

SYMPOSIUM: PROBLEM GAMBLING & THE LAW

EDITOR'S NOTE

Kerry E. Kleiman,
Editor-in-Chief

Problem gambling affects millions of people around the world, to varying degrees.¹ The advent and proliferation of online gaming has, in some ways, brought a new focus to this issue, because those against legalizing online gaming have raised the specter of parents so enthralled by easy-access gambling that they neglect their children.² Although this fear has been shown to be empirically without merit,³ lawmakers, attorneys, and scholars cannot—and should not—be ignorant to Gambling Disorder and its consequences.

We are, therefore, thrilled to present a two-part symposium dedicated to the intersection of problem gambling and the law. We hope that the articles contained in these two issues of Volume Six will become an invaluable resource to those involved in gaming law, as well as to those involved in health law and healthcare.

¹ See generally ROBERT J. WILLIAMS ET AL., THE POPULATION PREVALENCE OF PROBLEM GAMBLING: METHODOLOGICAL INFLUENCES, STANDARDIZED RATES, JURISDICTIONAL DIFFERENCES, AND WORLDWIDE TRENDS 5–10 (2012) (analyzing data from 202 different studies conducted around the world and developing a method of standardization regarding problem gambling rates so that it would be easier to compare prevalence of problem gambling across, and within, jurisdictions).

² See, e.g., Phill Dunn, *Online Gambling Spurs Addiction Fears*, USATODAY (Mar. 16, 2014 12:26 AM), <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/03/16/online-gambling-addiction/6476761>.

³ See generally, e.g., Sally M. Gainsbury, *Online Gambling Addiction: The Relationship Between Internet Gambling & Disordered Gambling*, 2 CURRENT ADDICTION REPS. 185, available at https://www.academia.edu/11932167/Online_Gambling_Addiction_The_relationship_between_Internet_gambling_and_disordered_gambling (pointing to empirical data debunking the myth that access to online gaming increases addiction rates).

The articles contained in this symposium use a variety of different terms to refer to, what is now clinically termed, “Gambling Disorder.”⁴ Although the varied terms herein may, at some point, fall out of use because of their negative connotations—nobody likes to think of themselves as having a “problem” or being “pathological”—the Journal has decided to leave all terms as originally written by the authors. We hope that, by doing so, we have not inadvertently harmed or offended any of our readers.

The Journal would like to thank Professor Stacey Tovino for bringing us the idea for this symposium, reaching out to her colleagues to garner submissions, and for writing an introduction to this issue. We are very appreciative for all of her insight and guidance. I would also like to thank the hard-working members of the *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* staff for helping bring this symposium to press, and would especially like to thank Stephanie Getler—the Journal’s incoming Editor-in-Chief—for graciously agreeing to devote Volume Six, Issue Two to the conclusion of this symposium.

On a more personal note: as someone who has been affected firsthand by the actions of someone suffering from Gambling Disorder, I hope that this symposium will prove itself a useful tool, and will promote discussion across industries and jurisdictions. I also hope—albeit for entirely different reasons—that the symposium is simply a good read.

⁴ AM. PSYCHIATRIC ASS’N, DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS 585 (5th ed. 2013).