Texas Law Review
Volume 75, Number 1, November 1996

FOREWORD TO VOLUME 75

A Law Review for Texas
_Thomas R. Phillips_ 1

And Now We Are 75
_Charles Alan Wright_ 5

Why Did We Do It?
_Scott J. Atlas_ 9

ARTICLES

The First Shall Be Last: A Contextual Argument for Abandoning Temporal Rules of Lien Priority
_Ronald J. Mann_ 11

Verbal Completeness and Exclusionary Rules Under the Federal Rules of Evidence
_Dale A. Nance_ 51

NOTES

Substantive Justice and State Interests in the Aftermath of _Herrera v. Collins_: Finding an Adequate Process for the Resolution of Bare Innocence Claims Through State Postconviction Remedies
_Michael J. Muskat_ 131

The Role of Nonuse Values in Natural Resource Damages: Past, Present, and Future
_Judith Robinson_ 189
BOOK REVIEW

Hans Linde and the Elusive Art of Judging: Intellect and Craft Are Never Enough
Patricia M. Wald

reviewing Robert F. Nagel's
INTELLECT AND CRAFT: THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JUSTICE HANS LINDE TO AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM

215
Why Did We Do It?

Scott J. Atlas*

Every lawyer who ever served on the Texas Law Review looks back with pride on his or her years of student law journal work. But after being told that TLR was celebrating its 75th anniversary, I found myself reflecting on an unexpected question: Why did we do it? Why would so many law students, most with excellent academic records and attractive work prospects, agree to spend two years of late nights and long weekends eating cold pizza and drinking tepid coffee, straining to find every last case on an obscure point of federal common law, or debating endlessly the relative merits of whether to include a comma before the “and” among items in a series? Why would we forsake our family and friends night after night, weekend after weekend, attempting to proof copy before a deadline in the ever-present hope that the TLR would appear on subscribers’ desks before the end of the month appearing on the cover?

After two years of being a law review member, almost twenty years of serving on the Texas Law Review Association board, and twenty years of meeting with members of each new editorial board early in their term to convey some sense of the institution and its history and traditions, I ultimately answered my own question. I believe these reasons are shared by most former TLR editors.

First, we received enormous satisfaction from the final product. We appreciated our role as part of an undertaking that, after diligence and sacrifice, produced a thorough, thoughtful, and (relatively) error-free series of articles that collectively made a meaningful contribution to legal scholarship. We knew that some of our end product would help legal advocates fashion their arguments, judges decide their cases, and possibly even legislators reform the law. We took pride in knowing that few other student law journals are cited as often by judges and other legal publications. We hoped that TLR’s reputation for excellence would enhance the law school’s already first-rate reputation and help attract top-notch faculty and students to Townes Hall.

Second, we enhanced our own skills. We recognized that our efforts on the Review would inevitably improve our analytical, research, writing,

and editing skills. We understood that in the end, we would be better lawyers. We discovered that many potential employers recognized this and sought us out.

Third, we enjoyed being part of a community of talented and dedicated students working toward a common goal. When we accepted TLR’s invitation to join, each of us knew only a few other members. But we forged sturdy, trusting relationships through survival during adversity—tight printing deadlines, late nights, missing library materials, nearly completed articles preempted at the last minute by another publication, obscure reference materials that defied Bluebook classification, recalcitrant authors, exam taking after a semester of sporadic class attendance, the unrequited temptation created by the cheers from a nearby Longhorn football game, and even just a depleted supply of coffee.

Our friendships grew also through the fun we shared. TLR members played as hard as they worked, albeit sometimes in unusual games. Many a Saturday night was spent among members engaged in a heated game of ping pong, using several stacks of Federal Supplement for a net and paper plates or issues of TLR for paddles. Another memorable game, “Filing 498 F.2d,” required members to reshelve completely Volume 498 of Federal Reporter (Second Series) from a position two-thirds of the way off the shelf; the players’ only tool was a football, which had to be thrown from the far side of the room. Game playing occasionally provoked controversy. One night, several editors were playing a game called “Johnny Ball,” which my grade-school children call “Two Square” and consists of players repeatedly bouncing a ball on the floor. This game continued so long that an irritated faculty member who officed directly below the Review unceremoniously confiscated the ball. Despite risks, these makeshift games engendered strong comradery and left us with many pleasant memories. Those who face and triumph over adversity forge strong bonds of friendship. Despite time and distance, many friendships formed in such circumstances last a lifetime.

Fourth, we embraced the opportunity to join an exclusive fraternity. Former TLR editors have gone on to distinguished careers in academia, the profession, and public service, including (but by no means limited to) the judiciary. They have engaged in many important and worthwhile projects. We found that members of this impressive group were (and are) always willing to lend a helping hand to younger ex-editors.

For all these reasons, our Law Review service remains one of the most enduring memories of law school and, indeed, one of the most enjoyable work-related tasks of our lives. That is why we joined, persevered with, and even enjoyed TLR.