

UNIVERSITY OF  
**COLORADO LAW REVIEW**  
VOLUME 96, ISSUE 4

**FOREWORD:  
ON FORESTS AND TREES**

Law professors commonly caution their students against “missing the forest for the trees” as they learn to absorb large amounts of reading material and distill legal rules from each case. But at the same time, it is easy to overdo this practice and forget that people, not abstract rules, are at the core of each case. Sometimes this distance between the abstract doctrine and the real people involved is necessary (in the context of cases from the 1800s) and helpful (in situations where cases involve deeply personal situations). Yet, other times, forgetting the people affected by a case’s outcome causes us to lose sight of what matters.

Relatedly, much of the realm of legal academia deals with people in an abstract sense. The discussion of humans is often left to the field of social science or the newspapers that analyze a given witness’s expression at trial. Yet, broadly speaking, laws regulate human behavior in the world. Any scholarship discussing such laws would necessarily involve a discussion of people. But it is a given author’s choice how abstract they want to make the connection between the legal topic they are discussing and the humans it may affect.

The six pieces in this Issue, though, confront how legal concepts affect people directly. Despite their varied and distinct subject matters, each piece engages with the laws that affect a specific group of people and proposes changes.

Rather than consider race and LGBTQ+ issues in the abstract, Professor Jessica Feinberg’s article, *The Identity Factor*, confronts the people affected by laws head-on with her discussion of identity development in multiracial and LGBTQ+ children vis-à-vis child custody laws. Professor Rachel Moran in *Red Flag Officers* proposes extending the concept of red flag laws for gun control to police officers with a history of violent misconduct, focusing on the people who pose a demonstrable

safety risk as opposed to regulating the weapons themselves. Similarly, Professor William Aceves' *Ending the Paper Chase at the U.S. Supreme Court* analyzes the Supreme Court's filing requirements, arguing that the rule to file multiple paper copies of often thousand-page documents reinforces the inaccessibility of justice at the highest level. Professor David Nows' article, *Accessible Financial Data for Equity Crowdfunding Investors*, also discusses accessibility but in a different way: ensuring financial data displayed on equity crowdfunding websites is accessible to the investors reviewing and engaging with the offerings, focusing on research from behavioral finance. Instead of an overview of the copyright system and why it may not work in today's modern music industry, Grace Detwiler's note on *Taylor Swift and Grimes's Competing Visions of Music Ownership: Copyright Protection versus Creative Innovation* captures this people-centric focus directly by comparing two artist's experiences with U.S. copyright law. In *The Hub-and-Spoke Model: How Everyone Can Get in on the Action in Colorado*, Sebastian Blitt proposes that Colorado change its gaming compacts to allow Native nations already authorized for sports betting to have a chance in the online sports betting market. Each piece puts people first in order to discuss the law.

As Managing Editor of the *Colorado Law Review*, it is imperative that I miss the forest and focus on the trees. To extend the metaphor, the trees are our editors and members without whom the *Colorado Law Review* could not exist. It is my job to work closely with our Board of Editors, associate editors, and second-year members. For the last year, I have gotten to know my fellow classmates far beyond the walls of a law school class. Between law schools' mandatory medians, the difficult job interview process, and the adversarial core of the American legal system, it is easy to ascribe to the notion that law school is a competitive, zero-sum game. Yet working together to produce our finished volume—our forest—reminds me how important it is to put people first.

The work of a law review encompasses different skillsets: technical editing, substantive editing, professional communication, discretion in selecting articles, and most importantly, teamwork. Our board members work tirelessly over the summer and on school breaks to polish these pieces. Our second-year members excitedly approach their cite checks and student notes. Our associate editors work together on whatever comes their way. The work is not easy—it can be

time-consuming, difficult, and very different from the type of work we do to prepare for class. But I have not doubted the ability of our people to complete it, which has made this job all the more rewarding.

Each member has a role, and I have had the pleasure of assigning members to teams based on various board positions, interests, and editing strengths. I may be biased, but the members of the *Colorado Law Review* are my favorite group of humans at this law school. We are filled with parents, marathon runners, former chefs, and engineers, and future public defenders, environmental lawyers, litigators, and law clerks. We are all different ages and bring to the table various careers and life experiences to inform our work. Some of us have mastered the *Chicago Manual of Style* and its comma rules; others know *The Bluebook* like the back of their hand. Taking the time to get to know each member on a personal level is my way of missing the forest for the trees. By learning about everyone's hobbies and experiences, not only do I connect with our members better but I can make more informed decisions about workloads and team assignments.

Managing *Colorado Law Review* has meant everything I do is people-focused and I would not have it any other way. I learn from our members daily, which has been the most rewarding experience of all. The trees—each member *and* each article—have turned this Volume into a wonderful forest. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with each and every member of Volume 96. Thank you.

Mallory Shaner<sup>†</sup>  
Managing Editor  
*Colorado Law Review*, Volume 96

---

<sup>†</sup> It takes a village; I could not do this alone. I would like to thank my fiancé, Jack, for championing my dreams for the past decade (and counting) and making countless sacrifices to support me in law school. I also want to thank my family for their encouragement, and my dog, Apollo, for his unfailing excitement to see me when I walked through the door after many long days at school. Lastly, to Devin: Thank you for showing me what true leadership is. Your patience, compassion, dedication, management, organization, commitment to your values, and ability to see the best in people have taught me beyond measure. You were absolutely the World's Best Boss.