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Kevin Burke is one of the success stories of the judiciary. A judge for almost 20 years, he retains his zeal and commitment to public service. In addition, he is the master of intelligent innovation. As chief judge of the state trial courts in Minneapolis, in recent years he has brought social scientists into the court to study things like the effects of judicial demeanor on impressions of fairness in the court; previously, he was one of the early pioneers in the drug-court movement. Burke's record of service led to his receipt of the 2003 William H. Rehnquist Award for Judicial Excellence, the highest award given to a state-court judge by the National Center for State Courts.

We begin this issue by reprinting Burke's remarks at the Rehnquist Award ceremony. Burke tries to identify the key ingredients needed to let a court fulfill its promise to the public. His list includes fairness and respect, listening and understanding, and accountability. We think you'll find his comments of interest. We invite your response, either via a letter to the editor or a responsive essay.

Researchers Robyn Robertson and Herb Simpson of the Traffic Injury Research Foundation present the findings of a survey of more than 900 judges on impediments to effective sanctioning of drunk drivers. Their article reviews both the views of judges and a summary of some of the existing research related to these problem areas. Take a look at what other judges think about the problem areas, then let us know if your experience suggests some effective solutions. Again, letters to the editor are welcome here.

We close the issue with Professor Charles Whitebread's annual survey of the past year's criminal decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Although there were no landmark decisions, it is always helpful to have a quick review of the most recent decisions.

I will close this column with a note about a coming event and special issue of Court Review. As part of the American Judges Association's annual conference this October in San Francisco, we will present a National Forum on Judicial Independence. This forum will be unique because it will focus on threats to judicial independence at the trial-court level. In advance of the conference, we will devote a special issue of Court Review to the topic. We hope you'll consider attending the conference (see the inside back cover for details) and will help us in our consideration of issues affecting judicial independence in the trial court. —SL