Maryland Law Review

Volume 47 | Issue 3 Article 2

January 1988

Editorial Section

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr

Recommended Citation
Editorial Section, 47 Md. L. Rev. 610 (1988)
Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol47/iss3/2

This Editorial Section is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact PBluh@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

VOLUME 47 SPRING 1988 NUMBER 3
Member, National Conference of Law Reviews
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

1987-88 EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief
CHARLTON T. HOWARD III

Executive Editor
JOHN J. KIM

Managing Editor
JOHN A. MESSINA

Research Editor
KATHRYN W. LOVILL

Articles Editors
DARRELL N. BRAMAN, JR.
TIMOTHY P. BRANIGAN
CARVILLE B. COLLINS
ROBIN EHRENBERG
STEPHEN J. KARINA

Notes and Comments Editors
LAURA B. BLACK
JENIPHR A.E. BRECKENRIDGE
CATHY A. CHESTER
KEVIN C. GOLDEN
J. PETER PUGLIA

Assistant Editors
JUDITH C. ENSOR
MICHAEL J. GENTILE
DEBRA J. HIRSHKOWITZ
ANNABELLE L. LISIC
AWILDA R. MARQUEZ
MARK D. NEUMANN
BARAK M. ROMANEK
GILLIAN N. RUDOW
PETER Q. SCHLUEDERBERG
AMY J. SEIFERT
DEBORAH A. SILVERMAN
MICHAEL J. SNIDER
F. LEIGH SWANN
KATHRYN A. TURNER
RACHEL A. WOHL

Members
DEBRA A. ABBOTT
MARY B. BAKER
KAREN D. BAYLEY
CRAIG W. CHRISTIAN
ELIZABETH M. COLLINS
KAREN M. CRABTREE
PAUL B. D'ARI
ERIC B. EASTON
JONATHAN R. FLORA
SCOTT B. GARRISON
RICHARD S. GORDON
MARY E. GOULET
DONALD C. HUBBARD, JR.
MARY ELLEN QUINN JOHNSON
THOMAS E. KANE
ANDREW C.J. MCC. KIDD
M. DESALES LINTON
MARK B. MONDRY
ROBERT D. PARRISH
BRIAN M. REIMER
LORI A. REINHOLD
JUDITH L. SCHLOSSBERG
TIMOTHY U. SHARPE
WILLIAM F. SPLITGERBER, JR.
JOSEPH B. TETRAULT
TRACEY G. TURNER

Faculty Advisor
ROBIN L. WEST

Administrative Assistant
PATRICIA A. TRICE

Maryland Law Review

VOLUME 47 SPRING 1988 NUMBER 3
© Copyright Maryland Law Review, Inc. 1988

FROM THE EDITOR

Every year the *Maryland Law Review* publishes an issue devoted primarily to Maryland law. The traditional centerpiece of the issue is the Annual Survey of Developments in Maryland Law. The Survey has taken various forms, as each Editorial Board tends to have its own preferences concerning scope and treatment. This approach, while occasionally yielding some fine results, has not achieved the sort of sustained, scholarly study that we believe the work of the Maryland appellate courts deserves. In addition, the Survey requires a major commitment of time and effort. It would be unfortunate if the ultimate product is of limited utility to practitioners and academicians. The 1987-88 Editorial Board, with much assistance from our predecessors, decided to take a hard look at the Survey. We questioned:

(a) whether, in view of the inherent time constraints, the *Maryland Law Review* should even attempt a survey of recent cases;
(b) whether it is better to cover a large number of cases lightly, or to concentrate on fewer cases in greater depth;
(c) how cases should be selected;
(d) what the proper balance should be between reporting and criticism; and
(e) how to ensure consistency in coverage from year to year.

The Board solicited opinions from former *Law Review* members, professors, and practicing attorneys. After long discussion, we came to several conclusions. The Survey is written by students, and publication schedules are already as compressed as possible. Thus, the Survey can never be an up-to-date digest of the latest Maryland cases. By the time the Survey is published, the decisions themselves are no surprise to the legal community. What we can do, however, is provide a scholarly treatment of the more important recent cases.

Indeed, we believe that a critical analysis of the major decisions, considering context, rationale, and effect, will prove of greater assistance to our readers than a mere compendium of recent headnotes.

We have attempted to move in that direction this year. Compared to previous surveys, there are fewer cases, with more attention paid to each case. Student writers have been encouraged to analyze critically, not simply rephrase, case holdings. In addition, the rationale for choosing cases has been standardized, though, as every year, important cases that should be featured have been omitted due to editorial problems or late-breaking developments. The results of this process are contained herein. We would appreciate any comments or suggestions our readers may have concerning the final product. Absent criticism, this is the course we intend to follow for the immediate future.

This issue commences with a tribute to John F. Davis, Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Maryland School of Law. Professor Davis retired this year after a long and distinguished legal career. For many years Professor Davis, a former Clerk of the Supreme Court, taught a constitutional law seminar at Maryland. Long a favorite of students, he will be sorely missed.

Next, Professor Garrett Power of the University of Maryland School of Law offers an illuminating analysis of the history of zoning in Baltimore City. While Professor Power's recounting of the occasionally sordid tale of Baltimore's urban expansion no doubt will be of interest to local residents, the conclusions he draws from this experience are truly national in scope.

Two student notes are included. Judith Ensor addresses the effect of the AIDS epidemic on doctor-patient confidentiality and the duty to warn. Charlton Howard analyzes the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Booth v. Maryland*, in which the Court constitutionally invalidated the use of victim impact statements in death penalty sentencing.

Finally, in addition to the Survey, we offer the student-compiled statistical miscellany, covering the work of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, 1986-87.

As always, we welcome our readers' response on these issues.