

2020

Introduction to Issue 3

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lawcommons.luc.edu/lucj>

Recommended Citation

Introduction to Issue 3, 51 Loy. U. Chi. L. J. ii ().

Available at: <https://lawcommons.luc.edu/lucj/vol51/iss3/2>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by LAW eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loyola University Chicago Law Journal by an authorized editor of LAW eCommons. For more information, please contact law-library@luc.edu.

INTRODUCTION TO ISSUE THREE

We are thrilled to present a wide-ranging collection of articles for Issue Three of Volume 51 of the *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*. This issue represents months of hard work and it is our first issue published during the COVID-19 outbreak, the greatest health crisis of our lifetimes.

This issue commences with Peter Carstensen’s discussion of the inconsistent caselaw surrounding self-regulation and cartel-like behavior exhibited by professional organizations. Carstensen proposes a new analysis for courts to evaluate these behaviors—the Carstensen-Roth framework—and contrasts it to the varying approaches employed in three major dental cases. Steph Tai’s article examines the influx of state laws that limit the use of the word “meat” to livestock-based products. Using comparable labeling discussions and the historical meaning of meat as a basis, Tai concludes that new labeling laws seek to shape eating habits under the guise of protecting consumers and hopes to aid sustainability advocates in their efforts to shape eater perceptions of meat substitutes.

Next, Nofar Yakovi Gan-Or analyzes the impact of at-home genetic testing technology in the context of anonymous gamete donations. She considers how the age of at-home genetic testing alters agreements between the anonymous donor, the recipient, and the reproductive service provider. Ultimately, Gan-Or recommends that reproductive service providers update their contracts to deal with at-home genetic testing and urges providers to reexamine their commitment to donor anonymity. Finally, David Min asserts that a bank’s fiduciary duty to prioritize shareholder wealth incentivizes risk taking, which is inconsistent with its obligations to maintain the safety and soundness of the banking system. He argues that federalizing bank governance will reconcile these incongruous motivations.

The *Law Journal* would like to thank our authors for contributing their insightful works to our publication. We are grateful to our incredible staff members, whose work is essential to our success. Finally, I am beyond impressed by the dedication of all our *Law Journal* members, who continue their excellent work despite the difficulties of social distancing, school closures, and the challenges of life under quarantine.

Alexandra R. Benigni
Executive Editor, Lead Articles
Loyola University Chicago Law Journal