Australian National University

Federal Law Review
2020, Vol. 48(1) 3
© The Author(s) 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0067205X19890442
journals.sagepub.com/home/flr
SAGE

Editors' Note

Dear Readers,

In this issue of the *Federal Law Review* we inaugurate the 'In Focus' feature, in which a handful of articles centring on a given theme appear together. This new feature will also include brief commentaries appearing in subsequent issues and responding thoughtfully to the initial articles. The In Focus format allows the *FLR*'s authors and readers to engage each other in sustained dialogue on vital topics in public law.

In keeping with our longstanding international presence (even our first issues, in 1964–65, had comparative articles), authors and commentators will often be based outside of Australia. In this way the *FLR* will continue to be a platform for Australian and international authors to inform each other on topics that transcend any single jurisdiction. Our aim is thus to deepen and internationalise Australian public law debates, but also to insert distinctive Australian perspectives into those debates.

The present issue commences two In Focus dialogues: one on important developments in constitutional proportionality testing (with papers by Rosalind Dixon and Adrienne Stone), and the other on interpretation in public law (with papers by James Allan, Scott Stephenson and Jules O'Donnell).

General Editor Ron Levy; Academic Editors Jelena Gligorijevic, Jonathan Liljeblad and Amelia Simpson

https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X19890442 Published online by Cambridge University Press