

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Court Review: The Journal of the American  
Judges Association

American Judges Association

---

April 2002

## Court Review: Volume 39, Issue 1 - Editor's Note

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



Part of the [Jurisprudence Commons](#)

---

"Court Review: Volume 39, Issue 1 - Editor's Note" (2002). *Court Review: The Journal of the American Judges Association*. 158.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ajacourtreview/158>

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 39, Issue 1

Spring 2002

## EDITOR'S NOTE

**M**ost state court judges in the United States stand for election, whether it be one in which an opposing candidate can run or one in which an appointed judge stands for retention. Accordingly, questions concerning what judicial candidates can say during an election campaign are of great significance. At the end of its past term, the United States Supreme Court issued its first decision regarding the tension between the First Amendment and restrictions that have been placed by states on the speech of judicial candidates.

We asked two leading experts on judicial campaigns to write in response to that decision, *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*. We are extremely pleased that they agreed to write for us in response to this decision and we think you'll find their views of interest. Both authors—Georgetown University law professor Roy Schotland and Washington lawyer Jan Baran—wrote Supreme Court amicus briefs in *White*, Schotland for the Conference of Chief Justices and Baran for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. (For additional background on judicial campaign conduct and the First Amendment, see the *Indiana Law Review*, Volume 35, No. 3 (2002), which contains a series of papers presented at the National Symposium on Judicial Campaign Conduct and the First Amendment, held in November 2001 before the *White* case was accepted by the Supreme Court.)

In addition to this review of the *White* decision and its legal impact, David Rottman presents the results of an opinion survey of both judges and the general public regarding judicial campaign issues. While the public and the judges agree on many things, there are also some intriguing differences.

The issue also includes:

- Professor Charles Whitebread's annual review of all of the significant cases of the past term of the U.S. Supreme Court;
- A report from the CCJ-COSCA Problem-Solving Courts Committee, authored by Utah court administrator Daniel Becker and Michigan Chief Justice Maura Corrigan; and
- Another effort by legal writing professor Joseph Kimble, a prior *Court Review* contributor, to keep the key concepts of good writing in our minds, this time reviewing the drafting of the USA Patriot Act.

As you read the issue, keep in mind that we're happy to print letters to the editor or other contributions from readers. —SL



*Court Review*, the quarterly journal of the American Judges Association, invites the submission of unsolicited, original articles, essays, and book reviews. *Court Review* seeks to provide practical, useful information to the working judges of the United States, Canada, and Mexico. In each issue, we hope to provide information that will be of use to judges in their everyday work, whether in highlighting new procedures or methods of trial, court, or case management, providing substantive information regarding an area of law likely to be encountered by many judges, or by providing background information (such as psychology or other social science research) that can be used by judges in their work. Guidelines for the submission of manuscripts for *Court Review* are set forth on page 43 of this issue. *Court Review* reserves the right to edit, condense, or reject material submitted for publication.

*Court Review* is in full text on LEXIS and is indexed in the Current Law Index, the Legal Resource Index, and LegalTrac.

Letters to the Editor, intended for publication, are welcome. Please send such letters to *Court Review's* editor: Judge Steve Leben, 100 North Kansas Avenue, Olathe, Kansas 66061, e-mail address: sleben@ix.netcom.com. Comments and suggestions for the publication, not intended for publication, also are welcome.

Advertising: *Court Review* accepts advertising for products and services of interest to judges. For information, contact Deloris Gager at (757) 259-1864.

Photo credit: cover photo, Mary Watkins. The cover photo is of the Old Cape May Courthouse in Cape May, New Jersey. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

© 2002, American Judges Association, printed in the United States. *Court Review* is published quarterly by the American Judges Association (AJA). AJA members receive a subscription to *Court Review*. Non-member subscriptions are available for \$35 per volume (four issues per volume). Subscriptions are terminable at the end of any volume upon notice given to the publisher. Prices are subject to change without notice. Second-class postage paid at Williamsburg, Virginia, and additional mailing offices. Address all correspondence about subscriptions, undeliverable copies, and change of address to Association Services, National Center for State Courts, P.O. Box 8798, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187-8798. Points of view or opinions expressed in *Court Review* are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the positions of the National Center for State Courts or the American Judges Association. ISSN: 0011-0647.