

Loyola University Chicago Law Journal

Volume 55
Issue 3 *Spring 2024*

Article 2

2024

Introduction

Jake Gnolfo
Loyola University Chicago Law School

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lawcommons.luc.edu/lucj>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jake Gnolfo, *Introduction*, 55 Loy. U. Chi. L. J. (2024).
Available at: <https://lawcommons.luc.edu/lucj/vol55/iss3/2>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by LAW eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loyola University Chicago Law Journal by an authorized editor of LAW eCommons. For more information, please contact law-library@luc.edu.

Introduction to Issue Three

Welcome to Volume 55, Issue Three of the *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*. With each publication, the *Law Journal* seeks to highlight thoughtful legal scholarship while honoring Loyola's commitment to transformation and social justice. Each article offers an essential framework for progress, emboldens the discussion on critical yet challenging subjects, and advances practical and visionary solutions. The *Law Journal* proudly presents this Issue as a testament to these guiding principles.

Issue Three begins with Professor Larissa G. Bowman evaluating today's eviction crisis by equating it to mass incarceration. Professor Bowman exposes the disparate impact caused by evictions on single, Black women with children and argues that although it is a civil legal process, evictions can be conceptualized on the "carceral continuum." As such, in line with opponents of mass incarceration, Bowman argues that eviction should be abolished. Eviction, like mass incarceration, cannot be reformed, and academics and activists alike must engage with the project of eviction abolition as a critical facet of the reimagination of the state as responsible for the lives of Black women rather than the profits of white men.

Next, Professor Michael C. Wetmore examines the recent Supreme Court decision, *Hemphill v. New York*. In this case, the Court held that a criminal defendant may not "open the door" to otherwise inadmissible evidence because of his Sixth Amendment right to confront adversarial witnesses. However, the Court was silent on whether this new rule is a "watershed rule of criminal procedure" and should be applied retroactively to those currently incarcerated on direct appeal. Using a well-established framework, Wetmore argues that the *Hemphill* rule is a watershed moment that implicates the fundamental fairness and accuracy of criminal proceedings.

In our penultimate piece, Professor Daniel S. McConkie Jr. critiques our state-centered, professionalized, and adversarial criminal justice system. By excluding victims, offenders, and other important community stakeholders, the current system is not responsive to those on which it has the greatest effect. As such, Professor McConkie argues that restorative justice, especially where it is centered in community courts, is an ideal reform to strengthen criminal justice citizenship and, therefore,

democracy itself. McConkie argues that restorative justice will increase collective action to address issues in a community, foster deliberation among the stakeholders, and strengthen membership in our democracy.

Finally, we are proud to present a note from Loyola student and *Law Journal* member, Rachel Dudley. Following the Supreme Court's recent ruling in *Allen v. Mulligan*—where the Court protected Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act when it held that Alabama's redistricting map diluted minority voters' voting rights—Dudley identifies a crucial issue that the Court did not address: whether computers can play a role in redistricting, and specifically whether they can adequately consider race. In her note, using a historical review of the Voting Rights Act and its accompanying case law, Dudley argues that the Court must limit the role that computers play in lawsuits. To best honor the Voting Rights Act, we cannot put all our trust in computer technology; instead, courts should require a multifaceted analysis of facts and circumstances, which computers do not adequately perform.

The *Law Journal* would like to sincerely thank our authors for contributing their valuable scholarship to our publication. The collective effort and care from each made this an immensely rewarding experience. The Executive Board would also like to extend its deepest appreciation to the staff members of the *Law Journal*, whose unwavering perseverance made this publication possible.

Jake Gnolfo
Executive Editor, Lead Articles
Loyola University Chicago Law Journal



SCHOOL *of* LAW