

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Court Review: The Journal of the American
Judges Association

American Judges Association

2009

Editor's Note

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ajacourtreview>

"Editor's Note" (2009). *Court Review: The Journal of the American Judges Association*. 302.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ajacourtreview/302>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the American Judges Association at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Court Review: The Journal of the American Judges Association by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Court Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN JUDGES ASSOCIATION

Volume 45, Issue 4

2008-2009

EDITOR'S NOTE

The lead article for this issue is an introduction to understanding court culture. In our last issue, we had a book review of the 2007 book, *Trial Courts as Organizations*, which provides a wealth of interesting data and insights. In this issue, two of the book's authors, Brian Ostrom and Roger Hanson, provide an overview of the different court cultures commonly encountered, including the results of a study of one large metropolitan trial court. Our second article is part of a continuing series looking at social-science information either about the courts or that can be readily used by judges. This time, Brian Bornstein and Monica Miller look at whether a judge's religion influences decision making. There has been a lot of research on this, and Bornstein and Miller survey the most interesting and authoritative studies.

Our third article, by Thomas Barton, is adapted from his recent book, *Preventive Law and Problem-Solving: Lawyering for the Future*. In this article, Barton looks both at problem-solving courts and the field called preventive law, focusing on how a general-jurisdiction judge—not necessarily one handling a specialized docket—may be able to use the same



principles that have become the mainstays of problem-solving courts. Our final article comes from Oregon trial judge Michael Marcus, one of America's most thoughtful judges. As more and more court functions go electronic, Marcus has focused on trying to have technology provide the information most needed by judges rather than having judges play a secondary role to computers and programmers. His thoughts are well worth considering.

I close by noting the death of one of the long-time members of our Editorial Board, Professor Philip Frickey. Phil helped us in many ways for more than a decade. Recently, he helped us put together a very useful Resource Page on Indian Law; he also recruited Professor Charles Weisselberg to take over the annual review of United States Supreme Court decisions of note after the death of our longtime contributor, Charles Whitebread. We will be reorganizing our Editorial Board for the next volume, so if you have an interest, please let me know. Phil will be missed.—SL