

Editor's Note

This is RLSC's 50th volume; it has been our honor to serve as its leaders for this milestone. But in many ways we are leaders only nominally—this journal embraces democracy and horizontal organizing, and we have been inspired by the spontaneous leadership and ambitious vision demonstrated by editors across the masthead. To each and every one of you: thank you for the passion, care, and countless hours you poured into bringing this volume to life.

We have treated this anniversary volume as an opportunity for rededication to our mission. RLSC exists to give a home to radical scholarship outside the dominant legal discourse. Scholarship that calls itself “radical” risks becoming an exercise in institutional self-congratulation if it fails to remain accountable to the people whose lives give it urgency. Thus, RLSC strives to be a conduit for indigent clients, people subjected to incarceration, victims of structural violence, and those who represent them. When possible, we publish those voices directly. We aim to offer fierce alternatives to reflexive legal narratives of reformism and incrementalism. “Be patient,” “ask permission of power,” and “someone should do something” have no place here. The articles in this collection question who the law protects, who it excludes, and how it inflicts and legitimizes violence, while putting forth novel ways to understand and change systems of oppression.

This volume is intentionally small. Limiting our output this year has allowed us to retool our selection and editing processes, entirely rebuild our production calendar, and recommit to our presence on the Law School campus as a home for student organizing. We cannot wait to see what future generations of passionate, radically-minded law students do with this reborn journal. (And we're already thrilled about what the next editorial board is working on.)

As our 3L masthead leaves to begin bright legal careers, we dedicate this volume, and this whole journal, to the casualties on this field of pain and death—those caged or disappeared; those who have lost children in family court; those denied TANF or LIHEAP; those touched by state bullet, bomb, or bulldozer; those harmed by structural power and those without structural power who have harmed.

We have faith that the law can be life-affirming; we found that possibility in the pages that follow. We hope you do too.

Miles Pulsford and Sunni Whitmore
2025–2026 Editors-in-Chief