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Points and Viewpoints

The new editors of the Journal need not inform you that their intention is to institute some changes in the policies and format of this publication. That much is obvious from seeing the cover and this column. Some of the alterations, however, are neither as noticeable nor as superficial as the two mentioned above.

There are, of course, obvious limitations on the extent to which one can modify a law review. For example, a symposium on obscenity with a full-color fold-out is clearly out of the question. Yet, there are a few things we can do.

One thing that law journals do too little of (except in Book Reviews where people float trial balloons or express personal opinion) is encourage free-flow writing on topics of immediate public importance. As my predecessor expressed it so well, law review writing need not be in “early-American dry.” In this issue, the article by Mitchell McConnell on the recent Supreme Court nominations is a dissertation by a person deeply involved in a recent controversy of great importance. And while Mr. McConnell poses items that deserve very serious, scholarly contemplation, his article is also a very readable narrative of recent history.

Similarly, a law review owes a duty to serve the practicing bar. Law journals have consistently included case comments and some broader notes which are primarily directed to the practitioner. Indeed this year we have directed some third year students to comment on cases of advanced subject matter, rather than writing a note, to fill a void created by having only 1st and 2nd year subjects covered in case comments. However, there is also room for commentary on the law by practitioners themselves in a format with sufficient brevity to account for the attorney’s lack of time to formulate copiously footnoted manuscripts. With the four special comments in this issue on Workmen’s Compensation, the Journal has refined the special comment to meet just this need.

Of course, a law review would be shirking its responsibilities if it allowed attention to the topical to supplant the truly scholarly research which itself aids the bar by probing at the horizons of
legal thought. This issue and its successors will not lose sight of that elementary fact.

Rather, it is our belief that by incorporating all these facets we will produce a Law Journal of true quality.

With the customary products of thorough research it is obvious that law journal articles represent the views of the authors rather than the editors. The editors can be presumed to intend to publish only articles of excellent scholarship without regard to the conclusions drawn. But when an article is primarily expressive of an ideological stance or a political viewpoint, as are the article by Mitchell McConnell and the book review by Henry Seney in this issue, the presumption as to the editors’ views ceases or is probably reversed. However, the fact that the mentioned two articles are poles apart politically is probably the most eloquent manner in which this Editorial Board can state that its encouragement of this writing style is not limited by its own views on the subject matter.

S. G. S.