

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR: A MAN WALKS INTO A BOARD

Each year, the editor in chief writes a letter commenting on the volume's articles and providing a glimpse into life at the DePaul Law Review.¹ I believe that the articles in Volume 57 speak for themselves. Thus, I discuss them only briefly. I devote most of this letter to providing a window into our office, our editors, and the improvements we have made over the course of the past year.

Between June 2007 and June 2008, we published forty-one articles in four issues. The topics included consumer protection, privilege waivers for white-collar criminals, mental retardation and the death penalty, and freedom of religion in a democratic society, to name a few. Seven of these articles were chosen by Mike Gentithes, our Managing Editor of Lead Articles. Twelve were student notes and comments chosen by last year's Managing Editor of Notes and Comments, Louis C. Shansky. The remaining articles were published in conjunction with the Thirteenth Annual Clifford Symposium on Tort Law and Social Policy and the Seventeenth Annual DePaul Law Review Symposium.

Looking back, I am quite pleased both with the quality and quantity of articles. Over the past few years, we have increasingly published "big name" authors. Consequently, our journal has enjoyed an increase in the quality of its articles and a corresponding rise in its rank among legal journals. Volume 57 has not strayed far from that pattern. However, in the belief that we should also serve as a forum for rising academics and practitioners, we have made a concerted effort to publish quality articles from lesser-known authors. We hope that the resulting mixture will serve as a catalyst for changes in legal theory and practice.

My predecessor, John C. Roberts, Jr., noted that the Volume 56 editorial board was "a quiet bunch," which spent much of its time working.² Only the latter may be said of the Volume 57 board. We were

1. See John C. Roberts, Jr., *Letter From the Editor*, 56 DEPAUL L. REV. 1131 (2007); Eric W. Schupp, *Letter From the Editor*, 55 DEPAUL L. REV. ix (2006); Karyn L. Bass, *Letter from the Editor*, 54 DEPAUL L. REV. 1039 (2005); Suzanne Milne Alexander, *Letter from the Editor*, 53 DEPAUL L. REV. 1401 (2004); Heather R. McDonald, *Letter from the Editor*, 52 DEPAUL L. REV. 1059 (2003); Annette Messitt, *Letter from the Editor*, 51 DEPAUL L. REV. 983 (2002); David Edward Dahlquist, *Letter from the Editor*, 50 DEPAUL L. REV. 1061 (2001).

2. Roberts, Jr., *supra* note 1, at 1131.

often loud and occasionally obnoxious. Additionally, we told bad jokes such as the following: “A skeleton walks into a bar and says, ‘I’d like a beer . . . and a mop’”³ As many of our readers can attest, however, long hours in an office can be difficult. For us, it meant time away from internships, coursework, and loved ones. In light of the challenges we faced, I believe that our rowdiness and bad jokes served a purpose. They may have made our meetings a bit longer, but we met our task without much suffering. As we step into a profession with high rates of alcoholism, depression, and suicide,⁴ I believe that this alone is an accomplishment.

Additionally, as the boards before us, we have attempted to leave the journal a little bit better than it was when we received it. Previous boards greatly improved our editing process. Thus, we focused largely upon improving non-editing tasks. Thanks in part to the work of Associate Editor Kimber Russell, we helped create an interjournal write-on competition. Beginning in August 2008, DePaul law students may apply to up to three journals simultaneously.⁵ We introduced new social events, including a holiday party, the Mike Gentithes Memorial Trophy Kickball Tournament, and the first-ever Law Review Service Day. We also improved our Alumni Event by creating the Sapientia Award. In this, the award’s inaugural year, we honored Joseph Bisceglia, DePaul Law Review Alumnus, Partner at Jenner & Block, and President of the Illinois State Bar Association.⁶ Further, we cleaned up our office, altered our orientation program, and decorated the office for the holidays. New copies of *The Bluebook*, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, the *Texas Manual for Style and Usage*, and *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* grace the shelves of our conference room.⁷ Finally, we created a manual for each editorial position so that the learning curve for future editors will not be so great.

Briefly, I would like to mention the contributions of each of our editors. First, Jeremy Roe, our Executive Editor, served as our resident *Bluebook* master and helped run our organization’s day-to-day

3. STEPHEN ARNOTT & MIKE HASKINS, *MAN WALKS INTO A BAR: OVER 6,000 OF THE MOST HILARIOUS JOKES, FUNNIEST INSULTS AND GUT-BUSTING ONE-LINERS* 115 (2007).

4. Illinois Lawyer’s Assistance Program, <http://www.illinoislap.org/index.html> (last visited Apr. 5, 2008).

5. In the past, each of DePaul’s legal journals held a separate write-on competition by which law students could become journal members.

6. Jenner & Block LLP—Joseph G. Bisceglia, <http://www.jenner.com/people/bio.asp?id=297> (last visited Apr. 12, 2008).

7. *THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION* (Columbia Law Review Ass’n et al. eds., 18th ed. 2005); *THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE* (Univ. of Chi. Press eds., 15th ed. 2003); *TEXAS LAW REVIEW MANUAL ON USAGE & STYLE* (10th ed. 2005); *WEBSTER’S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY* (2002).

operations. Jeremy was involved with everything from planning parties to scheduling meetings. It is difficult to imagine a person handling this wide array of duties as gracefully. Mike Gentithes, our Managing Editor of Lead Articles, not only pored over hundreds of submissions to find the best articles, but also organized the first Law Review Service Day, which took place at Goudy Elementary School. Mike edited with rare quickness and accuracy. To boot, Mike often played the role of straight man when I told my unbearable jokes. For that, I am truly grateful. Cat Ceko, our Managing Editor of Notes and Comments, ran our candidacy program like a boot camp. Although she was often strict, Cat provided invaluable guidance to our candidates, and the notes and comments she selected for publication in Volume 58 reflect the dedication and quality she helped foster. Shay-Ann Heiser Singh, our Symposium Editor, improved the quality and expanded the scope of the DePaul Law Review Symposium. Additionally, she was one of our most thorough editors. Patrick Ross, our Business Manager, spent countless hours honing our bookkeeping procedures. He was also perhaps the funniest of the bunch.⁸

The work of our Editors of Articles, Notes, and Comments was equally praiseworthy. They all worked quite hard, managing our candidates' writing and cite-checking groups and editing article after article. Sarah Baum, my fellow Kentuckian, in addition to being an eagle-eyed editor, showed great concern for the progress and well-being of our candidates. Joe Culig exhibited a quiet diligence in completing his work and was unerringly dependable. Mary Meixner's constant energy served as a model for us all. In addition, Mary was largely responsible for the success of our annual Alumni Event. Kathryn Richards may have been the brightest among us. Despite her great intellect, Kathryn remained humble and helpful. Elliott Riebman was perhaps the only true contender for Patrick Ross's title as the funniest person on Law Review. His quips kept our lengthy meetings fresh. Kimber Russell, in addition to working countless hours to ensure the success of the Interjournal Write-on Competition, kept our office flora flourishing throughout the year and graciously hosted our Editor Potluck Party. Steph Stalter, even more so than the other editors, knew how to have a good time in spite of the significant workload we faced. She also helped plan a number of Law Review events. Jon Urbanek was not only a reliable editor, but also a fair person in his interactions with editors and candidates alike.

8. As someone who prides himself in his corny jokes, this is a difficult confession.

Finally, I would like to thank the many other persons involved in producing Volume 57 of the DePaul Law Review. First, our candidates toiled for hours in the depths of the Rinn Law Library. They retrieved dusty books, photocopied forgotten opinions, and printed countless articles. Although the work is mundane, it is crucial to the Law Review's primary task: publishing a quality journal. Without their help, we could not have achieved the accuracy in which we take such great pride. Next, I would like to thank Professor Stephan Landsman. He exhibited the best qualities of a faculty advisor: deference to the decisions of a student organization but fierce support when necessary. Lastly, I wish to thank David Bell and Dean Howard Rubin for their help with budget concerns and Dean Diana White for her assistance with student affairs.

So that's Volume 57 in a nutshell. We have had a productive and hilarious year. I am proud to have served on this board. The DePaul Law Review has allowed me to hone my writing, editing, and management skills. I will miss my fellow editors and the work we have completed together. I hope that we have provided insightful articles that expand law and policy discussions. Finally, I hope that future boards will continue to publish eye-opening legal writing for scholars and practitioners alike.

*Geoffrey T. Burkhart**

* Editor in Chief, *DePaul Law Review*, Volume 57, J.D. 2008, DePaul University College of Law; M.A. 2002, Loyola University, Chicago; B.A. 2000, Xavier University. I would like to thank my wife, Beth Burkhart, for being a pretty good sport about the many hours I have spent in the Law Review office. I would also like to thank my parents, Tom and Marlene Burkhart, for their love and support and my brother, Mike Burkhart, for laughing at my jokes, even when they weren't funny.