

---

## EDITORS' FOREWORD

Law reviews have the potential to spark debate and accelerate change. We believe the best way to actualize that potential is to invite more voices into the conversation and make space for careful examination of ideas. Beginning with this issue, the *Boston University Law Review* will feature invited response essays alongside many of our articles in Volumes 102 and 103. These responses, we hope, will serve as vehicles for more meaningful and accessible dialogue around the issues our authors explore in their works.

The presentation of alternative and sometimes conflicting perspectives promotes rigor and invites the audience to examine for themselves which positions are most compelling. The consideration that an article receives, however, often reflects factors beyond the author's control. Careful critique and discussion take substantial time and effort, and with so many articles published each year, the bandwidth for meaningful engagement is limited. Yet, law reviews arguably fail in their purpose unless they foster such engagement—whether in the form of a conversation among students or an evolution in legal interpretation. In publishing response essays, we aim to take responsibility for the *Law Review*'s mission of advancing new ideas and starting dialogue.

Publishing in-print response essays is a new practice for the *Boston University Law Review*, and as such, there is almost certainly room for improvement in how we implement this idea. We welcome your feedback and suggestions.

We would like to thank the authors who contributed excellent original pieces to this October issue and the scholars who engaged with their work to pen the first in-print response pieces: Kenny Mok, Eric A. Posner, and Stephen I. Vladeck; Jill E. Fisch, Sergio Alberto Gramitto Ricci, and Christina M. Sautter; Aaron Saiger, the Honorable Jeffrey S. Sutton, and John L. Rockenbach; Jonathan P. Feingold and Jerry Kang; Esther K. Hong and Emily Buss; and Seth E. Montgomery. Thank you for engaging with us as student editors and trusting us to implement a new idea. We would also like to thank the *Law Review* editors who worked tirelessly to make this issue possible.

Finally, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to Professor Gary S. Lawson, for his insight and early enthusiasm for this initiative; to our predecessors, Seth E. Montgomery and Alina J. Cathcart, for their friendship and help in inspiring this innovation; and to Professor James E. Fleming, for his encouragement and support—not only of this idea, but of all the *Law Review* does.

Lisa Mary Richmond  
Editor-in-Chief  
*Boston University Law Review*

Margaret R. Houtz  
Senior Managing Editor  
*Boston University Law Review*