

Editorial Section

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

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 26 Md. L. Rev. 1 (1966)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol26/iss2/2>

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 smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

Member, National Conference of Law Reviews
Conference of Southern Law Reviews

STUDENT EDITORIAL BOARD

NEAL D. BORDEN, *Editor*

STANLEY J. NEUHAUSER, *Articles Editor*

THEODORE B. CORNBLATT, *Casenote Editor*

STANLEY B. ROHD, *Recent Developments Editor*

DANIEL A. BRONSTEIN

JAMES EARL PLUMHOFF

EDWARD J. SMITH, JR.

} *Assistant Editors*

PAUL S. BEATTY
JAMES R. EYLER
ALAN N. GAMSE
HERBERT GOLDMAN
FRANK R. GOLDSTEIN
GARY A. GOLDSTEIN
LAWRENCE M. KATZ
JOHN M. KING
KENNETH L. LASSON

J. MICHAEL MCWILLIAMS
LESLIE J. POLT
ROBERT M. SIMON
MILTON R. SMITH
NEVET STEELE, JR.
WILLIAM C. STIFLER III
CHARLES M. TATELBAUM
HARLAN L. WEISS

LEWIS D. ASPER, *Faculty Advisor*

HAL M. SMITH, *Ass't Faculty Advisor*

THE EDITOR'S PAGE

During the compiling and editing of the four hundred-odd pages of the *Review* over the past year, there have been several occasions to consider the essential purpose and value of our work. The quantity of legal literature has become most abundant; a veritable wave of periodicals washes over the shelves of the law libraries each month. One result of this inundation is that the points discussed in articles and notes — especially in notes — have become more and more narrow. This is the cause of some concern in these quarters, for we are forced to ask if the increase in particularization produces a corresponding diminution in the value to our readers of the material which we publish.

It has been said, with perhaps more than a little truth, that the writing of notes and comments merely perpetuates an endless cycle generated some years ago. So much has been written that every topic worthy of discussion has been discussed, and several times over, to be sure — or so the argument goes. The only persons left who will bother

to read current notes are other legal scholars, who will in turn analyze the analyses, to be yet analyzed again by other academicians. Thus, the pleasant pastime of law review publication continues, *ad infinitum*, within the comfortable confines of the ivory tower, oblivious to the needs and problems of the profession in the world outside.

We hope that this is not the proper characterization of the *Maryland Law Review*; we have certainly tried to avoid such a situation during our tenure. Our principal desire has always been to stimulate and inform our readers, with the former of as much importance as the latter. A journal of purely practical articles is not a law review, at least to our minds; articles of a theoretical and challenging nature, demanding reflection and consideration by the members of the Bar, keep the law alive. Likewise, matters of both local and national interest have been equally treated, for while we are primarily a state-oriented publication, we can ill afford to ignore developments in other areas of the country. The purely "local" lawyer is fast becoming an anachronism in this rapidly growing world, and we have a responsibility to keep pace with the changes being wrought, wherever they may occur.

Our present issue exemplifies especially well the approach we have taken and the scope we have attempted. Chief Justice Warren's address strikes a forthright note, exhorting lawyers in Maryland and across the nation to assume the responsibilities too long put aside by the Bar. Mr. Webb's article is eminently practical; the author, a leading automobile negligence attorney, gives careful consideration to one of the stickiest problems in the important field of automobile tort law. Mr. Wilner's article is of both theoretical and current interest; the recent refusal of some of our citizens to ratify the acts of their country by payment of taxes is closely related to the "superior orders" area.

The student material in this number includes a rather experimental Comment; considerably different from the usual law review fare, it should be of interest to everyone seeking to keep the law in step with changing circumstances. The Casenotes are a varied lot, discussing three Maryland cases and three from other jurisdictions. The greater length of our Notes is an indication of our desire to provide adequate analysis of increasingly complex questions.

* * * * *

With our heartiest good wishes for a successful year ahead, the Editors are pleased to announce the election of the following Editors for 1966-67: Editor-in-Chief, Milton R. Smith; Articles Editor, Lawrence M. Katz; Casenote Editor, Frank R. Goldstein; Recent Developments Editor, Alan N. Gamse; Research Editor, James R. Eyer; Assistant Editors, Leslie J. Polt, J. Michael McWilliams, William C. Stifler III.

* * * * *

Professor Lewis D. Asper has been associated with the *Review* for most of his career at the Law School and has been Faculty Advisor for the past two years. He is spending the next school year as Visiting Professor at the UCLA Law School, and in his absence, Professor Hal M. Smith will serve as Acting Advisor. The Editors and Staff of the *Review* have enjoyed and benefited from their association with Mr. Asper, and we extend our best wishes to him for a pleasant year in California.