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When we sat down to begin work on this book (which seems a long time ago), we knew what we wanted to accomplish—to create a casebook that would combine theory, practice, and ethics. We hope we have succeeded.

We both underestimated how difficult this project would be—the numerous decisions that would have to be made, the tedious detail work, the extensive research and culling of materials. If we had to do it over again, we might well do some things differently—we are told that this is the purpose of second editions.

One of our decisions was to edit Supreme Court cases lightly. They provide the basic constitutional framework for analyzing juvenile justice issues in the United States. We believe that students should discover and experience the full import and flavor of the Court’s opinions in order to be able to grapple with the Court’s shifting approaches in resolving questions regarding the juvenile justice system. We want students to view the subject matter in all its constitutional complexity rather than as simplistic “sandbox” law or “kiddie” court law.

We have also used the Institute of Judicial Administration—American Bar Association’s (IJA-ABA) Standards rather freely. Although they were written quite awhile ago, in general, they still provide the best source for what we consider the best practices.

In our efforts to make this a national case book, we used cases and statutes from many states. We think they are sufficiently representative of the juvenile justice systems in the United States. However, we recognize that most students want to know how the system works in their particular jurisdictions. To that end, we suggest that professors who use this book complement it with statutes from their home states.

We hope that our practice experience gives students greater access to the somewhat schizophrenic, secretive, and impenetrable juvenile justice world. We have tried to be neutral in our choice of materials and notes, but because we were both defense attorneys in large urban areas and share common views about the juvenile courts, some of our biases may be reflected in the book. We do not apologize for this, but we do want to make explicit what may be implicit.

Many ethical problems arise in juvenile practice. Unfortunately they are rarely acknowledged, and when they are, they are disposed of under the rubric of the “best interests of the child.” We have tried to explore these issues openly. Some students may find this disconcerting, but we think discussion of such problems will force students to examine their own views about children and the adversarial process.

Both of us have used some version of these materials when teaching juvenile law. We want to thank our students at the University of Houston Law Center who helped compile the materials and were willing to be experimental subjects with the various versions. A special thanks to Tobi A. Tabor, Co-Director and Clinical Assistant Professor of Legal Research and Writing, for her help in editing this book. We, however, are respon-
sible for any typos or editorial mistakes. We also want to thank the University of Houston Law Foundation for its financial support.

We invite your criticism, comments, suggestions, and any observations as to what worked and what did not. After receiving your input we will start tackling the teacher's manual. Please contact Ellen Marrus, emarrus@uh.edu, with your ideas.

We hope that you and your students enjoy using the book.

June 2007

E.M. and I.M.R.
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