From the Dean’s Desk:

New Curriculum

The past few issues of the Journal have tried to bring you into the Law School’s thoroughgoing study of its curriculum. I attempted to pose some of the basic issues for you last spring. More recently, Professor Robert A. Gorman, our one-man task-force on curricular reform, fleshed out some of the goals and programs he envisioned. Now I can report that the Faculty has approved the bulk of the Gorman proposals affecting the second and third years. Suffice it to say here that they provide a number of options for students in the third-year to engage in clinical type activity, for more intensive work in small groups, for sophisticated study of advanced subjects, offered both in “mini” courses and in programs requiring extended commitment. Hopefully, the new curriculum will make for more progression in the level of the student’s educational experience as he moves from second to third year.

The faculty is still to address the Gorman proposals for revision of the first-year curriculum. When it completes its work, you will receive a complete report. Implementation of the curricular changes will take time, the extent dependent in large part on the availability of the funds necessary to support programs which require a far better student-faculty ratio than we have had in the past.

More of our students engage in law related activities of an extra-curricular nature than ever before. Where possible, the Law School provides rooms in which the student groups meet and plan their work. The Law Review and the Moot Court Board are well known among these groups. The Law Clubs are also traditional, and although fewer in number than years ago, they continue their activities. Newer groups have formed to work on questions involving legal education and law in society. The Black Law Students’ Union helps in our effort to stimulate applications for admission from black students. The Prison Research Council does research on legal problems presented by prisoners. The Environmental Law Group has been active in legal efforts to control pollution. Legal questions in the area of women’s rights are the special concern of the Women’s Law Group. The Law Students Civil Rights Research Council and the Political Defense Council interest themselves in cases that present issues of civil rights and civil liberties. The High School Teaching Project arranges for law students to speak to high school students about the law and its processes. Although each of these groups uses a Law School room (with some doubling up), space is at premium. As our faculty grows and academic programs expand, less space will be available for extra-curricular activities. Substitute arrangements will become necessary if we are to preserve activities that have been highly rewarding to the students, to the Law School, and to society.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania recently announced new rules for admission to the Pennsylvania Bar. The changes are major and very forward-looking. Some of the questions to which the new rules respond were raised initially in a thoughtful and careful way by three of our law students. I congratulate Messrs. Barry J. London, Geoffrey C. Lord and Paul M. Schaeffer, whose scholarship, reflected in “Admission to the Pennsylvania Bar: The Need for Sweeping Change,” 118 U. Pa. L. Rev. 945-982 (1970), has had obvious impact, helping to produce a more rational, fairer, less expensive procedure for entry into the legal profession than most of us would have thought possible only a short time ago.

The 1970-71 Annual Giving Campaign is well under way. Your alumni leaders are making a tremendous effort to bring home to each alumnus the needs and goals of the Law School. Your responsiveness will make their effort successful, and it will assure the School that it can move forward securely as a leader and innovator in the world of legal education.

The Alumni Docket

MARCH 17
Alumni Committee of Delaware meets for cocktails and dinner at the Hotel Dupont in Wilmington.

APRIL 22
LAW ALUMNI DAY

APRIL 27 - MAY 15
Examination period for second and third year classes.

MAY 7
20th Reunion of Class of ’51 at Philmont C.C.

MAY 21
Class of ’52 reunion at the University Faculty Club.

MAY 24
Commencement.

JULY 16
London Alumni Reception.
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‘New’ Technology Is Answer To Garbage Crisis

Author Reminds: ‘Garbage Is Garbage Is Garbage’; Offers Pipeline Solution

By Bruce Ackerman

Despite all the rhetoric, America has yet to deal seriously with the problems posed by the fact of environmental degradation. Indeed, one of the principal reasons that cleanliness is next to godliness in the discourse of many of our leading "statesmen" is precisely because they believe that efforts at solving the "pollution" problem will require—unlike the race problem, the poverty problem, the health problem—little fundamental alteration in the structure of the American polity. Unfortunately, the myth that a better environment can be achieved without disturbing existing social relationships is a product only of superficial consideration of the problem.

Consider garbage. The principal thing to remember, to paraphrase Gertrude Stein, is that garbage is garbage is garbage. The thousands of tons of junk that are collected daily in any city can either be burned (causing air pollution) or dumped in a river or the ocean (causing you know what) or used for landfill. While the last possibility seems the most attractive at first glance, cities are running out of nearby potential landfill and the cost of trucking thousands of tons of garbage over great distances is enormous. Fortunately, emerging technology permits a way out of the problem.

As a consequence in part of pathbreaking research undertaken in the engineering school of the University of Pennsylvania, the following system has been shown to be technically feasible: instead of taking out the trash and garbage once or twice a week, each of us would throw these wastes down a vacuum tube a good deal larger than the present garbage disposal familiar in contemporary kitchen sinks. The waste would be sucked through the pipe system to a central station where the junk would be ground to a pulp, with due precautions being made to recover those portions of the waste which can feasibly be recycled. After the junk has been mashed, it will be pumped into a pipeline which could extend a thousand miles or more into a relatively unpopulated area in which landfill sources are relatively available.

Visionary? Not at all. Other pneumatic systems have already been put in operation abroad in relatively modest-sized "new towns," and one is being installed by the visionaries who are preparing Disneyland East for the delight of our progeny. Similarly, in the industrial context, apparently "unpipable" materials, like coal, have been pumped successfully over long distances. Indeed, a Public Health Service study indicates that the cost of trucking garbage and trash fifty miles out of downtown Philadelphia over the next fifty years will be 153 million dollars while the cost of installing the new system would be 148 million dollars; the economic analysis shifts decisively in favor of the pipeline when transport greater than 50 miles is contemplated. In addition, the system will eliminate one of the most hazardous professions in the United States—garbagemen have been found to have one of the highest accident and disease rates (and probably one of the lowest life expectancies) of any occupation in our land.

A proper economic analysis would take this factor into account, making the cost savings far more striking than suggested previously. (In fact, the figures quoted above should not be taken too seriously—the analysis needs much greater refinement.) Finally, the new regime would make it possible to assure regular garbage collection in the slums—a task notoriously underdone under our existing system.

Despite these substantial advantages, there is every reason to believe that the pipeline plan will not even be seriously considered in our large urban centers. First, the plan would lead to the general unemployment of large numbers of sanitation workers. Since these workers are increasingly unionized and powerful, it can be expected that their leadership will not take kindly to suggestions that their members are technologically obsolete, and will forcefully resist—in the most dramatic fashion—any attempt to introduce the new regime. Second, the pipeline plan requires some governmental organization which will have the power to label certain relatively unpopulated areas to serve as the dumping zone for each city's wastes.

One can imagine the outcry that will be emitted from the mining districts of Pennsylvania when the folks there learn the National Garbage Board has determined that, from a "sound ecological point of view," their homeland has been selected to serve as the nation's junkyard for the wastes of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore. Needless to say, before such a decision could be considered satisfactory, precautions must be taken to as-
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Alumni President Interviewed

'An Opportunity To Serve Rather Than An Honor'

When William F. Hyland, '49, talks about his term as president of the Law Alumni Society, he characterizes it as an opportunity to serve rather than an honor.

Hyland, a senior partner in the Cherry Hill, N. J. firm of Hyland, Davis and Reberkenny, began his term of office in May, 1970.

He is also a graduate of the Wharton School, '44. In his undergraduate days, Hyland was active in the University's musical organizations, including the Mask and Wig Club. A professional musician throughout his school life and in the early years that he was practicing law, Hyland has maintained this interest by performing locally with the Metropolitan Woodwind Quintet and as first clarinetist with the Cherry Hill Symphonic Band and Haddonfield Symphony.

Beginning in 1954 Hyland served for eight years in the New Jersey General Assembly where he became the Democratic floor leader and, in 1958, the first Assembly Speaker from his party in 21 years. He resigned in 1961 to accept appointment by Governor Meyner as President of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners, a post of cabinet rank in New Jersey. He continued in this capacity under Governor Hughes until 1968, when Hyland resigned to devote full-time to his law practice and family of six children. However, concern in New Jersey over the prominence of organized crime led to the creation of the State Commission of Investigation and Governor Hughes persuaded Hyland to become its first Chairman early in 1969.

With the Commission established as a constitutional and effective law enforcement agency, and a series of exposes and administrative reforms under its belt, Hyland resigned a year and one-half later to again resume the full-time practice of law.

"I was very pleased to be given the opportunity to serve as president of the Society," he said during a recent interview with the Journal, "because I have a great affection for the Law School and feel a sense of gratitude for the education I received. Serving on the Board of Managers and in various offices of the Society has made it possible for me to express and repay my gratitude."

In his capacity as president of the Society, he has seized the opportunity to serve the Law School by leading the launching of several projects related to the Law School.

Foremost among these is the establishment of the Friends of the Biddle Law Library, under the chairmanship of Edwin P. Rome, '40, second vice president of the Society and a member of the Philadelphia firm of Blank, Rome, Klaus and Comisky. "One of the purposes of this project," Hyland said, "is to provide financial support to the library to help maintain its preeminence in the country as one of the outstanding collections of legal materials."

"There is also a second purpose," he said, "namely to encourage the contribution to the Biddle Law Library of the significant papers of important public figures." One of the first such arrangements has been completed by Edwin Rome with Chief Justice John C. Bell, Jr., '17, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

"We believe it is helpful to have these arrangements established during the lifetime of the individual because he can be of immeasurable help in seeing that the library receives those documents which are of real importance and in organizing the materials."

Another project Hyland and the other officers of the Society have embarked upon is an attempt to step up the [Continued On Page 17]
Environmental Law Group Conceived In Dorm Corridor—With Pain

Leaders Take On Pollution Over Coq Au Vin Dinner

By Kenneth S. Kamlet, '73

The place was Hershey, Pennsylvania. 13 University of Pennsylvania law students had dragged themselves out of bed at 6:30 A.M. to attend a two-day workshop on Environmental Law Enforcement, under the auspices of the State Attorney General's office and the Pennsylvania Department of Health. As Attorney General Fred Speaker welcomed the more than 170 participants (who included young assistant district attorneys, city solicitors, assistant attorneys-general, as well as industry lawyers from across the state), Professor Curtis Reitz's Contracts class had just ended 90 miles away. What had brought these students here?

The students were members of a recently formed Environmental Law Group (ELG), whose more than 55 law student members (and the number is constantly growing) are committed to devoting their burgeoning legal talents to the world's growing environmental ills. The ELG was conceived in a corridor in Pepper Dormitory one afternoon in late August; it was born in early September at an organizational meeting which attracted some 20 recruits.

The labor pains were considerable and were quickly followed by a series of growth pains, made no less severe by the fact that all brand-new organizations experience them. Communications was a major problem. The ELG had no office, and little prospect of getting one. It had no bulletin board and no mailbox. All it had was the determination of 3 students [Kenneth Kamlet (1973), James Rochow (1971) and Kathy Montague (1971)] to hold the Group together and involve it in meaningful endeavors. The first months were spent in finding projects for the group. John Keene, of the University's Institute for Environmental Studies, was extremely helpful during those formative weeks. He addressed the Group at one of its first meetings, talking about "Environmental Planning and the Law," and presented a number of useful suggestions in the way of groups in need of student legal help in dealing with environmental problems.

The Philadelphia Bar Association's Committee on Environmental Quality, under the chairmanship of Edward Mannino (the Committee was established by Robert Landis, the then-Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association), was another source of helpful information. So were Philadelphia Earth Week Committee and a growing number of groups and individuals as time went on. In the meantime, Law School Assistant Professor Bruce Ackerman had agreed to serve as the Group's faculty mentor (so did Professor Jan Krasnowiecki, whose wisdom will be exploited more fully when his current sabbatical ends).

The next step was to make a policy decision. Should the Group devote its energies to a broad-based attack on local environmental problems? Or would it be better advised to concentrate its fire on a single type of problem? The latter course was provisionally adopted (at least until the Group acquires sufficient legal and technical competence and organizational facility to branch out and diversify).

The remaining questions were: What problem should it choose? And how should the problem be approached? The "die was cast" over Coq au Vin at La Terrasse Restaurant. The Group's three student helmsmen and Mr. Ackerman decided that Water Pollution would be a good point of departure. Pennsylvania's Clean Streams Law is probably one of the country's best, and water pollution seemed strategically a good way for the new-born Group to obtain its baptism. The ELG would offer its services to the Pennsylvania Attorney General's office and to the State Department of Health (through its Bureau of Sanitary Engineering).

Getting the State to accept volunteer assistance wasn't difficult. Getting State officials to come down and get the Group started was. Many phone calls (primarily by Mr. Ackerman) and several weeks later, a meeting was convened in a Law School classroom. About thirty students assembled themselves to find out what role they could play in Pennsylvania's water pollution enforcement program.

Attorney General Fred Speaker, Special Assistant Attorney General William Eichbaum (head of the Governor's Environmental Pollution Strike Force), Walter Lyon (Director of the State Bureau of Sanitary Engineering), Christopher Beechwood (Chief Environmental Engineer of the Bureau's Region I office) and Alan Neff (Assistant Attorney General, assigned to the Region I office) told the Group that they would be given Health Department files, would work them up, write out complaints, prosecute violators and follow up cases. Summary criminal proceedings would be the first step. Hopefully, more meaningful injunctive actions (having perceptible impact on big polluters) would follow later.

Things began to happen. The Group was given an office at the Law School. It appropriated bulletin board [Continued On Page 18].
Wolfman Sees New Breed In Corporate Law

Says Latent Social Leadership Exists Within Corporate Bar

By Dean Bernard Wolfman

Legal education is undergoing an extraordinary self-examination. Almost every law faculty in the country is dissecting its curriculum, the assumptions that underlie it, the goals to be achieved, the standards for entry, ways of minority participation, and the aims of the profession. The examination results from a number of stimuli: First, ongoing faculty striving for improvement; second, a more sophisticated, better educated, more restless, more demanding student body; third, a changing, perhaps deteriorating, society and its demands on the law and lawyers; and, fourth, a sense that since society does not yet provide justice, professors dedicated to justice must re-examine the education of those whose task it is to lead society in its quest.

There will be changes as a result of the curricular studies, just as years ago emphases on future interests and property gave way to concerns with commercial law and corporations, and lectures gave way to case analysis and Socratic teaching. One can expect that newer curricula will tend to show more progression in the work from first to third year. Each year will not be more of the same. Students will critically examine American institutions and world institutions, not doctrine and judicial rationale alone. Students of corporations and securities regulation will be able to study the innards of decision making and the externalities of such financial institutions as mutual funds and pension trusts. Students of taxation will study not only the intricacies of the Internal Revenue Code, but tax policy and its impact on resource allocation, welfare recipients, and urban transportation. Students in the welfare area will not only address workmen's and unemployment compensation, but they will engage in research and even litigation to determine the legal rules and structures for the allocation of resources into hospitals and clinics, and then the allocation within those institutions among classes of patients, rich and poor, black and white, patients with an "interesting" disease and those with garden variety pneumonia.

When resources permit, legal education will be conducted a bit less "on the cheap" than it is now, with its huge classes and few professors. To meet the demands of society and the capacities of our students, legal education will become more—not less—rigorous. In smaller groups, with more intensive supervision, upper classmen will deal with problems that require care and attention in their resolution—this often in seminar settings, in clinical groups, in supervised writing and research projects. The hope is that upon graduation, the young lawyer will be more professional, more sophisticated, more ready than before to perform responsibly as a full-fledged lawyer.

There are misconceptions that curricular reforms, the addition of courses like Labor Law in the first year, the opportunity for Health Law or Child Custody or Civil Rights in the third year, will deter students from the kinds of courses that are demanding, that make them think like lawyers. I suggest that the opposite is true. Broader and deeper exposure, more carefully supervised work, attention to emerging areas of law, all require that kind of legal thinking and training that hones the legal mind. Over-exposure to doctrine can dull it.

By now a fair question is occurring to you. What has all this to do with the corporate lawyer? The corporate lawyer uses in unique fashion the skill of focusing the issues and asking the right questions; he fixes the understanding of the parties after helping to shape it; he makes law through contract and charter, achieving progress and harmony through negotiation, persuasion and compromise. He knows how to avoid polarization. In all of this, serving corporate clients, the lawyer serves the public in-
terest. He uses skills that legal education now seeks to
develop at earlier stages than ever before, but without
sacrificing study of the fundamentals of the legal system
and the doctrinal analysis which are at the core.

The skills used by the able corporate lawyer need not
be taught only in the Law School courses of yesterday,
 nor only in the courses regarded as exclusively corporate.
Poverty law, labor contract negotiation, United Nations
law, housing and urban development law, health law, the
taxation of foreign income, all stimulate interest and make
the kinds of intellectual demands on students that prac-
tice makes on the corporate lawyer.

Lawyers and others ask today whether young law gradu-
ates will continue to go into corporate practice, at least
in sizable numbers, or will they staff community law and
public defender offices. The facts show—facts that are
still skimpy—that graduates still prefer traditional prac-
tice, even those whose interests in law school were in the
newer, more diverse curriculum. Fortunately, some do go
into community law offices, but federal stringencies, fiscal
and other, have not made it possible for large numbers to
go there even if they wished to do so.

Among the young lawyers who continue to go into cor-
porate practice, however, there is a new breed. This is a
group who wish to continue an active quest for justice for
those not counted among their regular clientele. They will
seek justice for their regular clients, of course, but they
also wish opportunities to seek it for those who need but
cannot themselves afford the skills of the corporate law-
ner. They are concerned for community action groups,
tenant unions, consumer lobbies, the victims of pollution
and defective products. Some few form public interest
law firms. Others, more of them, may wish to serve the
disadvantaged on a part-time basis, a day a week, at night,
on week-ends. They can do this best because of their
training as corporate lawyers. The skills needed by the
poor are not available in sufficient numbers among those
who devote their full time to the poor. The corporate
lawyers have the talents needed, and I encourage all
who are inclined to do so to give their talents to those
who need but cannot afford to pay for them. And if you
are not to give your own time, permit those in your firms
who have the interest to give some of their time and
talents to the unrepresented.

It occurred to me some months ago that throughout
the country there were many corporate lawyers with avail-
able time and skill who felt they lacked sufficient grasp
or overview of the "new" law—the developments in land-
lord-tenant law, on the consumer front, in debtor de-
fenses, in the rights of children and unwed mothers. In a
one-shot effort to make a quantum correction of this
condition, the Penn Law Faculty will offer a one week
Institute on Poverty Law for Non-poverty Lawyers, be-
ginning June 6. This is a course for your young associates
and even for you. It will provide an opportunity for cor-
porate lawyers to come abreast of the current in com-
community law, and then with such time as they have and
wish to use, to put their skills to work for the poor.

Thus far I have indicated why and how I think legal
education and the corporate lawyer, while serving both
the clientele who pay and who cannot, serve the public
interest. There is still another way in which corporate
lawyers sometimes do, often do not, serve the public in-
terest. This is a way which attracts the young and serves
everyone. Law students look for it; policy oriented legal
education trains for it; the corporate lawyer has the skill
to do it—and that is to speak out on public issues, free
of constraint caused by an over-identification with the
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"It is clear now that some kinds of hearsay are admissible . . . despite the confrontation clause . . . that the hearsay rule is not frozen, and that certain extensions of it may be upheld despite the confrontation clause." That's the conclusion offered by U. S. Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold as he delivered the Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture on February 4 in the Annenberg Auditorium.

Entitled "The Due Process Revolution and Confrontation," Griswold's lecture centered around the effects of the Fourteenth Amendment and recent Supreme Court decisions on the right of an accused to confront and cross-examine witnesses.

... it can be said, ... that there has been a constitutional revolution in the past twenty years—or at least that we are in the midst of a constitutional revolution . . . The heart of the revolution is found in the Fourteenth Amendment." "Until only a few years ago, however," he continued, "the Sixth Amendment itself was specifically held not to be applicable to the States." This interpretation was changed in April, 1965 when the Supreme Court ruled in Pointer v. Texas, 380 U.S. 400, 403 (1965), "that the Sixth Amendment's right of an accused to confront the witnesses against him is likewise a fundamental right and is made obligatory on the States by the Fourteenth Amendment."

"If the confrontation provision were read literally," Griswold said, "it would allow testimonial evidence to be represented only through witnesses who were present in court. This would exclude all hearsay evidence of statements of others. But it was long ago held that this was not the intended effect of the confrontation clause."

Citing Mattox v. United States, 156 U.S. 237, 240 (1895), Griswold said, "Thus it became apparent that the confrontation clause could not be taken literally. It was to be interpreted in the light of the law as it existed at the time of the adoption of the Sixth Amendment, and that law recognized exceptions to the hearsay rule. The confrontation clause had a purpose, clearly, but it was not designed to freeze the law of evidence; nor was it designed to exclude all hearsay evidence."

"If confrontation means cross-examination . . ." Griswold stated, "all testimonial evidence must be produced through live witnesses who are subject to cross-examination as to the truth of what they say.

"For some years there have been expressions by academic writers in the field of evidence that the hearsay rule is in fact an obstacle to the development of truth," Griswold continued, "and that we should greatly expand the exceptions to the hearsay rule, allowing the trier of the facts to weigh all relevant evidence . . ."

"If cross-examination and confrontation are equivalent, though, any such development would be impossible—short of a constitutional amendment—not only in federal courts, but also, since the Pointer decision, in state courts. "

"Thus, one consequence of the Pointer decision might be to freeze the hearsay rule into the Constitution, setting up a fixed national standard on this question, and making impossible any development or experimentation by the states in this area."

In contrast to the Pointer case, Griswold next cited California v. Green, 399 U.S. 149 (1970), in which he said the Supreme Court held that "the evidence given at
The main building of the Law School at 34th and Chestnut Streets has been named William Draper Lewis Hall in memory of Dr. Lewis, who was Dean of the Law School from 1896 to 1914.

The Trustees of the University named the building for Dr. Lewis on recommendation of the Law School faculty and Advisory Board.

The building was completed in 1901 when the Law School was moved to the present location from its former quarters in vacated court buildings in the vicinity of Independence Hall. The building underwent major renovations in 1968-69 and now houses faculty offices, seminar rooms, moot court rooms, and the Biddle Law Library.

Dr. Lewis continued as a professor of law at the University until 1924. From 1923 to 1947, he was Director of the American Law Institute. He died in 1949.

A major development during Dr. Lewis' term as Dean was the change to a faculty comprised primarily of full-time professors. Previously the faculty was comprised of lawyers and judges who taught on a part-time basis.

Hsieh-Chai Available

To: Law Alumni of the University of Pennsylvania

Gentlemen:

I am sure that each of you is familiar with the Hsieh-Chai statue which was given to the Law School some years ago by a group of alumni and other friends.

Hsieh-Chai (pronounced “Syeh-Jai”) is a one-horned goat, the Chinese symbol for a judge. Apparently the ancient Chinese chancellor used the goat as a lie detector—when witnesses told conflicting stories the goat would be introduced into the court and presumably would butt the malefactor!

Henry Mitchell, the well-known artist who created this outstanding work, has agreed to fashion a limited number of signed original models of the statue for the Law Alumni Society, which will make them available to alumni at a price of $350.00 each.

This is a rare opportunity to acquire a Mitchell original at substantially less than its true value and, at the same time, benefit the Society.

If this suggestion appeals to you, please place your order promptly with Harold Cramer, Esquire, 1510 The Fidelity Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19109—KI 5-4000.

With best regards,
Thomas N. O'Neil, Jr.
Secretary
PBA Chancellorship: Two Views

Landis, ’48 & McConnell, ’41 Assess Role of Chancellor

Accustomed as it is to seeing Law School alumni capably—sometimes flawlessly—filling the post of chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, the Journal prevailed upon the immediate past chancellor and the brand-spanking new chancellor to share with their fellow alumni their thoughts as they respectively leave and enter the coveted position of leader of the city’s 5000 plus lawyers.


By Robert M. Landis, ’48

It is always exhilarating to look ahead, standing, in Keats’s unforgettable phrase, “silent upon a peak in Darien,” contemplating plains to be overwhelmed, heights to be scaled, chasms to be spanned.

So it was a rare experience last year to stand on the brink of a new decade and to call upon the lawyers of Philadelphia to share a belief that the true measure of a lawyer’s stature as a professional, as a man of his generation, is his involvement with helping to fashion the quality of the social order in which he lives.

Looking backward a year later must be chastening after that: the plains not quite overwhelmed, the heights not quite reached, the chasms not bridged.

But the response to that call was heartening. It might have been expected to come from the shaggy-haired, contentious young lawyers, who had been clamoring for the profession to strike a keynote of relevance for their generation, to catch the reverberations of their concerns, to hear the overtones of meaning that they sensed in the basic issues of our time.

Yet the elders of the tribe caught it, too. All of them, and especially the young men and women, turned loose a pent-up idealism, a willingness to reach out to serve the disadvantaged and the forgotten in ways that people never realized the law was supposed to serve them.

It was a year for the activist, the analyst, and the dreamer. And controversy stalked close behind.

Controversy broke early, with a widely quoted response to a newspaperman’s question about the contempt citations imposed by the trial judge upon the lawyers in the Chicago Seven trial as “shocking.” They were shocking and they were historically unprecedented.

But the quiet truth that was lost in the noisy debate that followed these headlines was a more important observation, that we cannot lend our courtrooms as a stage for (Continued On Page 19)

By John R. McConnell, ’41

Few men, certainly not the writer, are equal to the task of being Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar. To be Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar is

— to be the spokesman for 4500 Philadelphia lawyers, charged with the grave obligation of correctly estimating their views and expressing to the community their best selves;

— to be coordinator of the work of some 76 active committees conducted by some 2500 able and aggressive lawyers;

— to be a leader in these activities in the sense of being responsible in some measure for the direction they shall take;

— to be required to be sensitive to the needs, so far as lawyers are competent to fill the needs, of all of the diverse people in our office buildings and factories and courts and piers and hospitals and jails and apartment houses and twelve-foot fronts along the old brick sidewalks, and to see to it as far as possible that all of them receive all of the help lawyers are able to give.

Our Association exists to be useful—clearly to lawyers, certainly to the law and now, after long and earnest soul-searching, to the community as well.

The Association serves the lawyer in part by providing as best it can one of the most complete law libraries in the world, continuing legal education in many forms, advisory services of various kinds, including among others, economic and managerial, protection from unauthorized practice, unethical practice and, as far as possible, from mistreatment by anyone within or without the profession (and vice versa).

It serves the law as best it can in part by continually studying and proposing legislation of all kinds, in various efforts aimed at assisting in the preservation and enhancement of an able and independent bench, and in working unstintingly to facilitate the administration of
justice by improving the methods of disposing of litigated cases.

As for service to the community, it does its best in part to see to it that all—all—citizens, including those able to pay, those able to pay only something, and those not able to pay at all, receive the best legal assistance possible. And here is where, despite the best efforts of lawyers, judges and government, we fail.

For the truth is that as of this writing there is a full measure of justice in our city only for those able to pay and not for those who can’t.

The Association, the entire profession and government as well, do all they can to relieve this detestable injustice by Community Legal Services, Public Defender and lawyers’ volunteered services, but those efforts are necessarily grossly inadequate in proportion to the need.

Why such an insatiable need for legal services by the poor?

Motivated initially by the dire necessity of reducing Philadelphia’s four year backlog of untried civil cases and two year backlog of criminal cases, the Association asked itself that question and sought the answer.

It very shortly learned, among other things, that our jail population is largely illiterate. Judge Charles Wright reports a study, for example, disclosing that of all juveniles who came before him in a specified period, at least 78% were illiterate!

This appalling fact directed the Association’s attention to the quality of public education in the city and here it discovered, thanks to the detailed testing and candid reporting of our impossibly overtaxed School Board, that the number of children in the public school system, grades 2 through 8, city wide, who are reading at “below minimum functioning level,” that is, the number of functional illiterates in the entire system, is 40%!

These figures are not cited in criticism of people as distinguished from system. Many unanticipated and novel circumstances have contributed to this social disaster. Our schools are managed and conducted by persons who daily give all they have to correct this appalling condition.

Yet this state of public education has consequences of the utmost gravity.

For until one learns to read and write, neither education nor training for the complex world of the 70s is remotely possible. Hence, the child, passed along from grade to grade even though unable to read, eventually leaves school from boredom and sheer embarrassment, recorded a drop-out at grade 12 but in fact, in mind, a drop-out at grade 4.

It is inescapable that the population of our city is thus composed of as yet undetermined thousands of persons unprepared for any but marginal employment, totally unequipped for a life of anything but the most menial drudgery or crime. It is from these unfortunate people that come the population of our jails, it is these who include the exploited.

No one knows better than lawyers that lawyers are not teachers of reading, that they do not know how to run schools. We do know, however, that the total frustration of a large segment of the population of any nation inevitably leads to violence and is conducive even to revolution. We know too that while it is undoubtedly more difficult to teach those of limited economic background, economic deprivation renders no one uneducable. Economic or even social deprivation does not constitute a license not to educate but represents only an obstacle to be overcome. The inability to read and write denies men dignity and self-respect. It makes them in every sense—economic, social, moral and intellectual—society’s liabilities when they could and should be its assets.

No person who enjoys a rich and happy life by virtue of his education can reasonably ignore the plight of those who are thus doomed to lives of deprivation at every level of existence, least of all those so fortunate as to be today’s lawyers.

We whose peculiar expertise it is to inquire, to analyze, sometimes to reconcile, sometimes to resolve or compromise conflicting views, and sometimes to solve problems, aspire to put these skills sympathetically and unobtrusively at the disposal of the school district, its teachers, administrators and all who share our deep concern in this matter, which, after all, is everybody.

---

**Book Night**

The Law School faculty and administration have reached into the reservoir of time-honored traditions of years gone by to revive “Book Night.”

The Spring 1971 version of this venerable exercise will be held on Thursday, March 23, and will feature a discussion of the controversial offering “Nuremberg and Vietnam: An American Tragedy.”

The book’s distinguished author, Telford Taylor of the Columbia University Law School, will be joined by Princeton’s Richard Falk and another as yet unnamed discussant.

The panel will meet at 8 P.M. in the Fine Arts Auditorium at 34th and Walnut Streets. The public is welcome.

---

**Book Night**  
**is**  
**March 23**
'Unmarried Father'
Alumnus Recalls
Painless Tale Of
Swedish Student

By J. C. Luitweiler, '14

This is a companion piece to the article published in the Law Alumni Journal, Winter 1969, THROUGH LAW SCHOOL THE HARD WAY. It's the tale of a young undergraduate student going through a Swedish law school in a delightful and painless way.

There was a day to kill in Gothenburg, Sweden, awaiting an airline connection to Reykjavik, Iceland, en route back to New York. I decided to spend it at the city's famous botanic garden, and hailed a taxi to take me there. The taxi was driven by a six foot tall Swedish youth, with bushy red hair and a large handle-bar moustache. He spoke English fluently. He was a glib talker and rapid fire questions and answers were exchanged all the way out to the Garden. When we reached the Garden's gate I overlooked that the taxi's meter was still running while we continued our excited conversation. He was indeed full of interesting information which I was seeking as a writer. I learned he was an undergraduate law student at the Gothenburg University and was spending his summer driving this taxi to help pay for his education.

“Are Swedish cities crime ridden as are our cities in America?” I asked.

In answer he produced from under his seat a foot-long truncheon, of solid rubber fastened to a wooden handle. With the other hand he drew out from his coat pocket an efficient looking little gun which he showed me was a tear-gas gun loaded with a half dozen cartridges.

“Have you had to use these often?” I asked.

“Only occasionally, but so far not to prevent being robbed. But the summer is still young! I carry these with police permission and have used both to quiet a bunch of unruly young drunks who piled into my car late at night, were too drunk to tell me where they wanted me to take them, to pay a fare, or to get out of the cab when I ordered them out. I'm a football player myself but singly I couldn't handle them all.”

“Sounds a lot like New York City though I doubt if our New York City cab drivers are as well equipped,” I commented.

The taxi meter kept on ticking away. He really aroused my interest when he drew out a colored photo of a handsome rosy cheeked year and a half old boy and exhibited it as the proud father.

“So you've gotten married before finishing law school?” I suggested.

“Not at all. The child's mother and I have been living together for four years now. She's a Norwegian girl.”

That did it! I wanted to hear more of the story of this proud unmarried father who was studying law, something I hadn't encountered back home. But the taxi meter kept ticking off the kroner at an alarming rate. So I suggested after I spent an hour in the Botanic Garden he call back for me to take me back to my hotel.

“I have to take a patient to the hospital and can be back within the hour,” he said. “How would you like to come out to my home for lunch and meet the child's mother?”

It was so agreed and at 12:30 he was back in his taxi and the meter was promptly turned on! I was a bit surprised. He was going home empty for midday lunch anyhow and it was the first time I had been invited to lunch and paid the taxi fare. He probably sensed this and explained, “This,” he said, “is how I earn my living.” But it was only half the story! He didn't live in Gothenburg or even on its outskirts, but in a suburb miles away! I watched that rapidly ticking meter register 10, 20, 30 kroner in quick succession. Five Swedish kroner equal an American dollar. I have heard of hitchhiking a ride in America but never of hitchhiking a rider!

When we finally drew up in front of a nice looking apartment house in a small suburban town, I couldn't help remarking, perhaps with some heat:

“You're going to turn off that damn thing while we have lunch, aren't you?”

“Of course, of course,” he said and he quickly did. Swedes aren't noted for their sense of humor and Mr. Redhead was no exception. It took him many minutes to explain the operation of his taxi meter:

“You see the meter on the left registers the 24-hour day's travel, while the meter on the right registers the passenger paid kilometerage. If the meter on the right doesn't reach two thirds of what the meter on the left shows, I'm in trouble with the owner of the cab. That extra third unpaid kilometerage is what I need for travelling to and from home and for cruising.” I decided it wasn't worth while to point out that presently we were supposed to be on one of those to and from home trips.

On the long trip out I had been fully briefed on the antecedents of this proud unmarried father. After three weeks in Scandinavia I had learned that youth, male and female, talked about sex as their elders might talk of a good square meal. So to get the picture it should be recorded about as it was told to me.

“Four years ago I shared a small dormitory room with a buddy. It became a bit awkward when my girl friend chose to spend the night with me. She was working as a hair dresser and I was just a young student in my teens, living on a small allowance from my father.

“But we took the plunge and chipped in together for a small one room apartment where we spent each night together. We were and are very much in love. It wasn't long before she became pregnant and she very much...
wanted to have her baby. She didn't want to abort it as is common with young Swedish girls, who even go to England for the purpose, where it is practically free and easy to arrange.

"We of course told our respective parents who already knew we were living together. My mother insisted we marry. But my father disagreed. His view was that he didn't want anything to interfere with his son's getting launched in his career as a lawyer and earning enough to support a family without dependence on parents. He settled the argument by agreeing to pay the added cost of the nice apartment we now have which you shall presently see.

"The child was born prematurely, weighing only a pound and a half. So he was an incubator baby. At this juncture all four grandparents entered the picture. It was a 50/50 fight for the child's life. We won as you shall soon see. I suppose it was this struggle that endeared the boy to all six of us—parents and grandparents."

The child's perambulator was in the downstairs hall. We walked up to the third floor. He paused before the door and pointed to two brass plaques—his own and his girl's maiden name.

"Do you ever see that in America?" he asked. I shook my head. "Every one in the apartment knows we are unmarried. There are many other cases like ours in Gothenburg among upper class people. It's no disgrace for boys and girls to live together unmarried in Sweden and is common among college students. In my case, of course, my girl isn't a college student, but that's immaterial. And it's no disgrace to have a child out of wedlock, either for the parents or the child. Doesn't it make sense to you?"

I was non-committal. "All I can say at this time is that it's not the American way!"

I don't think he had phoned the girl of our coming, for when he rang and the door opened she appeared with the boy of perhaps 20 pounds in her arms and she promptly handed him over to daddy. She was a beautiful woman indeed, in bare feet, wearing a simple white gown of mini-length that showed her slim limbs to perfection. She was a true Norwegian type, blond hair, fair skin, oval face and lovely soft eyes that smiled so easily.

"No wonder," I thought, "he's in love with her!"

During the next hour and a half I spent with them, daddy had the boy in his arms or in a walking contraption, or was otherwise engaged in amusing him. The girl spoke no English so papa acted as interpreter throughout.

Figuring that the taxi fare would make my lunch cost me $12 to $15 I decided to make this lunch my one square meal of the day, instead of the simple bowl of soup I had planned. So when I was asked what I would like for lunch I described a midwestern United States breakfast of ham, eggs and potatoes. I was of course prepared for a counter-proposal. There was a rapid exchange of Swedish between my hosts. Shoes and socks went on and the girl beat it out the front door and down stairs to the store.

While the meal was being prepared in the kitchen papa did a good job entertaining his guest. He showed me about the apartment which was as comfortable and nicely furnished as young American married couples start life in. The living room wasn't large, but one wall was filled with book shelves and books, including law books, from the ceiling to a shelf some 30 inches from the floor. Below the shelf was a drawer and cupboards, from which he pulled out his typewriter, a radio and a television set.

"I have to keep everything—and I mean everything—out of this kid's reach. He can't reach my law books yet. Goodness knows what'll happen when he can! You can see, can't you, how happy we are to be together every evening, and at lunch in this little home."

It was almost pathetic how anxious he was to sell me, an American, on his way of life. I thought, 'No, this is no phony'. When he learned I was lawyer trained myself he produced Blackstone's treatise on the English common law. And he brought out the family album and showed me snap shots of the four grandparents, themselves and the child, and even the great grandfather. It certainly looked like a well knit family unit.

When the girl through papa as interpreter learned that I was a writer she smiled:

"Are you going to write about us?" she asked.

"Doubtless I shall," I said, "yours is one of the most interesting stories I have heard in Scandinavia about an unmarried father. But I shall not mention names."

"Oh, we wouldn't mind," she said, "We are proud of how we are living and what we have done," and to emphasize it she got out a colored picture of herself and the boy, which she gave me.

She was indeed an intelligent and efficient woman and had prepared a delicious meal, pretty close to my prescription of a midwestern breakfast. The child had been put down in the bedroom for a nap, so we talked for quite a while of her life and her future.

"Are you happy with things as they are?" I asked.

"Not altogether," she said, "I want to get back to work earning something for our future home and so we may get married some day. I do want more children. He's such a fine boy we want more like him. And the doctors tell me it isn't likely that the next child will be premature. I plan to park the boy with one grandmother or the other. They are both anxious to have him."

We left at 3 P.M. for the drive back to Gothenburg, with the taximeter of course ticking off the kroner. On the return trip he made a comment that has nothing to do with his story, but an interesting sidelight on Sweden:

"I suppose you have been told that Sweden has no slums or ghettos like your American cities. Well, it isn't so. As we drive along, look at these long rows of buildings we are passing. They look substantial, don't they? They were built many years ago. But today they are about as they were when they were built, only in worse condition. They have no central heating, no running water in the apartments, no bathrooms or toilets. Toilets are old wooden shanties in the patios behind. They of course rent very cheaply, but people shouldn't be allowed to live and bring up children under such filthy conditions. I am proud of my native town of Gothenburg, which is a beau-
A young Swede, I thought, who is 'going places,' with social consciousness. P.S. I challenge the present undergraduates of the U. of P. Law School to match this story!

Laments and Contortions

When It Comes To The Study of Law
One Cannot But Stand In Awe
At How Much Is Written And Read
And How Very Little Is Said
But Do Not Despair or Resign
These Years Have A Special Design

To Shock One Out of Self-Satisfaction
Ending That Certain or Complacent Reaction
Take Hope And Smile
It'll Be Over In A Little While
Sounding Like A Lawyer One Must Pretend
Remember, It's All Just A Means To An End.

THE JUDICIARY:
A TRUST TO ADJUST

In The Law
We Daily Dispute
Whether The Status Quo
We Need To Refute

A Question of Intent, Impact And Thrust
If The Dilemma Is Real, The Conflict True
We Sacrifice The Accepted, For The Just

CONTRITION OVER AN INQUISITION
or
A DISPOSITION on A PRECARIOUS POSITION

The Problem With My Legal Submission
Is A Painful And Reluctant Admission
That My Planned And Studied Presentation
Became A Maimed And Fractured Oration
For When A Logically Deduced Contention
Is So Contested As To Affect One's Retention
Composure And Memory Are Dissolved
Just When You Thought The Question Resolved

But Do Not Despair, Moan, or Resign
The Interrogation Has A Post-Operative Design
To Aid One In His Self-Evaluation
And Assess The Official Degradation
Remember It Was Positive And Constructive Criticism
Like Being Stabbed By One Uttering A Witticism
So Don't Look At It As A Condemnation
But A Source of Hope And Inspiration

So You Find That The Prepared Argument
Was Little More Than A Detriment
That Your "On-Your-Feet" Advocacy
Was An "Off-The-Cuff" Tragedy
That "Off-The-Top-Of-Your-Head" Refutations
Were Countered By Overlooked Citations
And What Seemed Clearly Dispositive And Relevant
Produced Reactions Heated And Malevolent

And Permit You To Proceed With Your Own Discourse
With No Regret or After-The-Fact Remorse

—Joseph H. Cooper, '72
Alumnus Norman F. Caplan, '66 is engaged in this most interesting piece of litigation, the outcome of which will affect us all. He has forwarded us a copy of Petitioner's Brief, which we reprint here.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE COSMIC
UNIVERSE

GOD'S CHILDREN, SONS OF MAN, ET AL.,

Petitioners

v.

PRINCE OF DARKNESS PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
THE DEVIL AND HIS CHILDREN, ET AL.,

Respondents

Brief in Support of Motion to Get Us Back
On the Road to Paradise

KRISHNA, LORD, KATZ & DIAMONDSTONE

Attorneys for Petitioners

345 Park Avenue
New York, New York

I. Statement of Facts

The case between these two families resembles, in many pertinent aspects, the notorious feud between the Hatfields and the McCoys, and has resulted in repeated and constant litigation throughout history.

The difficulties between the parties commenced around Time Immemorial, B.C., when two of the Petitioners, Adam and Eve Firstman, were residing at premises 111 Eden Drive. The Respondents, through their duly appointed agent, one A. Serpent, did wilfully and maliciously tempt Mrs. Firstman to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge, thereby bringing the curse of sin upon the human race. Further difficulties occurred when one of the Respondents did slay his brother, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Firstman, and was later tried for murder in the first degree. (See Commonwealth v. Cain, 1 Cosm. Univ. Repts. 121).

Throughout the centuries, Respondents continued their harassment of Petitioners, until the first century, A.D., when Petitioners commenced an Action in Ejectment which was intended to rid the earth of Respondents and to banish them to the Lower Depths. Despite the Injunction then issued by the Court, Respondents have continued in their nefarious ways, and are presently involved in such activities as shipping large quantities of black market material and polluting our natural environment.

To set forth the entire history of this case, in extenso, would require several volumes. Accordingly, the Court's attention is directed to the history books of the world for a complete statement of facts. (See, especially, 1 Old. Test. Repts. 1 et seq.)

II. Discussion of Law

Confessedly, Petitioners have failed to comply with the original Order of Court, directing them to bring sufficient quantities of light and peace into the world for all of mankind, and have further failed to comply with contractual obligations to complete building at the Nirvana Homes construction site. However, Petitioners plead extenuating circumstances, in that a malalignment of the stars and various other difficulties made it impossible for them to fulfill these requirements. Petitioners aver that they now have the requisite technology, knowledge and determination to perform fully all of their obligations. It is clear that now is the appropriate time in history to end, once and for all, this costly litigation and for Petitioners to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

As Mr. Justice Isaiah so wisely stated in Sunshine Fast Freight Co. v. Lucifer Enterprises, 231 Cosm. Univ. Repts. 119:

"... And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore ... Come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

Further, it was stated in U.S. v. Beelzebub, 319 Cosm. Univ. Repts. 211:

"The people who sat in darkness have seen great light, and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up."


Finally, the Court's attention is directed to the amicus curiae briefs filed on behalf of the Petitioners by SSPROCCUS (Society for the Spread of Cosmic Consciousness in the United States), and by CHRISTA (Cosmic Harmony through Research, Illumination, Science, and Technology in America).

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray that the Court enter an Order directing Respondents to cease and desist forever from interfering in any way with the business of Petitioners, and directing Petitioners to proceed with all deliberate speed on the Road to Paradise.

KRISHNA, LORD, KATZ & DIAMONDSTONE

LAW ALUMNI JOURNAL
sure that the environmental consequences upon Pennsylvania will be limited to tolerable proportions; but it is naive to believe that at the present time we can solve our problems without taking any environmental risks at all.

It is easy to react to the "environmental crisis" by painting pretty pictures of a world of the future in which we have so mastered the recycling technique that there will be no such thing as "garbage" at all—junk dumped into the trashbag will simply be converted into brand new products in an endless cycle. Per contra, one can frighten oneself at the prospect of the world the future literally burying itself in its own garbage. But these apocalyptic visions, however striking, are diversions from the challenges we must confront if technology is to be harnessed to improve rather than degrade the quality of life in the here and now.

Is it possible for us to design institutions which will accommodate the interests of environmentalists, economically insecure sanitation workers and outraged Pennsylvanians in the name of a solution to the solid waste problem which, if not ideal, is at least tolerable? (Remember: garbage is garbage is garbage). Even if the institutions can be designed, does our political system have the ability to face the problem squarely and adopt the structural reforms necessary to handle the pipeline system, or other solutions which technology may offer us? Or will the student activist of today, when he is 50, still hear the familiar shout of his enraged spouse demanding that he take the garbage out at once before the garbage men arrive; will another generation of poor people die young after a career throwing trash around forty (or thirty) hours a week; will another group of city fathers be obliged to add to air and water pollution because there is no other "economically feasible" way to dispose of their solid wastes; and will yet another generation of "statesmen" (not to speak of "concerned citizens") be prating about the urgent necessity of improving our environment?

Hyland

[Continued From Page 5]

participation by the officers and members of the Board of Managers of the Society in the various regional meetings that alumni hold in different parts of the country.

"We want to maintain and improve upon the relationship between the Law School and its alumni, a relationship which in our judgment should be a continuing one," Hyland said.

"Most of the graduates of the Law School are anxious to continue their relationship with the Law School after graduation. We are attempting to enlarge their opportunities to do this, and have been in touch with the officers of the different regional groups."

Hyland said that the Law Alumni Society has also committed "a limited amount of funds" to the annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture, which this year features U.S. Solicitor General Erwin Griswold. The lecture until now has been sponsored by the Order of the Coif.

"This very worthwhile program has been jeopardized to some degree by financial problems, and at the September meeting of the Board of Managers we unanimously agreed to underwrite a portion of the expenses encountered in running the lecture series.

"We reached this decision because we feel that the lecture is an important contribution to the Law School's efforts to commemorate the memory of an illustrious former dean and also a very useful way to bring important speakers before the Law School community.

"In addition, the annual lecture may ultimately become a publication of the Friends of the Biddle Law Library, and in this fashion we can assist in disseminating the highly useful remarks of the annual speaker."

The Law School's new dean, Bernard Wolfman, and Hyland, began their administrations at about the same time, and Hyland is unequivocal in his admiration for the new dean.

"We are very proud of Dean Wolfman and have offered the facilities of the Law Alumni Society to him in whatever way he feels might be helpful. We have devoted a substantial amount of attention to anything that will facilitate his administration at a time when financial problems are severely curtailing the programs of educational institutions everywhere. One of the Society's projects, the Friends of the Biddle Law Library, grew out of the Dean's concern for the library."

Focusing on the financial plight of the Law School, Hyland stated that he considers the school's money problems its most critical challenge.

"There isn't any question in my mind that a strong Society helps to bring about many secondary benefits of a financial nature, aside from its function of helping to maintain a strong social bond among graduates," he said.

"In every way we can, we have and will continue to encourage participation by alumni in this critical task of providing financial resources that are needed to maintain the quality that all of us have grown to expect and want to continue in the Law School."

Plans are currently under way, Hyland pointed out, for the annual Law Alumni Day, this year scheduled for Thursday, April 22. "As in the past," he said, "it will include several seminars involving important contemporary subjects and authorities in subject-matter fields."

The focus of this year's Law Alumni Day, Hyland said, will be various legal facets of the growing consumer protection issue.

Reflecting on his term as president of the Law Alumni Society, Hyland concluded: "I think everyone now active in the Society will be able to look back upon these past few years with a sense of great accomplishment.

"I have nothing but the highest expectation that the
Law School will continue to be one of the foremost institutions in the world for the promulgation of legal education and advancement.

"I am grateful for the chance to remain acquainted with the educational policies of the Law School, which has an extremely vital role to play in providing well-prepared lawyers for the vital function they are called upon to play in our society. Most of all, I am grateful for the opportunity to help in some small way to make the Law School's many advantages available to others."

E. L. G.
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space. It was even assigned a mailbox. The Environmental Law Group was alive and well.

The Workshop at Hershey followed in mid-January. A week and a half later, about two dozen ELG members, led by Mr. Ackerman [occasionally the Group is referred to as: "Ackey's lackies"], descended on the Region I office in Norristown to obtain files and get down to business. Stan Wolf, an Assistant Attorney General and a member of the Strike Force (assigned to coordinate ELG's efforts), reiterated the Group's role (as Mr. Beechwood and Mr. E. W. Sayer, Chief of the Enforcement and Administrative Section of Region I, looked on; perhaps the thought crossed their minds that these young lawyers-to-be might one day put them out of work). The Group left with ten files and high hopes. Each student carried a card, bearing the seal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and certifying that the person named "is a duly appointed Environmental Intern" of the Department of Justice. The cards were signed "Fred Speaker, Attorney General."

At last, the Environmental Law Group was getting down to work. The project was christened: Project Shoot. The acronym stands for "Sue the Hell Out Of Them!"

The student members of the ELG entertain few illusions. They don't expect to save the world. They don't even expect to solve the problem of water pollution. But they share with an expanding new breed of law students throughout the country a desire and a need to get involved in the basic problems of society. What they do is not very glamorous; it wins them few "important" friends; it earns them little money or glory. But it yields a reward of a different and more important sort: the feeling of satisfaction that only honest hard work and deep commitment can generate.

The Environmental Law Group is now a force to be reckoned with. It will be involving itself in the whole array of environmental problems, from air and water pollution, to conservation, to urban sprawl. It will do its work in the courts, in the council rooms of City Hall, in the chambers of the state legislature, in the halls of Congress and in the minds of the people of the City, State and Nation.

Wolfman
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special interests of client groups.

The qualities that you have, the qualities of corporate lawyers—to seek the relevant, to discard the misleading, to narrow issues, to pursue truth—these are qualities at a premium in our mangled and confused society. America desperately needs the product of your training and experience to help it reallocate its resources; to separate demagogic appeal from fact; to prohibit lawlessness on the part of law enforcers; to describe injustice and denounced it, in politics, in business, in government. Poverty and racism will not go away by themselves. Agendas for decision and action will be reordered peacefully only if the orderly minded assert leadership!

Much of society's latent leadership is in the Bar—the corporate Bar. The corporation lawyer must become a more public, more visible citizen. He must decide to separate himself and the public interest from the presumed economic or social interest of clients. Some years ago lawyers had to be persuaded to represent unpopular defendants without fear of tarnish by such association. Corporate lawyers have not been concerned about client tarnish. As lawyers in advocacy and negotiation they should and will represent their clients. But America needs these lawyers not to identify with the general economic and social interests of clients just to avoid antagonizing their patrons and those associated with them. Corporate lawyers need not defend polluters or monopolists or shoddy manufacturers except when retained to do so. They need not stand pat against open and low income housing just because they may represent real estate interests. They need not oppose principled tax reform because some clients may have stakes in particular loopholes. More lawyers must reassert their traditional freedom and then act as free men. Your Chancellor, Robert Landis, is such a free man.

No lawyer who defends clients charged with murder or bookmaking feels compelled to seek repeal of the crimes or to oppose enforcement of the criminal law. Corporate lawyers must join the vanguard of law reform not merely when it comes to the laws relating to the duties of a corporate director, but also when it comes to the rights of a welfare recipient, the right of a tenant to fair treatment by a landlord and constable, the right of a working man to equitable taxation.

If there is cynicism among our youth in law school, it is not because of the activities of corporate lawyers, but because of their passivity. The corporate lawyer has the knowledge; he has the respect; he has the skill to bring light into public debate, to help restructure our agendas for public action, to pin point problems, to expose simplistic or deceptive solutions, to point the way to the needed solutions. He has the independence and the background and training as lawyer-citizen and citizen-lawyer to help society achieve justice. Society needs that help.
Griswold
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the preliminary examination could be admitted at the trial as affirmative evidence against the defendant.

The Court in that case specifically said, "Viewed historically then, there is good reason to conclude that the Confrontation Clause is not violated by admitting a declarant's out-of-court statements, as long as the declarant is testifying as a witness and subject to full and effective cross-examination."

"But," said Griswold, "the problems continue." Citing Dutton v. Evans, 400 U.S. 74 (1970), he said "We have thus a considerable extension of an exception to the hearsay rule, authorized by a rather venerable state statute, as construed by the state court. The statement was not under oath, nor subject to cross examination when it was made. And this case goes beyond California v. Green, since the person who made the statement is not available to testify at the trial . . ."

Referring to the decision itself, Griswold stated "It is obvious that this was an extremely difficult case, and this was borne out by the result . . . Thus, I think it may fairly be said that though the result was 5 to 4, the decision was about 4.6 to 4.4 . . . We have six years after Pointer v. Texas, a decision holding that hearsay evidence may be admissible even though there was no cross-examination when the statement was made, and the declarant does not appear at trial, and thus is not subject to cross-examination there.

"The marriage of cross-examination and confrontation which was certified in 1965 found its way by a very difficult path to at least a limited divorce in 1970. But though the concepts are no longer merged, they surely have much in common. Just how is the line to be drawn?"

Grilswold asked.

"It is now clear," Griswold said, "that some kinds of hearsay are admissible, despite the confrontation clause —dying declarations, prior recorded testimony when the witness is dead, or when he is currently present and subject to cross-examination. In addition, book entries are apparently admissible as exceptions to the hearsay rule.

"It appears, too, from Dutton v. Evans, that the hearsay rule is not frozen, and that certain extensions of it may be upheld despite the confrontation clause.

"Let us suppose, though, that some State, moved by a desire to make available all relevant evidence, repeals the hearsay rule, and enacts that for its courts all relevant evidence is admissible. This may seem a little startling to us. But it should not be forgotten that it is the rule in nearly all countries of the world, except those which follow the common law system . . ."

"It seems clear . . . that the application of such an enactment to its full extent would violate the confrontation clause (insofar as that clause is found to be applicable). It would allow the admission into evidence of any sort of an extra-judicial statement, without any possibility of cross-examination, even though the statement was by no means slight or incidental, and even though it had no earmark of truth, as in the case of book entries."

This raises some interesting questions, Griswold said, and he referred to an article about the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren E. Burger in the January 2, 1971 New Yorker, which said, "Part of the endless struggle to establish justice has been the attempt to establish it uniformly. Indisputably, Georgia justice is different from Maine justice or Nebraska justice; indisputably it should not be."

"But is this wholly clear?" Griswold asked. "Is there only one way to administer justice? . . . Is there anything in the federal Constitution which fairly prevents the use of some hearsay evidence? . . . Should there not be continued room for experimentation in the several states in the quest for justice?"

"That, after all, I suggest," Griswold said, "is the real significance of Dutton v. Evans. It is basically a decision in the realm of constitutional method, and specifically in the area of federal-state relationships.

"May it not fairly be said that there is more chance of achieving justice through Dutton v. Evans than through a contrary decision which would have solidified the law of evidence in all the states into a federal mold?"

"It may finally be observed that we would not have encountered these problems if, somehow or other, the Sixth Amendment had not been found applicable to the States . . . to leap from the Fourteenth Amendment to the Sixth may be a much more sweeping application of free human choice than is involved in the construction and application of the Fourteenth Amendment.

"If we know anything about the Sixth Amendment as a result of our experience with it to date, it is that it does not mean what it says. Despite the constitutional provision, it is not the applicable law that the accused is entitled, in all applications and circumstances, to confront the witnesses against him . . ."

"It is not a matter of strict construction or of loose construction. In the problem of confrontation as applied to the States, it takes a very loose construction of the Fourteenth Amendment to bring the Sixth Amendment into the picture at all. Perhaps it is better, then, to rest the problem on the Fourteenth Amendment, even though its terms are general, and leave much to the experienced and informed judgment of the judges. The task which then remains calls forth the highest aspects of the art of judging."

Landis

[Continued From Page 11]

a contest of flamboyant rhetoric and carnival obscenities. In a society which most of us still believe is dedicated to the rule of law, we cannot let ourselves be enthralled with the beguiling appeal of some zealots' notion that their
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special brand of justice should prevail over the orderly processes of our courts, which must be the bastion of the rights of all the people.

Disenchantment with our legal processes does little to enhance our confidence in the rule of law.

As I said then, I am prepared to put my professional conscience on the side of our system of justice which so far has done a fairly creditable job of protecting the rights of the individual and seeing to their ultimate vindication in our courts.

It takes time, perhaps, but not much more time than the vindication of these rights of political dissent deserve.

Another challenge was not long in coming, the nomination of Judge Carswell to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was one of those events that came over the horizon of American history as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand.

In the beginning there were only a few of us who were troubled about the wisdom of this appointment and wondered at the curious political strategy that sought to lift this man of obscure credentials to service upon the highest court of our land.

Slowly the opposition gathered. It escalated to a crescendo from some of the leaders of the bar and the academic community and then, at my request, the Board of Governors in an unprecedented action created a committee to review the evidence of the Carswell hearings before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate and to report its findings back to the Board.

The Board of Governors at a special meeting declared its opposition to the nomination of Judge Carswell to the Supreme Court.

There were lawyers in Philadelphia who saw this action of the Board of Governors as a regrettable incursion—to borrow a currently fashionable term from the military lexicon—into fields of political philosophy where bar associations should fear to tread. They insisted that the qualifications of a Supreme Court justice should be the concern of political leaders not of just plain Philadelphia lawyers. But the action of the Senate in rejecting Judge Carswell, even without its ultimate ratification by the voters of Florida, who turned him aside as their choice for the United States Senate, was a tacit vindication of the judgment of the Board of Governors.

And with this action the Philadelphia Bar Association showed its commitment to a principle of judicial selection that could not be turned aside simply because it involved the highest court of the land or a prerogative of presidential choice which some believed should stand beyond any challenge by the lawyers who have a stake in the quality of justice administered by a high court.

Protecting the quality of our environment would have seemed not long ago to be a far reach beyond the traditional competence of lawyers. The young men and women of our profession did not see it this way. They had been urging for some time that the organized bar should concern itself with the preservation of our countryside, our parklands, and our urban neighborhoods against the incursions of the highway builders and the shopping center developers.

So early last year I created a Special Committee on Environmental Quality and put it in the hands of the concerned young men and women of our profession. They took hold and discharged their mission with zeal and energy, testifying before legislative committees, making their influence felt in the City's Council chambers and in the United States Senate, and carrying abroad through the land their concern that there are values in our natural heritage and our urban environment that must be defended, lest we perish from consuming the resources that have given us life.

Through the year there were bold attacks upon the judges by other public officials, notably by the former police commissioner, whose vested interest in casting blame for crime in the streets on somebody else is obvious enough. The troublesome thing about these attacks was not only their impact upon the independence of the judiciary and the erosion of public confidence in the quality of our justice. They also struck at the right of lawyers to represent unpopular defendants. This disdain for impartial justice was epitomized in the spectacle of the police commissioner seated at defense counsel's table during a policeman's arraignment for homicide.

Such insensitivity to the objective processes of justice could not be condoned silently, unless by condoning it we were willing to sell out a little piece of our heritage of due process. And we invoked the great traditions of our profession and the spirit of Andrew Hamilton in defending the young lawyers who took up these unpopular causes in the teeth of public criticism.

So it was that the organized bar became involved in the Holmesburg prison riot. The former police commissioner declared that it was a racial uprising, and he and the district attorney took command of the investigation.

The Defender Association filed a petition for habeas corpus on behalf of some of the detentioners held in Holmesburg, asserting that their rights under the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, prohibiting cruel and inhuman punishment, were being violated. Hearings began and soon the district attorney filed a petition for a writ of prohibition with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, claiming that the judges of our courts had no right to interfere with his investigation of the conditions at Holmesburg.

Judges Nix, Smith and Spaeth retained me to represent them in this proceeding late on the Friday afternoon when the petition was filed. Over the weekend, after our answer was dispatched by messenger to the presiding justice, the writ of prohibition was rejected by the Supreme Court per curiam, followed by the landmark decision of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia declaring that the conditions at Holmesburg constituted a violation of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution which, unremedied, would justify discharging the detentioners held there.

Jails are not convenient warehouses for the castoffs of
our society. The failure of our "non-correcting correctional institutions"—to borrow a choice phrase of the Chief Justice of the United States—is the basic delinquency of our system of criminal justice.

But there was more to 1970 than prisoners' rights at Holmesburg and the rights of lawyers to represent unpopular defendants or the interests of lawyers in defending the quality of our environment.

Young lawyers in Philadelphia were concerned with other basic public issues. On the bootheels and the tank tracks of the Cambodian invasion, they called upon the bar to declare its moral opposition to the war in Indochina and to seek its termination; so did the Committee on International Law. The Board of Governors received their resolution and determined that it deserved a public hearing before all the members of the Association.

It was a tumultuous meeting. But with all the turmoil surrounding it, the voices on each side of the issue were articulate and persuasive and in the best traditions of advocacy. The special meeting of the Bar Association by a majority vote expressed its opposition to the Indochina war but at the same time concluded that to test the sense of the Association it would be better to hold a plebiscite. And in the vote that followed the lawyers of Philadelphia concluded that as their own choice of policy they should not express themselves on a political issue so sensitive and so divisive.

This ideological battleground looked like a scenario in which the field marshal marched the troops up the hill and marched them down again. But the important thing was that the lawyers of Philadelphia had closed in on a tense public issue and debated it out in the open.

And then there was a concern I had expressed last year that there was something wrong in our Society when so few of our black citizens could make their way into the legal profession. This was easy enough to say, but one of the burdens that came with this assertion was the recognition that some of our professional colleagues had claimed there was a racial barrier in Pennsylvania against the admission of black lawyers. It would have been more comfortable to put aside these claims and leave them where they had been left once before, in a report issued seventeen years ago which was buried in the archives of the Bar Association.

But I appointed a Special Committee on Bar Admission Procedures under Professor Peter Liecouns of Temple University Law School, including Judge Clifford Scott Green, Judge Paul Dandridge, Ricardo C. Jackson, and W. Bourne Ruthrauff, to investigate them. Their report, submitted to the Board of Governors late last year, has left its reverberations behind. Whatever may be said of the conclusions, it cannot be said that we failed to face up to the regrettable disparity between the numbers of black lawyers in our community and the needs of the community that must be served.

If there was any ultimate arena of the first year of the Seventies it must have been the Contest of the Generations. Our children called us to account. I could not accept the free-wheeling libels cast upon them by a high profile national figure who called them effete snobs and choleric young intellectuals. Some Americans found a comforting insulation in this kind of hyperbole that would shut out a whole generation behind it, but I could not accept this embargo on communication across the generation gap.

If we really paused to listen to what the young men and women were saying, we could find a resonance in our own consciences, a reach into the quietude of our own understanding, that would tell us that they are blood and bone of our creation, that, imperfect as our communication with them may be, they shared the inspirations and the aspirations that must move us on to higher priorities than capturing moon rocks. Toward a society that finds its prime values in the salvation of the disadvantaged and the dispossessed, the salvaging of our environmental heritage, not in overwhelming the nuts and rice paddies of Indochina.

There were many other eventful things that happened in this first year of a new decade, the Seventies, a decade unlabelled, waiting to be charged with momentous events, a vessel of time that could be filled with hope—if we have not exhausted our capacity for hope and aspiration.

But if there is nothing else that I can look back on than this, it is the sense of sharing responsibility with the young men and women of our profession, a concern for the real issues of our time, a feeling that we are searching for answers that are not just "blown in the wind."

I believe we have joined in a recognition that the action of our time is passionate and that there is no place with a greater share of it than our own profession, a belief that we can serve not with the loyalty of a negative indignation but with the loyalty of a positive conviction, that we can ride in the whirlwind and, perhaps, direct the storm.

**News Notes**

(Continued From Page 10)

Dean Bernard Wolfman, '48, has led a fund drive for the Biddle Law Library which has resulted in contributions by alumni and friends of the Law School totalling over $37,000. University President Martin Meyerson will seek non-alumni sources in an attempt to add another $25,000 to the fund by next September. The fund, which is dedicated to Professor Morris L. Cohen, Biddle Law Librarian, is aimed at increasing the Library's collection.

The class of 1931, at the suggestion of Philadelphia Common Please Court Judge Herbert Levin, has contributed over $1,000 to the Law School in memory of their deceased classmate Frank E. Gordon.

"We appreciate the generosity of the class in responding to this special fund," said Kellogg W. Beck, secretary of the class, who accepted the contributions from his classmates.
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Chief Justice JOHN C. BELL, JR., of Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, was honored at a testimonial dinner on Nov. 14 in Philadelphia. The fete paid tribute to the Chief Justice's half century of public service. Guest speaker was Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the United States.

ROBERT V. MASSEY, JR., of Philadelphia has been elected to a third term as president of the city's Legal Aid Society.

ALEXANDER F. BARBIERI, of Philadelphia, has been named to the vacancy on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court caused by the death of Justice Herbert Cohen, '25. He formerly served as a judge on the state's Commonwealth Court and in the Philadelphia Common Pleas Court.

ISRAEL PACKEL, of Philadelphia, has been appointed counsel to Pennsylvania Governor Milton Shapp. He resigned his partnership in the Philadelphia firm of Fox, Rothschild, O'Brien and Frankel before joining the Shapp Administration.

EDWARD A. KAIER, of Philadelphia, has announced the opening of his law office at 1600 Three Penn Center, Philadelphia.

LEWIS M. GILL, of Lower Merion, Pa., is serving as chairman of the President's emergency committee on the railroad labor controversy and has been elected president of the National Academy of Labor Arbitrators, according to Professor Louis Schwartz. Mr. Schwartz also reports that SYLVESTER GARRETT, '36 is "near the top of the heap in labor relations" as permanent arbitrator for U.S. Steel and the Steel Workers' Union. Both Gill and Garrett were on the War Labor Board, Schwartz notes, while Garrett also taught law at Pitt and Stanford.

JOHN E. WALSH, JR., of Philadelphia, has resigned his post as Register of Wills to accept an appointment as a Common Pleas Court judge. Walsh is joined on the Philadelphia bench by HERBERT W. SALUS, '48, who was also named to fill an unexpired Common Pleas Court term.

JOHN P. BRACKEN, of Philadelphia, is now serving
as the chairman of an eight man steering committee for the Philadelphia 1976 Bicentennial Corp., which is charged by President Nixon with the responsibility of hosting an international exposition in 1976 as part of the country’s 200th birthday celebration.

Joining Bracken on the steering committee is Philadelphia City Representative and Director of Commerce S. Harry Galfand, ‘45.

1941
JOHN R. McCONNELL, of Philadelphia, has begun his term as the 44th chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, succeeding ROBERT M. LANDIS, ‘48.

1942
ROBERT KUNZIG, of Washington, D.C., has been named by President Nixon to coordinate plans in Washington, D.C. for the 1976 Bicentennial. Kunzig also serves as administrator of the General Services Administration.

1943
JOSEPH N. BONGIOVANNI, JR., of Philadelphia, has been elected vice-chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, defeating HENRY T. REATH, ‘48. He will automatically succeed to the post of chancellor in three years.

1947
JAMES P. SCHELLENGER, of Devon, Pa., has been elected president of Delaware Fund, Decatur Income Fund, Delta Trend Fund, Delchester Mutual Fund and Delaware Management Co.

MICHAEL VON MOSCHZISKER, of Philadelphia, has been named executive secretary of the Committee of 70 by chairman DAVID RANDALL, ’61. The Committee, formed in 1904, is a nonpartisan organization devoted to the improvement of the city of Philadelphia, election reform, prevention of election fraud and education of the public in civic concerns.

1948
DANIEL H. HUYETT, 3d, of Reading, Pa., was sworn in as a federal district court judge in December after resigning as a member of the state Public Utility Commission.

1949
FRANCIS J. CAREY, of Spring House, Pa., has been elected to the Board of Managers of Western Savings Bank.

1950
ROGER S. HADDON, of Sunbury, Pa., is president of Sunbury Broadcasting Corp. which operates WKOK and WKOK-FM in Sunbury where he maintains “solo” practice.

D. DONALD JAMIESON, of Philadelphia, has been elected President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas’ 56 member Board of Judges, succeeding the late VINCENT A. CARROLL, ’14.

1952
DONALD M. ALLEN, of Media, Pa., has been appointed corporate vice president of Delaware Fund, Decatur Income Fund, Delta Trend Fund, Delchester Mutual Fund and Delaware Management Co.

1953
CALVINE K. PRINE, of Granville, O., has been named
director of university relations at his undergraduate alma mater, Dennison College.

1956

PETER J. LIACOURAS, of Philadelphia, a faculty member at Temple Law School, chaired a special committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association investigating possible discrimination in the admission practices of the Pennsylvania Board of Law Examiners. He was joined on the five man committee by W. BOURNE RUTHRAUFF, '67.

1959

AUSTIN B. GRAFF, of Richmond, Va., is now asso-

associated with the Richmond office of Reynolds Metals Co. CARL F. WERLEY, of Philadelphia, has been promoted to assistant vice president at Provident National Bank.

1963

LOUIS H. NEVINS, of Washington, D.C., has been appointed Director-Counsel of the Washington office of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

1964

ROBERT G. FULLER, JR., of Augusta, Me., continues as assistant attorney general in Maine and writes that his classmate Paul D. Pearson served as counsel for a company staging the folk-rock musical "Hair" when Boston authorities attempted to close the show.

1965

J. JOSEPH FRANKEL, of Eatontown, N.J. has won a three year term to the borough council. He is celebrating his victory concurrently with the birth of his second child, a daughter.

MARIO A. IAVICOLI, of Camden, N.J., has been appointed as legal counsel to the Speaker of the New Jersey General Assembly.

ANITA RAE SHAPIRO, of Fullerton, Calif., is now staff attorney for the California Court of Appeals, 2nd Appellate District.

1966

RICHARD M. GOLDMAN, of Pittsburgh, Pa., moderated an Allegheny County Bar Association panel on Juvenile Court practice in December.

PAUL W. TRESSLER, of Norristown, Pa., is now an assistant district attorney for Montgomery County, Pa.

1967

CARMEN L. GENTILE, of Washington, D.C., has joined the Washington firm of Debevoise and Liberman.

A. SCOTT LOGAN, of Morris Plains, N.J., has been ap-

pointed vice president, rules and regulations, of Union Service Corp.

ALAN R. MARKIZON, of Beverly Hills, Calif., has become assistant house counsel at the Seaboard Corp.

1968

DANIEL E. COHEN, of Easton, Pa., is a partner in the firm of Seidel & Cohen with NORMAN SEIDEL, '41 and serves as 1971 director of the Northampton County Legal Aid Society.

1969

PAUL E. KONNEY, of New York, is now associated with the New York firm of Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates.
A. RAYMOND RANDOLPH, of Washington, D.C., is now with the U.S. Solicitor General's Office.

1970

RONALD E. BORNESTEIN has received an appointment as a visiting Fulbright lecturer at the University of Dakar.

JOHN MICHAEL WILLMANN, of Philadelphia, has been appointed Deputy Court Administrator for Public Information and Planning for Philadelphia’s Common Pleas and Municipal Courts.

FACULTY & STAFF NOTES

Professor JAMES O. FREEDMAN has been elected to a three year term on the Board of Directors of the Mental Health Association of Southeastern Penna. In addition, Professor Freedman recently participated in a panel discussion of “The Latency Child in a Custody Conflict” at the annual national meeting of the American Association of Psychiatric Services for Children. His article, “Administrative Procedure and the Control of Foreign Direct Investment,” appeared in the November 1970 issue of the Law School’s Law Review.

Professor LOUIS B. SCHWARTZ participated in an Anglo-American conference on the causes and treatment of crime at the end of February which was sponsored by the Ditchley Foundation.

Mr. Schwartz also saw three and one half years of work as director of the staff of a 12 man commission set up by Congress to propose reforms in the nation’s criminal laws come to fruition.

On January 7 the group’s final report was released and the professor chose that occasion to describe the document as “historic, unprecedented.” The committee charged with the task was chaired by former California governor Edmund G. (Pat) Brown. Among the report’s more “sensational” recommendations were abolition of capital punishment, outlawing the private ownership of handguns and punishment of marijuana possession only by fines.

Visiting Professors DAVID S. RUDER and WILLIAM TWINING have joined the faculty for the Spring semester. Mr. Ruder is from Northwestern Law School and is teaching Securities Regulations. Mr. Twining is from Queen’s University of Belfast in Northern Ireland and is teaching Legal Realism and conducting a seminar on Problems of East African Law.

DONALD FARRAR, of the SEC’s Institutional In-
vestor Bureau, has joined the Law School's Center for the Study of Financial Institutions as a senior fellow for one year.

Part-time lecturers include HAROLD KOHN who conducts a seminar in Urban Transportation Problems, STEPHEN GOODMAN who is teaching first year Contracts and Mrs. NORMA L. SHAPIRO who is giving a course in Women's Rights during the Spring term.

Former Dean JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM delivered an address entitled "Earl Warren: A Man For All Men" at the ACLU's 50th Annual Dinner in New York City in December. He also was elected to membership on the executive committee of the national chapter of the Order of the Coif.

Professor GEORGE L. HASKINS attended the annual meeting of the Maine Bar Association in early February which honored the newly appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court. He also attended the association's probate committee annual meeting and will attend the first Harvard Conference on Legal History at the Harvard Law School on April 30 as president of the American Society for Legal History.

The 1951 Class at the University of California Law School at Berkeley has invited Professor and Mrs. COVEY T. OLIVER to be guests of the class during the celebration of the 20th anniversary of graduation from Boalt Hall. Mr. Oliver came to Pennsylvania from California in 1956.

Additionally, Mr. Oliver recently authored an article entitled “New Problems of Social Development” for the Foreign Service Journal.

Professor ROBERT A. GORMAN is continuing to serve as a “one-man” task force on curriculum reform.

Professors RALPH S. SPRITZER and JAMES O. FREEDMAN have been appointed as consultants to the Administrative Conference of the United States.
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