# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication ............................................. 3  
"...richly merited tribute..."  
by Dean Jefferson B. Fordham ................. 5  
"Think of poor Mary..."  
by Harold Cramer, L'51 ............................ 6  
"...on leaving the Law School"  
by Vice Dean Theodore H. Husted, Jr., L'50 ... 7  
The Distinguished Service Award—1968 ........... 9  
Law School Placement ............................... 9  
Law School Admissions Policy ..................... 10  
Class of 1971 ....................................... 11  
$1.5 Million in Grants ............................. 11  
Graduate Program .................................. 11  
January 30 Luncheon ............................. 11  
Draft Law Seminar ................................ 12  
ABA Reception ...................................... 12  
Filii Alumnorum ................................... 12  
An Historical Note ................................ 12  
ALUMNI NOTES .................................... 13  

*Picture Credits:*  
Frank Ross  
Cover and pages 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12
Vice Dean
Theodore H. Husted, Jr.
Leaves The Law School

THE LAW ALUMNI SOCIETY dedicates this issue of the Law Alumni Journal to Vice Dean Theodore H. Husted, Jr., Law '50, who, after 15 years at the Law School, left at the end of the fall term to join Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison in New York City.


The father of seven, Vice Dean Husted served with the United States Navy during World War II.

Commenting on his return to private practice, the Vice Dean says that “after fifteen years here, I feel that I am at a point to make a change. It’s a challenge and an opportunity that I can’t turn down.”

Dean Fordham: “...richly merited tribute...” on Page 5

Harold Cramer: “Think of poor Mary...” on Page 6

Vice Dean Husted: “...on leaving the Law School” on Page 7
I speak from both the mind and the heart in paying richly merited tribute to this good friend as the end of our professional association draws near and he approaches challenging new opportunities. So great and pervasive have been his work and influence as Vice-Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School that no set of words could do him justice. His leaving will be an immense loss to the School. We regret it beyond measure, but we must accept it.

I am glad to have the opportunity here to do three things: (1) express boundless good wishes to Ted and Mary Husted and to each of their seven children; (2) to speak in appreciation of the extraordinary service of Ted Husted to the Law School and (3) to say a special word about our work together.

It pleases me greatly that a very significant opportunity with fresh challenge has come to Ted Husted. I am confident that his role in the splendid law firm to which he is going will be productive, pervasive and vital, just as his role in the Law School has been. I hope that the new association far exceeds his high expectations and that the lives of all the Husteds will be marked by rich fulfillment. I am confident that, in this, I speak for the entire Law School family.

In 1953, three years after his graduation from the Law School, Ted Husted returned to join the faculty and to assume the post of Assistant Dean. Within a relatively short time and with the enthusiastic support of his colleagues he was made Vice-Dean. In more than fifteen years of service he has been the central figure in the effective operation of the School as a working unit. He has been its executive officer in a very broad sense of the term. There is no doubt but that he knows more about the School and all its affairs than anyone else. It is to him that the students, as well as the Dean, the other members of the faculty and the staff look as to matters ranging the entire gamut. This is far more than a matter of information and know-how; his grasp and his insights have contributed notably to the maturing and shaping of policy.

His "job description," in bare outline form, runs three double-spaced, typewritten pages. He has been Secretary of the Faculty throughout his tenure. He has borne responsibilities as to all aspects of student life. His roles have ranged from interviewer of prospective students through father-confessor to ad hoc participant in placement and adviser as to Bar admissions. He has had supervisory responsibility for registration and records. He has prepared class and examination schedules with all the sensitivity required both to serve the purpose well and to be thoughtful of his faculty colleagues. He has been charged with preparation of Law School budgets and largely with budget administration. He has been the business manager and personnel officer of the School.

As an example of his special role in the changing life of the School, let me point to his management of the arrangements necessary to keep the School going while major renovations in physical facilities were in progress. In 1967 it was determined to vacate the main building entirely in order to permit of a single full-scale program of renovation rather than have the work done in stages over a much longer period. Mr. Husted carried through this difficult matter exceedingly well in all respects, not the least of which was the problem of maintaining pleasant human relations under trying working conditions. The burden of this operation upon him during the summer of 1967 was staggering. It was physically wearing and so demanding as to time that he was left without benefit of vacation. I record this with profound appreciation for his loyalty and effectiveness.

It has been said that you can tell the quality of a man's character by the way he acts with respect to little things. It is the small, day-to-day things in human relations which may easily be slighted by the less sensitive and thoughtful. That Theodore H. Husted, Jr., does concern himself with the modest things in life—that he is thoughtful of the "little fellow" as well as the great; that he will put his hand to any honorable task to get the job done—is indicative of the essential humility, sincerity and goodness of his character.

Let us speak of Theodore Husted, the law teacher. Throughout his service he has been a very effective teacher. He has taught a course every semester. His major subject has been Land Transactions. He has also taught Restitution, Mortgages and Insurance. His mind is that of a lawyer's lawyer and he has had much to share with his students. All the while he has participated zestfully in the ongoing informal faculty discussion of a wide range of legal and related problems.

There is another Theodore Husted. I speak of the civic leader. He has had an active hand in a variety of community affairs, perhaps most notably in years of service in the Philadelphia Housing Association culminating in the presidency of the organization. His interest in problems of human shelter has had a wholesome influence upon public policy and administration.

I personally owe an incalculable debt to Theodore
Husted. For over fifteen years we have worked closely in a common enterprise to which we both have been deeply committed. For my part it has been a remarkably felicitous relationship. He has been a first deputy of rare quality. He has had the keen insight to give faithful application to the thinking of the Dean and the quick intelligence to perceive when he must act on his own. It has been a great boon to enjoy the benefit of his awareness, his selfless objectivity and his clearheadedness in confronting the problems of the day.

As he moves to new opportunities and new responsibilities Ted Husted leaves a record which will be a demanding challenge to his successor and a continuing reminder to all concerned of his great and fruitful service to the School. He has earned the warmest affection and highest respect of his colleagues and he has both.

“Think of poor Mary . . .”

by Harold Cramer, L'51

The words below are especially appropriate in that they come not only from the President of the Law Alumni Society but also from a Law School contemporary and long time friend of Vice Dean Husted’s.

“Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio; a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy.” Thus, if I was the great Bard, would I have labeled my good friend, the Vice Dean, Ted Husted. It fills my heart with sorrow to realize that soon our Ted will no longer be in our fellowship. To lose him to the practice of law is bad enough, but to have him go forth to the Big City (New York) with the thought that he would be swallowed up in its fleshpots—is worse.

Think of poor Mary, Ted’s wife. She only recently settled into a new home in the country and has finally made herself and their seven children “at home”—she will have to move again. Little did she think when she married that easy-going, soft spoken scholar that a degree from Bekins would be her most valuable asset.

Enough of this, we of the Alumni are going to miss Ted. He has been affectionately called (among other things) Mr. Law School. During his sojourn at the Law School, Ted could always be counted upon to pitch in and help on every occasion. For a decade and a half he has untangled the imbroglios of Law School administration. Ted has worn many different hats and each with equally great success. The Vice Deanship itself is a complexity of jobs. On top of this he helped keep the Order of the Coif together by serving as its permanent secretary-treasurer for many years. He was one of the early sponsors, co-founders and general man of all seasons in establishing the Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture which has now been given annually for more than ten years. He is also a civic leader, vitally interested in community affairs, particularly the problems of urban housing. This by no means exhausts the list of his many activities.

Ted is one of those great people with the willingness and determination to get the job done, from beginning to end, even if he had to personally obtain the silverware or the whiskey, or straighten up afterward because the work force had left. He did the job himself—and with excellence. Perhaps that best portrays our Vice Dean.

By the foregoing, I do not want to give the impression that we will miss Ted the most for that portion of his job which made him assistant janitor at the Law School. On the contrary, we will miss the rare ability that he possesses and that was so often relied upon; to provide wise counsel and sage advice; to discuss matters with clarity and to offer new thoughts or a new solution to a troublesome problem. Above all his other qualities, this will be our greatest loss.

We of the Law Alumni Society are saddened by the departure of Ted Husted but we wish him all happiness and success.
The departure of Vice Dean Theodore H. Husted, Jr., L'50, for New York City after the fall term will be a loss that the entire Law School will find difficult to endure; the faculty and administration, the student body and the Law alumni. Mr. Husted was kind enough to leave us these words . . .

I cannot hope to find words with which to give adequate expression to the sentiments I feel on leaving the Law School. It is even difficult to know where to begin. Perhaps I can best start at the top—with Dean Fordham, an exceptional man for whom I feel the greatest admiration. His strength of character, his idealism, his drive, his determination have been constant sources of inspiration to me. I know, better than most of his faculty colleagues, the discouragements and the disillusionments he has suffered. I have seen him spring back determined that nothing should deter him from advancing the interests of the Law School. The satisfactions I have found in my labors during the past decade and a half are largely traceable to the fact that he has been a great man for whom and with whom to work. Jeff Fordham gave me a great deal of freedom and responsibility. He trusted me to carry out the policies established by the faculty, to see to it that the day-to-day administration of the Law School was attended to. Frequently, I disappointed him but seldom did his disappointment find expression beyond the statement that he would have preferred that I had handled the matter in some other way or the admonition to proceed differently when and if a like issue presented itself. I have more fingers than the times he caused me embarrassment by overruling a decision I had made though I am not sure there are hairs enough on my head to equal the occasions when he might have considered doing so.

And then there are my faculty colleagues, who are both great teachers and fine people. I not only admire them but I feel a warm and abiding affection toward each and every one of them. It is truly a remarkable group; warm in friendship, able in intellect, firm in purpose, dedicated to the advancement of legal knowledge, sympathetic to the concerns of the students, responsive to the needs of the community. However, let me not create the impression that I view them as plaster saints. They have their faults; they have their inconsistencies. It takes a master mariner to steer a course between two of their major plaints: first, that too many administrative burdens are being placed upon faculty members that ought to be handled by the administrators in the front office and, second, that too many decisions are being made by administrators which ought to be referred to the faculty. My seamanship has not always been equal to the task and my prow has been dented on divers occasions.

Next there is the staff: that dedicated band of many women and fewer men, almost all underpaid, who are the stagehands, the makeup artists, the wardrobe mistresses—who share none of the glory of the limelight, whose names do not appear on the marquee, who don't get mentioned in the reviews, but without whom this great production could not go on. I shall miss them all.

And then there are the students—constantly changing, yet ever the same—the men and women who will be the leaders of the profession tomorrow. Many of my former students have already reached positions of prominence. I read of their accomplishments in the press—judges and legislators, trial attorneys, law teachers and counselors—and I permit myself the indulgence of believing that I contributed in some small measure to their success. I have met them in the classroom—where they get brighter every year, where it becomes ever more difficult to stay just a step ahead of them, where they offer insights which have never occurred to me or see an issue I have never seen in a case that I have been teaching for most of the fifteen years. I have met them in my office where they have come to me with complaints and suggestions—some justified and valuable, others unreasonable and impractical, though what I view as the latter
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today, I might recognize as the former tomorrow. They have come to me for consultation and advice on personal matters as well as academic concerns. On countless occasions, I have been cast in the role of father confessor, sensing my own inadequacies as I listened to their recitals of marital or premarital difficulties, as I tried to rebuild their confidence, as I sympathized with the injustices, real or imagined, under which they were suffering. My work with students is what I have enjoyed the most. I tried to keep my door always open so that no wall and no distance separated me from them. I tried to let them know that they were welcome to come in and to talk themselves out.

Finally, I must mention the alumni—those dedicated sons of Pennsylvania who do not earn their living at the Law School but who love it and serve it with unflagging loyalty. It has been a pleasure to work with them. The names of Bob Trescher, Ernest Scott and Harold Cramer come first to mind but, really, their names are legion. I hope the others will not take offense that I have mentioned only three. The trio I have listed stand as proxies for them all.

One thing I have gained in the past fifteen years is a certain infusion of humility. It is hard to be simultaneously a proud man and Vice-Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. It is not only that I feel an intellectual pygmy among the giants who make up the faculty, but the job itself prevents one from having too high an opinion of himself. How often have I been at my desk, preparing for class, wrestling with the most effective way to develop a difficult principle, when a minor crisis has presented itself. A truck load of books has arrived which the driver refuses to unload without assistance, a fuse blows, or a sink overflows. Who is to meet the crisis? A janitor can seldom be located, the secretaries were not hired for this, students paying two thousand dollars a year in tuition cannot be conscripted as laborers. The Vice-Dean rolls up his sleeves. Half an hour later, he is still uncertain about how to develop the distinction between an estate subject to special limitation and an estate subject to condition subsequent but the blamed water fountain is no longer spraying the corridor.

Of all the associations I have formed these past fifteen years, I must give special mention to one—that with Edwin R. Keedy. As a student I had feared him, but in his autumn years a warm friendship developed between us. When repeated heart attacks made it impractical for him to climb stairs, he occupied the office next to mine on the first floor of the Thirty-fourth Street building. I was barely thirty; he in his late seventies; but we were frequent visitors to each other's offices. He had the keenest interest in my problems, the gentlest manner of offering advice. On many a late afternoon he would suggest that I needed a drink. We would repair to his bachelor apartment in the Drake Hotel where I would be offered my choice of sherry or warm scotch—he had a refrigerator but never any ice. For one whose taste runs to very cold beer and to bourbon on the rocks, it was not much of a choice. But I went there not for the drink but for the opportunity to hear him reminisce of his thirty-five years as a member of the Law School faculty. I have frequently regretted my failure to bring a tape recorder to those late afternoon sessions. When Ned died, a large part of the Law School's history died with him.

Ned Keedy was not an alumnus of the Law School but few men loved it or contributed to it as he did. The Law School was his life. One afternoon as we left the building together he said, "Well, Ted, you are going home. But when I leave for the Law School in the morning, I say, 'I am going home.' " Despite the existence of a wife, my seven children, and a heavy mortgage, the Law School has meant almost as much to me. I shall miss it. This has been no ordinary job, no ordinary association.

The past fifteen years have been happy ones, but it is time for a change. I have been fortunate in that most of my personal decisions have worked out well though often they were made for pretty poor reasons. I was influenced to study law by my father who had little formal education and who had punched a time clock all his life. His idea of success was to be your own boss and, to him, the small-town lawyer was an outstanding example of a man who was his own boss. Having gone from the Law School to a large New York firm and from there back to the Law School, I was never my own boss, in my father's sense of the term; but not once have I regretted going to law school.

Having decided on a legal education, I was advised by someone who ought to have known better that it was very important to study law in the state in which you intended to practice. To me that meant somewhere in Pennsylvania. I knew nothing of the relative merits of the law schools in Pennsylvania but I did know a girl in Philadelphia.

My intention to return to Greenville, Pennsylvania, and hang out my shingle never materialized because, as a second-year law student working part-time for the American Law Institute, I had a chance encounter with Harrison Tweed who suggested that I seek a summer job in New York. I followed his suggestion, not because I was interested in New York practice, but because it offered an opportunity to spend three months in the big city with which I had had little contact.

After three satisfying years of practice in New York, I happened to attend an alumni dinner. I found myself sitting at the same table with Professor Clark Byse whom I had not seen since graduation. We had a pleasant evening and this chance encounter led him to suggest that I might be the assistant for whom Jeff Fordham, who had just become Dean, was searching.

The circumstance that brought about the initial contact with Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison was almost as fortuitous. I can only trust that the resulting association will be as pleasant and as satisfying. Suppose I had not known that girl in Philadelphia? Suppose I had not taken that summer job? Suppose I had not gone to the alumni dinner? Suppose I had sat at a different table? Suppose . . .
The Distinguished Service Award — 1968

The Law Alumni Society made the inaugural presentation of its Distinguished Service Award to Professor Anthony G. Amsterdam, L'60, last April during Law Alumni Day. At that time internationally renowned artist Leonard Baskin, who had been commissioned by the Society to create an original work of art symbolic of the Award, had designed the medal and rendered it in clay but it had not yet been cast.

Edwin P. Rome, L'40, Distinguished Service Award Committee Chairman, recently received the finished medal and forwarded it to Professor Amsterdam.

For purposes of clarity, the clay rendering of the medal, ready for casting, is pictured here. The medal was cast in bronze and had engraved on the back beneath the word "to" the words "Anthony G. Amsterdam 1968".

The lettering on the reverse side of the medal was also designed by Mr. Baskin and "George Sharswood—First Dean of Law School" is inscribed on the rim.

NEW PLACEMENT DIRECTOR

"My door is open . . ." is the work-a-day philosophy expressed in the Law School's current efforts to serve the placement needs of its students and alumni.

Helena Clark is her name and she replaces Irene Barrett who held the post of Placement Director since 1962, before leaving to join the Lindsay administration in Fun City.

Miss Clark, who operates with a phone in one hand and a stubby pencil in the other, is fortyish and comes to the Law School well qualified, having worked with the University Placement Service as Assistant Director in charge of alumni and women's placement since 1960.

A graduate of University of Delaware who has attended the graduate schools of social work at both Penn and Bryn Mawr, Miss Clark has a long and varied career that has touched the spheres of private industry, government service and social field work.

The first person to introduce the concept of the placement service to the Indian subcontinent, Miss Clark plans no radical departures from the present system of interviewing. However, she emphasizes that the Placement Office is equally open to alumni as well as the current student body. With student placement now in full swing and busier than ever, she hopes this spring to give the entire area of alumni placement close scrutiny and a thorough overhaul.

Certainly a key to a successful placement service is the efficient dissemination of information, and she encourages alumni who have either permanent or summer openings available or who know of some in their own or another firm to contact her office.
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In Response:

Law School Admissions Policy

In response to inquiries from many alumni, this article is presented as a general statement of the Admissions Office policy. The following article, The Class of 1974, should be referred to for considerations of a statistical nature.

Every effort of the Law School admissions policy and its Admissions Office is directed toward obtaining the most qualified student body possible. But this laudable declaration of purpose resembles, in a sense, the sage advice often given investors on how to succeed in the stock market: "Buy at the bottom and sell at the top." As a general proposition it is unexceptionable. To begin with, it is probably true that there is no set of admissions rules or criteria that does not lend itself to criticism on one ground or another. The applicant who has good grades but a poor LSAT (Law School Admissions Test) score would like to have his unsatisfactory score overlooked, arguing that 3½ or 4 years of good hard work and academic achievement should not go down the drain as the result of one day's poor testing. On the other hand, the applicant who has a very high LSAT score and poor grades will tend to argue that if the desideratum is the "potential" of a student, then he certainly has that potential if the LSAT score has any validity at all.

There is relevance in the story of the wise old sage before whom husband and wife presented themselves in a dispute. The wife stated her case and the sage declared that she was right. The husband then presented his argument and the sage declared that he was right. The spouse of the sage, who had been listening to the dispute, could contain herself no longer and asked her husband sharply, "How can you say they are both right?" Whereupon the sage replied calmly, "You're right, too."

The gist of the matter is that while each one speaks part of the truth, the whole truth is something else again. Commonly when an applicant propounds one or the other of these arguments to Arnold J. Miller, Assistant Dean for Admissions, he replies by asking, in turn, if the applicant were to choose between a student who stands high in both categories and one who stands high in only one of the categories, which would he choose. Invariably the answer is that he would choose the former. The point is generally understood and accepted.

Actually what are the criteria for admission? On what does the Admissions Office depend to select from the approximately 1700 applications received each year? In order of importance I would list the academic record, the LSAT score, the faculty appraisals, and then a variety of other factors which come into play mostly in borderline cases. However, much further explanation is in order. Numerical averages are not slavishly followed. The academic record must be interpreted and many variables are involved. What is the quality of the school? Is there an upward or downward trend discernible in the marks? Is there a reason to disregard some of the marks, e.g., illness, emotional problems, a change in major, or a change in school?

Even the LSAT score is not completely immune to collateral attack. In a very few cases the Admissions Committee has seen fit to ignore the results of the test completely and to accept a student on the basis of his academic record alone. These were cases where it was adjudged that the applicant was actually a superior student but that there was some kind of psychological block taking a standardized test such as the SAT and the LSAT; and that the evidence of the student's previous history was sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the test was no valid predictor of his likely performance in law school. Another facet in the evaluation of the LSAT is that generally a standard number of points is subtracted from the second score if the applicant has taken it twice, to compensate for the improvement which has been shown to be attributable to experience.

Faculty appraisals are used together with the academic record and the LSAT score to help arrive at a better understanding and evaluation of the applicant. As can well be imagined, the variety of appraisals runs the entire gamut and their importance to the Admissions Office is a direct function of their informativeness, authoritativeness, and judicious discrimination. Their utility comes mainly into play in the grey area where so many students fail. In this connection Arnold Miller is sometimes asked, often apologetically, whether he resents letters of recommendation from outside sources, i.e. not faculty appraisals. His answer is that he certainly does not resent these nor does he feel that the people who offer them need feel apologetic. Any letter of recommendation which is well conceived and based on close personal knowledge may be an added factor in properly evaluating an applicant and is taken in that light and not as an attempt to pressure or intimidate.

In addition to the above criteria there might be a number of other factors which could influence a borderline case but they are too diverse and perhaps too limited in application to discuss at any length in this brief presentation.

In the final analysis, the Admissions Office is well aware that their admissions criteria are fallible. There is no pretense to omniscience, but one thing they endeavor to do is to ensure that every applicant gets, and will always get, a fair and courteous consideration.
1971

This year of 1968 will be remembered as the year when the impact of the removal of draft deferments for prospective law students and first-year law students was first felt. The confusion and uncertainty which immediately began to bedevil the career plans of those affected found their reverberations in Law School administration circles and especially in the operations of the admissions office. It was a hard year. Questionnaires were devised, daily statistics were maintained, news media and other informational sources were consulted to get a bearing amidst the uncertainties which ebbed and flowed with each dictum emanating from Washington.

There was indeed, due directly or indirectly to the draft, a considerable turnover and it became necessary to admit a significantly larger number of students than usual in order to achieve the Class. The changes came particularly fast in the latter part of August and it became necessary to work right to the wire, accepting candidates from the waiting list even as late as Labor Day. Only with the close of Registration Day could the composition of the Class be known with any certainty.

The Class numbers 181, coming from 18 states and the District of Columbia, 68 different colleges and universities were represented, 15 of the students held graduate degrees. There had been a total of 1681 applications.

The academic qualifications and averages held up remarkably well despite the problems of the draft. The average LSAT (Law School Admission Test) score was 640—again approximately the 92nd percentile of all those who have taken the test since 1958. The average class standing, it is estimated, would have placed the student within the upper 15%-20% of his class at a school of very good quality. 20 members of the Class are women and six are black students, as opposed to 13 and 3 last year respectively.

Many of the first choice students who were unable to matriculate for reasons directly related to the draft have expressed a desire to come to the Law School as soon as they are enabled to. A number of the best of these have been granted “deferred status”, i.e. a guaranteed place in a future class. Logically, then, this should mean that, within the next two or three years at the most, competition for open places in the first year class will become keener and averages should rise, perhaps significantly.

With regard to financial aid the picture continues to be one of increasing frequency of requests and burgeoning needs. Tuition and fees during the year had been raised from $1850 to $2150 and, of course, taken together with other rising expenses, the cost of obtaining a legal education presented a formidable problem to very many of our students.

To meet these needs the Law School provided scholarships and loans to 79 members of the Class, representing 45% of the enrollment. This financial aid amounted to $140,560, consisting of $95,460 in scholarship grants and $45,100 in loans. In addition, the members of this Class received another $49,700 in outside financial aid which required Law School approval or processing.

Both faculty and administration wish the Class of 1971 well for a challenging and rewarding year of study in this time of great national and international ferment.

$1.5 MILLION IN GRANTS

The Law School has received two grants totaling over one and one-half million dollars from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to expand the Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellowship Program providing legal services to the poor.

One hundred lawyers began the year-long program in August, with sixty attending seminars at the Law School and forty others paralleling the local program at the University of Michigan Law School.

The topics being considered by the “100” include consumer protection, housing, welfare and family law—all in preparation for their work in OEO-sponsored legal offices in cities across the nation.

Present plans call for the lawyers to return to the campuses twice during the coming year for week long conferences centering on an evaluation of their work.

The two government grants include funds for the recruitment of 100 additional lawyers to enter the program in the summer of 1969 and also provide funds for thirty of the fifty lawyers who entered the program in August 1967 to continue their work for a second year.

GRADUATE PROGRAM

The Faculty Committee on Graduate Studies has selected seven foreign lawyers from four continents as graduate students for the 1968-69 academic year.

Assistant Dean Robert F. Maguire, L’51, reports that the seven come to Philadelphia from as far away as Down Under and as near as Great Britain, and were selected from over 140 applicants representing some 33 countries.

Maguire expects that, as in the past, the study and research of these lawyers will bear visible fruit in the form of theses which will constitute valuable contributions to legal learning.

LUNCHEON PLANNED FOR JANUARY 30

The Law Alumni Society will have a luncheon at the Pittsburgh Hilton Hotel on Thursday, January 30, 1969 during the annual Pennsylvania Bar Association meeting in Pittsburgh.
Professor John O. Honnold has initiated a seminar investigation that may prove to be of timely significance for the Law School classes of 1970 and 1971. The program, which is open to second and third year students, centers on an investigation of various aspects of the impact of the draft and military jurisdictions on constitutional guarantees.

With many of the members of the present student body threatened with an interruption in their graduate education because of the current draft laws and, in particular, the recently restricted criteria for educational deferment at the graduate and professional level, the program has a potentially vast and receptive basis of appeal.

Currently enrolling only eleven students because of its seminar status, the program discusses immunity from military service based on religious, moral and political objections to war or to a particular conflict, and procedural guarantees applicable to the Selective Service System. Included, too, will be a discussion of induction based on a violation of selective service regulations or laws, the Due Process Clause and the scope of discretion given to draft boards and to the Selective Service System, as well as post-induction problems.

These latter will deal with expressions of opposition to war on and off the military base, conscientious resistance to specific military commands, and the “Nuremberg defense.”

Professor Honnold has designed the program to begin with general reading to isolate specific problems needing further investigation and the preparation of an outline for an integrated monograph. Thereafter, topics within this outline will be assigned members of the group and drafts will then be exchanged for criticism and editing.

It is expected that the writing will reflect an impartial analysis of the issue, as contrasted with a brief for a “point of view.” Professor Honnold has also expressed the hope that a publishable monograph under the joint authorship of the group will result.

American Bar Association conventioneers sampled a typically tropical Philadelphia summer when they met here this August. Wednesday, August 7, 1968 was no exception but on that day there was some relief from things professional and climatic. The Law Alumni Society held a gala afternoon reception at the Law School in honor of ABA president elect Bernard G. Segal, L’31.

A particularly large number of alumni, approximately 400, attended the reception. Many were from out of town and had their families with them. They were received by Dean Fordham and Mrs. Fordham and Mr. and Mrs. Segal. And then, thanks to the excellent planning of Society President, Harold Cramer, L’51, they found three superbly stocked bars and tables of magnificent hors d’oeuvres bearing, among many other succulent treats, such specialties as Clams Casino, mini-Shish Kabobs and egg rolls.

An added feature at the reception was a large photographic display entitled “... in the community.” It showed how today’s Law School students are concerned not only with classrooms and case books but are actively involved in current social issues, working in such areas as Poverty Law, Police Practice, Civil Rights and in West Philadelphia ghettos.

Although scheduled at 7-ish, the whispered reports were that Jeffrey B. Schwartz, L’65, and a band of Reginald Heber Smith Fellows entertained the Assistant to the Dean for Alumni Affairs into the start of the following day.

The following alumni have the pleasure of seeing their sons retracing their yesterday’s steps as members of the Class of 1971:

K. F. Ralph Rochow, L’33
Francis Xavier Quinn, L’34
David J. Salaman, L’40
Walter Y. Anthony, L’48

Karl W. J. Rochow
Francis F. Quinn
Drew M. Salaman
Richard B. Anthony

No one presently at the Law School remembers the use of such a wallet-sized entrance card for classes but it would indicate that 100 years ago class attendance was under substantially closer surveillance than today.
ALUMNI NOTES

1903
Morris Wolf, of Philadelphia, celebrated his eighty-fifth birthday on August 20 with business as usual at Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen. Reminiscing about the firm's modest start in 1903, he recalled that its first fee was a whopping $1.18.

1915
Judge E. Leroy Van Roden, of Philadelphia, and his wife Flora celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary with their five children and many of their twelve grandchildren. They also have two great grandchildren.

1921
Robert Dechert, of Philadelphia, Life Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, has been elected to the board of trustees of International House. International House is a residence and social center for 4000 foreign students studying in the Philadelphia area.

1922
Frederick H. Knight, of Philadelphia, senior partner of Morgan, Lewis and Bockius on his retirement in 1966, died on June 12, 1968.

1927
Philip W. Amram, of Washington, D.C., was appointed by the State Department as the sole U.S. expert at a meeting of a Special Commission of the Hague Conference on taking testimony in foreign countries for use at the Hague Conference in October.

1929
Thomas Hart, of Philadelphia, has been named Chairman of the Board of the Magee Memorial Hospital for Convalescents in Philadelphia and also currently serves as Board Chairman of Charles F. Kellom & Company of Philadelphia.

1931
Bernard G. Segal, of Philadelphia, was elected president-elect of the ABA and will automatically become president at the close of the 1969 ABA national convention.

1933
Jay H. Eiseman, of Philadelphia, chief examiner for the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, has been re-elected chairman of the West Branch Southeastern Pennsylvania chapter of the American Red Cross.

Joseph H. Flanzer, of Wilmington, Del., was re-elected President of the Delaware State Bar Association.

The Class held a most enjoyable 35th Reunion at the Philmont Country Club in May. The festivities included lunch, golf and dinner. The members of the Class and their wives were delighted by guest of honor Alexander Frey's recollections of the Class. Those attending included:

- S. Eugene Kuen, Jr.
- David Rosenbloom
- Gustave G. Amsterdam
- Joseph N. Leib
- Nathan Silberstein
- A. Morre Lifter
- Joseph T. Turchi
- Samuel Popper
- Benjamin Lichtenfeld
- Jay Eiseman
- Jerome L. Markovitz
- Herbert G. Marvin
- Robert Callaghan
- Francis J. Morrissey, Jr.
- Carl P. Lundy
- Edward First
- Joseph H. Flanzer
- Charles Fink
- Samuel R. Wurtman
- John Paul Jones
- J. Josiah Rainier
- B. Nathaniel Richter

1936
Berthold W. Levy, of Philadelphia, has become a partner in the firm of Abrahams and Lowenstein.

1943
Bernard M. Borish, of Philadelphia, has been elected a Fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Miles W. Kirkpatrick, of Philadelphia, was installed as chairman of ABA's Section on Antitrust Law at the 91st annual meeting in Philadelphia.

1944
Rabbi Meyer Kramer, of Philadelphia, has been appointed religious leader of the Pennypack Park Jewish Community Center after 18 years at Adath Zion Congregation.

1947
Arlin M. Adams, of Philadelphia, served as Pennsylvania-for-Nixon chairman in the 1968 campaign.

1948
Professor Bernard Wolfman, of the Law School has been elected chairman of the University Faculty Senate for 1969-70.

1950
Peter Florey, of Pittsburgh, has opened labor arbitration offices in Pittsburgh and Chicago. His appointments include: Umpire, Kelly-Springfield Tire Co., (Cumber-
land, Md. plant) and United Rubber Workers; Special Arbitrator, Board of Arbitration, United States Steel and United Steel Workers.

1951

RICHARD S. DENNY, of New York City, has been elected vice president and secretary of Bankers Trust Company.

JAY S. FICHTNER, of Dallas, Texas, has formed a partnership with Harold B. Berman, Harvard Law '48. Their firm of Berman and Fichtner is located at 1516 L.T.V. Tower, 1525 Elm Street, Dallas, Texas 75201.

EDMOND H. HEISLER, of Haverford, Pa., is serving as Chief of the Civil Law and Claims Division in the office of the Staff Judge Advocate, 7th Air Force, at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, Vietnam.

ROBERT S. TRIGG, of Lancaster, Pa., has been named Assistant General Manager of the Legal Department of the Armstrong Cork Company.

1952

WILLIAM A. KELLY, of Philadelphia, has become a member of the firm of Dechert, Price and Rhoads.

EDWARD M. NAGEL, of Allentown, Pa., has been named Assistant General Counsel of the Pennsylvania Power and Light Company.

1953

JOSEPH A. SUCHOZA, of Pottstown, Pa., was elected Mayor of the Borough of Pottstown.

THE CLASS held its 15th Reunion at the Locust Club in September. Over 100 people, which included some forty percent of the Class, and their spouses, Dean Fordham, and several members of the faculty, attended for cocktails, dinner and dancing.

1954

BENNET N. HOLLANDER, of Reston, Va., has retired from the Army and is now with the Appellate Section, Tax Division, Department of Justice.

S. GERALD LITVIN, of Philadelphia, has opened law offices at 1420 Walnut Street, Suite 913-17, in Philadelphia, Pa. with practice limited to civil litigation.

1955

YALE B. BERNSTEIN, of Philadelphia, a partner in Brickley, Torpey and Bernstein is Assistant City Solicitor, counsel to the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations.

JAMES R. COOPER, of New Kensington, Pa., has resigned after five years as Executive Director of Urban Renewal in New Kensington, to take a new position as Assistant Professor of Real Estate and Business Law at the University of Illinois, College of Commerce and Business Administration.

EDWIN KRAWITZ, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., who has completed construction of a new Pocono professional office building, was defeated in the July primary election race for representative in the State Legislature.
Getson for the general practice of law, with offices at Suite 1300, One East Penn Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107. He and his wife, Renee, are parents of a son, Kenneth Brian, born on October 10, 1968.

1962

ALFRED W. CORTESE, JR., of Philadelphia, has become a partner in Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz.

JAMES D. CRAWFORD, of Philadelphia, has recently been appointed Chief of the Appeals Division of the Office of the Philadelphia District Attorney.

FRANCIS E. GLEESON, JR., of Philadelphia, was the Democratic candidate for the State Legislature from the 172nd District which includes sections of Northeast Philadelphia.

DAVID E. RAPORT, of North Hollywood, Calif., has been elected Vice President of International Development and a corporate officer of International Industries, Inc., a conglomerate in the franchising industry, headquartered in Beverly Hills, California. He will head all international development and expansion of the company's divisions into foreign markets.

1963

JOSEPH M. BOWMAN, of Westlake Village, Calif., has joined the staff of American Hawaiian Land Company as assistant vice president and corporate counsel.

BIRCHARD T. CLOTHIER, of Philadelphia, is now secretary and corporate counsel for the Keystone Automobile Club.

CHRISTIAN H. MILLER, of Philadelphia, has become a partner in the firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz.

RUTH BORSUK ROSENBERG, of Rochester, N. Y., has become associated with Nixon, Hargrave, Devans and Doyle in Rochester.

MAX SPINARD, of East Orange, N. J., has become a member of the firm Spinard, Steinberg and Marshall at 617A Central Avenue, East Orange, N. J.

ALBERT M. STARK, of Trenton, N. J., has been named Assistant Prosecutor for Mercer County, N. J.

1964

DAVID DEARBORN, of Wenam, Mass., has been elected Trust Representative of the State Street Bank and Trust Company in Boston.

FREDERICA B. KOLLER, of Detroit, Mich., married Arthur J. Lombard of the Harvard Law School in August. Both are currently Associate Professors of Law at Wayne State University Law School in Detroit.

WILLIAM J. LEVY, of Washington, D.C., formerly of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, has become associated with the firm of Cole, Zylstra and Raywid in Washington.

RICHARD LIPPE and MELVIN RUSKIN, of Mineola, N. Y., of the firm of Lippe and Ruskin (see Spring 1968 Law Alumni Journal), have been retained by the Student Government of the State University of New York at Stony Brook to represent the students in their confrontations with the school administration. The pair have developed a five point plan for dealing with the problems which cause student unrest.

JAMES ROBERT PARISH, of New York City, is the editor of American Reference Book of Sound Films (Prentice-Hall, Dec., 1968) and Red Book of TV Feature Films (New American Library, Spring, 1968) as well as a member of the Drama Desk in New York City.

FRANK P. SLATTERY, JR., of Hicksville, N. Y., is now counsel for Mergenthaler Linotype Company, a division of Eltra Corporation in New York.

ROBERT G. FULLER, JR., of Augusta, Maine, Assistant Attorney General for the State of Maine, has other duties than prosecuting violators of the short lobster law. He recently represented the Maine Port Authority in their application to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (Department of Commerce) for permission to establish a foreign-trade zone at Portland and a foreign-trade sub-zone at Machiasport where Occidental Petroleum Corporation wants to locate a 300,000 barrel-per-day refinery to refine low sulfur Libyan crude for export and domestic sale; all to the consternation of the major oil companies who contend that oil import allocations will be upset, etc. He is shown here in conference at the public hearing with Occidental's attorney, Louis Nizer.

1965

HENRY R. MARSHALL, of New York City, was awarded a diploma in comparative legal studies from the University of Cambridge for a paper entitled "Class Gifts and the Rule Against Perpetuities in England and the United States" written while on a Gowen Fellowship at Churchill College.

PETER V. SAVAGE, of Arlington, Va., is presently an
Assistant Program officer for the United States Agency for International Development in Washington, D.C. His Arlington address is listed locally and he would be delighted to entertain visiting classmates.

JEFFREY B. SCHWARTZ, of Adelphi, Md., has received a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellowship and will be working with the New Orleans Legal Assistance Corporation during the fellowship year, August 1968 to August 1969.

GILBERT W. HARRISON, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the firm of Blank, Rome, Klaus & Comisky.

HARVEY STEINBERG, of Philadelphia, has recently been appointed Assistant District Attorney of the City of Philadelphia and also was elected to the Board of Managers of the Central High School of Philadelphia Alumni Association.

1966

ALLEN D. BLACK, of Washington, D.C., is a lieutenant in the Navy JAG Corps for the next three years.

Darryl B. Deaktor, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., is now associated with the Philadelphia firm of Goodis, Greenfield, Narin and Mann.

RICHARD M. GOLDMAN, of New Orleans, La., has been transferred to the staff of the Chief, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington, D.C., and is working part-time for his LL.M. at George Washington University.

PETER LEWICKI, formerly of Wallingford, Pa., is serving with the Coast Guard in New York City as an investigating officer in administrative hearings conducted by the Coast Guard for the U.S. Merchant Marine. The hearings are in conformance with the APA and concern professional competence, negligence and misconduct of merchant marines.

TODD S. PARKHURST, formerly of Atlantic Highlands, N.J., is now associated with the firm of Wolfe, Hubbard, Voit and Osann in Chicago and is married to the former Karen J. Huckleberry, Northwestern University Law

JOEL H. SACHS, of Mt. Vernon, N.J., after serving as Law Clerk to Judge Charles H. Tenney (S.C.N.Y.), has been appointed an assistant Attorney General of the State of New York.

RICHARD D. STEEL, of Wyncote, Pa., is now with JAG, HHC, 2nd Infantry Division in South Korea.

JOEL WEISBERG, of Philadelphia, is now serving as a captain with the U.S. Army Military Assistance Command in Vietnam.

PAUL TRICKETT WILLIS, of Tucson, Ariz., has become associated with the firm of Holesapple, Conner, Jones, McFall and Johnson in Tucson.

1967

REINWALD M. BERNHARDT, of Washington, D.C., is now a tax specialist in the Pension Trust Branch of the I.R.S. in Washington, D.C.

DONALD G. GAVIN, of Point Pleasant, N.J., is now on active duty as a captain in the JAG Corps of the Army. He was formerly law clerk to Judge Bernard Kelley of Philadelphia Common Pleas Court.

THEODORE J. KOZLOFF, of New York City, is now associated with Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom in New York City.

STEPHENV SCHEMAN, of New Rochelle, N.Y., is working toward the degree of Master of International Affairs at Columbia University and is also a Fellow of the European Institute of Columbia University.

ROBERT T. STERN, of Westport, Conn., has been admitted to the District of Columbia Bar and has been practicing as Legal Services Lawyer in Norwalk, Conn.

ANDREW M. EPSTEIN, of Elizabeth, N.J., has become associated with the firm of Epstein, Epstein, Brown & Bosek.

MARVIN M. WITOFSKY, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the firm of Blank, Rome, Klaus & Comisky.