

AN EDITORIAL NOTE

For a number of reasons the operation of a law review easily becomes a very insulated process. Perhaps the major reasons lie in the exigencies of the law school schedule, especially in the chronology of the third year. For the typical editor the first semester proceeds between the interruptions of the placement process. Correspondence, interviews and trips exact a seemingly undeserved amount of time. The second semester brings the necessity of preparation for one or more bar examinations. At the same time an editor is usually preparing sporadically for the classes, papers and examinations of courses which he has elected out of genuine interest and neglects to his genuine regret. When the routine of his publication duties is added, including the monitoring of the legislative services and the advance sheets, the supervision of concurrent student drafts and the mechanical tasks paralleling the printing stages of each issue, it becomes understandable that little available editorial time or effort remains for consultation with the readership. Ironically, the special consumer of the product threatens to become the party most remote to its preparation. Consequently, an *Editorial Note* department recommends itself as a new channel of communication between the editors and the readers of the *Review*. This feature seeks to inform the reader of the intramural activities of the *Review* and to invite the practicing attorneys, judges, law professors, students and any others into whose hands it may fall to share their reading reactions with its editors.

Two specific items immediately suggest themselves for consultation with the readers. The first is the issue of law review specialization; the second is the process of topic selection.

At the inception of the *Review* ten years ago, it was felt that as a new journal it could most effectively contribute to an expanding body of legal literature and acquire the stature of a useful publication by specialization within the area of commercial- and industrial-related subject matter. While it is felt that the purpose of such a concentration has been accomplished, the working premise of specialization has never formally been subjected to the ratification or rebuttal of the *Review's* readers. Therefore, the following questionnaire is made available and the reader strongly encouraged to submit his views.

It is one of the ironies of the law that the movement of its cutting edge is chronicled by the apprentices of the profession. The pressures of practice usually compel the attorney to leave the function of commentary to the law student. As already noted, the topic selection process is one of the student editing tasks so easily insulated from

the participation and perspective of those who read the journal. The legislative services and the advance sheets often conceal the *practical* impact of their content from the student editor already handicapped by the lack of actual *practice* in the law. Also, many topics of genuine importance may never even make their appearance in these traditional law review sources. For these reasons consultation with the practicing reader offers an untapped source of worthwhile topics likely to be neglected by the academic periodicals. The preoccupied attorney lacking the opportunity to research and consolidate the law of an ongoing problem might profitably suggest that task to students able to do so. At the same time, he would enjoy at least a small opportunity to promote the practical relevance of legal training, a service in which he sometimes finds the law schools remiss. Therefore, the reader is strongly encouraged to avail himself of the topic selection questionnaire which follows and generally to recommend topics of his preference *at any time* in the future.

To either questionnaire respondents are welcome to attach replies as extensive as they wish. For even the briefest response we shall be most grateful.

THE BOARD OF EDITORS

QUESTIONNAIRE I: SPECIALIZATION

NAME

ADDRESS

- (1) What is your primary purpose for taking, reading or consulting the *Industrial & Commercial Law Review*?
- (2) Would you prefer that the *Review* continue its present specialized function? Why?
- (3) Would you prefer that the *Review* broaden its coverage to become a generalized law review? Why?
- (4) Would you approve or disapprove of a format whereby the *Review* featured *primarily* industrial and commercial topics, and secondarily occasional topics of general interest?
- (5) To what extent do you consult such specialized features as the U.C.C. Commentary and the Annual Survey of Labor Law? Do these areas comprise a considerable part of your work?

QUESTIONNAIRE II: TOPIC SELECTION

NAME

ADDRESS

- (1) What topics presently neglected do you regard as worthy of law review treatment?
- (2) How would you describe the significance of this topic?
- (3) What primary sources (cases, statutes) would you recommend as a starting point for research?