

1969

## Editor's Preface

David J. Newburger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/caselrev>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

David J. Newburger, *Editor's Preface*, 20 Case W. Rsrv. L. Rev. 321 (1969)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/caselrev/vol20/iss2/3>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Case Western Reserve Law Review by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## EDITORS' PREFACE

The second issue of Volume 20 of the Law Review continues to probe areas important to the attorney concerned with social progress in addition to presenting careful analysis of various current problems in more traditional areas of the law. Tersh Boasberg argues that the private Bar has ignored its public responsibilities by failing to become meaningfully involved in the effort to provide solutions to the "urban crisis." He delineates the potentially multifarious aspects of the private practice of urban law, concluding with the prophesy that unless private practitioners become involved in these problems, the practice of law will become an anachronism in our time.

Presenting an economic impact analysis of two recently passed consumer protection laws (the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act), Professor Robert L. Birmingham offers an explanation of how the laws operate to facilitate free market mechanisms, making it possible for the consumer to purchase more intelligently. Adopting a more classical approach to legal analysis, C. Michael Abbott has written on a generally ignored area of constitutional law — the rights of secondary school students. Mr. Abbott considers the conflict between the school administrators' desire for work to proceed as usual and the students' right to fair treatment and protection from undue constraints on their constitutional rights.

Professor Kathleen L. Barber documents a simple fact for the reader: State and federal court judges in Ohio and Michigan have tended to vote consistently with the interests of their respective political parties in the reapportionment cases following *Baker v. Carr*. Without attempting to draw any broad generalizations, Professor Barber alerts the Bar and the public to an apparent pattern of judicial partisanship.

