FOREWORD

Research is not only hard work; it is team work. Authors must dutifully persevere from the conception of an idea to its final published form, allowing their work to be sharpened (sometimes painfully) before again being re-worked, and humbly accepting correction without becoming too discouraged or ceasing to believe in the value of their work. Reviewers must lend their time and knowledge to another's work – for knowledge is a gift to be shared – reminding themselves that despite not having enough time for their own writing, others' generosity has benefitted them enormously and it is now their turn to keep the virtuous circle turning. Editors must chase reviewers too busy to remember the generosity they once received (particularly towards the beginning of their career), somewhat resembling a secretary by day, cattle-herder by night. And we, the readers, get to feast on the fruit of all this work without cost, like when a friend invites you over for Thanksgiving dinner – roast turkey, homemade pumpkin pie, and all – and insists that you 'only bring yourself'.

How then should the reader receive this gift? I would suggest that reading another's work carefully and charitably does it great justice.

Why then do the authors, reviewers, and editors go about all of this hard, team work, irrespective of the journal's impact factor or article download counts? I would like to put forward a simple explanation from the perspective of an early career scholar, rather than a proper exposition of the intrinsic value of research in the pursuit of truth (let's just say this is because of space constraints).

My suggestion is this: vibrant scholarly communities depend on the publication of research at all levels, from students, to early career researchers (ECRs), to chaired professors, and everyone in between. This is the only way to ensure a diverse marketplace of ideas and to avoid hallowed echo chambers. If you may excuse an analogy to capital markets regulation, which is my line of research, then I would propose that just as healthy capital markets must support and facilitate listings by small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), healthy research communities must encourage contributions from students and ECRs in particular. A marketplace that makes it difficult for SMEs to become publicly-listed is not good for the economy because it reduces access to capital for these companies and excludes the wider public from investing and benefitting in their growth. Similarly, academic environments that impose barriers for students and ECRs (such as single blind review) or lack suitable publication venues

 $[\]odot$ 2023, The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY) 4.0 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. DOI: 10.14324/111.444.2052-1871.1696.

for them make it harder for the next generation of scholars to grow in their research skills and development, and are not good for the wider society by limiting the diversity of ideas that are publicly debated. An article that is only downloaded once, yet meaningfully impacts its reader, is a valuable contribution that cannot be quantified. Citation counts are not the sole measure of influence nor worth – who knows how an article's ideas may end up influencing others?

Just as not all companies are sufficiently mature to publicly list, clearly not all arguments are rigorously enough developed to merit publication. It is only my contention that encouraging research from junior scholars need not entail a loosening of academic rigour – especially considering the surplus of well-trained junior scholars in this country (the UK) from around the world – and that one meaningful way to support junior scholars is through a diversity of publication venues that publish excellent scholarship at all levels.

With this in mind, I wish to commend all those involved in Volume 12 of the UCL Journal of Law and Jurisprudence – in particular Managing Editors Siyu Bao and Leon Vincent Chan – as well as the PhD Editorial Board, the LLM/LLB Editors, and Dr Narine Lalafaryan as Faculty Adviser. Finally, and with special consideration for the fruit we are freely able to enjoy, I wish to commend our authors in this volume: Salar Abbasi, Anna-Lisa Lafay, and Vanessa Li Ka Hang.

Dr Jonathan Chan Lecturer in Law UCL Faculty of Laws October 2023