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Dear Readers:

The Richmond Journal of Law and Technology is proud to present the first issue of the 2010–2011 academic year. This issue addresses topics ranging across the legal and technological spectrums, and tackles subject matter at the forefront and future of legal debate.

In our first article, “Near Impossible to Enforce at Best, Unconstitutional at Worst: The Consequences of Maryland’s Text Messaging Ban on Drivers,” Alan Lazerow examines Maryland’s law prohibiting texting while driving. Lazerow argues that the statute is inherently vague, and notes that this flaw risks future enforcement problems and the chilling of otherwise permissible behavior. To avoid these potential problems, Lazerow advocates for the enactment of legislation that will cure the defects in the current law.

Mark Flores, in his article “Blast off? – Strict Liability’s Potential Role in the Development of the Commercial Space Market,” evaluates liability as it relates commercial space travel. Flores discusses the steady evolution of the space flight industry and the difficulties before the federal government as it tries to balance the need for regulation with the need to support a growing market. Flores argues that to adequately treat these issues, the federal government should adopt a strict liability regime that will encourage the development of a new market and ensure passenger safety.

The challenge of adapting laws in the face of new markets also applies to industries beyond transportation. As Robert Rigg discusses in “The Not-So-Risky Business of High-End Escorts and the Internet in the 21st Century,” the current state of prostitution law is inadequate to regulate Internet solicitation of high-end escorts. In his article, Rigg describes the evolution of the Internet as a tool to fuel the practice of prostitution and addresses the difficulties – particularly First Amendment implications – associated with enacting legislation designed to limit such use of the Internet.
In our final article, “Bending Broken Rules: The Fourth Amendment Implications of Full-Body Scanners in Preflight Screening,” Madison Taylor examines the law as it relates to a technological innovation at the forefront of national debate. Taylor evaluates the use of full-body scans at airports against the Fourth Amendment’s search and seizure protections. He argues that the proposal to implement such scans as a form of primary screening is unreasonable, and suggests the appropriate standard under which full-body scans are justified.

On behalf of the entire 2010-2011 Journal staff, I extend our deepest gratitude and sincerest thanks for your continued readership and support. The Journal also appreciates the continuing support and assistance of the faculty and staff at the University of Richmond School of Law, most especially the guidance we receive from our faculty advisors, Professors Melanie Holloway and Christopher Cotropia.

We are confident you will enjoy our first issue. As always, your comments and suggestions are welcome at jolt@richmond.edu.

Best regards,

Francis C. Oroszlan
Editor-in-Chief
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