

UC Irvine
UC Irvine Law Review

Title

Foreword

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1370j9zm>

Journal

UC Irvine Law Review , 1(1)

ISSN

2327-4514

Publication Date

2011-03-01

FOREWORD

Well before the UC Irvine School of Law opened its doors last fall, the founding faculty's mantra was that the school must be "traditional enough to be credible, but innovative enough to justify our existence." Following this lead, the inaugural class has tried to balance innovation with tradition in all our undertakings, including establishing the *UC Irvine Law Review*.

This inaugural issue is the product of an evolving process: "organic" and "democratic" became the recurring themes of the first year. Nearly the entire inaugural class of sixty students expressed interest in founding a law review. Although as 1Ls we were still learning to adjust to the demands of law school, we began to lay the foundation for the journal in our second semester with the goal of publishing during our second year. We benefited from the foresight of our faculty, who had organized a series of symposia that would generate content for the first volume. Within a matter of weeks, nearly a dozen preliminary committees—design, editorial, governance, training, and so on—were formed to gather research, present options to the group, and make decisions regarding the inaugural issue.

Our class was enthusiastic about the opportunity to build a law review from the ground up and to consider—and reconsider—the standard assumptions about law review success. Between the hurdles often required for admission to membership and their byzantine procedures, law reviews are steeped in tradition. But tradition for the sake of tradition was not good enough. At every step, we have asked ourselves why, and justified our decisions in creating an editorial process and making stylistic and content choices.

Seeking to create leadership roles for all committed members of the law review, while recognizing that we were new to the editing process, we set out to create a system where nearly every member would oversee an article in the first volume. We settled on an unconventional and egalitarian structure, creating small, fixed editing teams with leadership duties rotating within the team for each article in the first volume. The membership also elected a six-member governing board free of any individual titles or other hierarchy to oversee the initial set-up and administration. The governing board met throughout the summer to lay the groundwork for the first issue. By August, the first batch of articles had arrived, so the "real work" was ready to begin.

This unconventional approach also found its way to the substance and shape

of the content. At the inspired suggestion of Dean Erwin Chemerinsky, our first volume begins outside the usual bounds of law reviews. The inaugural issue focuses on innovations in legal education in general and the UC Irvine School of Law in particular, with faculty and students contributing non-traditional essays and perspective pieces. Exploring the developments in the field through the lens of our hands-on experiment, the issue is a reflection on both the founding of the school and the reality of putting innovative principles into practice.

The first two essays by Dean Erwin Chemerinsky and founding faculty member Joseph F.C. DiMento present the history of the law school and explain the core principles underlying the school's construction, from the teaching-focused philosophy that drove faculty hiring to the considerations in the physical building of the school itself. The next essays by faculty members Jennifer M. Chacón, Ann Southworth and Catherine Fisk, and Carrie Menkel-Meadow discuss the innovative classroom experience at UC Irvine School of Law. Professor Chacón explores the challenge of skills-oriented learning in a traditionally doctrinal subject, criminal law, and how she adapted her teaching methods for the Statutory Analysis class. Professors Southworth and Fisk discuss another first-year curricular innovation, the Legal Profession class, a dynamic ethics course, which uses guest speakers and interactive exercises to provide first-year students with an overview of the legal profession and presents the underlying ethical, economic, and social issues of the profession. Professor Menkel-Meadow explains the importance of "transnational" law in an interconnected world and the best methods for teaching it in a twenty-first century law school.

Looking beyond the classroom, other essays focus on creating the wrap-around intellectual environment to stimulate coursework. Associate Dean Beatrice Tice, the school's chief librarian and a professor of international law, writes about the role of the library as the intellectual and physical center of a law school. Associate Dean of Clinical Education and Service Learning Carrie Hempel considers the challenges of starting a clinical program that will be a mandatory part of every student's coursework. From points of view outside the legal profession, UC Irvine sociologist Carroll Seron explains her research tracking the career paths of the inaugural class, matching the group's profile with the standard law school class, while psychologist Elizabeth F. Loftus and criminologist Gilbert Geis discuss the importance of incorporating an interdisciplinary perspective into legal studies. Professor and historian Christopher L. Tomlins then provides a comprehensive overview of the history of legal education, and analyzes the UC Irvine School of Law by asking, what would Langdell have thought?

This issue concludes with an essay by inaugural class members Denisha

McKenzie and David Rodwin that tells the UC Irvine story from the student perspective as they walk us through the formation of the Orange County Human Rights Association, a student group designed to address human rights issues through a local lens.

So, then—which way did we go? Trail-blazing or conventional? It's too soon to tell. One single issue and its individual voices can hardly be taken as proof of institutional identity, and the membership and structure of the law review are still in a state of development. But it's clear that what you hold in your hands (or are reading online) is the product of our democratic and entrepreneurial process—and that the dedication and spirit of the founding members have set the pace for the future. We have the rare opportunity to build a law review from scratch, and as we define and refine our processes and procedures over the months and years to come, we hope to continue to be traditional enough to be credible, but innovative enough to justify our existence.

UC Irvine Law Review Executive Board
March 2011