

2002

## Foreword

William E. Spruill  
*University of Richmond*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/lawreview>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

William E. Spruill, *Foreword*, 36 U. Rich. L. Rev. (2002).

Available at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/lawreview/vol36/iss1/2>

This Introduction is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Richmond Law Review by an authorized editor of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu).

## FOREWORD

This, the ninth annual *Allen Chair* Symposium issue of the *University of Richmond Law Review*, includes four spirited articles centered around the Symposium's 2001 topic: *Lawyer Advertising in the Electronic Age*. Rodney A. Smolla, in *The Puffery of Lawyers*, argues that there are many reasons why bar regulators around the nation should cease restricting lawyer advertising in the absence of evidence that such puffery confuses or misleads consumers. In *Change is in the Air: Lawyer Advertising and the Internet*, Louise L. Hill examines the current and future status of lawyers using cyberspace to promote their services. William E. Hornsby, Jr., in *Ad Rules Infinitum: The Need for Alternatives to State-Based Ethics Governing Legal Services Marketing*, argues that while state-based regulations of lawyer advertising may tend to strike a necessary balance between the flow of legal commerce and consumer protection, they are out of sync with Twenty-first Century practice settings. Finally, Ronald D. Rotunda, in *Lawyer Advertising and the Philosophical Origins of the Commercial Speech Doctrine*, provides a rich analysis of the history of the commercial speech doctrine and concludes that the government should not restrict lawyer advertising because to do so risks preventing people from being "convinced by what they hear."

The Allen Chair Symposium is made possible by the generous support of the friends and family of George E. Allen. The *Law Review* extends deep gratitude to the Allen family for their continued support of legal scholarship.

Also included in this year's *Allen Chair* issue are two articles unrelated to the Symposium topic. Katharine Inglis Butler navigates the present-day status of voter redistricting laws, and explores the measure and extent to which states may use race as a factor in creating voting districts in the wake of the United States Supreme Court decision in *Shaw v. Reno*. Finally, R. George Wright discusses Immanuel Kant's "formula of ends" theory in modern moral philosophy and argues that Kant's theory, especially in its positive dimensions, casts serious doubt on the moral adequacy of the current law of welfare and education.

I would like to thank all of the contributors to the ninth annual *Allen Chair* issue of the *Law Review*. I salute the *Law Review's* staff—most especially its Editorial Board—and Glenice Coombs, Legal Publication Coordinator, for her wit, invaluable assistance, and constant good cheer. Bravo!

William E. Spruill  
*Allen Chair Editor*