

FROM THE EDITOR

Over the past year or so, the National Labor Relations Board and the circuit courts have addressed a long standing controversy in the area of individual employment rights. The controversy concerns whether a worker, in a non-union environment, has a right to insist on the presence of a co-worker of his or her choice at an investigatory interview that has the potential for discipline. Morgan, Owens, and Gomes lead into the topic, discussing the issues and the law, while writing their article largely from a managerial perspective. Strickler, an NLRB attorney who handled one of the key cases that shaped the law, tells the story of that case, and thus deals with the topic from the perspective of the employee and of the attorney prosecuting the case. I close with a brief guide to further discussion and a digest of a recent decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia that provides the reader with the current state of the law.

We stay in the labor relations arena with the next entry, a study of the unionization of physicians presented by Staudohar and Dworkin. These authors discuss the historical and legal background, the current status of the unionization of doctors, and they provide projections for the future. Our attention then shifts to religious discrimination in employment in the study presented by Findley, Ingram, and Amsler. This form of discrimination in employment is not studied nearly as much as some of the other forms (e.g., race and sex). These authors have reviewed the law that surrounds the issue and have come up with a set of principles or guidelines to assist organizations confronted with problems in this area. Galle and Koen then examine the issues that surround employment contracts, additionally providing the reader with the results of their empirical study of the extent and usage of employment contracts, their coverage, and the topics such contract cover.

The issue closes with our second dialogue on a contemporary issue. In the previous issue we presented a digest of a contemporary court case on sexual harassment, posing questions about that case, and inviting reader response. We do the same this time with a digest of an article by Stephen Hayford printed in the *Baylor Law Review*. In that article, Hayford called for 1) the unification of the law of labor and employment arbitration; and 2) less judicial intrusion. We hope that this entry stimulates reader response.

Charles J. Coleman