

Editorial Section

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

Recommended Citation

Editorial Section, 27 Md. L. Rev. 2 (1967)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol27/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

MILTON R. SMITH, JR., *Editor*

LAWRENCE M. KATZ, *Articles Editor*

FRANK R. GOLDSTEIN, *Casenote Editor*

JAMES R. EYLER, *Research Editor*

ALAN N. GAMSE, *Recent Developments Editor*

J. MICHAEL McWILLIAMS }
LESLIE J. POLT } *Assistant Editors*
WILLIAM C. STIFLER, III }

BENJAMIN FORD DAVIS

MONTE FRIED

JAMES JUDGE HANKS, JR.

JOHN M. KING

STANLEY P. KOPS

STEVEN P. LOCKMAN

MARGARET P. MAHONEY

H. RICHARD PIET

ALAN R. SACHS

STEPHEN L. SHOCHET

ROBERT R. WINTER

HAL M. SMITH, *Faculty Advisor*

LAURENCE M. KATZ, *Ass't Faculty Advisor*

EDITOR'S NOTE

This issue of the REVIEW has been devoted almost exclusively to a study of the constitutional problems emanating from certain aspects of the individual-state relationship. Whatever the ordinary virtues of thematic unity in law review publication, they would seem to be enhanced when this phase of constitutional law is under consideration, for the present tack of the Supreme Court can be little understood, much less appreciated, in the context of isolated cases. One is entitled to call himself neither a student nor a critic of the Court until he has digested the reasoning *as well as the facts* of a multitude of the Court's recent decisions. The editors especially hope that those not educated in contemporary constitutional theory will be aided by this presentation. To that end a reading of Sanford Jay Rosen's comprehensive article is recommended. The article represents a thorough refresher and analysis of the Court's approach. Lest anyone be left with the impression that innovation in the area of the individual-authority relationship is within the exclusive domain of the Court, Senator Joseph

D. Tydings in his article reminds us that there is a vast frontier remaining for legislative development. Senator Tydings explores one of these areas with suggestions for reform.

Out of the mainstream of the issue, but well in the current flow of matters of professional controversy, is Henry G. Burke's article on the dual practice of law and accounting.

As "the old order changeth," the outgoing editors extend congratulations and best wishes for a successful year to the new editors: Steven P. Lockman, Editor-in-Chief; Robert R. Winter, Articles Editor; Margaret P. Mahoney, Casenote Editor; Melvin Rosen, Research Editor; Robert M. Wright, Recent Developments Editor; H. Richard Piet and James A. Kushner, Assistant Editors.