LAW-WISE

KANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION

NOVEMBER 2010

Greetings from the Kansas Supreme Court and the Kansas Bar Association (KBA). Welcome to this edition of *Law Wise* and the third edition of the 2010-2011 school year.

IN THIS ISSUE

Calendar of Events

Jan. 29, 2011	Kansas Day – Sesquicentennial
March 12, 2011	Regional Mock Trial (Olathe and Wichita)
April 2, 2011	State Mock Trial (Olathe)
May 4-8, 2011	National Mock Trial Competition (Phoenix, Ariz.)

Welcome

Stare Decisis, from the Latin, "to stand by things decided." The Black's Law Dictionary definition is "[t]he doctrine of precedent, under which it is necessary for a court to follow earlier judicial decisions when the same points arose in litigation." This issue of Law Wise explores the idea of *stare decisis* through an article from the SCOTUS blog describing the Supreme Court's decision to take up the issue of free speech as it applies to violent video games and minors. The issue, stated simply, is whether the protections of the First Amendment apply to video games when those games are sold to minors. To assist in student understanding of the doctrine of precedent, we have included a Street Law lesson plan on precedence and in our Terrific Technology section, you will find links to other First Amendment lesson plans. This issue also includes information about the Law Related Education Clearinghouse located on the campus of Emporia State University. Finally, we are once again fortunate to include an article from Dr. Bob Beatty, Political Science Professor at Washburn University, analyzing the recent elections. In January, we are putting out a special edition of Law Wise in honor of the sesquicentennial. Watch for it in your inbox! ■

Republican Voter Enthusiasm Had Huge Impact from Top to Bottom in Kansas

By Dr. Bob Beatty, Professor of Political Science, Washburn University

It was a big day for the Republican Party on Nov. 2, both nationally and in Kansas. Nationally, the GOP picked up sixty seats in the House and now holds the majority. In the Senate, they weren't as successful, with the Democrats now holding a 53-47 majority despite a six seat Republican pickup. In Kansas, the overall scope of the GOP victory was arguably even more impressive. Republicans won every statewide office on the ballot and all four congressional districts. The biggest surprise was at the local level, where the GOP picked up sixteen new Kansas House seats. The average margin of victory in the five competitive statewide races (U.S. Senate, Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and Treasurer) was twenty-six points; the average margin of victory in the four congressional races was thirty-two points. The new 92-33 GOP advantage in the Kansas House, coupled with the 31-9 advantage the Kansas GOP enjoys in the State Senate, puts Republicans in their strongest position since the early 1950's. How did this happen in light of the 2006 election where Democratic Governor Kathleen Sebelius and Democratic Attorney General candidate Paul Morrison both won by nearly twenty-point margins?

(Continued on Page 2)

Republican Voter Enthusiasm Had Huge ...

(Continued from Page 1)

Oddly enough, it was that success that helped pave the way for the 2010 rout, along with impressive GOP voter turnout and the disappearance of the unaffiliated voter.

Among many factors nationally - including a terrible economy – two forces were at work in Kansas to bring about the Republican sweep. The first is that Republican voters blamed the "party in power" for not only the woes of the country but for overreaching in trying to solve them. The White House under Barack Obama, the House under Nancy Pelosi, and the Senate under Harry Reid were all to blame for taking the country in the wrong direction. At the state level, the "party in power" was seen as the Democrats as well since they held four out of the five Kansas statewide offices, including the governorship. In a state where nearly one in two voters are registered Republicans, this was a universe out of whack. Hence, many Kansans became "Europeans for a day," voting for the party rather than the individual, which is a feature of several electoral systems in western European countries (although they are usually accompanied by proportional representation seat allocation). In other words, it looks as if most Republicans engaged in straight-ticket voting. This was a tactic actively promoted by the Kansas GOP in their campaign events, encouraging voters to conduct a "clean sweep" of all statewide offices.

Kansas Governor Sam Brownback

The second factor was that this straight-ticket voting tactic was devastatingly effective because Republicans also voted – in proportion to the Democrats and Unaffiliateds as a percentage of total voters - in what appear to be record numbers. To wit: Party registration in Kansas roughly runs 44% GOP, 28% Unaffiliated, and 27% Democrat. In the three elections from 2004 to 2008, GOP voters as a percentage of all voters held steady at about 50%, Unaffiliated voters have wavered from a high of 25% in 2008 to a low of 17% in 2006, and Democrats usually come out in direct proportion to their registration numbers, except in 2006 when the number was 31%. 2010? My analysis of who turned out to vote yielded an approximation of the Kansas electorate being made up of 57% GOP, 26% Democratic, and 16% Unaffiliated. In short: Many Unaffiliated voters in Kansas sat this election out and Republican voters were more than happy to take their place. Meanwhile Democrats voted in roughly the same numbers they always do. All of this added up to predictably big GOP wins at the statewide level, but also looks to have triggered the surprising and even shocking Democratic losses at the more local level, in the races for Kansas House. ■

Practice with Precedents

Source: www.constitutioncenter.org

Written in 1787, Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution provides that "the judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and lays the foundation for the Supreme Court of the United States, which was subsequently organized on February 2, 1790.

The judicial Power referred to in Article III, Section 1 "extend[s] to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under [the] Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;—to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;—to all Cases of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction;—to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party;—to Controversies between two or more States;—between a State and Citizens of another State;—between Citizens of different States;—between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and foreign States, Citizens or Subjects."

The Supreme Court of the United States is therefore the highest judicial body in the United States. It currently consists of the Chief Justice of the United States and eight Associate Justices, who are nominated by the President and confirmed with the "advice and consent" (majority vote) of the Senate, though the number of justices can vary.

The Supreme Court reviews cases and interprets the constitutional aspects of them. Its rulings set precedents which establish principles or rules that are binding, to which all lower courts must adhere when reviewing similar cases. Similarly, the Supreme Court has the power to overturn previous rulings and set new precedents.

Practice with Precedents is a lesson designed to familiarize students with the methods by which the Supreme Court of the United States reviews cases brought before it. The lesson begins with a warm up activity that will introduce students to the concept of precedents. Students will then participate in an activity in which they will review hypothetical court cases, discuss their constitutional connections and how the Court might rule based on the precedent. ■

Find the rest of the lesson at http://constitutioncenter.org/Files/practicewprecedents.pdf

Argument preview: Kids and video games

Lyle Denniston, Supreme Court of the United States Blog Source: www.scotusblog.com/?p=107224

The U.S. Supreme Court returns on Tuesday to the question of whether to create a new exception to the First Amendment — this time, to give state legislatures and Congress more authority to regulate the kinds of video games that can be sold or rented for playing by those under age 18. A clash of perceptions about video games dominates the briefs.

Case Pages

• *Schwarzenegger v. Entm't Merchants*

Like much else in the Digital Age, video games have changed enormously over the past three decades — from simple batting of a virtual tennis ball across a virtual net to highly sophisticated narratives and images that can be creatively manipulated for different outcomes. Now, for the first time, the U.S. Supreme Court is poised to clarify just what forms of expression in that medium are entitled to protection as free speech under the First Amendment, and how far such protection might extend.

Next Tuesday, at 10 a.m., the Court will hold a one-hour oral argument in the case of *Schwarzenegger, et al., v. Entertainment Merchants Association, et al.* (08-1448) — a test of the constitutionality of a five-year-old California state law that bans the sale or rental of violent video games to minors — that is, those younger than 18. Such laws have been tested repeatedly in federal courts over the past decade, and the result is absolutely clear: every time, each law has been struck down by a lower court. (Arguing for the state of California Tuesday will be a deputy state attorney general, Zackery P. Morazzini, and for the video game and software industries will be Paul M. Smith of Jenner & Block in Washington.)

Background

A starting point for the Court in examining the California law will be two legal truisms: first, children are different, and legislatures can — and sometimes must — take that into account in passing laws; and, second, expression in electronic formats is a form of speech for constitutional purposes. But, as the Court already knows, there is now what qualifies as a "culture war" over those truisms, when children have access to video game imagery that is — in one way or another – violent.

On the one side, the Court is being asked to pay close attention to a series of studies that, their proponents argue, show that exposure to violent video games can cause children — over time — to be more aggressive themselves; the violent idea, it is said, can become the source of violent behavior. On the other side, the Court is being asked to hold fast — as lower courts have — against social and political pressure to set government up as a video-game nanny; that, it is said, is parents' job.

Here and there across the country, lawmakers have chosen up sides between those two arguments. Beginning with an ordinance enacted by the city of Indianapolis in July 2000, laws to restrict minors' access to video games deemed to be violent have been passed in six states in addition to California, and also in St. Louis County, Mo., California's law was adopted in 2005, and was due to go into effect at the beginning of 2006, but has never done so because of the challenge to it — so far, successful — by the video game and entertainment software industries.

The Supreme Court passed up its first opportunity to rule on this kind of law. Indianapolis' pioneering ordinance — aimed at video arcades and barring minors from those places unless parents were with them — was struck down by the Seventh Circuit Court within a year after passage, and the Supreme Court refused to review an appeal in October 2001 (*Kendrick v. American Amusement Machine Co.*, 01-239).

Now, the Court has stepped in, and will be reviewing the California statute that targets video games that give the player the option of "killing, maiming, dismembering, or sexually assaulting an image of a human being." A game is covered by the law only if the acts it describes are shown in a way that a "reasonable person" would find appealing to "a deviant or morbid interest of minors," if the content would violate community standards on what minors should see, if the content lacks serious value, and if the player can inflict injury through "torture or serious physical abuse" of a human-like figure.

Minors under 18 may not buy or rent such games; the law does not say whether a minor accompanied by a parent could do so legally. Sales or rentals that violate the law can result in a fine of up to $1,000. Stores or on-line sources selling or renting games covered by the law must label them as violent video games, and restrict their sale or rental to customers who are 18 or older.

In defending the law against challenges by video gamemakers and software design groups, the state relied on a videotape of brief segments from, among others, a highly popular game, "Grand Theft Auto," delicately described by the Ninth Circuit Court as demonstrating "the myriad ways in which characters can kill or injure victims or adversaries." Somewhat skeptically, the Circuit Court noted that the videotape of that game had been "heavily edited," without showing context or story line. The Ninth Circuit struck it down under the First Amendment, applying "strict scrutiny."

The Circuit Court rejected the social science studies submitted by the state, concluding that they did not show that the games harmed minors and did not represent extensive research. It also found that the state could pursue its interest in shielding minors from inappropriate video content by other means, less threatening to free-speech rights — such as the game industry's own system of ratings for violent content, and the technology now available that lets parents control what games may be played by their children.

Petition for Certiorari

Top state officials in California took the case on to the Supreme Court, filing their petition on May 19 of last year. The petition raised two questions — whether violent video games are protected at all by the First Amendment when sold to minors, and, if they were protected and restrictions had to be judged under a "strict scrutiny" standard, whether the state had to prove a direct link between the game's violence and harm to minors before such games could be banned for young

(Continued on next page

customers.

The first question amounted to a plea for the Court to use a 1968 decision allowing states more leeway to keep obscene materials away from children (*Ginsberg v. New York*) as a basis for putting violent video games outside the protection of the First Amendment, when sold or rented to minors. Rather than use a "strict scrutiny" standard to judge a ban on such games for minors, the state argued, the Court should use the more lenient standard spelled out in *Ginsberg*: that is, a law regulating violent video games for children would be upheld if it was not irrational for the legislature to find that exposure of minors to such material would be harmful to them.

The California law, state officials argued, "reaches only expressive material that this Court should recognize lies outside the circle of constitutional protection." The only reason that lower courts have all ruled against such laws, it contended, was that none felt free to apply the *Ginsberg* standard to video games.

The petition's second question was a contingency request: if the First Amendment does apply, and the standard of review is "strict scrutiny," whether a state can meet that standard on the basis of the legislators' "inference" that harm will come to children after they play violent videos. The Ninth Circuit, the petition asserted, required a "far more stringent standard" — that is, proof that exposure to such games actually caused physical or psychological harm to the young.

The video-game industry group and the entertainment software industry group opposed Supreme Court review, relying on the string of lower court rulings striking down laws that banned violent video games for youths. The Ninth Circuit's decision did not stray from established First Amendment principles, the trade groups contended, and its ruling did not create any conflict with rulings of other courts.

Moreover, the associations contended, the *Ginsberg* flexible standard of review had never been used to judge any kind of law but one involving "sexual speech." Though video games may be a new medium of expression, the opposition brief argued, there was no need for the Court to write new First Amendment principles to apply to it.

On the merits, the associations contended that video games are "a modern form of artistic expression," like movies and TV programs, that tell stories and entertain audiences through a complex array of pictures, sounds, and text. They have much to teach the young, the trade groups said. Moreover, they added, the industry's own self-regulatory system of labeling was adequate to the task of warning about violent content.

The case was ready for the Supreme Court to consider at its first Conference of last Term, but the Justices took no action on it at the time. As it turned out, the Court appeared to be holding the case until it ruled on another case seeking an exception to the First Amendment's protection. That case was *U.S. v. Stevens* (08-769). In that case, the federal government wanted an exception in order to allow a ban on videos of animal cruelty — a plea the Court rejected in April.

Shortly after the *Stevens* decision came down, on April 26 the Court granted review of the violent video games case from California. The Court was not deterred by the fact that there had been uniformity among the lower courts on the constitutional issue. Thus, at least four Justices — the number needed to grant review — seemed at least temporarily persuaded by California's argument that the issue was one of "national importance" because of the rise of what the state called "a new, modern threat to children."

Merits Briefs

The California officials' brief on the merits, filed July 12, puts most of its emphasis on an argument that what really is at stake in the case is reinforcement of parents' control over the moral development of their children. Although continuing to argue, as it did in the petition for certiorari, that violent video games are inherently harmful to minors and thus deserve no First Amendment protection, the states' brief repeatedly invokes the need for regulation of "unsupervised" minors' access to such games — that is, access that parents do not know about and thus cannot control. The new emphasis may be an indication that the proof of harm to minors, in the social science research, was not strong enough to bolster the harm-to-children approach as the primary argument.

"The state," according to the brief, "has a vital interest in reinforcing parents' authority to direct the upbringing of children in order to protect their physical and psychological welfare, as well as their ethical and moral development."

Children, the state argued, have lesser First Amendment rights than adults, because they lack the capacity to make a "reasoned choice" about whether to view expression like that portrayed in violent videos. So, their rights are "best protected when the government reinforces parental authority and involvement in choices" affecting their children's development.

Discussing whether violent video games deserve any First Amendment shield, the state brief contended that — for minors — there is no real difference between "offensively violent" expression and "sexually explicit material." Thus, the state makes its argument for extending the Ginsberg flexible standard for minors' access to expression from obscenity to violence. A strict scrutiny standard for evaluating expression, the state brief asserted, should be reserved for use in evaluating adults' access to "a robust marketplace of ideas" that is not appropriate for children.

When the brief does reach the point of discussing whether violent videos do harm children, it relied upon the need to show only "a correlation," not a direct link, between the exposure and the likely harm. The games industry, the brief noted, concedes that some violent content should not be accessible to minors, because it has a rating system supposedly to insulate them from it. And, relying upon a Federal Trade Commission report to Congress on violent videos, the brief repeated the point that a majority of children ages 13 to 16 still can buy such games from retailers, even with the video game industry's efforts to voluntarily restrict that access.

The Entertainment Merchants Association and the Entertainment Software Association, in their combined merits brief filed September 10, sought to turn the case into a test of whether the Court will protect another "new medium" of expression from efforts at censorship. The brief opened this way: "The California statute at bar is the latest in a long history of overreactions to new expressive media. In the past, comic books, true-crime novels, movies, rock music, and other new media have all been accused of harming our youth. In each case, the perceived threat proved unfounded. Video games are no different."

Broadly defending video games as a new art form, widely popular and thus enjoyed by millions of people, the trade groups' brief contended that the Court should allow restrictions on its distribution only based on hard evidence of actual harm, with the restrictions narrowly tailored to satisfy only the "most compelling" government interest. What California has offered to justify its law, the brief said, is "the same sort of unsupported claims that animated past efforts to regulate new media."

The associations' brief thus was shaped to pull the Court's attention toward not only weaknesses that those groups perceive in the social science data over harm to youths, but the perceived social cost of curtailing access to a new medium of expression at its very inception. The former is, in essence, an argument about evidence, or lack of it, and the second is, in essence, an invitation to the Court to be cautious about stifling innovation in expression. Together, the two thrusts of the brief suggest that, in the real world, there is no problem that California needs to solve with an "ill-defined" statute that threatens a private — and frequently uplifting — diversion that Americans spend $10 billion a year to enjoy.

That brief offered a sturdy defense of the content of video games, and sought to demonstrate that what Americans were buying in such huge volume had positive social value. One of the games that California used to demonstrate how violent some games are — a game called "God of War" — is actually drawn from Greek mythology about redemption of one's own "brutal past," the brief noted. And, rather cleverly, in noting a link between video games and popular books or movies, it cited games based on "The Terminator" movie starring none other than Petitioner Schwarzenegger.

Taking on directly the argument that the *Ginsberg* standard should be extended from obscenity to violent content, when minors were the audience, the associations' brief argued that "violence is not and never has been a taboo subject for children," even though "explicit sexuality" has been off-limits to minors. It would be impossible, the brief contended, to write a law that "adequately demarcates the line between violence that is 'appropriate' for minors and violence that is not."

On the principal theme of the state's brief — the claim that the law at issue bolsters parents' role, the associations' brief argued that there is no reason to believe that parents need any such assistance, especially with the industry's labeling practice available, along with technology to allow parents to monitor what games their children will be allowed to play.

If a case's outcome is ever significantly influenced by the flow of *amici* briefs, and there is reason to think that can be a significant factor, the contest in this case is not an even one at all — at least not numerically. Three briefs of *amic*i support the state (including one from 11 other states), while 28 briefs have been filed to support the video game and software industries — ranging from the Chamber of Commerce to the American Civil Liberties Union, from the Future of Music Coalition to the Comic Book Legal Defense Fund.

Among the briefs on the state's side is one that sought to shore up the social science data argument behind regulating violent video games. The group filing that brief, Common Sense Media, is a nonprofit organization that seeks to protect children from new media. While defending the studies that have been done, however, that brief also suggested in a footnote that if the Court does find that the current state of the science does not support regulation, it should at least leave open the possibility that it will be forthcoming.

The bulk of the arguments of *amici* on the other side focus on the perceived threat to First Amendment principles. The majority of the briefs on that side, in fact, are from organizations and industries that rely heavily upon First Amendment protection in their everyday operations, such as movie studios, news organizations, and music and software producers.

One of the briefs, from the Pennsylvania Center for the First Amendment and the Brechner First Amendment Project, implied that the Court may have taken on more of a societal challenge than it realized when it granted review of the case. By granting the petition, it commented, "the Court now stands primed to wade deeply into the culture war over media violence. This is a surreal, surrogate and substitute war … for addressing the problems of real-world violence, as California and other government entities play the media blame game … It also is a war over censorship." What the Court is being asked to sustain, that brief said dismissively, is "feel-good legislation."

Analysis

The Court may already have signaled that it *does* see a problem with violent video games and their potential impact on children, simply by taking on the California appeal when there was no split in the lower courts on the issue. If that perception exists and if it represents a majority view, the argument between the two sides over whether the scientific data now available proves the point (or does not prove it at all) may have little effect. The Justices may be prepared to move on to the harder question of what to do about it.

At a very basic level of emotion, it may be harder for the Court to resist creating some special protection for children in this case than it was to turn aside pleas for protecting those offended, in the *Stevens* case, by depictions of animal cruelty. The Court thus could be strongly tempted by the argument that, just as children need protection from obscenity, they also need it from gratuitous violence — especially when minors themselves are choosing the level of violence they arrange to happen on their computer screen.

It is difficult to discern a potential compromise or middle-ground position on this issue. Once the Court embraced the thought that children at least might be affected by exposure to violent videos, the *Ginsberg* flexible standard to judge regulation of that exposure would immediately look promising as an answer. As the Stevens decision showed, the highest hurdle is getting the Court to step away from its tradition of allowing only a few very exceptions to First Amendment protection for expression.

On the other hand, the Court has demonstrated that it finds virtue in caution when confronting the social effects of new media. Perhaps there is a member of the Court who actually plays a video game (or knows well someone who does), but the chances are that the Justices are not closely familiar with what is available now in the universe of such games. The briefs on the side of the trade associations make a major effort to acquaint the Justices with the enormous diversity that does exist in that marketplace of ideas. If that effort succeeds, it could well raise cautionary flags about the difficulty in crafting a definition of video violence that would not seriously curtail this mode of expression — not just for children, but for adults as well. ■

Law-Related Education Clearing house ...Where?

This is no longer a mystery! The Kansas Bar Association's Law-Related Clearinghouse is located in the Teachers College Resource Center, room #224 of Visser Hall, here on the campus of Emporia State University. Packed on the shelves are a wide variety of civics resources for Kansas educators. A brief scan of the collection shows that there are booklets, books, games and kits, mock trial simulations, videos, DVDs, and more.

So why is this collection so unknown? For me *that* is a huge mystery! Any time that I can find valuable materials in my content area, ready to use with students, I consider that a resource that I will call upon again and again. I think that this collection may have been overlooked in the search for effective materials for students because of the variety of other resources offered here at the Teachers College Resource Center. I have excellent reason to believe that this non-use will change! The Kansas Bar Association, steered by their Public Services Manager, Meg Wickham, has put their valuable dollars to work for educators! New, timely audio-visual materials have been ordered and will soon invigorate this collection. Now, all you will need to do is be first in line to check out these brilliant new additions to the collection. The new additions will be available in mid December and some are listed in the above Clearinghouse Resources.

The hours at the Center are 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and 9 a.m. through 5 p.a. on Friday. For more information, call (620)341-5292, or e-mail me at jromeise@emporia.edu.

Janice Romeiser
Director Teachers College Resource Center/Instructional Materials Center
Emporia State University

Kansas Sesquicentennial
January 29, 2011

Law Wise is a six-time per school year publication, but 2011 marks a special anniversary for the state of Kansas. We as Kansans will be celebrating 150 of Kansas statehood or also known as the sesquicentennial of Kansas. The KBA will have a special January issue of Law Wise to help commemorate this momentous occasion. In addition to a special issue, we will have an online survey for students, teachers and community leaders to select 150 notable Kansans. This will go live in December and the results will be tallied for the January issue. Please email mwickham@ksbar.org if you would like to take part in this survey. For those already on our Law Wise email list, you will receive a link to the survey in December. Help us celebrate 150 of Kansas statehood!

Terrific Technology for Teachers

Check out these great websites …

First Amendment Lesson Plans:

http://www.billofrightsinstitute.org/Teach/FreeResources/Lessons/?action=showCatDetails&id=8

http://www.freedomforum.org/packages/first/curricula/educationforfreedom/index.htm

Controversies in the Arts:

http://www.crf-usa.org/bill-of-rights-in-action/bria-13-2.html

Law Wise is published by the Kansas Bar Association during the school year. The Kansas Bar Foundation, with Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts funding, provides support for this publication. It is published free, on request, for teachers or anyone interested in law-related education and is edited by Sarah Shipman, Topeka. For further information about any projects or articles, contact Kathryn Gardner, Topeka, (785) 295-2626; or Meg Wickham, manager of public services of the Kansas Bar Association, (785) 234-5696. *Law Wise* is printed at the Kansas Bar Association, 1200 S.W. Harrison, Topeka, KS 66612-1806.

Take a Field Trip!

Looking for a field trip idea? Interested in an interactive learning experience? Want to give your students a chance to meet with a federal judge? Need materials to help you teach about the courts?

Contact the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas for help! We offer tours of our three courthouses and fun, timely, and interactive EDUCATIONAL programs designed for students of all ages.

Check out the program offerings at www.uscourts.gov/outreach/index.html and contact Neely Fedde, the Court's Public Outreach Specialist, at neely_fedde@ksd.uscourts.gov or (913) 551-6692 for more information or to schedule a session in our Kansas City, Wichita, or Topeka courthouses or at your school.

Update: *The Kansas Bar Association Law-Related Education Clearinghouse Inventory catalog is available. To request a new copy, please call Meg Wickham, KBA Public Services Manager, at (785) 234-5696 or e-mail her at* mwickham@ksbar.org.

Law Wise Editor: Sarah Shipman, staff attorney, Silver Lake Bank, Topeka
Coordinators: Kathryn Gardner, a career law clerk to the Hon. Sam A. Crow, and Meg Wickham, Kansas Bar Association

Court Education Video Available

The Kansas Supreme Court has released a new educational video along with talking points on four court-related topics. The video, called Justice in Kansas, and the talking points may be accessed below.

Justice in Kansas Video: Published by the Kansas Supreme Court, produced in January 2009 and hosted by then Chief Justice Robert E. Davis, the video provides information regarding the structure and function of the Kansas Judicial Branch. Copies of the video are available upon request to teachers or anyone interested in law-related education. Contact Ron Keefover, Education and Information Officer of the Office of Judicial Administration, Topeka, (785) 296-4872 to order. Video is approximately seven (7) minutes in length. Window Media Player 9.0 or above is required. Free Download for WMP.

Talking Points:

- Interesting facts regarding the Kansas Judicial System
- Types of courts
- Case statistics
- Jury service in Kansas
- About Kansas courts

- Ron Keefover
  Education-Information Officer
  Kansas Judicial Center
  301 W. 10th
  Topeka, KS 66612
  (785) 296-4872
  Fax (785) 296-7076
  keefover@kscourts.org

Resources at the Law-Related Education Inventory

1. **Constitutional Packet.** H/S. Materials related to a nationwide campaign to educate Americans about the Constitution. Library numbers 342.02/N213c
2. **The American Constitution: The Road from Runnymede.** MS/HS DVD
3. **The Supreme Court.** H/S set of four DVDs
4. **Liberty's Kids: The complete series.** MS/HS 900 min. DVD set.

The Law-Related Education Inventory has many resources to help teach about law-related topics. The Kansas Bar Association and the lawyers in your community sponsor the Law-Related Education Inventory. To order a catalog, call Meg Wickham at the Kansas Bar Association, (785) 234-5696. The clearinghouse will mail free copies of law-related posters, games, mock trials, booklets, lesson plans, and other aids. It is open Monday through Thursday, 8 a.m. to 7 p.m., and Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The director of the Teachers College Resource Center, which houses the Law-Related Education Inventory, Janice Romeiser, can be reached at jromeise@emporia.edu.