



THE YALE LAW JOURNAL | ONLINE

SUBMISSIONS GUIDELINES

In October 2005, *The Yale Law Journal* launched *The Pocket Part*, www.thepocketpart.org, an online companion to the *Journal*. Since then, *The Pocket Part* has published original essays and responses to the articles printed in the *Journal*. In September 2009, the *Journal* announced the integration of *The Pocket Part* into *The Yale Law Journal Online* (“*YLJ Online*”). *YLJ Online* continues all of the features of *The Pocket Part*, including publishing shorter, timely, and more accessible commentaries and responses. As with *The Pocket Part*, all *YLJ Online* pieces are fully searchable and available on LexisNexis and Westlaw, and are also made available in PDF format.

The *Journal* seeks **three** types of submissions for *YLJ Online*, with an approximate word count of 1500-6000 words (not including footnotes):

1) Recent Developments. We invite members of the academy and the legal profession to submit original essays that bear directly on events unfolding in the present. The currency should be such that these ideas ought to be published at once, rather than at the end of a year-long editorial process. For example, while then-Judge Alito sat before the Senate Judiciary Committee, we published an essay on the scope of that Committee’s questions for a nominee: [Robert Post & Reva Siegel, *Questioning Justice: Law and Politics in Judicial Confirmation Hearings*, 115 YALE L.J. POCKET PART 38 \(2006\)](#). Additionally, we invite all our readers, professors and students, to submit commentaries on interesting legal events. Recent court decisions, statutes, trials, speeches, and publications might all be good subjects for a commentary. For an excellent example, see [Natalie Ram, *The Mismatch Between Probable Cause and Partial Matching*, 118 YALE L.J. POCKET PART 182 \(2009\)](#).

2) Practitioner and Policy Pieces. Despite daily engagement with the same issues, academics and practitioners sit worlds apart. We encourage both groups to use the *YLJ Online* forum to engage with and challenge each other. For example, in the wake of *Citizens United*, the preeminent First Amendment litigator, Floyd Abrams, submitted the following piece: [Floyd Abrams, *Citizens United and Its Critics*, 120 YALE L.J. ONLINE 77 \(2010\)](#). Additionally, we seek pieces where academics or practitioners want to speak to a broader audience, including policymakers or the general public. These pieces blend the common appeal of opinion-editorials with the rigor of scholarship.



THE YALE LAW JOURNAL | ONLINE

3) Responses and Symposia. We also solicit content in the form of responses to our print pieces and symposia commentaries. In Volume 120, one of our print pieces elicited three excellent responses:

- **Print piece:** Curtis Bradley & Mitu Gulati, *Withdrawing from International Custom*, 120 YALE L.J. 202 (2010), available at <http://www.yalelawjournal.org/images/pdfs/912.pdf>.
- **Online response:** David Luban, *Opting out of the Law of War: Comments on Withdrawing from International Custom*, 120 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 151 (2010), <http://yalelawjournal.org/2010/12/8/luban.html>.
- **Online response:** William S. Dodge, *Withdrawing from Customary International Law: Some Lessons from History*, 120 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 169 (2010), <http://yalelawjournal.org/2010/12/17/dodge.html>.
- **Online response:** Lea Brilmayer & Isasias Yemane Tesfalidet, *Treaty Denunciation and “Withdrawal” from Customary International Law: An Erroneous Analogy with Dangerous Consequences*, 120 YALE L.J. ONLINE 217 (2011), <http://yalelawjournal.org/2011/1/5/brilmayer-tesfalidet.html>.

As an example of symposia commentaries, our 2009 conference, “*Important Questions of Federal Law*”: *Assessing the Supreme Court’s Case Selection Process*, yielded a plethora of exceptional commentaries:

- [J. Harvie Wilkinson III, *If It Ain’t Broke . . .*, 119 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 67 \(2009\).](#)
- [Frederick Schauer, *Is It Important To Be Important?: Evaluating the Supreme Court’s Case-Selection Process*, 119 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 77 \(2009\).](#)
- [Richard J. Lazarus, *Docket Capture at the High Court*, 119 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 89 \(2009\).](#)
- [Sanford Levinson, *Assessing the Supreme Court’s Current Caseload: A Question of Law or Politics?*, 119 YALE. L.J. ONLINE 99 \(2010\).](#)

Kindly remove all self-references from the submission itself; we will use the same blind selection process that we use for the *Journal*. We hope to respond to submissions within two weeks of receipt, and to publish within a few months of acceptance. If you have any questions, please contact our Online Director, arpit.garg@yale.edu.



THE YALE LAW JOURNAL | ONLINE

STYLE GUIDE

In text:

Our previous style guide was much more nuanced. We have since reduced it to the following two propositions.

First, state the thesis promptly, clearly, and briefly—preferably within the first two sentences. This suggestion is particularly important because the “teaser” version on the main page will contain only the first 100 words of your piece. Furthermore, with limited space, we remind you not to digress but focus clearly on defending your thesis.

Second, write in a conversational tone. While some pieces are geared towards academics (e.g., response pieces), anything online has the potential for a much broader audience. We therefore encourage the use of active voice, shorter sentences, and even the first person (where appropriate).

In citations:

As general practice, *YLJ Online* pieces conform with standard Bluebook style, specifically as the PDF version of the Online piece appears no different from a Print piece in formatting and citation style.

The critical exception is that *YLJ Online* pieces will attempt, whenever possible, to provide a link to an online version of cited materials, according to Rule 18.2 of The Bluebook. As such, please include Internet links in your submissions.