

Washington University Law Review

Volume 64

Issue 2 *Corporate and Securities Law Symposium*

January 1986

Table of Contents

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview

Recommended Citation

Table of Contents, 64 WASH. U. L. Q. (1986).

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol64/iss2/1

This Table of Contents is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

Washington University Law Quarterly

VOLUME 64

NUMBER 2

SUMMER 1986

© 1986 by Washington University

CONTENTS

ARTICLE

- ESTATE PLANNING AND THE REALITY OF
PERPETUITIES PROBLEMS TODAY:
RELIANCE UPON STATUTORY
REFORM AND SAVING
CLAUSES IS NOT ENOUGH *David M. Becker* 287

CORPORATE AND SECURITIES LAW SYMPOSIUM

- INTRODUCTION *F. Hodge O'Neal* 423

- CIVIL LIABILITY UNDER THE
FEDERAL PROXY RULES *William H. Painter* 425

- INSIDER TRADING REGULATION AND THE
PRODUCTION OF INFORMATION:
THEORY AND EVIDENCE.....*James D. Cox* 475

- REPRESENTING MINORITY SHAREHOLDERS
IN CLOSE CORPORATIONS UNDER
MODERN BUSINESS
CORPORATION ACTS*Joseph Edward Olson* 507

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CORPORATE AND SECURITIES LAW

- CULPABILITY IN IMPLIED PRIVATE ACTIONS UNDER
§ 17(a): IS SCIENTER REQUIRED AFTER
AARON V. SEC? 561

MODIFICATIONS OF RULES 13e-4 AND 14d-8: A LIMITED EQUAL FOOTING OPPORTUNITY	567
<i>LOWE v. SEC</i> : GUARANTEEING THE RIGHT TO PUBLISH INVESTMENT NEWSLETTERS THROUGH STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION	577
DUE DILIGENCE: A POST-SALE OF BUSINESS DOCTRINE METHOD OF AVOIDING RULE 10b-5 LIABILITY	589

NOTES

CLASS-BASED DENIALS OF HOSPITAL STAFF PRIVILEGES AND THE LEARNED PROFESSIONS EXEMPTION	597
RULE 10b-16 AND THE REGULATION OF MARGIN ACCOUNTS	609
TITLE VII IN ACADEMIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE JUDICIAL POLICY OF DEFERENCE.....	619

COMMENTS

<i>Roa v. Lodi Medical Group, Inc.</i> , 37 Cal. 3d 920, 695 P.2d 164, 211 Cal. Rptr. 77 (1985)	635
<i>Fein v. Permanente Group</i> , 38 Cal. 3d 137, 695 P.2d 665, 211 Cal. Rptr. 368, <i>dismissed for want of a substantial federal question</i> , 106 S. Ct. 214 (1985).....	645
<i>Smith v. Van Gorkom</i> , 488 A.2d 858 (Del. 1985).....	655