

Missouri Law Review

Volume 25
Issue 1 *January 1960*

Article 9

1960

Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editorial Board, 25 MO. L. REV. (1960)

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/mlr/vol25/iss1/9>

This Masthead is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Missouri Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact bassettcw@missouri.edu.

MISSOURI LAW REVIEW

Published in January, April, June, and November by the
School of Law, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Volume 25

JANUARY 1960

Number 1

If a subscriber wishes his subscription to the REVIEW discontinued at its expiration, notice to that effect should be sent; otherwise it is assumed that a continuation is desired.

Subscription Price \$3.50 per volume

\$1.00 per current number

MEMBER, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF LAW REVIEWS

FACULTY ADVISER

HENRY T. LOWE

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

BERNARD N. FRANK

ARTICLE AND BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

JAMES W. M. RINER

MANAGING EDITOR

JOHN E. BURRUSS, JR.

REVISING EDITORS

BOBBY J. KEETER

JOHN W. M. RINGER

JULIUS F. WALL

FRED D. BOLLOW
RICHARD H. BREINER
DONALD E. CHANEY
DANIEL H. COLEMAN
LARRY D. DINGUS
CHARLES B. ERICKSON
JACK E. EVANS
CHARLES B. FAULKNER
JOHN H. GASSNER
TED M. HENSON
ANDREW H. LAFORCE, II

BYRON G. LANDER
TROY RICHARD MAGER
EVERETT A. OLSON, JR.
THOMAS I. OSBORNE
HARRY D. PENER
JOHN D. RAHOY
WILLIAM E. SEELEN
B. VINCENT TYNDALL
M. RANDALL VANET
JAMES R. WILLARD
DAVID A. YARGER

ESTHER MASON, *Business Manager*

Publication of signed contributions does not signify adoption of the views expressed by the REVIEW or its Editors collectively.

"My keenest interest is excited, not by what are called great questions and great cases, but by little decisions which the common run of selectors would pass by because they did not deal with the Constitution or a telephone company, yet which have in them the germ of some wider theory, and therefore of some profound interstitial change in the very tissue of the law."—OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, COLLECTED