

2016

# Legacy: William Mitchell Law Review

William Mitchell Board of Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://open.mitchellhamline.edu/mhlr>

## Recommended Citation

William Mitchell Board of Editors (2016) "Legacy: William Mitchell Law Review," *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*: Vol. 42: Iss. 4, Article 12.

Available at: <http://open.mitchellhamline.edu/mhlr/vol42/iss4/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at Mitchell Hamline Open Access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mitchell Hamline Law Review by an authorized administrator of Mitchell Hamline Open Access. For more information, please contact [sean.felhofer@mitchellhamline.edu](mailto:sean.felhofer@mitchellhamline.edu).

© Mitchell Hamline School of Law

## LEGACY: *WILLIAM MITCHELL LAW REVIEW*

William Mitchell Board of Editors<sup>†</sup>

The Board of Editors of the *William Mitchell Law Review* Volume 42 was elected in January 2015. We were flattered that our predecessors entrusted us to carry on this noble forty-one-year tradition and we were optimistic at the opportunity to make our mark.<sup>1</sup>

As we explored our new workspace, we encountered an old bookcase filled with past volumes of the *William Mitchell Law Review*. The first words of Volume 1 bear a message from then-Dean Doug Heidenreich comparing “the process of producing the first issue of the first volume of a new law review to the process of human birth.”<sup>2</sup> How startling—nay, how lurid!—that the very first words in our *Law Review* described its very inception as “bloody and squalling.”<sup>3</sup> It is ironic that one year later we would still find these words startling, not for their boldness, but rather for their clairvoyance.

Shortly after taking office, we learned that William Mitchell College of Law would combine with Hamline University School of Law, and our flagship law reviews, too, had to combine. Our Board of Editors prepared to stride ahead into an uncertain future. But, before moving forward, we had to return to that old bookcase. We needed to learn where we had been before we could determine how to move forward.

---

<sup>†</sup> The authors thank past members of the *William Mitchell Law Review*.

1. Which, at the time, we believed would comprise the implementation of a new edition of the *Bluebook*—uff da! Compare THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION (Columbia Law Review Ass’n et al. eds., 19th ed. 2010), with THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION (Columbia Law Review Ass’n et al. eds., 20th ed. 2015) (offering exciting new changes to the system of citation in legal scholarship, including expanded and streamlined citation guidance for electronic sources, condensed abbreviation tables, and other highly nuanced citation trickery).

2. Douglas R. Heidenreich, 1 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 1, intro. (1975).

3. *Id.*

In those old volumes, we found that the *William Mitchell Law Review* published its first issue in 1974 with an ambitious goal of creating an invaluable reference for judges and practitioners—and it did just that. Less than one year after the *William Mitchell Law Review* published its first articles, the Minnesota Supreme Court cited to one;<sup>4</sup> We also found that, in the *Law Review*'s forty-one year history, it published nearly 2000 articles, has been cited in hundreds of federal and state judicial opinions;<sup>5</sup> published prominent members of the federal and state judiciary, politicians, and countless professors and practitioners,<sup>6</sup> and its articles have been downloaded over 150,000 times.<sup>7</sup>

With a richer understanding of the journal's roots, we faced the combination with a sense of duty and an open mind. Combining two law reviews is no simple task: imagine attempting to fit a square peg and a circular peg into a triangular hole at the same time. Overnight, the Volume 42 Board of Editors swelled from fifteen to twenty-six individuals. Through a flurry of e-mails, meetings, and phone calls, we distilled from two distinct processes and legacies the rudiments of our new journal, the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*.

As we finish our tenure as the Board of Editors, we place the old volumes back on the bookcase, pausing once more to reflect on our journal's opening words:

It is tempting to compare the process of producing the first issue of the first volume of a new law review to the process of human birth. The period of gestation is long,

---

4. See *Holman v. Gen. Ins. Co. of Am.*, 304 Minn. 312, 317 n.5, 231 N.W.2d 81, 84 n.5 (1975) (citing Comment, *Civil Procedure: Seider with a Minnesota Flavor—A Federal Court Imports Quasi in Rem Jurisdiction Based on Garnishment of Liability Insurance Obligations* [Rintala v. Shoemaker, 362 F. Supp. 1044 (D. Minn. 1973)], 1 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 161 (1974)).

5. Michael K. Steenson, *A Thirtieth Anniversary Tribute to the William Mitchell Law Review*, 30 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 1465, 1467 n.5 (2004).

6. U.S. Supreme Court Justices Warren E. Burger, Harry Blackmun, Sandra Day O'Connor, and Byron R. White wrote for the *Law Review*. Additionally, many members of the Minnesota judiciary wrote articles for the *Law Review*, including Minnesota Supreme Court Justices Rosalie E. Wahl, Lorie Gildea, Paul A. Anderson, Eric Magnuson, Helen Meyer, and Esther M. Tomljanovich. Walter F. Mondale, Hubert H. Humphrey III, Jesse Ventura, and Amy Klobuchar authored articles in the *Law Review* as well.

7. See *William Mitchell Law Review: Legacy Archives*, MITCHELL HAMLINE SCH. L., <http://open.mitchellhamline.edu/wmlr> (last visited June 23, 2016).

the labor is difficult and the result is suddenly there,  
bloody and squalling.<sup>8</sup>

The gestation period of this combination was not long—less than nine months, in fact. Yet, the labor was similarly difficult and the result, the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*, arrived in crisp print in March 2016.

We entrust the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review* with the Volume 43 Board of Editors—whose momentous election comprised eighteen additional hours of labor—and their progeny. If ever during those long hours of editing you lose sight of why you are a part of the law review, we implore you to look at that old bookcase. Its shelves now hold twice as many books, twice as many legacies, and twice as many reminders that what you do, and how you do it, resonates in history. Go forth, and be awesome.

---

8. Heidenreich, *supra* note 2, intro.