Letter from the Board

It is with great pride that we present the inaugural edition of the LSE Law Review.

The LSE Law Review was borne out of a desire to create a student-run law journal befitting of the London School of Economics and Political Science’s reputation for world-leading academic thought. We firmly believe in the benefits of viewing the law and legal systems from a variety of perspectives, and thus have strived to provide a platform for legal scholarship which looks at familiar problems with a fresh pair of eyes. The submissions we garnered, from authors at all levels of study both within the LSE and beyond, reflect this ambition.

We owe a great debt to a number of people, without whom the founding and publication of the LSE Law Review would not have been possible. We would like to extend our unreserved gratitude to the LSE Law Department and Administrative Team for their guidance and support; in particular, Professor Jeremy Horder, Professor Andrew Murray, Dr Emmanuel Voyiakis, and Sarah Lee, all of whom listened to our ideas and believed in this project from the very beginning. Further praise must go to our terrific sponsors – Francis Taylor Building, 7KBW and Norton Rose Fulbright – whose generosity has been absolutely vital to the Review’s success. Finally, we want to thank all of the writers who submitted their work for consideration. Authors are the lifeblood of any journal, and we hope to have done justice to the selected works.

When we began work on this project more than five months ago, we knew we wanted it to be the start of something significant. It is our sincere hope and strong belief that, under the stewardship of future Boards, the Review can go from strength to strength and become a vital part of the LSE’s identity for years to come.

Yours,
The Board of Editors

Foreword

It is a rare privilege to be asked to write a foreword to mark the foundation of a new law journal. I am delighted to do so for the LSE Law Review. The most famous of all student-edited law journals is, of course, the Harvard Law Review. The latter began life in 1887, with the support of future Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis. At that time the editors were selected solely according to the grades they had received, although by the time future President Barack Obama headed the Review, candidates had to complete demanding written tests as well. By way of contrast, to take one example from England and Wales, the Law Quarterly Review (founded in 1885) was always run along more patrician lines for decades, having had only a handful of (lone) editors right up until the late 20th century. The editors included founding editor Sir Frederick Pollock and Sir Arthur Goodhart, the latter having edited the Law Quarterly Review for some 45 years. This very different – ‘English’ - way of appointing editors inevitably meant that issues of gender, diversity and inclusion have never quite had the influence on choice of journal editor(s) in England and Wales that they had from a much earlier time in the USA, although some Journals have made good progress in that regard. Happily, no such problems are likely to affect the LSE Law Review, whose editors will be drawn from the LSE’s famously diverse student body.

The older counterpart of the LSE Law Review, the Modern Law Review, has been run by the Department of Law since the foundation of the Review in 1937, and is currently edited by Pro-Director for Research and Professor of Law, Julia Black. At that time, the aim of the Journal was to move away from the ‘black letter’ approach of the more traditional Journals, and to introduce (consistent with the aims of the LSE as a whole) an outlet for more social science-focused legal research. Such research came to change the face of legal scholarship as a whole. How much such an approach was needed can be measured by the fact that even such a now well-established subject as Labour Law was at that time regarded with deep suspicion at Oxford and Cambridge, given its focus on collective action and evidence-based statutory intervention, both so alien to the more individualist common law tradition.