The most valuable legacy a new body of editors can receive is the
tradition of a quality publication. This is especially true where editorial
boards are transient, as is the case with law reviews. We, the Editorial
Board of Volume 21, have been left a valuable legacy. We shall seek, in
this current academic year, not just to maintain the quality of our
Review, but to improve upon it.

This, our first issue, is concerned with a variety of subject matter.
Dr. C. Thomas Dienes has written an in depth analysis of the birth con-
trol laws in Massachusetts. The scope of this article makes it useful to
the constitutional lawyer as well as the academician. Mr. Michael J.
Henke has discussed the ramifications of protecting non-party witnesses
and documents utilized at FTC hearings. This theme is particularly
topical in light of the increased concern for personal and corporate
security.

In looking to the future, our subsequent issues for Volume 21 shall
include a symposium dealing with law and education. The issue will be
set in a constitutional framework and shall contain analysis of integra-
tion problems, the status and trend of students’ first amendment rights,
and an analysis of the effect of the due process clause on codes of disci-
pline. In the Spring we shall be highlighting a Conflict of Laws Sympo-
sium. The Symposium shall include such notable authorities in the
conflicts area as Robert Leflar, Louis C. James, David Cavers, and
David D. Siegal, to name a few.

In addition to carrying forward our responsibility to publish important
legal material, we hope to develop, by the end of the publication of
Volume 21, a general publication philosophy which shall meet the needs
of our readers by provoking contemporary thought and stimulating
legal and social change. Obviously, there are a myriad of problems and
issues with which the Law Review can become concerned.

One alternative is to provide in depth legal analysis to those seg-
ments of the population, non-legal in the traditional sense, who would
benefit from such analysis. Another possibility is to utilize the Review as
a forum for the discussion of the inevitable integration between law and
humanitarian pursuits. A third course that the Review is investigating is
the possibility and feasibility of allying ourselves with our legal aid
agency to produce a clinical symposium.

The views of our readers would be valued most highly. In particular
we are interested in what people are reading in the Review, what is most
helpful, and what further services we can perform for our readers.

Hopefully, at the termination of Volume 21, we shall pass on a
valuable legacy.

Dennis Carluzzo
Editor in Chief