EDITOR’S NOTE

With this issue, we bring to a close another year of our publication. Thus, in addition to noting what’s in this issue, I want to provide an overview of what we’ve been doing to maintain and to improve the quality of Court Review.

First, though, the issue at hand. We have three essays that we think you’ll find of interest. Psychologist Isaiah Zimmerman discusses the isolation that can come from judging and ways to deal with it. Professor Stephen Ceci, one of the leading experts on the interactions between children and the courts, argues that children should not be deemed capable of waiving their right to an attorney. And Pennsylvania appellate jurist Stephen McEwen, Jr. provides an overview of that court’s move to televised oral arguments in selected cases.

We also have three articles: Professor Charles Whitebread, in separate articles, reviews criminal and civil decisions rendered in the past Term of the United States Supreme Court; in the third article, a group of authors reviews the problems encountered in maintaining court security and proposes a comprehensive plan to work toward further improvements. Last, we include a review of a new book about wrongful convictions overturned through DNA evidence and what these cases mean for our criminal justice system.

Now, a thought or two about Court Review in general. Our goal is to provide practical, useful information to working judges in a professionally appropriate but easy-to-read format. To do this, we need to make contacts with potential authors, to identify topics that need coverage and to stay alert to new resources and developments that judges would want to know about.

Recently, I attended the biennial conference of the American Psychology-Law Society, a division of the American Psychological Association, to spread the word about Court Review as a place to share useful information with judges. In the past year, we have had several submittals from prominent psychologists and hope to obtain more. Similarly, we have contacted a number of law professors, several of whom have committed to write for us.

We have not been as successful, thus far, in getting judges to write and to solicit articles, essays, and book reviews. We invite your help in making this journal one that you and your fellow judges will find greatly beneficial in your work. Feel free to contact me to discuss an idea that you might like to write about. If you would be interested in writing a review of a new book, let me know—as we hear of new books, we can check with you to see whether you’d like to review one we’re interested in. As you hear exceptional speakers at judicial education programs, let them know that you would really like to see an article from them in Court Review. Our guidelines for authors are in almost every issue.

With your help, we can continue to improve Court Review and to achieve our goal of providing useful information for working judges in every issue.

- SL