When my biography of Louis Dembitz Brandeis was published in 1984, I thought my involvement with the justice had ended. "Involvement" it was, as the research and writing had been spread over ten years, interspersed with teaching, other publications, childrearing, and all the minutiae of life. My family and friends learned more about Brandeis than they had ever wanted to know. My husband claimed I talked to Brandeis in my sleep. My daughter heard me quoting a journalist to the effect that an interview with Brandeis left the impression that the answers to all the world's problems could be found in Euripides. Her rather caustic comment across the dinner table was, "Well, to listen to you, Mom, it sounds as if all the answers can be found in Brandeis."

Perhaps not. But two decades after I first began reading Brandeis carefully, his ideas are as exciting and as relevant as ever. New scholarly works about him have been published, more of his letters have been unearthed, the attempt to assess his ideas and to apply them to current social problems has proved a never-ending process, and I have had almost ten additional years in which to read and think and regret all the things left unsaid in the biography. So I am grateful to Carey McWilliams and Lance Banning, editors of this series on American political thinkers, for giving me the opportunity to revisit and reexamine Brandeis's thought.

Five colleagues spent an extraordinary and much appreciated amount of time reading through various drafts of the manuscript,
commenting on everything from substantive matters to typos and some of my worst manglings of the English language. If there are few factual errors in the book, it is because every word was subjected to the eagle-eyed scrutiny of Melvin I. Urofsky and David W. Levy, editors of the Brandeis Letters, whose unfailing generosity to other Brandeis scholars deserves warm acknowledgment. Vincent Blasi, whose article on Brandeis's Whitney opinion will no doubt remain a classic, brought his wide range of knowledge to a meticulous and thought-provoking reading of the manuscript. Jill Norgren, whose pointed questions frequently fill the margins of my manuscripts, demonstrated once again her command of scholarly literature and the eclectic point of view that makes her such an invaluable reader. Peter Rajsingh, with his solid command of political theory, taught me how much one can learn from a student and the ways in which the teacher-student role can be reversed and enriched.

David de Lorenzo, curator of manuscripts and archives at the Harvard Law School, was gracious in helping me to track down elusive references. Thanks also are due to Fred Woodward, director of the University Press of Kansas, to production editor Megan Schoeck, and to copy editor Claire Sutton, all of whom were as meticulous about keeping to our time schedule as they challenged me to be.

My father, Joseph B. Strum, began critiquing my writing when I was in elementary school and never stopped. He commented upon, annotated, and frequently proofread almost all my scholarly work. His breadth of information was stunning and his command of English impeccable. I don't believe I ever mastered the intricacies of "who" and "whom" to his satisfaction, a lapse that he bore with his usual wry good humor. He managed to read through and correct this manuscript shortly before he died. I am fortunate to have had him as a friend and an intellectual guide as well as a father, and it is with great love that I dedicate this book to his memory.