

Why Scalia?

THE FIRST EDITION OF *The Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court of the United States* appeared in 1992. The new, enlarged, well-updated, and generally useful second edition came out not long ago. In both editions, the entries are admirably consistent in their substantive depth and dispassion. One small exception concerns the biographical entries for living members and former members of the Court, which have ranged from neutral to worshipful. But now, one exception to the exception. Compare the treatment of Justice Antonin Scalia in the first and second editions of the *Oxford Companion*. Scalia must have done something between 1992 and 2005 to offend his profiler, Professor Harold J. Spaeth. We welcome your alternative theories.

Kermit Hall, ed., THE OXFORD COMPANION TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 882 (2d ed. 2005); Kermit Hall, ed., THE OXFORD COMPANION TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 756 (1992).

eReviews

THE TOP TWO U.S. law reviews – Harvard’s and Yale’s (see 2006 GREEN BAG ALM. 260) – have started on-line journals. Harvard’s is the *Forum*. Yale’s is the *Pocket Part*. It is early to be passing judgment, but so far the signs are promising. Both journals are posting good work by competent authors and their web sites are attractive and user-friendly. Yale’s *Pocket Part* has the early lead in terms of both content (more of it and more varied) and design (snazzier), but the editors at Harvard know what really counts: On their “About the *Forum*” page they declare, “We are also working with Lexis and Westlaw to incorporate the *Forum* into their databases.”

The hard truth is that on-line law reviews will have the status of blogs – albeit unusually careful (uptight?) and thorough (long-winded?) blogs – until their content is available in a durable format controlled by a responsible, disinterested party. That means hard copy in the hands of libraries or, at the very least, digital copy in the hands of West and Lexis. Articles from the *Forum* or the *Pocket Part* in a library or on West or Lexis can be cited with confidence – no need to worry that transient leaders of law reviews will lose track of them, or that editors or authors with second thoughts will revise or remove them.

www.harvardlawreview.org/forum/issues/119/aboutforum.shtml; www.thepocketpart.org; The Great Disappearing Act, 9 *GREEN BAG 2D* 3 (2005).

Inamicable

THE SUPREME COURT OF Illinois has revised its Rule 345 governing leave to file an amicus brief:

Rule 345. Briefs Amicus Curiae

(a) Leave or Request of Court Necessary. A brief *amicus curiae* may be filed only by leave of the court or of a judge thereof, or at the request of the court. A motion for leave shall state ~~the reasons why a brief of an amicus curiae is desirable~~ the interest of the applicant and explain how an amicus brief will assist the court.

(b) Forms; Conditions; Time. A brief of an *amicus curiae* shall follow the form prescribed for the brief of an appellee, shall identify the *amicus* as such on the cover of the brief, and shall conform to any conditions imposed by the court. Unless the court or a judge thereof specifies otherwise, it shall be filed on or before the due date of the initial brief of the party whose position it supports. The color