Curriculum Reform

As an undergraduate I sat under a great history teacher, Frank Porter Graham, of the University of North Carolina, who liked to dwell upon the periods of transition in history. Had I been as outspoken as the students of 1969, I would have reminded him that all is transition. Reflection instructs me that he had a legitimate stance, since there are periods during which change is relatively great, measured one way or another.

At the risk of being provincial about the contemporary—that which is immediately with or before us—I do assert that this is the greatest and most fateful period of transition in all history. Man is doing drastic things to the physical environment; the enormous implications of change for all forms of life is by no means adequately appreciated. The problem of population control, which is so compellingly related to the maintenance of a supportable balance on this earth, is not far in time from the critical point. We have at hand the means of suicide for the whole society of man. All this is not even to mention the great social problems in urban areas and elsewhere, which press so hard upon us. I do not speak as a prophet of gloom or doom; it behooves us all—of optimistic outlook or otherwise—to be realistic about the human condition.

Little wonder that people in the University of Pennsylvania Law School and in legal education generally are profoundly concerned about the general order of things and about the effective role of institutions of legal education. Certainly, this is a time of major change in the life of this Law School. A searching effort is being made by the faculty to clarify our role with particular attention to objectives, content and method in the educational program and in related research and other activities. To this end, one member of the faculty, Professor Robert A. Gorman, is serving as a one-man task force in re-examining the educational program and process. He will devote most of the summer and all of the fall, 1969, to this undertaking. One cannot say at this juncture, of course, where we shall come out. It may be that current thinking along the lines of confining the formal required period of legal education to two years, with the effect of getting the student onto the scene of action more quickly, will, among other things, attract very serious consideration. Certainly, at the minimum, there is need to make the second and third years of law study more vital to and demanding of the students. But enough of speculative commentary; I will not anticipate the fruits of the faculty's exploration.

If I have a “message” at this particular time, it is that even in a critical period, such as this, a university and its center of legal learning can serve society best by preserving their institutional detachment in the educational process and in research. The scope of their interest is catholic; “universitas” does not mean a community service establishment. A law school is not a political or action institution. It is a place of free inquiry and research with a high potential both for critical evaluation of social institutions and programs and for fact-finding and thought relevant to human problems. It is consistent with this educational philosophy for a law school to maintain a climate congenial to participation by faculty members and students in social action. And it is positively needful that the stuff and method of legal education be relevant to contemporary society. But, however strong the appeal for institutional commitment to community service as a law school responsibility, the integrity of legal education requires that such service be confined to a voluntary and secondary level. At least, this is the way I see it.
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Summer 1969
Law Alumni Day: Scheduled Red

Roberts Speaks To Alumni As Pickets March; Rededication Features Fordham, Harnwell; Levi Questions Value Of Three-Year Course

Seminars Probe Problem: “Education In A Period Of Social Turmoil;” Law Alumni Society Holds Election Of Officers And Board Members; Tour Of The Renovated Building And Refreshments Precede Dinner

In 1969, Law Alumni Day took on an added significance as it was coupled with the celebration of the climax of the three-stage building program: the completed renovation of the Law Building, which had originally been dedicated in 1900.

The festivities began with a luncheon honoring the Quinquennial Classes between 1904 and 1969, at which the principal speaker was Justice Samuel J. Roberts of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

An unexpected addition to the program was the appearance of seven Negro men and women during the luncheon, who carried picket signs protesting: “PENN HAS A BLACKOUT,” “PENN RE-NEWAL-BLACK REMOVAL,” and “PENN IS 1% SOUL.”

“Education in a Period of Social Turmoil,” was the keynote for the series of two seminars held during the afternoon. The first, concentrating on “Legal Education: Relevance and Intellectual Discipline,” was conducted by Law School Professor John Honnold.

Following a half-hour coffee break, the second session moderated by Law School Professor Louis B. Schwartz, ’35, tackled the problem “The University: Student Demands for a Moral Society: Ends and Means.”

In late afternoon, the proceedings moved to the familiar tent in the courtyard for the annual meeting of the Law Alumni Society. The main order of business was the re-election of the officers: Harold Cramer, ’51, President; William F. Hyland, ’49, Vice-President; Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr., ’52, Secretary and Thomas N. O’Neill, ’53, Treasurer. The new members of Board of Managers, whose term expires in 1974, are Leonard L. Ettinger, ’38; William S. Hudders, ’29; and William T. Leith, ’41.

The focal point of Law Alumni Day came with the dedication of the renovated building. Professor Paul Bruon, Chairman of the Building Committee made the opening remarks, followed by Robert L. Trescher, ’37, Chairman of the University’s Board of Law. Trescher also read the remarks of Ernest Scott, ’29, representing the University Trustees, who was unable to attend. Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, University President Gaylord P. Harnwell and Harold Cramer also spoke.

Cocktails and a tour of the renovated building preceded a dinner which was held in the foyer of the Law School Addition. The evening was concluded in the courtyard, once again under the tent, with an address by Edward H. Levi, President of the University of Chicago.

The remarks by President Levi, Justice Roberts, Dr. Harnwell and Dean Fordham appear in their entirety hither and thither in this issue.
edication And Unexpected Protest
Chicago President Describes Wake Of Ten-Year Program

... EDWARD H. LEVI
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Karl Llewellyn, outstanding law teacher of a past creative period, thought lawyers could do almost everything. He thought doing was important. A scholar of folklore and legal history, he included the proper conduct of ceremonial events among the proper doings of lawyers. With special shrewdness, he knew these events were necessary and should be done well.

As a former law school dean, who in one year—stretching over two—took part in at least five separate final dedications of the very same building, I can only imagine with awe the trail of luncheons, symposia, dinners and dedications which your ten-year program to complete the law quadrangle has left in its wake. We do well to celebrate.

Ten years is a long time in the history of any American university; particularly for a private university where the art of planning is a subdivision of fortune-telling and witchcraft. Ten years is a particularly long time now; both law and education are at a turning point. We must welcome the realization that the conditions of 1969 and probably the next ten years are quite different from those perceived in 1959. You have earned the good fortune of new and renewed facilities. Their significance will be in their use to meet the changes of our time.

Our period is characterized by an enormous sense of inequality, a belief in the unbounded affluence of our country, a self-concern which is within the traditions of individualism and idealism but has other roots as well, an acceptance of power and coercion as ruling principles, and of an anti-intellectualism typical of agrarian or populist movements. These views and attitudes are widely shared. They are frequently coupled with such an assurance of helplessness as to make freedom of choice seem no longer personal, or merely symbolic, or at least something not to be exercised now, or to emphasize the desirability of drastic or catastrophic change. A feeling of collective guilt is pervasive. We have a soil conducive to self-righteousness, never hard to come by, for as Edmund Burke wrote describing the attitudes of a time which we hope is not too similar to our own “history consists for the greater part of the miseries brought upon the world by pride, ambition, avarice, revenge, lust, sedition, hypocrisy, ungoverned zeal, and all the train of disorderly appetites.”

There is a resurgence, too, reminiscent of older periods, of conviction in the inevitability and, therefore, the rightness of waves of the future. You may find this picture overdrawn and, of course, it is. Fierceness, exaggeration (Continued On Page 19)
And More Speeches

And More Speeches

High Court Justice Recalls Long, Close Law School Ties

HONORABLE SAMUEL J. ROBERTS
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Opportunities to speak at the University of Pennsylvania are ones which I always cherish. It is no secret that over the years I have sought to maintain the close personal relationship with Penn that began when I was an undergraduate and continued during my three years at this very Law School. Since 1963 when I first joined the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania I have worked closely with eleven young men, my law clerks, all of whom are graduates of this great Law School. I have also had the privilege, over the years, to count as my good friends many of the members of Penn's distinguished faculty. And so, to be able to stand here today and be a part of the dedication of our magnificent new law school building, is indeed a very great honor.

Yet, when I look at the program for today's activities and see the distinguished company into which I have been placed, I almost get the feeling that whatever I say here cannot possibly come up to the high level of what will follow later this afternoon. And so, rather than try to outstrip what I am sure will be a host of significant legal thoughts, I would like simply to speak briefly to the general topics of today's seminars. Let me begin by sharing a few observations with you on the subject of legal education.

Every year about two hundred new students matriculate at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. They come from all parts of the country, from every conceivable type of undergraduate training, from all socio-economic levels. The ultimate goals which these students bring to Penn are no more homogeneous than their backgrounds. Of course, there will always be the purists who really want to enter the private practice of law upon graduation. But in ever increasing numbers, law schools throughout the United States are witnessing the enrollment of students for whom private practice holds little fascination whatsoever. These students want, perhaps, to teach, to work in government, to work in the poverty law area, to enter the business world, or to engage in politics. In fact, many such young men and women think, rightfully or not, that the servicing of a corporate client seems almost like a nasty business.

With such a variety of backgrounds and objectives facing the typical law school each new academic year, it is no wonder that administrations and faculties spend countless hours trying to decide just what to do with students during their three year legal education. Of course, the law school has always been challenged to

(Continued On Page 22)
The completion of the Law School's major building program has been something devoutly to be wished. It is no longer so—c'est un fait accompli! This is, indeed, a time for rejoicing. I do rejoice and invite you to rejoice with me. Of course, I must acknowledge that it has taken a decade and a half to do the total job, which suggests that we are due credit for persistence, if nothing more.

This has been, happily, a common enterprise in which literally hundreds have participated. I welcome the occasion to express profound gratitude to the alumni for their leadership, their hard and effective work and their generous financial support. What they have done has been indispensable. In identifying Ernest Scott and Bob Trescher, who are participating in this ceremony, I both express deep and abiding appreciation to them for their extraordinary leadership and through them recognize the wonderful and sustaining support of many other active alumni and of the alumni body in general.

While I must say that I am not enamored of the function of money-raising, the job came as close to being a pleasure, working with men like Ernest and Bob, and Bob Bernstein as one could hope.

I am grateful to our President, Gaylord P. Harnwell, and his colleagues in the Administration. I am grateful to the Trustees. Gaylord has kindly given the members of the Law School family principal credit for seeing this undertaking through and, in turn, I want him to know that we are fully aware that we have had a great deal of help from his quarter and are very grateful indeed.

I pay particular tribute to my faculty colleagues who have served so faithfully and so well as members of the Law School Building Committee. This beautiful structure, which so delightfully melds the old with the new, is a credit to our architects, Messrs. Carroll, Grisdale and little more than an occasional cheer of encouragement from those of us entrusted with the care and feeding of the whole University.

I know that many of you gave until it hurt and worked until it hurt to see this program realized. Without in any way minimizing the labors of so many among you, however, I think of this building program especially as a tour de force on the part of your Dean, Jefferson Fordham. Jeff has been unrelenting and uncompromising in his resolve to make this Law School the best; and now that the School's immediate physical needs have been met, I know he will continue his unrelenting efforts to build up the endowment base of the faculty, library, and research program.

I notice that the theme of your afternoon seminars was "Education in a Period of Social Turmoil." As a university president I think I know what that means. And I cannot leave you today without acknowledging
Van Alen, but I am sure that those accomplished professionals would cheerfully grant that the Faculty Building Committee has contributed in a highly significant way to what has been wrought. The members of that Committee have been Paul W. Bruton, Chairman, Paul J. Mishkin, Curtis R. Reitz, Theodore H. Husted, Jr., and Morris Cohen. In the final stages, Assistant Dean Robert McGuire has had an active hand.

I think you will understand that there is not time to identify our non-alumni contributors. I do thank them warmly for their exceedingly helpful support.

Of course, the quality of physical facilities is not an index to the quality of a university or law school. This is not to say, however, that a day such as this is of limited significance. On the contrary, the providing of truly first-rate facilities for educational purposes is a worthy development. Beyond that the accomplishment does constitute a symbolic milestone; it is significant as a matter of tone.

This building is a thing of beauty; in it lives the spirit of the great tradition of the School and shines the promise of renewed commitment to the achievement of unsurpassed excellence in legal education, research and service in the interest of the larger community.

But we must look to the future; let us confine self-congratulation to this particular occasion and accept the extraordinary challenge of these difficult and exciting times in the life of our society. This ceremony comes rather late in my tenure as Dean, but my thinking is directed ahead to the future of the School as the faculty and its continuing leadership will carry on. So, I will speak briefly of my aspirations.

In the first place, I say in very hard, mundane terms, that the University should lift its sights with respect to the on-going financial support of the Law School. I am tremendously proud of the School's quality and its service and I assert that, in budgetary terms, the University has (Continued On Page 18)

what it has meant to the University of Pennsylvania during this turbulent period to have a distinguished and spirited Faculty of Law committed to the orderly progress of the total institution.

Ever since the establishment of our University Senate back in 1952, faculty members of this School have continually been applying their expertise and their sense of fairness to the refinement of the University's internal governing procedures. I hesitate to single these men out by name, because I have the impression that virtually every member of the faculty has been involved.

They helped organize the University Council, our highest governing body under the Trustees—which now has three law professors on its steering committee. A member of the law faculty, who is leaving shortly to become vice-president of another university, served for a time in the "hot seat" as Vice-Provost for Student Affairs. Another now heads our current Task Force on University Governance. And while I have no intention of gloating over our freedom to date from disorder and disruption, our much-publicized student demonstration in College Hall last February was, I believe, remarkably civil and democratic—thanks in part to our having unambiguous guidelines for open expression, drafted more than a year ago by a commission headed by a professor of law.

With such professional talent and concern as the great Law School faculty is contributing to the University community, we have the best counsel to be had—and we have reason to hope that the rule of law will continue to prevail on our campus.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, I felicitate you on the completion of this crowning project in your building program. I can't remember a time when this was not among the great law schools, but you have made it significantly greater.
Honored At Commencement

For her work as a civil rights lawyer in Mississippi and during the Poor Peoples' March in Washington, and for her continuing service as a public interest counsel in the Nation's Capitol, the Law School Faculty awarded Marion Wright Edelman an Honorary Fellowship in the Law School on the occasion of Commencement.
Commencement 1969

Seabrook Cites Faculty; Bail Study Gets Grant

by Carol O. Seabrook, '69
Class President

I believe it is my function today to speak to you briefly on behalf of the Class of 1969. I want to begin by saying that that is impossible. It is impossible for anyone to speak, either briefly or at great length, on behalf of 181 talented, articulate and extremely critical law school graduates, who are only united by the diverseness of their opinions and their felicity in expressing them.

Furthermore, having been elected by a semidemocratic process, I cannot pretend to represent any of the more colorful and committed extremes of opinion that are held by my classmates.

Despite all these disclaimers, a few things that we are all bound to agree upon do come immediately to mind. First of all, we are delighted to be here today, and to be leaving tomorrow. Whatever our experience of the past three years, whether we have been exhilarated and challenged or have merely survived, we are very happy to be receiving our coveted degrees and to be going on to those other things in life that are promised to all graduates of a fine institution.

Secondly, we agree that we cannot sing high enough praises of the brilliant, dedicated and inspiring men who are the faculty of this law school and who have devoted their time and energy to our edification. Of course, we would not have been good law students if we were not each critical of various courses, methods, policies, in fact everything about the school—and the faculty is well aware of our individual and collective criticisms.

Some of us may feel, in fact quite a few of us do feel, that law school, the law, and the legal profession are largely irrelevant to the solution of current problems, but none of us can doubt the sincerity of these men in preaching the application and themselves applying reason and moderation and due process to all manner of progressive change. Many of us intend to try to apply the same reason and moderation.

There is one last thing we are agreed upon, something of a rather different nature. It has been customary in the past for each member of the graduating class to donate his student deposit of $5 to the Class Treasury for class purposes. In the past, this money has been used for a class party and to start a fund for the Twenty-Fifth Reunion Gift. The majority of us have donated our deposits to the Class, but we did not want to spend it on the traditional purposes. Instead, we have decided to contribute from our class fund the sum of $500 to the Bail Litigation Project.

This uncontrovertibly worthy cause is a student-conceived and student-run program which is attempting to bring suits that will result in the setting of definite and even rational standards in the bail system. Two members of our class, Bob Czeisler and Max Stern, are the founders of this program, and many others have devoted a great deal of time to it. We hope our small gift will help keep the program running through the summer.

In conclusion, a word to the members of the class alone. Each of your class officers has great expectations for your future. Your Class Agents, George Davies and Greg Weiss, hope that you will be very prosperous and that you will contribute a large part of your earthly possessions to Penn Law School. Your Class Secretary, Carl Feldbaum, hopes that you will lead exotic and titillating lives, and correspond with him frequently and in great detail about them.

Your Vice President, Peter Gross, and myself hope that you will eagerly attend all the exciting class functions that we plan for you over the years. And last but not least, your Treasurer, Tom Wilner, hopes that none of you will ever demand to audit his books.

Campaign Tops Goal

Conversion of the old Law School building into a modern library and research center was among the aims of a University-wide $93,000,000 Development Program—which has now exceeded its goal.

William L. Day, Chairman of the Trustees, announced May 1 that gifts totaling $100,103,000 had been received for new buildings and endowment throughout Pennsylvania's 18 schools. The Law School renovation was one of 15 major construction projects completed during the campaign, which was announced late in 1964. In addition, 27 new professorships were established, including the William A. Schnader Professorship of Commercial Law (Law Alumni Journal, Winter '69) and the Benjamin Franklin Professorship of Law, held by Louis B. Schwartz.
'33 Graduate Dons Apron; Transformed Into Busboy

"... You Mean You're Not A Lawyer?!",

When one is accepted into a law school, while he is in attendance and even when he is graduated, it is assumed that he is there because he entertains a strong ambition to one day practice his profession—in some form or other. Man (or Woman), Fate and the elements sometimes conspire, however, to lead him (or her) down some other petal-strewn path, often with great success.

Having encountered several such creatures,
heavy oak tables and chairs. The walls were panelled in oak and covered with Mink's prized collection of antique oyster plates. Over the bustle in the kitchen hung two huge paintings acquired by the original owner in 1933.

“A young painter named Reginald Beauchamp came into Kelly's one night looking for work,” Mink explained. “Mrs. Kelly felt sorry for him—he needed a layette for his new baby. She didn't hire him, but she did commission those two paintings and paid him $90. He is now assistant to the president of the Philadelphia Bulletin. By the way, he eventually used the money to buy a dog.”

Mink will also be moving his staff of 35, who man the large cauldrons of snapper soup, clam chowder and oyster stew, open thousands of clams and oysters every year, and prepare the shrimp and lobster which attract large lunch and supper crowds down Mole St. from Market. Some of his employees, like Jerry Bowles, Royal Harvey and Oscar Carpenter, have been at Kelly's for 30 years and worked for the late Mrs. Kelly. In 1967, they celebrated Mink's 20th anniversary in the business with a party complete with champagne and flowers.

There are literally dozens of anecdotes which Sam Mink has gathered from his years on Mole St., but perhaps the most charming is about a 91-year-old woman who was so enthusiastic about Kelly's that she insisted her son accompany her on her second visit. Her son is Paul Hunsberger, who hosts a radio talk show called "Off the Cuff from the Hickory Steak House," which originates from WSNJ in Bridgeton, N.J. He enjoyed Kelly's and Sam Mink so much that he had Mink on his show. "It just goes to show you the force of a mother's influence," Mink said.

Undoubtedly Mink's favorite part of Kelly's and a subject which he never tires talking about is his famous collection of over 400 antique oyster plates. He began the collection, which is the largest in the world, in 1947 and is now regarded as an expert. "I've travelled all over the United States and even to Europe to acquire a particular plate," Mink said. They come in an infinite variety of colors, shapes and sizes, some incorporating real shells
and others sculpted to hold six or more oysters.

Among the most valuable and unusual plates in Mink's collection is one which belonged to former President Rutherford B. Hayes and dates to the late 19th century. "Mrs. Hayes had it made to order for use in the White House," Mink recently purchased it for $250.

A Meissen plate from Germany is one which Mink counts particularly valuable, since it is one of a kind. "I have many single plates and pairs which are the only ones of their kind in existence," Mink said. "Many people approach me, wanting to trade or buy and sometimes I let them make copies, but I especially treasure the plates which are most unique. Many of the pairs I have acquired, though, have been through trades with people who were willing to give up their half of the pair in return for a specific plate in my collection."

Mink has also begun a collection of Royal Bayreuth, that is pottery dealing with the sea. Large lobster pitchers and fish plates hang over a sign at the bar which encourages customers to "Eat Fish and Live Longer!"

As a restauranteur, Mink is active in many local business organizations—he is a director of both the Delaware Valley Restaurant Association and the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau. He was responsible for the establishment in 1968 of the DVRA's annual Policeman's Community Service Award, given to a city and a suburban policeman for community work contributed during their off-hours.

Although it has been 36 years since Sam Mink was a student at the Law School, he still feels very much a part of the University. "I can't get over the change," he exclaimed on Law Alumni Day as he toured the renovated Law School. He is a faithful donor to the annual giving campaign and attends his class reunion every year.

His memories of the Law School are both vivid and unique. "I especially remember one elderly professor who was so forgetful that his fly was never closed," he chuckled. "Finally, the Administration installed a wooden panel in the front of his desk. Things were certainly different then."

Sam Mink readily concedes that he no longer thinks of himself as a lawyer, but one really can't take him seriously—especially when he follows that statement with a sly smile and "As long as I have a restaurant, no lawyer will ever go hungry in Philadelphia!"
Professor Cites 1st Year Seminar Program Success

by Robert A. Gorman
Professor of Law

Mr. Gorman, a graduate of Harvard College and the Harvard Law School, joined the faculty in January, 1965. He offers courses in Contracts, Conflict of Laws, Copyright, and Labor Law. He was primarily responsible for instituting the first-year seminar program, which has been in operation for the past two years. He is currently undertaking a study of the law curriculum and of problems of legal education generally.

The first-year program has traditionally been regarded as the most successful feature of the Law School curriculum. The students experience—not without some pain but with even greater excitement—a new style of classroom discourse, a new method of analysis of substantive problems and a new approach to the solution of social conflicts. The mysteries of the case method and the idiosyncrasies of the faculty are common fare at the luncheon table. Study groups are formed and outside reading done as a means of resolving some of the countless dilemmas exposed in the classroom.

It therefore came as something of a surprise to me to learn from a number of first-year students, two years ago, that they regarded their educational experience as in some ways lacking. Each of the two sections of ninety students traveled from class to class as a monolith; there was little "intellectual cross-breeding" between the two groups. The large-class type of instruction intimidated the less assured and more introverted members of the group. The instructor's felt need to cover so much ground per hour often made it difficult to pursue in depth questions which a number of students may have found puzzling and important. There was little opportunity to deal with the faculty and with classmates in a more leisurely setting.

In short, the students to whom I spoke believed that the first-year program was too highly structured and too depersonalized.

What to do? In some measure, the assignment of faculty advisors to groups of first-year students has helped to dispel the illusion of an olympian faculty. In greater measure, the first-year legal method program of legal research and writing has added an element of personal faculty supervision. Some of the other problems continued to linger, however, and my discussion of them with a number of my colleagues led to the development of the first-year seminar program.

My hope was to get faculty together with small groups of first-year students on an informal basis, discussing substantive problems of common concern. Ideally, a number of the seminar offerings would not fit comfortably within the range of subjects in the first-year curriculum. In order that such a program could coexist with the already heavy course load of the first year, I thought it best to make the seminar program wholly voluntary both for students and faculty.

No credit would be given for offering or for enrolling in the seminar, and no examinations or grades would be given. The general subject matter of each seminar would

Curriculum Study

The faculty of the Law School recently voted to undertake a thoroughgoing re-examination of the curriculum. Subject to study and evaluation are the courses being taught, the manner of instruction, the role of extracurricular legal activities, and most other items of relevance to the academic and professional goals of the school. Professor Gorman has been named to initiate the study. It will involve, among other things, consultation with the faculty, law students and, hopefully, alumni.

Specific suggestions concerning improvements in legal education at Pennsylvania are earnestly sought from the alumni. If it is convenient to reduce these to writing, they might be forwarded to Professor Gorman, c/o the Law School.
be at the choosing of the faculty member, with specifics to be determined by him in consultation with the interested first-year students. The frequency of meetings, their length, and the nature and quantity of reading would be similarly flexibly determined. In the late spring of 1967, a number of the faculty expressed an interest in participating in such a “free law school” (both in substance and in tuition) and the seminar program was put into operation during the following academic year.

That fall, the existence of the program was announced to the first-year class and a list of the offerings circulated. Perhaps the best way to indicate the sweep of the available offerings is to list them: studies in the history of legal literature; the concept of mistake in continental criminal law; the Moynihan Report on the negro family; legal control of school discipline and policy; introduction to the conflict of laws; landlord-tenant problems in poverty areas; the international movement for the protection of human rights; “reverse discrimination” and equal employment opportunity legislation; problems in interstate discovery; negotiable instruments; the urban crisis: transportation, air pollution, housing, planning and the planner.

It was a happily diverse collection, and the reactions of the students were also somewhat diverse. Some second- and third-year students sought entry into these strictly first-year offerings, while at least one first-year student expressed disappointment and distress because all of the offerings were “related to the law”! On the whole, the students embraced the program and roughly half of the members of the first-year class enrolled.

In retrospect, although some students evidently found the burden of preparation more onerous than they had anticipated and quietly ceased to participate, the program was, I think, a success. It brought together for the first time in an academic setting students from both of the first-year sections, in groups of no more than fifteen students, digging at some depth into a problem which was not typical first-year fare. The informal contact with a member of the faculty proved refreshing and welcome, as did the break with the case method (for both students and faculty). Some offerings were attractive to the students because they permitted exploration of problems in the emerging “law and poverty” area which were not systematically encountered in the first-year program. Other offerings were attractive because they dealt with subject matter which the students would not be able to study formally until the second or third year of Law School, if even then.

The benefits were not, happily, limited to the student participants in the seminar program. The faculty and the school as a whole benefited as well. One of the seminars proved to be the precursor of a full-fledged seminar offered the following academic year for third-year students. Another of the seminars was offered by a member of the legal method staff, enabling him to tie together original materials and affording him the opportunity to teach in a group setting. Some of us used the seminar program in order to indulge our taste for extracurricular legal reading; some have used it as a tie-in with the legal research in which we are actively engaged.

The experiment with the first-year seminar program worked sufficiently well that most of the faculty participants urged that it be continued the following academic year. And so it was. A new roster of volunteer teachers was posted in the fall of 1968, and a new set of seminars was offered this past spring semester. The offerings were even more diverse than in the preceding year. Professors Freedman and Ruth jointly offered a seminar dealing with “the lawyer's new role in the juvenile court”; Professor Goldstein, at popular request, offered an over-subscribed seminar which explored the problems discussed by him and Professor Schwartz in their manuals prepared for the Philadelphia police force; Professor Levin, in conjunction with a charming young lady member of the New York Bar, discussed the legal problems of the woman, treating those aspects of the civil (such as welfare, education and labor) and criminal law unique to America's better half; Mr. Kramer of the legal method staff offered a seminar in Jewish Law (in which he holds a degree); two offerings (those of Professor Reitz and myself) fell loosely within the category of jurisprudence; and Professor Mishkin offered a most timely and provocative seminar entitled the University and Morals.

---

**Cure-All For Inflation Woes**

**10% To God**

The following analysis seems especially apropos during what many consider the heyday of our old friend creeping or, if you prefer, galloping inflation.

by Holman G. Knouse, '23

You can stop INFLATION by stressing the importance of the INNER QUALITIES. The INNER is more important than the OUTER. You can never escape from your shadow or your inner man. Your greatest reward is that Inner Satisfaction of knowing that you have performed to the Best of your Ability. The reward from your fellow man is limited to your accomplishments which might or might not have been your best.

This is a good program to acquire HEALTH, WEALTH and GOODNESS and to stop INFLATION. Spend your income as follows—

1. 10% for GOD
2. 60% for Necessaries
3. 20% for Wise Investments
4. 10% for pleasure and luxuries

Above thought matter can be applied at the individual, city, state and national level.
Once again, participation by faculty and students was voluntary; the average seminar group was roughly ten in number and met five or six times during the spring semester.

The question arises whether the first-year seminar program should be continued and, if so, whether the format should be changed. By a happy coincidence, the development of the program in the last two years has been accompanied in the world of legal education generally by a drive toward more informal law school instruction, teaching in smaller groups, use of non-case materials, and incorporation of more writing and of electives in the first-year program.

Our seminar program has helped to serve many of those functions. A number of my colleagues who have offered seminars have in fact suggested that they might be formally incorporated into the first-year program as a means of bringing small-group instruction and intensive substantive study into our curriculum at an earlier stage than has been customary. Indeed, some members of the faculty accompanied this recommendation with the suggestion that such a course might go ungraded, or graded on a pass-fail basis, in view of the inherent incentives in such a program for full student participation. Unfortunately, the present size of the faculty (although we are growing) may make it difficult to require enrollment on the part of every member of the first-year class.

I have, perhaps, exaggerated the virtues and the significance of the first-year seminar program. It has been, after all, only a modest and relatively untested feature of the first-year educational operation. It has, however, served as a laboratory for pedagogical experimentation—experimentation both in the manner and substance of instruction.

The faculty has recently initiated a thorough re-examination of our entire curriculum. Presumably, we shall draw upon our experiment with the first-year seminar program, and perhaps it will furnish some lessons which can be of use in charting the future of the Law School.

---

One Man's Opinion:

Business Oriented Firms Explored

Students Must Become Aware Of Social, Environmental Frameworks

by John F. Hellegers, '65

As an alumnus of the Law School who had the pleasure of pursuing graduate studies on a Gowen Fellowship during the 1968-69 academic year, I was surprised by the apparent indifference with which the current crop of campus activists regard schools of law and business. I would have expected them to take a lively interest in what goes on in both places.

Perhaps, though, their present indifference is a blessing. It gives us time to explore for ourselves the problems of business, of business oriented law firms, and of the schools that serve each—before these problems become intolerably urgent.

There is a well known saying to the effect that the law, in its majestic equality, forbids rich and poor alike to thieve bread or sleep under bridges. The first corollary of this proposition is that the services of our bigger and better law firms are available on an absolutely equal basis to any and all who can pay for them.

The services of the firms as such, of course, are distinct from those of their individual attorneys—who may devote considerable time to unpaid outside work. But this time is rarely if ever spent on causes which might embarrass firm clients.

It is reported, for example, that when a group of associates at a prominent Washington firm recently wished to conduct a stockholders' suit against a corporation whose hiring practices were allegedly biased, the firm's management committee "vetoed the idea. Their principal objection, they told the lawyers, was that the firm had a primary responsibility to its clients, and it was not in their clients' interests to establish a legal precedent that might be used against them." Kopkind & Ridgeway, "Law and Power in Washington: Arnold & Porter—and Fortas," 36 Hard Times 2 (June 16-23, 1969).

This attitude, which of course is usually expressed more subtly, may have something to do with Ralph Nader's blunt judgment that "the legal profession, like a fish, rots from the head down." Playboy, Oct., 1968, p. 206.

The chief exception that comes to mind is the case of Mr. John F. Banzhaf, III, Columbia Law School '65, who induced the FCC to require "anti-smoking commercials" on radio and TV at the same time that he was working for a firm that had a prominent tobacco company among its clients. (For reasons I don't know, Mr.
Banzhaf has since left this firm.)

The unsurprising results are that the principal clients are prosperous corporations; that the firms themselves become more or less identified with the interests of these corporations—and that within the larger social framework the interests that can pay for such services tend to be grossly over-represented, at the expense of those that cannot.

This is perfectly clear in a long line of contemporary American "horror cases," ranging from the 1965 fight over regulation of cigarette advertising, to the chemical companies' determined attempts to beat back efforts to limit the use of pesticides that kill people and wildlife as well as bugs, or the use of non-organic fertilizers which in California and the Middle West have already raised the nitrate content of drinking water above safe levels.

A further consequence is that law and business school curriculums tend to be weighted toward skills which have a ready market in the "real world." Thus an already distorted system is distorted further. As ex-Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois put the matter in an article on the frustrations of trying to reform the tax structure:

"When we considered a tax bill, the room was filled with prosperous lawyers, graduates of great universities and of top ranking law schools, whom Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley Surrey once referred to in a burst of admiration as 'the best minds in the country,' all working to hold what they and their clients had and to enlarge it.

"One major trouble with the tax system is, therefore, precisely this: that these 'best minds' have largely worked to make it what it is. Not more than one out of every hundred citizens actively working on a tax bill is trying to represent the general interest. And in the halls outside the hearing rooms the lobbyists are as thick as flies, while the publicity men and noisemakers are busily at work in Washington and elsewhere. In the halls of academe, erudite professors train their students in the intricacies of the tax code so that their students may succeed in the private practice of law by helping wealthy clients avoid taxes and thus beat the government of the people.

"All this raises the question of whether this is a fundamental weakness of our democratic system. . . ."

If tax reform were our only problem, or even our principal one, there might not be much cause for worry. But the system works like this in other areas, too—and for better or worse the world seems to be entering a period of exceptional stress, one marked by varying degrees of social disintegration; massive population growth; unprecedented environmental pollution; and an arms race in which, according to some expert opinion, we have less than a 50-50 chance of making it to the end of the 20th century without an all-out nuclear war.

In the light of all these problems, Prof. Richard Falk of Princeton has warned that human extinction is a likely possibility if parochial planning and decision making cannot be made to conform more closely to the general interest. And in hearings recently conducted by Sen. Muskie, Prof. Barry Commoner of Washington University in St. Louis testified that "our present system of technology is not merely consuming [our natural resource] capital, but threatening—probably within the next 50 years—to destroy it irreparably." According to Dr. Commoner and to Mr. W. H. Ferry of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, the problems are so profound that they call for "not a new legislative base, but a new constitutional one."

If this is the situation, I think the law and business schools may have to take much stronger measures than they have previously to ensure that their students are aware of the larger social and environmental framework within which law and business operate—and to ensure that these students have learned something more than what Robert Frost called "improved means to an unimproved end."

(Continued From Page 9)

An Historical Note

Although a short course was offered in 1817, the modern Law School was born in 1850 when George Sharswood, a Judge of the District Court of Philadelphia and later Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, was appointed Professor of Law. Sharswood was an able and scholarly lawyer of broad intellectual interests. His lectures were well attended and proved so successful that, on May 4, 1852, the Trustees voted to establish a "Faculty of Law" and appointed Sharswood Dean. The Law School has been in continuous existence from that time.
advocacy with little more than impromptu argumentation. That would be superficial. I am for involvement, but involvement fortified by thorough preparation and strong intellectual discipline.

Both in the short and the long view, we law school folk face the basic problem of preserving the important values of our traditional, demanding intellectual discipline and the indispensable detachment and objectivity of the true scholar at the same time that we relate the law and its institutions and processes to the living problems of society. I see at least the following important components in the effective meeting of this problem at Pennsylvania.

1. Legal education should be conducted with a keen sense of history. I consider this essential to the gaining of the requisite perception of human character and problems in the depth of historical perspective. Some people are acting these days as if there were no yesterday, and certainly no day before yesterday or day before that.

2. The law student should gain a demanding respect for facts and develop sharply honed capacity for fact discrimination.

3. Rationality should be pervasive; stridency and raw emotion are poor substitutes.

4. Law school is a highly appropriate place to set an example of the individual and social discipline, which are essential to the maintenance of true freedom within the framework of order in a democratic society.

5. In the relating of the law, legal institutions and processes to contemporary problems, the opportunity should be seized for the broadening of a sense of professional responsibility with respect to human rights and social needs which reach beyond immediate client service. A university being, by its true nature, a setting for critical examination of human institutions—whether social, political, economic or whatnot—it is clear that in this Law School the best thought which can be mustered should be addressed to the constructively critical examination of the law, legal institutions and processes in broad behavioral and societal context.

In terms of the human components, I speak with pride of the splendid alumni body of the Law School and express the hope that the quality of the graduates who will be emerging from the School in the years ahead will serve to enrich further that fine group.

I wish for the School enrichment of its splendid student body in terms of a rich mix, drawn from a broad geographic and undergraduate institutional base and representative of backgrounds of widely ranging ethnic, economic and social characteristics.

As for the faculty, I hope that the present superb company of scholars will be substantially augmented in number and that the enlarged faculty, too, will combine with individual quality a rich and interesting mix of human backgrounds.

I should like to close with a very special personal word. I am grateful beyond expression for the true friendship, the unfailing loyalty and superb performance of my closest associate in the Law School for a dozen years and more.

I refer, of course, to Miss Rue DiBlasi, who goes under the title of secretary but who, in fact, is a real major domo. She is a wonderful human being with the capacity to bear with good cheer all the tensions that this peripatetic pressure worker could generate. She deserves a large measure of credit for whatever may have been accomplished. And, she has, most assuredly, my warm affection and abiding appreciation.

(Continued From Page 6)

and wild, rapid swings in points of view are endemic in our history. But there is enough correctness in the characterization to present problems with which both law and education must deal.

Our present condition is the result of many circumstances, including the normal ones described by original sin. The attitudes and beliefs have deep roots. A combination of events has made them dominant today. To some extent the beliefs are based on reality. There has been and there is great inequality. The divisions and barriers are high. Steps to reduce them intensify awareness. There is affluence, although progress is not just purchasable—even though we may think it is—and resources are inadequate for the jobs to be done. The individualism in our country has always given high marks for getting ahead, even when individualism is used as an excuse for dropping out. We have not found a comfortable way of assuring an individual that even contentment is appropriate. So there is pressure. Even though we value the individual for what he is, we still find it necessary and so does he, to explain a lack of advancement as due to helplessness within a system.

As for power and coercion, the examples cannot be avoided. The civil rights movement is seen as the creation of power necessary to counteract the coercion—and largely unlawful coercion—inherent in the society itself. The undeclared Viet Nam War harrowingly questions public and private morality and the legitimacy of violence.

Of importance to both law and education is the increased power of the communications media, with new forms and a new reach, and with an effectiveness which has made the creation of stereotypes and images a national endeavor. The stereotypes and images not only substitute for thought and discussion, they also substitute for experience. There have been times in the past when our country has had a special failing for platitudes. Now the combination of affluence, delayed entry into the world of doing, and the kind of education we have developed has made a large segment of the population more dependent upon what it is repeatedly told for its view of reality. It is not the world which is made available to the individual, but someone else’s conception of it, telling him not only what is said to go on, but defining for him, in lieu of the real thing, what his reactions are. Of course, this has always been the case.

One must depend upon the observations of others. But the patterns of life have changed sufficiently to make
the individual particularly vulnerable to the message which substitutes for questioning and doing. Socrates taught by examining with his students certain common experiences. Today the pictures and the slogans not only come complete with the answer, when there is insufficient experience or thought to ask the question, but they operate on a level of a manufactured mythology of gods and devils. The individual is enveloped in this stuff. He is hard to reach—where does one begin?—and education is much more difficult.

Despite all the talk about the knowledge explosion and the rat race, we have a leisurely pace for education for many people in our country. At least we can say the education is long in time. Our motto seems to be “the longer, the better.” Many more people are going to college and many more are going to graduate school. We have made a fetish about general education, confusing it with liberal education. We have contrasted liberal education with professional, sometimes called vocational, training, meaning by this contrast that liberal education is not serious, or is not held to a high standard of proficiency, or that it is too serious, since it is concerned with self-development, to be turned to practical ends.

In a peculiar although historic way, liberal education is often equated with amateurism. As Robert Brustein has cogently written, “the word amateur comes from the Latin verb, to love—presumably because the amateur is motivated by passion rather than money. Today’s amateur, however, seems to love not his subject but himself.” Since he frequently has not known any subject well enough to do anything with it, he often has not learned how to read, write or think very well. So he goes on to do graduate work, or enters a law school or some other professional school.

If he goes to graduate school it is likely he does this not because he wishes to learn how to do research, but rather because he would like to get the credentials so that he can become a teacher of other students who will go to college as he did and then on to graduate school for the same reasons.

The process is self-sustaining. The professional schools are in a separate category, although the lines are blurred. In general one can say the overwhelming trend is to build up more graduate programs and more professional schools, including for example, schools of business. It is a matter of some prestige to have the graduate or professional training begin as late as possible and to go on for as long a period as can be justified. Medicine is a good example. Not so long ago a medical student was expected to spend one year as an intern; now it is almost necessary that he spend two or three years more as a resident, or perhaps five or six more for some specialties. He may be well in his thirties when this part of his training is over.

Or, take the law schools. There was a time when we hardly had them. Then we began increasing the number of pre-law years required in college. In 1925 only one state required as much as two years of college before beginning law school. Today the general minimum is to require three years of college, and leading law schools, such as the University of Pennsylvania Law School, proudly require four. All this is regarded as good. But I wonder.

Education is costly. It costs the student. It costs society. For the student, a requirement of added years of formal study preempts part of his life. Should we not have as a mild principle: the required period of formal training will be as short as possible consistent with its proper purpose? To lengthen the period in order to screen or limit entry into the professions or because this is a result of the characteristic behavior of guilds, or adds prestige—these do not seem to come within a proper purpose.

Our society has an educational burden which it has not met. The need is greatest at the pre-school, primary and secondary level. It is wasteful to misallocate educational resources—to keep the total period any longer than necessary is wrong. There are other consequences of the present system. We have isolated a substantial segment of the population, denying to it experiences which it wants and needs. At the same time we have encouraged the megalomania of colleges and universities by demanding they behave as substitutes for the world at large and for the agencies of government. Thus, we have weakened the intellectual aims and life of the universities, and we have deprived students a chance to develop skills and even wisdom by working on tasks outside formal education. The results should give us pause.

On a festive occasion such as this it would be nice to conclude that these doubts and questions do not concern law schools. Perhaps they don’t. I hope the merits of our great law schools are obvious. Their intellectual standards are often high. They are teaching institutions in which the students share to an amazing degree in the creativity of research in the humanistic tradition. The unity of subject matter and interest and the method of instruction, which as an ideal, anyway, compels participation, not only create an intellectual community, but they provide a training in the liberal arts not otherwise given in most academic programs.

We should take note that these qualities are insufficient in the minds of those who call for more social science training or research in law schools, decry the overemphasis on the case method—which in its pure form surely has not existed for generations—and decry the emphasis on case law, believe that law students should be able to take broadening courses outside of law in other departments of the university, feel strongly that some further training in service and more explicitly in processes of law reform should somehow be a greater part of the law student’s experience. I do not know whether the call for a more practical training has waned or has become lost in the effort to staff anti-poverty and similar programs.

On all these points of criticism, the law schools over the last forty years—and nothing in this area is entirely new of course—have made certain adjustments and accommodations. In addition, the schools have developed,
and particularly in the foreign field, intensive graduate programs of their own. But I believe it is fair to say that law schools deserve their distinction because of their dedication to the application of structured thought, with precision and persuasion, to complex human problems and transactions. This is a great contribution which, in itself, invites questions.

There are three questions. I do not suggest the answers are obvious. The first is, accepting what the law school's greatest strength is, would it not be possible to give this basic training within a two-year rather than a three-year period? I believe there is general acceptance of the view that for many students the guts of what a law school has to teach have been given within two years. The coverage would not be as great. But the suggestion is not to wipe out a third, fourth or fifth year, but rather to give a reasonable early termination point for those who wish to leave formal law training after two years of study. What an extraordinary constructive challenge to the rest of the academic world it would be if law schools took this step! I don't think they will.

The second question is why should law schools, now that some of the malaise of undergraduate and graduate education is perceived, insist that their students have completed a four-year program before their law study is commenced? I am not sure there is even a doubt but that undergraduates could do just as well as graduates in formal law study. The argument has rather been that a broad liberal arts training or perhaps a general education was necessary to make a man or a woman a good lawyer or a public servant.

But law is a liberal arts training. It is one of the best. I realize the argument is that law training will replace other study, although we are not usually sure what this is. It is a fallacy, in any event, and one with particular significance for the age which we seem to be entering, to assume that education must come in these college years or not at all. We must work toward a period in which not only is self-education understood to be the education which counts, but also a period in which there is continuing access to courses and lectures, and continuing self-education throughout an adult's life.

The third question cuts deeper. Why not make law study clearly undergraduate with some courses available to all students followed by more specialized work for those who desire this? This shocking suggestion has at least three points to commend it. The first is that it is of the greatest importance that the average college student have access to some training in basic legal theory. And second, this should be offered in terms of the serious consideration of legal problems so that college education can be revitalized by a professional standard of proficiency—we once could say excellence—building upon problems which can be perceived. And third, placing the lawyer's professional education at this point would respond to the law student's desire to take other broadening courses while he is engaged in law study. Those non-law courses are usually undergraduate courses which could be more easily available to him.

I do not believe this suggestion will be adopted. It somewhat follows a European model, and we believe our training for law is better. Moreover, it flies in the face of the strongly held views of both the colleges and the law schools.

I have asked these questions to put the subject of law schools and legal education in its double perspective. One perspective looks towards the problem of education in its full sweep, with its confinement of the student, the length of time involved, the misallocation of resources as I think it is, the distance it imposes between the student and the reality of doing, and the lack of standards of proficiency when work is not seriously undertaken.

We must, I think, find a way to shorten this period, to provide easier means for entrance and exit from the system with time cut for doing, and we must find a way to give renewed seriousness—I have avoided the use of the word relevance—both in terms of the problems looked at and the standards of excellence required. The other perspective looks towards the law and the legal profession. Law schools do not train a complete lawyer. They cannot do so.

In many ways we still have an apprenticeship system. But I do not believe the Bar has created the institutions which can make the necessary internship or apprenticeship as viable, equal and serviceable as can be done. And here, too, I believe, there are consequences for the law. It is not good to develop programs which only use law students to defend and represent the poor in criminal or civil cases or to lead community action programs, thus giving rise to the public view that the successful lawyer is busy on other things, and giving rise to the law student's view that virtue is to be found only on one side. We are in danger of developing a caricature of the adversary system, forgetting that this system only operates when the institutions of the law are created, defended and reformed by the Bar.

I realize that in the last few years it has done quite a bit. I am suggesting there might well be a new allocation of responsibility between the law schools and the Bar, particularly if the law school could shorten the time, and young lawyers could more quickly move into a period of supervised practice.

What a queer talk to give at the end of a celebration of the completion of facilities which so elegantly meet the needs of the great law schools of today, and enable them to preserve the community which they have created. Our great law schools must be preserved. They will be.

But they will do so best in these shifting times by looking ahead, not only at their own needs, and not only at the needs of the legal profession, but at the pattern of professional life in this country, and not only of education in general, but our system of justice and our understanding of it. The responsibility is very great. It is a responsibility for leadership. I am sure this school, in the light of its tradition and its strength, will be among the leaders.
find new and stimulating ways to present decedents' estates or torts or contracts. But now, the demands of curriculum planning and teaching methodology have far eclipsed such narrow boundaries.

Legal education—no less, I suppose, than all the higher branches of learning—has, in recent years, been feeling the pressure to re-evaluate some of its most basic and heretofore inviolable precepts. How much black letter law does a student need to learn? Why can't law school courses be meshed with city planning, with sociology or even with psychiatry?

To this end, the University of Pennsylvania Law School has frequently been in the vanguard of such educational experiments. It is one of the reasons, perhaps, for the high stature of this institution and why it is one of the top three or four law schools in the country. But, to retain this mantle of excellence requires that our law school dig even deeper into the foundations of legal education and continually re-examine for cracks in the existing educational structure.

I can think of no better time than right now, as we formally celebrate the completion of our new building, for us to take a long cold look at legal education today, both here at Penn and elsewhere—to see just how we are launching new lawyers into society. I surely do not foresee the need to overthrow traditional legal training completely, any more than the men who re-designed this building felt constrained to discard all that was old, yet still beautiful. But, at the same time, just as the building itself had to be renovated—so also, I think, do certain aspects of the law school program have to be studied anew.

The soft drink ad that recently dubbed us the "now" generation did more, I believe, than sell sodas; it put its finger squarely on the societal trait that could be doing more than any other to shape the course of this country. Patience is no longer in vogue; "tomorrow" is an unsatisfactory substitute for today. And, like it or not, our law student population has been bitten with the "now" bug just as hard as anyone.

When one couples this phenomenon with the fact that, by and large, the average Penn law student is better educated and possesses better undergraduate credentials than ever before, it is not surprising to find in our student body a certain restlessness yet, at the same time, a very high level of intellectual curiosity. We cannot allow this curiosity to stagnate.

It is no secret to members of practically any law faculty that third year classes play to something less than standing room only student audiences. Perhaps to some extent this has always been so. But, that is no reason to condone it. Admittedly, some of the blame can be laid at the doorstep of the student; but that hardly excuses the law school itself. The learning experience for the third year law student is not drastically different procedurally than it is for the first year student. There are still casebooks to read, cases to brief, lectures to attend, and socratic dialogues in which to engage.

Admittedly, no man can stand successfully at the bar unless and until he has read casebooks, briefed cases, attended lectures and engaged in socratic dialogues. There is just no better way to learn substantive law or to learn how to think like a lawyer. But, when the same eager student who carefully read every footnote during his first year, suddenly begins to answer "unprepared" in class after class during his third, perhaps it is time for us to have a little socratic dialogue with our own third year curriculum.

By the time a student reaches his last year of law school, he is usually fairly convinced that he does not need to learn another entire year's worth of substantive legal principles in order to practice; and he may well be right. How many of us really believe that the success of our legal careers has turned on the difference between two years of classroom law and three? Of course, there are always things to learn about the law—and if law school lasted twenty years we would still be learning. But, given the limited time we have to train our future lawyers, it may well be that the ultimate value of two or three extra classroom courses is not so great that better use of this time could not be made. I do not mean to suggest that the entire third year program now in existence be dropped. But I do think that the average third year law student would gain more practical, useable knowledge from his last year of formal education if a greater effort were made to engage him in non-classroom activities. In fact, there is a substantial likelihood that, under such a schedule the overall third year interest in legal education might be stimulated to the point where even the classroom courses will take on new meaning.

Of course, designing the bell for the cat is always a lot easier than putting it around his neck. I am sure that programs for clinical training in law school have frequently blossomed in the past, only to wither and die without the water of implementation. Yet, I am convinced the situation is far from hopeless. As a matter of fact, right here at Penn we are witnessing the emergence of several new programs that could, eventually, fill this need.

Take, for example, the litigation seminar soon to be offered. Under this program several faculty members will be appointed to represent clients, usually indigents accused of crime. The students in the seminar will then assist the professors in the preparation for trial, if the case is still on that level, or in the preparation of briefs and oral argument on appeal, or perhaps in a trial court proceeding. I realize, however, that this program is only a small step toward the ultimate goal of involving law students in the actual trial of cases; for most of the cases, I am told, will not come to the seminar until they have reached the appeal stage. To this extent, the learning experience for the students involved in the program will not be as unique as it could be, were they able to help prepare for trial.

I say this because law schools now generally operate on the appellate level. The substantive principles are
learned from judicial opinions—as well they should be. And the techniques of legal analysis are similarly gleaned largely from the writings of appellate judges. In addition, the moot court programs are styled as appellate arguments. All of this has given rise to the sometimes cited aphorism that the student fresh out of law school is better equipped to be a judge than to be a lawyer. To a large extent, however, the law schools of this Commonwealth at least cannot easily be faulted for leaning so heavily on appellate law as a teaching mainstay; for to teach trial techniques properly requires actual student involvement in real litigation which Pennsylvania’s existing rules of court unfortunately do not yet permit.

The American Bar Association has recognized this critical need to involve law students more in the actual preparation and trial of cases. In fact, this past January, at a meeting of its House of Delegates, a draft of a Proposed Model Rule Relative to Legal Assistance by Law Students was adopted by the ABA and urged upon the several states for their consideration. The beneficial effects of such a proposal upon many facets of the law cannot be underestimated. In addition to providing the student himself with much needed training, putting the law student in court would benefit the indigent person who cannot afford private counsel, yet for whom our free legal services have been unable to provide help due to their own small staffs. It would benefit the community at large, by providing a needed service for disadvantaged persons; it would benefit the courts, by assuring that each side will be well represented; and it would benefit the legal profession, by relieving somewhat the increasing obligation of rendering free legal services to indigents.

Under the ABA plan, a third year law student who has been properly certified by his dean as being of good character and competent legal ability, and who has been introduced to the court in which he is appearing by an attorney admitted to practice in that court, may appear on behalf of any indigent person who has authorized this appearance in writing. Of course, at all times there must be a supervising lawyer on the case, although it is not always necessary for that lawyer to be present in court when the student is representing his client. For example, in civil matters, or in any criminal matter in which the defendant does not have the right to the assignment of counsel, the student may handle the case by himself. In other criminal cases, the supervising lawyer must be present although the student may try the entire case.

In addition to the ABA plan, several states have already enacted rules permitting, under certain circumstances, the limited practice of law by qualified law students. These states include Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York and Oklahoma. A recent symposium, conducted by Villanova Law School, made the area of law students in court the subject of extensive study, including a significant presentation by our own Dean Fordham on “Trial Experience as Clinical Education.” At this symposium the laws of the various states were examined, with an eye toward inaugurating a similar program in Pennsylvania. As yet, however, no such permissible rule exists.

But Pennsylvania is at least heading in the right direction. Just this March, our Court adopted an expanded Rule 12½, permitting certain individuals enrolled in graduate criminal law or poverty law programs in approved Pennsylvania law schools to practice before the courts of this Commonwealth, provided, however, that these individuals have already been admitted to practice before the highest court of another state.

Indeed, there are many who hope and believe that our new Rule 12½ is only the beginning of Pennsylvania’s progress toward involving law students in actual practice. In the meantime, however, the law schools of this Commonwealth can still take steps to make more varied their existing third year curricula, just as Penn has already done. For example, it is now possible for law students here to work and study closely with the University’s Department of City Planning, with the result that a master’s degree in that discipline can follow only months behind an LL.B. Moreover, a group of young lawyers in Washington, D.C. have set about implementing a center for law and social policy, where law students can come to work for a semester while getting full scholastic credit from their home schools. This Law School has agreed to take an experimental part in this program. Admittedly, the program is still in its early stages, but the mere fact of its conception testifies to the growing feeling among members of the organized bar that a large untapped well of legal talent exists this very moment in our law schools.

Everywhere around us we see and hear the student crying to have higher education made more relevant to his own life and time. This cry is not limited to the law student alone. Yet, when the study of law begins to drift even slightly from the currents of reality, our entire legal system is weakened; and now is certainly not the time when our country can afford to see this system damaged in any way.

The relevance of law to life is being questioned all around us. It is being questioned by the poor; by blacks; by students; and sometimes, though perhaps only inwardly, it is even being questioned by members of the so-called establishment. In the face of this questioning, the young lawyer perhaps stands most ready and able to provide some answers. But we certainly cannot expect him to be willing to provide them, unless the education he receives in law school begins to convince him that the answers are right ones.

And this, my friends, brings us to the truly critical question of the moment. As we stand here and admire the beauty of this new building, there is one issue that goes far beyond the individual courses we offer our students, although the curriculum is indeed a part of the issue. I am speaking about the basic role of the law school as an institution in today’s university community—or if one cares to go so far, in our whole society.

Much has been said and written during recent months
concerning the need for the legal profession in general to respond more actively to current assaults upon our rule of law. For the most part these have been wise words, words designed to prick our collective legal conscience and make us realize that the very foundation of our professional lives—the law and our legal system—is under siege. Ironically, however, it seems that few, if any, of these calls to arms have been directed at our law schools. Yet the law school is the place where it all begins. It is here that young men and women are taught the very techniques of analysis, advocacy, and logic that lawyers throughout the country are now being called upon to use in educating the public against lawlessness and violence. Moreover, being part of a university community, the law school is frequently located near the very focal point of a turbulent confrontation.

It is no secret that the techniques learned in law school are peculiarly suited to resolving disputes. In fact, the lawyer often performs his most useful function when he keeps people out of court. I should think, therefore, that the law school could well play a valuable role in bringing together the diverse factions now at odds on so many college campuses. Mr. Justice Brennan said not long ago: “The lawyer is still the indispensable middleman of our social progress.” I suggest that by analog so also can the law school become the “indispensable middleman” of our campuses.

Professor William A. Stanmeyer of Georgetown Law School, writing in last month’s ABA Journal, painted a frightening picture of what he calls the “Ideological Criminal”—the man who carries to their furthest extremes the teachings of the New Left. Make no mistake about it, Stanmeyer warns, this individual is no less a lawbreaker than the man who murders or steals for purely personal gain. And, in fact, he may in some respects be an even more dangerous person to society.

The traditional criminal realizes what he is doing is wrong; the ideological criminal, however, does not. To the contrary, he is convinced that the burning of buildings, the forceful kidnapping of college officials, or the take-overs of entire campuses do nothing more than violate laws that are, in themselves, so rooted in evil as to deserve no obedience.

As a result, while the traditional criminal seeks to maintain anonymity in order not to be caught, the ideological criminal, says Stanmeyer, takes great pride in making his activities publicly known. The real danger of such an attitude, of course, is its propensity to attract new followers; young persons who, by themselves, would not choose to take up the cudgels of violence, but who, spurred by fiery leaders and their promises of a new world of “bread and circuses,” decide to cast their lot with the lawless.

The separation of this mass of students from what Stanmeyer calls their “Pied Piper leaders” can be accomplished only when young people begin to see the real hypocrisy which permeates the actions of those who rely on violent means. It is here that our law schools can provide, I believe, much needed education. I should hope that the law student more than any other member of the university community, realizes the importance of “due process” in preserving any society. In fact, in practically every course he takes, he can see the dangers that lurk behind any attempt to circumvent orderly procedure. But, to the students who teach violence, due process is only an empty concept that administrations throw up to halt the progress of true democracy. Due process, says the campus revolutionary, is nothing more than sophisticated stalling and foot-shuffling. It must be stripped away, he believes, before any real changes in our social order can be made.

But does this young man realize that an essential part of political “due process” is the very right to dissent that he himself cherishes so dearly? Obviously not, for he would deny that right to anyone who disagree with his ideas. That is what I mean when I speak of the students’ own brand of hypocrisy. The non-negotiable demand—is it any less democratic than the most oppressive university regulation? And does he realize the true definition of civil disobedience: a definition which includes the willingness of the lawbreaker to suffer punishment for the law he breaks, in order to arouse the sympathy of society to change that law through orderly channels? Obviously not, for he does not wish to be punished at all. Instead, he wants amnesty in the face of his own lawlessness. Once again, the violent students’ own brand of hypocrisy.

As practitioners and students of the law, we can do much, I believe, to expose this hypocrisy. And this is especially true for the law student, who, in many cases, is still young enough to be trusted by those of our young citizens who brand us older folk as sociological lepers—hopelessly tainted by the curse of being “over thirty.”

In a similar fashion the law students on our campuses perhaps can help administrations bend a little too. For I would not be so naive as to assume that some college administrations—or for that matter many of the entire older generation—have never worn the mantle of insincerity. I have heard it said that our young people have taught us a lie. They have caught us sometimes preaching decency and practicing indecency. They have caught us sometimes waving the flag of freedom for peoples on the other side of the globe, while trampling on that flag within our own borders. Are they always wrong? They accuse us of subverting to the lure of corporate power the very goals for which we purportedly stand. Is there no truth to this charge? And what do we do when confronted with these accusations? It is not enough to lash out and call them ignorant kids. Instead, if there be truth to what they say, we must face that truth, admit we have made mistakes, and admit we can learn from the young.

Admissions such as these are not easy. There is always that precious face to save; and for the college administration, there is always the excuse that a polite distance must be kept between university and student. But how much easier would it be for the wrongs to be righted before we reach the confrontation stage? If,
for example, the college administration were able to see in advance that certain of its policies were unwise or unfair as well as unpopular, would it not then be possible to cut out the tumor before the malignancy reached revolutionary proportions? And could this not be done gracefully, with all faces saved, and with all polite distances kept? I cannot guarantee that early diagnosis would totally prevent the disease. But it would certainly help.

Once again, the role of the law student and the law school seems almost obvious. I see the law school students and faculty as a sort of academic legal conscience for the university; periodically sitting down with the administration to probe for possible trouble spots on campus. The lawyers as mediator: spotting the issues now, avoiding painful "litigation" later.

This afternoon, both of the subjects I have only briefly touched upon will be probed in depth under the leadership of two distinguished panels. There will be a seminar on legal education, as well as a seminar on the broad problem of university-student relations. I sincerely hope that at one, or perhaps both of these seminars, some thought will be given to the need for our law school population to turn its talents toward College Hall. The idea of the law school as mediator, as a sort of "house counsel" for the university must admittedly have time to germinate, to take shape, to gain substance. What I have sketched today is but the barest of outlines. But perhaps a truly constructive plan for law school involvement in the affairs of the university can emerge from these seminars.

Edmund Burke once issued a now familiar admonition: All that is required for the triumph of evil is that good men remain silent and do nothing. Nowhere, perhaps, does that warning sound a graver note than on the university campuses of this country. I believe that these campuses are literally laced with good men—men dedicated not to violence or to hatred or to senseless confrontations, but to the real promotion of justice through due process and the rule of law. Especially, I think, are such men present in our law schools. But if these good men "remain silent and do nothing!" we will have contributed to the transformation of the campus into the camp—armed, hostile and ready for war.

If, however, the law school community does not remain silent, it could perhaps provide a giant step toward educating society as to the true meaning of justice, a concept about which Professor Karl Lewellyn wrote: "it is one of the more hidden things in law, and yet the finest of them all."

ALUMNI NOTES

1922
JUDGE LEON B. MILLER, of Welch, W.Va., has been elected the first Negro judge in West Virginia’s 105-year history. The Republican write-in candidate, who had been named to fill the term of the late Criminal Judge L. R. Morgan, received 1200 more votes than his Democratic opponent in the heavily Democratic county of McDowell.

1925
BALDWIN MAULL, of New York City, has been named by New York’s Governor Nelson Rockefeller to be chairman of the State Board of Social Welfare.

1928
GUY deFURIA, of Chester, Pa., was named “Man of the Year,” by the Chester Businessmen’s Association, a division of the Delaware County Chamber of Commerce.
FRANKLIN H. BERRY, of Toms River, N. J., has been appointed a trustee of the new state college to be established in southern New Jersey and represents the New Jersey State Bar Association in the House of Delegates of the A.B.A.

1929
LOUIS SHERR, of Merion Station, Pa., was presented the Order of the Lion Award by Alpha Epsilon Pi, a national collegiate fraternity.

1931
BERNARD G. SEGAL, of Philadelphia, has received the Police Athletic League of Philadelphia Award, the Humanitarian Award of Philadelphia’s 32 Carat Club, and the Barnwell Distinguished Service Award of the Associated Alumni of Central High School, also in Philadelphia.

1935
RALPH SHALON, of Washington, D. C., recently retired as Colonel, office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force and is now a professional staff member of the United States Senate Special Committee on Aging.

1938
JESSE G. HEIGES, of New York City, has been elected by the Board of Directors of Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc. to the company’s Executive Committee. He has been a member of the Pfizer Board of Directors since 1960.

JUDGE HARRY ARTHUR GREENBERG, of Miami Beach, Fla., was recently appointed Judge of Municipal Court, Bay Harbor Islands, Fla., after serving as Judge of Municipal Court, Surfside, Dade County, Fla.

BERNARD FRANK, of Allentown, Pa., will present a paper on “Man, Rights and Law (Ombudsman)” to be discussed at a work session at the Bangkok World Peace
Through Law Conference in September.

SYLVAN M. COHEN, of Philadelphia, has been re-appointed as Chairman of the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Fidelity Award Committee.

1939

WILLIAM H. LOESCHE, JR., of Gladwyne, Pa., vice-president and treasurer of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, has been named a director of Central-Penn National Bank of Philadelphia.

EDWARD S. MARTIN, of Washington, Pa., has been elected vice chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

1939

WILLIAM H. LOESCHE, JR., of Gladwyne, Pa., vice-president and treasurer of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, has been named a director of Central-Penn National Bank of Philadelphia.

EDWARD S. MARTIN, of Washington, Pa., has been elected vice chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

1943

RICHARD E. McDEVITT, of Malvern, Pa., was appointed as a director of the Eagle Downs Racing Association by John J. Finley, Jr., president of Eagle Downs. He is presently treasurer and director of the Pennsylvania Horse Breeders Association, and operates a breeding farm in Pennsylvania.

1946

H. WARREN RAGOT, of Levittown, Pa., is presently serving as Title Officer, City Title Insurance Company in Levittown, where he maintains a real estate practice.

1947

ROBERT M. LANDIS, of Philadelphia, informs the Journal that ANDREW HOURIGAN, ‘40, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., served as chairman of the Governor’s Advisory Commission on Judicial Qualifications and that MARVIN COMISKY, ‘41, of Cheltenham, Pa., has been elected to the vice-presidency of the Pennsylvania Bar Association. Mr. Landis, as he put it, has “slipped into the seat” of Chancellor-Elect of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

1948

RICHARD P. BROWN, JR., of Philadelphia, has been appointed cochairman of the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Bi-Partisan Committee to Support Sitting Judges.

BERNARD L. FRANKEL, ’20, of Philadelphia and ROBERT DECHERT, ’21, of King of Prussia, Pa., have been appointed honorary cochairmen of the Committee.

1949

EDWARD M. HARRIS, JR., of Darien, Conn., secretary and general counsel of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., since 1967, has been elected a vice-president of the company.

SAMUEL S. CROSS, of Stamford, Conn., has announced the formation of the firm of Cross and Brodrick in Stamford.

CHARLES COOLIDGE PARLIN, JR., of Englewood, N. J., has established a $25,000 fund for the continuation of the Charles Coolidge Parlin Marketing Award, made annually by the Philadelphia chapter of the American Marketing Association. The fund, which will be administered by the University, was established in 1945 by the Philadelphia chapter in honor of the late Charles Coolidge Parlin, who is recognized as the founder of market research.

1950

E. DAVID HARRISON, of Washington, D.C., a partner in the Washington firm of Marshall, Harrison and Soll, was married to Meryl Comer, a 1964 graduate of the University, on February 15.

1951

JAY S. FICHTNER, of Dallas, Texas, was recently elected to the Board of Directors of Lawyer Pilot’s Bar Association, a national organization of attorneys who are airplane pilots.

1952

MRS. SHIRLEY RAE GASPER DON, of Harrisburg, Pa., recently became counsel for the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. She previously served as Law Member of the Board of Review, Bureau of Taxes for Education.

GEORGE W. NORDHAM, of Waldwick, N. J., has been named corporate secretary of Binney & Smith, Inc., New York City, and all of its subsidiaries.

JUDGE THOMAS A. MASTERTON, of Philadelphia, discussed student lawlessness in a talk at Seton Hall University in April.

1954

MORTON S. GORELICK, of Philadelphia, has been appointed a member of the Zoning Hearing Board of Cheltenham Township, Pa.

1955

FRANK M. COLLINS, of Ardmore, Pa., has joined the Trust Department of The Bryn Mawr Trust Company as vice-president. Collins was previously vice-president in the Trust Division of Continental Bank and Trust Company.

WILLIAM H. BROWN, 3d, of Philadelphia, has received Senate approval as a member of the Zoning Hearing Board of Cheltenham Township, Pa.

1956

FRANK M. COLLINS, of Ardmore, Pa., has joined the Trust Department of The Bryn Mawr Trust Company as vice-president. Collins was previously vice-president in the Trust Division of Continental Bank and Trust Company.

WILLIAM H. BROWN, 3d, of Philadelphia, has received Senate approval as a member of the Zoning Hearing Board of Cheltenham Township, Pa.

1957

FRANK M. COLLINS, of Ardmore, Pa., has joined the Trust Department of The Bryn Mawr Trust Company as vice-president. Collins was previously vice-president in the Trust Division of Continental Bank and Trust Company.

WILLIAM H. BROWN, 3d, of Philadelphia, has received Senate approval as a member of the Zoning Hearing Board of Cheltenham Township, Pa.

1958

FRANK M. COLLINS, of Ardmore, Pa., has joined the Trust Department of The Bryn Mawr Trust Company as vice-president. Collins was previously vice-president in the Trust Division of Continental Bank and Trust Company.

WILLIAM H. BROWN, 3d, of Philadelphia, has received Senate approval as a member of the Zoning Hearing Board of Cheltenham Township, Pa.
had previously served as assistant to Philadelphia District Attorney Arlen Specter.

JOEL C. COLEMAN, of Larchmont, N. Y., has been appointed general counsel of International Playtex Corporation. What a bust!

ROBERT C. TAYLOR, of Atlanta, Ga., has been named to the new position of director of Real Estate for the Retail Stores Division of Hart Schaffner & Marx. Taylor was formerly real estate negotiator, attorney and analyst for the J. C. Penney Co., in Chicago, New York, San Francisco and Atlanta.

1956

ARTHUR W. LEIBOLD, JR., of Wynnewood, Pa., has been appointed as general counsel of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and general counsel of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Since 1965, Leibold had been a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Dechert, Price and Rhoads, which he joined in 1956.

ALAN G. KIRK, II, of Radnor, Pa., assistant dean of the Law School from 1958 to 1962, has been appointed Associate Solicitor in the U.S. Department of the Interior. Kirk will be in charge of the Water Resources and Procurement Division.

GEORGE L. BERNSTEIN, of Philadelphia, was recently elected president of the Philadelphia Chapter of Certified Public Accountants. Bernstein is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Laventhol, Krekstein, Horwath & Horwath.

1957

J. EARL SIMMONS, JR., of Philadelphia, has been appointed a Judge of the Municipal Court of that city.

RAYMOND SCHWARTZ, of Stony Brook, N. Y., was recently appointed "General Attorney-Northern Zone" of Levitt & Sons, Inc. and was also elected assistant secretary of the company. Schwartz has been with Levitt & Sons, Inc., as house counsel since 1962.

MAHLON M. FRANKHAUSER, of Ridgewood, N. J., has joined the staff of the New York Stock Exchange as vice-president and deputy director of its Department of Member Firms. Frankhauser has been a Securities and Exchange Commission official for the last 12 years, having served since 1966 as its New York regional director.

RONALD P. WERTHEIM, of Washington, D. C., has joined the Washington firm of Ginsburg and Feldman. Wertheim was formerly deputy general counsel for the Peace Corps in Washington and director of the Peace Corps in Brazil.

1958

PHILIP COHEN, of Philadelphia, has been elected by Continental Bank and Trust Company to the position of vice-president. Cohen, who is also a trust officer, is head of the administration unit of the estates and trusts department in the bank’s Philadelphia office.

1959

THOMAS B. MOORHEAD, of New Canaan, Conn., has been elected vice-president, Industrial Relations of Hooker Chemical Corporation, a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum Corporation. He had previously served in the corporation’s legal department as associate counsel and assistant secretary.

GEORGE F. REED, of Harrisburg, Pa., has been appointed Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Department of Insurance. Reed has served as general counsel of the Insurance Department for two years, and was formerly a member of the Philadelphia firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius.

BERNARD M. GROSS, of Philadelphia, was elected to his second term as a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and has been appointed secretary of the House Judiciary Committee.

ALAN R. SQUIRES, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the Philadelphia firm of Steinberg, Greenstein, Richman and Price.

ROBERT P. OBERLY, of Philadelphia, has become a
member of the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis.

1960

JOHN H. HIGGS, of New York City, has become a member of the New York firm of Wickes, Riddell, Bloomer, Jacobi & McGuire.

1961

PAUL R. ANAPOL, of Cherry Hill, N. J., a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Ettinger, Poserina, Silverman, Dubin, Anapol & Sagot, has recently been elected Secretary of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission. He is a Camden County Freeholder and chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of Cherry Hill Township, N. J.

FREDRICK D. GILES, of Tyrone, Pa., was recently appointed Deputy Attorney General serving as attorney for the Pennsylvania Crime Commission.

CHARLES K. KEIL, of Wilmington, Del., a partner in the Wilmington firm of Bayard, Brill & Handelman, is presently serving as a member of the Delaware Constitutional Revision Commission.

WILLIAM B. PENNELL, of Brooklyn, N. Y., has been elected president of the Brooklyn Heights Association, one of the oldest civic organizations of its kind in New York City.

PHILIP L. HUMMER, of Kalamazoo, Mich., has become a partner in the Kalamazoo firm of Howard and Howard.

1963

DAVID H. MARION, of Huntingdon Valley, Pa., has been appointed to participate in the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies at its general session on law this summer. Marion will be attending the seminar under the sponsorship of the Law School.

THOMAS LUMBARD, of Washington, D. C., has become an attorney advisor for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the office of the U.S. Deputy Attorney General. Lumbard had previously served as assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

1964

WILLIAM T. ONORATO, of Geneva, Switzerland, has become associated with the New York firm of Coudert Brothers, and will be based in their London office. He had previously served with the International Labour Office.

MICHAEL A. O'PAKE, of Reading, Pa., a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, has been named the winner of the 1969 Distinguished Services Award of the Reading Jaycees.

IRWIN J. TENENBAUM, of New York City, has become associated with the New York firm of Silverstone and Rosenthal.

OSCAR B. GOODMAN, of Las Vegas, Nevada, was recently elected president of the Southern Nevada Trial Lawyers Association, according to a note from his father, A. ALLAN GOODMAN, '28, of Philadelphia.

1965

JOHN HELLEGERS, of Cambridge, Mass., who has just completed a Gowen Fellowship at Harvard University, has become associated with the firm of Nagashima and Ohno in Tokyo, Japan.

LOUIS KURLAND, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the Philadelphia firm of Manchel, Lundy & Lessin.

WILLIAM H. LAMB, of West Chester, Pa., has become a partner in the West Chester firm of Rogers, Gentry, Windle & Lamb.

1966

JOHN N. AKE, JR., of Washington, D.C., is an attorney in the Office of the Chief Counsel, Division of Corporate Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, in Washington.

MARY JANE SNYDER, of Los Angeles, Calif., has
joined the legal department of Capitol Records, Inc., in Hollywood. She had previously clerked for the Appellate Department of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

RICHARD M. GOLDMAN, of Silver Spring, Md., a Lt. jg with the Coast Guard assigned to the Hazardous Material Division at Coast Guard Headquarters, has been working with the Panel on Cargo Size Limitations of the Committee on Toxicology of the National Academy of Sciences. Goldman recently presented a paper entitled “Maximum Credible Accident and Systems Analysis as Tools for the Legislative Draftsmen.”

H. DONALD PASQUALE, of King of Prussia, Pa., has become associated with the Norristown firm of Fox, DiFer, & DiGiacomo. Pasquale recently completed a two year tour of duty with the army at Fort Richardson, Alaska.

JEFFREY K. KOMINERS, of Charleston, S. Car., has joined the Office of the General Counsel, Department of the Navy, Naval Air Systems Command.

MARVIN S. GOLDKLANG, of New York City, is associated with the New York firm of Cahill, Gordon, Sonnett, Reindel & Ohl. Goldklang, who received his LL.M. from New York University Law School in 1967, is also a member of the U.S. Army Reserve.

1967

JACOB P. HART, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis.

REINWALD M. BERNHARDT, of Doraville, Ga., has become associated with the Atlanta firm of Hansell, Post, Brandon & Dorsey.

STEPHEN ZIVITZ, of Yeadon, Pa., is a first lieutenant in the Army Finance Corps, assigned to Fort Gordon, Ga. JAMES B. MCCURLEY, JR., of Chevy Chase, Md., is now in Saigon as legal clerk, HHC, 125th Transportation Command APO 96307.

WARD KELSEY, of Waterloo, Iowa, has been a Vista Volunteer in Iowa with his wife since last October.

THOMAS A. REED, of New York City, an associate in the New York firm of Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, has been announced first prize winner in the 30th annual Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition. Reed won $1500 for his essay, “The Role of the Register of Copyrights in the Registration Process: A Critical Appraisal of Certain Exclusionary Regulations.” The Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition is named in honor of the first general counsel of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, and was established to stimulate interest in the field of copyright law. Reed’s paper, along with those of the four other winners, will be published by Columbia University Press in ASCAP Copyright Law Symposium Number Eighteen.

MURRAY AUSTIN GREENBERG, of Miami Beach, Fla., was recently appointed an assistant county attorney in Dade County, Fla.

DAVID H. LISSY, of Philadelphia, has joined the staff of President Richard M. Nixon in Washington.

CAPT. ROBERT H. DICKMAN, of Philadelphia, has joined the Office of the Staff, Judge Advocate General’s Corps, stationed at Office of the Staff, Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army Air Defense Center, Fort Bliss, Texas.

NOW YOU DROP US A NOTE-OK?
Professor A. LEO LEVIN, '42, former University vice provost for student affairs, has assumed the newly created position of vice president for academic affairs at Yeshiva University in New York City.

Under this title, Levin will be dealing with the day to day operation of the university, including faculty, academic planning and the operation of educational programs, on undergraduate, graduate and professional levels.

Levin joined the Law School in 1949 as an Assistant Professor and was named Associate Professor in 1951, full Professor in 1953 and vice provost in 1965.

As vice provost he was responsible for insuring that the administration of student affairs was focused upon the total educational experience of the undergraduate. He coordinated and directed the activities of the offices of the dean of men, women, admissions, student financial aid, international services, fellowship information and the Counseling Service. He resigned as vice provost in 1968 to devote more time to teaching.

Professor Levin received his B.A. in 1939 from Yeshiva College, which awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1960. After his graduation from the Law School, he entered the U.S. Army, serving as first lieutenant until 1946.

Levin was elected national president of the Order of the Coif in 1968, after serving as national vice president since 1965. He is a member of the Board of Governors of the American Law Institute, Dropsie College board of trustees and Bar Ilan University. He is former chairman of the University Senate and of the University Council's undergraduate publications committee.


He has served as vice president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and is a past president of Lower Merion Synagogue. He is a past president of the Jewish Exponent, and associate editor of "Jewish Horizon."

Levin is married to the former Doris Feder and has two sons.

DEAN JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM addressed an assembly of lawyers and law students from the six law schools in Pennsylvania during an all-day seminar at the Villanova Law School. The question under consideration was whether third-year law students should be permitted, under carefully defined conditions, to represent indigent clients in the courts of Pennsylvania.

STEPHEN R. GOLDSFtein, '63, has been promoted from the rank of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in the Law School, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, has become chairman of the Civil Liberties Subcommittee and a member of the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia Jewish Relations Council, and will participate with second-year student Buford W. Tatum, II, in a CLEO program at Duke University on June 25 and the University of Virginia on June 26. Goldstein is the author of "The Scope and Sources of School Board Authority to Regulate Student Conduct and Status: A Nonconstitutional Analysis, 117 U.Pa. Law Review 373C 1969."

Associate Professor JAMES O. FREEDMAN has been promoted to the rank of Professor of Law.

Associate Professor ROBERT A. GORMAN has been promoted to the rank of Professor of Law.

Professor BERNARD WOLFMAN, '48, has become chairman of the University Faculty Senate and chairman of the Steering Committee of the University Council. He is presently chairman of the Trustees' Task Force on University Governance, a body composed of trustee, faculty, administration and student representatives and is a member of the Trustees' Committee on Criteria for Selection of a New University President, also composed of trustee, faculty and student representatives. On April 15, Wolfman addressed the Young Lawyers of the Philadelphia Bar Association on "Tax Problems of Incorporating a Small Business."
On March 17th and 18th, Professor RALPH S. SPRITZER served as a member of the "faculty" at a briefing conference on Supreme Court Practice and Procedure conducted for practicing lawyers. The conference, sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and the Bureau of National Affairs, was held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Professor PAUL W. BRUTON has been serving since last fall as a member of a task force of the Joint State Government Commission to draft legislation to implement the recent state constitutional amendments involving taxation and has also been serving as a member of the Committee on State and Local Taxation for which he has prepared a redraft of the interest and penalty sections of the Philadelphia Code.

Since his retirement on July 1, 1968, Professor ALEXANDER H. FREY, '31, has been serving as a consultant on an ad hoc basis for the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Associate Professors HOWARD LESNICK and DAVID FILVAROFF were informed that the Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship program, of which they are the guiding spirits, has received a $796,687 grant from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The grant, which was awarded to the University, will permit an increase in the number of fellowships from 100 to 250.

Professor ANTHONY G. AMSTERDAM, '60, has left the Law School to accept a position with the Stanford University Law faculty. He was graduated from Haverford College in 1957, led his class at the Law School for 3 years, served as Editor-in-Chief of the Law Review and was awarded the LL.B. summa cum laude in 1960. Following graduation, he clerked for one year in the chambers of Justice Felix Frankfurter of the U.S. Supreme Court and served for one year as an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia. He joined the Law School faculty in 1962.

Professor HENRY S. RUTH, '55, has been named director of the new National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and has taken a leave of absence from the Law School. A specialist in organized crime, Ruth was an assistant director in 1965-66 of the National Crime Commission, which recommended the Institute as a counterpart in the crime field to the National Institutes of Health. Ruth joined the Law School faculty in 1967. From 1961 to 1965, he had been on the staff of the U.S. Department of Justice in its Office of Criminal Justice and in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section.

MARIE BOWES, a secretary in the office of Admissions and Financial Aid, was married on April 26 to second-year student Ralph N. Teeters, of Oneonta, N.Y.

Summer 1969

JAMES A. STRAZZELLA, '64, assumed the position of vice-dean of the Law School in March. As such he will be the Dean's first deputy and devote particular attention to student interests.

A member of both the Pennsylvania and District of Columbia Bars, Strazzella comes to the Law School from Washington where he served variously as Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Columbia; Deputy Chief of the Appellate Division and Special Assistant to the U.S. Attorney, as well as serving in the Criminal Trial Division.

A native of Hanover, Pa., Strazzella was graduated cum laude from Villanova University in 1961 and cum laude from the Law School in 1964. While at the Law School, he was chairman of the Honor Committee, an editor of the Law Review and served on the Moot Court Board.

Following his graduation, he was law clerk for Justice Samuel J. Roberts of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Strazzella now lives in Bala Cynwyd, Pa., with his wife Judith and their three children.

LLOYD S. HERRICK has assumed the post of Assistant to the Dean for Alumni Affairs and Development which had been filled on an interim basis by Jeffrey W. Ross of the University office of Alumni Annual Giving after the December resignation of Alexander A. Zvegintzov, Esq.

A 1950 graduate of the Wharton School, he has served in the Office of the Secretary of the University since 1964 as Assistant to the Secretary and then Assistant Secretary of the Corporation. Prior to 1964, he was associated with the Northern Virginia Sun newspaper in Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. Herrick and his wife, the former Marcia Chambers, live in Wynnewood, Pennsylvania with their three sons—Gordon, Philip, and Stephen.
Look Out Next Year!

A Law School Monopoly Materializes On Bar Association Hierarchy Horizon

BERNARD G. SEGAL, '31
PRESIDENT-ELECT
American Bar Association

ROBERT M. LANDIS, '47
CHANCELLOR-ELECT
Philadelphia Bar Association

MARVIN COMISKY, '41
PRESIDENT-ELECT
Pennsylvania Bar Association
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