 Ark.L.Rev. 401 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [89] Forrow, The Corporate Law Department Lawyer: Counsel To The Entity, 24 Bus.Law. 1797 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [90] Forum, The Proposed Rules of Evidence for United States District Courts and Magistrates. 37 Ins.Counsel J. 565 (1970). [History]
- [91] Foster, The Jencks Act: Rule 26.2-Rule 612 Interface—“Confusion Worse Confounded”, 34 Okla.L.Rev. 679 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [92] Foster, Present Sense Impressions: An Analysis and A Proposal, 10 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 299 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]
- [93] Foster, An Overview of Confidentiality and Privilege, 4 J.Psch.& Law 313 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [94] Foster, Expert Testimony—Prevalent Complaints and Proposed Remedies, 11 Harv.L.Rev. 169 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [95] Fox, Professional Confidences and The Psychiatrist, 3 U.Tasm.L.Rev. 12 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [96] Fosterlee, Horowitz & Bourgeois, Effects of Notetaking on Verdicts and Evidence Professing in A Civil Trial, 18 Law & Hum.Behav. 567 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [97] Fox., Psychotherapy and Legal Privilege, 53 Mass.L.Q. 307 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [98] Fox, The “Presumption of Innocence” As Constitutional Doctrine, 28 Cath.U.L.Rev. 253 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [99] Fradella, et al., The Impact of *Daubert* on The Admissibility of Behavioral Science Testimony, 30 Pepp.L.Rev. 403 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

- [100] Fraher, Adjudicative Facts, Non-Evidence Facts, and Permissive Jury Background Information, 62 Ind.L.J. 333 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [101] Frank, The Proof is In The Prejudice: Implicit Racial Bias, Uncharged Act Evidence, and The Colorblind Courtroom, 32 Harv.J.Racial & Ethnic Just. 1 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [102] Frank, The Jury Wants to Take the Podium— -But Even With Authority to Do So , Can It?: An Interdisciplinary Examination of Jurors’ Questioning of Witnesses at Trial, 38 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 1 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 611]
- [103] Frank, Obscenity: Some Problems of Values and The Use of Experts, 41 Wash.L.Rev. 631 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [104] Frankel, The Search for Truth Continued: More Disclosure, Less Privilege, 54 Colo.L.Rev. 51 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [105] Frankena, The Basic Theory of Relevance, 35 Mich.B.J. 12 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [106] Franklin, Reflections on *Herbert v. Lando*, 31 Stan.L.Rev. 1035 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [107] Franze, The Confrontation Clause and Originalism: Lessons From *King v. Brasher*, 15 J.L.& Pol’y 495 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [108] Free, It’s Not Who You Are But What You Know: Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege Expanded, 52 Okla.B.J. 701 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [109] Freed, Legal Aspects of Computers and Confidentiality, 18 Jurimetrics J. 328 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [110] Freedman, Lawyer-Client Confidentiality: Rethinking the Trilemma, 43 Hofstra L.Rev, 1025 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [111] Friedland, 27 Years of “Truth-in-Evidence”: The Expectations and Consequences of Proposition 8’s Most Controversial Provision, 14 Berkeley J.Crim.L. 1 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [112] Friedman, The Sky is Still Not Falling, 20 J.L.& Pol’y 427 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [113] Friedman, *Crawford, Davis and Way Beyond*, 15 J.L.& Pol’y 553 (2007). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [114] Friedman, *Crawford and Davis: A Personal Reflection*, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 303 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [115] Friedman, *Minimizing The Jury Overvaluation Concern*, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 967. [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [116] Friedman, *Irrelevance, Minimal Relevance, and Meta-Relevance*, 34 Hous.L.Rev. 55 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [117] Friedman & Knoop, *A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing: Other Incident Evidence in Aviation Litigation*, 73 J.Air L.&Comm. 441 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [118] Freedman, *Duck-Blind Justice: Justice Scalia's Memorandum in The Cheney Case*, 2004 18 Geo.J.Legal Ethics 229 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [119] Freedman, *Medical Privilege*, 32 Can.B.Rev. 1 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [120] Freedman, *Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege Since Upjohn At Home and Abroad*. 9 U.Dayton L.Rev. 425 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [121] Freedman, *Where The Bodies Are Buried: The Adversary System and The Obligation of Confidentiality*, 10 Crim.L.Bull. 979 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [122] Freeman, *The Attorney-Corporate Client Privilege: An Obstacle to The Pursuit of Truth*, 2 Litigation 14 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [123] Freer, *Erie's Mid-Life Crisis*, 63 Tul.L.Rev. 1087 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [124] Freund, *Forward: On Presidential Privilege*, 88 Harv.L.Rev. 13 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [125] Fried, *Too High A Price For Truth: The Exception to The Attorney-Client Privilege For Contemplated Crimes and Frauds*, 64 N.C.L.Rev. 443 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [126] Friedenthal, *Discovery and Use of Adverse Party's Expert Information*, 14 Stan.L.Rev. 455 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [127] Friedman, *Confrontation and Forensic Laboratory Reports*, 45 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 51 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [128] Friedman, *The Conumdrum, of Children, Confrontation, and Hearsay*, 65 Law & Comtemp.Prob. 243 (2002). [Confrontation]
- [129] Friedman, *Forfeiture of Confrontation Right After Crawford and Davis*, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 489 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [130] Friedman, Grappling With The Meaning of “Testimonial”. 71 Brook.L.Rev. 241 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [131] Friedman, A Presumption of Innocence, Not of Even Odds, 52 Stan.L.Rev. 873 (2000).[F.R.Ev. 303]
- [132] Friedman, Confrontation: The Search For Basic Principles, 86 Geo.L.J. 1011 (1998). [Confrontation]
- [133] Friedman, The History, Development, and Interpretation of The Maryland Declaration of Rights, 70 Temp.L.Rev. 945 (1997). [Confrontation]
- [134] Friedman, Truth and Its Rivals in The Law of Hearsay and Confrontation, 49 Hast.L.J. 545 (1998). [Confrontation]
- [135] Friedman, Prior Statements of A Witness: A Nettlesome Corner of The Hearsay Thicket, 1995 Sup.Ct.Rev. 277. [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(b)]
- [136] Friedman, Confrontation and The Definition of Chutzpah, 31 Israeli L.Rev. 506 (1997). [Confrontation]
- [137] Friedman, The Death and Transfiguration of *Frye*. 34 Jurimetrics J. 133 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [138] Friedman, Some Reflections on The Corporation As Criminal Defendant, 55 Notre Dame L. 173 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [139] Friedman, The Creation of The Attorney-Client Relationship: An Emerging View, 22 Cal.West.L.Rev. 207 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [140] Friedman, Expert Testimony, Its Abuse, and Reformation, 19 Yale L.J. 247 (1910). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [141] Friend, et al., The New Rules of Show-and-Tell: Identifying and Protecting The Peer Review and Medical Committee Privileges, 49 Baylor L.Rev. 607 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [142] Frissell & Vukellic, Application of The Hearsay Exceptions and Constitutional Challenges to The Admissibility of A Child’s Out-Of-Court Statements in The Prosecution of Child Sexual Abuse Cases in North Dakota, 66 No.Dak.L.Rev. 597 (1990). [Confrontation]
- [143] Frumholz, Discovery, Evidence, Confidentiality and Security Problems Associated With The Use of Computer-Based Litigation Support Systems, 1977 Wash.U.L.Q. 445. [F.R.Ev. Rule 803(6)]

Faculty Articles

[144] Frost, The State Secrets Privilege and Separation of Powers, 75 Fordham L.Rev. 1931 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[145] Fuchs, Judging Secrets: The Role Courts Should Play in Preventing Unnecessary Secrecy, 58 Admin.L.Rev. 131 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[146] Fuller & Urich, An Analysis of The Constitutionality of Statutory Presumptions That Lessen The Burden of The Prosecution, 25 U.Miami L.Rev. 420 (1971).[F.R.Ev. 301]

[147] Funk & Hicks, Admissibility of “Day-in-The-Life” Films in Virginia, 18 U.Rich.L.Rev. 751 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[148] Furedy & Hesslegrave, Validity of The Lie Detector: A Psycho-Physiological Perspective, 15 Crim.Just. & Behav. 219 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]

G

[1] Gaal, Evidence Legislation in California, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 561 (2008). [History]

[2] Gaffney & Cohen, The New Practice in Cross-Examination of A Character Witness Under Arizona Rule of Evidence 405(b), 1978 Ariz.St.L.J. 31. [F.R.Ev. 405(b)]

[3] Galloway, Symposium on Mississippi Evidence: General Provisions, 48 Miss.L.J. 901 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[4] Gallup, Further Consideration of A Privilege For Newsmen, 14 Albany L.Rev. 16 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[5] Galves, Where The Not-so-Wild Things Are: Computers In The Courtroom, The Federal Rules of Evidence, and The Need For More Judicial Acceptance, 13 Harv.J.L.& Tech. 161 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[6] Galvin, Shielding Rape Victims in The State and Federal Courts: A Proposal For The Second Decade, 70 Minn.L.Rev. 763 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[7] Gamble & Fowlkes, Comprehensive Principles Governing The Interaction Between The Alabama Rules of Evidence and Alabama Statutory Rules of Evidence, 56 Ala.L.Rev. 937 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[8] Gamble & Windle, Subsequent Remedial Measures in Alabama: From Exclusion to Admissibility, 37 Ala.L.Rev. 547 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 407]

[9] Gamble, The Motion in Limine: A Pretrial Procedure That Has Come of Age, 33 Ala.L.Rev. 1 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 103]

Faculty Articles

- [10]** Gannon, FIFRA and The “Taking” of Trade Secrets, 8 B.C.Env.Aff.L.Rev. 593 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [11]** Garcia, Rape, Lies and Videotape, 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 711 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [12]** Garcia, The Winding Path of *Bruton v. United States*: A Case of Doctrinal Inconsistency, 26 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 401 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 105].
- [13]** Gard, Executive Privilege: A Rhyme Without a Reason, 8 Ga.L.Rev. 809 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [14]** Gard, The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 19 (1956). [History]
- [15]** Gardner, Agency Problems in The Law of Attorney-Client Privilege: Privilege and Work Product Under Open Discovery, 46 U.Det.L.J. 253 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [16]** Gardner, Attorney-Client Privilege: Principles of Waiver, 35 J.Cal.St.B. 262 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [17]** Gardner, A Personal Privilege for Communications of Corporate Clients: Paradox or Public Policy?, 40 U.Det.L.J. 299 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [18]** Gardner, The Crime or Fraud Exception To The Attorney-Client Privilege, 47 A.B.A.J. 708 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [19]** Gardner, A Re-Evaluation of The Attorney-Client Privilege, 8 Vill.L.Rev. 279, 447 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [20]** Gardner, Agency Problems in The Law of Attorney-Client Privilege: The Expert Witness, 42 U.Det.L.J. 473 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [21]** Garfield, Back To The Future: Does *Apprendi* Bar A Legislature’s Power to Shift The Burden of Proof Away From The Prosecution By Labelling An Element of A Traditional Crime As An Affirmative Defense?, 35 Conn.L.Rev. 1351 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [22]** Garland: An Essay on Judges and Juries Revisited in The Context of Certain Preliminary Fact Questions Determining The Admissibility of Evidence Under Federal and California Rules of Evidence, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 853 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [23]** Garland, An Overview of Relevance and Hearsay: A Nine Step Analytical Guide, 22 Sw.U.L.Rev. 1039 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

[24] Garland & Snow, The Co-Conspirators Exception to The Hearsay Rule; Procedural Implications and Confrontation Clause Requirements, 63 J.Crim.,C. & P.S. 1 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(D)]

[25] Garrett, Constitutional Regulation of Forensic Evidence, 73 Wash.& Lee L.Rev. 1147 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[26] Garrett, Constitutional Law and The Law of Evidence, 101 Corn.L.Rev. 57 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[27] Garrett, Contaminated Confessions Revisited, 101 Va.L.Rev. 395 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[28] Garvin, The Unintended Consequences of Rebuttable Presumptions to Determine Child Custody in Domestic Violence Cases, 50 Fam.L.Q. 173 (2016). [F/R.Ev. 301]

[29] Gaskins, Evidentiary Problems in Multiple Defendant Cases: How To Plan For and Deal With Them, 13 No.Car.Cent.L.J. 62 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 105]

[30] Gastwirth, The Need to Carefully Interpret the Statistics Reporting the Accuracy of a Narcotics Detection Dog: Application to *South Dakota v. Nguyen*, *Florida v. Harris*, and Similar Cases, 53 Jurimetrics J. 415 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[31] Gausewitz, Presumptions, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 391 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[32] Gauswitz, Presumptions In a One Rule World, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 324 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[33] Gaynes, Two Juries/One Trial: Panacea of Judicial Economy or Personification of Murphy's Law?, 5 Am.L.Tr.Adv. 285 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 105]

[34] Gaynor, Evidence: The Penitent-Clergy Privilege, 1 No.Ky. L.Rev. 16 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[35] Geis & Geis, Rape Reform: An Appreciative-Critical Review, 6 Bull.Amer.Acad.Psych. & L., 301 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[36] Gelbach, The Triangle of Law and The Role of Evidence in Class Action Litigation, 165 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1807 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[37] Geldart, Legal Personality, 27 L.Q.Rev. 90 (1911). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[38] Gellhorn, Rules of Evidence and Official Notice in Formal Administrative Hearings, 1971 Duke L.J. 1. [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [39] George, Someone's Watching: Protecting Privilege on Both Sides of The Table During Electronic Discovery, 2004 U.Ill.J.Tech. & Pol'y 283. [Prop.F.R.Ev. 503]
- [40] Geraldson, Effect of Presumptions, 26 Marq.L.Rev. 142 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [41] Gergacz, Attorney-Client Privilege: Inadvertent Disclosure and A Proposed Construction of Federal Rule of Evidence, 5 Fed.Cts.L.Rev. 101(2011-2012). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [42] Gergacz, Attorney-Corporate Client Privilege: Cases Applying *Upjohn*, Waiver, Crime-Fraud Exception, and Related Topics, 38 Bus.Law. 1653 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [43] Gergacz, Privileged Communications Between An Attorney and A Corporate Client: A Comparison Between The United States and Great Britain, 14 Anglo-Am.L.Rev. 127 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [44] Gergacz, Employee's Use of Employer Computers to Communicate With Their Own Attorneys and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 10 Computer L.Rev. & Tech.J. 269 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [45] Gergacz, Using The Internet to Attract Clients and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 33 Rutgers Computer & Tech.L.J. 17 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [46] Gergacz, Attorney-Corporate Client Privilege, 37 Bus.Law. 461 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [47] Germer & Tebbs, Conduct of Defense Attorney and Insurance Company in Defending An Insured Where A Coverage Question is Involved, 13 So.Tex.L.J. 223 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [48] Gesell, The Use of Economic and Opinion Surveys in Court and Administrative Proceedings, 5 J.Am.Tr.L. 263 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [49] Ghent, Victim Testimony in Sex Crime Prosecutions: An Analysis of The Rape Shield Provision and The Use of Deposition Testimony Under The Criminal Sexual Conduct Statute, 34 So.Car.L.Rev. 583 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [50] Gianelli, Confrontation, Experts, and Rule 703, 20 J.L.& Pol'y 443 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [51] Gianelli, *Daubert* and Forensic Science: The Pitfalls of Law Enforcement Control of Scientific Research, 2011 U.Ill.L.Rev. 53. [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [52] Giannelli, Scientific Evidence in Criminal Proceedings: A Retrospective, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1137 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [53] Gianelli, Wrongful Convictions and Forensic Science: The Need to Regulate Crime Labs, 86 N.C.L.Rev. 163 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [54] Gianelli & McMunigal, Prosecutors, Ethics, and Expert Witnesses, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1493 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [55] Gianelli, The Supreme Court's Criminal *Daubert* Cases, 33 Seton H.L.Rev. 1071 (2003).[F.R.Ev. 703]
- [56] Gianelli, Scientific Evidence in Civil and Criminal Cases, 33 Ariz.St.L.J. 103 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [57] Gianelli, Polygraph Evidence: Post-*Daubert*, 49 Hast.L.J. 895 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [58] Gianelli, *Daubert*: Interpreting the Federal Rules of Evidence, 15 Cardozo L.Rev. 1999 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [59] Gianelli, The Abuse of Scientific Evidence in Criminal Cases: The Need for Independent Crime Laboratories, 4 Va.J.Soc.Pol'y & L. 439 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [60] Giannelli, "Junk Science": The Criminal Cases, 84 J.Crim.L. & Crim. 105 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [61] Gianelli, Expert Testimony and The Confrontation Clause, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 45 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [62] Giannelli, The Admissibility of Laboratory Results in Criminal Trials: The Reliability of Scientific Proof, 49 Ohio St.L.J. 671 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [63] Giannelli, The Proposed Ohio Rules of Evidence: The General Assembly, Evidence, and Rulemaking, 29 Case-Wes.Res.L.Rev. 16 (1978). [History]
- [64] Gibbs, Prejudicial Error: Admissions and Exclusions of Evidence in The Federal Courts, 3 Vill.L.Rev. 48 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [65] Giesel, The Legal Advice Requirement of The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Special Problem for In-House and Outside Counsel Representing Corporations, 48 Mercer L.Rev. 1169 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [66] Gilats, Out-of-Court Statements in Guardian Ad Litem Written Reports and Oral Testimony, 33 Wm.Mitchell L.Rev. 911 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [67] Gilded, Sifting The Dross: Expert Testimony in Minnesota After The *Daubert* Trilogy, 26 Wm.Mitchell L.Rev. 93 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

[68] Gilles, The Image of “Good Journalism” in Privilege, Tort Law, and Constitutional Law, 32 Ohio No.U.L.Rev. 485 (2006). [Rule 501]

[69] Gill, Classified Information Cases on The Ground: Altering the Attorney-Client Privilege, 51 U.Rich.L.Rev. 897 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[70] Gillet, The Federal Tax Practitioner-Client Privilege: A Shield To Cloak Confidential Communications or A Dagger for The Practitioner and The Client?, 23 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 129 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[71] Gilligan, Character Evidence, 109 Mil.L.Rev. 83 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[72] Gilligan & Imwinkelreid, Waiver Raised To The Second Power: Waiver of Evidentiary Privileges by Lawyers Representing Accused Being Tried In Absentia, 56 S.Car.L.Rev. 509 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 511]

[73] Gilligan & Lederer, The Procurement and Presentation of Evidence in Courts Martial: Compulsory Process and Confrontation, 101 Mil.L.Rev. 1 (1983). [Confrontation]

[74] Gianoni, Lose The Battle, Win The War: The Use, Dangers, and Problems Surrounding Rules 806 and 608(b), and How They Can Be Fixed, 20 Suff.J.Tr.&App.Advoc. 31 (2014-2015). [F.R.Ev. 806 & 608(b)]

[75] Ginsberg, An Evidentiary Oddity: “Careful Habit” — -Does The Law of Evidence Embrace This Archaic/Modern Concept?, 43 Ohio.N.U.L.Rev. 293 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 406]

[76] Ginzberg, The Confrontation Clause and Forensic Autopsy Reports—-A “Testimonial.” 74 La.L.Rev. 117 (2013). [Confrontation]

[77] Gippini-Fourier, Legal Professional Privilege in Competition Proceedings Before The European Commission: Beyond The cursory Glance, 28 Fordham Int.L.J. 967 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[78] Gitchell, Charting A Course Through Character Evidence, 41 Ark.L.Rev. 585 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[79] Glanzer & Tasker, Attorneys Before The Grand Jury: Asserting The Attorney-Client Privilege to Protect A Client’s Identity, 75 J.Crim.L.&Crim. 1070 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[80] Glick, Impeachment by Prior Convictions: A Critique of Rule 609 of The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence for U.S. District Courts, 6 Crim.L.Bull. 330 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 609]

Faculty Articles

- [82]** Glicksman, Judicialization of The Administrative Process: Adversarial Risks for Fairness, 42 So.Car.L.Rev. 345 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [83]** Glover, Evidentiary Privileges for Cohabiting Parents: Protecting Children Inside and Outside of Marriage, 70 La.L.Rev. 751 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [84]** Glynn, One Privilege to Rule Them All? Some Post-Sarbanes-Oxley and Other Reflections on A Federally Codified Attorney-Client Privilege, 38 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 597 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [85]** Glynn, Federalizing Privilege, 52 Am.U.L.Rev. 59 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [86]** Godfrey, The Revised Attorney-Client Privilege for Corporations in Texas, 30 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 139 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [87]** Gold, The Three Commandments of Amending The Federal Rules of Evidence, 85 Ford.L.Rev. 1615 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [88]** Gold, Two Jurisdictions, Three Standards: The Admissibility of Misconduct Evidence to Impeach, 36 Southwestern Law Review 769 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [89]** Gold, Impeachment by Conviction Evidence: Judicial Discretion and the Politics of Rule 609 15 Cardozo Law Review 2295 (1994) [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [90]** Gold, Covert Advocacy: Reflections on The Use of Psychological Persuasion Techniques in The Courtroom, 65 N.C.L.Rev. 481 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [91]** Gold, Federal Rule of Evidence 403: Observations on The Nature of Unfairly Prejudicial Evidence, 58 Wash.L.Rev. 497 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [92]** Gold, Juror Competency to Testify that a Verdict was the Product of Racial Bias, 9 St. John's Journal of Legal Commentary 125 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [93]** Gold, Do the Federal Rules of Evidence Matter? 25 Loyola Law Review 909 (1992) [History]
- [94]** Gold, Psychological Manipulation in the Courtroom, 66 Nebraska Law Review 562 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [95]** Gold, Covert Advocacy: Reflections on the Use of Psychological Persuasion Techniques in the Courtroom, 65 North Carolina Law Review 481 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [96]** Gold, Jury Wobble: Judicial Tolerance of Jury Inferential Error, 58 Southern California Law Review 391 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[97] Gold, Limiting Judicial Discretion to Exclude Prejudicial Evidence, 18 UC Davis Law Review 59 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[98] Gold, Federal Rule of Evidence 403: Observations on the Nature of Unfairly Prejudicial Evidence, 58 Washington Law Review 497 (1983).

[99] Gold, Impeaching the Credibility of a Hearsay Declarant: The Foundation Prerequisite, 22 UCLA Law Review 452 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 806]

[100] Gold & Wyatt, The Rape System: Old Roles and New Times, 27 Cath.U.L.Rev. 695 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[101] Goldberg, The Supreme Court, Congress, and Rules of Evidence, 5 Seton H.L.Rev. 607 (1974). [History]

[102] Goldberg, The Peer Review Privilege: A Law in Search of A Valid Policy, 10 Am.J.L. & Med. 151 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[103] Goldberg, The Physician-Patient Privilege— -An Impediment to Public Health, 16 Dal.L.J. 787 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[104] Goldfuss, *Herbert v. Lando*: No Cause for Alarm, 1 Comm. & Law 61 (1979) [F.R.Ev. 501]

[105] Goldman, Not So “Firmly Rooted”: Exceptions to The Confrontation Clause, 66 N.C.L.Rev. 1 (1987). [Confrontation]

[106] Glanzer & Tasker, Attorneys Before The Grand Jury: Asserting The Attorney-Client Privilege to Protect a Client’s Identity, 75 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 1070 (1984). (F.R.E. 503).

[107] Goldner & Mrovka, Demonstrative and Audio-Visual Aids at Trial, 8 U.Fla.L.Rev. 189 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[108] Gomez, It Is Not So Simply Because An Expert Says It Is So; The Reliability of Gang Expert Testimony Regarding Criminal Street Gangs: Pushing The Limits of Texas Rule of Evidence 702, 34 St. Mary’s L.J. 581 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[109] Goodale, *Branzberg v. Hayes* and The Developing Qualified Privilege for Newsmen, 26 Hastings L.J. 709 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[110] Goodale, *Branzberg* and The Protection of Reporters’ Sources, 29 U.Mia.L.Rev. 456 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [111] Goode, Identity, Fees and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 59 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 307 (1991). (F.R.E. 503).
- [112] Goode & Sharlot, Article V: Privileges, 20 Houston L.Rev. 273 (1983). [History]
- [113] Goodhart, A Changing Approach to The Law of Evidence, 51 Va.L.Rev. 759 (1965). [History]
- [114] Goodman, The Color of Our Character: Confronting The Racial Character of Rule 404(b) Evidence, 25 Law & Ineq. 1 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [115] Goodman, Confrontation's Convolutions, 47 LOY. U. CHI. L.J. 817 (2016) [Confrontation]
- [116] Goodman, Evidence, California Litigation Review: Review of 2014 Developments [History]
- [117] Goodman, When Privacy is Not an Option: Codifying the Contours of Necessary Third Parties in Emergency Medical Situations, 63 SYRACUSE L. REV. 399 (2013) [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [118] Goodman, The Gate(way)s of Hell and Pathways to Purgatory: Eradicating Common Law Protections in the Newly Sculpted Character Evidence Rules of the United Kingdom's 2003 Criminal Justice Act, 66 U. MIAMI L. REV. 79 (2011) [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [119] Goodman, The Color of Our Character: Confronting the Racial Character of Rule 404(b) Evidence, 25 LAW & INEQ. 1 (2007) [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [120] Goodman et.al., Child Witnesses and The Confrontation Clause: The American Psychological Association's Brief in *Maryland v. Craig*, 15 Law & Hum.Behav. 13 (1991). [Confrontation]
- [121] Goodman et al., Face-to-Face Confrontation: Effects of Closed-Circuit Technology on Children's Eyewitness Testimony and Juror's Decisions, 22 Law & Hum.Behav. 165 (1998). [Confrontation]
- [122] Goodman & Zak, The Heat Is On: Thermographs as Evidence Under The *Frye* Standard, 8 West.N.Eng.L.Rev. 13 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [123] Goodno, Protecting Any Child: The Use of The Confidential Marital Communications Privilege in Child Molestation Cases, 59 U.Kans.L.Rev. 1 (2010). (F.R.E. 505).

Faculty Articles

[124] Goodwin, Fifty Years of *Frye* in Alabama: The Continuing Debate Over Adopting The Test Established in *Daubert*, 35 *Cumb.L.Rev.* 231 (2004-2005). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[125] Gora, The Source of The Problem of Sources: The First Amendment Fails The Fourth Estate, 29 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 1399 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[126] Gordon & Arenberg-Lyman, The Role of *Daubert* in Scrutinizing Expert Testimony in Class Certification, 82 *Geo.Wash.L.Rev.* 135 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[127] Gorwon, Demonstrative Evidence: Past, Present, and Future, 22 *Wisc.Bar Bull.* 11 (Feb. 1959). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[128] Grady, The Admissibility of A Prior Statement of Opinion For Purposes of Impeachment, 49 *Corn.L.Q.* 224 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[129] K. Graham, Justice and Other Crimes Evidence: The Smorgasbord Ploy, 85 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1627 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[130] K. Graham, Confrontation Stories: Raleigh on The Mayflower, 2005 *Ohio St.J.Crim.L.* 209. [Confrontation]

[131] K. Graham, Government Privilege: A Cautionary Tale for Codifiers, 38 *Loy. (L.A.)L.Rev.* 861 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[132] K. Graham, The Right of Confrontation and The Hearsay Rule: Sir Walter Raleigh Loses Another One, 8 *Crim.L.Bull.* 99 (1972). [Confrontation]

[133] M. Graham, Evidence As To Character—Other Crimes, Wrongs, or Acts, 19 *Crim.L.Bull.* 349 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[134] M. Graham, The Cry of Rape: The Prompt Complaint Doctrine and The Federal Rules of Evidence, 19 *Willam.L.Rev.* 489 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[135] M. Graham, “Stickperson Hearsay”: A Simplified Approach to Understanding The Rule Against Hearsay, 1982 *Ill.L.Rev.* 887. [F.R.Ev. 801]

[136] M. Graham, Exclusion of Relevant Evidence on Grounds of Prejudice, Misleading, Confusion or Waste of Time, 18 *Crim.L.Bull.* 154 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[137] M. Graham, Relevancy and Exclusion of Relevant Evidence—Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements, 18 *Crim.L.Bull.* 442 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 410]

Faculty Articles

- [138] M. Graham, Admissibility in Illinois of Convictions and Pleas of Guilty to Traffic Offenses in Related Civil Litigation, 2 So.Ill.U.L.J. 209 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [139] M. Graham, Habit and Routine Practice, 19 Crim.L.Bull. 149 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 406]
- [140] M. Graham, Waiver of Right to Object Other Than By Failure to Make Objection --The Concept of "Door Opening", 16 Crim.L.Bull. 461 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [141] M. Graham, Evidence of Character; Circumstantial Use, 19 Crim.L.Bull. 234 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [142] M. Graham, Privileges--Their Nature and Operation, 19 Crim.L.Bull. 442 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [143] M. Graham, The Lawyer-Client Privilege, 19 Crim.L.Bull. 513 (1983). (Rej.F.R.E. 503).
- [144] M. Graham, Advance Payment in Personal Injury Claims, 3 The Forum 208 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 409]
- [145] M. Graham, Rulings on Admissibility of Evidence Outside The Hearing of The Jury--"Motions in Limine", 17 Crim.L.Bull. 60 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [146] M. Graham, The *Daubert* Dilemma: At Last A Viable Solution, 2 Int.J.Evid.& Proof 1 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [147] K. Graham, What's The Matter With Evidence, 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 77 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [148] M. Graham, Judicial Notice of Adjudicative and Legislative Facts, 17 Crim.L.Bull. 241 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [149] M. Graham, Privileges--Husband and Wife; Identity of Informers, 20 Crim.L.Bull. 34 (1984). (F.R.E. 505).
- [150] M. Graham, Allocating The Burden of Proof, 17 Crim.L.Bull. 334 (1981). (F.R.E. 303).
- [151] M. Graham, Relevancy and Exclusion of Relevant Evidence--Real Evidence, 18 Crim.L.Bull. 241 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [152] M. Graham. Presumptions in Civil Cases in Illinois: Do They Exist?. 1977 So.Ill.L.J. 1. [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

- [153]** M. Graham, The Confrontation Clause, The Hearsay Rule, and The Forgetful Witness, 56 Texas L.Rev. 151 (1978). [Confrontation]
- [153]** M.Graham, The Relationship Among Federal Rules of Evidence 607, 801(d)(1)(A), and 403: A Reply to Weinstein's Evidence, 55 Texas L.Rev. 573 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 607 and 403]
- [154]** M. Graham, Examination of A Party's Own Witness Under The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Promise Unfulfilled, 54 Texas L.Rev. 917 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 607]
- [155]** Grant, Attorney-Client Privilege and The Proposed Model Code of Professional Responsibility, 6 Nat.J.Crim.Def. 163 (1980). (F.R.E. 503).
- [156]** Grant, Historical Note; Testimonial Exclusion Because of Race: A Chapter in The History of Intolerance in California, 17 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 192 (1969). [History]
- [157]** Graves, Attorney-Client Privilege in Preparation of Income Tax Returns: What Every Attorney-Preparer Should Know, 42 Tax Lawyer 577 (1989). [F.R.E. 503]
- [158]** Gray, The Right to Confrontation in Common Law Systems: A Critical Comparison, 18 New Crim.L.Rev. 125 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [159]** Green & Sanders, Admissibility Versus Sufficiency: Controlling The Quality of Expert Witness Testimony, 50 Wake For.L.Rev. 1057 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [160]** Green, A Heretical View of The Mediation Privilege, 2 Ohio St.J.Disp.Res. 1 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [161]** Green, Blindfolding The Jury, 33 Texas L.Rev. 157 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [162]** Green, Federal Civil Procedural Rule 43(a), 5 Vand.L.Rev. 560 (1952). [History]
- [163]** Green, The Military Rules of Evidence and The Military Judge, May 1980 Army Lawyer 47. [History]
- [164]** Green, Highlights of The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 4 Ga.L.Rev. 1 (1969). [History]
- [165]** Green, Drafting Uniform Federal Rules of Evidence, 52 Corn.L.Q. 177 (1967). [History]
- [166]** Green, The Admissibility of Evidence Under The Federal Rules, 55 Harv.L.Rev. 197 (1941). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [167] Green, The Model and Uniform Statutes Relating to Business Entries as Evidence, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 49 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(6)]
- [168] Green, Relevancy and Its Limits, 1969 Law & Soc.Order 533. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [169] Gregg, Other Acts of Sexual Misbehavior and Perversions as Evidence in Prosecutions for Sexual Offenses, 6 Ariz.L.Rev. 212 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [170] Gregory, Secrecy in University and College Tenure Deliberations: Placing Appropriate Limitations on Academic Freedom, 16 U.C.Davis L.Rev. 1023 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [171] Gregory, Let's Understand The Lie Detector Test, 36 Mich.St.B.J. 6 (Feb. 1951). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [172] Griffin, Impartial Medical Testimony: A Trial Lawyer in Favor, 34 Temp.L.Q, 402 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [173] Griffith, The Power of A Presumption: California as A Laboratory for Unauthorized Immigrant Workers' Rights, 56 U.C.Davis L.Rev. 1279 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [174] Grimm, Delse & Grimm, The Confrontation Clause and The Hearsay Rule: What Hearsay Exceptions Are Testimonial?, 40 U.Balt.L.F. 155 (2010). [Confrontation]
- [175] Grippando, Attorney-Client Privilege: Implied Waiver Through Inadvertent Disclosure of Documents, 39 U.Miami L.Rev. 511 (1985). (F.R.E. 503).
- [176] Griswold, The Due Process Revolution and Confrontation, 119 U.Pa.L.Rev. 711 (1977). [Confrontation]
- [177] Grumley, Discovery Against The Government of Military and Other Confidential Matters, 43 Ky.L.J. 343 (1955). (F.R.E. 509).
- [178] Groves, Lawyers, Psychologists, and Psychological Evidence in Child Protection Hearings, 5 Queen's L.J. 241 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [179] Grubb, Physician-Patient Privilege, 1945 Wis.L.Rev. 409. (F.R.E. 504).
- [180] Grusin, A Recognition Intentionally Invoked: Extending *Daubert* to Eyewitness Identification, 51 Willam.L.Rev. 17 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [181] Guardino, Friedman & Daynard, Remedies for Document Destruction: Tales From The Tobacco Wars, 12 Va.J.Soc.Pol'y & L. 1 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [182] Guarneri, Husband-Wife Privileged Communications Summarized, 8 Cleve-Mar.L.Rev. 531 (1959). [F.R.E. 505].
- [183] Guernsey, Toward A Unified Approach to Privileges and Relevancy, 17 Mem.St.U.L.Rev. 1 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [184] Guernsey, The Psychotherapist Privilege in Child Placement: A Relevancy Analysis, 26 Vill.L.Rev. 955 (1981). [F.R.E. 504].
- [185] Guest & Stanzler, The Constitutional Argument for Newsmen Concealing Their Sources, 64 Nw.U.L.Rev. 18 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [186] Gutterman, The Informer Privilege, 58 J.Crim.L., Crim. & P.S. 32 (1967). [F.R.E. 510]
- [187] Guttmacher & Weihofen, Privileged Communications Between Psychiatrist and Patient, 28 Ind.L.J. 32 (1952). [F.R.E. 504]
- [188] Guttmacher, Problems Faced By The Impartial Expert Witness in Court: The American View, 34 Temp.L.Q. 369 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 706].
- [189] Guttmacher, The Psychiatrist As An Expert Witness, 22 U.Chi.L.Rev. 325 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 702]

H

- [1] Haack, What's Wrong With Litigation-Driven Science?: An Essay in Legal Epistemology, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 1053 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [2] Haddad & Agin, A Potential Revolution in *Bruton* Doctrine: Is *Bruton* Applicable Where Domestic Evidence Rules Prohibit Using a Codefendant's Confession as Evidence Against A Defendant Although The Confrontation Clause Would Allow Such Use?, 86 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 235 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [3] Haddad, Post-*Bruton* Developments: A Reconsideration of The Confrontation Rationale And A Proposal For A Due Process Evaluation of Limiting Instruction, 18 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 1 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [4] Haddad, The Future of Confrontation Clause Developments: What Will Emerge When The Supreme Court Synthesizes The Diverse Lines of Confrontation Decisions?, 81 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 77 (1990). [Confrontation]
- [5] Hafele, Evidence in Products Liability Cases: Proof of Post-Injury Alterations: A Proposal, 60 Ill.B.J. 936 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 407]

Faculty Articles

[6] Haight, Keeping The Privilege Inside The Corporation, 18 Bus.L.Rev 551 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[7] Hale, Some Comments on Character Evidence and Related Topics, 22 So.Calif.L.Rev. 341 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[8] Hale, *Comment*, Evidence—-Constitutional Law—-Necessity of A Logical Inference to Support A Presumption, 17 So.Calif.L.Rev. 48 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[9] Hale, *Comment*, Evidence—-Presumptions, 17 So.Calif.L.Rev. 384 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[10] Hall, Henwood & Smith, Evidence, 67 Mercer L.Rev. 63 (2015). [History]

[11] Hall, Procedural Due Process Meets National Security: The Problem of Classified Evidence in Immigration Proceedings, 35 Corn.Int'l.L.J. 515 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[12] Hall, Hospital Committee Proceedings and Reports: Their Legal Status, 1 Am.J.Leg.Med. 245 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[13] Hallett, From The Picket Line to The Courtroom; A Labor Organizing Privilege to Protect Workers, 39 N.Y.U.Rev.L.& Soc. Change 475 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[14] Halligan, Exceptional Business Hearsay—-A Transactional Analysis of Illinois Supreme Court Rule 236, 24 DePaul L.Rev. 633 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 803(6)]

[15] Hallock, The Numbers Game—-Use and Misuse of Statistics in Civil Rights Litigation, 23 Vill.L.Rev. 5 (1977-1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[16] Halperin, Judicial Review of National Security Classifications By The Executive Branch After The 1974 Amendments to The Freedom of Information Act, 25 Am.U.L.Rev. 27 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[17] Halperin, Government Intrusion Into The Attorney-Client Relationship: An Interest Analysis of Rights and Remedies, 32 Buff.L.Rev. 127 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[18] Hamilton, Attorney-Client Privilege in Congress, 12 Litigation 3 (Winter 1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[19] Hammelman, Rules of Evidence Under The New Italian Civil Codes, 29 J.Comp.Leg.& Int'l Law 39 (3d Ser. 1947). [History]

[20] Hammelman, Professional Privilege: A Comparative Study, 28 Can.B.Rev. 750 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [21]** Hammelman, Hearsay Evidence, A Comparison, 67 Law Q.Rev. 67 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [22]** Hanasono, The Muddled State, California's Application of Confrontation Clause Jurisprudence in *People v. Dungo* and *People v. Lopez*, 41 Hast.Con.L.Q. 1 (2013). [Confrontation]
- [23]** Hanaway, Corporate Law Departments—A New Look, 17 Bus.Law. 595 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [24]** Hanbury, The Burden of Proof, 61 Jurid.Rev. 121 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [25]** Hand, Historical and Practical Considerations Regarding Expert Testimony, 15 Har.I.Rev. 40 (1901). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [26]** Haney, The Evolutionary Development of Marital Privileges in Federal Criminal Trials: Constricting The Invocation and Growth of Spousal Privilege In Federal Criminal Cases by Interpreting The Common Law in The "Light of Reason and Experience", 6 Nat.J.Crim.Def. 49 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [27]** Hans, Judges, Juries, and Scientific Evidence, 16 J.L.& Pol'y 19 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [28]** Hansen-Young, Considering The Constitutionality of Confrontation Clause Exception For Domestic Violence, 14 Buff. Women's L.J. 81 (2005-2006). [Confrontation]
- [29]** Hanson, James Alphonso Frye Is Sixty-Five Years Old: Should He Retire?, 16 West,St.U.L.Rev. 357 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [30]** Harrison, *Crawford v. Washington* and *Davis v. Indiana's* Originalism: Historical Arguments Showing Child Abuse Victims Statements to Physicians Are Nontestimonial and Admissible As An Exception to The Confrontation, 58 Mercer L.Rev. 569 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [31]** Harcourt, The Shaping of Change: Actuarial Models and Criminal Profiling at The Turn of The Twenty-First Century, 70 U.Chi.L.Rev. 105 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [32]** Hardin, Executive Privilege in The Federal Courts, 71 Yale L.J. 879 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [33]** Hardman, The Evidentiary Effect of A View: Stare Decisis or Stare Dicta?, 53 W.Va.L.Rev. 103 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [34]** Hardman, The Evidentiary Effect of A View: Another Word, 58 W.Va.L.Rev. 69 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [35]** Hardman, Lie Detectors: Extra-Judicial Investigation and The Courts, 48 W.Va.L.Q. 37 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [36]** Hare & Shelley, The Admissibility of Other Similar Incident Evidence: A Two-Step Analysis, 15 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 541 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [37]** Hare, Admissibility of Evidence Concerning Other Similar Incidents in A Defective Design Case: Courts Should Determine “Similarity” By Reference to The Defect Involved, 21 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 491 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [38]** Hare, Demonstrative Evidence, 27 Ala.Law. 193 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [39]** Hargrave, Presumptions and Burdens of Proof in Louisiana Property Law, 46 La.L.Rev. 225 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [40]** Harman & Arthur, The Utilization of The Reid Polygraph By Attorneys and The Courts, 2 Crim.L.Rev. 12 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [41]** Harmon & Imwinkelreid, The Admissibility of Evidence of The Accused’s Opportunity to Retest Physical Evidence in Criminal Cases, 37 N.Eng.J.Crim. & Civ. Conf. 3 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [42]** Harnish, Confidential Communications Between Clients and Patent Agents: Are The Protected by The Attorney-Client Privilege?, 16 Hast,Comm/Ent.L.J. 433 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [43]** Harnon, Evidence Obtained By Polygraph: An Israeli Perspective, 1982 Crim.L.Rev. 340. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [44]** Harris, Constitutional Limits on Criminal Presumptions As An Expression of Changing Concepts of Fundamental Fairness, 77 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 308 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [45]** Harshberger, Botford & Kepler, Prosecuting Child Sexual Abuse Cases in Middlesex County, 30 Bost.B.J. 6 (Mar-April 1986). [Confrontation]
- [46]** Hart & McNaghton, Evidence and Inference in The Law, Evidence and Inference (Lerner ed. 1959). [History]
- [47]** Harter, Neither Cop Nor Collection Agent: Encouraging Settlements by Ensuring Mediator Confidentiality, 41 Ad.L.Rev. 315 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 408]

Faculty Articles

- [48] Hartman, The “Whys” and “Whynots” of Judicial Comments on Evidence in Jury Trials, 23 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 1 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [49] Hartman, The Presumption Against Suicide As Applied in The Trial of Insurance Cases, 19 Marq.L.Rev. 20 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [50] Hartwig, Congressional Enactment of The Uniform Judicial Notice Act, 40 Mich.L.Rev. 174 (1931). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [51] Harvey, Protection of News Sources in Pennsylvania, 35 Penn.B.A.Q. 197 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [52] Harvey, Evidence Code Section 1224— -Are An Employee’s Admissions Admissible Against His Employer?, 8 Santa Clara Lawyer 59 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)]
- [53] Hashimoto, Science As Mythology in Constitutional Law, 76 Ore.L.Rev. 111 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [54] Hatchett, Discovering The Identity of The Informer, 46 Fla.B.J. 644 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [55] Havener, Malpractice Medical Discovery v. Physician-Patient Privilege— -Something’s Got To Give!, 35 Ins.Coun. 41 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [56] Haward & Ashworth, Some Problems of Evidence Obtained By Hypnosis, 1980 Crim.L.Rev. 469. [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [57] Haviland, Some Recent American Developments in The Protection of Know-How, 20 Buff.L.Rev. 110 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [58] Hayden, Should There Be a Psychotherapist Privilege In Military Courts-Martial?, 123 Mil.L.Rev 31 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [59] Haydock, Some Evidentiary Problems Posed By Atomic Energy Security Requirements, 61 Harv.L.Rev. 468 (1948). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [60] Hayes, Disclosure of Informers: The Accused’s Right, 48 Conn.B.J. 91 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [61] Hazard, An Historical Perspective on The Attorney-Client Privilege, 66 Calif.L.Rev. 1061 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [62] Hazel, The Motion in Limine in Texas: A Proposal, 21 Hous.L.Rev. 919 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 103]

Faculty Articles

[63] Heafy, Return to Sender?: Inadvertent Disclosure of Privileged Information, 28 Am.J.Tr,Adv. 615 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[64] Healy, Ten Years After: A Reconsideration of The Codification of Evidence Law In Massachusetts, 15 West.N.Eng,L.Rev. 1 (1993). [History]

[65] Hebl, Spoliation of Electronically Stored Information, Good Faith, and Rule 37, 29 N.Ill.U.L.Rev. 79 (2008). [Rule 401]

[66] Hecht & Dinzler, Rebutting Presumptions: Order Out of Chaos, 58 Bost.U.L.Rev. 527 (1978).[F.R.Ev. 301]

[67] Heck,U.S. Misinterpretation of The Hague Evidence Convention, 24 Col.J.Transnat.L. 231 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[68] Heffernan, Effective Use of Demonstrative Evidence: “Seeing Is Believing”, 5 AmJ.Tr,Adv. 427 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[69] Hefflinger, Propose Rule Broadens Scope of Judicial Notice, 53 Neb.L.Rev. 333 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[70] Heidt, The Conjurer’s Circle—The Fifth Amendment in Civil Cases, 91 Yale I.J. 1062 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[71] Heininger, The Attorney-Client Privilege As It Relates to Corporations, 52 Ill.B.J. 376 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[72] Heineken & Avitan, Reconciling *Branzberg* and *Daily Mail*: A Proposal For a Qualified Reporters’ Privilege, 32 Ohio N.U.L.Rev. 503 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501].

[73] Heller, The Cognitive Psychology of Circumstantial Evidence, 105 Mich.L.Rev. 241 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[74] Heller, Some Comments to Lawyers on The Practice of Psychiatry, 30 Temp.L.Q. 401 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[75] Hellman, The Abominable Claim-monger: Bogeyman in The Cross-Examination, 41 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 26 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 611]

[76] Helman, Presumptions, 22 Can.B.Rev. 118 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[77] Hendel & Bard, Should There Be A Researchers’ Privilege?, 59 A.A.U.P.Bull. 398 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

[78] Henderson, Product Liability and Admissibility of Subsequent Remedial Measures: Resolving The Conflict by Recognizing The Difference Between Negligence and Strict Tort Liability, 64 Neb.L.Rev. 1 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 407]

[79] Hendren, Spoliation of Evidence: Why This Evidentiary Concept Should Not Be Transformed Into Separate Causes of Action, 27 U.Ark.Little Rock L.Rev. 281 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[80] Henke, Admissibility of Computer-Generated Animated Reconstructions and Simulations, 35 Tr.L.Guide 434 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[81] Hennings, The Executive Privilege and The People's Right to Know, 19 Fed.B.J. 1 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[82] Hepburn, The Objective Reality of Evidence and The Utility of Systemic Jury Selection, 4 Law & Hum.Behav. 89 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[83] Herald, Trade Secrets As An Alternative To Patents, 9 Am.L.S.Rev. 1107 (1941). [F.R.Ev. 508]

[84] Herasimchuck, The Relevancy Revolution in Criminal Law: A Practical Tour Through The Texas Rules of Evidence, 20 St. Mary's L.J. 737 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[85] Herbert & Mount, Ohio's "Similar Acts Statute": Its Uses and Abuses, 9 Akron L.J. 301 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[86] Herman, The Use of Hypno-Induced Statements in Criminal Cases, 25 Ohio St.L.J. 1 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 612]

[87] Herman, What's Wrong With The Rape Reform Laws, 3 Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 60 (Dec.-Jan. 1976-1977). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[88] Herrman & Speer, "To A Moral Certainty": The Historical Context of The *Webster* Charge on Reasonable Doubt, 36 Bost.B.J. 22 (May/April 1992). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[89] Herzel & Hagan, Do Corporations Really Have An Attorney-Client Privilege?. 59 Chi.Bar Rec. 296 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[90] Herzel, The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Pragmatic Approach, 6 Del.J.Corp.L. 443 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[91] Hetland, Admissions in The Uniform Rules: Are They Necessary?, 46 Iowa L.Rev. 307 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801(c)(3)]

Faculty Articles

- [92]** Heydon, Legal Professional Privilege and Third Parties, 37 Mod.L.Rev. 601 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [93]** Heydon, Current Trends in The Law of Evidence, 8 Syd.L.Rev. 305 (1977). [History]
- [94]** Heyman, Corporate Privilege and An Individual's Right to Defend, 85 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1112 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [95]** Hibey, The Trial of A Rape Case: An Advocate's Analysis of Corroboration, Consent, and Character, 11 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 309 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [96]** Higgins & Robin, Judicial Discretion, 9 J.Leg.Stud 129 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [97]** Highleyman, The Deceptive Certainty of The "Lie Detector". 10 Hast.L.J. 47 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [98]** Higley & Buck, Confidentiality of Communications by In-House Counsel for Financial Institutions, 6 N.C.Banking Inst. 205. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [99]** Hill & Westhof, "I'll Take It For What It's Worth" --The Use of Hearsay Evidence By Labor Arbitrators: A Primer and Modest Proposal, 1998 J.Disp.Resol. 1. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [100]** Hill, The Erie Doctrine in Bankruptcy, 66 Harv.L.Rev. 1013 (1953). [Rule 302].
- [101]** Hill, State Procedural Law in Federal Non-Diversity Litigation, 64 Harv.L.Rev. 66 (1953). [Rule 402]
- [102]** Hill, Testimonial Privilege and Fair Trial, 80 Colum.L.Rev. 1173 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [103]** Hilton, Science and The Scientific Examination of Signatures, 24 Tul.L.Rev. 204 (1949). [F.R.Ev.901(b)(3)]
- [104]** Hines, Privileged Testimony of Husband and Wife in California, 19 Calif.L.Rev. 390 (1931) [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [105]** Hinton, Judgment of Conviction--Effect in A Civil Case, 27 Ill.L.Rev. 195 (1932). [F.R.Ev. 803(22)]
- [106]** Hinton, Changes in Exceptions to The Hearsay Rule, 29 Ill.L.Rev. 422 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 804(a)]
- [107]** Hippler, The Turning Point Between Lawyer and Accomplice, 12 Trial 48 (May. 1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [108] Hirschman, It Will Be Pleasanter to Tell You A Story, 13 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 445 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [109] Hitchler, Entrapment As A Defense in Criminal Cases, 42 *Dick.L.Rev.* 195 (1931). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [110] Hitt, Unveiling Confrontation Forfeiture; A Return To Lord Morley, 33 *Hamline L.Rev.* 39 (2010). [Confrontation]
- [111] Ho, The Legitimacy of Medieval Proof, 19 *J.L.&Relig.* 259 (2003-2004). [History]
- [112] Ho., The Psychiatrist and The Accused: Some Evidentiary Problems, 38 *U.Tor.Fac.L.Rev.* 197 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [113] Hoeffel, The Sixth Amendment's Lost Clause: Unearthing Compulsory Process, 2002 *Wis.L.Rev.* 1275 (2005). [Compulsory Process]
- [114] Hoffman, If The Glove Don't Fit, Update The Glove: The Unplanned Obsolescence of The Substantial Similarity Standard for Experimental Evidence, 86 *Neb.L.Rev.* 633 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [115] Hoffman, The Alabama Rules of Evidence: The First Dozen Tears, 54 *Ala.L.Rev.* 241 (2005). [History]
- [116] Hoffman, On Learning of A Corporate Client's Crime or Fraud—The Lawyer's Dilemma, 33 *Bus.Law.* 1389 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [117] Hoffman, Similar Facts After *Boardman*, 91 *L.Q.Rev.* 193 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [118] Hoffman & Schroeder, Burdens of Proof, 38 *Ala.L.Rev.* 51 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [119] Hogan, A Modern Problem of PrivilegeThe Privilege of The Confessional, 6 *Loyola (N.O.)L.Ev.* 1 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [120] Hogan, Encounter Groups and Human Relations Training: The Case Against Applying Traditional Forms of Statutory Regulation, 11 *Harv.J.Legis.* 639 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [121] Hogan, Justice Story on The Common Law of Evidence, 9 *Vand.L.Rev.* 51 (1955). [History]
- [122] Holbrook & Dunn, Medical Malpractice Litigation; The Discoverability and Use of Hospitals' Quality Assurance Committee Records, 16 *Washburn L.J.* 54 (1976). [F.R.Ev.501]

Faculty Articles

- [123] Holland, *Crawford* and Beyond: How Far Have We Travelled from *Roberts* After All?. 21 J.L.& Pol'y 517 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [124] Holland, Testimonial Statements Under *Crawford*: What Makes Testimony. . . Testimonial? 71 Brook.L.Rev. 281 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [125] Holland, Section 60.41 of The New York Criminal Procedure Law: The Sexual Assault Reform Act of 1999 Challenges *Molineux* and Due Process, 27 Ford.Urb.L.J. 435 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [126] Holland & Chamberlin, Statutory Criminal Presumptions: Proof Beyond A Reasonable Doubt?, 7 Valpo.U.L.Rev. 147 (1973), [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [127] Holtorf, Motions To Limit Evidence, 4 Neb.L.Rev. 502 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [128] Holtzoff, Institute on Practical Evidence, 18 F.R.D. 367 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 101]
- [129] Hooper & Van Hemmen, Admiralty L.J. Symposium: Towage, Salvage, Pilotage and Pollution: Burdens of Proof Between Tugs and Tows, 70 Tul.L.Rev. 531 (1995). [F.R.Ev.301]
- [130] Hoover, The Confidential Nature of F.B.I. Records, 8 Syr.L.Rev. 2 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [131] Hornstein, On The Horns of An Evidentiary Dilemma: The Intersection of the Federal Rules of Evidence 806 and 608(b), 56 Ark.L.Rev. 543 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 806]
- [132] Hornstein, The New Maryland Rules of Evidence: Survey, Analysis, and Critique, 54 Md.L.Rev. 1032 (1995). [History]
- [133] Horton, A Transactional Lawyer's Perspective on The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Jeremiad for *Upjohn*, 61 Bus.Law. 95 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [134] Horvath, Detecting Deception: The Promise and Reality of Voice Stress Analysis, 77 J.Foren.Sci. 340 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [135] Horvath & Reid, The Polygraph Silent Answer Test, 63 J.Crim.L., Crim. & Pol.Sci. 285 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [136] Horvath & Reid, The Reliability of Polygraph Examiners; Diagnosis of Truth and Deception, 62 J.Crim.L., Crim. & P.S. 276 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [137] Howard, Evidence in Federal Criminal Trials. 51 Yale L.J. 763 (1942). [History]
- [138] Howe, Untangling Competing Conceptions of "Evidence". 30 Loy.(I..A.) L.Rev. 1197 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [139] Howell, Seven Weeks: The Making of The USA Patriot Act, 72 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1145 (2004) [History]
- [140] Howell & Lesemann, FISA's Fruits in Criminal Cases: An Opportunity for Improved Accountability, 12 U.C.L.A.J.Int'l L. & Foreign Aff. 145 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [141] Huber, Junk Science in The Courtroom, 26 Valpo.U.L.Rev. 723 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [142] Huefner, Congressional Searches and Seizures: The Place of Legislative Privilege, 24 J.L.& Pol. 271 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [143] Hug, Presumptions and Inferences in Criminal Law, 56 Milit.L.Rev. 81 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [144] Hughes, Did The National Security Agency Destroy the Prospects for Confidentiality and Privilege When Lawyers Store Clients' Files in The Cloud—and What, If Anything, Can Lawyers and Law Firms Do In Response?, 41 N.Ky.L.Rev. 405 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [145] Huhn, Ohio's "Sacred Seal of Secrecy": The Rules of Spousal Incompetency and Marital Privilege in Criminal Cases, 20 Akron L.Rev. 433 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [146] Hull, Unearthing Mansfield's Rule: Analyzing the Appropriateness of Federal Rule of Evidence 606(b) in Light of The Common Law Tradition, 38 S.Ill.U.L.J. 403 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 606(b)]
- [147] Hurtgen, The Case for Presidential Prerogative, 7 U.Tol.L.Rev. 59 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509][
- [148] Huston, The Tender Years Presumption in Missouri: A Judicial Anachronism, 23 St.U.L.J. 697 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [149] Hutchins. Discretion of A Trial Judge—-In Trial to Exclude Otherwise Admissible Evidence, 6 Dalhousie L.J. 690 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [150] Hutchins & Slesinger, Some Observations on The Law of Evidence—- Consciousness of Guilt, 77 U.Pa.L.Rev. 725 (1929). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [151]The Hutchins & Slesinger, Some Observations on The Law of Evidence: Spontaneous Exclamations, 28 Colum.L.Rev. 432 (1926). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]
- [152] Hutchins & Slesinger, Some Observations on The Law of Evidence: Family Relations, 13 Minn.L.Rev. 675 (1929). [F.R.Ev. 505]

Faculty Articles

[153] Hutchins & Slesinger, Some Observations on The Law of Evidence—-Memory, 41 Harv.L.Rev. 860 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 612]

[154] Hutchins & Slesinger, Some Observations on The Law of Evidence —-The Competency of Witnesses, 37 Yale L.J. 1017 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 601]

[155] Hutton, Sir Walter Raleigh Revived: The Supreme Court Revamps Two Decades of Confrontation Clause Precedent in *Crawford v. Washington*, 50 S.D.L.Rev. 41 (2005). [Confrontation}

[156] Hutton, Commentary: Prior Bad Acts Evidence in Cases of Sexual Contact With a Child, 34 So.Dak.L.Rev. 604 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 414]

I

[1] Imwinkelried, “Revising State Post-Conviction Relief Statutes to Cover Convictions Resting on Subsequently Invalidated Expert Testimony,” ___ Seton Hall Law Review ___ (forthcoming 2018). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[2] Imwinkelried, “Criminal Minds: The Need to Refine the Application of the Doctrine of Objective Chances as a Justification for Introducing Uncharged Misconduct Evidence to Prove Intent,” 45 Hofstra L.Rev. 851 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[3] Vosk & Imwinkelried, “Measurements in Forensic Science—of Errors and Uncertainty,” 53 Crim.L.Bull. 532 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[4] Imwinkelried, “Computer Source Code: A Source of the Growing Controversy Over the Reliability of Automated Forensic Techniques,” 66 DePaul L.Rev. 97 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[5] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Novel Techniques to Link a Shooter to the Bullet or Cartridges Used in a Shooting Incident—A Cautionary Tale of Putting the Legal Cart Before the Scientific Horse,” 53 Crim.L.Bull. 158 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[6] Imwinkelried et al., “Forensic Bitemark Identification: Weak Foundations, Exaggerated Claims,” *Journal of Law and the Biosciences* (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Imwinkelried, "The Case for the Present Sense Impression Hearsay Exception: The Relevance of the Original Version of Federal Rule of Evidence 803 to Judge Posner's Criticism of the Exception," 54 U.Louv.L.Rev. 455 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 803 (1)]

[8] Song & Imwinkelried, “Animal Behavior as Scientific Evidence,” 52 Crim. L. Bull.788 (2016) [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[9] Imwinkelried, "Should Rape Shield Laws Bar Proof that the Alleged Victim Has Made Similar, False Rape Accusations in the Past? Fair Symmetry with the Rape Sword Laws," 47 U.Pac.L.Rev. 709 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[10] Imwinkelried, "The Effect of the Successful Assertion of the State Secrets Privilege in a Civil Lawsuit in Which the Government is Not a Party: When, If Ever, Should the Defendant Shoulder the Burden of the Government's Successful Privilege Claim?," 16 Wyo.L.Rev. 1 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[11] Imwinkelried & Liu, "The Challenge of Bitcoin Pseudo-Anonymity to Computer Forensics," 52 Crim.L.Bull. 191 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[12] Imwinkelreid, Criminal Minds: The Need to Refine the Application of The Doctrine of Objective Chances as A Justification of Introducing Uncharged Misconduct Evidence to Prove Intent, 45 Hofstra L.Rev. 851 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[13] Imwinkelreid, Computer Source Code: A Source of Growing Controversy Over The Reliability of Automated Forensic Techniques, 66 DePaul L.Rev. 97 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[14] Imwinkelreid, Evidence of A Third Party's Guilt of The Crime The Accused is Charged With: The Constitutionalization of the SODDI (some other dude did it) Defense, 47 Loy.U.(Chi.)91 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[15] Steussy, Eisen, Imwinkelried & Vandamme, "Microbial Forensics: The Biggest Thing Since DNA?," 51 Crim.L.Bull. 726 (May-June 2015).

[16] Imwinkelried, Distinguishing Lay from Expert Opinion: The Need to Focus on the Epistemological Differences Between the Reasoning Processes of Lay and Expert Witnesses, 68 S.M.U.L.Rev. 73 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 701]

[17] Imwinkelried & Mayor, "Skid Mark Analysis: The Central Importance Distinguishing Lay From Expert Opinion: The Need to Focus on The Epistemological Differences Between the Reasoning Processes Used by Lay and Expert Witnesses, 68 S.M.U.L.Rev. 73 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 701]

[18] Imwinkelreid, Formalism Versus Pragmatism in Evidence: Reconsidering The Absolute Ban on The Use of Extrinsic Evidence to Prove Impeaching, Untruthful Acts That Have Not Resulted in A Conviction, 48 Creighton L.Rev. 213 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 608(b)]

[19] Imwinkelried, "A Statute Overtaken by Time: The Need to Reinterpret Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)(A)(iii) Governing the Admissibility of Expert Opinions in Government Investigative Reports," 46 St. Mary's L.J. 31 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 803(8)(A)(iii)]

Faculty Articles

[20] Imwinkelried, "Preliminary Thoughts on an Attorney-Client Privilege for Law Firms: When A Current Client Threatens to Sue the Firm for Malpractice, Does the Privilege Apply to The Firm's Consultation with In-House Counsel About the Potential Claims?," 48 *Valpo.U.L.Rev.* 715 (2014) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[21] Imwinkelried, "The Applicability of Privileges to Employees' Personal E-Mails: The Errors Caused by the Confusion Between Privilege Confidentiality and Other Notions of Privacy," 2014 *Mich.St. L.Rev.* 1. [F.R.Ev. 501]

[22] Imwinkelried, "The Tactical Choice Under Federal Rule of Evidence 703," 41 *Litigation*, Fall 2014, at 8. [F.R.Ev. 703]

[23] Imwinkelried, "The Importance of Forensic Metrology in Preventing Miscarriages of Justice: Intellectual Honesty About the Uncertainty of Measurement in Scientific Analysis," 7 *J.Marsh.L.J.* 333 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[24] Imwinkelried & Osman, "Facial Recognition Systems," 50 *Crim.L.Bull.* 695 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[25] Imwinkelried, "The Government's Increasing Reliance on—and Abuse of—the Deliberative Process Evidentiary Privilege: '[T]he Last Will Be First,'" 83 *Miss.L.J.* 509 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[26] Imwinkelreid, The Importance of Forensic Metrology in Preventing Miscarriages of Justice: Intellectual Honesty About The Uncertainty of Measurement in Scientific Analysis, 7 *J.Marsh.L.J.* 333 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[27] Imwinkelreid, A Statute Overtaken by Time: The Need to Reinterpret Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)(A)(iii) Governing the Admissibility of Expert Opinions in Governmental Investigative Reports, 46 *St. Mary's L.J.* 31 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 803(8)(A)(iii)]

[28] Imwinkelreid, The Applicability of Privileges to Employees' Personal E-Mails: The Errors Caused by Confusion Between Privilege, Confidentiality, and Other Notions of Privacy, 2014 *Mich.St.L.Rev.* 1. [F.R.Ev. 503]

[29] Imwinkelreid, The Epistemological Trend in The Law of Expert Testimony: A Scrutiny at Once Broader, Narrower, and Deeper, 47 *Ga.L.Rev.* 863 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[30] Imwinkelried & Noval, "Retrograde Extrapolation of Blood Alcohol Concentration," 50 *Crim.L.Bull.* 190 (2014).

[31] Imwinkelried, et al., "The Use of Global Positioning (GPS) and Cell Tower Evidence To Establish a Person's Location—Part II," 49 *Crim.L.Bull.* 637 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[32] Imwinkelried, "The Epistemological Trend in the Evolution of the Law of Expert Testimony: A Scrutiny at Once Broader, Narrower, and Deeper," 47 *Ga.L.Rev.* 863 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 702]

Faculty Articles

[33] Imwinkelried & Faigman,, "Wading into the *Daubert* Tide: Sargon Enterprises, Inc. V. University of Southern California," 64 *Hast.L.J.* 1665 (2013)

[34] Imwinkelried, "The Need for Truly Systemic Analysis for Reform of Both Pretrial Practice and Evidentiary Rules: The Role of The Law of Unintended Consequences," 34 *Rev.Litig.* 201 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[35] Imwinkelried, "The Gordian Knot of the Treatment of Secondhand Facts Under Federal Rule of Evidence 703 Governing the Admissibility of Expert Opinions: Another Conflict Between Logic and Law," 3 *U.Denver Crim.L.Rev.* 1 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[36] Imwinkelried, "The Need for Truly Systemic Analysis of Proposals for the Reform of Both Pretrial Practice and Evidentiary Rules: The Role of the Law of Unintended Consequences in 'Litigation' Reform," 32 *Rev.Litig.* 201 (2013). [History]

[37] Imwinkelried, "A Trial Advocacy Postscript to the *Daubert* Hearing," 46 *U.C.Davis L.Rev.* 931 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[38] Imwinkelried, "Protecting the Attorney-Client Privilege in Business Negotiations: Would the Application of the Subject-Matter Waive Doctrine Really Drive Attorneys from the Bargaining Table?," 51 *Duq.L.Rev.* 167 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[39] Imwinkelried, "The Validity of the 2010 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Amendment Governing the Waiver of Work Product Protection: Is the Work Product Doctrine an Evidentiary Privilege?," 37 *U.Dayton L.Rev.* 279 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 502]

[40] Imwinkelried, "The Golden Anniversary of the 'Preliminary Study of the Advisability and Feasibility of Developing Uniform Rules of Evidence for the Federal Courts': Mission Accomplished?," 57 *Wayne L.Rev.* 1367 (2011). [History]

[41] Imwinkelried, et. al., "The Use of Global Position System (GPS) and Cell Tower Evidence to Establish a Person's Location—Part I," 49 *Crim.L.Bull.* 160 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[42] Flood & Imwinkelried, "Inferring Race by Using Ancestry Informative Markers (AIMS) as a Forensic Technique in the Courtroom," 48 *Crm.L.Bull.* 1049 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[43] Imwinkelried, Mendez & Gaal, "Document Summaries in Court," *California Lawyer*, May 2012, at 37. [F.R.Ev. 1006]

[44] DeFranco & Imwinkelried,"Forensic Science: The Role of the Acid Phosphatase Spot Test in Sexual Assault Prosecutions," 48 *Crim.L.Bull.* 195 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[45] Imwinkelried, "Rationalization and Limitation: The Use of Learned Treatises to Impeach Opposing Expert Witnesses," 36 *Vt.L.Rev.* 63 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 803(18)]

Faculty Articles

[46] Imwinkelried, "Using the National Research Council's Report, *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward* (2009), in the Courtroom," 47 *Crim.L.Bull.* 975 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[47] Imwinkelried, "The Dangerous Trend Blurring the Distinction Between a Reasonable Expectation of Confidentiality in Privilege Law and a Reasonable Expectation of Privacy in Fourth Amendment Jurisprudence," 57 *Loy.L.Rev.* 1 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[48] Imwinkelried & Amoroso, "The Application of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Interactions Among Clients, Attorneys, and Experts in the Age of Consultants: The Need for a More Precise, Fundamental Analysis," 48 *Houston L.Rev.* 265 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[49] Imwinkelried, "Serendipitous Timing: The Coincidental Emergence of the New Brain Science and the Advent of an Epistemological Approach to Determining the Admissibility of Expert Testimony," 62 *Mercer L.Rev.* 959 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[50] Imwinkelried et al., "Another 'View' of Fingerprint Evidence," 94 *Judicature* 306 (May-June 2011). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[51] Imwinkelried & Harmon, "The Admissibility of Evidence of the Accused's Opportunity to Retest Physical Evidence in Criminal Cases," 37 *N.Eng.J.Crim. & Civ. Conf.* 3 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[52] Imwinkelried & Clement, "Forensic Intoxication Testing: From Breath to Saliva?," 47 *Crim.L.Bull.* 131 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[53] Imwinkelried, "Serendipitous Timing: The Coincidental Emergence of The New Brain Science and The Advent of an Epistemological Approach to Determining The Admissibility of Expert Testimony," 62 *Mercer L.Rev.* 959 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[54] Imwinkelried, "Dealing With Supposed Jury Preconceptions About the Significance of the Lack of Evidence: The Difference Between the Perspective of the Policymaker and That of the Advocate," in "CSI Effect" Symposium Issue, 27 *T.Cooley L.Rev.* 37 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[55] Imwinkelried, "A Crash Course in Rule 502," 46 *Trial* 38 (July 2010). [F.R.Ev. 502]

[56] Imwinkelried, "The Second Coming of *Res Gestae*: A Procedural Approach to Untangling the 'Inextricably Intertwined' Theory for Admitting Evidence of an Accused's Uncharged Misconduct," 59 *Cath.U.L.Rev.* 719 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[58] Imwinkelried, "Shaken Baby Syndrome: A Genuine Battle of the Scientific (and Non-Scientific) Experts," *Crim.L.Bull.* 156 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[59] Imwinkelreid, *Dealing With Supposed Jury Preconceptions About The Significance of The Lack of Evidence: The Difference Between the Perspective of The Policymaker and That of The Advocate*, 27 T.M.Cool.L.Rev. 37 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401] [F.R.Ev. 401]

[60] Imwinkelried & Faigman, "Evidence Code Section 802: The Neglected Key to Rationalizing the California Law of Expert Testimony," 42 Loy.(L.A.) L.Rev. 427 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[61] Imwinkelried, "Bloodstain Pattern Evidence Revisited," 45 Crim.L.Bull. 3 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[62] Imwinkelried, "Poetic Justice in Punishing the Evidentiary Misdeed of Knowingly Proffering Inadmissible Evidence," 7 International Commentary on Evidence, Issue 1, Article 6 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[63] Imwinkelried, "The Need to Resurrect the Present Sense Impression Hearsay Exception: A Relapse in Hearsay Policy," 52 Howard L.J. 319 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]

[64] Imwinkelreid, *Reshaping The "Grotesque" Doctrine of Character Evidence: The Reform Implications of The Most Recent Psychological Research*, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 742 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[65] Imwinkelreid, *The Case Against Abandoning The Search for Substantive Accuracy*, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 1031 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[66] Imwinkelried, "'This Is Like Deja Vu All Over Again': The Third, Constitutional Attack on the Admissibility of Police Laboratory Reports in Criminal Cases," 38 N.Mex.L.Rev. 303 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(8)]

[67] Imwinkelried & Cherry, "Questions About the Accuracy of Fingerprint Evidence, 92 *Judicature* 158 (Jan.-Feb. 2009). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[68] Imwinkelried, "Rethinking the Limits of the Interpretive Maxim of Constitutional Avoidance: The Case Study of the Corroboration Requirement for Inculpatory Declarations Against Penal Interest (Federal Rule of Evidence 804(b)(3)), 44 *Gonzaga L.Rev.* 187 (2008/09). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(3)]

[69] Imwinkelried & Chan, "The Use of Forensic Entomology in Determining the Time of Death," 45 Crim.L.Bull. 3 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[70] Imwinkelried & Cherry, "Winning Forensic Evidence Cases—Sometimes Without Even Using an Expert Witness," 32 *The Champion* 24 (Nov./Dec. 2008). [F.R.Ev. 702]

Faculty Articles

[71] Imwinkelried & Kitano, "Forensic Detection of Seminal Fluid by Using Prostate Specific Antigen," 44 *Crim.L.Bull.*747 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[72] Imwinkelried & Anacker, "Controlled Substance Analogue Enforcement Act Criminal Defense," 37 *Sw.U.L.Rev.* 267 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[73] Imwinkelried, "The Case Against Abandoning the Search for Substantive Accuracy," 38 *Seton H.L.Rev.*1031 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[74] Imwinkelried & Land, "Confidence Intervals: How Much Confidence Should the Courts Have in Testimony About a Sample Statistic?," 44 *Crim.L.Bull.* 257 (Mar.-Apr. 2008). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[75] Imwinkelried, "Reshaping the 'Grotesque' Doctrine of Character Evidence: The Reform Implications of the Most Recent Psychological Research," 36 *Sw.U.L.Rev.* 741 (2008), [F.R.Ev. 404]

[76] Imwinkelried, "The Lessons to be Learned from the Last Three Decades of American Legal Experience with Expert Testimony," 15 *Evidence Science* 181 (Dec. 2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[77] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Scientific Evidence—and Statutes," 43 *Crim.L.Bull.* 739 (Sep.-Oct. 2007). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[78] Imwinkelried, "Impoverishing the Trier of Fact: Excluding the Proponent's Expert Testimony Due to the Opponent's Inability to Afford Rebuttal Evidence," 40 *Conn.L.Rev.* 317 (2007).

[79] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Scientific Evidence—and Statutes," 43 *Crim.L.Bull.* 739 (Sep.-Oct. 2007).

[80] Imwinkelried, "Clarifying The Curative Admissibility Doctrine: Using The Principles of Forfeiture and Deterrence to Shape Relief for An Opponent's Evidentiary Misconduct," 76 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1295 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[81] Imwinkelried & Cherry, "How Can We Improve the Reliability of Fingerprint Identification," 90 *Judicature* 55 (Sep.-Oct. 2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[82] Imwinkelried & Cherry, "A Cautionary Note About Fingerprint Analysis and Reliance on Digital Technology," 89 *Judicature* 339 (May-June 2006). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[83] Imwinkelried & Anacker, "Forensic Science: The Confusing World of Controlled Substance Analogue (CSA) Criminal Defense," 42 *Crim.L.Bull.* 744 (Nov.-Dec. 2006).

Faculty Articles

- [84] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: The Importance of *Daubert* in *Frye* Jurisdictions," 42 *Crim.L.Bull.* 215 (Mar.-Apr. 2006). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [85] Imwinkelreid, Draft Article V of The Federal Rules of Evidence on Privileges, One of The Most Influential Pieces of Legislation Never Enacted: The Strength of In-Group Loyalty of The Federal Judiciary, 58 *Ala.L.Rev.* 41 (2006). [History]
- [86] Imwinkelreid, The Alienability of Evidentiary Privileges of Property and Evidence, Burden and Benefit, Hearsay and Privilege, 80 *St. John's L.Rev.* 497 (2006).[F.R.Ev. 501]
- [87] Imwinkelreid, An Evidentiary Paradox: Defending The Character Evidence Prohibition by Upholding A Non-character Theory of Logical Relevance, The Doctrine of Chances, 40 *U.Rich.L.Rev.* 419 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [88] Imwinkelried & Heffernan, "The Accused's Constitutional Right to Introduce Critical, Demonstrably Reliable Exculpatory Evidence," 40 *Irish Jurist* 111 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [89] Imwinkelried & Min, "Forensic Science: Palynology, the Use of Pollen and Spores as Associative Trace Evidence," 41 *Crim.L.Bull.* 655 (Nov.-Dec. 2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [90] Imwinkelried, "Can This Photo Be Trusted?," 41 *Trial* 48 (Oct. 2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [91] Imwinkelried, "*Daubert* Attacks: The Three Fundamentally Different Arguments That the Opponent Can Make Under Federal Rule of Evidence 104(a)," 41 *Crim.L.Bull.* 423 (July-Aug. 2005). [F.R.Ev. 104(a)]
- [92] Imwinkelried, "Expert Testimony by Ethicists: What Should be the Norm?," 33 *J.L.Med. & Ethics* 198 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [93] Imwinkelried & Gilligan, "Waiver Raised to the Second Power: Waivers of Evidentiary Privileges by Lawyers Representing Accused Being Tried in Absentia," 56 *So.Car.L.Rev.* 509 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [94] Imwinkelreid, A More Modest Proposal than *A Common Law for the Age of Statutes*: Greater Reliance in Statutory Interpretation on The Concept of Interpretive Intention, 68 *Alb.L.Rev.* 949 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [95] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Plant and Water Analysis," 41 *Crim.L.Bull.* 75 (Jan.-Feb. 2005). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [96]** Imwinkelried & Johns, “Using Federal Civil Rights Laws to Right the Wrong of Evidence Spoliation in Civil Cases in State Court,” 28 Am.J.Tr.Ad. 279 (2004) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [97]** Imwinkelried, “‘Junk Science’ in the Courtroom: Will the Changes in the American Law of Expert Testimony Influence the Irish Courts?,” 26 Dub.U.L.J. 83 (2004).[F.R.Ev. 401]
- [98]** Imwinkelried & Schlueter, “Evidentiary Tactics: Selecting the ‘Best’ Evidence to Simplify the Case,” 19 Crim.Just. 20 (Summer 2004). [F.R.Ev. 1001]
- [99]** Imwinkelreid, The Admissibility and Legal Sufficiency of Testimony About Differential Diagnosis (Etiology): Of Under—and Over—Estimations, 56 Hous.L.Rev. 391 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 702] [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [100]** Imwinkelreid, A Psychological Critique of The Assumptions Underlying the Law of Evidentiary Privileges: Insights From The Literature on Self-Disclosure, 38 Loy. (L.A.)L.Rev. 707 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [101]** Imwinkelreid, Questioning The Behavioral Assumptions Underlying Wigmorean Absolutism in The Law of Evidentiary Privileges, 65 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 145 (2004).[F.R.Ev. 501]
- [102]** Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Glass Evidence,” 39 Crim.L.Bull. 608 (Sep.-Oct. 2003). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [103]** Imwinkelried, “The Relativity of Reliability,” 34 Seton H.L.Rev. 269 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [104]** Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Opinions by Forensic Pathologists as to the Cause of Death,” 38 Crim.L.Bull. 87 (Jan.-Feb. 2003). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [105]** Imwinkelried, “Flawed Expert Testimony: Striking the Right Balance in Admissibility Standards,” 18 Crim.Just. 28 (Spr. 2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [106]** Imwinkelried, “A Defense of the Right to Present Defense Expert Testimony: The Flaws in the Plurality Opinion in United States v. Scheffer.” Tenn.L.Rev. 539 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [107]** Imwinkelreid, Comparative Bullet Lead Analysis (CBLA) Evidence: Valid Inference or *Ipse Dixit?*, 28 Okla.City U.L.Rev. 43 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 401] [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [108] Imwinkelreid, The Dubiety of Social Engineering Through Evidence: A Reply to Professor Sanchirico's Recent Article on Character Evidence, 51 Drake L.Rev. 283 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [109] Imwinkelreid, Expert Testimony by Ethicists: What Should Be The Norm?, 76 Temp.L.Rev. 91 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [110] Imwinkelreid, *Peer Dialogue: The How and What of "Appropriate Validation" Under Daubert: Reconsidering The Treatment of Einstein and Freud*, 68 Mo.L.Rev. 43 (2003).
[F.R.Ev. 703]
- [111] Imwinkelreid, The New Wigmore: An Essay on Rethinking the Foundation of Evidentiary Privileges, 83 B.U.L.Rev. 315 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [112] Imwinkelreid, The Reach of *Winship*: Invalidating Evidentiary Admissibility Standards That Undermine The Prosecution's Obligation To Prove Defendant's Guilt Beyond A Reasonable Doubt, 70 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 805 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [113] Imwinkelreid, The New Wigmore: An Essay on Rethinking The Foundations of Evidentiary Privileges, 83 Bost.U.L.Rev. 315 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [114] Imwinkelreid, The Dubiety of Social Engineering Through Evidence: A Reply to Professor Sanchiro's Recent Attack on Character Evidence, 51 Drake L.Rev. 283 (2003), [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [115] Imwinkelreid, The Meaning of "Appropriate Validation" in *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmacueticals, Inc.*, Interpreted in Light of The Broader Rationalist Tradition, Not The Narrow Scientific Tradition, 30 Fla.St.U.L.Rev. 735 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [116] Imwinkelreid, The Historical Cycle in The Law of Evidentiary Privileges: Will Instrumentalism Come Into Conflict With Modern Humanistic Theories?, 35 Ark.L.Rev. 241 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [117] Imwinkelried, "Privacy and Privilege in Civil Family Law Disputes," 18 Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers 75 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [118] Imwinkelried, "Introduction to the Evidence Symposium: The New Generation of Realists in Evidence Law," 55 U.Mia.L.Rev. 527 (2001). [History]
- [119] Imwinkelried, Kaye & Smith, "Is a DNA Identification Database in Your Future," 16 Crim. Just. 4 (Fall 2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[120] Imwinkelried, Saltzburg & Capra, "Keeping the Reformist Spirit Alive in Evidence Law." 149 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1277 (2001). [History]

[121] Imwinkelried & Gilligan, "Bringing the 'Opening the Door'" Theory to a Close: The Tendency to Overlook the Specific Contradiction Doctrine in Evidence Law," 41 Santa Clara L.Rev. 807 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[122] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Explosives," 37 Crim.L.Bull. 80 (Jan.-Feb. 2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[123] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Bloodspatter Analysis," 36 Crim.L.Bull. 509 (Nov.-Dec. 2000). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[124] Imwinkelreid & Kaye, DNA Typing: Emerging or Neglected Issues, 76 Wash.L.Rev. 413 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[125] Imwinkelreid, *Logerquist v. McVey*: The Majority's Flawed Procedural Analysis, 33 Ariz.St.L.J. 121 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[126] Imwinkelreid, Prejudice to the Nth Degree: The Introduction of Uncharged Misconduct Admissible Only Against a Co-defendant at a Megatrial, 53 Okla.L.Rev. 35 (2000).[F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[127] Imwinkelreid, A Minimalist Approach to The Presentation of Expert Testimony, 31 Stet.L.Rev. 105 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[128] Imwinkelried, "A Final Comment -- The Importance of the Procedural Framework," 50 Case-West.Res.L.Rev. 669 (2000).

[129] Imwinkelried & Gianelli, "Scientific Evidence: The Fallout from the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Kumho Tire*," 14 Crim.Just. 12 (Wint. 2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[130] Imwinkelreid, Evaluating The Reliability of Nonscientific Expert Testimony: A Partial Answer to The Questions Left Unresolved by *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*. 52 Me.L.Rev. 20 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]

Faculty Articles

- [131] Imwinkelreid, Trial Judges—Gatekeepers or Usurpers?: Can The Trial Judge Critically Assess the Admissibility of Expert Testimony Without Invading the Jury's Province to Evaluate the Credibility and Weight of The Testimony?. 84 Mar.L.Rev. 1 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [132] Imwinkelreid, The Taxonomy of Testimony Post-*Kumho*: Refocusing on The Bottomlines of Reliability and Necessity, 30 Cumb.L.Rev. 185 (1999-2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [133] Imwinkelreid, A Final Comment—The Importance of The Procedural Framework, 50 Case-Wes.Res.L.Rev. 669 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [134] Imwinkelreid, Whether the Federal Rules of Evidence Should be Conceived as a Perpetual Index Code: Blindness is Worse Than Myopia, 40 Wm.&Mary L.Rev. 1595 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [135] Imwinkelreid, Should The Courts Incorporate a Best Evidence Rule Into the Standard Determining The Admissibility of Scientific Testimony?: Enough is Enough Even When It Is Not The Best, 50 Case Wes.Res,L.Rev. 19 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [136] Imwinkelried, et al, "Jurors Perceptions of Hearsay in Child Sexual Abuse Cases," 5 Psych., Pub.Pol'y & L. 388 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 414]
- [137] Imwinkelried & Gianelli, "Forensic Science: Handwriting Comparison," 35 Crim.L.Bull. 517(Sep.-Oct. 1999) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [138] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Paint Evidence," 35 Crim.L.Bull. 305 (May-June 1999). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [139] Imwinkelried, "The Escape Hatches from Frye and Daubert: Sometimes You Don't Need to Lay Either Foundation in Order to Introduce Expert Testimony," 23 Am.J.Tr.Ad. 1 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [140] Imwinkelreid, The Silence Speaks Volumes: A Brief Reflection on The Question of Whether It Is Necessary or Even Desirable to Fill The Seeming Gaps in Article VI of The Federal Rules of Evidence Governing the Admissibility of Evidence Logically Relevant to The Witness's Credibility, 1990 U.Ill.L.Rev. 1013. [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [141] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Extrapolation Testimony in Drunk Driving Prosecutions," 34 Crim.L.Bull.536 (Nov.-Dec. 1998).
- [142] Imwinkelried, "The Rivalry Between Truth and Privilege: The Weakness of the Supreme Court's Instrumental Reasoning in *Jaffee v. Redmond*," 518 U.S. 1 (1996), 49 Hast.L.J. 969 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 504]

Faculty Articles

[143] Imwinkelried, "A Radical Approach to the Law of Impeachment: The Statutory Outer Limits," 22 Am.J.Tr.Ad. 1 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 608]

[144] Imwinkelried, "The Blockbuster *Adams* Decision," 34 Trial 26 (Oct. 1998).

[145] Imwinkelried, "Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Should the Judge or the Jury Decide the Question of Whether the Accused Committed an Alleged Uncharged Crime Proffered Under Federal Rule of Evidence 404?," 42 St.Lou.L.Rev. 813 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 104]

[146] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: A Primer on the Admissibility of Accident Reconstruction Testimony," 33 Crim.L.Bull. 172 (Mar.-Apr. 1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[147] Imwinkelried & Amann, "The Supreme Court's Decision to Recognize a Psychotherapist Privilege in *Jaffee v. Redmond*, 116 S.Ct. 1923 (1996): The Meaning of 'Experience' and the Role of 'Reason' Under Federal Rule of Evidence 501," 65 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 1019 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[148] Imwinkelried & McCall, "Issues Once Moot: The Other Evidentiary Objections to the Admissibility of Exculpatory Polygraph Examinations," 32 Wake For.L.Rev.1045 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[149] Imwinkelried, "Evidentiary Heresy: Disregarding the Rules of Evidence at Trial!," 41 Tr.L.Guide 40(1997). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[150] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: The Second Prong of the *Daubert* Test: Disturbing Implications of Two Recent Civil Cases," 33 Crim.L.Bull. 570 (Nov.-Dec. 1997). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[151] Imwinkelried, "Judicial Remedies for the Exposure of the Jury to 'Irrelevant' Evidence," 34 Hous.L.Rev. 73 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[152] Imwinkelreid, Symposium: International Perspectives on Scientific Evidence; Foreword, 30 U.C.D.L.Rev. 941 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[153] Imwinkelreid & McCall, Issues Once Moot: The Other Evidentiary Objections to The Admission of Exculpatory Polygraph Examinations, 32 Wake For.L.Rev. 1045 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[154] Imwinkelreid, Judicial Remedies for The Exposure of The Jury to “Irrelevant” Evidence, 44 Hous.L.Rev. 73 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[155] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: The Constitutional Right to Surmount Exclusionary Rule Barring the Introduction of Exculpatory Scientific Evidence,” 32 Crim.L.Bull. 255 (May-June 1996). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[156] Imwinkelried, Gillian & Loftus, "The Theory of 'Unconscious Transference': The Latest Threat to the Shield Laws Protecting the Privacy of Victims of Sex Offenses," 38 B.C.L.Rev. 107 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[157] Imwinkelried, "The Case Against Evidentiary Admissibility Standards That Attempt to 'Freeze' the State of a Scientific Technique," 67 U.Colo.L.Rev. 887 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[158] Imwinkelried, "Frye's General Acceptance Test vs. Daubert's Empirical Validation Standard--'Either. . . Or' or 'Both . . . And'?" 33 Crim.L.Bull. 72 (Jan.-Feb. 1997). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[159] Imwinkelried, "Admissibility of Nonscientific Expert Testimony," 32 Trial 58 (Oct. 1996).

[160] Imwinkelried, "Developing a Coherent Theory of the Structure of Federal Rule of Evidence 703," 47 Mercer L.Rev. 447 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[161] Imwinkelreid, Moving Beyond “Top Down” Grand Theories of Statutory Construction: A “Bottom Up” Interpretive Approach to The Federal Rules of Evidence, 75 Ore.L.Rev. 389 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[162] Imwinkelreid, Declarations Against Social Interest: The (Still) Embarrassingly Neglected Hearsay Exception, 69 So.Calif.L.Rev. 1427 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(3)]

[163] Imwinkelreid, Using a Contextual Construction to Resolve the Dispute Over The Meaning of The Term “Plan” in Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b), 43 U.Kan.L.Rev. 1005 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[164] Imwinkelreid, Coming to Grips with Scientific Research in *Daubert's* “Brave New World”: The Courts’ Need to Appreciate the Evidentiary Differences between Validity and Proficiency Studies, 61 Brook.L.Rev. 1247 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[165] Imwinkelreid, Undertaking The Task of Reforming The American Character Evidence Prohibition: The Importance of Getting The Experiment Off on The Right Foot, 22 Ford.Urb.L.J. 285 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 413]

Faculty Articles

- [166] Imwinkelreid, The Meaning of “Facts or Data” In Federal Rule of Evidence 703: The Significance of The Supreme Court’s Decision to Rely on Federal Rule of Evidence 702 in *Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 54 Md.L.Rev. 352 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [167] Imwinkelreid, Evidence Visits Jurassic Park: The Far-Reaching Implications of the *Daubert* Courts Recognition of the Uncertainty of the Scientific Enterprise, 81 Iowa L.Rev. 55 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [168] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Qualifying A Witness as an Expert: Evidentiary Mini-Issues,” 31 Crim.L.Bull. 250 (Jul.-Aug. 1995). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [169] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Federal Rule of Evidence 703: A Minefield for the Criminal Litigator,” 31 Crim.L.Bull. 259 (May-June 1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [170] Imwinkelried, "Expert Testimony in the US -- A Different Perspective," 145 New L.J. 644 (May 5, 1995). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [171] Imwinkelried & Mendez, "People v. Ewoldt: The California Supreme Court's About-Face on the Plan Theory for Admitting Evidence of an Accused's Uncharged Misconduct," 28 Loy.(L.A.) L.Rev. 473 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [172] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Scanning Electron Microscopy,” 30 Crim.L.Bull. 556 (Nov.-Dec. 1994) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [173] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Toxicological Procedures to Identify Poisons,” 30 Crim.L.Bull. 172 (Mar.-Apr. 1994). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [174] Imwinkelried, “Forensic Science: Time of Death Determinations,” 30 Crim.L.Bull., 76 (Jan.-Feb. 1994). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [175] Imwinkelreid, An Hegelian Approach to Privileges Under Federal Rule of Evidence 501: The Restricted Thesis, The Expansive Antithesis, and The Contextual Synthesis, 73 Neb.L.Rev. 511 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [176] Imwinkelreid, The Next Step After *Daubert*: Developing a Similar Epistemological Approach to Ensuring The Reliability of Nonscientific Expert Testimony, 15 Cardozo L.Rev. 2271 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [174] Imwinkelreid, Some Comments About Mr. David Karp’s Remarks on Propensity Evidence, 70 Chi.Kent L.Rev. 37 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [175] Imwinkelreid, A Brief Defense of The Supreme Court’s Approach to The Interpretation of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 27 Ind.L.Rev. 269 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[176] Imwinkelried, "A New Antidote for an Opponent's Pretrial Discovery Misconduct: Treating the Misconduct at Trial as an Admission by Conduct of the Weakness of the Opponent's Case," 1993 B.Y.U.L.Rev. 793. [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)]

[177] Imwinkelried, "The Daubert Decision: Frye is Dead, Long Live the Federal Rules of Evidence," 29 Trial 60 (Sep. 1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[178] Imwinkelried, "The Educational Significance of the Syllogistic Structure of Expert Testimony," 87 Nw.U.L.Rev. 1148 (1993).

[179] Imwinkelried, "The Evolution of the Use of the Doctrine of Chances as Theory of Admissibility for Similar Fact Evidence," 22 Anglo-Amer.L.Rev. 73 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[180] Imwinkelried, "The Admissibility of Expert Testimony in *Christophersen v. Allied-Signal Corp.*: The Neglected Issue of the Validity of Nonscientific Reasoning by Scientific Witnesses," 70 Denver U.L.Rev. 473 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[181] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: The Role of the Hearsay Rule in Litigating Frye Challenges to The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence," 29 Crim.L.Bull. 158 (Mar.-Apr. 1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[182] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Forensic Evidence in Arson Cases: Part II," 29 Crim.L.Bull. 70 (Jan.-Feb. 1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[183] Imwinkelreid, The *Daubert* Decision on The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence: Evidence The Supreme Court the Right Piece for All The Evidentiary Puzzles, 9 St.Johns J.Leg.Comm. 5 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[184] , A Small Contribution to The Debate Over The Proposed Legislation Abolishing The Character Evidence Prohibition in Sex Offense Prosecutions, 44 Syr.L.Rev. 1125 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 413]

[185] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Forensic Evidence in Arson Cases: Part I," 28 Crim.L.Bull. 554 (Nov.-Dec. 1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[186] Imwinkelried, "The Worst Evidence Principle: The Best Hypothesis as to the Logical Structure of Evidence Law," 46 U.Mia.L.Rev. 1069 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

[187] Imwinkelried, "The Neglected Intermediate Premise in the Forensic Expert's Testimony," 11 Int'l J.Med.&L. 229 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[188] Imwinkelried, "Attempts to Limit the Scope of the *Frye* Standard for the Admission of Scientific Evidence; Confronting the Real Cost of the General Acceptance Test," 10 Behav.Sci.&L. 441 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[189] Imwinkelried, "The Dispute Over the Doctrine of Chances," 7 Crim.Just. 16 (Fall 1992). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[190] Imwinkelried, "The Constitutionalization of Hearsay: The Extent to Which the Fifth and Sixth Amendments Permit or Require the Liberalization of the Hearsay Rules," 76 Minn.L.Rev. 521 (1992). [Confrontation]

[191] Imwinkelried, "The Pretrial Importance and Adaptation of the 'Trial' Evidence Rules," 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 965 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[192] Imwinkelried & Mendez, "Resurrecting California's Old Law on Character Evidence," 23 Pac.L.Rev. 1005 (1992) [F.R.Ev. 404]

[193] Imwinkelried & Margolin, "The Case for the Admissibility of Defense Testimony About Customary Political Practices in Official Corruption Prosecutions," 29 Am.Crim.L.Rev.1 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[194] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Science: Hair Analysis," 27 Crim.L.Bull. 447 (Sep.-Oct. 1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[195] Imwinkelried & Scofield, "The Recognition of an Accused's Constitutional Right to Introduce Expert Testimony Attacking the Weight of Prosecution Scientific Evidence: The Antidote for the Supreme Court's Mistaken Assumption in *California v. Trombetta*," 33 Ariz.L.Rev. 59 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[196] Imwinkelried, "The Right to 'Plead Out' Issues and Block the Admission of Prejudicial Evidence: The Differential Treatment of Civil Litigants and the Criminal Accused as a Denial of Equal Protection," 41 Emory L.J. 341 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 403]

Faculty Articles

- [197] Imwinkelried, "The Debate in the DNA Cases Over the Foundation For the Admission of Scientific Evidence: The Importance of Human Error as a Cause of Forensic Misanalysis," 69 Wash.U.L.Q. 19 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [198] Imwinkelreid, A Comparativist Critique of The Interface Between Hearsay and Expert Testimony in American Evidence Law, 33 B.C.L.Rev. 1 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [199] Imwinkelried, "The Liberalization of American Criminal Evidence Law--A Possibility of Convergence," 1990 Crim.L.Rev. 790. [History]
- [200] Imwinkelried, "The Use of an Accused's Uncharged Misconduct to Prove Mens Rea: The Doctrines Which Threaten to Engulf the Character Evidence Prohibition," 51 Ohio St.L.J. 575 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [201] Imwinkelried, "The Case for Recognizing a New Constitutional Entitlement: The Right to Present Favorable Evidence in Civil Cases," 1990 Utah L.Rev. 1. [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [202] Imwinkelried, "The Case for a New Constitutional Entitlement: The Right to Present Favorable Evidence in Civil Cases," 13 Tr.Diplom.J. 74 (Sum. 1990). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [203] Imwinkelried, "The Applicability of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Non-Testifying Experts: Reestablishing the Boundaries Between the Attorney-Client Privilege and the Work Product Protection," 68 Wash.U.L.Q. 19 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [204] Imwinkelried, "The Evolution of the American Test for the Admissibility of Scientific Evidence," 30 Med.,Sci.& L. 60 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [205] Imwinkelreid, The Use of Evidence of an Accused Uncharged Misconduct to Prove *Mens Rea*: The Doctrine Which Threatens to Engulf the Character Evidence Prohibition, 51 Ohio St.L.J. 575 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [206] Imwinkelried, "The Court Appointment of Expert Witnesses in the United States: A Failed Experiment," 8 Int'l J.Med.& L. 601 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [207] Imwinkelried, "The Admissibility of Similar Facts Evidence in Civil Cases in the United Kingdom and the United States: The Need for Rethinking on Both Sides of the Atlantic," 9 Liverpool L.Rev. 137 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [208] Imwinkelried, "Uncharged Misconduct: What Would Irving Younger Have Done?," 16 Litig. 6 (Fall 1989). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

Faculty Articles

- [209]** Imwinkelried, "A Comparative Law Analysis of the Standard for Admitting Scientific Evidence: The United States Stands Alone," 42 *Foren.Sci.Int'l* 16 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [210]** Imwinkelreid, The Importance of The Memory Factor in Analyzing The Reliability of Hearsay Testimony: A Lesson Slowly Learned and Quickly Forgotten, 41 *Fla.L.Rev.* 215 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [211]** Imwinkelried, "The 'Bases' of Expert Testimony: The Syllogistic Structure of Scientific Testimony," 67 *No.Car.L.Rev.* 1 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [212]** Imwinkelreid, The Meaning of Probative Value and Prejudice in Federal Rule of Evidence 403: Can Rule 403 Be Used to Resurrect The Common Law of Evidence?. 41 *Vand.L.Rev.* 880 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [213]** Imwinkelreid, A Comparative Law Analysis of The Standards for Admitting Scientific Evidence: The United States Stands Alone, 42 *Foren.Sci.Int'l* 15 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [214]** Imwinkelried, "Federal Rule of Evidence 402: The Second Revolution," 6 *Rev.Litig.* 129 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [215]** Imwinkelried, "False Positive: Shoddy Drug Testing Is Jeopardizing the Jobs of Millions," 27 *The Sciences* 22 (Sep./Oct. 1987). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [216]** Imwinkelried & Schwed, "Guidelines for Drafting Understandable Instructions: An Introduction to the Use of Psycholinguistics," 23 *Crim.L.Bull.* 135 (Mar.-Apr. 1987). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [217]** Imwinkelreid, The Worst Surprise of All: No Right to Pretrial Discovery of The Prosecution's Uncharged Misconduct Evidence, 56 *Ford.L.Rev.* 247 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [218]** Imwinkelried, "Of Evidence and Equal Protection: The Unconstitutionality of Excluding Government Agents' Statements Offered as Vicarious Admissions Against the Prosecution," 71 *Minn.L.Rev.* 269 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(D)]
- [219]** Imwinkelried, "Uncharged Misconduct," 1 *Crim.Just.* 6 (Sum. 1986). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [220]** Imwinkelried, "Demeanor Impeachment: Law and Tactics," 9 *Am.J.Tr.Ad.* 183 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[221] Imwinkelried, "Limiting Instructions on Uncharged Misconduct Evidence: The Last Line of Defense Against Jury Misuse of the Evidence," 8 Tr.Diplom.J. 23 (Fall 1985) [F.R.Ev. 405]

[222] Imwinkelried, "The Plan Theory for Admitting Evidence of the Defendant's Uncharged Crimes: A Microcosm of the Flaws in the Uncharged Misconduct Doctrine," 50 Missouri L.Rev. 1 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[223] Imwinkelried, "Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307 (1979): Reopening of the Pandora's Box of the Legal Sufficiency of Drug Identification Evidence," 73 Ky.L.J. 1 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[224] Imwinkelried, "Uncharged Misconduct," 12 Litig. 25 (Fall 1985).[F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[225] Imwinkelreid, The Need to Amend Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b): The Threat to The Future of Federal Rules of Evidence, 30 Vill.L.Rev. 1465 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[226] Imwinkelried, "Uncharged Misconduct Evidence," 20 Trial 58 (Nov. 1984)

[227] Imwinkelreid, Judge versus Jury: Who Should Decide Questions of Preliminary Facts Conditioning The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence, 25 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 317 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 104]

[228] Imwinkelried & P. Giannelli, "Stipulations in Criminal Cases," 10 Crim.Def. 4 (May - June 1983). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[229] Imwinkelreid, The Standard for Admitting Scientific Evidence: A Critique From The Perspective of Juror Psychology, 100 Mil.L.Rev. 99 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[230] Imwinkelried, "Forensic Hair Analysis: The Case Against the Underemployment of Scientific Evidence," 39 Wash.& Lee L.Rev. 41 (1982).[F.R.Ev. 401]

[231] Imwinkelried, "The Use of Learned Scientific Treatises Under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(18), 18 Trial 56 (Feb. 1982). [F.R.Ev. 803(18)]

[232] Imwinkelreid, A New Era in The Evolution of Scientific Evidence: A Primer on Evaluating The Weight of Scientific Evidence, 23 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 201 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[233] Imwinkelreid, The Constitutionality of Introducing Evaluative Laboratory Reports Against Criminal Defendants, 30 Hast.L.J. 621 (1979). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [234] Imwinkelried, "The Scope of the Residual Hearsay Exceptions in the Federal Rules of Evidence," 15 San Diego L.Rev. 239 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [235] Imwinkelried & Gilligan, "The Unconstitutional Burden of Article 15: A Rebuttal," 83 Yale L.J. 524 (1974).
- [236] Imwinkelried & Mullin, "The Court of Military Appeals: A Survey of Recent Decisions," 62 Milit.L.Rev. 115 (1974). [History]
- [237] Imwinkelried, "Chambers v. Mississippi, ___ U.S. ___ (1973): The Constitutional Right to Present Defense Evidence," 62 Milit.L.Rev. 225 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [238] Imwinkelried, "The Identification of Original, Real Evidence," 61 Milit.L.Rev. 145 (1973).[F.R.Ev. 401]
- [239] Imwinkelreid, The Constitutional Right To Present Defense Evidence, 67 Mil.L.Rev. 225 (1973). [Confrontation]
- [240] Inbau, The Lie Detector, 26 Bost.U.L.Rev. 264 (1946). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [241] Inbau & Reid, The Lie Detector Technique: A Reliable and Valuable Investigative Aid, 50 A.B.A.J. 470 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [242] Inbau, Lie-Detector Test Limitations, 2 J.Foren.Sci. 253 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [243] Inbau, Lay Witness Identification of Handwriting, 31 Ill.L.Rev. 433 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [244] Ireland, Deconstructing Hearsay's Structure: Toward A Witness Recollection Definition of Hearsay, 43 Vill.L.Rev. 529 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [245] Ireland, Reform Rape Legislation: A New Standard of Sexual ResponsibilityJ, 49 U.Colo.L.Rev. 185 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [246] Ireton, Hearsay Evidence in Europe, 66 U.S.L.Rev. 252 (1932). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [247] Iraola, Congressional Oversight, Executive Privilege, and Requests for Information Relating To Federal Criminal Investigations and Prosecutions, 87 Iowa L.Rev. 1559 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [248] Isaac, The Organizational Ombudsman's Quest for Privileged Communications, 32 Hofstra Lab.& Emp.L.J. 31 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [249] Isaacs, The Law and The Facts, 22 Colum.L.Rev. 1 (1922). [F.R.Ev. 201]

J

[1] Jack, The Doctrine of Recent Possession and The Rule Against Hearsay Evidence. 15 Crim.L.Q. 195 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[2] Jacobs, Giving The Lie to Antiquated Notions About Scientific Evidence, 22 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 507 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[3] Jacobs, Evidence Rule 403 After *United States v. Old Chief*, 20 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 563 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[4] Jackson, Probability and Mathematics in Court Fact-Finding, 31 No.Ire.L.Q. 239 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[5] Jacobs, The Uniform Rules of Evidence: General Provisions, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 485 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[6] Jafee, Comment on The Judicial Use of HLA Paternity Test Results and Other Statistical Evidence: A Response To Terasaki, 17 J.Fam.L. 457 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Jaffer, Secret Evidence in The Investigatory State: F.I.S.A., Administrative Subpeonas, and Privacy, 5 Cardozo J.Pub.L.& Pol'y & Ethics 7 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[8] Jalet, Mysterious Disappearance: The Presumption of Death and The Administration of Estates of Missing Persons or Absentees, 54 Iowa L.Rev. 177 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[9] James, et al., The New Medical Imaging Technologies As Evidence, 11 J.Contemp.L. 105 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[10] James, The Role of Hearsay in A Rational Scheme of Evidence, 34 Ill.L.Rev. 788 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[11] James, Burdens of Proof, 47 Va.L.Rev. 51 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[12] James, Relevancy, Probability, and The Law, 29 Calif.L.Rev. 689 (1941). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[13] Janicki, Aircraft Accident Reports and Other Government Documents: Evidentiary Use in International Air Crash Litigation in the United States, 74 J,Air L. & Comm. 801 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 803(6)]

[14] Jaros, The Lessons of *People v. Moscat*, Confronting Judicial Bias in Domestic Violence Cases Interpreting *Crawford v. Washington*, 42 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 995 (2005). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [15] Jefferson, The Hearsay Rule—-Determining When Evidence is Hearsay or Non-Hearsay and Determining Its Relevance As One or The Other, 25 U.West.L.A.L.Rev. 39 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [16] Jenkins, Computer-Generated Evidence Specially Prepared For Use at Trial, 52 Chi-Kent L.Rev. 680 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [17] Jentz, Accountant Privileged Communications: Is It A Dying Concept Under The New Federal.Rules of Evidence?, 11 Am.Bus.L.J. 149 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [18] Jewett, Law Reform Commission of Canada Report on Evidence, 18 Crim.L.Q. (Can) 155 (1976). [History]
- [19] Johnson, The Use of Presumptions in Summary Judgment Procedure in Texas and Federal Courts, 54 Baylor L.Rev. 605 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [20] Johnson & Perkins, The Black Lung Battle—-Procedural Ingenuity and Substantive Conflict, 21 Creighton L.Rev. 1101 (1987-1988). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [21] Johnston, Breach of Medical Confidence in Ohio, 19 Akron L.Rev. 373 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [22] Johnston, How The Confrontation Clause Defeated The Rape Shield Statute: Acquaintance Rape, The Consent Defense, and The New Jersey Supreme Court's Ruling in *State v. Garon*, 14 S.Cal.L.& Women's Stud. 117 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [23] Johnston, A Guide For The Proponent and Opponent of Computer-Based Evidence, 1 Comp/L.J. 667 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [24] Jonakait, Confrontation Clause Curiosities: When Logic and Proportion Have Fallen Sloppy Dead, 20 J.L.& Pol'y 485 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [25] Jonankait, The (Futile) Search For A Common Law Right of Confrontation: Beyond *Braster's* Irrelevance (Perhaps) To Relevant American Cases, 15 J.L.& Pol'y 471 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [26] Jonakait, "Witnesses" in The Confrontation Clause: *Crawford v. Washington*, Noah Webster, and Compulsory Process, 74 Temp.L.Rev. 155 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [27] Jonakait, The Too-Easy Historical Assumptions of *Crawford v. Washington*, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 219 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [28] Jonakait, The Standard for Appellate Review for Scientific Evidence: Beyond *Joiner* and *Scheffer*, 32 U.C.D.L.Rev. 289 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 103]

Faculty Articles

- [29] Jonakait, The Assessment of Expertise: Transcending Construction, 37 Santa Clara L.Rev. 301 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [30] Jonakait, Texts, or Ad Hoc Determinations: Interpretations of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 74 Ind.L.J. 551 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [31] Jonakait, Biased Evidence Rules: A Framework For Judicial Analysis and Reform, 1992 Utah Law.Rev. 67. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [32] Jonakait, The Origins of The Confrontation Clause: An Alternate History, 27 Rutgers L.J. 77 (1995). [Confrontation]
- [33] Jonakait, The Assessment of Expertise: Transcending Construction, 37 Santa Clara L.Rev. 301 (1997). [F.R.Ev.702]
- [34] Jonakait, Insuring Reliable Fact Finding in Guidelines Sentencing: Why Not Real Evidence Rules?, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 45 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [35] Jonakait, Making The Law of Factual Determinations Matter More, 25 Loy. (L.A.)L.Rev. 673 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [36] Jonakait, The Subversion of The Hearsay Rule; The Residual Hearsay Exceptions, Circumstantial Guarantees of Trustworthiness, and Grand Jury Testimony, 36 Case-West.Res.L.Rev. 431 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [37] Jonakait, Restoring The Confrontation Clause To The Sixth Amendment, 35 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 557 (1968). [Confrontation]
- [38] Jonakait, Forward: Notes For a Consistent and Meaningful Sixth Amendment, 82 J.Crim.L. & Crim. 713 (1992). [Confrontation]
- [39] Jonakait, The Supreme Court, Plain Meaning, and The Changed Rules of Evidence, 68 Texas L.Rev. 745 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [40] Jones, Fingerprint Problems: Laden With Historical Misconceptions, 18 W.Mich.U.Cool.J.Prac.& Clin.L. 199 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [41] Jones, Evidentiary Autopsies, 61 Colo.L.Rev. 567 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [42] Jones, An Overview of The Oregon Evidence Code, 19 Willam.L.Rev. 343 (1983). [History]
- [43] Jones, Admission of Psychiatric Testimony in Alger Hiss Trial, 11 Ala.Lawyer 212 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 608]

Faculty Articles

- [44] Joshua, Fingerprint Problems: Laden With Historical Misconceptions, 18 W.Mich.U.Cool.J.Prac. & Clin.L. 199 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [45] Joucov, Who's The Expert?; *Frye* and *Daubert* in Alabama, 47 Cumb.L.Rev. 285 (2016-2017). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [46] Jox, Attorney-Client Privilege—Its Application To A Corporate Client, 3 Washburn L.J. 33 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [47] Joy & Uphoff, "What Do I Do With the Porn on My Computer?: How A Lawyer Should Counsel Clients About Physical Evidence, 54 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 885 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [48] Juviler, Psychiatric Opinions As To The Credibility of Witnesses: A Suggested Approach, 48 Calif.L.Rev. 648 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- K**
- [1] Kadish, The Attorney-Client Privilege: Can It Stand Its Ground Against New Government Intrusions? 36 Emory L.J. 793 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [2] Kadish, Brofman, Peskin & Baclos, The Polygraph, Hypnosis, Truth Drugs, and The Psychological Stress Evaluator: Admissibility In A Criminal Trial, 4 AmJ.Tr.Adv. 393 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [3] Kahan, The Economics—Conventional, Behavioral, and Political—of Subsequent Remedial Measures Evidence, 110 Colum.L.Rev. 1616 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [4] Kainen & Tendler, The Case for A Constitutional Definition of Hearsay: Requiring Confrontation of Testimonial Non-Assertive Conduct and Statements to Explain An Unchallenged Investigation, 93 Marq.L.Rev. 1415 (2010). [Confrontation]
- [5] Kaiser, Entering Into The Path of Inference: Textualism and Conceptualism In The *Bruton* Trilogy, 44 U.S.F.L.Rev. 95 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [6] Kall, The Attorney-Client Privilege for Corporations: Predictability and Clarity Last, 10 Colo.L.Rev. 529 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [7] Kaminski, Restoring The Grand Security: The Debate Over A Federal Bill of Rights, 1787-1792, 33 Santa Clara 887 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [8] Kaminski, State Evidentiary Privileges in Federal Civil Litigation, 43 Ford.L.Rev. 923 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [9] Kandian, The Parent-Child Privilege and The Parent-Child Crime; Observations on *State v. DeLong* and *In Re Agosto*, 36 Me.L.Rev. 59 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [10] Kaplan, Of Mabrus and Zurgs—-An Essay in Honor of David Louisell, 66 Calif.L.Rev. 987 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [11] Kaplan, The Lie Detector: An Analysis of Its Place in The Law of Evidence, 10 Wayne L.Rev. 381 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [12] Kaplan, Decision Theory and The Factfinding Process, 20 Stan.L.Rev. 1065 (1968) [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [13] Kaplan & Logan, The Case Against Recognition Of A General Academic Privilege, 60 U.Det.J.Urb.L. 205 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [14] Kaplan & Shavell, Legal Advice About Information to Present in Litigation: Its Effect and Social Desirability,102 Harv.L.Rev. 565 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [15] Karmely, Presumption Law in Action, Why States Should Not Be Seduced into Adopting a Joint Custody Presumption, 30 Notre Dame J.L.Ethics & Pub.Pol'y. 321 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [16] Kash, Rewarding Confidential Informants: Cashing in On Terrorism and Narcotics Trafficking, 34 Case W.Res.J.Int'l L. 231 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [17] Karst, Legislative Facts in Constitutional Litigation, 1960 Sup.Ct.Rev. 75. [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [18] Katsoris, Confidential Communications—-The Accountant's Dilemma, 35 Ford.L.Rev. 51 (1966). [F.R.Ev.501]
- [19] Katz, The Games Bureaucrats Play: Hide And Seek Under The Freedom of Information Act. 48 Texas L.Rev. 1261 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [20] Katz, Dilemmas of Polygraph Stipulations, 14 Seton Hall L.Rev. 285 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [21] Katz, Privileged Communications: A Proposal for Reform, 1 Dalhousie L.J. 547 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [22] Katz, The Paradoxical Role of Informers Within The Criminal Justice System:A Unique Perspective, 7 U.Dayton L.Rev. 51 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [23] Katz, Proof in Law and Science, 32 Jurimetrics 313 (1992). [F.R.Ev.401]
- [24] Kaye, The Limits of The Preponderance of The Evidence Standard: Justifiability Naked Statistical and Multiple Causation. 1982 A.B.F.Res.J. 487. [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

- [25] Kaye, Probability, Individualizations, and Uniqueness in Forensic Science Evidence; Listening To Academies, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1163 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [26] Kaye, The Current State of Bullet-Lead Evidence, 47 Jurimetrics J. 99 (2006) [F.R.Ev.401]
- [27] Kaye, The Science of DNA Identification: From The Laboratory to The Courtroom (and Beyond), 8 Minn.J.L.Sci. & Tech. 409 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [28] Kaye, Congressional Papers and Judicial Subpoenas, 23 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 57 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [29] Kaye, Apples and Oranges: Confidence Coefficients and The Burden of Persuasion, 73 Corn.L.Rev. 54 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [30] Kaye, Probability Theory Meets Res Ipsa Loquitur, 27 Mich.L.Rev. 1456 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [31] Keefe, Landis & Shaad, Sense and Nonsense About Judicial Notice, 2 Stan.L.Rev. 664 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [32] Keeler, Debunking The "Lie-Detector", 15 J.Crim.L., Crim. & P.S. 153 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [33] Keeton, Statutory Presumptions—-Their Constitutionality and Legal Effect, 10 Texas L.Rev. 34 (1931). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [34] Kehoe, Massachusetts Malpractice Evidentiary Statute: Success or Failure?, 44 Bost.U.L.Rev. 10 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 803(18)]
- [35] Keith, The Economics of The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Comprehensive Review and A New Justification, 36 Ohio No.U.L.Rev. 481 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [36] Keilbowicz, The Role of Leaks in Governance and The Law of Journalists' Confidentiality, 1795-2005, 43 San Diego L.Rev. 425 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [37] Kendall & Rylander, Tainted Justice; How Private Judicial Tribunals Undermine Public Confidence in The Judiciary, 18 Geo.J. Legal Ethics 65 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [38] Kenneally, Legislation to Admit Evidence of Propensity When Prosecuting DUI Recidivists, 37 N.Ill.U.L.Rev. 126 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [39] Kenety, The Psychological Stress Evaluator: The Theory, Validity, Legal Status of An Innovative "Lie Detector", 55 Ind.L.J. 349 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [40] Kennelly, Post-Accident Remedial Measures—Suggested Discovery and Methods To Establish Admissibility, 21 Tr.Law.Guide 61 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [41] Kerper, Killing Him Softly With Words: The Art and Ethics of Impeachment With Prior Statements, 26 Am.J.Tr.Adv. (1997). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)]
- [42] Kessler, Our Inquisitorial Tradition: Equity Procedure, Due Process, and A Search For An Alternative to The Adversarial, 90 Corn.L.Rev. 1181 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [43] Kettles, Ancient Documents and The Rule Against Multiple Hearsay, 39 Santa Clara L.Rev. 719 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 803(16)]
- [44] Kidston, Privileged Communications, 34 Bus.Law. 853 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [45] Kilroy, Seeing Is Believing, 8 U.Kans.L.Rev. 445 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 602]
- [46] Kim, Characteristics of Soulless Persons: The Applicability of The Character Evidence Rule to Corporations, 2000 U.Ill.L.Rev. 763. [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [47] Kindel & Richter, Spoliation of Evidence: Will The New Millenium See A Further Expansion of Sanctions For The Improper Destruction of Evidence?. 27 Wm.Mitch.L.Rev. 687 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [48] King, Liebig & Clardy, *Melendez-Diaz* and *Briscoe*: Return of Constitutional Guarantees Worth The Cost To The System, 36 New Eng.J. On Crim.& Civ.Confinement 284 (2010). [Confrontation]
- [49] King, The Molested Child Witness and The Constitution: Should The Bill of Rights Be Transformed to The Bill of Preferences?, 53 Ohio St.L.J. 49 (1992). [Confrontation]
- [50] King-Ries, An Argument For Original Intent: Restoring Rule 801(b)(1)(A) to Protect Domestic Violence Victims in A Post-*Crawford* World, 27 Pace L.Rev.199 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [51] King, Waving Goodby to Waiver? Not So Fast: Inadvertent Disclosure, Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege and Federal Rule of Evidence 502, 32 Campbell L.Rev. 467 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [52] King & Amin, Social Framework Analysis as Inadmissible Character Evidence, 32 Law 7 Psychol.Rev. 1 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [53] King-Reis, Forfeiture By Wrongdoing: A Panacea for Victimless Domestic Violence Prosecutions, 39 Creighton L.Rev. 441 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [54] King-Reis, *Crawford v. Washington*: The End of Victimless Prosecution?, 28 Seattle U.L.Rev. 301 (2005). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

[55] Kinkopf, The State Secrets Problem: Can Congress Fix It?. 80 Temp.L.Rev. 489 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[56] Kirby, New Life for The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation, 69 A.B.A.J. 174 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[57] Kirgis, A Legisprudential Analysis of Evidence Codification: Why Most Rules of Evidence Should Not Be Codified—But Privilege Law Should Be, 38 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 809 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[58] Kirgis, Meaning, Intention, and The Hearsay Rule, 43 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 275 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[59] Kirk, The Interrelationship of Law and Science, 13 Buff.L.Rev. 393 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[60] Kirkpatrick, Non-Testimonial Hearsay After *Crawford*, *Davis*, and *Bochting*, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 307 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]

[61] Kirkpatrick, Scholarly and Institutional Challenges to the Law of Evidence: From Bentham to The ADR Movement, 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 837 (1992). [History]

[62] Kirkpatrick, Confrontation and Hearsay: Exemption From Constitutional Unavailability Requirement, 70 Minn.L.Rev. 665 (1986). [Confrontation]

[63] Kirst, Confrontation Rules After *Davis v. Washington*, 15 J.L.& Pol'y 635 (2007). [Confrontation]

[64] Kirst, Does *Crawford* Provide A Stable Foundation For Confrontation Doctrine?, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 35 (2005). [Confrontation]

[65] Kirst, Appellate Court Answers to The Confrontation Questions in *Lilly v. Virginia*, 53 Syr.L.Rev. 87 (2003). [Confrontation]

[66] Kirst, The Procedural Dimension of Confrontation Doctrine, 66 Neb.L.Rev. 485 (1987). [Confrontation]

[66] Kirtley, Mask, Shield, and Sword: Should The Journalist Privilege Protect The Identity of Anonymous Posters to News Media Websites?, 94 Minn.L.Rev. 1478 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[67] Kirtley, Will The Demise of The Reporter's Privilege Mean The End of Investigative Reporting?, 32 Ohio No.U.L.Rev. 519 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [68] Klein, The Technical Trade Secret Quadrangle: A Survey, 55 Nw.U.L.Rev. 437 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [69] Klein, Reviewing The Evidence on Appeal. 44 L.A.Bar Bull. 154, (1969). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [70] Kleinfeld, The Detection of Deception—A Resume, 8 Fed.B.J. 153 (1947). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [71] Kleinmuntz & Szucko, On The Fallibility of Lie Detection, 17 Law & Soc'y Rev. 85 (1982) [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [72] Kleri, Judicial Notice of Scientific Facts, 15 Cleve-Marsh.L.Rev. 140 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [73] Klitzke, The Uniform Trade Secrets Act, 69 Marq.L.Rev. 277 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [74] Knapp, Vandecreek, & Zirkel, Privileged Communications For Psychotherapists in Pennsylvania, 60 Temp.L.Q. 267 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [75] Kneeder, Sexual Assault Law Reform in Virginia—A Legislative History, 68 Va.L.Rev. 459 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [76] Knepper, Exhibits and Demonstrative Evidence, 30 Ins.Counsel J. 133. (1963). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [77] Knoth, The Protection of Unpatented Ideas and Inventions, 32 J.Pat.Off.Soc'y 268 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [78] Knowles & McCarthy, Parents, Psychologists, and Child Custody Disputes: Protecting The Privilege and The Children, 37 Ala.L.Rev. 391 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [79] Knowlton, The Uniform Rules of Evidence: Judicial Notice, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 501 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [80] Koback, The Uneven Application of The Attorney-Client Privilege to Corporations in Federal Courts, 6 Ga.L.Rev. 339 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [81] Kobayashi, Product Liability Lawsuits: Admissibility Questions and Miscellaneous Evidentiary Developments, 25 Tr.Law.G. 297 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [82] Kober, The Case of The "Life After Death"; Reflections on The Admissibility of Evidence of Remarriage Under The Massachusetts Wrongful Death Statute, 15 N.Eng.L.Rev. 227 (1979-1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [83] Koehler, et alt., Science, Technology, or The Expert Witness: What Influences Jurors' Judgments About Forensic Science Testimony?, 22 Psychol.Pub.Pol'y & L. 401 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [84] Koehlert-Page, Tell Us A Story But Don't Make It A Good One: Embracing The Tension Regarding Emotional Stories and Federal Rule of Evidence 403, 84 Miss.L.J. 351 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [85] Koffler, The Lie Detector, 3 N.Y.L.F. 123 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [86] Kohn, *In re Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation*: The Jury's Role in Resolving The Battle of The Experts, 4 Vill.Env.L.J. 1 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [87] Kongsgard, Judicial Notice and The California Evidence Code, 18 Hast.L.J. 47 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [88] Koppuzh, Secrets and Security; Overclassification and Civil Liberties in Administrative National Security Decisions, 60 AlbL.Rev. 501 (2016-2017). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [89] Korenberg & Korenberg, Psychiatry: The Lost Horizon: The Erosion of Human Rights, 5 Leg.Med.Q. 79 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [90] Korn, Law, Fact, and Science in The Courts, 66 Colum.L.Rv. 1080 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [91] Koroway, Confidentiality in The Law of Evidence, 16 Osgood H.L.J. 361 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [92] Kovera, Park & Penrod, Jurors' Perceptions of Eyewitness and Hearsay Evidence, 76 Minn.L.Rev. 703 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [93] Kraft, The Parent-Child Testimonial Privilege: Who's Minding The Kids?. 18 Fam.L.Q. 505 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [94] Kramer & Marcuse, Executive Privilege—A Study of The Period 1953-1960, 29 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 623 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [95] Krash, Professional Responsibility to Clients and The Public Interest, 55 Chi.B.Rec. 31 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [96] Krasnowiecki, Confrontation by Witnesses in Government Employee Security Proceedings, 33 Notre Dame Law. 180 (1958). [Confrontation]
- [96] Krattenmaker, Interpersonal Testimonial Privileges Under The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Suggested Approach, 64 Geo.L.J. 613 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [97] Krattenmaker, Testimonial Privileges in Federal Courts: An Alternative to The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 62 *Geo.L.J.* 61 (1973) [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [98] Krauser, The Use of Prior Convictions As Credibility Evidence: A Proposal For Pennsylvania, 46 *Temp.L.Q.* 291 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [99] Kreiling, DNA Technology in Forensic Science, 33 *Jurimetrics* 449 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [100] Kreiling, Expert and Opinion Evidence in Vermont: Developments, Profiles, and Emerging Concerns for Reliability of Scientific Evidence. 12 *Vt.L.Rev.* 109 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [101] Krieger & Fox, Evidentiary Issues in Sexual Harassment Litigation, 1 *Berkeley.Wom.L.J.* 115 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [102] Krier, Environmental Litigation and The Burden of Proof, 69 *Inst.Gov.& Pub.Aff.* 1 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [103] Krivosila, Langswath, & Pirsch, Relevancy: The Necessity Exception in Using Evidence of Other Crimes, Wrongs, and Bad Acts to Convict, 60 *Neb.L.Rev.* 657 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [104] Krupp, Problems of Privilege and Witnesses Under The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 20 *Tr.L.Guide* 489 (1976). [History]
- [105] Kiry, Confrontation Under The Marian Statutes: A Response to Professor Davies, 72 *Brook.L.Rev.* 493 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [106] Kubie, Implications for Legal Procedure of The Fallibility of Human Memory, 108 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 59 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [107] Kuhlman, Communications to Clergymen—-When Are They Privileged?, 3 *Valpo.U.L.Rev.* 265 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [108] Kuhns, The Propensity to Misunderstand The Character of Specific Acts Evidence, 66 *Iowa L.Rev.* 777 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [109] Kunnert, Some Observations on The Origin and Structure of Evidence Rules Under The Common Law System and The Civil Law System of “Free Proof” in The German Code of Criminal Procedure, 16 *Buff,L.Rev.* 122 (1966) [History]
- [110] Kutner, Executive Privilege: Growth of Power Over A Declining Congress, 20 *Loy. (N.O.)L.Rev.*33 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [111] Kyvig, Book Review, 18 *Law & History Review* 228 (2000). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

L

- [1] La Belle, Privilege for Patent Agents, 23 B.U.J.Sci.& Tech.L. 350 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [2] Lacey, Scientific Evidence, 24 Juri.J. 254 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [3] Lacey, Admissibility of Evidence of Crimes Not Charged in The Indictment, 31 Ore.L.Rev. 267 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [4] Lacey, Oregon Evidence Law in The Sixties: Problems, Patterns, and Projections, 49 Ore,L.Rev. 188 (1970). [History]
- [5] Ladd, Presumptions in Civil Actions, 1977 Ariz.St.L.J. 275.[F.R.Ev. 301]
- [6] Ladd, Common Problems in The Technique of Trial, 22 Iowa L.Rev. 609 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [7] Ladd, Some Highlights of The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 1 Fla.St.U.L.Rev. 191 (1973) [History]
- [8] Ladd. Techniques and Theory of Character Testimony, 24 Iowa.L.Rev. 498 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [9] Ladd, Expert and Other Opinion Testimony, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 437 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [10] Ladd, The Relationship of The Principles of Exclusionary Rules of Evidence to The Problem of Proof, 18 Minn.L.Rev. 506 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [11] Ladd, Determination of Relevancy, 3 Tul.L.Rev. 81 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [12] Ladd, Credibility Tests—Current Trends, 89 U.Pa.L.Rev. 166 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 607]
- [13] Ladd, Expert Testimony, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 414 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [14] Ladd, Some Observations on Credibility: Impeachment of Witnesses, 52 Corn.L.Q. 239 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 613]
- [15] Ladd, The Need in Iowa of An Offer of Excluded Testimony for Appeal, 18 Iowa.L.Rev.304 (1933). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [16] Ladd, Objections, Motions, and Foundation Testimony, 43 Corn.L.Q. 543 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [17] Ladd Uniform Rules in The Federal Courts, Va.L.Rev. 692 (1963). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [18] Ladd, Legal Aspects of Hypnosis, 11 Yale L.J. (1902). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [19] Ladd, The Hearsay We Admit, 5 Okla.L.Rev. 271 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [20] Ladd, Privileges, 1969 Law & Soc.Order 555. [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [21] Ladd, Uniform Rules of Evidence: Witnesses, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 523 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [22] Lammon, *Perlman Appeals After Mohawk*, 80 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 1 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [23] Langhenry, Immunity of In-Hospital Staff Committee Members and Confidentiality of Staff Committee Records, 42 Fed.Ins.Coun.Q. 3 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [24] Langley, The Polygraph Lie Detector: Its Physiological Basis, Reliability and Admissibility, 16 Ala.Law. 209 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [25] Langley & Levine, *Branzburg* Revisited: Confidential Sources and First Amendment Values, 57 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 13 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [26] Langstraat, Client Identity and The Attorney-Client Privilege: The Tax Attack Continues, 23 Cal.West.L.Rev. 42 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [27] Langum, Uncodified Federal Evidence Rules Applicable to Civil Trials, 19 Willam.L.Rev. 513 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [28] Landsman, Are The Federal Rules of Evidence Dynamite?, 33 B.U.Int.L.J. 343 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [29] Landsman, Of Mushrooms and Nullifiers: The Rules of Evidence and The American Jury, 21 St.Louis U.Pub.L.Rev. 65 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [30] Landsman, The Rise of The Contentious Spirit: Adversary Procedure in Eighteenth Century England, 75 Corn.L.Rev. 497 (1990). [History]
- [31] Landsman, From Gilbert to Bentham: The Reconceptualization of Evidence Theory, 36 Wayne L.Rev. 1149 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [32] Landsman, When Justice Fails, 84 U.Mich.L.Rev. 824 (1986). [History]
- [33] Landsman, Reforming Adversary Procedure: A Proposal Concerning the Psychology of Memory and The Testimony of Disinterested Witnesses, 45 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 547 (1984).[F.R.Ev. 601]

Faculty Articles

- [34]** Landsman, The Decline of The Adversary System: How The Rhetoric of Swift and Certain Justice Has Affected Adjudication in American Courts, 29 Buff.L.Rev. 487 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [35]** Lane, Presumptions, 22 Mich.L.Rev. 207 (1924). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [36]** Langbein, Historical Foundations of The Law of Evidence: A View From The Ryder Sources, 96 Colum.L.Rev. 1168 (1996). [History]
- [37]** Landis, New York Psychologists and Social Workers: Confidentiality and Professional Malpractice, 32 Cath.Law. 132 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [38]** Landis, Constitutional Limitations on The Congressional Power of Investigation, 40 Harv.L.Rev. 153 (1926). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [39]** Lao, Federalizing Trade Secrets In An Information Economy, 59 Ohio St.L.J. 1633 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [40]** Larkin, The Right of Confrontation: What's Next?, 1 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 47 (1969). [Confrontation]
- [41]** Larkin, Article IV: Presumptions, 20 Hous.L.Rev. 133 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [42]** Larkin, Article II: Judicial Notice, 20 Hous.L.Rev. 107 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [43]** Larkin, Accountant-Client Privilege Statutes: A Clear Need For Reform, 8 Set.H.Leg.J. 209 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [44]** Larson, Blood Test Exclusion Procedures in Paternity Litigation: The Uniform Acts and Beyond, 13 J.Fam.L. 713 (1973-1974). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [45]** LaRue, Stories Versus Theories at The Cardozo Evidence Conference; It's Just Another Metaphor to Me, 14 Cardozo.L.Rev. 121 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [46]** Laski, The Personality of Associations, 29 Harv.L.Rev. 404 (1916). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [47]** Lasky, Lawyer-Client Privilege, 38 Cal.St.B.J. 427 (1903). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [48]** Latheram & Nelson, The Time is Right to Amend Rule 404(b), 45 U.Mem.L.Rev. 149 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [49]** Latimer, Confrontation After *Crawford*: The Decision's Impact On How Hearsay Is Analyzed Under The Confrontation Clause. 36 Seton H.L.Rev. 327 (2006). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [50] Latty, The Corporate Entity As A Solvent of Legal Problems, 34 Mich.L.Rev. 597 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [51] Lau, Reliability of Present Sense Impression Hearsay Evidence, 52 Gonz.L.Rev. 175 (2016/2017). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]
- [52] Laughlin, Preliminary Questions of Fact: A New Theory, 31 Wash.&Lee L.Rev. 285 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [53] Laughlin, The Location of The Burden of Persuasion, 18 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 3 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [54] Laughlin, Judicial Notice, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 365 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [55] Laughlin, In Support of The Thayer Theory of Presumptions, 52 Mich.L.Rev. 195 (1953). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [56] Laughlin, Business Entries and The Like, 46 Iowa L.Rev. 276 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(6)]
- [57] Lauderdale, A New Trend in The Law of Privilege: The Federal Settlement Privilege and The Proper Use of Federal Rule of Evidence 501 For The Recognition of New Privileges, 35 U.Mem.L.Rev. 255 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [58] Laurens, Criminal Law's Science Lag: How Criminal Justice Meets Changed Scientific Understanding, 93 Texas L.Rev. 1751 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [59] Lawson, Annual Survey of Michigan Law: Evidence, 44 Wayne L.Rev. 849 (1998). [History]
- [60] Lawson, Interpretation of The Kentucky Rules of Evidence: What Happened?, 87 Ky.L.J. 517 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [61] Lawson, Credibility and Character: A Different Look At An Interminable Problem, 50 Notre Dame Law. 758 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [61] Lawson, The Law of Presumptions: A Look At Confusion, Kentucky Style, 57 Ky.L.Rev. 7 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [62] Lay, The Use of Real Evidence, 37 Neb.L.Rev. 501 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [63] Laymon, Lie Detectors, 10 S.D.L.Rev. 1 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [64] Leach, How Do Jurors React To "Propensity" Evidence? --A Report On A Survey, 27 Am.J.Trial Ad. 559 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 404]

Faculty Articles

- [65] Leach, State Law of Evidence in The Federal Courts, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 554 (1930). [History]
- [66] Leary, Is There A Conflict of Interest In Representing A Corporation and Its Individual Employees?, 36 Bus.Law. 591 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [67] Lederman, The Crown's Right to Suppress Information Sought in The Litigation Process: The Elusive Public Interest, 8 U.B.C.L.Rev. 272 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [68] Lederman, The Admissibility of Business Records: A. Partial Metamorphosis, 11 Osgood Hall L.J. 373 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(6)]
- [69] Lee, The Priestly Class: Reflections On A Journalist's Privilege. 23 Cardozo Arts & Ent.L.J. 635 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [70] Lee, Probing Secrets: The Press and Inchoate Liability for Newsgathering Crimes, 36 Am.J.Crim.L. 129 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [71] Lee, Corporate Criminal Liability, 28 Colum.L.Rev. 1 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [72] Lefkowitz, The Attorney-Client Relationship and The Corporation, 26 Rec.Ass'n Bar City N.Y. 697 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [73] Leggett, The Character of Complainants in Sexual Charges, 21 Chitty's L.J. 132, (1973). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [74] Leifer, The Competence of The Psychiatrist to Assist in The Determination of Incompetency: A Sceptical Inquiry Into The Courtroom Functions of Psychiatrists, 14 Syr.L.Rev. 564 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [75] Lemmon & Murphy, The Evidentiary Use of The HLA Blood Test in Virginia, 19 U.Rich.L.Rev. 235 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [76] Lempert, The New Evidence Scholarship: Analyzing The Process of Proof, 66 B.U.L.Rev. 439 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [77] Lempert, A Right To Every Woman's Evidence, 66 Iowa L.Rev. 725 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [78] Lenhoff, The Law of Evidence: A Comparative Study Bases Essentially on Austrian and New York Law, 3 Am.J.Comp.L. 313 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [79] Lentz, Comparison Evidence in Obscenity Trials, 15 U.Mich.J.L.Ref. 45 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [80] Lenvin & Myers, *Nolo Contendere: Its Nature and Implications*, 51 *Yale L.J.* 1255 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [81] Leonard, *The Legacy of Old Chief and The Definition of Relevant Evidence: Implications for Uncharged Misconduct Evidence*, 36 *Sw.U.L.Rev.* 819 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [82] Leonard, *Federal Privileges in The 21st Century: Introduction*, 38 *Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev.* 515 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [83] Leonard, *The Use of Uncharged Misconduct Evidence to Prove Knowledge*, 81 *Neb.L.Rev.* 115 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [84] Leonard, *Character and Motive in Evidence Law*, 35 *Loy.(I.A.)L.Rev.* 439 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [85] Leonard, *Minimal Probative Value and The Failure of Common Sense*, 34 *Hous.L.Rev.* 89 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [86] Leonard, *In Defense of The Character Evidence Rule: Foundation of The Rule Against Trial By Character*, 73 *Ind.L.J.* 1161 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [87] Leonard, *Power and Responsibility in Evidence Law*, 60 *So.Calif.L.Rev.* 937 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [88] Leonard, *Codifying A Privilege for Self-Critical Analysis*, 25 *Harv.J.Legis.* 113 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [89] Leonard, *The Use of Character to Prove Conduct: Rationality and Catharsis in The Law of Evidence*, 58 *U.Colo.L.Rev.* 1 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [90] Lerner, *Conspirator's Privilege and Innocents Refuge, A New Approach to Joint Defense Agreements*, 77 *Notre Dame L.Rev.* 1449 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [91] Leslie, *The Costs of Confidentiality and The Purpose of Privilege*, 2000 *Wisconsin L.Rev.* 31. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [92] Lester, *Polygraph Evidence: Are Courts Failing to Keep Abreast of Modern Technology?*, 3 *Crim.Just.J.* 33 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [93] Letourneau & Manganas, *Violence in Sports: Evidentiary Problems in Criminal Prosecutions*, 16 *Osgoode Hall L.J.* 577 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [94] Letwin, *Impeaching Defendants With Their Prior Convictions: Reconsidering the Dangerous Propensities of Character Evidence After *People v. Castro**, 18 *U.C.Davis L.Rev.* 681 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 609]

Faculty Articles

- [95] Letwin, Waiver of Objections to Former Testimony, 15 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 118 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [96] Leubsdorf, The Surprising History of The Preponderance Standard of Civil Proof, 67 Fla.L.Rev. 1569 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [97] Leubsdorf, Presuppositions of Evidence Law, 91 Iowa L.Rev. 1209 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [98] Lev, The Law of Vicarious Admissions: An Estopple, 26 U.CinciL.Rev. 17 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 801(c)(3)(iv)]
- [99] Levary & Duke, Some Aspects of Potential Disclosure of Confidential Computerized Legal Materials, 4 Comp./LJ. 159 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [100] Levenson, Comment to The Jury of The Trial Judge—A Reply, 21 Ore.L.Rev. 168 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [101] Leventhal & Aldrich, The Admission of Evidence in Domestic Violence Cases After *Crawford v. Washington*, 11 Berkeley J.Crim.L. 77 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [102] Levi, Confidentiality and Democratic Government, 30 Record Assoc.B.C.N.Y. 323 (1975).[F.R.Ev. 509]
- [103] Levie, Hearsay and Conspiracy, 52 Mich.L.Rev. 1159 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(E)]
- [104] Levin, Pennsylvania and The Uniform Rules of Evidence: Presumptions and The Dead Man Statues, 103 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [105] Levin, Hypnosis and The Law, 1964 Ins.L.J. 97. [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [106] Levin & Cohen, The Exclusionary Rules in Nonjury Trials, 119 U.Pa.L.Rev. 905 (1971).[F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [107] Levin & Levy, Persuading The Jury With Facts Not In Evidence: The Fiction-Science Spectrum, 105 U.Pa.L.Rev. 139 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [108] Levin & Robert, Promises of Confidentiality to News Sources After *Cohen v. Cowles Media Company*: A Survey of Newspaper Editors, 24 Golden Gate U.L.Rev. 423 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [109] Levine & Flowers, Your Secrets Are Safe With Us: How Prosecutors Protect Trade Secrets During Investigation and Prosecution, 38 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 461 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 508]

Faculty Articles

- [110] Levine, Self-Interest or Self-Defense: Lawyer Disregard of The Attorney-Client Privilege for Profit and Protection, 5 Hofstra L.Rev. 703 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [111] Levine, Access to “Confidential” Welfare Records in The Course of Child Protection Proceeding, 14 J.Fam.L. 535 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [112] Levinson, Confrontation, Fidelity, Transformation: The “Fundamentalist” Judicial Persona of Justice Antonin Scalia, 26 Pace L.Rev. 445 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [113] Levinson, Testimonial Privileges and Preferences of Friendship, 1984 Duke L.J. 631. [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [114] Levitt, Scientific Evaluation of The Lie Detector, 40 Iowa L.Rev. 440 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [115] Levy, Impartial Medical Testimony Revisited, 34 Temp.L.Q. 416 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [116] Levy, Hypnosis and Legal Immutability, 46 J.Crim.L., Crim.& P.S. 333 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [117] Lewan, The Rationale of Habit Evidence, 16 Syr.L.Rev. 39 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 406]
- [118] Lewinbuk, Transformation of Critical Boundaries of The Attorney-Client Privilege in Response to The Growing Complexity of The Modern Business World, 42 Willam.L.Rev. 74 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [119] Lewis, Consistent for Prior Statements; Advocating for The Substantive Use of Prior Consistent Statements in Massachusetts Courts, 48 Suff.U.L.Rev. 305 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(B)]
- [120] Lewis, The Availability of The Attorney-Client and Work Product Privileges in Shareholder Litigation, 32 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 189 (1982-1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [121] Lewis, Corroborated Hearsay and The Confrontation Clause, 15 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 293 (1991). [Confrontation]
- [122] Lewis, Are Journalists Privileged?, 29 Cardozo L.Rev. 1353 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [123] Lewis, Cantankerous, Obstinate, Ubiquitous: The Press, 1975 Utah L.Rev. 75. [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [124] Liang & Liang, Lies on The Lips: Dying Declarations, Western Legal Bias, and Unreliability, 5 Law Text Culture 113 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 804(B)(2)]

Faculty Articles

- [125] Liang, Shortcuts to “Truth”: The Legal Mythology of Dying Declarations, 35 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 229 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(2)]
- [126] Lichtman & Lemley, Rethinking Patent Law’s Presumption of Validity, 60 Stan.L.Rev. 45 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [127] Liddle, Mathematical and Statistical Probability As A Test of Circumstantial Evidence, 19 Case-West.Res.L.Rev. 254 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [128] Liebman, Proposed Evidence Rules 413 to 415—Some Problems and Recommendations, 20 U.Dayton L.Rev. 753 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [129] Lifland, Corporate Clients and The Attorney-Client Privilege—Who Is The Corporate Client?, 41 Antitrust L.J. 557 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [130] Likeat, Precautionary Measures and Compromises, 1945 Wis.L.Rev. 399. [F.R.Ev. 407, 408]
- [131] Lilley, Suboptimal Executive Privilege, 2009 B.Y.U.L.Rev. 1127. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [132] Lilly, Notes on The Confrontation Clause and *Ohio v. Roberts*, 36 U.Fla.L.Rev. 207 (1984). [Confrontation]
- [133] Lim, A Logical View of The Hearsay Rule, 68 Aust.L.J. 724 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [134] Limburg, The Bankers and The Brokers Privilege, 25 Col.L.Rev. 152 (1925). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [135] Lininger, Reconceptualizing Confrontation After *Davis*, 85 Texas L.Rev. 271 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [136] Lininger, Kids Say The Darndest Things: The Prosecutorial Use of Hearsay Statements By Children, 82 Ind.L.J. 999 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [137] Lininger, Yes, Virginia, There Is a Confrontation Clause, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 401 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [138] Lininger, Prosecuting Batterers After *Crawford*, 41 Va.L.Rev. 749 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [139] Linklater, Disclosure of Confidential Information Can Destroy The Attorney-Client Privilege, 1985 Tr.L.Guide 178. [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [140] Lipman, Invoking The Crime-Fraud Exception: Why Courts Should Heighten the Standard in Criminal Cases, 52 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 595 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [141] Lipscomb, Privileged Communications Statute—Sword and Shield, 16 Miss.L.J. 181 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [142] Liptiak, Keynote Address: Secret Evidence in The Age of National Security, 5 Cardozo Pub.L Pol'y & Ethics J. 93 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [143] Lipton, Privileged Communications, 13 Inst.Fed.Tax. 955 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [144] Lipton, The Results of Scientific Techniques as Evidence in Federal Courts: Evolution of The *Frye v. United States* Standard in The Period 1969-1977, 8 Environ,L. 769 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [145] Little, Counsel By Clergy: Is It Privileged?, 10 Fam.Adv. 24 (Summer 1987). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [146] Lively, Government Housekeeping Authority: Bureaucratic Privileges Without A Bureaucratic Privilege, 16 Harv.Cic.Rts-Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 495 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [147] Livnah, Branding The Sexual Predator: Constitutional Ramifications of Federal Rules of Evidence 413 Through 415, 44 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 169 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [148] Livnah, The Law of Evidence (Amendment) Law, 1968, 5 Israel L.Rev. 260 (1970). [History]
- [149] Lloyd, Admissibility of Post-Accident Repairs: The Graying of A Black-Letter Rule, 25 Drake L.Rev. 400 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [150] Loevinger, Standards of Proof in Science and Law, 32 Jurimetrics 323 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [151] Lofts, The Attorney-Client Privilege in Federal Tax Investigations, 19 Tax L.Rev. 405 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [152] LoGatto, Privileged Communications and The Social Worker, 8 Cath.Law. 5 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [153] Log, The Impact of Common Law and Reform Rape Statutes on Prosecution: An Empirical Study, 55 Wash.L.Rev. 543 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [154] Long, The Physician-Patient Privilege Statutes Obstruct Justice, 25 Ins.Coun.J. 224 (1958).[F.R.Ev. 504]
- [155] Lopez, Application of The Audit Privilege to Occupational Health and Safety Audits: Lessons Learned From Environmental Audits, 12 Nat.Res.&Env.L. 211 (1996-1997). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [156] Lordi, The Attorney-Client Privilege in The European Union and Italy: Time For A Change, 11 Duq.Bus.L.J. 23 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [157] Loth, The Confrontation Clause: Statements Against Penal Interest As A Firmly-Rooted Hearsay Exception, 48 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 321 (2000) [Confrontation]
- [158] Lousell & Crippen, Evidentiary Privileges. 40 Minn.L.Rev. 413 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [159] Louisell, Confidentiality, Conformity, and Confusion: Privileges in Federal Court Today, 32 Tul.L.Rev. 101 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [160] Louisell, Construing Rule 301: instructing The Jury on Presumptions in Civil Actions and Proceedings, 63 Va.L.Rev. 281 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [161] Louisell, The Psychologist in Today's Legal World: Part i, 39 Minn.L.Rev. 235 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [162] Louisell, The Psychologist in Today's Legal World; Part II. 41 Minn.L.Rev. 731 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [163] Louisell & Sinclair, ForwardL Reflections on The Law of Privileged Communications—The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege in Perspective, 59 Calif.L.Rev. 30 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [164] Love & Vanity, Psychotherapy and The Law, 1974 Medical Trial Tech.Q. 405, [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [165] Love, The Applicability of Rules of Evidence in Non-Jury Trials, 24 Rocky Mt.L.Rev. 480 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [166] Lowy & Dudich, After *Crawford*: Using The Confrontation Clause in Massachusetts Courts, 12 Suffolk J. Trial & App.Advoc. 1 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [167] Lowy, Stetson, & Winer, Forensic Evidence in Massachusetts After *Melendez-Diaz*, 45 New Eng.L.Rev. 39 (2010). [Confrontation]
- [168] L.S.E. Jury Project, Juries and Rules of Evidence, 1973 Crim.L.Rev. 208. [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [169] Lvovsky, The Judicial Presumption of Police Expertise, 130 Harv.L.Rev. 1995 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [170] Lucii, 4th and 205: How A Rush of Global Comments Blocked the S.E.C.'s First Attempted Punt of Attorney-Client Privilege Under Sardanes-Oxley, 20 Touro L.Rev. 363 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

[171] Lucas, An Empirical Assessment of Georgia's Beyond a Reasonable Doubt Standard to Determine Intellectual Disability in A Capital Case, 35 Ga.St.U.L.Rev. 553 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[172] Lukowski, The Constitutional Right of Litigants to Have The State Trial Judge Comment Upon The Evidence, 55 Ky.L.J. 121 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 105]

[173] Lyon & Lamagna, The History of Children's Hearsay From Old Bailey to Post-Davis, 82 Ind.L.J. 1029 (2007). [Confrontation]

[174] Lyons, The State Secrets Privilege: Expanding Its Scope Through Government Misuse, 11 Lewis & Clark L.Rev. 99 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[175] Lynn-Ford, Annual Survey of New York Law: Evidence, 67 Syr.L.Rev. 949 (2017). [History]

[176] Lynn-Ford, Annual Survey of New York Law: Evidence, 66 Syr.L.Rev. 939 (2016). [History]

[177] Lynch, Expertise in Action: Presenting and Attacking Expert Evidence in DNA "Fingerprinting" Cases, 52 Vill.L.Rev. 925 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[178] Lynn, Restricting Attorney Speech About Matters of Recent Employment, 24 Ariz.L.Rev. 531 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 503]

M

[1] Machen, Corporate Personality, 24 Harv.L.Rev. 253 (1911). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[2] Maclean, *Campbell's Case* and Legal Professional Privilege, 13 Aust.Tax Rev. 17 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[3] Madden, Anchoring the Law in A Bed of Principle: A Critique of, and Proposal to Improve, Canadian and American Hearsay and Confrontation Law, 35 B.C.Int'l & Comp.L.Rev. 395 (2012). [Confrontation]

[4] Madden, Admissibility of Post-Incident Measures: A Pattern Emerges, 5 J.Prod.Liab. 1 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 407]

[5] McGuire, The Hearsay System: Around and Through The Thicket, 14 Vand.L.Rev. 741 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[6] Maguire & Epstein, Preliminary Questions of Fact in Determining The Admissibility of Evidence, 40 Harv.L.Rev. 392 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 104]

Faculty Articles

- [7] Maguire & Epstein, Rules of Evidence In Preliminary Controversies As To Admissibility, 36 Yale L.J. 1101 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [8] Maguire & Haehsy, Requisite Proof of Basis For Expert Opinion, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 432 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 705]
- [9] Maguire & Vincent, Admissions Implied From Spoliation, 45 Yale L.J. 226 (1935). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [10] Mahoney & Jacobson, The Motion in Limine: A Remedy for Dirty Tricks, Fed.Ins.Coun.Q. 65 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [11] Mamiya, Taking Judicial Notice of Genocide? : The Problematic Law and Policy of The *Karemera* Decisions, 25 Wis.Int'l L.J. 1 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [12] Manchester, Judicial Notice and Personal Knowledge, 42 Mod.L.Rev. 22 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [13] Mangrum, Nebraska's Procedural Rules of Evidence, 29 Creighton L.Rev. 219 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 103-105]
- [14] Mangrum. The Law of Hearsay in Nebraska, 25 Creighton L.Rev. 499 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [15] Mangrum, Judicial Notice in Nebraska, 22 Creighton L.Rev. 379 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [16] Manley, Patient, Penitent, Client and Spouse in New York, 31 N.Y.State Bar Ass'n J. 288 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [17] Manne & Williamson, Hot Dogs and Cold Economics: The Use and Misuse of Business Documents in Antitrust Enforcement and Adjudication, 47 Ariz.L.Rev. 609 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 803(6)]
- [18] Mansfield, Evidential Use of Litigation Activities of The Parties, 43 Syr.L.Rev. 695 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [19] Marcus, The Tudor Treason Trials: Some Observations on The Emergence of Forensic Themes, 1984 U.Ill.L.Rev.675. [Confrontation]
- [20] Marcus, The Development of Entrapment Law, 33 Wayne L.Rev. 5 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [21] Marcus, The Perils of Privilege: Waiver and The Litigator, 84 Mich.L.Rev. 1605 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 502]

Faculty Articles

- [22] Marcus, The Confrontation Clause and Co-Defendant Confessions: The Drift from *Bruton* to *Parker v. Randolph*, 1977 U.Ill.L.F. 559. [F.R.Ev. 105]
- [23] Marcus, The Reporter's Privilege: An Analysis of The Common Law, *Branzburg v. Hayes*, and Recent Statutory Developments, 25 Ariz.L.Rev. 815 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [24] Marcum & Campbell, The Ethical Boundaries of The Attorney-Client Privilege, 39 J.Leg.Prof. 199 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [25] Margolis, Prosecutorial Cross-Examination: Limitations on The Sword of Justice, 6 J.Crim.L., Crim. & P.S. 1 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 611]
- [26] Marino, The New York Freedom of Information Law, 43 Ford.L.Rev. 83 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [27] Mark, Recanting Confidential Witnesses in Securities Litigation, 45 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 575 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [28] Markel, The Future of State Secrets in War Crimes Prosecutions, 16 Mich.St.J.Int'l L. 411 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [29] Markey & Bonnell, Privileged Communication Between Counsel and Corporate Client, 28 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 565 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [30] Markham, Why a "Burden of Going Forward"? 16 No.Cal.L.Rev. 12 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [31] Marks, Corporate Investigations, Attorney-Client Privilege, and Selective Waiver: Is a Half-Privilege Worth Having at All?. 30 Seattle U.L.Rev. 155 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [32] Marks, Electromagnetic From Overhead High-Voltage Transmission of Electricity: Establishing Causation Using Toxicological and Epidemiological Evidence Under a Post-*Daubert* Standard, 13 J.Env.L.&Litig. 163 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [33] Marovich, The Applicability of The Attorney-Witness Rule to Labor Arbitration, 35 Arb.L.J. 41 (March, 1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [34] Marriss, The Informant and The Accomplice Witness: Problems for The Prosecution, 9 J.Marsh.J.Prac.&Proc. 243 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [35] Marshall, Garcia, & Prager, The Habit Evidence Rule and Its Misguided Judicial Legacy: A Statistical and Psychological Primer, 36 Law & Psych.Rev. 1 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 406]
- [36] Marshall, Privileged Occasions and Professional Secrecy, 6 Med.Sci.& L. 68 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]

Faculty Articles

- [37]** Mart & Ginsburg, [Dis]informing The People's Discretion, Judicial Deference Under The National Security Exemption of The Freedom of Information Act, 66 Admin.L.Rev. 725 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [38]** Martin, Lessons About Justice From A "Laboratory" of Wrongful Convictions: Tunnel Vision, The Construction of Guilt, and Informer Evidence, 70 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 847 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [39]** Martin, The New York Proposed Code of Evidence: Article IV, 47 Brook.L.Rev. 1339 (1981). [History]
- [40]** Martin & Brophy, Industries' Proprietary Information and Freedom of Access to State-Held Information: A Review of The Law and Its Implications for Special Business Interests, 59 So.Car.L.Rev. 831 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [41]** Martin, Inherent Judicial Power: Flexibility Congress Did Not Write Into The Federal Rules of Evidence, 57 Texas L.Rev. 167 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [42]** Martin, The Proposed "Science" Court, 75 Mich.L.Rev. 1058 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [43]** Martin, The Former Testimony Exception in The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 57 Iowa L.Rev. 547 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(1)]
- [44]** Martin, The Burden of Proof as Affected By Statutory Presumptions of Guilt, 17 Can.B.Rev. 37 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [45]** Massaro, The Dignity Value of Face to Face Confrontations, 40 U.Fla.L.Rev. 863 (1988). [Confrontation]
- [46]** Matte, Privileged Communication Between Attorney-Client-Polygraphist, 51 N.Y.St.B.J. 1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [47]** Matthias, The Admissibility of Novel Scientific Evidence in The Fourth Circuit, 19 Willam.L.Rev. 533 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [48]** Maurer, Privileged Communications and The Corporate Client, 16 Bus.Law. 959 (1961) and 28 Ala.L.Rev. 352 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [49]** Mauet, Prior Identification in Criminal Cases: Hearsay and Confrontation Issues, 24 Ariz.L.Rev. 29 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(C)]
- [50]** Mauet, Reputation Evidence in Criminal Trials, 58 Chi.Bar Rec. 72 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 405]

Faculty Articles

[51] Mayer, 9-11 and The Secret FISA Court: From Watchdog to Lapdogm 34 Case W.Res.J.Int'l L. 249 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[52] Maxwell, "I Object!", 46 So.Dak.L.Rev. 203 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[53] Mayfield, Preventing Manufacturer Compelled Disclosure of Confidential Information Contained in Voluntarily Submitted Adverse Event Reports, 19 AmJ.Tr.Adv. 265 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[54] Mazza, Should Clergy Hold The Priest-Penitent Privilege?, 82 Marq.L.Rev. 171 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[55] Mears & Day, The Challenge of Fingerprint Comparison Opinions in The Defense of A Criminally Charged Client, 19 Ga.St.U.L.Rev. 705 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[56] McAllister, Two-Way Video Trial Testimony and The Confrontation Clause: Fashioning A Better *Craig* Test In Light of *Crawford*, 34 Fla.St.U.L.Rev. 835 (2007). [Confrontation]

[57] McAllister, Executive or Judicial Determination of Privilege of Government Documents, 41 J.Crim.L., Crim. & P.S., 330 (1950) [F.R.Ev. 509]

[58] McBaine, The Attorney-Client Privilege for Corporations: What Comes Next?, 4 Litigation 18 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[59] McBaine, Burden of Proof: Degrees of Belief, 32 Calif.L.Rev. 242 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[60] McBaine, Burden of Proof: Presumptions, 2 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 13 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[61] McBaine, Presumptions: Are They Evidence? 26 Calif.L.Rev. 519 (1938). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[62] McCabe, Legislative Facts as Evidence in State Constitutional Search Analysis, 65 Temp.L.Rev. 1229 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[63] McCan, Addressing The Balance: Restructuring CIPA and FISA to Meet the Needs of Justice and The Criminal Justice System, 80 Alb.L.Rev. 1131 (2016/2017). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[64] McCarthy, The Use of Unilateral Stipulation As A Trial Tactic After *Old Chief*: The Effect of The Federal Rules of Evidence on An Infancy State, 50 Ala.L.Rev. 237 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 402]

Faculty Articles

- [65] McAuliffe, Burdens of Proof: Degrees of Belief, Quanta of Evidence, or Constitutional Guarantees?, 35 Vand.L.Rev. 1293 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [66] McClain, Post-*Crawford*: Time To Liberalize The Substantive Admissibility of A Testimonial Witness's Prior Consistent Statements, 74 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 1 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 801(b)]
- [67] McLucas, Shapiro & Sung, The Decline of The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Corporate Setting, 96 J.Crim.L & Criminology 821 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [68] McCord, "But Perry Mason Made It Look So Easy": The Admissibility of Evidence Offered By A Criminal Defendant to Suggest That Someone Else Is Guilty, 63 Tenn.L.Rev. 917 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [69] McKay, The Right of Confrontation, 1954 Wash.U.L.Q. 122. [Confrontation]
- [70] McMurray, Challenging Untested Facts At Sentencing: The Applicability of *Crawford* At Sentencing, 37 McGeorge L.Rev. 589 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [71] McCoid, The Admissibility of Sample Data Into A Court of Law: Some Further Thoughts, 4 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 235 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [72] McCoid, *Hanna v. Plumer*: The Erie Doctrine Changes Shape, 51 Va.L.Rev. 884 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [73] McConaway, Mullin & Frederick, The Uses of Social Science in Trials With Political and Racial Overtones: The Trial of Juan Little, 41 Law & Contemp.Prob. 205 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [74] McCord & Bennett, The Proposed Capital Penalty Phase Rules of Evidence, 36 Cardozo L.Rev. 417 (2014). [History]
- [75] McCord, Syndromes, Profiles, and Other Mental Exotica: A New Approach To The Admissibility of Nontraditional Psychological Evidence in Criminal Cases, 66 Ore.L.Rev. 19 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [76] McCormick & Grau, *Christian v. Gray*: The Oklahoma Supreme Court Accepts The *Daubert* Standard, 57 Okla.L.Rev. 787 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [77] McCormick, Scientific Evidence: Defining A New Approach To Admissibility, 67 Iowa L.Rev. 879 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [78] McCormick, Can The Courts Make Wider Use of Reports of Official investigations?, 42 Iowa L.Rev. 363 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 803(8)]

Faculty Articles

- [79] McCormick, Charges on Presumptions and Burden of Proof, 5 N.C.L.Rev. 291 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [80] McCormick, Detection-Tests and The Law of Evidence, 15 Calif.L.Rev. 484 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [81] McCormick, Opinion Evidence in Iowa, 19 Drake L.Rev. 245 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [82] McCormick, Some Highlights of The Uniform Evidence Rules, 33 Texas L.Rev. 559 (1954). [History]
- [83] McCormick, Some Observations Upon The Opinion Rule and Expert Testimony, 13 Texas L.Rev. 109 (1945). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [84] McCormick, Science, Experts, and The Courts, 29 Texas L.Rev. 611 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [85] McCormick, What Shall The Trial Judge Tell The Jury About Presumptions. 13 Wash.L.Rev. 185 (1938). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [86] MacDonald, False Accusations of Rape, 7 Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality 170 (May 1973). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [87] McDonough, The California Evidence Code: A Précis, 18 Hast.L.J. 89 (1966). [History]
- [88] McElhaney, A Quick Review of The Federal Rules, 9 Litigation 8 (Winter 1983). [History]
- [89] McElhaney, Speaking Objections, 11 Litigation 39 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [90] McGaffey, The Expert Witness and Source Credibility—The Communication Perspective, 2 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 57 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [91] McGarity & Shapiro, The Trade Secret Status of Health and Safety Testing Information: Reforming Agency Disclosure Policies, 93 Harv.L.Rev. 837 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [92] McGeehee, Subsequent Remedial Measures in A Product Liability Case: The Fastest Spinning Wheel in Litigation, 19 Ga.St.B.J. 89 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [93] McGough & Hornsby, Reflections on Louisiana's Child Witness Video Statute; Utility and Constitutionality In The Wake of *Stinzel*, 47 La.L.Rev. 1255 (1987). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [94] McGuire & Bruce, Keeping Children's Secrets: Confidentiality in The Physician-Patient Relationship, 8 Hous.J.Health L.&Pol'y 315 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [95] McGowan, Presidents and Their Papers, 68 Minn.L.Rev. 409 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [96] McGowan, Impeachment of Criminal Defendants By Prior Convictions, 1970 Law & Soc.Ord. 1. [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [97] McHale, Using Demonstrative Evidence in Admiralty Proceedings, 34 J.Mar.L.&Com.135 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [98] McKeever, Contours and Chaos: A Proposal For Courts to Apply The "Dangerous Patient" Exception to The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege, 34 N.M.L.Rev. 109 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [99] McKusick, Techniques in Proof of Other Crimes to Show Guilty Knowledge and Intent, 24 Iowa L.Rev. 471 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [100] McLachlin, Confidential Communications and The Law of Privilege, 11 U.Bt.Col.L.Rev. 266 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [101] McLain, Maryland's Statutory Hearsay Exception For Reliable Statements By Alleged Child Abuse Victims: A Hesitant Step Forward, 17 U.Balt.L.Rev. 1 (1987) [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [102] McLane, The Burden of Proof in Criminal Cases: *Mullaney and Patterson* Compared, 15 CrimL.Bull. 346 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [103] McLaughlin, The Treatment of Attorney-Client Privilege and Related Privileges in The Proposed Rules of Evidence For The United States District Courts, 26 The Record 30 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [104] McMonigal & Mallen, The Attorney's Dilemma in Defending Third Party Lawsuits: Disclosure of The Client's Confidences or Personal Liability, 14 Willam.L.J. 355 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [105] McNabb, Farrell & Brown, Voluntary Adoption of Evidence Based Practices in Local Law Enforcement: Eye-Witness Identification Procedures in Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska, 20 J.Gender Race & Just. 509 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [106] McNaughton, Burden of Production of Evidence: A Function of A Burden of Persuasion, 68 Harv.L.Rev. 1382 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [107] McNaughton, Judicial Notice—-Excerpts Relating to The Morgan-Wigmore Controversy, 14 Vand.L.Rev. 779 (1961) [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [108] McNeil, The Admissibility of Child Victim Hearsay in Kansas: A Defense Perspective, 23 Washburn L.J. 265 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 807]
- [109] McNichols, Some Random Thoughts on The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 7 Idaho L.Rev. 187 (1970). [History]
- [110] McReight, The Physician and The Evidence Act of 1907, 6 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 89 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [111] Medford & Sanfellippo, Admissible or Inadmissible?, Getting in—-Or Keeping Out —-Government Documents in Aviation Cases, 71 J.Air L.&Comm. 449 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(8)]
- [112] Medine, The Adverse Testimony Privilege: Time to Dispose Of a “Sentimental Relic”, 67 Ore.L.Rev. 519 (1988).[F.R.Ev. 505]
- [113] Meiklejohn, The Courts, The Press, and The Public: The Case of Myron Farber and The New York Times, 30 Syr.L.Rev. 789 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [114] Meizlish, Annual Survey of Michigan Law: Evidence, 60 Wayne L.Rev. 687 (2015). [History]
- [115] Meizlish, Annual Survey of Michigan Law: Evidence, 58 Wayne L.Rev. 739 (2012). [History]
- [116] Melilli, The Character Evidence Rule Revisited, 1998 B.Y.U.L.Rev. 1547. [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [117] Melilli, Exclusion of Evidence in Federal Prosecutions on The Basis of State Law, 22 Ga.L.Rev. 667 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [118] Meltzer, Who Do You Trust? Everything You Never Wanted to Know About Ethics, Conflicts, and Privilege in The Bankruptcy Process, 97 Comm.L.J. 749 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [119] Meltzer, Privilege Against Self-Incrimination and The Hit-and-Run Opinions, 1971 up.Ct.Rev. 1. [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [120] Menard, Admission of Computer-Generated Visual Evidence: Should There Be A Clear Standard?, 6 Softwear L.J. 352 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [121] Menashe, A New Paradigm for Understanding Judicial Notice and Its Implications in The Modern Digital Era, 9 Elon L.Rev. 267 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [122] Mendez, The Victims’ Bill of Rights—-Thirty Years After Proposition 8, 25 Stan.L.& Pol’y.Rev. 379 (2014). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [123] Mendez, IX. General Provisions: Conforming California's Evidence Code to The Federal Rules of Evidence, 44 U.S.F.L.Rev. 891 (2010). [History]
- [124] Mendez, Comparing The Federal Rules of Evidence With The California Evidence Code: Proposition 8 and The Wisdom of Using Initiatives as A Rule-Making Device, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 571 (2008). [History]
- [125] Mendez, California Evidence Code—Federal Rules of Evidence v. Witnesses: Conforming The California Evidence Code to The Federal Rules of Evidence, 39 U.S.F.L.Rev. 455 (2005). [History]
- [126] Mendez, Hearsay and Its Exceptions: Conforming The Evidence Code to The Federal Rules, 37 U.S.F.L.Rev. 351 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [126] Mendez, Character Evidence Reconsidered: "People Do Not Seem To Be Predictable Characters", 49 Hast.L.J. 871 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [127] Mendez, *Crawford v. Washington*: A Critique, 57 Stan.L.Rev. 569 (2004). [Confrontation]
- [128] Mendez, The Law of Evidence and The Search for A Stable Personality, 45 Emory L.J. 221 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [129] Mengler, The Theory of Discretion in the Federal Rules of Evidence, 74 Iowa L.Rev. 413 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [130] Merker, Polygraph For The Defense, 40 N.Y.St.B.J. 569 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [131] Messer, To Client @ workplace.com: Privilege at Risk?, 23 J.Marsh.J.Computer & Info.L. 75 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [132] Metzger, Confrontation Control, 45 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 83 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [133] Meyer, *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*: What The Expanded Confrontation Clause Ruling Means For Computer Forensics and Electronic Discovery, 28 Temp.J.Sci.Tech. & Env'tl.L. 243 (2009).[Confrontation]
- [134] Meyer & Farrell, The New York Proposed Code of Evidence: Some Background and Some Suggestions, 47 Brook.L.Rev. 1237 (1981). [History]
- [135] Meyers, An Analysis of Federal Rule of Evidence. 502 and Its Early Application, 55 Wayne L.Rev. 1441 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [136] Michael & Adler, Real Proof I, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 344 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 901]

Faculty Articles

- [137] Michael, Discovery and The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege, 15 Chi. Bar Rec. 12 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [138] Miene, Park & Borgida, Juror Decision Making and The Evaluation of Hearsay Evidence, 76 Minn.L.Rev. 683 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [139] Mikell, The Doctrine of Entrapment in The Federal Courts, 90 U.Pa.L.Rev. 245 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [140] Milanich, Decision Theory and Standards of Proof, 5 Law & Hum.Behav. 87 (1981).[F.R.Ev. 301]
- [141] Millich, Georgia's New Evidence Code—An Overview, 38 Ga.St.U.L.Rev. 379 (2012). [History]
- [142] Miller, A Shock to The System: Analyzing The Conflict Among Courts Over and When Excited Utterances May Follow Subsequent Startling Occurrences in Rape and Sexual Assault Cases, 12 Wm.& Mary J.Women & L. 49 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [143] Miller, Before The Law: Military Investigations and Evidence at The Iraq Special Tribunal, 13 Mich.St.J.Int'l L. 107 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [144] Miller, Rules of Evidence: Tools or Obstacles? 22 Def.L.J. 361 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [145] Miller, The Game Plan: Drafting The Ohio Rules of Evidence, 6 Cap.U.L.Rev. 549 (1977) [History]
- [146] Miller, The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege and The Work Product Doctrine: Protection From Compelled Disclosure In a Criminal Investigation of A Corporation, 12 U.S.F.L.Rev. 569 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [147] Miller, Getting To The Bottom or Digging Your Own Grave?: The Application of The Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrines in Internal Corporate Investigations, 9 Colo.Law. 945 (1980).[F.R.Ev. 503]
- [148] Miller, A Corporations Attorney-Client and Work Product Privileges, 29 Prac.Law. 55 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [149] Miller, The Best Offense Is A Good Defense: Why Criminal Defendants' Nolo Contendere Pleas Should Be Inadmissible Against Them When They Become Civil Plaintiffs, 75 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 725 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [150] Miller, Federal Rule 44.1 and The "Fact" Approach to Determining Foreign Law: Death Knell For a Die-Hard Doctrine, 65 Mich.L.Rev. 613 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [151] Miller, The Challenges to The Attorney-Client Privilege, 49 Va.L.Rev. 262 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [152] Miller, Beyond The Law of Evidence, 40 So.Car.L.Rev. 1 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [153] Miller & Barron, The Supreme Court, The Adversary System, and The Flow of Information to The Justices, 61 Va.L.Rev. 1187 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [154] Mills, Military Rules of Evidence: Adoption or An Abrogation of The Common Law?, 22 Akron L.Rev. 329 (1989). [History]
- [155] Millstone & Codinach, The Survivors' 25 Year Presumption Under The Black Lung Reform Act of 1977: A Case for Its Unconstitutionality, 82 W.Va.L.Rev. 1079 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [156] Milne, "Bless Me, Father, For I Am About to Sin. . .":Should Clergy Counsellors Have a Duty to Protect Third Persons?, 32 Tulsa L.J. 139 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [157] Milvid, The Misuse of Demonstrative Evidence, 28 Ins.Coun.J. 405 (1961), [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [158] Mintz, Patterns in Forcible Rape: A Review Essay, 8 Crim.L.Bull. 703 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [159] Mirfield, Similar Fact Evidence of Child Sexual Abuse in English, United States, and Florida Law: A Comparative Study, 6 J.Trans.L.& Pol'y 7 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [160] Mitchell, Mapping Evidence Law, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1065. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [161] Mitchell, Fair Press and Fair Trial: The Subpoena Controversy, 59 Ill.B.J. 282 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [162] Mitchell, Government Secrecy in Theory and Practice: "Rules and Regulations" As An Autonomous Screen, 58 Col.L.Rev. 199 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [163] Mitchell, The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence: How They Effect Product Liability Practice, 12 Duq.L.Rev. 551 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [163] Mitchell, Must Clergy Tell? Child Abuse Reporting Requirements Versus Clergy Privilege and Free Exercise of Religion, 71 Minn.L.Rev. 723 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [164] Mnookin, The Image of Truth, Photographic Evidence and The Power of Analogy, 10 Yale J.L.&Hum. 1 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [165] Mnookin, The Courts, The N.A.S., and The Future of Forensic Science, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1209 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [166] Mnookin, Expert Evidence and The Confrontation Clause After *Crawford*, 15 J.L.&Pol'y 791 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [167] Mnookin, Idealizing Science and Demonizing Experts: An Intellectual History of Expert Evidence, 52 Vill.L.Rev. 763 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [168] Mobilia, The Academic Freedom Privilege: A Sword or A Shield?, 9 Vt.L.Rev. 43 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [169] Mobilia, The Subsequent Repairs Doctrine in Product Liability Litigation, 5 J.Prod.Liab. 253 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [170] Moenssens, Admissibility of Scientific Evidence—An Alternative to The *Frye* Rule, 25 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 577 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [171] Mogel, The Effect of A Claim of Privilege Upon The Subpoena Power of an Administrative Law Judge, 28 Drake L.Rev. 67 (1978-1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [172] Moise, The Confrontation Clause and Justice Scalia: Everything Old Is New Again, 16-Sep.S.C.Law 11 (2004). [Confrontation]
- [173] Molko, The Law of Unintended Consequences Strikes Again: Does Murder Have A Statute of Limitations Now? The Sky Will Fall Unless the Supreme Court Changes Its Interpretation of the Confrontation Clause, 63 Drake L.Rev, 525 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [174] Molnar, Crown Privilege, 42 Sask.L.Rev. 123 (1978) [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [175] Monaghan, The Liability Claim Racket, 3 Law & Contemp.Prob. 491 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [176] Monk, Evidentiary Privilege For Journalists' Sources: Theory and Statutory Protection, 51 Mo.L.Rev. 1 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [177] Montiel, The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege as an "Occasional Instrument of Injustice": An Argument for a Criminal Threat Exception, 36 S.Ill.U.L.J. 445 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [178] Montoya, Lessons From *Akiki* and *Michaels* on Shielding Child Witnesses, 1 Psych.Pub.Pol'y & L. 340 (1995). [Confrontation]
- [179] Montoya, Something Not So Funny Happened on The Way to Conviction: The Pretrial Interrogation of Child Witnesses, 35 Ariz.L.Rev. 927 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [180] Montrose, Basic Concepts of The Law of Evidence, 70 Law Q.Rev. 527 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

- [181] Moody, A Blow To Domestic Violence Victims: Applying The “Testimonial Statements” Test in *Crawford v. Washington*, Wm.& Mary Women & L. 387 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [182] Moore, Trial by Schema: Cognitive Filters in The Courtroom, 37 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 273 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [183] Moore, Basic Practice Guide For Demonstrative, Experimental, and Scientific Evidence, 50 Ins.Coun.J. 279 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [184] Moore, The Medical Diagnosis and Treatment Exception to Hearsay—The Use of The Child Protection Team in Child Sexual Abuse Prosecutions, 13 No.Ky.L.Rev. 51 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 803(4)]
- [185] Moore, Testimony of The Expert Document Examiner, 22 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 675 (1961), [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [186] Moore, The Accuracy of Testimony Relative to Time Intervals, 26 J.Crim.L., Crim.& P.S. 210 (1935). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [187] Moore & Schaeffer, Congress and The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 4 Mem.St.U.L.Rev. 1 (1953). [History]
- [188] Mooreman, Executive Privilege and The Freedom of Information Act: Sufficient Protection for Aircraft Mishap Reports, 21 A.F.L.Rev. 581 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [189] Morales, Presumption of Union’s Majority Status in N.L.R.B. Cases, 29 Lab.L.J. 309 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [190] Moran, Jury Uncertainty, Elemental Independence, and The Conjunction Paradox: A Response to Allen and Jehl, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 945. [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [191] Moreno, C.S.I. Bulls#lt, The National Academy of Sciences, *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*, and Future Challenges to Forensic Science and Forensic Experts, 2010 Utah L.Rev. 237. [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [192] Moreno, Translating “Visions of Rationality” into Specific Legal Reforms, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1175. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [193] Morgan, Hearsay Dangers and The Application of The Hearsay Concept, 62 Harv.L.Rev. 177 (1948). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [194] Morgan, Res Gestae, 12 Wash.L.Rev. 91 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]
- [195] Morgan, The Hearsay Rule, 12 Wash.L.Rev. 1 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

- [196] Morgan, Admissions As An Exception to The Hearsay Rule, 30 Yale L.J. 355 (1921). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [197] Morgan, Choice of Law Governing Proof, 58 Harv.L.Rev. 153 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [198] Morgan, Declarations Against Interest, 5 Vand.L.Rev. 451 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(4)]
- [199] Morgan, Functions of Judge and Jury in Determination of Preliminary Questions of Fact, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 165 (1929). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [200] Morgan, Presumptions, 12 Wash.L.Rev. 255 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [201] Morgan, The Jury and Exclusionary Rules of Evidence, 4 U.Chi.L.Rev. 247 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [202] Morgan, The Relation Between The Hearsay Rule and Preserved Memory, 40 Harv.L.Rev. 712 (1927). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [203] Morgan, Evidence—-Presumptions—-Burden of Proof, 23 Ore.L.Rev. 269 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [204] Morgan, Techniques In The Use of Presumptions, 24 Iowa L.Rev. 413 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [205] Morgan, How To Approach Burden of Proof and Presumptions, 25 Rocky Mt.L.Rev. 34 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [206] Morgan, Instructions to The Jury on Presumptions and Burden of Proof, 47 Harv.L.Rev. 59 (1933). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [207] Morgan, Judicial Notice, 57 Harv.L.Rev. 269 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [208] Morgan, Practical Difficulties Impeding Reform In The Law of Evidence, 14 Vand.L.Rev. 725 (1961). [History].
- [209] Morgan, The Rationale of Vicarious Admissions, 42 Harv.L.Rev. 461 (1929). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [210] Morgan, Some Observations Concerning Presumptions, 44 Harv.L.Rev. 906 (1931). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [211] Morgan, Suggested Remedy For Obstructions to Expert Testimony By Rules of Evidence, 10 U.Chi.L.Rev. 284 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 702]

Faculty Articles

- [212] Morgan, The Future of The Law of Evidence, 22 Texas L.Rev. 587 (1951). [History]
- [213] Morgan, *Tot v. United States*: Constitutional Restrictions on Statutory Presumptions, 56 Harv.L.Rev. 1324 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [214] Morgan, The Uniform Rules and The Model Code, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 145 (1956). [History]
- [215] Morgan, The Uniform Rules of Evidence: Presumptions, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 512 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [216] Morgan, Some Observations Concerning A Model Code of Evidence, 89 U.Pa.L.Rev. 145 (1940). [History]
- [217] Morgan, Further Observations On Presumptions, 16 So.Calif.L.Rev. 245 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [218] Morgan & Maguire, Looking Backward and Forward at Evidence, 50 Harv.L.Rev. 909 (1937). [History]
- [219] Moriarity, Wonders of The Invisible World: Prosecutorial Syndrome and Profile Evidence in The Salem Witchcraft Trials, 26 Vt.L.Rev. 43 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [220] Morris, Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b): The Fictitious Ban on Character Reasoning From Other Crime Evidence, 17 Rev.Litig. 181 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [221] Morris, Admissions and The Negligence Issue, 29 Texas L.Rev. 407 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [222] Morris, Proof of Safety History in Negligence Cases, 61 Harv.L.Rev. 205 (1948). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [223] Morris, The Sixth Amendment Right of Confrontation and The Non-English Speaking Accused, 41 Fla.B.J. 475 (1967). [Confrontation]
- [224] Morris, The Role of Expert Testimony in The Trial of Negligence Issues, 26 Texas L.Rev. 1 (1947). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [225] Morrison, The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence and Antitrust Trial Practice, 41 Antitrust L.J. 567 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [226] Morrison, Some Features of The Roman and The English Law of Evidence, 33 Tul.L.Rev. 577 (1959). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [227] Moser, Compellibility of One Spouse To Testify Against The Other in Criminal Cases, 15 Md.L.Rev. 16 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [228] Mosk & Ginsberg, Evidentiary Privileges in International Arbitration, 50 Int'l & Comp.L.Q. 345 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [229] Moss, Beyond The Fringe: Apocryphal Rules of Evidence in Texas, 46 Baylor L.Rev. 761 (1991) [History]
- [230] Moss, Public Information Policies, The A.P.A., and Executive Privilege, 15 Ad.L.Rev. 111 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [231] Moss, The Sweeping Claims Exception and The Federal Rules of Evidence, 1982 Duke L.J. 61. [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [232] Mostek, Limited Privilege and Immunity for Self-Evaluative Environmental Audits in Nebraska: Moving Environmental Performance To The Next Level, 32 \ Creighton L.Rev. 515 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [233] Mosteller, The Sixth Amendment Rights to Fairness: The Touchstones of Effectiveness and Pragmatism, 45 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 1 (2013). [Confrontation]
- [234] Mosteller, Confrontation in Children's Case: The Dimensions of Limited Coverage, 20 J.L.& Pol'y 393 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [235] Mosteller, Revealing and Thereby Tempering The Abuses of Government-Created Evidence in Criminal Trials, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1277 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [236] Mosteller, *Crawford's* Impact on Hearsay Statements in Domestic Violence and Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 411 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [237] Mosteller. Softening The Formality and Formalism of Testimonial Statement Concept, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 429 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [238] Mosteller, The Duke Lacrosse Case, Innocence, and False Identifications: A Fundamental Failure to "Do Justice", 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1337 (2007). [History]
- [239] Mosteller, Testing The Testimonial Concept and Exceptions to Confrontation: A Little Child Shall Lead Them, 82 Ind.L.J. 917 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [240] Mosteller, Confrontation as Constitutional Criminal Procedure:*Crawford's* Birth Did Not Require That *Roberts* Had To Die, 15 J.L.&Pol'y 685 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [241] Mosteller, *Crawford v. Washington*: Encouraging and Ensuring the Confrontation of Witnesses, 39 U.Rich.L.Rev. 511 (2005). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [241] Mosteller, Admissibility of The Fruits of Breached Evidentiary Privileges: The Importance of Adversarial Fairness, Party Culpability, and Fear of Immunity, 81 Wash.U.L.Q. 961 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [242] Mosteller, The Maturation and Disintegration of The Hearsay Exception for Statements for Medical Examination in Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 65 L.&Contemp.Prob. 47 (2002).[F.R.Ev. 803(4)]
- [243] Mosteller, N.C. Innocence Inquiry Commission's First Decade: Impressive Successes and Lessons Learned, 94 N.C.L.Rev. 1725 (2016). [History]
- [244] Mosteller, Pernicious Inferences: Double Counting and Perception and Evaluation Biases In Criminal Cases, 58 Howard L.J. 365 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [245] Mosteller, The Danger to Confidential Communications in the Mismatch between the Fourth Amendment's "Reasonable Expectation of Privacy" and the Confidentiality of Evidentiary Privileges, 32 Campb. L.Rev. 147 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [246] Mosteller, Giles v. California: Avoiding Serious Damage to Crawford's Limited Revolution, 13 Lewis & Clark L.Rev. 675 (2009). [Confrontation]
- [247] Mosteller, The Special Threat of Informants to the Innocent Who Are Not Innocents: Producing "First Drafts," Recording Incentives, and Taking a Fresh Look at the Evidence, 6 Ohio St.J.Crim.L. 519 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [248] Mosteller, Testing the Testimonial Concept and Exceptions to Confrontation: " A Little Child Shall Lead Them," 82 Ind.L.J. 917 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [249] Mosteller, Davis v. Washington and Hammon v. Indiana: Beating Expectations, 105 Mich.L.Rev.Fst.Imp. 6 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [250] Mosteller, Victims' Rights and The United States Constitution: An Effort to Recast The Battle in Criminal Litigation, 85 Geo.L.J. 1691 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [251] Mosteller, Syndromes and Politics In Criminal Trials and Evidence Law, 46 Duke L.J. 461 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [252] Mosteller, Popular Justice, 109 Harv.L.Rev. 487 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [253] Mosteller, Legal Doctrines Governing The Admissibility of Expert Testimony Concerning Social Framework Evidence, 52 L.&Contem.Prob. 85 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [254] Mosteller, Child Sexual Abuse and Statements for The Purpose of Medical Diagnosis or Treatment, 67 N.C.L.Rev. 257 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 803(4)]

Faculty Articles

- [255] Mosteller, "Testimonial" and the Formalistic Definition -- The Case for an "Accusatorial" Fix, 20 *Crim.Just.* 14 (Summer 2005). [Confrontation]
- [256] Mosteller, The Confrontation Clause Radically Redefined by *Crawford v. Washington*, 9 *N.C.St.B.J.* 6 (Winter 2004). [Confrontation]
- [257] Mosteller, The Maturation and Disintegration of the Hearsay Exception for Statements for Medical Examination in Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 65 *L.& Contem.Prob.* 47 (Winter 2002). [F.R.Ev. 803(4)]
- [258] Mosteller, Discussion: Interpretation of Federal Rule 801, 16 *Miss.C.L.Rev.* 21 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [259] Mosteller, Remaking Confrontation Clause and Hearsay Doctrine Under the Challenge of Child Sexual Abuse Prosecutions, 1993 *U.Ill.L.Rev.* 691 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [260] Mosteller, Child Abuse Reporting Laws and Attorney-Client Confidences: The Reality and the Specter of Lawyer as Informant, 42 *Duke L. J.* 203 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [261] Motley & Player, Issues In "Crime-Fraud" Practice and Procedure: The Tobacco Litigation Experience, 49 *So.Car.L.Rev.* 187 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [262] Motomura, Using Judgments As Evidence, 70 *Minn.L.Rev.* 979 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 803(22)]
- [263] Mueller, Cross-Examination Earlier or Later: When Is It Enough To Satisfy *Crawford?*, 19 *Regent U.L.Rev.* 319 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [264] Mueller, Instructing The Jury Upon Presumptions in Civil Cases: Comparing Federal Rule 301 With Uniform Rule 301, 12 *Land & Water L.Rev.* 219 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [265] Mueller, The Federal Coconspirator Exception: Action, Assertion, and Hearsay, 12 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 328 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)]
- [266] Mueller, Foreword: Should Wyoming Adopt These Rules?, 12 *Land & Water L.Rev.* 585 (1977). [History]
- [267] Mulkey, Confronting Legal and Technological Incongruity: Remote Testimony for Child Witnesses, 17 *Vand.J.Ent.& Tech.L.* 463 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [268] Mulvaney, Government Secrecy and The Right of Confrontation, 31 *Notre Dame Law.* 602 (1956). [Confrontation]
- [269] Munday, Handling The Evidential Exception, 1958 *Crim.L.Rev.* 345.

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[270] Munda, Forward Progress: A New Pattern Criminal Jury Instruction for Impeachment With Prior Inconsistent Statements Will Ease The Court's Burden by Emphasizing The Prosecutors, 84 Ford.L.Rev. 1455 (2016).[F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]

[271] Murasky, The Journalist's Privilege: *Branzburg* and Its Aftermath, 52 Texas L.Rev. 829 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[272] Murphy, Neuroscience and The Civil/Criminal *Daubert* Divide, 85 Ford.L.Rev. 619 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[273] Murphy, A Tale of Two Sciences, 110 Mich.L.Rev. 909 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[274] Murphy, Spin Control and The High-Profile Client—Should The Attorney-Client Privilege Extend To Communications With Public Relations Consultants?, 55 Syr.L.Rev. 549 (2005) [F.R.Ev. 503]

[275] Murphy, The Self-Evaluative Privilege, 7 J.Corp.L. 404 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[276] Murphy, Medical Records and Privileged Communications: From Hippocrates to Elvis Presley, 15 Forum 1040 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[277] Murphy, Oral Motions In Limine, 14 Litigation 15 (Spring 1988). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[278] Murray & Chorvat, State Gladiators Go High Tech With Records—Will The Feds Follow?, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 573 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 803(8)]

[279] Murray, The Hearsay Maze: A Glimpse of Some Possible Exits, 50 Can.B.J. 1 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[280] Murray, Evidence: A Fresh Approach; The American Uniform Rules of Evidence, 37 Can.B.Rev. 576 (1959). [History]

[281] Murray & Aitken, The Constitutionality of California's Under-The-Influence-of-Alcohol Presumption, 35 So.Calif.L.Rev. 955 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[282] Myers, *Ohio v. Clark*: A Real-Life Whodunit, 21 Psycho.Pub.Pol'y& L. 383 (2015). [Confrontation]

[283] Myers, The Attorney-Client Relationship and The Code of Professional Responsibility: Suggested Attorney Liability for Breach of Duty to Disclose Fraud to The Securities and Exchange Commission, 44 Ford.L.Rev. 1113 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[284] Myers, Hearsay Statements of The Child Abuse Victim, 38 Baylor L.Rev. 775 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

[285] Myers, Uncharged Misconduct Evidence in Child Abuse Litigation, 1988 Utah L.Rev. 479. [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

[286] Myers, "The Battle of The Experts": A New Approach to An Old Problem in Medical Testimony, 44 Neb.L.Rev. 539 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 706]

N

[1] Nacht, Privileges in The Federal Courts: The Two Faces of Rule 501, 1978 Ann,Surv.Am.L. 393. [F.R.Ev. 501]

[2] Nader, Freedom From Information: The Act and The Agencies, 5 Harv.Civ.Rts.-Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 1 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[3] Naftalis, "Queen For A Day": Agreements and The Proper Scope of Permissible Waiver of The Federal Plea Statement Rules, 37 Colun.J.L.& Soc.Probs. 1 (2003) [F.R.Ev. 410]

[4] Nance, Adverse Inferences About Adverse Inferences: Restructuring Juridical Rules for Responding to Evidence Tampering by Parties to Litigation, 90 B.U.L.Rev. 1089 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[5] Nance, Naturalized Epistemology and The Critique of Evidence Theory, 87 Va.L.Rev. 1551 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[6] Nance, Evidential Completeness and The Burden of Proof, 49 Hast.L.J. 621 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 106]

[7] Nance, A Theory of Verbal Completeness, 80 Iowa L.Rev. 825 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 106]

[8] Nance, Conditional Probative Value and The Reconstruction of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 94 Mich.L.Rev. 419 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]

[9] Nance, Civility and The Burden of Proof, 17 Harv.J.L.& Pub.Pol'y 649 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[10] Nance, Missing Evidence, 13 Cardozo L.Rev. 831 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[11] Nance, The Best Evidence Principle, 78 Iowa L.Rev. 227 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[12] Nasu, State Secrets Law and National Security, 64 Int'l & Comp.L.Q. 365 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[13] Natali, *Green, Dutton And Chambers*: Three Rules in Search of A Theory, 7 Rutgers-Camden L.J. 43 (1975). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

[14] Natali, Does A Criminal Defendant Have A Constitutional Right to Compel The Production of Privileged Testimony Through Use Immunity, 30 Vill.L.Rev. 1501 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[15] Natali & Stigall, "Are You Going to Arraign His Whole Life?": How Sexual Propensity Evidence Violates The Due Process Clause, 28 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 1 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 413]

[16] Natapof, Beyond Unreliable: How Snitches Contribute To Wrongful Convictions, 37 Golden Gate U.L.Rev. 107 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 510]

[17] Nath, *Upjohn*: A New Perspective For The Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrines In Administrative Investigations, 30 Buff.L.Rev. 11 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[18] Nathanson, From Watergate to *Marbury v. Madison*: Some Reflections on Presidential Privilege in Current Historical Perspectives, 16 Ariz.L.Rev. 59 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[19] Needham, When Is An Attorney Acting As An Attorney?: The Scope of The Attorney-Client Privilege As Applied to Corporate Negotiations. 38 So.Tex.L.Rev. 681 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[20] Neitzert, Jury Trials of Insurance Companies and Large Corporations, 18 Chi.B.Rec. 87 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 411]

[21] Nejjelski & Lerman, A Researcher-Subject Testimonial Privilege: What To Do Before The Subpoena Arrives, 1971 Wis.L.Rev. 1085. [F.R.Ev. 501]

[22] Nelken, The Limits of Privilege: The Developing Scope of Federal Psychotherapist-Patient Law, 20 Rev.Litig. 1 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[23] Nelson, The Newsmen's Privilege Against Disclosure of Confidential Sources and Information, 24 Vand.L.Rev. 667 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[24] Nesson, Rethinking The Lawyer's Duty to Disclose Information: A Critique of Judge Frankel's Proposal, 24 N.Y.L.S.L.Rev. 677 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[25] Nelsson, Solomon's Sword: The Loser Gets Process, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 479 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]

[26] Nesson, The Evidence or The Event?: On Judicial Proof and The Acceptability of Verdicts, 98 Harv.L.Rev. 1357 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[27] Nesson, Reasonable Doubt and Permissive Inferences: The Value of Complexity, 92 Harv.L.Rev. 1187 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 303]

Faculty Articles

- [28]** Nesson, Rationality, Presumptions, and Judicial Comment: A Response to Professor Allen, 94 Harv.L.Rev. 1574 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [29]** Nesson & Benkler, Constitutional Hearsay: Requiring Foundational Testing and Corroboration Under The Confrontation Clause, 81 Va.L.Rev. 149 (1995). [Confrontation]
- [30]** Nesson, Aspects of The Executive's Power Over National Security Matters: Secrecy Classifications and Foreign Intelligence Wire Taps, 49 Ind.L.J. 399 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [31]** Neuman, The Constitutional Requirement of "Some Evidence". 25 San Diego L.Rev. 631 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [32]** Newman & Shepherd, The Excessive Use of Presumptions and The Role of Subjective Employee Intent in Effecting the Purpose of The National Labor Relations Act, 17 Akron L.Rev. 145 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [33]** Newman, Former Corporate Counsel and Client Confidences in A Derivative Action, 4 J.Corp.L. 321 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [34]** Nichols, The Interpretation of The Confrontation Clause: Desire to Promote Perceived Societal Benefits and Denial of The Resulting Difficulties Produces Dichotomy in The Law, 26 N.M.L.Rev. 393 (1996). [Confrontation]
- [35]** Nicolas, De Novo Review in Deferential Robes?: A Deconstruction of The Standard of Review of Evidentiary Errors in The Federal System, 54 Syr.L.Rev. 531 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [36]** Nicolas, "They Say He's Gay": The Admissibility of Evidence of Sexual Orientation, 39 Ga.L.Rev. 793 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [37]** Nilsen, The Criminal Defense Lawyer's Reliance on Bias and Prejudice, 8 Geo.J.Leg Ethics 1 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [38]** Nokes, Codification of The Law of Evidence in Common Law Jurisdictions, 5 Int.&Comp.L.Q. 347 (1956). [History]
- [39]** Nokes, Professional Privilege, 66 Law Q.Rev. 88 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [40]** Nokes, The English Jury and The Law of Evidence, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 153 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [41]** Noonan, The Purposes of Advocacy and The Limits of Confidentiality, 64 Mich.L.Rev. 1485 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

[42] Nored, *Crawford v. Washington*: Implications For The Presentation of Child-Witness Testimony in Child-Abuse Cases, 25 Miss.C.L.Rev. 97 (2005). [Confrontation]

[43] North, Presumption Rules Try To Indicate If Fact Can, Should Be Inferred, 53 Neb.L.Rev. 347 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[44] Northrop, The Epistemology of Judicial Judgments, 58 Nw.U.L.Rev. 732 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[45] Northrop, The Mediatonal Approval Theory of Law In American Realism, 44 U.Va.L.Rev. 347 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[46] Noyes, Federal Rule of Evidence 502: Stirring The State Law of Privilege and Professional Responsibility With A Federal Stick, 66 Wash.&Lee L.Rev. 673 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 502]

[47] Nussbaum, The Problem of Proving Foreign Law, 50 Yale L.J. 1018 (1941). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[48] Nussbaum, Proving The Law of Foreign Countries, 3 Am.J.Comp.L. 60 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[49] Nutting, Freedom of Silence: Constitutional Protection Against Government Intrusion in Political Affairs, 47 Mich. L.Rev. 101 (1940). [F.R.Ev. 507]

O

[1] O'Brien, Pedophilia: The Legal Predicament of Clergy, 4 J.Conemp.Hlth.L.&Pol'y 91 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[2] O'Brien, The Hearsay Within Confrontation, 29 St.Louis U.Pub.L.Rev. 501 (2010). [Confrontation]

[3] O'Brien, The Dissenting Opinions in *Nixon v. Sirica*: An Argument for Executive Privilege in The White House Tapes Controversy, 28 Sw.L.J. 373 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[4] O'Brien, Judicial Responses When A Civil Litigant Exercises A Privilege: Seeking The Least Costly Remedy, 31 Si.Louis U.L.J. 323 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 513]

[5] O'Brien, The Seduction of The Judiciary: Social Science and The Courts, 64 Judicature 8 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[6] O'Connor, "That's The Man": A Sobering Study of Eyewitness Identification and The Polygraph, 49 St.J.L.Rev. 1 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [7] O'Donnell, Character Evidence and The Juvenile Record, 20 *Cleve.St.L.Rev.* 86 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 405]
- [8] Oldfather, Other Bad Acts and The Failure of Precedent, 28 *Wm.Mitch.L.Rev.* 151 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [9] Olson, A Look at Indiana Code 34-1-14-5: Indiana's Physician-Patient Privilege, 8 *Valpo.U.L.Rev.* 37 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [10] O'Neal & Thompson, Vulnerability of Professional-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation, 31 *Bus.Law.* 1775 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [11] O'Neal, Court-Ordered Psychiatric Examination of A Rape Victim in A Criminal Prosecution—Or How Many Times Must A Woman Be Raped?, 18 *Santa Clara L.Rev.* 119 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [12] O'Neil, The Political Safeguards of Executive Privilege, 60 *Vand.L.Rev.* 1079 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [13] O'Neil, A Researcher's Privilege: Does Any Hope Remain?, 59 *L.&Contmp.Prob.* 35 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [14] O'Neil, Scientific Research and The First Amendment: An Academic Privilege, 16 *U.C.Davis L.Rev.* 837 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [15] O'Neil, Shield Laws: A Partial Solution to A Pervasive Problem, 20 *N.Y.L.F.* 515 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [16] O'Neil, Ohio's Physician-Patient Privilege In Personal Injury Cases—Time For Reform, 16 *West.Res.L.Rev.* 324 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [17] Onstott, Judicial Notice and The Law's "Scientific" Search for Truth, 40 *Akron L.Rev.* 405 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [18] Oppenheim, Congressional Free Speech, 6 *Loy.(N.O.)L.Rev.* 1 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [19] Ordover, Balancing The Presumption of Guilt and Innocence: Rules 404(b), 608(b), and 609(a), 38 *Emory L.J.* 135 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [20] Ordover, Admissibility of Patterns of Similar Sexual Conduct: The Unlamented Death of Character for Chastity, 63 *Corn.L.Rev.* 90 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [21] O'Reilly, Discovery Against The United States: A New Aspect of Sovereign Immunity, 21 *N.C.C.L.Rev.* 1 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

[22] Orenstein, Sex, Threats, and Absent Victims: The Lessons of *Regina v. Bedingfield* for Modern Confrontation and Domestic Violence Cases, 19 Ford.L.Rev. 115 (2010). [Confrontation]

[23] Orenstein, Her Last Words: Dying Declarations and Modern Confrontation Jurisprudence, 2010 U.Ill.L.Rev. 1411. [Confrontation]

[24] Orenstein, Special Issues Raised by Rape Trials, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1585 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[25] Orenstein, Deviance, Due Process, and The False Promise of Federal Rule of Evidence 403, 90 Corn.L.Rev. 1487 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[26] Orenstein, No Bad Men!: A Feminist Analysis of Character Evidence in Rape Trials, 49 Hast.L.J. 663 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 413]

[27] Orenstein, "My God!": A Feminist Critique of The Excited Utterance Exception to The Hearsay Rule, 85 Calif.L.Rev. 159 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 803(2)]

[28] Orfield, Uniform Federal Rules of Evidence, 67 Dick.L.Rev. 381 (1963). [History]

[29] Orfield, Can Rules of Evidence Be Codified?, 42 No.Dak.L.Rev. 13 (1965). [History]

[30] Orfield, The Husband-Wife Privileges in Federal Criminal Trials, 24 Ohio St.L.J. 144 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 505]

[31] Orfield, Burden of Proof and Presumptions in Federal Criminal Cases, 80 U.K.C.L.Rev. 30 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[32] Orfield, Pleas in Federal Criminal Procedure, 35 Notre Dame L. 1 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 410]

[33] Orfield, The Defense of Entrapment in Federal Courts, 1967 Duke L.J. 39. [F.R.Ev. 404]

[34] Orfield, Relevancy in Federal Criminal Evidence, 43 Neb.L.Rev. 485 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[35] Orland & Tegland, The Federal Rules of Evidence: Washington Follows The Federal Model, 15 Gonzaga L.Rev. 277 (1980). [History]

[36] Orland, Presumptions: Reflections on Washington's Proposed Rule 301, 13 Gonz.L.Rev. 935 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[37] Orloff & Stedinger, A Framework for Evaluating The Preponderand-of-The-Evidence Standard, 131 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1159 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

- [38] Ormrod, Evidence and Proof, Scientific and Legal, 12 *Med.Sci.& L.* 9 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [39] Ortego & Weller, Products Liability and The Elements of Science: Admissibility of Expert Testimony in New York and Other *Frye* States, 41 *Tort Trial & Ins.Prac.L.J.* 83 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [40] Orth, The Use of Expert Witnesses in Musical Infringement Cases, 16 *U.Pitt.L.Rev.* 272 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [41] Orts & Murray, Environmental Disclosure and Evidentiary Privilege, 1997 *U.Ill.L.Rev.* 1. [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [42] Osborn, The Reporter's Confidentiality Privilege: Updating The Empirical Data After a Decade of Sunpoenas, 17 *Col.Hum.Rts.L.Rev.*57 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [43] Oscapella, A Study of Informers in England, 1980 *Crim.L.Rev.* 136. [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [44] Osenbaugh, The Constitutionality of Affirmative Defenses to Criminal Charges, 29 *Ark.L.Rev.* 429 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [45] O'Sullivan, The Last Straw: The Department of Justice's Privilege Waiver Policy and The Death of Adversarial Justice in Criminal Investigations of Corporations, 57 *DePaul L.Rev.* 329 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [46] O'Sullivan, Does The DOJ's Privilege Waiver Policy Threaten The Rationales Underlying Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine?, 45 *Am.Crim.L.Rev.* 1237 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [47] O'Toole, Artificial Presumptions in The Criminal Law, 11 *St.John's L.Rev.* 167 (1937) [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [48] Owens, The Establishment of A Doctrine: Executive Privilege and *United States v. Nixon*. 4 *Tex.South.U.L.Rev.* 22 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [49] Owsley, The Supreme Court Goes to The Dogs: Reconciling *Florida v. Harris* and *Florida v. Jardines*, 77 *Alb.L.Rev.* 349 (2013-2014). [F.R.Ev. 402]

P & Q

- [1] Packel, Confidentiality Under The Pennsylvania Attorney-Client Privilege Statutes and The New Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct, 34 *Vill.L.Rev.* 91 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [2] Paddock, Utilizing E-Mail as Business Records Under The Texas Rules of Evidence, 19 Rev.Litig. 61 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 803(6)]
- [3] Paine, Character or Reputation of The Criminal Defendant in Tennessee, 34 Tenn.L.Rev. 351 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [4] Palmer, Battle of Presumptions, 17 L.A.Bar Bull. 267 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [5] Panel, *Crawford, Davis & Right of Confrontation: Where Do We Go From Here?*, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 507 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [6] Panel, The Politics of [Evidence] Rulemaking, Transcript, 53 Hast.L.J. 733 (2002). [History]
- [7] Paplocki, Malpractice in The Ministry, 3 Compleat Lawyer 18 (Spring 1986). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [8] Park, Exporting The Hearsay Provisions of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 33 B.U.Int'l.L.J. 343 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [9] Park, Is Confrontation The Bottom Line?, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 459 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [10] Park, Grand Perspectives on Evidence Law, 87 Va.L.Rev. 2055 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [11] Park, Character At The Crossroads, 49 Hast.L.J. 717 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [12] Park, Purposes As A Guide to The Interpretation of The Confrontation Clause, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 295 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [13] Park, Visions of Applying the Scientific Method to The Hearsay Rule, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1149. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [14] Park, An Outsider's View of Common Law Evidence, 96 Mich.L.Rev. 1486 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [15] Park, "I Didn't Tell Them Anything About You": Implied Assertions as Hearsay Under The Federal Rules of Evidence, 74 Minn.L.Rev. 783 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [16] Park, A Subject Matter Approach to Hearsay Reform, 86 Mich.L.Rev. 51 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [17] Park, The Rationale of Personal Admissions, 21 Ind.L.Rev. 509 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(2)(A)]

Faculty Articles

- [18] Park & Saks, Evidentiary Scholarship Reconsidered: Results of The Interdisciplinary Turn, 47 B.C.L.Rev. 949 (2006). [History]
- [19] Park, The Hearsay Rule and The Stability of Verdicts: A Reply to Professor Nelson, 70 Minn.L.Rev.1057 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [20] Park, McCormick on Evidence and the Concept of Hearsay: A Critical Analysis Followed By Suggestions to Law Teachers, 65 Minn.L.Rev. 423 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [21] Park, The Entrapment Controversy, 60 Minn.L.Rev. 163 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [22] Park & Bryden, The Twenty-Second Annual Kenneth J. Hodson Lecture: Uncharged Misconduct Evidence in Sex Crime Cases: Reassessing The Rule of Exclusion, 141 Mil.L.Rev. 171 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [23] Parker, The Rights of Child Witnesses: Is The Court A Protector or A Perpetrator?, 17 New Eng.L.Rev. 643 (1982). [Confrontation]
- [24] Parker, Automobile Accident Analysis by Expert Witnesses, 44 Va.L.Rev. 789 (1958).[F.R.Ev. 702]
- [25] Parker, Opinion Evidence, 6 Crim.L.Q. 187 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [26] Parks, Secrecy and The Public Interest in Military Affairs, 26 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 123 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [27] Parness, The Presence of Family Members and Others During Attorney-Client Communications: Himmel's Other Dilemma, 25 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 481 (1994). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [28] Parry, Legislatures and Secrecy, 67 Harv.L.Rev. 737 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [29] Paruch, The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege in The Family Court: An Exemplar of Disharmony Between Social Policy, Professional Ethics, and The Current State of The Law, 29 No.III.U.L.Rev. 499 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [30] Patel, The Right to Submit "Testimony" Via 911 Emergency After *Crawford*, 46 Santa Clara L.Rev. 737 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [31] Patterson, Evidence of Prior Bad Acts: Admissibility Under The Federal Rules, 38 Baylor L.Rev. 331 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [32] Patterson, The Types of Evidence: An Analysis, 19 Vand.L.Rev. 1 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 404]

Faculty Articles

- [33] Patton, Evolution in Child Abuse Litigation: The Theoretical Void Where Evidentiary and Procedural Worlds Collide, 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 1009 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 414]
- [34] Paul, Why A Shield Law?, 29 U.Mia.L.Rev. 459 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [35] Paulsen, Dead Man's Privilege: Vince Foster and The Demise of Legal Ethics, 68 Ford.L.Rev. 807 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [36] Payne, Presumptions: What Are They and How Do They Work, 1 Glendale L.Rev. 202 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [37] Payne, The Law Whose Life Is Not Logic: Evidence of Other Crimes in Criminal Cases, 3 U.Rich.L.Rev. 62 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [38] Pedraza-Farifia, Spill Your (Trade) Secrets: Knowledge Networks as Innovation Drivers, 92 Notre Dame L.Rev. 1611 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [39] Pemberton, Polygraphy: Modern Rules and Videotape Technology to Promote The "Search for Truth" in Criminal Trials, 7 Nat.J.Crim.Def. 35 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [40] Penfil, In The Light of Reason and Experience: Should Federal Evidence Law Protect Confidential Communications Between Same-Sex Partners?, 88 Marq.L.Rev. 815 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [41] Perlin, The Legal Status of The Psychologist in The Courtroom, 5 J.Psych.& Law 41 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [42] Perlman, Demonstrative Evidence, 33 Ky.St.Bar J. 5 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [43] Perlmutter, More Therapeutic, Less Collaborative?: Asserting the Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege on Behalf of Mature Minors, 17 Barry L.Rev. 48 (2011). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [44] Perr, Problems of Confidentiality and Privilege Communications in Psychiatry, 1971 Leg.Med.Ann. 329. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [45] Perr, Privilege, Confidentiality, and Patient Privacy: Status 1980, 26 J.Foren.Sci. 109 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [46] Perrin, Pricking Boils, Preserving Error: On The Horns of A Dilemma After *Ohler v. United States*, 24 U.C.Davis L.Rev. 615 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [47] Perry & Melton, Precedential Value of Judicial Notice of Social Facts: *Parham* As An Example, 22 J.Fam.L. 633 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [48] Person & Herzberg, Thermography: Objective Evidence of Soft Tissue Injury, 2 Cooley L.Rev. 363 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [49] Peterfreund, Relevancy and Its Limits in The Proposed Rules of Evidence For United States District Courts, 1970 Record of The Bar.Cit.N.Y. 80 (1970). [History]
- [50] Peters, Belmas & Bobkowski, A Paper Shield?: Whether State Privilege Protections Apply to Student Journalists, 27 Ford.Itell.Prop. Media & Ent.L.J. 761 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [51] Petersen, Attorney-Client Privilege in Internal Revenue Service Investigations, 54 Minn.L.Rev. 67 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [52] Peterson, The Patient-Physician Privilege in Missouri, 20 U.K.C.L.Rev. 122 (1952). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [53] Petty, Proving Forfeiture and Bootstrapping Testimony After *Crawford*, 45 Willam.L.Rev. 593 (2007) [Confrontation]
- [54] Pettys, The Emotional Juror, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1609 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [55] Pettys, Counsel and Confrontation, 94 Minn.L.Rev. 201 (2009). [Confrontation]
- [56] Phannstill, Usefulness Of Polygraph Results in Paternity Investigations When Used In Conjunction With Exclusionary Blood Tests and A 60 Day Conception Period, 21 J.Fam.L. 69 (1982-1983). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [57] Phillips, Are Trade Secrets Dead?: The Effect of The Toxic Substances Control Act and The Freedom of Information Act on Trade Secrets, 62 J.Pat.Off.Soc'y 652 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [58] Phillips, The Confrontation Clause and The Scope of The Unavailability Requirement, 6 U.Mich.J.L.Ref. 377 (1973). [Confrontation]
- [59] Phillips, "Mention of Insurance During Trial", 1961 Tr.L.Guide 247. [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [60] Pierce & Colomario, Defense Counsel As Witnesses For The Prosecution: Curbing The Practice of Issuing Grand Jury Subpoenas to Counsel For Targets of Investigation, 36 Hast.L.J. 821 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [61] Pierce, Use of The Federal Rules of Evidence in Federal Agency Adjudications, 39 Ad.L.Rev 1 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [62] Pierce, Admissibility of Expert Testimony in Hearsay Form, 5 AmJ.Tr.Ad. 277 (1981).[F.R.Ev. 702]
- [63] Pike & Fisher, Discovery Against Federal Administrative Agencies, 56 Harv.L.Rev. 1125 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

- [64] Pinto, Cooperation and Self-Interest Are Strange Bedfellows: Limited Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege Through Production of Documents in A Government Investigation, 106 W.Va.L.Rev. 359 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [65] Pitler, Introduction: Symposium: *Crawford* and Beyond: Exploring The Future of The Confrontation Clause in Light of Its Past, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 1 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [66] Pizzimenti, The Lawyer's Duty to Warn Clients About The Limits of Confidentiality, 39 Cath.U.L.Rev. 441 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [67] Plitt & Rogers, The Battle to Define the Scope of Attorney-Client Privilege in The Context of Insurance Company Bad Faith: A Judicial War Zone, 14 U.N.H.L.Rev. 105 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [68] Pokorak, Rape Victims and Prosecutors: The Inevitable Ethical Conflict of De Facto Attorney-Client Relationship, 48 So.Tex.L.Rev.695 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [69] Polelle, The Death of Dying Declarations In A Post-*Crawford* World, 71 Mo.L.Rev. 285 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [70] Pollock, To Tell Or Not To Tell: What A Lawyer Should Know About Florida's Clergy Privilege, 62 Fla.B.J. 19 (April 1988). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [71] Pollard, Unconscious Bias and Self-Critical Analysis: The Case For A Qualified Evidentiary Equal Employment Opportunity Privilege, 74 Wash.L.Rev. 913 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [72] Polsky, Expert Testimony: Problems in Jurisprudence, 34 Temp.L.Q. 357 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [73] Ponsoldt, A Due Process Analysis of Judicially Authorized Presumptions in Federal Aggravated Bank Robbery Cases, 74 J.Crim.L.,Crim.& P.S. 363 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [74] Pope & Hampton, Presenting and Excluding Evidence, 9 Texas L.Rev. 403 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [75] Popkin, Client-Lawyer Confidentiality, 59 Texas L.Rev. 755 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [76] Portley, Rape Trauma Syndrome: Modifying The Rules in Rape Prosecution Cases, 1983 Army Law. 1. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [77] Portune, Media Relationships in The Post-9-11 World—-Have Changes Impacted News-gathering and Reporter Privilege?, 32 Ohio No.U.L.Rev. 529 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [78] Posner, On Hearsay, 84 Ford.L.Rev. 1465 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

- [79] Potterfield, The Right To Subpoena Expert Testimony, 5 *Hast.L.J.* 50 (1953). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [80] Poulos, The Trial of Celebrated Criminal Cases: An Analysis of Evidentiary Objections, 56 *Tul.L.Rev.* 602 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [81] Powell, Privilege of Counsel and Confidential Communications, 6 *Ga.B.J.* 333 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [82] Powell & Burns, A Discussion of The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 8 *Gonzaga L.Rev.* 1 (1972). [History]
- [83] Powers, Comparing Exceptions To Privilege and Confidentiality Relating to Crime, Fraud, and Harm—Can Hard Cases Make Good Law?, 79 *U.M.K.C.L.Rev.* 61 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [84] Price, Expired Patents, Trade Secrets, and Stymied Competition, 92 *Notre Dame L.Rev.* 1611 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [85] Prince, Character of The Accused in New York: Practical and Theoretical Considerations, 1 *N.Y.L.F.* 32 (1955) [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [86] Pritchett, Shielding The Deplorable Outsider: Exploring the Rape Shield Law As A Model Evidentiary Law U Visa Applicants as Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings, *Harv.J.L.& Gender* 365 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [87] Probert, Law and Persuasion: The Language Behavior of Lawyers, 108 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 35 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [88] Prosser, The Procedural Effect of Res Ipsa Loquitur, 20 *Minn.L.Rev.* 241 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [89] Pugh, Rule 43(a) and The Communication Privileged Under State Law: An Analysis of Confusion, 7 *Vand.L.Rev.* 556 (1954). [History]
- [90] Pugh, Character Testimony, 17 *La.L.Rev.* 421 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [91] Purdy, The Marital Privilege: A Prosecutor's Perspective, 18 *Crim.L.Bull.* 309 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [92] Purrington. A Recent Case of Patient's Privilege, 9 *Bench & Bar.* 48 (1907). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [93] Purrington, An Abused Privilege, 6 *Col.L.Rev.* 328 (1906). [F.R.Ev. 504]

Faculty Articles

[94] Pye, Fundamentals of The Attorney-Client Privilege, 15 Prac.Law. 15 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Q

[1] Quick, Hearsay, Excitement, Necessity, and The Uniform Rules: A Reappraisal of Rule 63(4), 6 Wayne L.Rev. 204 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]

[2] Quick, Privileges Under The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 26 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 537 (1957). [History]

[3] Quinn, *McCray v. Illinois*: Probable Cause and The Informer Privilege, 45 Den.L.J. 399 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 510]

[4] Quinn, Hearsay in Criminal Cases Under The Colorado Rules of Evidence: An Overview, 50 U.Colo.L.Rev. 277 (1979). [History]

[5] Quinn, The Physician-Patient Privilege in Colorado, 37 U.Colo.L.Rev. 349 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 504]

R

[1] Radek, The Admissibility of Polygraph Results in Criminal Trials: A Case For The Status Quo, 3 Loy.(Chi.)L.Rev. 289 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[2] Radin. The Right To A Public Trial, 6 Temp.L.Q. 381 (1932). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[3] Radin, The Endless Problem of Corporate Personality, 32 Colum.L.Rev. 643 (1932). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[4] Radin, The Privilege of Confidential Communication Between Lawyer and Client, 16 Calif.L.Rev. 487 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[5] Raeder, Domestic Violence After *Davis*: Is The Glass Half Empty or Half Empty? 15 J.L.&Pol'y 739 (2007). [Confrontation]

[6] Raeder, Comments on Child Abuse Litigation in A Testimonial World: The Intersection of Competency, Hearsay, and Confrontation, 82 Ind.L.J. 1009 (2007). [Confrontation]

[7] Raeder, Thoughts About *Giles* and Forfeiture in Domestic Violence Cases, 75 Brook.L.Rev. 1329 (2010). [Confrontation]

[8] Raeder, Do Different Approaches to Business and Official Records Foundation in The CEC and FRE Tell The Whole Story? 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 677 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(6) and (8)]

Faculty Articles

- [9] Raeder, See No Evil: Wrongful Convictions and The Prosecutorial Ethics of Offering Testimony of Jailhouse Informants and Dishonest Experts, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1413 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [10] Raeder, Remember The Ladies and Children Too: *Crawford's* Impact on Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Cases, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 311 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [11] Raeder, Finding The Proper Balance in Hearsay Policy: The Uniform Rules Attempt to Stem The Hearsay Tide in Criminal Cases Without Prohibiting All Nontraditional Hearsay, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 631 (2001). [History]
- [12] Raeder, What Does Innocence Have to Do With It?: A Commentary on Wrongful Convictions and Rationality, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1315. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [13] Raeder, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Unintended Consequences, and Evidentiary Policy: A Critique and A Rethinking of The Application of A Single Set of Evidence Rules in Civil and Criminal Cases, 19 Cardozo L.Rev. 1585 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [14] Raeder, Irrelevance: It's All in The Eyes of The Beholder, 34 Hous.L.Rev. 104 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [15] Raeder, Navigating Between Scylla and Charybdis: Ohio's Efforts to Protect Children Without Eviscerating The Rights of Criminal Defendants—-Evidentiary Considerations and The Rebirth of Confrontation Clause Analysis in Child Abuse Cases, 25 U.Toledo L.Rev. 43 (1994). [Confrontation]
- [16] Rakoff, Confidential Informants and Securities Class Actions: Mixed Messages and Incentives, 45 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 571 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [17] Raitt, Personal Knowledge and The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Three-Legged Stool, 18 Rutgers L.J. 591 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 602]
- [18] Rambo, Impeaching Lying Parties With Their Statements During Negotiation: Demystifying The Public Policy Rational Behind Rule 408 and The Mediation Privilege Statutes, 75 Wash.L.Rev. 1037 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [19] Ranney, Presumptions in Criminal Cases: A New Look At An Old Problem, 41 Mont.L.Rev. 21 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [20] Rappeport, Psychiatrist-Patient Privilege, 25 Md.L.Rev. 39 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [21] Rappoport, Crisis in Confidentiality, Ethics, and Legality For a Psychiatrist, 5 J.Psch.&Law 467 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 504]

Faculty Articles

- [22] Raskin, The Polygraph in 1986: Scientific, Professional, and Legal Issues Surrounding Application and Acceptance of Polygraph Evidence, 1986 Utah L.Rev. 29. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [23] Rasmussen, *Mezzanatto* and The Economics of Self-Incrimination, 19 Cardozo L.Rev. 1541 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [24] Ratner, Insurance: The Forbidden Word, 3 U.Kan.L.Rev. 328 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [25] Ratner, Consequences of Exercising The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination, 24 U.Chi.L.Rev. 472 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 513]
- [26] Rault, An Overview of The New Louisiana Code of Evidence—Its Imperfections and Uncertainties, 49 La.L.Rev. 697 (1989). [History]
- [27] Ray, Burden of Proof and Presumptions, 13 Texas L.Rev. 33 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [28] Ray, The Law of Privilege in Texas, 12 Texas L.Rev. 144 (1934). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [29] Ray, Presumptions and The Uniform Rules of Evidence, 33 Texas L.Rev. 588 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [30] Read, The New Confrontation-Hearsay Dilemma, 45 So.Calif.L.Rev. 1 (1972). [Confrontation]
- [31] Reaugh, Presumptions and Burden of Proof, 36 Ill.L.Rev. 703 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [32] Record, The Federal Rules of Evidence—Origins, Analysis, and Impact, 24 Def.L.J. 1975). [History]
- [33] Redmayne, Rationality, Naturalism, and Evidence Law, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 847. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [34] Reed, *Crawford v. Washington* and The Irretrievable Breakdown of A Union: Separating The Confrontation Clause From The Hearsay Rule, 56 S.Car.L.Rev. 185 (2004). [Confrontation]
- [35] Reed, The Futile Fifth Step: Compulsory Disclosure of Confidential Communications Among Alcoholics Anonymous Members, 70 St.John's L.Rev. 693 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [36] Reed, The Character Evidence Defense: Acquittal Based on Good Character, 45 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 345 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [37] Reed, The Development of The Propensity Rule in Federal Criminal Cases, 1840-1975, 51 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 299 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 404]

Faculty Articles

- [38] Reed, Trial By Propensity: Admission of Other Criminal Acts Evidence in Federal Criminal Trials, 50 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 713 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [39] Reed, Admitting The Accused's Criminal History: The Trouble With Rule 404(b). 78 Temp.L.Rev. 201 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [40] Reed, Admission of Other Criminal Act Evidence After Adoption of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 53 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 113 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [41] Reed, The Pushy Ox: Character Evidence in Pennsylvania Civil Actions, 58 Temp.L.Q. 623 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [42] Reese, Confidential Communications To The Clergy, 24 Ohio St.L.J. 55 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [43] Reese & Liewant, Testimonial Privileges and Conflict of Laws, 41 L.&Contemp.Prob. 85 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [44] Reeves, Audio-Stress Analysis: A Means of Truth Verification in Forensic Practice, 1980 Med.Tr.Tech.Q. 420. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [45] Regan, Spousal Privilege and The Meaning of Marriage, 81 Va.L.Rev. 2045 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [46] Regan & McCartney, Professional Secrecy and Privileged Communication, 2 Cath.Law. 3 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [47] Rehnquist, The Old Order Changeth: The Department of Justice Under John Mitchell, 12 Ariz.L.Rev. 251 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [48] Reich, Inexorable Intertwinement: The Internet and The American Jury System, 51 Idaho L.Rev. 389 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [49] Reid, The Lie Detector in Court, 4 DePaul L.Rev. 31 (1954). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [50] Reid, A Speculative Novelty: Judge Doe's Search For Reason in The Law of Evidence, 39 Bost.U.L.Rev. 321 (1959). [History]
- [51] Reid & Alexander, A Test Case for Newsgathering: The Effects of Sept. 11, 2001 on The Changing Watchdog Role of The Press, 25 Loy.(L.A.) Ent.L.Rev. 357 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [52] Reinstein & Silvergate, Legislative Privilege and The Separation of Powers, 86 Harv.L.Rev. 1113 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

- [53] Reiser, Evidence of Other Criminal Acts in South Carolina, 29 So.Car.L.Rev. 125 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [54] Renard, Confidential Communications Between Husband and Wife: Admissibility Under Missouri Law, 3 Mo.B.J. 91 (1947) [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [55] Render, The Rules of Evidence in Labor Arbitration, 54 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 2008). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [56] Reutlinger, Prior Inconsistent Statements: Presently Inconsistent Doctrine, 26 Hast.L.J. 361 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)]
- [57] Reutlinger, Policy, Privacy, and Prerogatives: A Critical Examination of The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence as They Affect Marital Privilege, 61 Calif.L.Rev. 1353 (1973).[F.R.Ev. 505]
- [58] Rheingold, The Admissibility of Evidence in Malpractice Cases: The Performance Records of Practitioners, 58 Brook.L.Rev. 75 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [59] Rheingold, The Basis of Medical Testimony, 15 Vand.L.Rev. 473 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [60] Rhode, Moral Character: The Personal and The Political, 20 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 1 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [61] Ribstein, Introduction of Evidence of Post-Sale Modification, 1981 S.M.U.Prod.Liab.Inst. 10-1. [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [62] Rice, Restoring Justice: Purging Evil From Federal Rule of Evidence 609, 89 Temp.L.Rev. 683 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [63] Rice, Back to The Future With Privileges: Abandon Codification, Not The Common Law, 38 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 739 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [64] Rice: *Peer Dialogue*: The Quagmire of Scientific Expert Testimony: Crumping The Supreme Court's Style, 68 Mo.L.Rev. 53 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [65] Rice & Delker, Federal Rules of Evidence Advisory Committee: A Short History of Too Little Consequence, 191 F.R.D. 678 (2000). [History]
- [66] Rice, Attorney-Client Privilege: The Eroding Concept of Confidentiality Should Be Abolished, 47 Duke L.J. 853 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [67] Rice, Attorney-Client Privilege: Continuing Confusion About Attorney Communications, Drafts, Pre-Existing Documents, and The Source of Facts Communicated, 48 Am.U.L.Rev. 967 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [68] Rhiannon & Bussey, The Effects of Cross-Examination on Children's Coached Reports, 21 Psych.Pub.Pol'y & L. 10 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [69] Richings, Privilege of Religious Advisers, 91 So.African L.J. 167 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [70] Richman, Decisions About Coercion: The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege Waiver Problem, 57 DePaul L.Rev. 295 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [71] Richman, *Old Chief v. United States*: Stipulating Away Prosecutorial Accountability, 83 Va.L.Rev. 939 (1997). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [72] Richmond, The Frightening At-Issue Exception to The Attorney-Client Privilege, 121 Penn.St.L.Rev. 1 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [73] Richmond, The Case Against Selective Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Immunity, 30 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 253 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [74] Richmond, The Attorney-Client Privilege and Associated Confidentiality Concerns in The Post-Enron Era, 110 Penn.St.L.Rev. 781 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [75] Richter, Reality Check: A Modest Modification to Rationalize Rule 803 Hearsay Exceptions, 84 Ford.L.Rev. 1473 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 803]
- [76] Richter, Posnerian Hearsay: Slaying The Discretion Dragon, 67 Fla.L.Rev. 1851 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [77] Richter, The Power of Privilege and The Attorney-Client Privilege Protection Act: How Corporate America Has Everyone Excited About The Emperor's New Clothes, 43 Wake Forest L.Rev. 979 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [78] Richter, Corporate Salvation or Damnation?: Proposed New Federal Legislation on Selective Waiver, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 129 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [79] Ringer, A Six Step Analysis of "Other Purposes" Evidence Pursuant to Rule 404(b) of The North Carolina Rules of Evidence, 21 No.Car.Cent.L.J. 1 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [80] Riordan, The Attorney-Client Privilege & The "Posthumous" Corporation: Should The Privilege Apply?, 34 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 237 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [81] Risinger, Unsafe Verdicts: The Need for Reformed Standards for The Trial and Review of Factual Innocence, 41 Hous.L.Rev. 1281 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [82] Risinger & Saks, Rationality, Research, and Leviathan: Law Enforcement-Sponsored Research and The Criminal Process, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1023.

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 401]

[83] Risinger & Loop, Three-Card Monte, Monty Hall, Modus Operandi, and “Offender Profiling”: Some Lessons of Modern Cognitive Science for The Law of Evidence, 24 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 193 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[84] Risinger, Inquiry, Relevance, Rules of Exclusion, and Evidentiary Reform, 75 *Brook.L.Rev.* 1349 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[85] Risinger, Defining the “Task At Hand”: Non-Science Forensic Science After *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 57 *Wash.& Lee L.Rev.* 767 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[86] Risinger, Preliminary Thoughts on a Functional Taxonomy of Expertise for The Post-*Kumho* World, 31 *Seton H.L.Rev.* 508 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[87] Risinger, John Henry Wigmore, Johnny Lynn, *Old Chief*, and “Legitimate Moral Force—-Keeping The Courtroom Safe for Heartstrings and Gore, 49 *Hast.L.J.* 403 (1998).[F.R.Ev. 404]

[88] Risinger, Denbeaux & Saks, Brave New Post-*Daubert* World—-A Reply to Professor Moenssens, 29 *Seton H.L.Rev.* 405 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[89] Risinger, "The Irrelevance, and Central Relevance, of the Boundary Between Science and Non-Science in the Evaluation of Expert Witness Reliability", 52 *Villanova L. Rev.* 679 (2007) [F.R.Ev. 702]

[90] Risinger & Saks, Base-rates, The Presumption of Guilt, Admissibility Rulings, and Erroneous Convictions, 2003 *Mich. St. L. Rev.* 1051 (2003) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[91] Risinger & Denbeaux, *Kumho Tire* and Expert Reliability: How the Question You Ask Gives the Answer You Get, 34 *Seton Hall L. Rev.* (2003) [F.R.Ev. 703]

[92] Risinger, et al., The *Daubert/Kumho* Implications of Observer Effects in Forensic Science: Hidden Problems of Expectation and Suggestion, 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1 (2002) [F.R. Ev. 703]

[93] Risinger. Navigating Expert Reliability: Are Criminal Standards of Certainty Being Left on the Dock, 64 *Albany L. Rev.* 99 (2000) [F.R.Ev. 702]

[94] Risinger & Saks, Science and Non-science in the Courtroom: *Daubert* Meets Handwriting Identification Expertise, 82 *Iowa L. Rev.* 21 (1997) [F.R.Ev. 703]

[95] Risinger, Benbeaux & Saks, Exorcism of Ignorance as a Proxy for Rational Knowledge: The Lessons of Handwriting Identification "Expertise", 137 *U. Pa. L. Rev.* 731 (1989) [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[96] Risinger, "Substance" & "Procedure" Revisited, (with Some Afterthoughts on the Constitutional Problems of "Irrebuttable Presumptions"), 30 U.C.L.A. L. Rev. 189 (1983) [F.R.Ev. 301]

[97] Risinger & Denbeaux, Questioning Questions: Problems of Form in the Interrogation of Witnesses, 33 Arkansas L. Rev. 439 (1980) [F.R.Ev. 611]

[98] Risinger & Ashford, Presumptions, Assumptions, and Due Process in Criminal Cases: A Theoretical Overview, 79 Yale L. J. 165 (1969) [F.R.Ev. 303]

[99] Risinger, The NSA/NRC Report on Forensic Science: A Glass Nine Tenths Full (This Is About the Other Tenth), 50 Jurimetrics 21 (2009) [F.R.Ev. 401]

[100] Robb, *Do You Want to Know a Secret? Do You Promise Not to Tell? Whoa oh oh:* Judges, Opinions, and Judicial Notice, 49 Ind.L.Rev. 847 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[101] Roberts, Reclaiming The Importance of the Defendant's Testimony: Prior Conviction Impeachment and The Fight Against Implicit Stereotyping, 83 U.Chi.L.Rev. 835 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 609]

[102] Roberts, Conviction By Prior Impeachment, 96 Bost.U.L.Rev. 1977 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 609]

[103] Roberts, Impeachment By Unreliable Conviction, 55 Bost.Coll.L.Rev. 563 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 609]

[104] Roberts, Some Observations on The Problems of The Forensic Psychiatrist, 1965 Wis.L.Rev. 240. [F.R.Ev. 504]

[105] Roberts, Judicial Notice: An Essay Concerning Human Misunderstanding, 61 Wash.L.Rev. 1435 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[106] Roberts, A Practitioner's Primer on Computer-Generated Evidence, 41 U.Chi.L.Rev. 254 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[107] Roberts, An Introduction to The Study of Presumptions, 4 Vill.L.Rev. 1 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[108] Roberts, Preliminary Notes Toward A Study of Judicial Notice, 52 Corn.L.Q. 210 (1967).[F.R.Ev. 201]

[109] Roberts, Judicial Notice: An Exercise In Exorcism, 19 N.Y.L.F. 745 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [110] Robinson, Evidentiary Privileges and The Exclusionary Rule: Dual Justifications For An Absolute Rape Victim Counsellor Privilege, 31 New Eng.J.Crim.& Civ. Confinement 331 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [111] Robinson & Stoltenberg, Privilege and Accountant's Workpapers, 68 A.B.A.J. 1248 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [112] Robinson, Testimonial Privilege and The School Guidance Counsellor, 25 Syr.L.Rev. 911 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [113] Robison, The Confidence Game: An Approach to The Law About Trade Secrets, 25 Ariz.L.Rev. 347 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [114] Robitscher, Isaac Ray Lecture I: Psychiatric Labelling, Predicting, and Stigmatizing, 5 J.Psych.&Law 333 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [115] Robitscher, Isaac Ray Lecture II: Psychiatric Control of Behavior, 5 J.Psych.& Law 367 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [116] Robitscher, Doctors' Privileged Communications, Public Law, and History's Rights, 17 Cleve-Marsh.L.Rev. 199 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [117] Roche, Truth-Telling, Psychiatric Expert Testimony, and The Impeachment of Witnesses, 22 Pa.B.A.Q. 140 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [118] Rodgers, Privileged Communications Between Attorney and Client, 64 Cent.L.J. 66 (1907). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [119] Rogers, The Right to Know Government Business From The Viewpoint of The Government Official, 40 Marq.L.Rev. 83 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [120] Rogers, The Best Evidence Rule, 1945 Wis.L.Rev. 278. [F.R.Ev. 1002]
- [121] Rohde, Real to Reel: The *Hirsch* Case and First Amendment Protection for Filmmakers Confidential Sources of Information, 5 Pepp.L.Rev. 351 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [122] Romero, The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence Under The New Mexico and Federal Rules of Evidence, 6 N.Mex.L.Rev. 187 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [123] Rooney, Freedom of The Press: An Emerging Privilege, 67 Marq.L.Rev. 33 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [124] Root & Blynn, Abandonment of Common Law Principles: The North Carolina Trade Secrets Protection Act. 18 Wake For.L.Rev. 823 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [125] Rose, Toward a Critical Race Theory of Evidence, 101 Minn.L.Rev. 2243 (2017).

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 102]

[126] Rose, Should The Tail Wag The Dog?: The Potential Effects of Recidivism Data on Character Evidence Rules, 36 N.M.L.Rev. 341 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 404]

[127] Rose, The Social Scientist As An Expert Witness, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 205 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[128] Rose & Chapman, The Military's Rape Shield Rule: An Emerging Roadmap, The Army Lawyer 29 (Feb.1984). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[129] Rosenberg, Judicial Discretion of The Trial Court Viewed From Above, 22 Syr.L.Rev. 635 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[130] Rosenfeld, The Transformation of The Attorney-Client Privilege: In Search of An Ideological Reconciliation of Individualism, The Adversary System, and The Corporate Client's S.E.C. Disclosure Obligations, 33 Hast.L.J. 495 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[131] Rosenheim, Privilege, Confidentiality. And Juvenile Offenders, 11 Wayne L.Rev. 660 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[132] Rosenthal, Admissibility of Evidence Contradicting Evidence As To Immaterial or Collateral Matters, 33 Mass.L.Q. 28 (1948). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[133] Rosenzweig, Truth, Privileges, Perjury, and The Criminal Law, 7 Tex.Rev.L.& Pol'y 153 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[134] Rosman, A Reporter's Privilege in Florida: Has the Conflict Between the First Amendment and the Sixth Amendment Been Reconciled?, 18 Barry L.Rev. 93 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[135] Ross, et al., The Impact of Protective Shields and Videotape Testimony on Conviction Rates, 18 Law & Hum.Behav. 553 (1994). [Confrontation]

[136] Ross, *Crawford's* Short-Lived Revolution: How *Davis v. Washington* Reins In *Crawford's* Reach, 83 N.D.L.Rev. 387 (2007). [Confrontation]

[137] Ross, After *Crawford* Double-Speak: "Testimony" Does Not Mean Testimony and "Witness" Does Not Mean Witness, 97 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 147 (2006). [Confrontation]

[138] Ross, Implementing Constitutional Rights For Juveniles: The Parent-Child Privilege in Context, 14 Stan.L.&Pol'y Rev. 85 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[139] Ross, "He Looks Guilty": Reforming Good Character Evidence to Undercut The Presumption of Guilt, 65 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 227 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 404]

Faculty Articles

- [140] Ross, Confrontation and Residual Hearsay: A Critical Examination and A Proposal For Military Courts, 116 *Mill.Rev.* 31 (1987). [Confrontation]
- [141] Ross, Rule 302—An Unfair Balance, 1981 *Army Lawyer* 5. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [142] Rossi, The Federal Rules of Evidence—Past, Present, and Future: A Twenty-Five Year Perspective, 28 *Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev.* 1271 (1995). [History]
- [143] Rossi, The Silent Revolution, 9 *Litigation* 13 (Winter, 1988). [History]
- [144] Roth, Machine Testimony, 126 *Yale L.J.* 1972 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [145] Roth, Informer Witnesses and The Risk of Wrongful Convictions, 53 *Am.Crim.L.Rev.* 737 (2016). [F/R.Ev. 510]
- [146] Roth, Defying DNA: Rethinking the Role of The Jury in An Age of Scientific Proof of Innocence, 93 *B.U.L.Rev.* 1643 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [147] Roth, Understanding Admissibility of Prior Bad Acts: A Diagramatic Approach, 9 *Pepp.L.Rev.* 297 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [148] Roth, The Tender Years Presumption in Child Custody Disputes, 15 *J.Fam.L.* 473 (1976-1977). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [149] Rothblatt, Cross-Examination of Polygraph Expert, 16 *U.W.L.A.L.Rev.* 55 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [150] Rothblatt & Leroy, The Motion in Limine in Criminal Trials: A Technique For The Pretrial Exclusion of Prejudicial Evidence, 60 *Ky.L.J.* 613 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [151] Rothstein & Imwinkelreid, Just What Evidence of Witness Misdeeds Does Federal Rule of Evidence Exclude?—Imwinkelreid vs. Rothstein, 49 *Creighton L.Rev.* 121 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 608(b)]
- [152] Rothstein, Ambiguous Purpose Statements of Children and Other Victims under The Confrontation Clause, 44 *Sw.L.Rev.* 508 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [153] Rothstein, “Anything You Say May Be Used Against You”: A Proposed Seminar on The Lawyer’s Duty to Warn of Confidentiality’s Limits in Today’s Post-Enron World, 76 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1745 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [154] Rothstein, An Evidence Code: The American Experience, 36 *Crim.Rep.(N.S.Ann.)* 274 (1977). [History]
- [155] Rothstein, A Re-Evaluation of The Privilege Against Adverse Spousal Testimony in Light of Its Purpose, 12 *Int.&Comp.L.Q.* 1189 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 505]

Faculty Articles

- [156] Rothstein, The Proposed Amendments to The Federal Rules of Evidence, 62 Georgetown L.J. 125 (1973). [History]
- [157] Rotunda, Presidents and Ex-Presidents As Witnesses: A Brief Historical Footnote, 1975 U.Ill.L.F. 1. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [158] Rouhanian, A Call for Change: The Detrimental Impact of *Crawford v. Washington* on Domestic Violence and Rape Prosecutions, 37 B.C.J.L. & Soc. Just. 1 (2017). [Confrontation]
- [159] Rowe & Mahood, Trade Secrets, Trade, and Extraterritoriality, 66 Ala.L.Rev. 63 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [160] Rozell, Executive Privilege Revived?: Secrecy and Conflict During The Bush Presidency, 52 Duke L.J. 403 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [161] Rozovsky & Akhtar, Should Psychiatric Communications Be Privileged?, 1 Leg.Med.Q. 115 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [162] Rubinstein, A Transactional Model of Adjudication, 89 Geo.L.J. 371 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [163] Rudenstein, A Reporter Keeping Confidences: More Important Than Ever, 29 Cardozo L.Rev. 1431 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [164] Rudstein, Rape Shield Laws: Some Constitutional Problems, 18 Wm.&Mary L.Rev. 1 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [165] Ruebner, Durcova & Taylor, Why Illinois Should Adopt Federal Rule of Evidence 803(18) to Allow The Learned Treatises Exception to The Hearsay Rule, 39 So.Ill.U.L.J. 275 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 803(18)]
- [166] Ruebner & Scahill, *Crawford v. Washington*, The Confrontation Clause, and Hearsay: A Paradigm for Illinois Evidence Law, 36 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 703 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [167] Ruebner & Goryunov, A Proposal to Amend Rule 407 of The Federal Rules of Evidence to Conform With The Underlying Relevance Rational For The Rule In Negligence and Strict Liability Actions, 3 Seton H.Cir.Rev. 435 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [168] Ruebner & Reis, Hippocrates to HIPAA: A Foundation For A Federal Physician-Patient Privilege, 77 Temp.L.Rev. 505 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [169] Russell, Previous Acts of Employment Discrimination: Probative or Prejudicial? 27 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 297 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 403]

Faculty Articles

[170] Russell, The Federal Rules of Evidence With Special Emphasis on Bankruptcy Proceedings, 49 Amer.Bank.L.J. 231 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 1101]

[171] Rustad & Koenig, The Supreme Court and Junk Social Science: Selective Distortion in Amicus Briefs, 72 N.Car.L.Rev. 91 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[172] Rutner & Bach, Florida's "Brave New World": The Transition From *Frye* to *Daubert* Will Transform The Playing Field for Litigants in Medical Causation Cases, 20 Barry L.Rev. 173 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[173] Ryan, Expert Opinion Testimony and Scientific Evidence: Does M.C.L. § 600.2955 "Assist" The Trial Judge in Michigan Tort Cases?, 75 U.Det.Mercy L.Rev. 263 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[174] Rychlak, Sound in The Courtroom: Audio Recordings at Trial, 39 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 1 (2015).[F.R.Ev. 901]

[175] Ryerson, Query: Can The States Adapt The Federal Rules of Evidence for Small Case Litigation? 67 Judiatore 421 (1984). [History]

S

[1] Sacharoff, Former Presidents and Executive Privilege, 88 Texas L.Rev. 301 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[2] Sachs, "Other Accident" Evidence in Product Liability Actions: Highly Probative or Accident Waiting to Happen?, 49 Okla.L.Rev. 257 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[3] Sales, Secrecy and National Security Investigations, 58 Ala.L.Rev. 811 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[4] Sack, Reflections on The Wrong Question: Special Constitutional Privilege for The Institutional Press, 7 Hofstra L.Rev. 629 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[5] Sadvari, Quasi-Kidnapping and Privilege: Whose Best Interest?, 1 Fam.L.Rev. 283 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[6] Sahm, Demeanor Evidence: Elusive and Intangible Imponderables, 47 A.B.A.J. 580 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Saks & Risinger, Baserates, The Presumption of Guilt, Admissibility Rulings, and Erroneous Convictions, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1051. [F.R.Ev. 303]

[8] Salisbury, *Fulton v. State* and *Anderson v. State*: Insurmountable Barriers For The Polygraph, 12 Tulsa L.J. 682 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [9] Salerno, Seeing Red: Disgust Reactions to Gruesome Photographs in Color (but not in black-and-white) Increase Convictions, 23 *Psycho., Pub.Pol'y & L.* 336 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [10] Salop, The Evolution and Viability of Merger Presumption: A Decision-Theoretic Approach, 80 *Antitrust L.J.* 269 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [11] Salkin, Beware: What You Say To Your Government Lawyer May Be Held Against You—The Erosion of Government Lawyer-Client Confidentiality, 25 *Urb.Law* 283 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [12] Saltzburg, Rethinking The Rationale for Hearsay Exceptions, 84 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1485 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [13] Saltzburg, Prior Inconsistent Statements and Substantive Evidence—Federal Rule 801(d)(1)(A): The Compromise, 84 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1499 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]
- [14] Saltzburg, Privileges and Principles: Lawyers and Psychiatrists, 66 *Va.L.Rev.* 597 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [15] Saltzburg, Communications Falling Within The Attorney-Client Privilege, 66 *Iowa L.Rev.* 811 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [16] Saltzburg, Corporate and Related Attorney-Client Privilege Claims: A Suggested Approach, 12 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 279 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [17] Saltzburg, The Federal Rules of Evidence and The Quality of Practice in Federal Courts, 27 *Cleve.St.L.Rev.* 173 (1978). [History]
- [18] Saltzburg, A Special Aspect of Relevance: Countering Negative Inferences Associated With The Absence of Evidence, 66 *Calif.L.Rev.* 1011 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [19] Saltzburg, Tactics of The Motion in Limine, 9 *Litigation* 17 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [20] Saltzburg, Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation and Similar Cases, 12 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 817 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [21] Saltzburg, The Unnecessarily Expanding Role of The American Trial Judge, 64 *Va.L.Rev.* 1 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 614]
- [22] Saltzburg, Standards of Proof and Preliminary Questions of Fact, 27 *Stan.L.Rev.* 271 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [23] Samaha, Government Secrets, Constitutional Law, and Platforms for Judicial Intervention, 53 *U.C.L.A.L.Rev.* 909 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]

Faculty Articles

- [24] Sampsell-Jones, Prevention, Detention, Character Evidence, and The New Criminal Law, 2010 Utah L.Rev. 723. [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [25] Sanborn, Physician's Privilege in Wisconsin, 1 Wis.L.Rev. 141 (1921). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [26] Sanchiro, Finding Error, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1189. [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [27] Sanchiro, Character Evidence and The Object of Trial, 101 Colum.L.Rev. 1227 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [28] Sanders, The Benedictin Litigation: A Case Study in The Life Cycle of Mass Torts, 43 Hast.L.J. 301 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [29] Sanders, Scientific Validity, Admissibility, and Mass Torts After *Daubert*, 78 Minn.L.Rev. 1387 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [30] Sanders, et al., The Relevance of "Irrelevant" Testimony: Why Lawyers Use Social Science Experts in School Desegregation Cases, 16 Law & Soc.Rev. 403 (1981-1982). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [31] Sanford, Evidentiary Privileges Against The Production of Data Within The Control of Executive Departments, 3 Vand.L.Rev. 73 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [32] Santeusanio, Lay Witness Opinion Testimony on Mental State & Depression: A Call for Reform, 38 U.Ark.Lit.Rock L.Rev. 477 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [33] Santoni, Application of The Attorney-Client Privilege to Disputes Between Owners and Managers of Closely-Held Entities, 32 Creighton L.Rev. 849 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [34] Saunders, Expert Witness Ethics, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1539 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [35] Sawyer, The Physician-Patient Privilege: Some Reflections, 14 Drake L.Rev. 83 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [36] Scallen, Proceeding With Caution: Making and Amending The Federal Rules of Evidence, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 601 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 101]
- [37] Scallen, Relational and Informational Privileges and The Case of The Mysterious Mediation Privilege, 38 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 537 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [38] Scallen, Evidence Law as Pragmatic Legal Rhetoric: Reconnecting Legal Scholarship, Teaching, and Ethics, 21 Quin.L.Rev. 813 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [39] Scallen, Analyzing "The Politics of [Evidence] Rulemaking, 53 Hast.L.J. 843 (2002). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [40] Scallen & Taslitz, Reading The Federal Rules of Evidence Realistically: A Response to Professor Imwinkelreid, 75 Ore.L.Rev. 429 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [41] Scallen, Interpreting The Federal Rules of Evidence: The Use and Abuse of The Advisory Committee's Notes, 28 Loy.(L.A.) L.Rev. 1283 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [42] Scallen, Classical Rhetoric, Practical Reasoning, and The Law of Evidence, 44 Am.U.L.Rev. 1717 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [43] Schaeffer, The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Modern Business Corporation, 20 Bus.Law. 909 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [44] Schaeffer, How Can A Modern Business Corporation Preserve The Attorney-Client Privilege in Communicating With "Outside" and "Inside" Counsel.5 Am.Bus.L.J. 263 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [45] Shargel, Federal Rule 608(b): Gateway to The Minefield of Witness Preparation, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1263 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 608(b)]
- [46] Schauer, Can Bad Science Be Good Evidence, Neuroscience, Lie Detection, and Beyond, 95 Cornell L.Rev. 1191 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [47] Schauer, On The Supposed Jury-Dependence of Evidence Law, 165 U.Pa.L.Rev. 165 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [48] Shecttman, From "Reliability" to Uncertainty: Difficulties Inherent in Interpreting and Applying The New *Crawford* Standard, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 305 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [49] Scheindlin & Orr, The Adverse Inference Instruction After Revised Rule 37(e): An Evidence Based Proposal, 83 Ford.L.Rev. 1299 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [50] Schinasi, The Military Rules of Evidence: An Advocate's Tool, May 1980 Army Lawyer 3. [History]
- [51] Schiff, An Unusual Case of Psuedo-Rape, 20 J.Foren.Sci. 637 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [52] Schleifer, Might Versus Flight: The Confrontation Clause and The Search for Truth in The Child Abuse Family Court Case, 16 Nova L.Rev. 783 (1992). [Confrontation]
- [53] Schleuter, The Parent-Child Privilege: A Response to Calls For Adoption, 19 St. Mary's L.J. 35 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [54] Schneider, Evidence, 56 Wayne L.Rev. 307 (2010). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [55] Schmalbeck, The Problem With Statistical Evidence, 49 L.& Contemp.Probs. 221 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [56] Schmertz, Relevancy Under Rule 401: A Dual Concept, 14 Litigation 12 (Spring 1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [57] Schmertz, Relevancy and Its Policy Counterweights: A Brief Excursion Through Article IV of The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 33 Fed.B.J. 1 (1974). [History]
- [58] Schmolesky, *County Court of Ulster County v. Allen and Sandstrom v. Montana*: The Supreme Court Lends An Ear But Turns Its Face, 33 Rutgers L.Rev. 261 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [59] Schmid, Journalist's Privilege in Criminal Proceedings: An Analysis of U.S. Court of Appeals' Decisions From 1973 to 1999, 39 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 1441 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [60] Schneider, Evidence, 54 Wayne L.Rev. 229 (2008). [History]
- [61] Schneyer, Who Should Define Arizona's Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege?; Asserting Judicial Independence Through The Power To Regulate The Practice Law, 48 Ariz.L.Rev. 419 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [62] Schoenfeld, Discretion in The Law: A Psycholegal Overview, 5 Psych.& L. 104 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [63] Schoone & Evans, Medical Evidence, 50 Marq.L.Rev. 516 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [64] Schmerz & Czpankiy, Bias Impeachment and The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 61 Geo.L.Rev. 257 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 607]
- [65] Schroeder, Evidentiary Use in Criminal Cases of Collateral Crimes or Acts: A Comparison of The Federal Rules and Alabama Law, 35 Ala.L.Rev. 241 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [66] Schroeder, Evidence of Habit and Routine Practice, 29 Loy.U.(Chi.)L.J. 385 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 406]
- [67] Schroeder, Missouri Judicial Notice, 48 Mo.L.Rev. 843 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [68] Schroeder, Judicial Notice in Alabama, 34 Ala.L.Rev. 197 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [69] Scurich & John, Jurors' Presumption of Innocence, 46 J.Legal Studs. 187 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [70] Schwartz, The Corporate Preference for Trade Secrets, 78 Ohio St.L.J. 623 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 508]

Faculty Articles

[71] Schwarz & Clear, Feminism and Rape Law Reform, *Bull.Am.Acad.Psych.& Law* 313 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[72] Schwartz, The Trials of Jesus and Paul, *9 Law & Relig.* 501 (1992). [Confrontation]

[73] Schwartz, A Suggestion for The Demise of Judicial Notice of “Judicial Facts”, *45 Texas L.Rev.* 1212 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[74] Schwartz, Privileges Under The Federal Rules of Evidence—-A Step Forward?, *30 U.Pitt.L.Rev.* 79 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[75] Schwartz, The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence: An Introduction and Critique, *38 Cinci.L.Rev.* 449 (1969). [History]

[76] Schwartz, Bad Presidents Make Hard Law: Richard M. Nixon and The Supreme Court, *31 Rutgers L.Rev.* 22 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[77] Schwartz, Executive Privilege and Congressional Investigatory Power, *47 Calif.L.Rev.* 3 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[78] Schwartz, The Exclusionary Rule on Subsequent Repairs—-A Rule In Need of Repair, *16 Trial L. Guide* 96 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 407]

[79] Schwendinger & Schwendinger, Rape Myths: In Legal, Theoretical, and Everyday Practice, *1 Crime & Soc.Just.* 18 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[80] Shuck, Techniques for Proof of Complicated Scientific and Economic Facts, *40 F.R.D.* 33 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[81] Schwinn, The State Secrets Privilege in The Post-9/11 Era, *30 Pace L.Rev.* 778 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[82] Seabrook, Closing The Credibility Gap: A New Approach to Section 1(4)(ii) of The Criminal Evidence Act 1848, *1987 Crim.L.Rev.* 231. [F.R.Ev. 404]

[83] Seaman, Triangulating Testimonial Hearsay: The Constitutional Boundaries of Expert Opinion Testimony, *96 Geo.L.J.* 827 (2008). [Confrontation]

[84] Seamans, Winson & McCartney, Use of Criminal Pleas in Aid of Private Antitrust Actions, *10 Antitrust Bull.* 795 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 410]

[85] Sedler, The Erie Outcome Test As A Guide to Substance and Procedure in The Conflict of Laws, *37 N.Y.U.L.Rev.* 813 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

- [86] Sedler & Simeone, The Realities of Attorney-Client Confidences, 24 Ohio St.L.J. 1 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [87] Seidel & Gingrich, Hearsay Objections To Expert Psychiatric Opinion Testimony and The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 39 U.M.K.C.L.Rev. 141 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [88] Segal, "Insurance"—A Nasty Word, 31 Conn.B.J. 87 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [89] Seidelson, Hearsay Exceptions and The Sixth Amendment, 40 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 76 (1971). [Confrontation]
- [90] Seidelson, The Confrontation Clause, The Right Against Self-Incrimination, and The Supreme Court: A Critique and Some Modest Proposals, 20 Duq.L.Rev. 429 (1982). [Confrontation]
- [91] Seidelson, The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Few Surprises, 12 Hofstra L.Rev. 453 (1984). [History]
- [92] Seidelson, The Federal Rules of Evidence: Rule 501, *Klaxon*, and The Constitution, 5 Hofstra L.Rev. 21 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [93] Seidelson, Conditional Relevance and Federal Rule of Evidence 104(b). 47 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1048 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [94] Seidelson, The Attorney-Client Privilege and The Client's Constitutional Rights, 6 Hofstra L.Rev. 693 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [95] Seidelson, Medical Malpractice Cases and The Reluctant Witness, 16 Cath.U.L.Rev. 150 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [96] Siegel, Corporate America Fights Back: The Battle Over Waiver of The Attorney-Client Privilege, 49 B.C.L.Rev. 1 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [97] Siegel, Rationalizing Hearsay: A Proposal for A Best Evidence Hearsay Rule, 72 Bost.U.L.Rev. 893 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [98] Sell, Deception Detection and The Law, 11 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 210 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [99] Semerjian, The Right of Confrontation, 55 A.B.A.J. 152 (1969). [Confrontation]
- [100] Semeta, Journalist's Testimonial Privilege, 9 Cleve.-Marsh.L.Rev. 511 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [101] Senef, The Background of The New Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 22 Fed.Ins.Coun.Q. 9-12 (1972). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [102] Sevier, Testing Tribe's Triangle: Juries, Hearsay, and Psychological Distance, 103 *Geo.L.J.* 879 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [103] Sevilla, Polygraph 1984: Beyond The Closed Door of Admissibility, 16 *U.W.L.A.L.Rev.* 5 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [104] Sexton, A Post-*Upjohn* Consideration of Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege, 57 *N.Y.U.L.Rev.* 443 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [105] Seymour, Isn't It A Crime: Feminist Perspectives on Spousal Immunity and Spousal Violence, 90 *Nw.U.L.Rev.* 1032 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [106] Shaffer, Bullets, Bad Florins, and Old Boots: A Report on The Indiana Trial Judges Seminar on The Judge's Control Over Demonstrative Evidence, 39 *Notre Dame L.* 20 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [107] Shaffer, Judges, Repulsive Evidence, and The Ability to Respond, 43 *Notre Dame Law.* 503 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [108] Shain, Presumptions Under The Common Law and The Civil Law, 18 *So.Calif.L.Rev.* 91 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [109] Shaman, Constitutional Fact: The Perception of Reality By The Supreme Court, 35 *U.Fla.L.Rev.* 236 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [110] Shadira, Economic Analysis of The Law of Evidence: A Caveat, 19 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 1607 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [111] Shapiro & Steinzur, The People's Agent: Executive Branch Secrecy and Accountability In An Error of Terrorism, 61 *Law & Contemp.Prob.* 99 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [112] Shapiro & Balsey, Attorney-Client Privilege: A Changing Concept in Corporate Reorganization, 90 *Comm.L.J.* 109 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [113] Sharpe, Two-Step Balancing and The Admissibility of Other Crimes Evidence: A Sliding Scale of Proof, 59 *Notre Dame L.Rev.* 556 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [114] Shea, Circumstantial Evidence Under New York's Proposed Code of Evidence, 47 *Brook.L.Rev.* 1373 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [115] Sheehe, The Federal Rules of Evidence: How Will The Trial of Corporate and Commercial Cases Be Affected?, 31 *Bus.Law.* 377 (1977). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [116] Sheft, Federal Evidence Rule 413: A Dangerous New Frontier, 33 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 57 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 413]
- [117] Sheldon, Presumptions Against Criminal Defendants, Affirmative Defenses, and A Substantive Due Process Interpretation of *County Court of Ulster v. Allen*, 34 Me.L.Rev. 277 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [118] Sherbow & Craig, Confidential Sources and Defamation Litigation, 6 Litigation 25 (1950). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [119] Sherman & Kinnard, The Development, Discovery, and Use of Computer Support Systems in Achieving Efficiency in Litigation, 79 Colum.L.Rev. 267 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [120] Shetreet, Exemption and Privileges on Ground of Religion and Conscience, 62 Ky.L.J. 377 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [121] Shuman & Weiner, Privilege—A Comparative Study, 12 J.Psch.&L. 373 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [122] Shuman & Weiner, The Privilege Study: An Empirical Examination of The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege, 60 N.C.L.Rev. 893 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [123] Shuman, Weiner & Pinard, The Privilege Study (Part III): Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege in Canada, 9 Int.J.L.& Psych. 393 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [124] Shuman, Behind Closed Doors: Limitations on Psychiatric and Psychological Evidence, 50 J.Air L.& Comm. 1011 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [125] Shuman, The Origins of The Physician-Patient Privilege and Professional Secret, 39 Sw.U.L.Rev. 661 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [126] Shuman, The Road to Bedlam: Evidentiary Guideposts in Civil Commitment Proceedings, 55 Notre Dame L. 53 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [127] Shutte, *Waste Management Disposal Services of Pa. v. D.E.P.*: Considering The Parameters of The Deliberative Process Privilege in The E.H.B. Setting, 18 Viil.Env'tl L.J. 151 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [128] Silberlight, Confronting A Testimonial Definition in A Post-*Crawford* Era, 29 Am.J.Tr.Adov. 65 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [129] Silbert, The Crime-Fraud Exception to The Attorney-Client Privilege, and Work Product Doctrine, The Lawyer's Obligation of Disclosure, and The Lawyer's Response To Accusation of Wrongful Conduct, 23 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 351 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [130] Silver, Courts Are Upholding Attorney-Client Privilege in Anonymous Payment Situations, 43 J.Tax. 338 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [131] Silverman, The Burden of Proof and Procedural Fairness in Capital Cases, 3 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 75 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [132] Silving, Testing of The Unconscious in Criminal Cases, 69 Harv.L.Rev. 683 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [132] Simon-Kerr, Credibility by Proxy, 85 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 152 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [133] Simon & Cockerham, Civil Commitment, Burden of Proof, and Dangerous Acts: A Comparison of The Perspectives of Judges and Psychiatrists, 5 J.Psych. & L. 571 (1977).[F.R.Ev. 301]
- [134] Simon, Reporter Privilege: Can Nebraska Pass A Shield Law to Bind The Whole World?, 61 Neb.L.Rev. 446 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [135] Simon, Evidence Excluded by Considerations of State Interest, 1955 Camb.L.J. 62. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [136] Simon, Judge's Translations of Burdens of Proof Into Statements of Probability, 1969 Tr.Law.Guide 103. [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [137] Simon, The Attorney-Client Privilege As Applied to Corporations, 65 Yale L.J. 953 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [138] Simpson & Huang, Uniform Rules of Evidence: Procedural Rules Governing The Admissibility of Evidence, 54 Okla.L.Rev. 513 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [139] Sing, Search Warrants and Legal Professional Privilege, 10 Crim.L.J. 32 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [140] Singer, Proposed Changes to The Federal Rules of Evidence As Applied to Computer-Generated Evidence, 7 Rutgers J.Comp., Tech.& L. (1979) [F.R.Ev. 803]
- [141] Sink, The Unused Power of A Federal Judge To Call His Own Expert Witnesses, 29 So.Calif.L.Rev. 195 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [142] Siporin, The Least Best Hope of Legal Services For The Poor in The Eighties: The Need for Public Sector Lay Advocates With Confidential Communications, 10 San Fern.U.L.Rev. 21 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [143] Sisk & Abbate, The Dynamic Attorney-Client Privilege, 23 Geo.J.Leg.Ethics 201 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [144] Siwica & Swindle, The Defendant's Right of Confrontation—-Are The Exceptions Swallowing The General Rule?. 6 Am.J.Tr.Advoc. 421 (1983). [Confrontation]
- [145] Sklansky, Confrontation and Kabuki, 20 J.L.& Pol'y 501 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [146] Sklansky, Confrontation and Fairness, 45 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 103 (2012). [Confrontation]
- [147] Sklar, Similar Fact Evidence—-Catchwords and Cartwheels, 23 McGill L.J. 60 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [148] Skoler, New Hearsay Exceptions For A Child's Statements of Sexual Abuse, 18 J.Marsh.L.Rev. 1 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 804]
- [149] Skolnick, Scientific Theory and Scientific Evidence: An Analysis of Lie-Detection, 70 Yale L.J. 694 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [150] Sloan & Klein, Psychotherapeutic Disclosures: A Conflict Between Right and Duty, 9 U.Tol.L.Rev. 57 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [151] Slobogin, Experts, Mental States, and Acts, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 1009 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [152] Slobogin, Doubts About *Daubert*: Psychiatric Anecdota as a Case Study, 57 Wash.&L.L.Rev. 919 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [153] Slobogin, The Admissibility of Behavioral Science Information in Criminal Trials, 5 Psych.Pub.Pol'y & L. 100 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [154] Slobogin, Psychiatric Evidence in Trials: To Junk or Not to Junk?. 40 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 1 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [155] Slough & Knightly, Other Vices, Other Crimes, 41 Iowa L.Rev. 325 (1956). [F.R.Ev.404(b)]
- [156] Slough, Relevancy Unraveled, 5 Kan.L.Rev. 1 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [157] Slough, Spontaneous Statements and State of Mind, 46 Iowa L.Rev. 224 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(2)]
- [158] Slough, Other Vices, Other Crimes: An Evidentiary Dilemma, 20 U.Kan.L.Rev. 411 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [159] Slough, Other Vices, Other Crimes: Kansas Statutes Annotated Section 60-455 Revisited, 26 U.Kan.L.Rev. 161 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

Faculty Articles

- [160] Slovenko, Psychotherapist-Patient Testimonial Privilege: A Picture of Misguided Hope, 23 Cath.U.L.Rev. 649 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [161] Slovenko, Group Psychotherapy: Privileged Communication and Confidentiality, 5 J.Psycho. & Law 405 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [162] Slovenko, Commentaries on Psychiatry and Law: Shielding Communications With a Pet, 10 J.Psycho.& Law 405 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [163] Slovenko, Dreams as Evidence, 1995 J.Psych.& L. 191. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [164] Slovenko, Witnesses, Psychiatry, and The Credibility of Testimony, 18 U.Fla.L.Rev. 1 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [165] Slovenko, Psychotherapy and Confidentiality, 24 Cleve.St.L.Rev. 375 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [166] Slovenko, The Opinion Rule and Wittgenstein's Tractatus, 14 U.Miami.L.Rev. 1 (1959).[F.R.Ev. 701]
- [167] Slovenko, Constitutional Limits on The Rules of Evidence, 26 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 493 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [168] Slovenko, Establishing The Guilt of The Accused, 31 Tul.L.Rev. 173 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 201 and 301]
- [169] Slovenko, Psychiatry and A Second Look At The Medical Privilege, 6 Wayne L.Rev. 175 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [170] Smith, Policing Hoover's Ghost: The Privilege for Law Enforcement Techniques, 54 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 233 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [171] Smith, The Increasing Use of Challenges to Expert Testimony Under *Daubert* and Rule 702 in Patent Litigation, 22 J.Intell.Prop.L. 345 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [172] Smith, Prior Sexual Misconduct in State Courts: Constitutional and Common Law Challenges, 52 Am.Crim.L.Rev. 321 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [173] Smith, The Admissibility of Statements by Computer, 1981 Crim.L.Rev. 387. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [174] Smith, An Uncertain Privilege: Implied Waiver and The Evisceration of The Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege in The Federal Courts, 58 DePaul L.Rev. 79 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [175] Smith, A Proposal to Codify Executive Privilege, 70 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 570 (2002).

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 509]

[176] Smith, Peering Into The Microscope: The Role of Judicial Gatekeeping After *Daubert* and Its Affect on Federal Toxic Tort Litigation, 13 B.U.Sci.& Tech.L. 218 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 703]

[177] Smith, Constitutional Privacy and Psychotherapy, 49 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 1 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[178] Smith, The Public's Need For Disclosure v. The Individual's Right to Financial Privacy: An Introduction to The Financial Right to Privacy Act of 1978, 32 Ad.L.Rev. 511 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 402]

[179] Smolla, Qualified Intimacy, Celebrity and The Case For a Newsgathering Privilege, 33 U.Rich.L.Rev. 1233 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[180] Snell, Eying The Iowa No Eyewitness Rule, 43 Iowa L.Rev. 57 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[181] Snyder, A Requiem for Client Confidentiality: An Examination of Recent Foreign and Domestic Events and Their Impact on The Attorney-Client Privilege, 50 Loy.L.Rev. 439 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[182] Snyder, Defining The Contours of Unavailability and Reliability for the Confrontation Clause, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 189 (1993). [Confrontation]

[183] Snyder, Criminal Investigation With The Lie Detector, 15 Rocky Mt.L.Rev. 162 (1943). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[184] Sofaer, Executive Power and The Control of Information: Practice Under The Framers, 1977 Duke L.J. 1. [F.R.Ev. 509]

[185] Sokol, Irresistible Forces and Immovable Objects, 31 Chi.B.Rev. 23 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[186] Sokoler, Between Substance and Procedure: A Role for States in The Scope of The Confrontation Clause, 110 Colum.L.Rev. 161 (2010). [Confrontation]

[187] Solan, Refocussing The Burden of Proof in Criminal Cases: Some Doubt About Reasonable Doubt, 78 Texas L.Rev. 105 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[188] Solomons, A Critical Analysis of The Legislative History Surrounding The Black Lung Interim Presumption and A Survey of Its Unresolved Issues, 83 W.Va.L.Rev. 969 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

- [189] Solum & Marzen, Truth and Uncertainty: Legal Control of The Destruction of Evidence, 36 Emory L.J. 1085 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [190] Soma & Youngs, Confidential Communications and Information in A Computer Age, 12 Hofstra L.Rev. 849 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [192] Soules, Presumptions in Criminal Cases, 20 Baylor L.Rev. 277 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [193] Spalding, The Uncertain State of The Law As To Waiver of Professional Privilege As To Confidential Communications, 20 Mass.L.Q, 16 (May 1935). [F.R.Ev. 511]
- [194] Spangenberg, The Federal Rules of Evidence—-An Attempt At Uniformity in The Federal Courts, 15 Wayne L.Rev. 1061 (1969). [History]
- [195] Spangenberg, The Use of Demonstrative Evidence, 21 Ohio St.L.J. 178 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [196] Spector & Foster, The Utility of Hypno-Induced Statements in The Trial Process: Reflections on *People v. Smerkar*, 10 Loy.(Chi.) L.Rev. 691 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [197] Spector, Impeachment by Past Conviction: What Hath *Montgomery* Wrought?, 10 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 339 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [198] Spector & Foster, Admissibility of Hypnotic Statements, 38 Ohio St.L.J. 567 (1977).[F.R.Ev. 612]
- [199] Spector & Foster, Rule 412 and The *Doe* Case: The Fourth Circuit Turns Back The Clock, 35 Okla.L.Rev. 87 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [200] Spector, Impeaching The Defendant By His Prior Convictions and The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence: A Half-Step Forward and Three Steps Backward, 1 Loy. (Chi.) L.J. 247 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 609]
- [201] Spellman, Federal Common Law of Journalistic Privilege: Fairness in The Clash of Competing Interests, 17 Comm. & The Law 95 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [202] Spencer, *Ohio v. Clark* in Comparative Perspective, 21 Psycho.Pub.Pol’y& L. 389 (2015). [Confrontation]
- [203] Spencer, The Motion in Limine: Pretrial Tool to Exclude Prejudicial Evidence, 56 Conn.B.J. 325 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [204] Spencer, *Zurcher v. Stanford Daily*: A Fishing License For Lawyer’s Files?, 36 J.Mo.B. 158 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [205] Spies, Opinion Evidence, 15 Ark.L.Rev. 105 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 701]
- [206] Springer, Professional Standards Review Organization: Some Problems of Confidentiality, 1975 Utah L.Rev. 361. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [207] Spronken, Taru & Fermon, Protection of Attorney-Client Privilege in Europe, 27 Penn.St.Int'l L.Rev. 439 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [208] Sprowl, Evaluating The Credibility of Computer-Generated Evidence, 52 Chi.Kent L.Rev. 547 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [209] Sprowls, The Admissibility of Sample Data Into A Court of Law: A Case Study, 4 U.C.L.A.L.Rev. 222 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [210] Stahl, Ex Parte Interviews With Enterprise Employees: A Post-*Upjohn* Analysis. 44 Wash.& Lee L.Rev. 1181 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [211] Stake, Professionalism and Confidentiality in The Practice of Spiritual Direction, 43 The Jurist 214 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [212] Stanchi, The Science of Persuasion: An Initial Exploration, 2006 Mich.St.L.Rev. 411. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [213] Stancil, Close Enough for Government Work: The Committee Rulemaking Game, 96 Va.L.Rev. 69 (2010). [History]
- [214] Stanton, Child-Parent Privilege for Confidential Communications: An Examination and A Proposal, 16 Fam.L.Q. 1 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [215] Starkman, State Legislators, Speech and Debate, and The Search for Truth, 11 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 334 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [216] Starrs, "A Still-Life Water Color": *Frye v. United States*, 27 J.Foren.Sci. 684 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [217] Stason, Choice of Law Within The Federal System: *Erie Versus Hanna*, 52 Corn.L.Q. 196 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [218] Steckman & Granofsky, The Assertion of Attorney-Client Privilege by Counsle in Legal Malpractice Cases—-Policy, Privilege, and The Search for Truth in Cases involving Implied Waivers, 45 Tort Trial & Ins,Prac.L.J. 839 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [219] Stedman, Trade Secrets, 23 Ohio St.L.J. 4 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [220] Stein, The New Doctrinalism: Implications for Evidence Theory, 163 U.Pa.L.Rev. 2085 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

- [221] Stein, The Refoundation of Evidence Law, 9 Can.J.L.& Juris. 279 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [222] Stein, F.O.I.A. And F.A.C.A.: Freedom of Information in The “Fifth Branch”?. 27 Ad.L.Rev. 31 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [223] Steinbach, The Treatment of Confidential Information in WTO Dispute Settlement Proceedings, 24 Am.Rev.Int’l Arb. 591 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [224] Steinberg, The Corporate/Securities Attorney as A “Moving Target”—Client Fraud Dilemmas, 46 Washburn L.J. 1 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [225] Steinbrink, The Medical Witness, 6 Brook.L.Rev. 155 (1936). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [226] Steinman, Privacy of Association: A Burgeoning Privilege of Civil Discovery, 17 Harv.Civ.Rts.-Civ.Lib.L.Rev. 355 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [227] Steinbuch & Seitz, Unscrambling The Confusion: Applying the Correct Standard of Review for Rape Shield Evidentiary Rulings, 34 Am.J.Tr.Ad. 281 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [228] Stenzel, Eyewitness Misidentification: A Mistake That Blinds Investigations, Sways Juries, and Locks Innocent People Behind Bars, 50 Creighton L.Rev. 515 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 602]
- [229] Stephens, The Admissibility of Polygraph Results in Alabama State and Federal Courts: Must We Await Buck Rogers in The Twenty-Fifth Century?. 6 L.&Psych.Rev. 69 (1981).[F.R.Ev. 401]
- [230] Stephens, Administrative Tribunals and The Rules of Evidence, (1933). [F.R.Ev. 1101]
- [231] Stephens & Hollon, Closing The Evidentiary Gap: A Review of Circuit Court Opinions Analyzing Federal Black Lung Presumptions of Entitlement, 83 W.Va.L.Rev. 793 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [232] Stephenson, Alone and Out of Excuses: The Tenth Circuit’s Refusal to Apply Federal Rule 407 to Product Liability Actions, 36 N.M.L.Rev. 391 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [233] Stephenson, The Waite Court At The Bar of History, 81 Den.U.L.Rev. 449 (2008). [History]
- [234] Sterk, Testimonial Privileges: An Analysis of Horizontal Choice of Law Problems, 61 Minn.L.Rev. 461 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [235] Stern & Hoffman, Privileged Informers: The Attorney Subpoena Problem and A proposal for Reform, 136 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1783 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [236] Stern & Oehme, Increasing Safety for Battered Women and Children: Creating A Privilege for Supervised Visitation Intake Records, 41 U.Rich.L.Rev. 499 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [237] Stern, Attorney-Client Privilege: Supreme Court Repudiates The Control Group Test, 67 A.B.A.J. 1142 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [238] Sternbach, Gustafson & Couer, Don't Trust The Lie Detector, 40 Harv.Bus.Rev. 127 (November-December 1962). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [239] Stevens, Pattern Jury Instructions: Some Suggestions on Use and The Problem of Presumptions, 41 Wash.L.Rev. 282 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [240] Stewart, Waiver of The Physician-Patient Privilege in Personal Injury Litigation, 1 Forum 16 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [241] Stewart, Perception, Memory, and Hearsay: A Criticism of Present Law and The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 1970 Utah L.Rev. 1. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [242] Stewart, The Newsman's Source Privilege—A Balancing of Interests, 2 U.San Fern.V.L.Rev. 95 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [243] Stewart, "Past Recollection Recorded" and Kansas Statutes Annotated 60-460(a), 12 Washburn L.J. 151 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 803(5)]
- [244] Stoddard, Privileged Communications, 1947 Ins.L.J. 291. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [245] Stoebuck, Opinions on Ultimate Facts: Status, Trends, and A Note of Caution, 41 Penny.C.C.J. 226 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 704]
- [246] Stoebuck, Relevancy and The Theory of Probability, 51 Iowa L.Rev. 849 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [247] Stoegbauer, Proposition 115 After *Crawford v. Washington*: It Is Time to Revisit The Constitutionality of Police Officer Hearsay Testimony in Preliminary Hearings, 34 W.St.U.L.Rev. 143 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [248] Stolz, The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978: The Role of Symbolic Politics, 24 Law & Pol'y 269 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [249] Stone, Why We Need A Federal Reporter's Privilege, 54 Hofstra L.Rev. 39 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [250] Stone, Judge Learned Hand and The Espionage Act of 1917: A Mystery Unravelled, 70 U.Chi.L.Rev. 335 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [251] Stone, The *Tarasoff* Decisions: Suing Psychotherapists to Safeguard Society, 90 Harv.L.Rev. 358 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [252] Stone, Scope of The Fourth Amendment: Privacy and Police Use of Spies, Secret Agents, and Informers, 1976 A.B.F.Res.J. 1195. [F.R.Ev. 510]
- [253] Stone, Burden of Proof and The Judicial Process, 60 L.Q.Rev. 262 (1944). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [254] Stone, Prosecuting The Press for Publishing Classified Information, 2 F.I.U.L.Rev. 93 (2006-2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [255] Stone, The Rule of Exclusion of Similar Fact Evidence: England, 46 Harv.L.Rev. 954 (1933). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [256] Stone, The Decline of Jury Trial and The Law of Evidence, 3 Res Judicatae 144 (1947).[F.R.Ev. 102]
- [257] Stonefield, Rule 801(d)'s Oxymoronic "Not Hearsay Classification: The Untold Backstory and A Suggested Amendment, 5 Fed.Cts.L.Rev. 31 (2011-2012). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)]
- [258] Stopher, The Uniform Rules of Evidence: Government by Man Instead of Law, 29 Ins.Coun.J. 405 (1962). [History]
- [259] Story, Twenty-First Century Pillow-Talk: Applicability of The Marital Communications Privilege to Electronic Mail, 58 S.C.L.Rev. 275 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [260] Stover & Koesterer, Attorney-Client Privilege in Wisconsin, 59 Marq.L.Rev. 227 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [261] Stoyles, The Dilemma of The Constitutionality of The Priest-Penitent Privilege—The Application of The Religion Clauses, 29 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 137 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [262] Strack, Attorney-Client Privilege—House Counsel, 12 Bus.Law. 229 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [263] Strahorn, A Reconsideration of The Hearsay Rule and Admissions, 85 U.Pa.L.Rev. 484 (1937). [F.R.Ev. 801(c)(3)]
- [264] Strahorn, Extra-Legal Materials and The Law of Evidence, 29 Ill.L.Rev. 300 (1934).[F.R.Ev. 102]

Faculty Articles

- [265]** Strahorn, The Process of Judicial Notice, 14 Va.L.Rev. 544 (1928). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [266]** Strassberg, Privilege Can Be Abused: Exploring the Ethical Obligations to Avoid Frivolous Claims of Attorney-Client Privilege, 37 Seton H.L.Rev. 413 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [267]** Streit, Investigative Journalism and National Security, 5 Cardozo Pub.L.Pol'y & Ethics J. 75 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [268]** Streb, Right, Proof, and Truth at Trial, 16 Cap.U.L.Rev. 637 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [269]** Street, State Secrets—A Comparative Study, 14 Mod.L.Rev. 121 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [270]** Strocky, Losing The Right of Confrontation & Cross-Examination in Administrative Proceedings, 46 U.Tol.L.Rev. 95 (2014). [Confrontation]
- [271]** Stripinis, Probability Theory and Circumstantial Evidence: Implications From A Mathematical Analysis, 22 Jurimetrics J. 59 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [272]** Strom, Proposed Relevancy Rules Generally Restate Law, 53 Neb.L.Rev. 365 (1974). [History]
- [273]** Strong, Liberalizing The Authentication of Private Writings, 52 Corn.L.Q. 284 (1967). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [274]** Strong, Consensual Modification of The Rules of Evidence: The Limits of Party Autonomy in The Adversary System, 80 Neb.L.Rev. 159 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [275]** Strong, Questions Affecting The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence, 1970 Ill.L.F. 1. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [276]** Stumbo, Presumptions—A View At Chaos, 5 Washburn L.J. 182 (1964). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [277]** Suarez, Congressional Immunity: A Criticism of Existing Distinctions and A Proposal for A Definitional Approach, 20 Vill.L.Rev. 97 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [278]** Subrin, Presumptions and Their Treatment Under The Law of Ohio, 26 Ohio St.L.J. 175 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [279]** Sucaet, Truth and Consequences: Environmental Audit Privilege and Immunity. 1997 Det.C.L.Mich.St.U.L.Rev. 1203. [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [280] Sullivan, What Structural Presumption?: Reuniting Evidence and Economics on The Role of Market Concentration in Horizontal Merger Analysis, 42 J.Corp.L. 403 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [280] Sullivan, *Crawford*, Retroactivity, and The Importance of Being Earnest, 92 Marq.L.Rev. 231 (2008). [Confrontation]
- [281] Summers, Science Can Get The Confession, 8 Ford.L.Rev. 334 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [282] Suni, Subpoenas To Criminal Defense Lawyers: A Proposal for Limits, 65 Ore.L.Rev. 215 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [283] Sutton, Trade Secrets Legislation, 9 Idea 587 (1965-1966). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [284] Sweeny & Emanuel, Recent Developments in Indiana Evidence Law, 43 Ind.L.Rev. 773 (2010). [History]
- [285] Sweeney, Federal or State Rules of Evidence in Federal Courts, 27 Ill.L.Rev. 394 (1932). [History]
- [286] Swift, The Problem of “Trustworthiness” in The Admission of State of Mind Hearsay Under California and Federal Evidence Law, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 619 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [287] Swift, Further Thoughts on The Critique of The “Timeliness” Test Under F.R.E. 803(3), 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 1411 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [288] Swift, Narrative Theory, F.R.E. 803(3) and Criminal Defendants’ Post-Crime State of Mind Hearsay, 38 Seton H.L.Rev. 975 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [289] Swift, Aspirational Optimism About Evidence Law: An Implicit Theme of the *Visions of Rationality* Symposium, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1337. [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [290] Swift, Rival Claims to “Truth”, 49 Hast.L.J. 693 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [291] Swift, Smoke and Mirrors: The Failure of The Supreme Court’s Accuracy Rationale in *White v. Illinois* Requires a New Look at Confrontation, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 145 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [292] Swift, Does It Matter Who is In Charge of Evidence Law?. 25 Loy.(L.A.)L.Rev. 649 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [293] Swift, The Hearsay Rule at Work: Has It Been Abolished De Facto by Judicial Decision?, 76 Minn.L.Rev. 473 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

[294] Swift, A Response to The “Probative Value Theory of Hearsay Suggested by *Hearsay From a Layperson*, 14 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 103 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[295] Swift, Abolishing The Hearsay Rule, 75 *Calif.L.Rev.* 495 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[296] Swift, A Foundation Fact Approach to Hearsay, 75 *Calif.L.Rev.* 1339 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[297] Swinehart, Reliability of Expert Evidence in International Disputes, 38 *Mich.J.Int’l.L.* 287 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 702]

[298] Swire, The System of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Law, 72 *Geo.Wash.L.Rev.* 1306 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[299] Symposium, Beyond Reproach: Becoming An Expert on Expert Witnesses, 7 *Drexel L.Rev.* 239 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 702]

T

[1] Tabor, Demonstrative Evidence, 32 *J.Kan. Bar Ass’n* 250 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[2] Taconite, A Question of Privilege: Valid Protection or Obstruction of Justice?, 17 *Osgoode H.L.J.* 332 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 504]

[3] Tague, Perils of The Rulemaking Process: The Development, Application, and Unconstitutionality of Rule 804(b)(3)’s Penal Interest Exception, 69 *Geo.L.J.* 851 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(3)]

[4] Tait, The New Federal Rules of Evidence: A Summary of The Differences Between The Rules and The Connecticut Law of Evidence, 9 *Conn.L.Rev.* 1 (1976). [History]

[5] Taintor, “Presumptions” in Pennsylvania, 17 *Pa.Bar Ass’n. Q.* 89 (1945). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[6] Tanford, The Limits of Scientific Jurisprudence: The Supreme Court and Psychology, 66 *Ind.L.J.* 137 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[7] Tanford, A Political-Choice Approach to Limiting Prejudicial Evidence, 64 *Ind.L.J.* 831 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[8] Tanford & Boccachino, Rape Victim Shield Laws and The Sixth Amendment, 128 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 544 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[9] Tanford, Penrod, & Collins, Decisionmaking in Joined Criminal Trials: The Influence of Charge Similarity, Evidence Similarity, and Limiting Instructions, 9 *Law & Hum.Behav.* 319 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]

Faculty Articles

- [10] Tanenhaus & Bush, Toward A History of Children As Witnesses, 82 Ind.L.J. 1059 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [11] Tapper, Criminal Law Revision Committee 11th Report: Character Evidence, 36 Mod.L.Rev. 56 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [12] Taranto, The Psychiatrist-Patient Privilege and Third Party Payers: *Commonwealth v. Kobrin*, 14 L.Med.& H.Care 25 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [13] Tarlow, Law Office Searches, 6 C.A.C.J. Forum 15 (Sept.Oct. 1979) [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [14] Tarlow, Admissibility of Polygraph Evidence in 1975: An Aid To Determining Credibility in A Perjury Plagued System, 26 Hast.L.J. 917 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [15] Taslitz, What Feminism Has To Offer Evidence Law, 28 Sw.U.L.Rev. 171 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [16] Taslitz, Abuse Excuses and The Logic and Politics of Expert Relevance, 49 Hast.L.J. 1039 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [17] Taslitz, A Feminist Approach to Social Scientific Evidence: Foundations, 5 Mich.J.Gen.& L. 1 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [18] Taslitz, *Daubert's* Guide To The Federal Rules of Evidence: A Not-So-Plain-Meaning Jurisprudence, 32 Harv.J.Leg. 3 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [19] Taslitz, Myself Alone: Individualizing Justice Through Psychological Character Evidence, 52 Md.L.Rev. 1 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [20] Taslitz, Catharsis, the Confrontation Clause, and Expert Testimony, 22 Cap.U.L.Rev. 103 (1993). [Confrontation]
- [21] Taslitz, Does The Cold Nose Know?: The Unscientific Myth of the Dog Scent Lineup, 42 Hast.L.J. 15 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [22] Taubeveck & Sexton, Executive Privilege and The Court's Right To Know— - Discovery Against The United States in Civil Actions in Federal District Courts, 48 Geo.L.J. 486 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [23] Taylor, Obtaining Immunity for Defense Witnesses, 29 Prac.Law. 75 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [24] Teeter & Singer, Search Warrants in Newsrooms: Some Aspects of *Zurcher v. Stanford Daily*, 67 Ky.L.J. 847 (1978-1979). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [25] Teitelbaum, Admissibility of Hypnotically Adduced Evidence and The *Arthur Nebb* Case, 8 St.Louis U.L.J. 205 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [26] Teitelbaum & Hertz, Evidence II; Evidence of Other Crimes As Proof of Intent, 13 N.Mex.L.Rev. 423 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [27] Teitelbaum, Sutton-Barbere & Johnson, Evaluating The Prejudicial Value of Evidence: Can Judges Identify The Improper Evidence on Juries? 1983 Wis.L.Rev. 1147. [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [28] Teitelbaum, Personal Injury Law and Hypnotism, 1963 Med.Tr.Tech.Q. 95. [F.R.Ev. 612]
- [29] Teliman, Our Very Privileged Executive: Why The Judiciary Can (and Should Be) Fix The State Secrets Privilege, 80 Temp.L.Rev. 499 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [30] Tenney, The Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus Test and The Admissibility of Scientific Evidence, 27 N.H.St.B.J. 179 (1986). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [31] Teter, Acts of Emotion: Analyzing Congressional Involvement in The Federal Rules of Evidence, 58 Cath.U.L.Rev. 153 (2008). [History]
- [32] Teubner, The Computer as Expert Witness: Toward A Unified Theory of Computer Evidence, 19 Jurimetrics J. 274 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [33] Thayer, "Law and Fact" in Jury Trials, 4 Harv.L.Rev. 147 (1890). [F.R.Ev. 104]
- [34] Thayer, The Burden of Proof, 4 Harv.L.Rev. 45 (1890). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [35] Thayer, Presumptions and The Law of Evidence, 3 Harv.L.Rev. 141 (1889). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [36] Thayer, Judicial Notice and The Law of Evidence, 3 Harv.L.Rev. 285 (1890). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [37] Thayer, *Bedingfield's Case*: Declarations as Part of The Res Gestae, Legal Essays (Thayer ed. 1908). [F.R.Ev. 801(c)]
- [38] Thayer, Observations on The Law of Evidence, 13 Mich.L.Rev. 355 (1915). [History]
- [39] The Doctor as Witness: Statements for Purposes of Medical Diagnosis or Treatment, 10 Loy.(Chi.)L.J. 363 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 803(4)]
- [40] Thomas, Colonial Criminal Law and Procedure: The Royal Colony of New Jersey, 1 N.Y.U.J.L.& Liberty 671 (2005). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [41] Thomas, The Lawyer-Client Privilege, 10 Tulsa L.J. 130 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [42] Thomas, Seeing Is Believing—Most of The Time: Lay Observation In Proving The Obvious, 12 Tulsa L.J. 487 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [43] Thomas, Looking Logically At Evidence of Other Crimes in Oklahoma, 15 Okla.L.Rev. 431 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [44] Thompson, Evaluating Negative Forensic Evidence: When Do Jurors Treat Absence of Evidence as Evidence of Absence, 14 J.Empir.L.Studs. 565 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [45] Thompson, Blackness as Character Evidence, 20 Mich.J.Race & L. 321 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [46] Thompson, The Use of Modern Technology to Present Evidence in Child Sex Abuse Prosecutions: A Sixth Amendment Analysis and Perspective, 18 U.W.L.A.L.Rev. 1 (1986). [Confrontation]
- [47] Thompson, The Constitutionality of Chemical Test Presumptions of Intoxication in Motor Vehicle Statutes, 20 San Diego L.Rev. 301 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [48] Thoreau, The Physician-Patient Privilege, 1983 Med.Tr.Tech.Q. 61. [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [49] Thornburg, Sanctifying Secrecy: The Mythology of The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege, 69 Notre Dame L.Rev. 157 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [50] Thornburg, Metaphors Matter: How Images of Battle, Sports, and Sex Shape The Adversary System, 10 Wis.Wom.L.J. 225 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [51] Thornburg, Attorney-Client Privilege: Issue Related Waiver, 50 J.Air L.& Comm. 1039 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [52] Tien, Litigating The State Secrets Privilege, 42 Case W.Res.J.Int'l L. 675 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [53] Tillers, Intellectual History, Probability, and The Law of Evidence, 91 Mich.L.Rev. 1465 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [54] Tillers, Legal History For A Dummy: A Comment on The Role of History in Judicial Interpretation of The Confrontation Clause, 71 Brook.L.Rev. 235 (2005). [Confrontation]
- [55] Tillers, Introduction: Three Contributions to Three Important Problems in Evidence Scholarship, 18 Cardozo L.Rev. 1875 (1997). [History]

Faculty Articles

- [56] Tillers, A Curious Document Recently Discovered in The Archives, 14 *Cardozo L.Rev.* 149 (1992). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [57] Tillers, Webs of Things in The Mind: A New Science of Evidence, 87 *Mich.L.Rev.* 1225 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [58] Tilley, A Feminist Repudiation of The Rape Shield Laws, 51 *Drake L.Rev.* 45 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [59] Timbers & Cohen, Demands of Litigants for Government Information, 18 *U.Pitt.L.Rev.* 687 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [60] Todaro, The Admissibility of Medical Testimony in Ohio: *Daubert*, *Joiner*, and Ohio's Relevance-Reliability Standard, 56 *Cleve.St.L.Rev.* 319 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [61] Tone, The Federal Rules of Evidence, 54 *Chi.Bar Rec.* 307 (1973). [History]
- [62] Tony, The Credibility-Based Evaluative Purpose: Why Rule 703 Disclosures Don't Offend the Confrontation Clause, 67 *Rutgers U.L.Rev.* 953 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [63] Toran, Information Disclosure in Civil Actions: The Freedom of Information Act and The Federal Discovery Rules, 49 *Geo.Wash.L.Rev.* 843 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [64] Tornquist & Olson, Why Oregon Should Adopt An Equivalent to Federal Rule of Evidence 502, 46 *Willam.L.Rev.* 539 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 502]
- [65] Tornquist, The Prior Inconsistent Statement: The Illinois Law and The Art, 10 *Loy. (Chi)L.J.* 381 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 801(d)(1)(A)]
- [66] Tracy, The Introduction of Documentary Evidence, 24 *Iowa L.Rev.* 436 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 901]
- [67] Traster, Protecting Your Client With The Motion in Limine, 1978 *Tr.Law.Guide* 147. [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [68] Trautman, Logical or Legal Relevancy—A Conflict in Theory, 5 *Vand.L.Rev.* 385 (1952).[F.R.Ev. 401]
- [69] Travers, An Essay on The Determination of Relevance Under The Federal Rules of Evidence, 1977 *Ariz.St.L.J.* 327. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [70] Travis, Impartial Expert Testimony Under The Federal Rules of Evidence: A French Perspective, 8 *Int'l Lawyer* 492 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 706]

Faculty Articles

- [71]** Traylor, An Uncertain Privilege: Why The Common Interest Doctrine Does Not Work and How Uniformity Can Fix It, 15 B.U.Pub.Int.L.J. 49 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [72]** Treadwell, Annual Survey of Georgia Law: Evidence, 59 Mercer L.Rev. 157 (2007). [History]
- [73]** Tribe, Trial By Mathematics: Precision and Ritual in The Legal Process, 84 Harv.L.Rev. 1329 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [74]** Tribe, Triangulating Hearsay, 87 Harv.L.Rev. 957 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [75]** Trovillo, Scientific Proof of Credibility, 22 Tenn.L.Rev. 743 (1953). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [76]** Tuchler, Credibility of A Witness, 8 J.Foren.Sci. 325 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [77]** Tucker, The Flexible Doctrine of Spoliation of Evidence: Cause of Action, Defense, Evidentiary Presumption, and Discovery Sanction, 27 Toledo L.Rev. 67 (1995). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [78]** Tuerkheimer, Incredible Women: Sexual Violence and The Credibility Discount, 105 U.Pa.L.Rev. 1 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [79]** Tuerkheimer, A Relational Approach to The Right of Confrontation and Its Loss, 15 J.L.& Pol'y 725 (2007). [Confrontation]
- [80]** Tuerkheimer, *Crawford's Triangle*: Domestic Violence and The Right of Confrontation, 85 N.C.L.Rev. 1 (2006). [Confrontation]
- [81]** Tuerkheimer, Convictions Through Hearsay in Child Sexual Abuse Cases, 72 Marq.L.Rev. 47 (1988). [Confrontation]
- [82]** Turley, Presidential Papers and Popular Government; The Convergence of Constitutional and Property Theory in Claims of Ownership and Control of Presidential Records, 88 Corn.L.Rev. 651 (2003). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [83]** Turner, Judicial Notice and Federal Rule of Evidence 201 --A Rule Ready For Change, 45 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 181 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [84]** Tursi, The Reporter's Privilege in The 21st Century: The Need for a Qualified Federal Media Shield Law That Balances Freedom of Speech With National Security Concerns, 54 Santa Clara L.Rev. 201 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [85]** Tushnet, Constitutional Limitation of Substantive Criminal Law—An Examination of *Mullaney v. Wilbur*, 55 B.U.L.Rev. 775 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 303]

Faculty Articles

[86] Twerski, Post-Accident Design Modification Evidence in A Manufacturing Defect Setting: Strict Liability and Beyond, 4 J.Prod.Liab. 143 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 407]

[87] Tyree, Uniform Rules of Evidence—The Opinion Rule, 10 Rutgers L.Rev. 601 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 701]

U & V

[1] Uelmen, Conditional Relevancy and the Admissibility of Party Admissions, 36 Sw.U.L.Rev. 657 (2008). [F.R.Ev. 803(a)(2)(d)]

[2] Ugland, The New Abridged Reporter's Privilege: Policies, Principles, and Pathological Perspectives, 71 Ohio St.L.J. 1 (2010). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[3] Ullman, Medieval Principles of Evidence, 62 L.Q.Rev. 77 (1946). [Confrontation]

[4] Ulmschneider, Rape and Battered Women's Self-Defense Trials As "Political Trials": New Perspectives on Feminists' Legal Reform Efforts and Traditional "Political Trials" Concepts, 39 Suff.U.L.Rev. 85 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[5] Underwood, The Thumb on The Scales of Justice: Burdens of Persuasion in Criminal Cases, 86 Yale L.J. 1299 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[6] Ungerman, Presumption [sic] Under The Federal Rules of Evidence Compared With Presumptions Under Oklahoma Law, 46 Ok.B.J.Q.Supp. 191 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[7] Uviller, Credence, Character, and The Rules of Evidence: Seeing Through The Liar's Tale, 42 Duke L.J. 776 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 608]

[8] Uviller, Evidence of Character to Prove Conduct: Illusion, Illogic, and Injustice In The Courtroom, 130 U.Pa.L.Rev. 845 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 404]

V

[1] Vandegrift, The Privilege of Self-Critical Analysis: A Survey of The Law, 60 Alb.L.Rev. 171 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[2] Vandervort, Videotaping Investigative Interviews of Children in Cases of Child Sexual Abuse: One Community's Approach, 96 J.Crim.L.& Crim. 1353 (2006). [Confrontation]

[3] Van Dusen, A United States District Court Judge's View of The Impartial Medical Expert System, 32 F.R.D. 498 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 706]

Faculty Articles

- [4] Van Kessel, Hearsay Hazards in The American Criminal Trial: An Adversary-Oriented Approach, 49 *Hast.L.J.* 477 (1998). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [5] Van Niekerk, Journalistic Privilege—Need For A New Approach, 86 *So.Afr.L.J.* 100 (1939). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [6] Van Voorhis. Expert Opinion Evidence, 13 *N.Y.L.F.* 651 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [7] Varadarajan, Trade Secret Precautions, Possession, and Notice, 68 *Hast.L.J.* 357 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [8] Varadarajan, Trade Secret Fair Use, 83 *Ford.L.Rev.* 1401 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [9] Vartabedian & Vartabedian, Striking A Delicate Balance, 24 *Judge's J.* 16 (1985). [Confrontation]
- [10] Vaver, “Without Prejudice” Communications—Their Admissibility and Effect, 9 *U.B.C.L.Rev.* 85 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 408]
- [11] Velvel, The Supreme Court Tramples *Gravel*, 61 *Ky.L.J.* 525 (1973). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [12] Vestal, Sua Sponte Consideration in Appellate Review, 27 *Ford.L.Rev.* 477 (1958). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [13] Vestal, *Erie R.R. v. Tompkins*: A Projection, 48 *Iowa L.Rev.* 248 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [14] Vesterdorf, Legal Professional Privilege and The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination in E.C. Law: Recent Developments and Current Issues, 28 *Ford.Int'l L.J.* 1179 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [15] Vickers, *Daubert*, Critique, and Interpretation: What Empirical Studies Tell Us About The Application of *Daubert*, 40 *U.S.F.L.Rev.* 109 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 703]
- [16] Vinizki, Trade Secrets Registry, 35 *Pace L.Rev.* 355 (2014). [F.R.Ev. 508]
- [17] Volz & Ellis, An Attorney-Client Privilege for Embattled Tax Practitioners: A Legislative Response to Uncertain Legal Counsel, 38 *Hofstra L.Rev.* 213 (2009). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [18] Vu & Tamor, Of *Daubert*, Elvis, and Precedential Relevance: Live Sighting of A Dead Legal Doctrine, 41 *U.C.L.A.L.Rev.* 487 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 703]

W

- [1] Wachtell, Proof of Foreign Law in American Courts, 69 *U.S.L.Rev.* 426 (1935).

Faculty Articles

[F.R.Ev. 201]

[2] Walther, Pipe-Dreams of Truth and Fairness: Is *Crawford v. Washington* A Breakthrough for Sixth Amendment Confrontation Rights, 9 Buff.Crim.L.Rev. 953 (2006). [Confrontation]

[3] Wagner, The End of The Virtually Constitutional: The Confrontation Right and *Crawford v. Washington* As A Prelude to Reversal of *Maryland v. Craig*, 19 Regent U.L.Rev. 469 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]

[4] Waldman, Beyond *Upjohn*: The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Corporate Context, 28 Wm.&Mary L.Rev. 473 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[5] Walen, Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt: A Balanced Retributive Account, 76 La.L.Rev. 355 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 303]

[6] Walwsky, Applying Military Rule of Evidence 403: A Defense Counsel's Guide, 14 The Advocate 2 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[7] Walinsky & Abramoff, The Proposed Ohio Rules of Evidence: The Case Against, 28 Case-Wes.Res.L.Rev. 344 (1978). [History]

[8] Walker, The Problem of Indemnity Insurance in Damage Actions As Answered by The Courts of California, 11 So.Calif.L.Rev. 407 (1930). [F.R.Ev. 411]

[9] Wall, Judicial Admissions: Their Use in Criminal Trials, 53 J.Crim.L.Crim.&P.S. 15 (1962). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[10] Wallace, Article I: General Provisions, 20 Hous.L.Rev. 876 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 106]

[11] Wallace, Official Written Statements, 46 Iowa L.Rev. 256 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 803(b)(8)]

[12] Wallach, The Living Corpse: An Animistic Survival in Modern Evidence Law. 10 Trial Lawyer's Q. 58 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(2)]

[13] Walsh, The Priest-Penitent Privilege: A Hibernocentric Essay in Post-Colonial Jurisprudence, 80 Ind.L.J. 1007 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[14] Waincymer, Pathologies, Presumptions, and Proof—-Adjudicating The Effectiveness of Arbitration Agreements, 26 Am/Rev.Int'l.Arb. 407 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]

[15] Walther, Everything Is Presumed in Texas: Analyzing The Presumption Against Preemption, 56 So.Tex.L.Rev. 579 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 301]

Faculty Articles

[16] Walton, Argumentation Schemes: The Basis of Conditional Relevance, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1205. [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]

[17] Walton, Defining Conditional Relevance Using Linked Arguments and Argumentation Schemes: A Commentary on Professor Callen's Article, *Rationality and Relevancy: Conditional Relevancy and Strained Resources*, 2003 Mich.St.L.Rev. 1305. [F.R.Ev. 104(b)]

[18] Waltz, Evidence is Dead, Wigmore Obsolete: Long Live Judicial Discretion!, 65 Chi. Bar Rec. 284 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 403]

[19] Waltz, The Offer of Proof, 1972 Trial Lawyer's Guide 385. [F.R.Ev. 103]

[20] Waltz, The Present Sense Impression Exception to The Rule Against Hearsay: Origins and Attributes, 66 Iowa L.Rev. 869 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 803(1)]

[21] Waltz & Huston, The Rules of Evidence in Settlement, 5 Litigation 11 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 408]

[22] Ward, The Attorney-Client Privilege: A Litigator's Perspective, 6 Del.J.Corp.L. 447 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]

[23] Warnke, "Forfeiture by Wrongdoing" After *Crawford v. Washington*: Maryland's Approach Best Preserves The Right to Confrontation, 37 U.Balt.L.Rev. 203 (2008). [Confrontation]

[24] Warren & Roberts, Challenging The Use of Hypnotically Induced Evidence, 9 Colo.L.Rev. 1142 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 401]

[25] Washburn, Rape and The Rules of Evidence: The Need for Reform, 5 N.M.L.Rev. 293 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 412]

[26] Watkins, The Journalist's Privilege in Arkansas, 7 U.Ark.(L.R.)L.Rev. 473 (1984). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[27] Watson, Blood, Drugs, and Lab Reports: Using Agent Reports to Establish Guilt in DUI's Involving Drugs, Alcohol, or Both, 39 Am.J.Tr.Adv. 547 (2016). [Confrontation]

[28] Watson, New Federal Evidence Rules As to Judicial Notice; Authentication; and Identification and Contents of Writings, Recordings, and Photographs, 46 Okla.B.J.Q.Supp. 179 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 901]

[29] Watts, The Parent-Child Privileges: Hardly A New or Revolutionary Concept, 29 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 583 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 501]

Faculty Articles

- [30] Weaver, The Effect in Georgia of A Plea of Nolo Contendere Entered in A Georgia Court, 13 Ga.L.Rev. 723 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 410]
- [31] Weaver & Jones, The Deliberative Process Privilege, 54 Mo.L.Rev. 279 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [32] Weaver & Pallitto, State Secrets and Executive Power, 120 Poli.Sci.Q. 85 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [33] Weddington, Rape Law in Texas: H.B. 284 and The Road to Reform, 4 Am.J.Crim.L. 1 (1975-1976). [F.R.Ev. 412.]
- [34] Wedgwood, The Revolutionary Martyrdom of Jonathon Robbins, 100 Yale L.J. 229 (1990). [Confrontation]
- [35] Weihofen, Testimonial Competence and Credibility, 34 Geo.Wash.L.Rev. 53 (1965). [F.R.Ev. 601]
- [36] Weinapple & Perk, The Right of A Minor to Confidentiality: An Aftermath of *Bartley v. Kremens*, 9 Bull.Am.Acad.Psych.& L. 247 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [37] Weinberg, The Judicial Discretion to Exclude Relevant Evidence, 21 McGill L.J. 1 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 403]
- [38] Weinberger, *Caprara Over The Rainbow*—New York Grapples With Post-Accident Design Changes in Products Liability Actions, 66 Alb.L.Rev. 132 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 407]
- [39] Weinschel, Corporate Employee Interviews and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 12 B.C.Ind.& Comm.L.Rev. 873 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [40] Weinstein, The Relevance of *Mullaney v. Wilbur*, *U.S. v. Booker*, and The Reassessment of Judicial Limits on Legislative Power to Define Crimes, 84 Or.L.Rev. 393 (2005). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [41] Weinstein, Is There Scholarship After Death, or Are Evidence Teachers Needed After The Federal Rules? 41 Md.L.Rev. 209 (1982). [History]
- [42] Weinstein, Recognition in The United States of The Privileges of Another Jurisdiction, 56 Colum.L.Rev. 535 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [43] Weinstein, The Uniformity-Conformity Dilemma Facing Draftsmen of Federal Rules of Evidence, 69 Colum.L.Rev. 353 (1969). [History]
- [44] Weinstein, Judicial Notice and The Duty to Disclose Adverse Information, 51 Iowa L.Rev. 807 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 201]

Faculty Articles

- [45] Weinstein, Alternatives to The Present Hearsay Rules, 44 F.R.D. 375 (1968). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [46] Weinstein, Probative Force of Hearsay, 46 Iowa L.Rev. 331 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [47] Weinstein & Berger, Basic Rules of Relevancy in The Proposed Federal Rules of Evidence, 4 Ga.L.Rev. 43 (1969). [History]
- [48] Weinstein, Some Difficulties in Devising Rules for Determining Truth in Judicial Trials, 66 Colum.L.Rev. 223 (1966). [History]
- [49] Weinstein, The Ohio and Federal Rules of Evidence, 6 Cap.U.L.Rev. 517 (1977). [History]
- [50] Weir, Evidence—-Compellability of One Spouse As a Witness Against the Other in A Criminal Prosecution, 5 Alberta L.Q. 98 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 505]
- [51] Weisberger, A Tale of Two Privileges, 15 Suff.U.L.Rev. 191 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [52] Weisbrodt & Wilson, Piercing The Confidentiality Veil: Physician Testimony in International Tribunals Against Perpetrators of Torture, 15 Minn.J.Int.L. 43 (2002). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [53] Weiss, Who's Watching The Watchdog?: Self-Evaluative Privilege and Journalistic Responsibility in *Westmoreland v. C.B.S., Inc.* 7 Hast.J.Comm.&Ent.L. 149 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [54] Weissenberger, The Elusive Identity of The Federal Rules of Evidence, 40 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 1613 (1999). [History]
- [55] Weissenberger, Evidence Myopia: The Failure to See The Federal Rules of Evidence as a Codification of The Common Law, 40 Wm.& Mary L.Rev. 1539 (1999). [History]
- [56] Weissenberger, Hearsay Puzzles: An Essay on Federal Evidence Rule 803(3). 64 Temp.L.Rev. 145 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [57] Weissenberger, Making Sense of Extrinsic Act Evidence: Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b), 70 Iowa L.Rev. 579 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [58] Weissenberger, Toward Precision in The Application of The Attorney-Client Privilege For Corporations, 65 Iowa L.Rev. 899 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [59] Weissenberger, Character Evidence Under The Federal Rules: A Puzzle With Missing Pieces, 48 U.Cinc.L.Rev. 1 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [60] Weissman, Voiceprints and The Defense, 10 N.Eng.L.Rev. 25 (1874). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [61] Welch, Classified Information and The Courts, 31 Fed.B.J. 360 (1972). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [62] Welch, Another Anomaly—The Patient’s Privilege, 13 Miss.L.J. 137 (1941). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [63] Welch, *Upjohn*: A Survey of The Case, 6 Del.J.Corp.L. 435 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [64] Wellborn, Demeanor, 76 Corn.L.Rev. 1073 (1991). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [65] Wellborn, Judicial Notice Under Article II of The Texas Rules of Evidence, 19 St.Mary’s L.J. 1 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [66] Wellborn, Article I of The Texas Rules of Evidence and Articles I and IX of The Texas Rules of Criminal Evidence: Applicability of The Rules, Procedural Matters, and Preserving Error, 18 St.Mary’s L.J. 1165 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [67] Wellborn, The Definition of Hearsay in The Federal Rules of Evidence, 61 Texas L.Rev. 49 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [68] The “Best Evidence” Article of the Texas Rules of Evidence, 18 St. Mary’s L.J. 99 (1986).
- [69] Authentication and Identification Under Article IX of the Texas Rules of Evidence, 16 St.Mary’s L.J.371 (1985).
- [70] The Texas Rules of Evidence—Article VIII: Hearsay, 20 Hous.L.Rev. 477 (1983).
- [71] The Federal Rules of Evidence and the Application of State Law in the Federal Courts, 55 Texas L.Rev. 371 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [72] Welles, A Survey of Attorney-Client Privilege in Joint Defense, 35 U.Miami L.Rev. 321 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [73] Wells, “National Security” Information and The Freedom of Information Act, 56 Admin.L.Rev. 1195 (2004). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [74] Wells, Criminal Sanctions Imposed Against Newsmen: Shield Protection Needed, 2 Am.J.Crim.L. 309 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [75] Wendell, The Case Against Plea Bargaining Child Sexual Abuse Charges: *Deja Vu* All Over Again, 64 Mo.L.Rev. 317 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 410]

Faculty Articles

- [76] Wendorf, The 1984.Texas Rules of Evidence Amendments, 37 Baylor L.Rev. 81 (1985). [History]
- [77] Wendorf, Should Texas Adopt The Federal Rules of Evidence?, 28 Baylor L.Rev. 249 (1976). [History]
- [78] Wendorf, Some Views on Jury Views, 18 Baylor L.Rev. 379 (1963). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [79] Wieninger, Electronic Discovery and Sanctions for Spoliation: Perspectives From the Classroom, 61 Cath.U.L.Rev. 775 (2012). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [80] Wesson, “Remarkable Stratagems and Conspiracies”: How Unscrupulous Lawyers and Credulous Judges Created an Exception to The Hearsay Rule, 76 Ford.L.Rev. 1675 (2007). [F.R.Ev. 803(4)]
- [81] Wesson, “Particular Intentions”: The *Hillmon* Case and The Supreme Court, 18 Law & Lit. 33 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 803(a)(3)]
- [82] West & Meterko. Innocence Project: DNA Exonerations, 1989-2014: Review of Data and Findings from The First 25 Years, 79 Alb.L.Rev. 717 (2015-2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [83] Westen, Reflection on Alfred Hill’s “Testimonial Privilege and Fair Trial”, 14 U.M.J.L.Ref. 371 (1981).
- [84] Westen, The Future of Confrontation, 77 Mich.L.Rev. 1185 (1979). [Confrontation]
- [85] Westen, Order of Proof: An Accused’s Right to Control The Timing and Sequence of Evidence in His Defense, 66 Calif.L.Rev. 935 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [86] Westen, Away From Waiver: A Rationale For The Forfeiture of Constitutional Rights in Criminal Procedure, 75 Mich.L.Rev. 1214 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [87] Westen, Compulsory Process II, 74 Mich.L.Rev. 191 (1975). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [88] Westen, The Compulsory Process Clause, 73 Mich.L.Rev. 71 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 402]
- [89] Wetlauer, Justifying Secrecy: An Objection to The General Deliberative Privilege, 65 Ind.L.J. 845 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 509]]
- [90] Wetzel & Ward, The Changes in Patent Litigation and The New Federal Rules of Evidence, 57 J.Pat.Off.Soc’y 519 (1973). [History]
- [91] Weyrauch, Law as Mask—-Legal Ritual and Relevance, 66 Calif.L.Rev. 699 (1978). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [92] Wharam, Crown Privilege in Criminal Cases: I The Background, 1971 *Crim.L.Rev.* 675. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [93] Wheaton, What is Hearsay?, 46 *Iowa L.Rev.* 210 (1961). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [94] Whicher, The *Erie* Doctrine and The Seventh Amendment: A Suggested Resolution of Their Conflict, 37 *Texas L.Rev.* 549 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 102]
- [95] Whipple, The Legal Principle of Concealing The Truth, 10 *Mass.L.Q.* 30 (1925). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [96] Wines & Lamberth, Revisiting “An Important Consequence of HIPPA: No More Ex Parte Communications Between Defense Attorneys and Plaintiffs’ Treating Physicians” — -An Examination of Alabama’s Experience With HIPPA’s Privacy Regulation, 40 *Am.J.Tr.Advoc.* 323 (2016). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [97] Whinnery, Uniform Rules of Evidence: Presumptions and Their Effect, 54 *Okla.L.Rev.* 553 (2001). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [98] White, Rescuing the Confrontation Clause, 54 *S.C.L.Rev.* 537 (2003). [Confrontation]
- [99] White, *Radiant Burners* Still Radiating: Attorney-Client Privilege for The Corporation, 23 *So.Tex.L.J.* 293 (1982) [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [100] White, He Said, She Said, and Issues of Life and Death: The Right to Confrontation at Capital Sentencing Hearings, 19 *Regent U.L.Rev.* 387 (2006-2007). [Confrontation]
- [101] White, Evidentiary Privileges and The Defendant’s Constitutional Right to Introduce Evidence, 80 *J.Crim.L.& Crim.* 377 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [102] White, Presumptions in Violent Death Cases or Quo Vadis Presumption?, 15 *U.Miami L.Rev.* 1 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [103] Whitford, The Physician, The Law, and The Drug Abuser, 119 *U.Pa.L.Rev.* 933 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [104] Whitmore, Crown Privilege in Criminal Cases: 2. *The Lewes Justice* Case, 1971 *Crim.L.Rev.* 682. [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [105] Whitney, Technical and Scientific Evidence in Administrative Adjudication, 45 *U.Cini.L.Rev.* 37 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

- [106] Whittaker, The Priest-Penitent Privilege: Its Constitutionality and Doctrine, 13 Regent U.L.Rev. 145 (2000). [F.R.Ev. 506]
- [107] Wicker, The Polygraph Truth Test and The Law of Evidence, 22 Tenn.L.Rev. 711 (1953). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [108] Wield, The Presumption of Dangerousness: How New York's SAFE Act Reflects Our Irrational Fear of Mental Illness, 38 Seton H.Legis.J. 35 (2013). [F.R.Ev. 301]
- [109] Wiggins & McKenna, Researchers' Reactions to Compelled Disclosure of Scientific Evidence, 59 L&Contemp.Prob. 67 (1993). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [110] Wigmore, The History of The Hearsay Rule, 17 Harv.L.Rev. 437 (1904). [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [111] Wigmore, Contracts to Alter or Waive The Rules of Evidence, 16 Ill.L.Rev.87 (1921). [F.R.Ev. 103]
- [112] Williams, Abolishing The Excited Utterance Exception to The Rule Against Hearsay, 63 U.Kan.L.Rev. 717 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 803(3)]
- [113] Williams, The Problem of Similar Fact Evidence, 5 Dalhousie L.J. 281 (1979). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [114] Williams, Admissibility of Polygraph Results Under The Military Rules of Evidence, June 1980 Army Lawyer 1. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [115] Williams, The Defense of Entrapment and Related Problems in Criminal Prosecution, 28 Ford.L.Rev. 399 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 404]
- [116] Williams, The Mathematics of Proof, 1979 Crim.L.Rev. 297. [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [117] Williams, DNA Fingerprinting: A Revolutionary Technique in Forensic Science and Its Probable Effects on Criminal Evidentiary Law, 37 Drake L.Rev. 1 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [118] Williams, The Proposals for Hearsay Evidence, 1973 Crim.L.Rev. 76. [F.R.Ev. 801]
- [119] Williamson, The Prior Recorded Testimony Exception to The Hearsay Rule in Criminal Cases in State and Federal Courts, 6 Crim.L.Bull. 179 (1970). [F.R.Ev. 804(b)(1)]
- [120] Wilson, The Attorney-Client Privilege in The Corporate Context: Analysis and Comparison, 9 Canada-U.S.L.J. 59 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 503]

Faculty Articles

- [121] Wilson, Shifting Burdens in Criminal Law: A Burden on Due Process, 8 *Hast.Con.L.Q.* 731 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [122] Wilson, *Martin Marietta* and The Erosion of The Attorney-Client Privilege and Work product Protection, 99 *Md.L.Rev.* 917 (1990). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [123] Wilson, Evidence of Liability Insurance in Texas, 2 *Baylor L.Rev.* 25 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 411]
- [124] Windridge, Assessing Circumstantial Evidence and Inference at ICTR, 26 *Crim.L.Forum* 403 (2015). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [125] Winick, The Psychotherapist Privilege: A Therapeutic Jurisprudence View, 50 *U.Mia.L.Rev.* 240 (1996). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [126] Winslade & Ross, Privacy, Confidentiality, and Autonomy in Psychotherapy, 64 *Neb.L.Rev.* 578 (1985). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [127] Winslade, Confidentiality of Medical Records: An Overview of Concepts and Legal Policies, 3 *J.Leg.Med.* 417 (1982). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [128] Withrow, How To Preserve The Privilege, 15 *Prac.Law.* 30 (1969). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [129] Wolfram, Client Perjury, 50 *So.Calif.L.Rev.* 809 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [130] Wolkinson, Demands of Congressional Committees for Executive Papers, 10 *Fed.B.J.* 103 (1949). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [131] Wood, Applying M.R.E. 412: Should It Be Used at Article 32 Hearings?, 1982 *Army Law.* 13. [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [132] Woodruff, Privilege Under The Military Rules of Evidence, 92 *Mil.L.Rev.* 5 (1981). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [133] Woolhandler, Rethinking The Judicial Reception of Legislative Facts, 41 *Vand.L.Rev.* 111(1988). [F.R.Ev. 201]
- [134] Wormser, Piercing The Veil of Corporate Entity, 12 *Colum.L.Rev.* 416 (1912). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [135] Wriggins, Rape, Racism, and The Law, 6 *Harv.Wom.L.J.* 103 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- [136] Wright, Causation, Responsibility, Risk, Probability, Naked Statistics, and Proof: Pruning the Bramble Bush by Clarifying the Concepts, 73 *Iowa L.Rev.* 1001 (1988). [F.R.Ev. 401]

Faculty Articles

[137] Wright, The Doubtful Omniscience of Appellate Courts, 41 Minn.L.Rev. 751 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[138] Wright, Procedural Reform: Its Limitations and Its. Future, 1 Ga.L.Rev. 563 (1967). [History]

[139] Wright, The Invasion of The Jury: Temperature of The War, 27 Temp.L.Q. 137 (1953). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[140] Wright, The Invasion of The Jury: Instructions to The Jury: Summary Without Comment, 1954 Wash.U.L.Q. 177. [F.R.Ev. 105]

[141] Wright, The Invasion of The Jury: Adequacy of Instructions to The Jury, 53 Mich.L.Rev. 505 (1955). [F.R.Ev. 103]

[142] Wright, The Law of Evidence: Present and Future, 20 Can.B.Rev. 704 (1942). [F.R.Ev. 102]

[143] Wright, Uniform Rules and Hearsay, 22 U.Cinci.L.Rev. 572 (1957). [F.R.Ev. 801]

[144] Wright, A Primer of Practical Evidence, 40 Minn.L.Rev. 625 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 102]

Y & Z

[1] Yankwich, The Immunity of Congressional Speech—Its Origen, Meaning, and Scope, 99 U.Pa.L.Rev. 960 (1951). [F.R.Ev. 509]

[2] Yarbrough, Press Privilege Claims and Balancing Doctrine, 31 Ala.L.Rev. 523 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 501]

[3] Yasser, Strangulating Hearsay: The Residual Exceptions to The Hearsay Rule, 11 Tex.Tech.L.Rev. 587 (1980). [F.R.Ev. 807]

[4] Yellin, The History and Current Status of The Clergy-Penitent Privilege, 23 Santa Clara L.Rev. 95 (1983). [F.R.Ev. 506]

[5] Yetter, Wrestling With *Crawford v. Washington* and The New Constitutional Law of Confrontation, Fla.B.J. (October 2004). [Confrontation]

[6] York, Unjudicial Notes on Judicial Notice, 13 Rocky Mt.L.Rev. 374 (1941). [F.R.Ev. 201]

[7] Young & McDonald, The Aftermath of *Coy v. Iowa*: Are South Dakota's Child Witness Statutes in Jeopardy?, 34 So.Dak.L.Rev. 627 (1989). [Confrontation]

Faculty Articles

- [8] Youm, International and Comparative Law on Journalist's Privilege: The *Randal* Case as A Lesson for The American Press, 1 J.Int'l Media & Ent.L. 1 (2006). [F.R.Ev. 501]
- [9] Younger, Hearsay and Confrontation, or, What Every Criminal Defense Lawyer Should Have in Mind When He Objects to The Prosecutor's Offer of Hearsay, 11 Nat.J.Crim.Def. 65 (1976). [Confrontation]
- [10] Younger, Three Essays on Character and Credibility Under The Federal Rules of Evidence, 5 Hofstra L.Rev. 7 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 608]
- [11] Younger, Congressional Investigations and Executive Secrecy: A Study in Separation of Powers, 20 U.Pitt.L.Rev. 755 (1959). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [12] Younger, Confrontation and Hearsay: A Look Backward, A Peek Forward, 1 Hofstra L.Rev. 32 (1973). [Confrontation]
- [13] Younger, On Technology and The Law of Evidence, 39 Colo.L.Rev.1 (1977). [F.R.Ev. 702]
- [14] Younger, The Requirement of Corroboration in Prosecutions for Sex Offenders in New York, 40 Ford.L.Rev. 263 (1971). [F.R.Ev. 303]
- [15] Yung, Rape Law Gatekeeping, 58 B.C.L.Rev. 205 (2017). [F.R.Ev. 412]
- Z**
- [1] Zakarias, Rethinking Confidentiality, 74 Iowa L.Rev. 351 (1989). [F.R.Ev. 503]
- [2] Zagel, The State Secrets Privilege, 50 Minn.L.Rev. 875 (1966). [F.R.Ev. 509]
- [3] Zambrano, Annual Survey of Texas Law: Civil Evidence, 64 S.M.U.L.Rev. 113 (2011). [History]
- [4] Zambrano, Annual Survey of Texas Law: Civil Evidence, 63 S.M.U.L.Rev. 369 (2010). [History]
- [5] Zamir, Ritov & Harlev, New Evidence About Circumstantial Evidence, 41 Law & Pscyo.Rev. 107 (2016-2017). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [6] Zeffertt, Confidentiality and The Courts, 91 So.Afra.L.J. 432 (1974). [F.R.Ev. 504]
- [7] Zeidman, Who Needs An Evidence Code?: The New York Court of Appeals Radical Re-Evaluation of Hearsay, 21 Cardozo L.Rev. 211 (1999). [F.R.Ev. 801]

Faculty Articles

- [8]** Zeisel, The New York Expert Testimony Project: Some Reflections on Legal Experiments, 9 *Stan.L.Rev.* 530 (1956). [F.R.Ev. 706]
- [9]** Zeisel, The Uniqueness of Survey Evidence, 45 *Corn.L.Q.* 322 (1960). [F.R.Ev. 401]
- [10]** Zimmerman, Rudderless: 15 Years and Still Little Direction on the Boundaries of Military Rule of Evidence 513, 223 *Mil.L.Rev.* 312 (2015). [History]
- [11]** Zucker, The Right to Confront Adverse Witnesses at Post-Conviction Release Revocation Hearings, 39 *N.Eng.J.Crim.&Civ.Conf.* 87 (2008). [Confrontation]
- [12]** Zuckerman, Similar Fact Evidence—The Unobservable Rule 103 L.Q.Rev. 187 (1987). [F.R.Ev. 404(b)]
- [13]** Zweeling, Federal Grand Juries v. Attorney Independence and The Attorney-Client Privilege, 27 *Hast.L.J.* 1263 (1976). [F.R.Ev. 503]