

1-1-2011

Preface

Stanley W. Hammer

University of Richmond School of Law

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

 Part of the [Courts Commons](#), [Judges Commons](#), [State and Local Government Law Commons](#), and the [Supreme Court of the United States Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stanley W. Hammer, *Preface*, 45 U. Rich. L. Rev. (2011).

Available at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/lawreview/vol45/iss2/2>

This Prefatory Matter 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.

PREFACE

Is there a general equality principle to guide us in our goal of achieving equality under law? What place do metaphors have in the shaping of the law, and what place *should* metaphors have in shaping the law? How might we better protect unenumerated rights within the existing, but flawed, jurisprudential framework? Can we conceptualize an interpretive mission and an interpretive method for Article III judicial review that serves not only the rule of law but also the rule of the sovereign living electorate? How can we determine, in a principled manner consistent not only with reason but our widespread intuition that “harm matters,” how much punishment is deserved for a wide range of criminal offenses? Where has the now twenty-five-year-old federal sentencing regime succeeded, where has it failed, and what should be done about it?

The *Law Review* proudly presents these questions, and the exploration of their answers, through the scholarly work contained in this second issue of Volume 45. The essay and five articles that follow offer thoughtful analysis on how we should approach equality, constitutional doctrine and interpretation, and punishment. They encourage us to take pause and reexamine big-picture issues and their solutions, and breathe new life into debate over important legal questions. Ultimately, we hope they make a lasting and positive contribution to the development of the law.

I sincerely thank the authors of this issue for giving us the honor of publishing this valuable legal scholarship. Working with you has truly been a pleasure.

I especially thank three members of the *Law Review* who have played an integral role in this book from start to finish. I thank Blake Boyette for tirelessly poring through submissions and for constantly taking on great challenges without complaint or desire for approbation. Your vision is represented in these pages. I

thank Michael Matheson for countless hours of hard work shepherding these articles through the publication process. Your ideas, passion, unrelenting energy, and leadership are responsible for this issue's success. And I thank Glenice Coombs for consistently going above and beyond the call of duty. Your devotion to this law review is critical to its success, and I feel exceedingly fortunate to work with you every day.

I am particularly grateful for the fine work and support of the other leaders of the *Law Review*—Sarah Warren Beverly, Garland Carr, Meagan Thomasson, and Katherine Womack—without whom publication of this issue could not have been accomplished, and for the guidance and backing of our faculty advisors, John Douglass and Carl Tobias.

I deeply thank my family and my wife, Catherine. Your love, constant support, and belief in me keeps me going and makes my best work possible.

Finally, I thank each and every member of the *University of Richmond Law Review*, whose tremendous dedication and unwavering commitment to excellence is evidenced in every sentence and footnote. I am proud beyond measure to be associated with such an outstanding group of people.

Stanley W. Hammer
Editor-in-Chief