ARIZONA JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 2 SPRING 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This article provides a history of the post-treaty development of Navajo marriage. It traces the development of Navajo marriage law particularly as it affected tribal customary marriages. The Navajo Supreme Court fused elements of Anglo-American traditions and tribal traditions to recognize customary marriages. It places the development of marriage law in the context of the development of tribal courts as well as state and federal recognition of tribal marriages. The article concludes that states and federal governments must continue to allow tribal domestic relations law to evolve by continuing to defer to tribal jurisdiction over domestic relations matters.

The purpose of this article is to examine the recent developments concerning same-gender parent adoptions in the United States and the Netherlands, and to compare the different routes these changes have taken. The first section of the article examines the present status of the case law in both countries. It begins with an analysis of the court decisions in the United States, in which case law now makes it legal in numerous states for gays and lesbians to adopt, wither as "co-parents" or as "strangers." The section also includes an analysis of the recent Dutch case before the highest court in the Netherlands, the Hoge Raad, which involves a request for a co-parent adoption by two women who were raising their children together as a family. The next section sets out the current status of Dutch law as it affects gay and lesbian co-parents, and includes present adoption laws, joint parental authority, and registered partnerships. The fourth section examines proposed legislation in the two countries concerning the right of same-gender couples, and homosexual individuals in general, to adopt. The final section is a comparison and analysis of the Dutch and U.S. legal histories concerning same-gender co-parent adoptions. It examines the differences in the two countries' legal systems, the social status of homosexuals, the social acceptance of adoption, and each country's underlying assumptions about family law. The article concludes by pointing out that recognition of same-gender co-parent adoption is in the best interest of the children raised by same-gender couples.

In particular, this Note provides a brief explanation of the history of Canadian and U.S. equal rights jurisprudence. It explores the more important cases dealing with Canadian and U.S. equal protection jurisprudence as applied to sexual minorities, and it also illustrates that the concept of homosexuality as an immutable characteristic has been accepted by Canadian courts while the same concept has been repeatedly rejected by U.S. courts. It then explains why sexual minorities may not want to be labeled immutable by U.S. courts, and, therefore, why Canadian jurisprudence may not be helpful to the advancement of the equal rights of sexual minorities in U.S. courts. Finally, the Note offers some alternatives to the concept of immutability that might be pursued in U.S. courts to advance the civil rights of sexual minorities in the United States.

CASINOS OF THE NEXT MILLENNIUM: A LOOK INTO THE PROPOSED BAN ON INTERNET GAMBLING

Jenna F. Karadbil 413

This Note examines the legality and wisdom of the proposed ban on Internet gambling. In particular, it explores the applicable federal, state, and international laws across and beyond U.S. borders. It explains why the United States cannot enforce the ban from a technological standpoint and suggests alternative solutions to a complete ban on Internet gambling.

The World Wide Web makes visiting an Internet gambling site possible by providing a graphical interface for users to access. Currently, the Internet brings the games to the gamblers. An Internet user can place a wager simply by using a computer and a modem. One can stroll through an Internet casino at their own convenience, sit at a blackjack table, and play with four anonymous individuals. One can then play the slow machines or the roulette wheel, place a sports wager, or buy lottery tickets. However, since 1998, participating in this form of gambling is illegal for anyone in the United States. Thus, Internet casino owners now face fines of up to twenty thousand dollars, four years in prison, or both.

On July 23, 1998, the Senate approved the first legislation banning most forms of Internet gambling. Although this first measure failed to reach the House, it was again revived and passed by the Senate in 1999. The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act prohibits the use of wire communications for accepting interstate or foreign wagers. Its main focus is on the gambling "business," however, there are exceptions in which horse racing and lotteries are available online. However, most Internet casinos are located outside the United States and are thus assured of anonymity, tax-free profits, and no regulatory oversight. For $100,000 per year,

an Internet casino can obtain a license to operate outside of the United States, thereby escaping the U.S. ban.

PROPERTY RIGHTS IN HUMAN BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS: STUDIES IN SPECIES REPRODUCTION AND BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Amy S. Pignatella Cain 449

Currently, laws in the United States and abroad have been slow in recognizing property rights in human biological materials like sperm, embryos, and cells. The inability of law to keep up with technological advances leads to fear throughout the world concerning the ownership of human biological materials. This Note argues that if human biological materials were considered "property" in the traditional sense, then human beings may not be as fearful of future technological advances pertaining to the human body because they would have ownership rights in their own biological materials. This Note explores the relevant laws and cases concerning property rights in human biological materials. It discusses how courts in the United States and abroad view ownership interests in human reproductive materials and human organs and cells. Furthermore, it discusses how recognition of property rights in human biological materials may ease the fear that human beings feel in confronting new technologies such as human cloning. This Note asserts that recognition of property rights in the human body is necessary to encourage organ donation, to assure greater personal autonomy, to diminish the international market in human body parts, and to diminish fears of the commodification of the human body. Finally, it discusses the procedural implications of recognizing property rights in human biological materials. In particular, this Note argues that recognizing property rights in human biological materials may provide courts with a uniform way to analyze cases concerning disputes over human biological materials. Adopting a property-based approach for dealing with disputes over human biological materials may result in greater predictability and flexibility, enabling people to encourage the advancement of technology without the current fears surrounding the ownership of human biological materials.

ARIZONA JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW