LAW LIBRARIES
A Scholar's Comparison

PRISONER'S RIGHTS
A Litigation Project

A.A.G. REPORT
1971-1972
From the Dean's Desk:

The Year in Review

This issue of the Journal features the report of the Law School Alumni Annual Giving Campaign for 1971-72. Achieving a new high, the campaign demonstrates the depth of alumni faith in legal education and scholarship at Penn. Annual Giving provides enrichment to our educational program, colloquia and book nights, research assistants and the multitude of other activities which the University budget cannot support. Those of us at the School who see the results of annual giving on a daily basis want to assure all of you whose contact is less frequent that your efforts as campaign workers and contributors are productive in a very tangible way, and very much appreciated. Once again, we express our gratitude to John F. E. Hippe!, L'26, General Chairman of Law School Annual Giving, and to each of his campaign cohorts. I also wish to express appreciation to Lloyd Herrick, the Dean's Assistant for Alumni Affairs, for his dedicated service in both the planning and execution of the annual giving effort.

The year 1971-72 has been mixed with accomplishment and excitement, and with tension and stress. As you know, the Faculty adopted a new curricular design. When implemented fully it should provide unique educational opportunities for our students—earlier legal sophistication, exposure to a fuller array of societal problems in which legal process has a role, patterns for concentration in special areas of interest, more independent work and seminars, and greater clinical activity. Full implementation of the new curriculum will be achieved only when we have succeeded in enlarging our faculty. In the meantime, we have made important starts and have provided a model for many other law schools.

Our admissions policy has been reexamined and altered. My Annual Report will discuss the new policy in detail. Suffice it for now to note that in the future more emphasis will be placed on an applicant's individual academic performance in college, and less on the particular college in which he or she performed. At the same time, the applicant's individual LSAT score will continue to play a significant role since, more than any other single factor, it has a positive correlation with actual performance in law school. We have also recognized, however, that many of our very highly qualified applicants are indistinguishable from each other by any totally objective criteria. This small group, just below those with the highest academic qualifications, are pooled. In filling out the class of 200, the Admissions Committee draws from the pool with the help of such factors as unusual work or military experience, superior graduate school performance, and alumni parentage. With over 3100 applicants, it is understandable that the class is chosen largely from entirely objective criteria, but we are hopeful that our experience will show it wise to use relatively subjective criteria in selecting from a small pool of people who are not otherwise distinguishable in any reliable way.

Questions of "pass/fail" grading, student voting in Faculty meetings, and tenure decisions have created division. Some of these problems have been discussed in the Journal before; some will be discussed in this and subsequent issues, and in my Annual Report. I wish only to say here that the concerns of those who differ with School policy and decisions are respected. Premises and procedures are open to re-examination as we continue the endless process of self-education out of which we seek an environment which will assure a quality of legal education for our students and of legal scholarship for all the world that one has come to expect of Penn.

Owen Roberts Lecture - March 22
# UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

## Law Alumni Journal

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWS &amp; FEATURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From The Dean's Desk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloane On Law Libraries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner's Rights Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Alumni Day Revisited</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Of An Issue Of Fact</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wilson—A Look At His Life</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women In The Law</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribulations Of A Review Editor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarantine Drug Addicts?</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Annual Giving—1971-72 Report</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Notes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Notes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty And Staff Notes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necrology</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- **Law Libraries—A Comparison**
  Page 4

- **Klaus Honored At Commencement**
  Page 7

- **Law Alumni Day Revisited**
  Page 6

- **A.A.G. Report 1971-1972**
  Page 17
Law Librarian Compares Firm And Law School

Different Challenges Presented to Author By Each ‘Institution’

By Richard Sloane
Biddle Law Librarian

The purpose of this article is to contrast and compare two kinds of institutions: the large Wall Street firm (Cravath) and the topflight law school (Pennsylvania)—but only from the vantage point of their libraries.

It is an interesting fact that the two most articulate insiders who have written about law firm and university life in our day, Louis Auchincloss [Powers of Attorney] and Mary McCarthy [Groves of Academe] respectively, have filled their readers with such despair as to persuade them either to flee to the hills or apply the torch to both Wall Street and the campus. Are their portraits distorted? Not to them, certainly.

My view—neither bird’s eye nor worm’s eye—was altogether different. After 20 years in the Cravath office, I never felt the urge to run or burn. Nor after nearly a year at Penn has either thought crossed my mind.

What is the Cravath firm like? It is a large firm, but not an impersonal one. When I left last July, there were about 165 lawyers, compared to a Penn faculty of fewer than 30 and a student body of more than 600. The firm occupied two floors and part of a third near the top of the 60-story Chase Manhattan Bank Building in New York. Its accounting machines and storage files, with their supporting personnel, were located in nearby buildings. Each of the Chase Building floors is nearly the size of a Center City block running from Market to Chestnut Streets in Philadelphia.

Through the entrance doors you can see Mr. Seward’s combination desk-chair (it predates the Alaska Purchase). Across from the desk is a wall chart that traces the firm’s membership from 1819 to the present. In a bookcase nearby are Cravath’s briefs and some other mementos of the firm’s practice.

Down the hall is the Cravath library of nearly 30,000 volumes. The nine-man library staff expands to about 15 in the summer in order to assist the newly hired second-year law students, each of whom tries to make a reputation for himself in 60 days. We thought that they were doing it by reading—or at least removing from the shelves—about 1,000 books each during that time. Or so it seemed to our stack attendants who had to reshelve them.

What is different about the Cravath firm? I cannot contrast it with the great Philadelphia firms, but I know how it differs from most of the New York firms. It is more flexible. Its members are willing, indeed eager, to try new ideas—if the ideas seem sensible.

I can illustrate this best by reference again to the library because I know it best. When I went there to become their librarian, I had never opened a law book. Yet they were willing to experiment if I was.

Some time after that, but long before I even began to study law, an old pro of a lawyer at Cravath asked me if I would like to try writing an appellate brief. It was to be in defense of a $3,000,000 law suit against the owners of a ship that had been lost at sea. That they used the brief virtually as I wrote it is a tribute to their courage. That they won the case was a stroke of good fortune—especially for me—because it led indirectly to law study, admission to the bar and eventually—to the University of Pennsylvania.

(Continued on page 36)
Students Act As Counsel For Pennsylvania Prisoners

By Jonathan Silver

Over the past few years the courts, particularly the federal courts, have begun to reverse a former policy of refusal to entertain the legal challenges of state and federal prisoners to the conditions of their incarceration. "He is for the time being the slave of the State," Ruffin v. Com., 62 Va. (21 GRATT.) 790, 796 (1871), was the universal judicial response to prisoners' rights suits for a long period of time. Eventually, the judges rejected the analogy, but retained the conclusion that they ought not to insist that the Constitution be enforced in prison. Recently, however, many courts have held that prisoners' complaints can state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

In several recent cases courts have found substantial Constitutional violations within prisons, and have entered far-reaching orders to remedy the situation. The Prisoner's Rights Litigation program at the Law School is a manifestation of the developing concern over prison conditions.

Because nearly all prisoners' complaints are filed pro se and in forma pauperis, many are poorly drafted and not overly legible. It is generally assumed that many of the complaints are frivolous. Those factors resulted in the failure of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to process, litigate, and dispose of prisoners' rights complaints as promptly as desirable. Many open cases were as much as three years old.

In the fall of 1971, Judge Thomas A. Masterson, whose excellent judicial reputation includes a real concern for the fates of the persons who become involved in the criminal justice system, decided that the prisoners' rights docket deserved more attention. He conceived the idea of using law student man-power to assist the prisoners and the courts in that endeavor. Judge Masterson communicated with Professors Paul Bender and Ralph Spritzer of this law school, and with professors of other area law schools. He suggested that if a sufficient number of law students were interested in acting as appointed counsel in pro se prisoners' rights actions, the Court might adopt a local rule permitting such assignments.

Mr. Bender and Professor Martha Field met with John Myers, a third-year student and then Chairman of the Prison Research Council, and myself. Bender thought that Judge Masterson's idea was a worthwhile one, and that if student interest was sufficient the law school should participate in the program. He, Spritzer and Field, agreed to act as faculty supervisors for the students who would be appointed. It was suggested to us that the Prison Research Council offices could serve as a good administrative center for the program. We agreed to act in that capacity.

When some thirty students responded favorably to the idea, Judge Masterson was informed that the program seemed feasible from our point of view. Temple's Law School also submitted an affirmative report. The Court then adopted local rule 9½ to permit the appointment of law student counsel.

Rule 9½ applies to all civil rights and habeas corpus matters. The prisoner must consent in writing to the appointment of a law student to handle his case. A third-year law student is permitted to appear in court in any proceeding in connection with the case to which he has been appointed. A second-year law student may appear at any pre-trial stage of a civil rights case. Students must be certified by the dean of the law school as being of good character and competent legal ability. No compensation of any kind may be received.

It was then decided that the initial cases should be assigned to members of Mr. Spritzer's Litigation Seminar. The development of those cases served as a pilot for the cases which were subsequently assigned to other students. Presently, the Court sends copies of pro se complaints to the Prison Research Council, after leave to proceed in forma pauperis has been granted. (It had been agreed that Temple would handle complaints from Philadelphia city jails (Holmesburg), and that we would handle cases from the state prison at Graterford.) We then recommend appointments to the Court. If the Court accepts the recommendation, appointed counsel is then in a position to begin to work on his case.

Counsel's first step is normally to look at the documents on file at the courthouse. Some files contain only a brief conclusory complaint and an equally brief answer, usually including a motion to dismiss. On the other hand, some files are fairly well developed. In at least one case, both parties had moved for summary judgment and submitted affidavits and briefs. The Court had granted defendant's motion, then granted

(Continued on page 33)
Ernest Scott, '29
Receives Award
On Alumni Day

Former Law Alumni Society president Ernest Scott, '29, received the Law School's Distinguished Service Award at Law Alumni Day on April 27.

Presentation of the award was made by Henry T. Reath, '48, chairman of the seven-member Distinguished Service Award Committee.

Scott received the award, which was the third in the five-year history of the committee, for his service to the Law School, the University and the city of Philadelphia.

"How do you write about a man whose life and service to others is marked—not by empty words and unfulfilled promises—but by action and accomplishment?" Reath said in making the presentation.

"We can say, as those who know him well can attest, that he has always exhibited inspired leadership, extraordinary courage, brilliance of mind and soundness of judgment; that he has always been a prodigious worker, seeking after perfection and frequently finding it—by his quiet manner that inspires others to emulate his fine example."

Scott has been chairman of the Law School's Board of Trustees and is a life trustee of the University. He has served as chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association and President of the United Fund in Philadelphia.

He is senior partner in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz.

The Alumni Day program began with a luncheon honoring the Quinquennial Classes between 1907 and 1972, and was highlighted by a ceremony honoring the Fifty Year Class.

Main speaker at the luncheon was Biddle Law Librarian Richard Sloane, who directed his remarks to the proliferation of legal publications and their increasing costs.

Sloane proposed the establishment of a law book and law firm library clinic as one aid to Philadelphia firms who have questions about acquisition, cost, and management of legal materials.

Additionally, he highlighted three developments in the area which, he believes, have at least raised the consciousness of book publishers about the attitudes of their consumers.

The first is an article by Robert Taylor summing up the complaints many practitioners have against the publishers. (55 ABÁ Jr. 553 (1969).

The second development is the two-year-old investigation into publishing practices by the Federal Trade Commission. Sloane cautioned against optimism with respect to a report on that investigation: "There are so many more vulnerable and defenseless consumers than lawyers in this country, they (FTC) point out, that surely we can take care of ourselves."

The Special Committee on Law Book Publishing Practices established by the American Bar Association in 1970, is the third development listed by Sloane.

Composed of five lawyers, including Sloane, the committee, according to his own admission, accomplished "only a little more than the FTC."

"Our single accomplishment to date: they have promised to eliminate misleading statements from their advertising . . . But in response to our major complaints—excessive pricing and unnecessary supplementation—we obtained no promises."

A seminar on the financial plight of local govern-

(Continued on page 37)
Law School Honors Klaus At Graduation
C.L.S. President Praised For Service To Community

William R. Klaus, partner in the Philadelphia law firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz, and president of the board of trustees of Community Legal Services, Inc., received the Law School's Honorary Fellowship on May 22 at the Law School Commencement ceremony in the Law School courtyard.

Klaus has been president of the trustees of Community Legal Services since he led the Philadelphia Bar Association group responsible for its founding in 1966. He presently serves as vice-chairman of the Philadelphia Bar Association and as a vice-president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. He is also a director of the Philadelphia Urban Coalition and of the Greater Philadelphia Movement.

Klaus received the Honorary Fellowship from Dean Bernard Wolfman and then addressed the law graduates and guests. The graduating class included 204 J.D. recipients, one S.J.D., and seven masters degrees.

In the American Bar Association, Klaus is chairman of the Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants and is a former chairman of the Committee on Right to Legal Services. In the Pennsylvania Bar Association, he is a member of the House of Delegates, the founder and present chairman of the Section on Service to the Public, and past chairman of the Section on Corporation, Banking, and Business Law. In 1966, Mr. Klaus was the first recipient of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Award for Services to the Bar in organizing Community Legal Services.

The citation to Mr. Klaus read:

"Your career at the Bar provides a striking example of the lawyer who has pursued the private practice of the profession with energy and distinction, yet has always found time and strength for the insistent demands of public service. You have shown wisdom, resourcefulness and determination in the continuing effort to make the legal profession more responsive to public needs and to make its services available to the indigent and the oppressed. Overcoming widespread inertia and resistance, you were the moving force in the organization of Community Legal Services in the City of Philadelphia. Elected its first President in 1966, you have continued in that post to the present day. In the various professional and civic organizations of which you are a member, you have consistently emphasized the public responsibilities of the legal profession rather than parochial concerns, addressing yourself to the development of legal service programs, to the protection of civil rights and to problems of housing and urban law.

We hold you in esteem and commend your example to the future lawyers who go forth from this school."

Klaus is a graduate of the Carnegie Institute of Technology and of Temple University Law School.

The Honorary Fellowship of the Law School was established in 1965 to provide appropriate recognition each year to a lawyer who has distinguished himself or herself by combining an active professional career with outstanding public service.

Previous recipients of the Honorary Fellowship are J. LeVonne Chambers, Jr., senior partner in the Charlotte, N.C., law firm of Chambers, Stein, Ferguson and Lanning; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., a partner in the Washington, D.C., law firm of Rauh and Silard, and counsel to the late Joseph Yablonski in his campaign for the presidency of the United Mine Workers Union; Mrs. Marion Wright Edelman, director of the Washington Research Project of Clark College's Center for Public Policy; Ralph Nader, head of the

(Continued on page 34)
Dean Wolfman Addresses The Class Of '72
Trial Of An Issue of Fact:

Spectators Crowd Classroom For Litigation With A Light Touch

By Charles Sweet

"Your Honor, do I understand the Court to be refusing to hear testimony or argument on the inherent differences between men and women?"

"That is correct, counsel. On the contrary, this Court takes judicial notice that no such inherent differences exist. Please proceed with another line of questioning."

While the above colloquy might not typify the scene in many traditional trial courts, it is without doubt highly unusual emanating from the classroom of an establishment law school. Yet this exchange (which will be explained shortly) was only one of many somewhat lighthearted moments in this year's Trial of An Issue of Fact course, which ranged from dead seriousness to frequent whimsy and occasional hilarity.

This course is one of the very few in law school for the student who is interested in trial work, as virtually all of the coursework in law school emphasizes appellate cases and appellate advocacy techniques. This course stressed trial techniques and was run, insofar as possible, as if it were a real courtroom populated with approximately fifty lawyers all trying the same case.

Trial of an Issue was taught by Professor A. Leo Levin and Assistant District Attorney James D. Crawford, along with a host of eminent trial practitioners from the Philadelphia Bar, and a number of respected Judges from various Philadelphia and Pennsylvania Courts. On one occasion the class was so fortunate as to have Chief Justice Benjamin Jones of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court sitting as guest judge. As it turned out, the Chief Justice knew a great deal more about the subject being litigated—valuation of coal land—than anyone had anticipated. Needless to say, the class benefitted greatly from the presence of the many guests who generously donated their time.

However, in a very real sense, the actual instructors were the students themselves. In the process of going through each facet of a trial from voir dire to cross examination to closing argument, each student was expected to participate actively on several occasions. While the majority of participants were prepared in advance for their leap into the icewater of litigation, there were frequent spontaneous "volunteers" in the traditional military sense. The quality of advocacy varied greatly, of course, but the most penetrating lessons were often learned from the mistakes made, as well as from the demonstrations of technique. Since the quality of advocacy rose measurably during the semester, it seems safe to speculate that lessons learned in the crucible of a trial—even a mock trial—tend to be well remembered.

Student reaction to the course was generally very favorable. At the outset the course was greatly oversubscribed so that selection of those enrolled was by lottery. Because the class sessions had considerable entertainment as well as educational value, they were well attended, not only by the students but invariably by a number of spouses and other guests. (As a matter of fact, the author's three year old daughter attended eight of the last nine class sessions, consuming animal crackers in the back of the room at the rate of one box per class hour. She managed to get introduced to Chief Justice Jones, and received an honorary grade of "distinguished," although the students enrolled were graded on a Pass/Fail basis.)

The negative comments centered around the large size of the class and an insufficient number of hours to cover all the material. Both of these problems will be alleviated in the coming year, as the course will

(Continued on page 35)
School’s First Professor

Wilson’s Mark Remains On School; Also Felt On High Court And Nation

By Julian Karpooff, ’71

If you ask any schoolboy or even a first year Penn Law student “Who was a delegate to the Second Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a Colonel in the Pennsylvania militia, a member of the Confederation Congress, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, a member of the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, a member of the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention of 1790, a member of the first Supreme Court of the United States and first professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania,” you would most likely draw a blank. Beside the main entrance of the old Law School building a marker reads

Law
Department
of the
University
First Professor
James Wilson
1790

Aside from this, a James Wilson Law Club (read: Beer and Basketball Society), a dilapidated hotel and roadside historical marker in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and a gravesite near William Penn’s in downtown Philadelphia there is little remembrance of that great man.

James Wilson was active in virtually every important political event of the critical early years of the Republic. He was an Enlightenment intellectual. He was the colleague and confidant of the Founding Fathers, including Ben Franklin, Sam Adams, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Dickinson and others. In addition he was an engaging individual—complete with warts. In recognition of these achievements and for the sheer pleasure of the historical perspective, I submit the following account of the life and career of a distinguished man.

James Wilson was a Scotsman. He was born in 1742 to a yeoman farmer and his wife in the lowlands near St. Andrews, on the east coast of Scotland. The area was relatively prosperous, marked by economic democracy and Calvinism. The elder Wilsons were Presbyterian and were both literate, if mainly for the purpose of Scripture study. The area had an intellectual tone, being close to the university towns of Edinburgh and St. Andrews and the scene of religious fervor. In addition, Scotland was enjoying a renaissance at the time, as the names Hume, Berkeley and Smith, among others, indicate.

As a first son, Wilson was pledged to the Lord’s work and, as such, slated for an education. In addition to the standard family religious instruction he was sent to the parish school to study Sallust and Virgil, Euclid’s geometry, penmanship and rhetoric. In 1757, at the age of 14, Wilson graduated from the grammar school and took an examination for a bursarship, or scholarship, at the University of St. Andrews in the fishing town of the same name. He was awarded funds

Wilson’s Roadside Marker
of college, entered the school of divinity at the same University in 1761.

The death of Wilson’s father in 1762 ended his study of divinity. To support his family Wilson was forced to become a tutor and so remained until 1765 when his sisters were married and his brothers employed. He then went to Edinburgh to take a course in bookkeeping and accounting. Apparently that calling did not beckon or there appeared to be more opportunity for a commoner in America, or both, for Wilson soon thereafter laid plans to go to America. The cost of the journey—approximately £20, the yearly income of an artisan—was raised by borrowing, a practice that was to haunt Wilson in later years.

In 1765, at the age of 23, Wilson landed in New York and made his way to Philadelphia. He had a letter of introduction to a trustee of the College of Philadelphia—Ben Franklin’s forerunner of the University of Pennsylvania—and was appointed as a tutor. He served out the year 1765-66 and was awarded a honorary master’s degree in 1766. In the same year, funded by a loan from a cousin also in Pennsylvania, Wilson began studying law under John Dickinson. His notebooks reflect that he studied pleadings, forms, contracts, replevins, torts and land law. In addition, he studied Cicero, Hume, Montesquieu, Blackstone, Hale, Bracton and Coke. He also studied the Pennsylvania constitution and the government of England. The course of study lasted less than a year.

Wilson’s legal education was played against the background of increasing friction with the mother country. The French and Indian war had recently ended, providing England considerable new real estate in the interior of the continent, which brought with it increased defense costs. Theretofore, the principal source of revenue had been the sometimes-enforced Molasses Act of 1733. The Sugar Act of 1764 lowered the duty, but made it enforceable. This was followed by the Stamp Act in 1765 and the Townsend Duties on imports and tea. The Colonial response included general agitation, a declaration by James Otis and Dickinson’s Letters of a Pennsylvania Farmer. There can be no doubt that these events were also a part of Wilson’s education.

Upon completion of his apprenticeship to Dickinson—and perhaps sensing a surfeit of lawyers in Philadelphia—Wilson removed to Reading in Berks County. Reading was, at the time, a rough frontier town and was said to boast a fair ratio of taverns to settlers. There was commercial fishing and barge traffic on the Schuylkill and the principal industry was making felt hats. Business for Wilson was slow, however, and he had to travel to Chester, Lancaster, and Carlisle for clients. Apparently the court house clique disfavored newcomers, for he had but 3 cases in the February 1767 term of the Berks County Common Pleas Court.

While struggling to launch his legal career, Wilson dabbled in journalism. He collaborated on a column called The Visitant, which appeared in the Pennsylvania Chronicle in 1768. It concerned such topics as happiness, courtship, manners and philosophy. He also wrote an outspoken piece on the colonial cause, but it was not to be published until 1774.

Business in Reading gradually picked up. Also, Wilson met his bride-to-be, Rachael Bird, of a prominent Reading family, but he nonetheless moved on to Carlisle, in 1770. He was married in 1771, bought a house at the corner of Penn and Hanover Streets and established a household. He was 29.

Carlisle, which had an even greater ratio of taverns...
to settlers than Reading, afforded unbounded opportunity at the time. The area was newly settled—giving rise to extensive land litigation—and lawyers were scarce. His clientele broadened and his reputation spread as far as Philadelphia, as a Philadelphia trading company relied on his services. Wilson still travelled the circuit with the Provincial Court of Appeal, however, and doubtless became acquainted with his colleagues from around the colony.

By 1772 Wilson was prosperous enough to purchase 2 horses and a cow, but apparently neglected to pay his debt to his sponsors in Scotland, as correspondence indicates. He became the father of a daughter in the same year.

His practice continued to expand and in 1773 he was called upon to represent Westmoreland County in a boundary dispute with certain would-be Virginians in southwestern Pennsylvania. (At the time, what is now West Virginia was a part of Virginia.) Larger events were to eclipse the dispute.

The early 1770's saw the beginning of the end of British colonial rule. In quick succession, the British vessel Gaspe was burned; the Committees of Correspondence were formed; the Tea Act passed; the Boston Tea Party put on by Sam Adams and his Sons of Liberty; and the Coercion Acts passed. A series of public meetings in May and June of 1774 in Philadelphia urged that meetings be held around the province.

The meeting in Carlisle took place in July, 1774. Wilson, a leader of this meeting, was appointed to the local Committee of Correspondence. He was also appointed a representative to a province-wide convention to be held in Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia meeting opened its deliberations by affirming allegiance to the King—indeed, independence was not yet an idea whose time had come, and Pennsylvania was a conservative colony. A committee appointed to propose instructions for the Assembly included Wilson and Dickinson. The report, mostly Dickinson's work, had a distinctly conservative and legalistic tone. The Assembly, complying with the instructions, appointed delegates to a general congress, which was to become known as the First Continental Congress. The Assembly's choices, however, were from among its own numbers. It is important to note, as later events will verify, that the provincial government was, in 1774, in firmly loyal hands. The power structure of the colony was dominated by a Quaker oligarchy and the Proprietary forces, closely allied with the Penns. The opposition came from the westerners and yeoman farmer class.

Meanwhile Wilson resurrected and published his 1768 tract on the colonial cause. It was similar to other works of the time—John Adams' "Novanglus" [New England] and Jefferson's "Summary View of the Rights of British America." The tone was definitely legalistic. Allegiance to the King was unquestioned. Rather, the propagandists asserted that Parliament had no right to tax the colonies arbitrarily. Wilson's tract, "Considerations on the Nature and Extent of the Legislative Authority of the British Parliament," included the concept that sovereignty lies with the people, not with any government, a view which was to be central in Wilson's statesmanship.

The next year, 1775, saw Wilson chosen as a delegate to another provincial convention, the principal purpose of which was to place a stamp of approval on the work of the (First) Continental Congress. The meeting also adopted high resolves and submitted to an oration by Wilson on the justice of the colonial cause and the tyrannies of Britain.

Upon returning to Carlisle, Wilson helped to form the Cumberland Militia, made up of 3000 "Associators," the Pennsylvania version of New England Minutemen. The Pennsylvania Assembly made him a Colonel at its May, 1775 session.

The Assembly also saw fit to select Wilson as a delegate to the Second Continental Congress. The mood had changed since the previous Congress. The confrontations at Lexington and Concord occurred in April, 1775. Boston was under siege and the New England militia was gathering. In Pennsylvania the conservatives declined in influence. Dickinson, who had appeared a middle-of-the-roader was now viewed as a conservative. The membership of the Second Congress included such radicals as John and Sam Adams, John Hancock and Patrick Henry. In addition, George Washington, John Jay and Wilson were in the middle camp.

Events overtook the Congress. Ethan Allen took Fort Ticonderoga in the name of the "great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." Various provinces requested advice on policy matters from the Congress, which itself was uncertain of its role and unsure of its authority, a condition which was to plague its entire existence. A committee, including Wilson, was established to consider the matter. The committee's report was temporizing, but still Congress could not avoid the fact that it now had an army assembled near Boston. Washington was selected as its Commander.

The Battle of Bunker Hill, on June 24, 1775, from which the Continental Army withdrew for lack of ammunition, underscored the need to finance and supply the forces. A committee, once again including Wilson, was appointed to arrange for the printing of $2 million in paper currency.

Another committee, also including Wilson, was appointed to consider securing the friendship of the Indian nations. The committee suggested that the colonies be broken into 3 departments and that commissioners be appointed for each department. Wilson was appointed a commissioner for the middle department. Armed with cloth, worsted caps, beads, thimbles, powder and lead, ivory combs, broadcloth coats, duffel and shroud (cloth), linen handkerchiefs and ruffled shirts, plumed hats and caluminoce, Wilson traveled to Pittsburgh in August of 1775 and secured a treaty with the Delawares.
Wilson returned to Congress in late 1775. Old problems still pressed. General Washington was continually requesting supplies. Congress turned to commissioning privateers—legal pirates—for sources of supplies. Another committee, including Wilson, was selected to determine the disposal of maritime prizes. The report suggested all prizes be confiscated, but that admiralty courts be established to oversee the process.

Early in 1776 Wilson moved that Congress declare its intentions “respecting an Independence.” A committee, again including Wilson, was appointed to prepare an address to the inhabitants of the colonies on the issue. The resulting work was largely Wilson’s and in the name of legitimate authority asserted that temporary deviations must be made from the provincial constitutions. Once again the sovereignty of the people was affirmed. In conclusion, it was asserted that America must be free. Meanwhile, Tom Paine’s Common Sense was published. The mood of Congress shifted again; the final step toward independence was approaching.

It will be instructive at this point to contemplate Wilson’s rise from debtor immigrant in 1765 to leading figure at the Continental Congress in 1775. First off, as de Tocqueville was to note some 60 years later, lawyers constitute the American aristocracy. In his early years of practice Wilson doubtless made many acquaintances among the Pennsylvania Bar. Also, it (Continued on page 32)

Women In The Law

Black Alumna On Temple Law Faculty

By Cyndi Bloom

Law School alumna Germaine Ingram ('71) is the first Black woman ever appointed to a position on the faculty of Temple University School of Law. With the Fall semester, she will be an Assistant Professor teaching Torts and Constitutional Law.

Miss Ingram entered the Law School in 1968 with a degree in Political Science from Syracuse University. Law School was an entirely new experience for her, she recalls: “When I first thought about studying law, I envisioned staying with it only two years at the most, but I found the experience exciting and challenging with an opportunity to learn an entirely new mode of thinking.”

Having graduated from the Law School last year, she now clerks for the Hon. Theodore O. Spaulding, Judge of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

A native Philadelphian, Miss Ingram was raised at 11th and Fairmount Sts. She remembers growing up in an active household with five brothers and sisters. Her father, prior to his death nine years ago, was a successful real estate broker in North Philadelphia, and her mother, at that time, worked in real estate sales. After her father’s death, Miss Ingram’s mother undertook the responsibility of raising her six children by working for and receiving the broker’s license which enabled her to continue with her husband’s work. Miss Ingram relates a great deal of her own pursuit of an “independent means of fulfillment,” to her mother’s continued independence, courage and competent abilities.

Germaine Ingram’s teenage days were filled with violin lessons and studies at Girls’ High. Thoughts of entering Syracuse University as a mathematics major became a reality for her in 1964. However, once settled into the university routine, she soon became disenchanted with college math and changed her major to political science.

There were 20 women students in her class at the
Law School, and she remembers very little prejudice by the faculty against women. She does recall, "Some professors were hostile towards women, but most of the problem came during the first year from our own fellow students. They criticized us for taking the seat of some soldier fighting in Viet Nam. We were also accused of merely husband hunting." Personally, Miss Ingram says she did not feel, "out of place as a woman or as a Black student."

A capable and intelligent student, she participated in the Law Students Civil Rights Research Council, the Black Students Union and a High School Teaching Project. While a member of the Civil Rights Research Council, she worked on the Philadelphia bail project interviewing inmates at the Philadelphia Detention Center and at Holmesburg Prison.

As a third-year law student, Miss Ingram clerked with prominent Philadelphia attorney Austin Norris. She recalls particular fascination with the work: "Austin Norris draws extremely interesting cases which often have quite an impact on society. He is a man of extraordinary intellect and drive. Working with him, I had an opportunity to research and prepare cases which I believe will have an impact on the development of the law, particularly in the area of eminent domain."

Analyzing the educational atmosphere at Penn, Miss Ingram commented, "I received a good education at Penn. What I really appreciated was the faculty's accessibility to the students. There was never a clear demarcation between students and faculty. I believe the atmosphere stimulated a healthy competition and exchange among students."

She began clerking for Judge Spaulding immediately after graduation, and thus did not meet with many of the career problems which confronted her fellow female class members. "Many of them," she states, "had difficulty getting jobs in law firms. It seems the first criteria most firms applied was whether or not a woman was on the Law Review and secondly what her marital plans were."

"But the stereotype of women in the law is beginning to change. Women are no longer assumed to be unattractive and overly aggressive."

Her year with Judge Spaulding has been most eventful and educational. Candidly she reveals, "I am happy with my clerkship although at first I was astounded by the mass of cases flowing through the office. My notion of a methodical process oriented toward individual treatment of cases was somewhat undermined. I have received a tremendous exposure to a broad cross-section of substantive law which wasn't available in law school."

"With Judge Spaulding I have had the opportunity to be more than a mere research assistant. I've had the opportunity to help develop the direction of the law. I have also been afforded substantial discretion in selecting cases for dissenting opinions and in devising solutions to the issues they present."

(Continued on page 36)
the expectation that a successor board will do it the same favor. Exams in early May disrupt the Review's work briefly, and some editors are always chagrined to discover that the course they most often cut was the course they might have found most fascinating, and as a result come to regret the fact that the Review's time frames, for all their uniqueness, cannot include more than 24 hours in a day. By 2 or 3 weeks after exams, all but one or two members of the board will have left for summer jobs—cut short to 7 or 8 week tenures, and in August (in 1972, July 31st) new associates arrive and the cycle repeats. The satisfactions derived from Law Review may differ from individual to individual, but in almost all cases include the sense of camaraderie generated by any difficult experience shared with others. Beyond this, the perfectionist, the advocate of a cause, or the credential-collector who values the Review's not-to-be-gainsaid advantages in job-seeking, may each pursue their own goals.

The Review's publication schedule was last year cut back from eight issues annually to six, in order to give fuller treatment to worthier topics, rather than to further the overwriting of some areas of the law. In the past year the content of the Review has included articles and comments on Serrano v. Priest, securities law, the Pentagon Papers, public participation in administrative proceedings, parole, and similarly timely topics.

In the course of their work, the Review's editors garner counsel from a number of sources. Most frequently, the faculty contribute ideas and criticism. But practitioners, and alumni particularly, are an especially welcome source of advice. The Review is currently attempting to augment and better structure its contact with this quarter through the formation of a Law Review Alumni Association, with membership automatic for former editors and open to all alumni who wish to assist their school's publication. Interested readers are invited to write the Review.

**Domestic Vietnam?**

Quarantine Addicts To Reduce Crime

*By James C. Luitweiler, '14*

**IS AMERICA RUNNING SCARED?**

This is a logical conclusion from Life's leading article in their January 14th issue, which in bold black face answers the question—

**ARE YOU PERSONALLY AFRAID OF CRIME?**

by the following tabulation:

- 78% sometimes feel unsafe in their own homes
- 80% in big cities are afraid in the streets at night
- 43% of families were crime victims last year
- 30% keep a gun for self-defense
- 41% say their police protection is inadequate

This tabulation was not a figment of some writer's imagination, but is the synthesis of some 43,000 of its readers across the country responding to Life's questionnaire sent out after their November 19th article about "fortress on E. 78th Street, New York City."

Recently Vice-President Agnew in a television newscast reported President Nixon's decision to spend $140 million on the Federal Government's "battle against crime," which Mr. Agnew forecasts will reduce crime by 5%. Take 5% off the above tabulation and what have you left? One is reminded of the fable of the old woman who tried to sweep back an incoming tide with her broom.

Is this battle against crime to mushroom into another domestic Vietnam, with equally sorry results; worse perhaps because it is a battle in our own back yards?

One respondent to Life's questionnaire from Greenville, S. C.—of all places!—is pictured in Life's issue of January 14th, returning home with a drawn revolver in his right hand. He opines the U. S. must spend billions, not millions, to stop drug traffic.

The writer who lived some 50 years in and about New York City witnessed that proud metropolis
metamorphized in from the mecca, with its Statue of Liberty beckoning Europeans to come to America to enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, into one of the world’s worst crime centers with 50% of the heroin addicts concentrated in it. Certainly the above percentages would apply to New York City and perhaps also to some of our larger Southern cities.

This writer was impelled to spend summer before last in Scandinavia, where he had spent many years between the two world wars, to take samplings to determine whether what was transpiring in the United States was duplicated there. Conclusion: No, except in Sweden where some Swedes attributed their wave of drug addiction to the influx of a horde of American army deserters and draft dodgers. Unless they were ‘remittance men’ with support from their families in America, they were without visible means of support until they found a lucrative income by becoming drug pushers.

This writer listened to a lengthy debate on how England was facing up to the drug problem. Now a resident of North Carolina, it led him to write a letter to Governor Scott of North Carolina on December 29th with a novel suggestion of how to ‘undercut’ the crime wave. In essence the suggestion was that the State set an example modelled on England’s experience: namely, instead of jailing drug users the State should pass a law authorizing drug users to go to physicians and, in strict confidence obtain a prescription for the drugs the physician determines was necessary to continue their habit, such drugs to be furnished free or at cost by State agencies, without pilloring the patients publicly as criminals. This could have two effects: (1) Deprive pushers of their lucrative business and force them to leave the State; and (2) remove the necessity for drug addicts to resort to robberies and burglaries to raise money to pay for their drugs, and so reduce the incidence of crime. Of course, should drug addicts continue to commit crimes they would be apprehended and dealt with as criminals. But the mere possession of drugs alone would thereafter not be a crime.

This letter to the Governor brought a reply from the Acting Director of the North Carolina Drug Authority. This brought a second letter from me. Fortunately the views expressed in this second letter were reinforced by two articles appearing in the Charlotte Observer under dates of January 9th and 10th. These articles were in flat contradiction to the statement of the Director of the North Carolina Drug Authority that England’s “program has proven to be a failure and drug addiction is more prevalent today in England than it ever has been.”

The suggestion about a change in the State’s policy vis-a-vis drug users may seem cynical in that it provides no cure for drug addiction. But it has precedent in the treatment of disease epidemics which separates the healthy from the afflicted by quarantining the latter. There is ample evidence of the success of such policies. Witness the stamping out of the black plague of Manchuria by Dr. Richard P. Strong, of Harvard University, and later his success with the typhus epidemic in the Balkans. The writer heard these stories from Dr. Strong himself when serving at a later date as his secretary.

Of course it is recognized that the policy suggested might well drive drug pushers into the other 49 States. But if the Carolinas could furnish proof of the workability of their plan, it would probably be followed by action elsewhere, including the Federal Government. It would certainly be less costly than spending hundreds of millions on chasing drug addicts and criminals underground.

Granting the contention that the plan offers no cure for drug addiction, might it not be more effective if treatment of drug users was left to the medical profession instead of to bureaucrats?

There is evidence that using drugs in moderate doses does not incapacitate the users from doing useful and gainful work. Drug users are mainly youths and if they can be encouraged to take jobs and perform acceptable work, it might restore lost ambition and gradually win them away from drugs. Certainly it would remove the incentive to commit crimes to provide the wherewithal for their habit.

Why drug addiction and crime aren’t epidemic in Norway and Iceland is the subject of another article by the writer, which is still unpublished manuscript.

There is so much going on in America of a constructive nature by the majority of the people, that if these healthy, vigorous and ambitious youths could be quarantined against drug pushers and not forced to “run scared,” our future might be a bright one.

Let’s not have another domestic Vietnam!

Letters To The Editor

To The Editor:

No doubt the entire Law School community is said to be indebted to Prof. Gorman for his efforts concerning the Law School curriculum. It is unfortunate that his energies appear to have been misdirected and his suggestions, as presented in the Journal, less than useless.

The central fault is his apparent failure to start from purpose, that is, to recognize and articulate the asserted shortcomings of the status quo and to identify the interests involved. Upon this omission, all that follows is irretrievably far afield.

Specifically, one might ask what is the purpose of law school? What is to be learned in law school? What is the best method to accomplish this? Why do students come in the first place and what motivates them? What occurs under the present system? Why is morale so bad? Why do graduates leave enervated and testing the experience?

In addition, it should be asked whether the method

(Continued on page 34)
23rd Annual Campaign
FINAL REPORT • 1971-1972

Alumni Annual Giving

SPECIAL REPORT
Dean Bernard Wolfman  
The Law School  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear Bernie:

The results of our 1971-72 Law School Alumni Annual Giving campaign will be fully documented in the next edition of the Law Alumni Journal. I am happy to report that our total of $132,461 is the highest amount ever achieved.

This success is attributable to the dedicated work of our volunteer workers, to the loyalty and generosity of alumni, and to the interest in the Law School shown by the parents of students and others who are not alumni.

Although I am somewhat disappointed that our total is only $2,300 greater than last year, I feel that we have laid the groundwork for a substantial leap forward next year. I am deeply grateful to our chairmen, and to our class and regional agents. I know that I speak for them in thanking every individual who recognized the needs of the Law School and who responded by making their personal contributions to our Annual Giving program.

Sincerely,

John F. E. Hippel

August 1, 1972
August 8, 1972

Dear John:

It was a pleasure to receive your letter of August 1, reporting that our 1971-72 Law School Alumni Annual Giving campaign reached a record total of $132,461. The leadership and hard work that you and your organization of volunteer workers exhibited have been remarkable.

I agree with your evaluation that the groundwork has been laid for a significant increase next year both in number of participants and in total dollars contributed. Thanks to your Annual Giving team, our alumni are becoming increasingly aware that successful Annual Giving programs are indispensable to our Law School.

I am indeed grateful to you, to your co-workers, and to our alumni for being so responsive to the needs of the Law School.

Sincerely,

Bernard Wolfman

John F. E. Hippel, Esquire
1418 Packard Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102
THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ASSOCIATES ARE A UNIVERSITY-WIDE GROUP OF ALUMNI AND FRIENDS WHO CONTRIBUTE ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS OR MORE TO ALUMNI ANNUAL GIVING. LISTED ARE LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI WHO JOINED THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ASSOCIATES.

THE FELLOWS OF THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ASSOCIATES, THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF CONTRIBUTION IN ALUMNI ANNUAL GIVING, HONORS THOSE WHO CONTRIBUTE FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS OR MORE TO ALUMNI ANNUAL GIVING.

Chairman for the Law School
—Richard P. Brown, Jr., L’48

FELLOWS OF THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN ASSOCIATES
W. James MacIntosh, W’22, L’26
*Bernard G. Segal, L’31

*Philip W. Amram, C’20, L’27
Gustave G. Amsterdam, C’30, L’33
*Walter W. Beachboard, C’29, L’32
*Richard P. Brown, Jr., L’40
*Edwin H. Burgess, L’14
Sylvan M. Cohen, C’35, L’38
Robert Dechert, C’16, L’21
*L. Leroy Deininger, L’14
in memory of
Hon. J. Whitaker Thompson
*Richard M. Dicke, L’40
*Aaron M. Fine, C’43, L’48
Max Freedman, W’23, LNA
*Kenneth W. Gemmill, L’35
*George B. Gifford, L’12,
Estate of

*John F. Headly, L’27
*John F. E. Hippel, C’23, L’26
Charles M. Justi, W’22, L’27
Harold E. Kohn, C’34, L’37
Robert C. Ligget, W’13, L’17
*John T. Macartney, W’44, L’49
*William A. Marquard, Jr., W’40, LNA
*Baldwin Maull, L’25
*John L. McDonald, L’40
J. Wesley McWilliams, W’15, L’15
*Albert B. Melnik, C’24, L’27
*Morton Meyers, C’22, L’25
*Leon J. Obermayer, W’08, L’08
*Marvin Schwartz, L’49
*Ernest Scott, C’25, L’29

*Robert Trigg, L’51
*Wendell E. Warner, L’24

*To recognize those Benjamin Franklin Associates gifts allocated solely to the Law School.

TO HONOR THE MEMORY OF WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS, DEAN OF THE LAW SCHOOL FROM 1896 TO 1914, THE WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS ASSOCIATES WAS FOUNDED IN RECOGNITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS OR MORE TO LAW SCHOOL ANNUAL GIVING.

WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS ASSOCIATES

Anonymous—Barton E. Ferst, L’44

Anonymous
William B. Arnold, L’29
Prof. Martin J. Aronstein, L’65
Hon. Francis Shunk Brown, Jr., L’16
Clive S. Cummis, L’52
Barton E. Ferst, L’44
Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr., L’52
Bernard M. Guth, L’58
Leon C. Holt, Jr., L’51

Ashby M. Larmore, L’31
Daniel Lowenthal, L’31
Desmond J. McTighe, L’25
Philip F. Newman, L’17
Thomas A. O’Boyle, L’40
Gilbert W. Oswald, L’34
Lipman Redman, L’41
Evan Y. Semerjian, L’64
G. William Shea, L’36

LAW ALUMNI JOURNAL
CENTURY CLUB

CENTURY CLUB MEMBERSHIP IS AWARD ED IN RECOGNITION OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS OR MORE TO LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI ANNUAL GIVING. THE SUSTAINING FELLOWS OF THE CENTURY CLUB ARE THOSE MEMBERS WHO EXCEED THE BASIC MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS AND AS SIST THE SCHOOL BY CONTRIBUTING TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS OR MORE.

SUSTAINING FELLOWS OF THE CENTURY CLUB

S. Samuel Arsh, L'34
Frederic L. Ballard, L'42
Hon. Alexander F. Barbieri, L'32
Ralph M. Barley, L'38
Marshall A. Bernstein, L'49
Robert M. Bernstein, L'14
John Bertman, L'57
William C. Bodine, L'32
Raymond J. Bradley, L'47
Floyd E. Brandon, Jr., L'54
Mitchell Brock, L'53
E. Calvert Cheston, L'35
Mrs. Joseph A. Coleman
Stuart Coven, L'51
Harold Cramer, L'51
Guy G. deFuria, L'28
Park B. Dilks, Jr., L'51
Bernard Eskin, L'35
Myer Feldman, L'38
James D. Carpenter, L'34
John R. Gibbel, L'64
Louis J. Goffman, L'35
Robert A. Hauslohner, L'50
William S. Hudders, L'29
William F. Hyland, L'49
Edward A. Kaufer, L'33
Bernard V. Lentz, L'36
W. Barclay Lex, L'12
Paul A. Mueller, Jr., L'55
David H. Nelson, L'49
Michael A. Orlando III, L'58
Isidore Ostroff, L'30
Charles C. Parlin, Jr., L'49
Raymond M. Pearlstine, L'32
Robert E. Penn, L'60
Franklin Poul, L'58
Walter N. Read, L'42
G. Ruhrland Rebmann, Jr., L'22
Pace Reich, L'54
Hon. Theodore O. Rogers, L'40
Edwin P. Rome, L'40
Alex Satinsky, L'37
John N. Schaeffer, Jr., L'37
Mr. & Mrs. Dorrance Sexton
Herbert M. Silverberg, L'68
Steward E. Warner, L'27
Morris L. Weissberg, L'47
Morris Wolf, L'03
Dean Bernard Wolfman, L'48

Chairman—Harold Cramer, L'51

Alexander B. Adelman, L'31
Sadie T. M. Alexander, L'27
John T. Andrews, Jr., L'64
Jerome B. Apfel, L'54
Louis D. Apotheker, L'56
William W. Atterbury, Jr., L'50
Frank B. Baldwin III, L'64
Henry W. Balka, L'26
Augustus S. Ballard, L'48
Samuel Bard, L'36
Jay D. Barsky, L'45
John G. Bartol, Jr., L'52
Hyman L. Battle, Jr., L'49
Max M. Baumer, L'35
Lewis B. Beatty, Jr., L'49
Robert M. Beckman, L'56
Thomas J. Beddow, L'39
Harry P. Begier, Jr., L'64
Hon. John C. Bell, Jr., L'17
Joseph Bell, L'37
Martin M. Bell, L'48
Robert K. Bell, L'24
J. Glenn Benedict, L'27
John G. Berg, L'67
Leonard J. Bernstein, L'34
Franklin H. Berry, L'28
John H. Bertolotti, L'31
Claire G. Bich, L'37
Henry M. Biglan, L'39
G. William Bissell, L'64
Allen D. Black, L'60
Samuel A. Blank, L'32
Charles J. Bloom, L'71
Stanley W. Bluestine, L'54
Fred Bloom, L'66
Richard L. Bond, L'56
Bernard M. Borisich, L'43
Clifford M. Bowden, L'28
John P. Bresławski, L'39
Christopher Branda, Jr., L'51
Joseph Brandschel, L'28
Gerald Broker, L'59
Hon Hazel H. Brown, L'24
William H. Brown III, L'55
Herman M. Buck, L'35
Edward V. Buckley, L'24
Neil W. Burd, L'51
Francis J. Burgweger, Jr., L'70
Joseph W. P. Burke, L'39
Thomas J. Burke, L'49
William M. Burkardt, L'14
John Butchart, L'53
E. Bracy Cale, Jr., L'62
J. Scott Calkins, L'52
Robert J. Callaghan, L'33
James D. Carpenter, L'34
Hon. Curtis C. Carson, Jr., L'46
Benjamin E. Carter, L'38
Louis J. Carter, L'49
Meyer L. Castan, L'17
Harry Cassman, L'12
Sidney Chait, L'33
Kerim D. Chance, L'38
Frederick J. Chey, L'41
Morris Cheston, L'28
Dr. Roland J. Christy, L'34
Hon. Joseph S. Clarke, Jr., L'26
Roderick T. Clarke, L'36
William N. Clarke, L'42
Harrison H. Clement, L'37
Donald S. Coburn, L'66
W. Frederic Colcough, L'30
Ira B. Coldren, Jr., L'52
Marvin Comisky, L'41
William H. Conca, L'32
George H. Conover, Jr., L'52
Charles R. Cooper, Jr., L'47
Jerome J. Cooper, L'51
A. Lynn Correllius, L'41
Henry B. Cortesi, L'63
Robert I. Cottom, L'41
J. Harry Covington III, L'38
Stephen A. Cozen, L'64
Cassius W. Craig, L'49
Albert J. Crawford, Jr., L'39
James D. Crawford, L'62
Samuel S. Cross, L'49
Thomas F. Cunnane, L'63
Edward I. Cutler, L'37
Mrs. Florence S. Davidow, L'37
J. Lawrence Davis, L'28
David J. Dean, L'27
Daniel DeBrier, L'29
Raymond K. Denworth, Jr., L'61
Harry T. Devine, L'36
Samuel Diamond, L'55
Ralph B. D’Orion, L'49
Pasquale J. DiQuinzio, L'54
M. Carton Dittmann, L'38
James B. Douk, L'35
Robert J. Dodds, Jr., L'40
Robert J. Dods III, L'69
Robert B. Doll, L'47
Miss Ethel F. Donagheu, L'20
Charles H. Dorsett, L'35
Herbert G. DeBois, L'36
Wayland F. Dunnaway III, L'36
William H. Easburn III, L'59
Murray S. Eckell, L'59
Nathan L. Edelstein, L'28
Joseph L. Ehrenreich, L'16
Hon. Jay H. Eisemann, L'33
William S. Eisenhart, Jr., L'40
Mr. & Mrs. Robert R. Endicott
Neil G. Epstein, L'65
Leonard L. Ettinger, L'38
Harold Evans, L'10
Neil K. Evans, L'64
Martin S. Evelev, L'58
John K. Ewing III, L'27
Samuel E. Ewing, L'30
William B. Fairman, L'41
Richard J. Farrell, L'41
Nelson P. Fegley, L'11
Albert J. Feldman, L'53
Anthony G. Felix, Jr., L'34
Howard W. Fineshriber, L'33
Joseph M. First, L'30
Joseph H. Finzer, L'33
Peter Florey, L'50
Caleb Foote, L'53
Prof. Jefferson B. Fordham
Leon S. Forman, L'39
Michael D. Foxman, L'61
Bernard Frank, L'38
Edward P. Frankel, L'36

Fall 1972
PARENTS
Max Freedman, Chairman
Mrs. Joseph A. Coleman
Mrs. Kjeld Damsgaard
Mrs. Marian A. Davidoff
Mrs. Eleanor C. Edgar
Mrs. K. M. Shay, L'61
Mrs. John A. White, Jr., L'46
H. James Sautter, L'14
Mrs. Theodore Rosen, L'22
Mr. M. Belmont VerStanding
Mrs. M. Belmont VerStanding
Harry P. Voldow, L'31
Mrs. Virginia B. Wallace, L'50
John A. Voldow, L'32
Guy E. Wiltman, L'29
Michael Waris, Jr., L'44
Mrs. Helen Moran Warren, L'30
Gilbert Waris, L'61
William Webster, L'12
Mr. Gerald Weiner
Jerome B. Weinstein, L'34
Lewis Weinstock, L'40
H. John Weisman, Jr., L'42
Morris Weisman, L'27
Aaron Weiss, L'16
Robert T. Weniger, L'38
Carroll R. Wetzel, L'30
Edward S. Weyl, L'28
David H. Wheeler, L'61
Hon. C. Norwood Wherry, L'53
Samuel K. White, Jr., L'47
Thomas R. White, Jr., L'36
William White, L'38
Hon. Roy Wilkinson, Jr., L'39
William C. Wise, L'33
Morton Witkin, L'37
Marvin M. Wolf, L'60
Joseph C. Woodcock, Jr., L'53
Sidney T. Yates, L'54
H. Albert Young, L'29
John R. Young, L'30
Norman P. Zarin, L'55
Judah Zelitch, L'27
Ronald Ziegler, L'60
Lloyd R. Ziff, L'71
David B. Zoob, L'27

CONTRIBUTORS
William A. Marquardt, Jr.
Mrs. Samuel Mink
in memory of
Samuel Mink, L'33
Prof. Trevor Oliver
Prof. Robert H. Mundheim
Mrs. Theodore Rosen
in memory of
Hon. Theodore Rosen, L'22
Dr. Julius Wishner
CLASS OF 1899
Marcus S. Hottenstein
CLASS OF 1903
Morris Wolf
CLASS OF 1904
Walter Cook Longstreth
CLASS OF 1907
George Ovington, Jr.
CLASS OF 1908
Isaac Ash
James D. Carpenter
Leigh M. Morss
Leon J. Obermayer
CLASS OF 1909
Russell Wolfe
CLASS OF 1910
Harold Evans
Sidney Loewenstein
*Philip Sterling
CLASS OF 1911
Nelson P. Fegley
Fred T. Fruit
Samuel L. Howell
Thomas M. Hyndman
Michael Korn
David S. Mals
CLASS OF 1912
Harry N. Brenner
Harry Cassman
George B. Gifford,
Estate of
W. Barclay Lex
James C. Peacock
Wilton W. Webster
CLASS OF 1913
Samuel R. Rosenbaum
CLASS OF 1914
J. Charles Adams
Robert M. Bernstein
Edwin H. Burgess
Walter M. Burkhardt
Leroy Deininger
in memory of
Hon. J. Whitaker Thompson
Domenic Furia
Domenic Furia
Arthur Magaziner
Frank H. Mancill
Mark T. Milnor
H. James Sautter
CLASS OF 1915
Justin S. Bamberger
David D. Goff
Clarence E. Hall
Edwin P. Longstreet
J. Wesley McWilliams
Thomas Reath
CLASS OF 1916
Hon. Francis Shunk Brown, Jr.
Joseph L. Ehrenreich
Harry G. Lensner
Hon. Louis E. Levinthal
Hon. Thomas M. Lewis
Thomas E. Shipley
Aaron Weiss
CLASS OF 1917
Harry E. Apeler
Hon. John C. Bell, Jr.
Meyer L. Casman
Hon. T. Linus Hoban
Robert C. Liggett
*Edwin A. Lucas
Philip F. Newman
Mrs. Rose Perlmans
P. Herbert Reigner
Maurice Saeta
Edward J. Swotes
Morton Witkin
CLASS OF 1918
Ernest N. Votaw
CLASS OF 1919
Ernest R. Keiter
CLASS OF 1920
Ellis Brodstein
Miss Ethel F. Donaghue
Hon. Harold L. Ervin
Hon. Thomas K. Finletter
Arthur Littleton
Harry Polish
Eugene H. Southall
Donald H. Williams

*deceased

Fall 1972
CLASS OF 1921

CLASS OF 1922

CLASS OF 1923
Samuel A. Goldberg Hon. George W. Griffith Holman G. Knouse Hon. Felix Piekarski John G. Rothermel

CLASS OF 1924

CLASS OF 1925

CLASS OF 1926

CLASS OF 1927


CLASS OF 1928

CLASS OF 1929

CLASS OF 1930

CLASS OF 1931

CLASS OF 1932

CLASS OF 1933


CLASS OF 1934

CLASS OF 1935

*deceased
Donn P. Slonim
Dr. Barlow Smith
John A. Vuono
Hon. John M. Wajert
Vincent Y. Yakowicz

CLASS OF 1957
John E. Backenstoe
John Bertman
Isaac H. Clothier
Robert S. Cohen
Michael M. Dean
James N. Diefenderfer
Mrs. Patricia H. Frankel
Mahlon M. Frankhauser
Larry J. Goldsborough
George C. Greer
Ronald H. Isenberg
John O. Karns
S. Philip Klein
Goncer M. Krestal
Seymour Kurland
William W. Lanigan
William G. Malkames
James F. McClure, Jr.
Stephen J. McEwen, Jr.
Edward M. Medvene
James M. Mullin
D. Frederick Muth
Russell R. Reno, Jr.
Stephen I. Richman
Richard M. Rosenbleth
Edward D. Russell
Ronald N. Rutenberg
Richard G. Schneider
Myles H. Tanenbaum
Michael L. Temin
E. Norman Vasey
Ronald P. Wetsch
Simon R. Zimmerman, III

CLASS OF 1958
Harris C. Arnold, Jr.
Duffield Ashmead, III
Benett I. Bardfeld
Albert R. Beal
Harold J. Berger
S. David Brandt
Benjamin E. Carter
Arthur M. Dolin
Martin S. Ekeland
J. Harold Flery, Jr.
Hon. Michael V. Franciosa
Philip R. Frieder
Howard Gittis
Sidney R. Granite
Bernard M. Guth
John G. Harkins, Jr.
Henry R. Heebner, Jr.
Raymond L. Hovis
Aaron M. Kress
Michael G. Kurcas
Harvey Levin
Alan W. Margolis
John P. McKenna, Jr.
George B. McNelis
Ramon R.
Michael A. Orlando, III
Littleton W. Roberts, Jr.
Ronald R. Rosenberg
John J. Runzer
Joseph H. Savitz
Allan B. Schneirov
Edwin W. Sans, Jr.
William J. Sharkey
David J. Steinberg
Richard W. Stevens
Marvin W.
Elliott Yampell

CLASS OF 1959
Louis J. Adler

L. Carter Anderson
Philip G. Auerbach
Donald Beckman
Joseph Belcher
John W. Brock, Jr.
Gerald Broker
Richard L. Cantor
James J. Chesby, Jr.
Philip Cherry
Jonathan S. Cohen
George C. Corson, Jr.
John J. Cowan
William H. Eastburn, III
Murray S. Eckell
Seymour H. Feingold
Gerald F. Flood, Jr.
William J. Geen
Murray C. Goldman
Arthur R. Gorr
Austin B. Graff
Hon. Bernard M. Gross
Charles H. Harris
John S. Hayes
Selwyn A. Horvitz
John R. Hudders
David M. Jordan
Edmund H. Kane, III
Thomas B. Moorhead
Alvin S. Moses
John T. Mulligan
Peter C. Paul
Peter H. Pfund
Martin B. Pitkow
George F. Reed
G. Wayne Renneisen
James L. Rosenbaum
Marshall A. Rutter
Bernard L. Segal
Walter A. Smith
Oscar F. Spicer
Alan R. Squires
Joseph F. Strain
Louis M. Tarasi, Jr.
Ira P. Tiger
John D. Wilson

CLASS OF 1960
David Acton
Charles J. Bogdanoff
Jesse H. Choper
Ralph H. Clover
Preston L. Davis
Edward J. Dobin
John F. Dugan
Frank Federman
Melvin S. Feldman
Gordon Gelfond
Lewis J. Gordon
Frank E. Greenberg
John S. Halsted
Edmund G. Hauff
Charles A. Heimbold, Jr.
John H. Higgs
Richard S. Hyland
I. Grant Irey, Jr.
Allan Katz
Rodman Kober
Charles G. Kopp
Henry W. Lavine
Frank H. Lewis
Randall D. Luke
Bernard H. Lundy
Michael H. Malin
Robert A. Miller
Roland Morris
Samuel W. Newman
Benjamin S. Chenrein
Robert E. Penn
Hugh A. A. Sargent
Hugh D. Seymour
David S. Shagster
Edwin L. Solot

Silas Spengler
William T. Suphin
Lowell S. Thomas, Jr.
Thomas T. Trettis, Jr.
Nicholas Vadino, Jr.
John A. Walter
Charles M. Weissman
Alvin M. Weissman
David L. Williams
Marvin M. Wodlinger
Ronald Ziegler

CLASS OF 1961
Jared H. Adams
Edward N. Adourian, Jr.
James H. Agger
Paul R. Anapol
Lewis Becker
Bernard D. Beitch
Lawrence F. Conson
Raymond K. Denworth, Jr.
Mrs. Ruth M. Foree
Michael D. Foxman
Fredric J. Freed
Robert A. Freedman
Bernard Glassman
Rayner M. Hamilton
Mrs. Ann E. Harrison
Peter Hearns
Joseph J. Horvath
James N. Horwood
Philip L. Hummer
Howard M. Jaffe
Anthony L. Joseph
Michael Joseph
Malcolm B. Kane
Lewis S. Kunkel, Jr.
Herbert W. Larson
Anthony S. Leidner
Paul G. Levy
Willard F. Lowry
Jack K. Mandel
William B. Moyer
Spencer G. Nauman, Jr.
S. Allen Needleman
David F. Norcross
Robert A. Rosin
Robert M. Shap
Anthony J. Sobczak
David L. Steck
Marc L. Swartzbaugh
Gilbert Wasserman
David H. Wheeler
Bruce B. Wilson
Lawrence E. Wood
Roger S. Young
Edward K. Zuckerman

CLASS OF 1962
Milton D. Abowitz
Mrs. Andrea C. Balliette
William M. Balliette, Jr.
Leigh W. Bauer
Martin M. Berliner
Mrs. Barbara P. Berman
R. David Bradley
Jonas Brodie
Philip R. Burnaman
E. Barclay Cale, Jr.
James D. Crawford
Kenneth M. Cushman
Mrs. Judith N. Dean
George C. Decas
Richard D. Ehrlich
Barton H. Finkelstein
Nick S. Fitsis
Roy Friedman
John E. Gillmor
Herbert Goldfield
Stephen R. Goldstein
Gerald E. Haughey
John A. Herdeg
Burton Hoffman
Gary Hyatt
Steven D. Pins
Warren J. Kaufman
Edmond M. Kirby
Daniel J. Lawler
David P. Loughran
Spencer A. Manthorpe
Edwin S. Moore, III
Stephen J. Moses
Francis J. Murphy
Alexander Neave
H. Christopher Nolde
Philip S. Nyman
Lewis F. Parker
Robert M. Philson
Alan J. Pogarsky
Martin M. Pollock
John H. Potts
Charles B. Pursel
Richard J. Sharkey
Louis P. Silverman
Martin W. Speter
Clayton H. Thomas, Jr.

CLASS OF 1963
Steven A. Arbittier
David C. Auten
Philip H. Baer
Donald V. Berlanti
Aaron D. Blumberg
Harold Bogatz
Robert P. Browning
A. Richard Caputo
Abraham J. Chasnoff
Henry B. Cortesi
Robert J. Cotton
Thomas F. Cunnane
Nicholas P. D'Amico
Mrs. Joanne R. Denworth
Lowell H. Dubrow
Melvyn Freeman
Edward M. Glickman
Jay L. Goldberg
Frederick P. Hafetz
John L. Harrison, Jr.
Harold Jacobs
Albert W. Johnson, III
Arthur S. Karnaft
Morris C. Kellett
Martin N. Kell
Robert Kruger
Judah I. Labovitz
John J. Langenbach
Gerald M. Levin
Arthur L. Levine
Arnold Mackles
David H. Marion
Sidney G. Masri
John H. McGrail
Paul R. Metzler
Gustaf E. Michaelis
Henry F. Miller
Joseph L. Monte, Jr.
Louis H. Nevis
Ralf J. Patterson, III
Neil Reisman
Herbert Riband, Jr.
LORI J. Ashley Roach
Michael J. Rotko
Charles A. Shaffer
Stephen A. Sheller
Daniel C. Sohrano, Jr.
Max Spinrad
Albert M. Stark
David C. Toomey
Michael D. Varholaw
Thomas R. White, III
Mrs. Faith R. Whittlesby
Miss Susan P. Windle
Edwin D. Wolf

Fall 1972
27
ABOVE AVERAGE

These classes equalled or bettered the overall Alumni participation of 33%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Donald H. Williams</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>David S. Malis</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>William I. Woodcock, Jr.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Frank H. Mancill</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Barton E. Frest</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Joseph Branschissenschaft</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>M. Carton Dittmann, Jr.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Miss Doris E. Montgomery</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Morris M. Shuster</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Desmond J. McTigue</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>C. Leo Sutton</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Nathan Silberstein</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Frank E. Hahn, Jr.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>John A. Walter</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>W. Barclay Lex</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Wilfred F. Lorry</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Herbert S. Riband, Jr.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>William J. Levy</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Henry M. Irwin</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Kenneth M. Cushman</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Isaac Ash</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Franklin Poul</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Paul A. Wolkin</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Leonard Barten</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Thomas A. Ralph and Alfred H. Wilcox</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Stephen J. Korn</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Richard G. Schneider</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLASS OF 1971

Marc S. Alpert
Jules E. Bernard, III
James D. Beste
Stewart A. Block
Charles J. Bloom
James S. Boynton
James S. Bryan
Henry S. Bryans
Miss Rose J. Candeloro
Frank G. Cooper
Craig Currie
Gary C. Gomes
Jeffery C. Hayes
Steven P. Katz
Mrs. Sue N. Lang

CLASS PERFORMANCES

GREATEST NUMBER
OF DOLLARS CONTRIBUTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Marc S. Alpert</td>
<td>$12,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>C. Leo Sutton</td>
<td>5,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Franklin Poul</td>
<td>5,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GREATEST NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>James F. Bell III</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Thomas A. Ralph and</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred H. Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Herbert S. Riband, Jr.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>William J. Levy</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEST PERCENT OF PARTICIPATION
(Classes of 25 or more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Joseph Branschenschaft</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>M. Carton Dittmann, Jr.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Miss Doris E. Montgomery</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Morris M. Shuster</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Donald H. Williams</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>David S. Malis</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEST PERCENT OF PARTICIPATION
(Classes of less than 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Jack P. Levin</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>G. Craig Lord</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Joel W. Messing</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>William Petrick</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Thomas R. Schumil</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Andrew J. Schwartzman</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Michael K. Simon</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Richard M. Singer</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Steven A. Sage</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>E. Clinton Swift, Jr.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Bruce L. Thall</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>James Weiner</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Theodore A. Young</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Arthur A. Zutz</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Lloyd R. Ziff</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A GLANCE AT TEN YEARS
OF ANNUAL GIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Contributors</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>102,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 1972
CORPORATE GIFT PROGRAM

A total of 27 forward-looking companies matched, wholly or in part, the gifts that their employees, officers and directors made to Law Alumni Annual Giving in the 1971-1972 campaign.

Alumni who are eligible to have their gifts matched are urged to send their company’s form in order that the Law School may benefit from it. The matching amount is also credited to you, your class, and your region. The Alumni Office will be glad to supply information to any alumni who may be in a position to suggest the establishment of a matching gift plan in his company.

The companies who participated in the 1971-72 Law School Alumni Annual Giving campaign are listed below.

AETNA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY
AIR PRODUCTS & CHEMICALS, INC.
AMERICAN STANDARD, INC.
ARMSTRONG CORK COMPANY
ARTHUR ANDERSON COMPANY
BRISTOL-MYERS COMPANY
CHASE MANHATTAN BANK FOUNDATION
COVINGTON & BURLING
DIAMOND SHAMROCK CORPORATION
FORD FUND EDUCATIONAL AID PROGRAM
GENERAL ELECTRIC FOUNDATION
HERCULES, INC.
INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA
JOHNSON AND HIGGINS
MARINE MIDLAND CORPORATION
McGRAW-HILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
MERCK COMPANY
Occidental Petroleum
OLIN MATHIESON CHARITABLE TRUST
PAN AM CHARITABLE FOUNDATION, INC.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Company
Pennwalt Foundation
Pittsburgh National Foundation
Prudential Insurance Company
Smith, Kline & French Foundation
Standard Oil Company (Indiana)
Westinghouse Educational Foundation

SUMMARY OF REGIONS
(Areas other than Pennsylvania, with 15 or more alumni)

Chairman—Lipman Redman, L’41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Number of Alumni</th>
<th>No. participating</th>
<th>Per Cent Participation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Marshall Rutter, L’59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wilmington</td>
<td>Herbert W. Larson, L’61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*District of Columbia</td>
<td>Charles B. Ruttenberg, L’49</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Richard J. Farrell, L’41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boston</td>
<td>Philip S. Nyman, L’62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic County</td>
<td>Robert Neustadter, L’56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mercer County</td>
<td>Edward B. Meredith, L’51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New York City</td>
<td>Richard M. Dicke, L’40</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cleveland</td>
<td>Henry W. Lavine, L’60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These Regions equaled or bettered the over-all alumni participation of 33 per cent.

The following Pennsylvania counties outside of the Delaware Valley area equalled or exceeded the overall total of 33%:
Berks County with 38%; Lackawanna, 33%; Lancaster, 34%; Lehigh, 36%; and York, 39%.
## REPORT OF CLASSES

**Chairman—ANDREW HOURIGAN, JR., L’40**

**1970-71**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>No. in Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>No. in Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$1,635.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,545.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Alumni</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,081.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,175.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,840.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>295.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>631.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>277.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,490.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,125.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,598.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5,255.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,869.00</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12,666.25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,005.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,670.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,735.38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,422.50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3,575.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2,906.00</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2,655.00</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2,737.00</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,242.75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3,420.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 1972**
Wilson

(Continued from page 13)

should be noted that in the 18th century a literate man was rare enough, while anyone with an education or library was regarded a scholar. Finally, Wilson poured hard work and careful thought into his political undertakings, all resulting in his rise in the ranks.

Considerable politicking preceded the July 4th declaration, however. Wilson, although a major figure at the Second Continental Congress, was reluctant to take a stand for independence because of the instructions the Pennsylvania Assembly had given its delegates. Meanwhile, the radicals, or Whigs, pressured the Assembly. To assure them, the Assembly voted to increase and reapportion its numbers; elections were held May 1, 1776. The moderate Whigs, Tories (Conservatives), and a limited franchise combined to hold the line.

Abetted by Bay Staters Elbridge Gerry and John Adams, the radicals grew impatient. Congress passed a resolution declaring that "it is necessary that the exercise of every kind of authority under the said Crown should be totally suppressed and all the powers of government [be] exerted under the authority of the people of the Colonies [the 1776 version of "All power to the people?"). This was the radicals' cue. Petitions were circulated and meetings held. The Pennsylvania Assembly was confronted by a crowd in the yard of the State House (now Independence Hall) on May 20. The radicals declared the Assembly dissolved. The Tories countered that the Congressional resolution was a recommendation only; counter petitions were circulated. A provincial convention was called for June 18.

Finally, the Assembly yielded and voted to alter its instruction to its delegates in Congress. All the while Wilson had been silent. While he was anxious that Congress address the issue, he was chary of taking the big step. At a vote in Congress on July 1, 1776 only 9 states voted for the Declaration of Independence. Pennsylvania voted against: 3 delegates, including Dickinson and Wilson, for; 4 delegates, including Dickinson and Robert Morris, against. It is unknown what manner of persuasion was applied, but on July 2, Dickinson and Morris did not take their seats. Pennsylvania, along with all but New York, voted to declare independence. The unfolding of events reflected Wilson's legalism and conservativism. It appears he and others were reluctantly swept up by a force which would not be resisted.

Soon thereafter Congress framed the Articles of Confederation. Among the issues confronted were certain colonies' claims to western lands, representation and taxation of slaves and representation of smaller states. Wilson spoke for ceding land claims to the national government, against tax breaks for slavery, against slavery itself and to allay small states' anxieties.

The war news was bad. The Quebec expedition had failed. New York fell and Washington and the Continental Army were being pursued toward Philadelphia. Congress withdrew to Baltimore.

Wilson was appointed to more committees: to consider the state of the army; and to plan for executive departments. The problems of finance and supply persisted. Wilson had occasion, however, to fashion what may be the first instance of porkbarrel legislation of the new republic: he had Congress establish an army depot in Carlisle. (The original structure still stands and serves as a museum on the grounds of the Army War College.)

The news of Washington's victory at Trenton on Christmas Eve, 1776 heartened the cause and permitted Congress to return to Philadelphia. But the problems dragged on into 1777. Representatives of the New England states had met and threatened currency depreciation. Congress was faced with a delicate problem: to permit such outflanking of the national government would be dangerous; also, to censure the action could upset the fragile Confederation. A committee, including Wilson, was appointed. A moderate recommendation was forthcoming, but Wilson wanted to uphold Congress' power to disapprove state acts affecting the common interest. Wilson turned his attentions to financial matters. He supported a sound system of finance, meaning stiff taxes, but Congress could not agree. The military news was mixed: victory at Bennington; Washington was pressed by General Howe's maneuvering.

In September, 1777 the Pennsylvania Assembly removed Wilson from Congress. The new state government which formed in Pennsylvania in July of 1776 was controlled by doctrinaire radicals. The Constitution of 1776, for instance, had judges removable by the Assembly. A convention reviewed all legislation every 7 years and an oath was required of all voters. The new charter did, however, extend the franchise, modify the debtor's laws and break the grip of the eastern oligopoly. A debate raged statewide, marked by frequent riots. Wilson, a staunch opponent of the radicals from the beginning, led a movement which attempted to replace the 1776 Constitution, but to no avail. It is curious to note that Wilson was at first too liberal for the Assembly in 1775 and then recalled for being too conservative only 2 years later.

The ousted and defeated Wilson returned to Carlisle in late 1777. It was to be a temporary stay, however, for while in Congress Wilson had rubbed elbows with the leading men of the day and had made some valuable commercial contacts. This, combined with the fact that the Carlisle area was in hostile radical hands, led Wilson to move his household to Philadelphia.

Thus he ended 9 years in Carlisle and began a new career as prominent lawyer, businessman, politico and public citizen. He was 36.

It was the summer of 1778. The British had just abandoned Philadelphia after wintering there. (Washington and the Continental Army had wintered at
Valley Forge under less hospitable conditions.) Revenge was in the air and the radicals rose to the occasion. British sympathizers were indicted daily. Wilson defended a number of them. In his defense he carefully traced the law of treason, citing Foster, Hale, Strange, the statute of 25 Edward III (1351) and Blackstone to the effect that treason required an overt act and proof by two witnesses. The arguments failed to persuade the courts. Nine years later, however, Wilson served on a committee at the Constitutional Convention which drafted the clause embodying these two elements.

In December, 1778 Wilson was involved in an admiralty suit which touched on the tacky question of national-state relations. A British merchant ship, the Active, with 4 impressed American sailors aboard, was heroically captured by those sailors and, with the aid of a Pennsylvania-commissioned vessel, the Convention, and a privateer, the Gerard, was brought into Philadelphia. The Admiralty Court of Pennsylvania awarded one-fourth to the crew of the Convention, one-fourth to the Gerard, one-fourth to the state, and one-fourth to the 4 sailors. Benedict Arnold, with funds from taking graft as military governor of Philadelphia, bought up the sailors' claim and retained Wilson to appeal the case to the Court of Commissioner set up by Congress. (It will be recalled that in 1775 Wilson had served on the committee which recommended establishing this Court.) The Court increased the share. However, the Pennsylvania authorities declined to enforce the judgment. Writs and injunctions followed, but to no avail. The claim was eventually settled in 1809, but not before going up to the U.S. Supreme Court. No doubt the episode impressed upon Wilson the need for more authority in the national government. The case also enhanced his reputation as a practitioner and benefited his practice, which he came to call "the retail business of the law." It may be of interest that Benedict Arnold's rights reverted to the sailors when he was unmasked.

Meanwhile, the state political struggles continued. Wilson again campaigned against the Constitutionalists. He engaged in a squabble with Tom Paine and an Alamo-style pitched battle. On October 4, 1779 numerous ill-disciplined and ill-disposed militiamen occupied Philadelphia. A group gathered at a tavern at Tenth and Race Streets and fortified itself with drink and invective. By and by the mob began to cry "Get Wilson" and moved toward his house. Wilson and a small band of Anti- Constitutionalists, or Republicans, convened on Second Street. As the militiamen approached, the Republicans fell back to Wilson's house at Walnut and Third Streets. Despite attempts at restraint by militia officers and Republican leaders, shots rang out and an assault was made on the house. Only the appearance of the President of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphia City Troop averted a showdown. Five men were killed and 17 wounded. Wilson judiciously took refuge in the country for two weeks. The episode ended when, in March of 1780 a general pardon was declared for all concerned.

Despite the demands of the political situation, Wilson had attention to give to various business enterprises. He sought to be a supplier of the French Navy and embark on other commercial ventures, but domestic currency instability hindered his efforts. At the same time Congress was having its usual difficulties in paying its bills for munitions. As a result, Wilson and other leading Philadelphians established the Bank of Pennsylvania in March, 1780. The Bank made a promising start, but Wilson was unable to persuade the Assembly to make the Bank its fiscal agent. The Bank went out of business in September.

Wilson's scheme was an advanced one. A close student of the fledgling science of political economy, Wilson was foresightedly aware of the requirements of modern public finance. He did not give up the notion and, in 1781, sold Congress on the idea of a national banking system. The Bank of North America was chartered. With the aid of sleight-of-hand and other methods this bank got off to a strong start.

Before long, curiously, Wilson's political and business involvements merged. In 1785 the Republicans mounted a new attack on the Constitutionalists, who countered by attacking the Bank of North America. The Bank refused to accept Pennsylvania's recent issue of currency. The Constitutionalists charged that all difficulty stemmed from the bank which had allegedly sucked all specie out of Pennsylvania and sent it abroad in exchange for European luxuries for rich merchants. The Bank's State charter—it operated under State and Congressional charters—was under attack.

(Continued on page 40)

Prisoners

(Continued from page 5)

plaintiff's motion to reconsider, and eventually vacated its previously entered judgement. Some of the complaints ramble illegibly for pages, while others articulate the plaintiff's grievance surprisingly well.

The file usually gives counsel some idea of what the case is all about. He then attempts to locate and communicate with his client. Such communication may take the form of a personal interview at Graterford, or, if the client has been released, here at the law school. If the client has been transferred to another part of the state, communication must be by mail.

The object of the client interview is to clarify the factual issues involved. As a result, counsel will normally take one or more of several actions. Often, counsel will move to file an amended complaint. Discovery procedures, usually by interrogatory pursuant to Rule 33, but in other forms as well, are begun. Occasionally counsel will conclude that the action is either moot or frivolous. In such cases the client may file a motion to withdraw the complaint, or counsel...
may move to withdraw himself.

In most cases the defendant files a motion to dismiss or a motion for summary judgment. Appointed counsel will normally file appropriate documents to oppose such motions. Counsel also prepares a brief in opposition to the defense motions. Occasionally the fruits of discovery suggest that a plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is appropriate. In such cases the motion is filed and a brief in support of the motion is submitted.

The subject-matter of the complaints includes nearly all of the conditions of imprisonment. One plaintiff seeks wages for labor he was required to perform as a convicted but unsentenced prisoner. Two ask for damages from allegedly racially motivated prison job demotions. Several complain of grossly improper medical attention, resulting in great pain and some permanent disabilities. Many ask for injunctions with regard to prison mail censorship and prison disciplinary procedures. Others seek relief from the physical conditions of punitive segregation; i.e., solitary. Some prisoners complain that prison officials interfere with their access to the courts. In one case papers which a prisoner needed to perfect an appeal were mailed to him special delivery. He received them over four days later. Although the fault may lie with either Postal Service or the prison mail room, the result was that the Superior Court refused to docket the appeal.

Prisoner's complaints also raise issues that are not directly related to the conditions within the walls. One plaintiff succeeded in obtaining a reversal of his conviction. The conviction had been obtained with the help of an involuntary confession. Now the plaintiff asks for financial compensation for the loss of his Fifth Amendment rights. Some federal prisoners complain that the failure of the federal parole board to give reasons when it denies parole is a deprivation of due process. Other prisoners complain that the state ought to be required to permit them to vote, especially since it continues to tax them.

We have been assigned nearly 50 cases thus far. Only a few of those cases have gone to trial. Most are in various pre-trial stages. Some have been dismissed without a trial, either for failure to state a claim, or summary judgement motion, or as moot.

*Motley v. Rundle*, 11 Cr.L. 2087, CA #41023 (E.O. Pa. 3/29/72), appeal filed, 4/26/72, a recently decided case, though not technically a part of the Penn Law School program, helps to illustrate the service which the program performs for the prisoners, and its ability to make new law. In *Motley*, Al Hester, at the time a third-year student at Penn, represented the plaintiff. Hester was appointed under Rule 94, but not through the law school nor under the supervision of one of the professors here. The plaintiff alleged that while incarcerated at Graterford he had worked in the weave shop at $0.69 per day. He was transferred from Graterford to Holmesburg to appear at a post-conviction hearing, pursuant to a petition which he had filed. Upon his return to Graterford, plaintiff was not signed to work at the weave shop, but rather on the "run". His pay at the latter job was $0.15 per day. Plaintiff alleged that racial prejudice motivated the prison officials' failure to return him to the higher-paying job.

When defendant failed to file any response whatever to the Complaint, Chief Judge Joseph Lord III granted plaintiff's motion for the entry of judgment by default. Judge Lord denied defendant's subsequent motion to re-open the judgment, and set the case for trial on the amount of damages.

Following trial at which Mr. Hester appeared for plaintiff, Judge Lord awarded $1,461.70 in damages. Four-hundred sixty-one dollars and seventy cents was computed specifically to compensate plaintiff for wages he would have earned at the better job. The remainder of the award, $1,000 was to compensate plaintiff simply for the deprivation of a constitutional right, and for certain speculative collateral consequences. The tenor of the opinion strongly suggests that most of the $1,000 was intended to compensate for the deprivation of the right, without reference to actual damage. It is believed that the *Motley* case is the first one which compensated a plaintiff solely for the loss of a constitutional right.

We think that the Prisoners' Rights Litigation program has enjoyed substantial success in its first half-year of operation. Prisoners whose claims were unlikely ever to receive a fair hearing now have a trained, capable, energetic advocate. The Court will be able to dispose of its prisoners' civil rights suits with the knowledge that each case receives the attention of someone trained to look for, and hoping to find, possible merit to the claim. The students have the opportunity to handle a case from start to finish, in a developing, difficult, exciting area of the law. They receive invaluable practice in drafting documents for submission to the Court. They appear before the Judge, and come to understand what advocacy is all about. Finally, of course, they may be able to vindicate the rights of a person whose chances of success without them were negligible.

### Commencement

(Continued from page 7)

Center for Study of Responsive Law; Charles Morgan, Atlanta attorney active in civil rights causes; John P. Nelson, Jr., New Orleans attorney active in representing civil rights cases; and Henry Sawyer, Philadelphia attorney active in the American Civil Liberties Union and Americans for Democratic Action.

### Letters

(Continued from page 16)

of "critical analysis" is overdone in law school. Should law school teach some substantive material?
Is the Socratic method productive in the second or third years? Is the concern with esoteric subjects, however timely, well advised, or to the exclusion of comprehensive treatment of more elemental aspects of law?

What Prof. Gorman presents instead is a series of 20 resolutions: 3 deal with scheduling; 5 with grading; 3 with work-study programs; 2 with group study programs; and 1 each with recommended readings, a legal methods course, an orientation course, an advocacy course, and independent reading courses. The two remaining resolutions advise that "courses in a wide variety of subject matter" be offered and that the other 19 resolutions be implemented.

Several of these resolutions strike a familiar note; recent graduates will recall _The Life of the Law_ and Jud Pro. Other resolutions suggest present methods: seminars, Appellate Advocacy and Legal Methods. Only two of the resolutions appear to display any merit: work-study programs and independent reading programs. It will be noted that both of these tend to phase out law school. Indeed, if work-study were to include work in a regular law school, legal education will have come full circle. The independent reading alternative is attractive because at least it is a time-tested method.

I spoke with Prof. Gorman approximately a year ago on these matters. He said my ideas were reactionary and accused me of asking for "spoon feeding" in wanting courses with some content. Or, as I have heard it said too many times, "Oh, no, we don't teach law. We teach the method." Then I had no response, but now I submit that that stance and Prof. Gorman's report are patently inadequate.

Julian Karpoff

**Trial**

*(Continued from page 9)*

be run over the entire year, with half the session being held with small groups rather than the full class.

Trial of an Issue was also the vehicle for an innovative experiment this past year; the session involving closing argument to the jury was done with the presence of videotape, with sound and instant replay capability, on closed circuit TV. The value of an instant replay of a football play is viewed rather differently by the halfback who sweeps around end for a touchdown than it is by the linebacker who missed the tackle. It is apparent that two advocates might view an instant replay of courtroom action with similarly varied degrees of enthusiasm. Yet the potential training value of videotape for the fledgling lawyer is equally as great as for the rookie football player. The instant replay gives you the invaluable ability to step back and watch yourself in action—with all your flaws hanging out. It is anticipated that this formidable and graphic educational technique will be used more fully in the coming year, hopefully in connection with small group sessions. If successful, it could well be transplanted to other similar courses in law school.

One of the participants in the videotape session was Burton Caine of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen. A frequent guest at the Monday evening classes, Mr. Caine's quietly persuasive summation to the jury on this occasion was a pleasure to watch. The Trial of an Issue class in the coming year will be treated to Mr. Caine's style of advocacy on a regular basis, as he will join Mr. Crawford in teaching this year's class. This high level of instructional ability coupled with the increased emphasis on individual participation seems to ensure that the forthcoming course will be even more rewarding than the past class.

The finale of the course this year was a full scale criminal trial, stretching over an afternoon and evening. The case involved arson, along with several lesser crimes, and was based on the record of the preliminary hearing in an actual trial following the firebombing of College Hall several years ago. The identity of the defendant, however, was changed to that of a militant feminist formerly employed by the University.

The guest judge for this session was Hon. Lisa Richette from the Philadelphia Common Pleas Court. The roles of the defendant and numerous witnesses were filled principally by lawyers from various offices throughout Philadelphia who were available to the prosecution and defense teams for about a week prior to the trial for preparation. Their availability and willingness to cooperate with the prosecution or defense; however, was prearranged by the instructors so as to simulate reality.

The conduct of the trial was highly interesting and eventful, involving argument on defense motions for suppression of evidence and mistrial. attempts by student advocates to cross examine witnesses who were actually seasoned litigators, and several lengthy and well acted diatribes by one witness which relegated both the prosecution and defense to the status of "male chauvinist pigs." The Bench rose admirably to the occasion, as is evident from the brief excerpt of her dialogue with the prosecution, paraphrased at the beginning of this article. One prosecution witness, testifying that one of the arsonists "ran like a girl" was totally chagrined at the Court's insistence that the witness, a male Wharton School student, demonstrate that style of running. Despite his insistence that such a demonstration was a physical impossibility, the Court remained steadfast, and the witness gamely gave a creditable performance as a girl running, causing a brief total breakdown in courtroom decorum.

Ultimately, the trial ended in a hopelessly hung jury, with the defense persuading all but three jurors of the defendant's innocence. Although the performance of counsel was hardly without flaws, the external difficulties of staging such a trial and the extensive preparation required make the successful result a credit to the efforts of Professor Levin and Mr. Crawford.
The author heartily recommends the course to all who are interested, either as members of the class, observers, or as future guests participating as demonstrating attorneys or judges.

**Ingram**

(Continued from page 14)

In citing disadvantages of the system experienced during her clerkship, Miss Ingram recounts, "I have realized how haphazard the law can be sometimes—with its tremendous caseload it often seems to be a grinding out process. It is frustrating to see how political and economic factors in certain instances account for disparities in the quality of justice among litigants."

Considering her teaching career at Temple, she is both apprehensive because she has never taught, and also challenged by the thought of new experiences and opportunities to expand her own education.

"I have no political aspirations," she states, "right now I want to become a competent teacher and get the most experience from the opportunity that has just been presented me."

**Library**

(Continued from page 4)

Hardly a day went by during my years there that we failed to read in The New York Times or the Wall Street Journal a report of a matter that we had worked on a day or two earlier. One of the most exciting of them I have related elsewhere: At the height of Senator Joseph McCarthy's career, he demanded time to blow-ups of those film strips and asked to identify the documents within 48 hours. In most cases only a portion of a government seal and fragments of a few words or dates and document numbers were visible. The CBS lawyers understood that they were all Congressional documents. To my surprise, most of them proved to be reports of subversive investigating committees in New York, California and Massachusetts. Only a few were federal documents. All 10 were identified in time for Murrow's use on his CBS telecast in reply.

More recently the Cravath firm was retained to defend the House of Representatives in an action brought in the U.S. Supreme Court by a New York congressman whom the House had refused to seat. In the course of that case and because of it, the library acquired a great number of books on the history of parliaments and the rights of legislators that only a fine law school library could expect to own. Penn has them all. They covered the period from the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 to the present day.

Contrary to published reports, there is no computer in the Cravath library. Nor is there one at the Biddle Law Library. But to the extent that machines can eliminate repetitive tasks, Cravath uses them.

For example, access to memora of law at Cravath—as in most large firms—has always been a perplexing problem. We attempted to solve it by preparing new abstracts of all the bound volumes of legal memora written in the past 20 years. The abstracts were turned over to Aspen Corporation, a computer service center. Aspen produced a "Key Word in Context" index to the abstracts. It can be expanded indefinitely.

To my knowledge, this was the first successful law firm experiment with computerized indexing on a fairly large scale. The library's abstracting, indexing and bibliographical uses of computers can be expected to grow.

The results of experiments with computerized research that we conducted at Cravath a few years ago, however, were inconclusive. In those experiments, lawyers competed with a machine on a products liability problem. In one case, the lawyers did a workmanlike job, but the machine failed. In a second experiment, the quality of the results was nearly equal; but the machine was faster. One of the Cravath partners quipped about the results to a very new associate, "Now that we have this machine, I guess we won't need you much longer."

The firm's managing partner put the matter in better perspective, "This firm has been practicing law a long time. If it is a simple question, we don't need a computer to answer it; we already know the answer. And if it is a difficult question, we wouldn't trust it to a computer."

What about the burning issues of the day: race, civil rights, consumer protection and environmental problems? Their impact on the Cravath library has been comparable to their effect at Penn. The shift in emphasis in book buying in those fields has been greater at Penn in the past two or three years, but library staff participation in research has been greater at Cravath—doubtless a matter of personal, rather than law firm or law school, policy or preference.

During the Carswell controversy, for example, the library at Cravath (and at other Wall Street firms) was the scene of research by both sides, with library staff members assisting.

It is a fact of law firm life that client problems come first. But the issues of race discrimination and environmental protection are no strangers to large corporate clients. The scope of the firm library's research in many cases is no different from that performed by the various Nader teams. The Nader and law firm aims
sometimes even coincide.

Not long ago one member of the Cravath firm defended a steel manufacturer against a charge of race discrimination in the promotion of its employees. In resolving that problem, he observed, “My hardest job was to persuade the white union foremen that they had to comply with the law, too.”

The non-professional library staff at Penn is unionized; at Cravath it is not. The members of both are drawn from several races and nationalities and their problems are no different from those of people all over. There is a preponderance of men, chiefly students and aspiring writers, at Cravath. There is a greater number of women on the library staff at Penn. There were always a few assistants with the Cravath library staff who had great intellectual gifts. But their tenure was usually short. There is greater stability among the Penn library staff members.

I might mention one distressing development among the law school libraries in New York that has not yet affected Philadelphia. New York school libraries are discouraging outside use of their facilities by imposing high fees and eliminating service to practicing lawyers.

On the other hand, one of the most gratifying features of the Penn law school library is the excellent rapport its staff has achieved with the members of the Philadelphia bar. Miss Nancy Arnold, our Reference Librarian, Christy Ridley, our Documents Librarian, Mrs. Marta Tarnawsky, our Foreign Law Librarian, Mrs. Betty Warner, our Acquisitions Librarian, Paul Gay, the Assistant Librarian, and other library staff members at Penn offer a research service both by telephone and in person that the New York schools began to curtail some 10 years ago. True, the change at the New York schools was dictated in part by finances and in part by an increase in student enrollment, without a comparable increase in library staff size. But damage to school relations with the bar was the inevitable result. No matter what the financial strains at Penn, great care will be taken to maintain the present lines of communication between its library and the Pennsylvania bar.

Another unique service at the Penn library is its work with prisoners in penitentiaries throughout Pennsylvania. One library staff member at Biddle handles stacks of prisoner letters requesting copies of court opinions each week, in addition to performing her other reference services.

Because Philadelphia is smaller than New York, its law libraries are necessarily fewer in number. For a librarian, the most useful fact about the Cravath location in New York is that there are four other law libraries in the same building—each with book collections of comparable size. Those collections are a source of duplicate runs of books that are indispensible to a busy firm. I have known days when even six copies of a particular volume of Federal Supplement could not satisfy the need—and no copy was left for “Xeroxing”. But more important, the librarians in those four firms are a source of information in answering puzzling legal questions. Moreover, within a radius of two or three blocks there are a dozen other law librarians with similar gifts. Together with the bar association, New York Law Institute and court librarians, they form a network of information specialists.

The professional advantage to each of them is that they share one another’s information. Thus, New York lawyers command the services of all when they employ only one of them.

What about the future? Must the physical size of law libraries expand forever? Probably not. Do the developing techniques of microforms and compact book storage offer a hope of containing, if not contracting, the sheer bulk of those libraries? Probably yes.

The 240,000 volume book collection at the University of Pennsylvania Law School is now eight times as large as that of Cravath. The library serves about four times as many readers with a staff only twice the number at Cravath. But it includes eight professionals on its library staff, compared to one at the law firm.

The intellectual resources of the Biddle Law Library go back to the first stirrings of legal thought. Those resources include one of the best foreign law book collections on the eastern seaboard. The Anglo-American book collection is superb and it is growing. Like every law school library, it faces financial problems. And in a few years, it will have space problems too. But if the library staff, faculty and administration at Penn, and its student body and alumni continue to show the ingenuity and concern for it that they have shown in the past, then the future of the Biddle Law Library—among the great law school libraries of the country—is secure.

Alumni Day

(Continued from page 6)

ment, with special emphasis on Serrano v. Priest, highlighted the afternoon portion of Law Alumni Day.

University Professor Jefferson B. Fordham moderated the panel which included William F. Hall, Jr., regional counsel, Region III, Housing and Urban Development Department; Professor Stephen R. Goldstein, '62; and the Honorable William H. Wilcox, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs.

In addition to the presentation of the Distinguished Service Award, the business meeting included reports by outgoing Law Alumni Society President William F. Hyland and Dean Bernard Wolfman, and election of officers.

In his report, Dean Wolfman spoke about changes in the School, including changes in the curriculum, new admissions policies, and faculty changes, not the
least of which is the departure of former Dean Jefferson B. Fordham.

The new officers of the Society are President: Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr., '52; First Vice-President: Edwin P. Rome, '40; Second Vice-President: Thomas N. O'Neiil, Jr., '53; Secretary: David H. Marion, '63; and Treasurer: Sharon Kaplan Wallis, '67.

Elected to the Board of Managers were Hon. Doris May Harris, '49, whose term will expire in 1976; John G. Harkins, Jr., '58, whose term will expire in 1975 and Carol O. Seabrook, '69, whose term will also expire in 1975.

The day ended with a supper in the foyer of the new Law Building.

NEWS NOTES

Louis J. Goffman, '35, has been named to head the Friends of the Biddle Law Library. The other members of the committee are Richard Sloane, Biddle Law Librarian; Edwin Wolf, head of the Library Company of Philadelphia; William F. Hyland, '49; Edwin P. Rome, '40; David H. Marion, '63; Leonard L. Ettinger, '38; John G. Harkins, Jr., '58; Mary Ellen Talbott, '63; Thomas E. Wood, '66; Richard J. Farrell, '41; G. William Shea, '36; and Donald M. Swan, Jr., '53.

Dean Wolfman announces that Jane Freedman has established the Abraham L. Freedman Memorial Fund in honor of her late husband, the Hon. Abraham L. Freedman of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. According to Dean Wolfman, the fund "may be augmented by Jane Freedman and others who wish to honor his memory." The proceeds of the fund will be "available at the discretion of the dean to assist the school in programs of instruction in advocacy, clinical activities and special lectures and programs of significant interdisciplinary context."

Harold E. Kohn, '37, has established the J. C. Kohn Fund, in honor of his father. The fund is intended to supplement the loan funds available for students and is an experiment which will provide the basis for a partially income-contingent repayment program.


Justice Harry Blackmun of the U. S. Supreme Court will act as presiding judge in the Keedy Cup Finals on April 6, 1973.

The Murry Waldmans hosted a reception for the Law Alumni Society on August 17 in San Francisco during the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. Mr. Waldman was graduated from the Law School in 1952.

Dean Wolfman hosted the dedication of the Sydney L. Weintraub Rare Book Room in the Biddle Law Library on May 19th.

A luncheon honoring Mr. and Mrs. Weintraub, of Miami, Fla., followed the dedication. Mr. Weintraub

Weintraub Room Dedication

is a member of the class of 1925. The Rare Book Room is named in his honor in appreciation for his generosity to the Law School.

Pennsylvania Attorney General J. Shane Creamer addressed the first year luncheon scheduled for September 11 at the Houston Hall auditorium.
Carroll R. Wetzel, '30, has been named to head the Law School Development Committee. The committee is charged with launching and following through on capital fund raising.

The other members of the committee are Dean Wolfman; Hon. Arlin M. Adams, '47; Philip W. Amram, '27; S. Samuel Arsh, '34; Frederic L. Ballard, '48; John Ames Ballard, '48; Richard P. Brown, Jr., '48; Morris Cheston, '28; Richard M. Dicke, '40; Louis J. Goffman, '35; Kenneth W. Gemmill, '35; John G. Harkins, Jr., '58; Philip Newman, '17; and Robert L. Trescher, '37.

Apparently unhappy with a decision last spring by the tenured faculty denying tenure to faculty member David Filvaroff and the faculty's earlier rejection of a pass/fail grading system, 140 students in the first year class signed a resolution of "no confidence" in Dean Bernard Wolfman during the spring examination period.

Student "spokesmen" Elizabeth Freedman, Nancy Weinman, Pat DeCarlo, Mark Friedman and Emund Tiryak made the results of the poll available to the Journal and expressed their "disillusionment" at what they characterized as the "dean's lack of understanding."

The negative vote represented approximately 93% of those voting and roughly two-thirds of the entire class. Second and third year students were not included in the poll.

Faculty leaders contacted by the Journal expressed "total and complete confidence" in the dean, noting that the decisions which seemed to underly the first-year students' reactions were the result of the actions of either the whole faculty or the tenured faculty, and not the dean alone. Some faculty members characterized the first-year student vote as "baseless" and "irrational."

In a joint statement, President Martin Meyerson and Provost Curtis R. Reitz declared: "We firmly support both the Dean and the Faculty in their decisions. In doing so we reject the statement of lack of confidence in our Dean. He is among the most distinguished of deans of law schools."

Summer vacations precluded comprehensive interviewing of faculty and students. However, one graduating student, Patricia L. Freeland, noted that "the current no-confidence petition is reminiscent of an earlier Law School incident in which students placed large black X's on the doors of faculty members who voted against a pass/fail grading system. I have always had the highest respect for Dean Wolfman, and I continue to have the utmost confidence in his leadership of the School."

Because vacations prevented any independent, comprehensive analysis of student, faculty or alumni opinion concerning the issues involved in this controversy by the Journal, the magazine invites representaives of all factions and facets of opinion to submit their views for consideration for publication in the next issue of the magazine.

All submissions will be considered. Those which are duplicative will be rejected. As usual the editors reserve the right to edit to meet space limitations. All submissions must be signed of course.

On July 1, 1972, Associate Professor Martin J. Aronstein, L'65, and Associate Professor Stephen R. Goldstein, L'62, were promoted to the rank of Professor of Law. On the same date, Assistant Professor Bruce Ackerman was promoted to the rank of Associate Professor of Law and Public Policy Analysis.

The accreditation team that visited the Law School last February on behalf of the American Bar Association and Association of American Law Schools concluded its 37 page report by saying:

The Law School of the University of Pennsylvania is one of the nation's great law schools, with effective leadership, an excellent though too small faculty, a very good though inadequately supported library, an ample and fully adequate physical plant, and a promising and exciting new program of legal education under way.

The Council of the American Bar Association adopted a resolution in light of the accreditation report commending the Law School on the excellence of its program.

Provost Reitz
Wilson, who was, coincidentally, a heavy borrower at the Bank, made an appeal to Congress on its behalf. He argued that the authority of the national government to charter the Bank in the first place was an implied power and that the obligation of contracts could not be impaired. Both points were to become cornerstones of Constitutional law and theory. He also cited the service of the Bank to the revolutionary cause, that the specie outflow would exist even without the Bank, and that banks were necessary for economic development.

 Nonetheless, the Assembly voted to revoke the Bank's State charter. Stock prices, confidence and cash reserves tumbled. The Bank secured a Delaware charter and contemplated moving down the river. Another campaign was made upon the Assembly, including the rhetoric of Tom Paine—now on Wilson's side—but again the Bank lost. Finally, the 1786 elections returned a pro-Bank majority to the Assembly. The charter was renewed in the spring of 1787.

Meantime Wilson was deeply involved in a very popular post-war pastime: land speculation. Actually his land dealings dated from his days in Reading, but his holdings increased markedly through the 1780's. These included a large portion of stock in the Illinois-Wabash Company, which controlled 60,000,000 acres, and interests in other land companies in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio and New York. In addition, he was a joint owner of a nail factory up the Delaware River. These ventures were, needless to say, founded on borrowed capital. Land investment required a small down payment in exchange for a preliminary warrant, which authorized the speculator to survey the land and file a plat. Upon payment of the balance, clear title would issue. The potential for financial embarrassment is obvious.

Despite the shady overtones, land investors viewed themselves as promoters of the country's development. Indeed, they looked down upon mere "speculators." Wilson authored a pamphlet, "On the Improvement and Settlement of Lands in the United States"—a tract on tracts—which reflected this perspective, mixed with more political economy.

In 1782 Wilson was appointed to represent the State in a boundary dispute with Connecticut over the Wyoming Valley in northeastern Pennsylvania. Under the Articles of Confederation, Congress was the last resort of appeal in such cases. The procedure for selecting the tribunal was for the parties to alternately strike names off a list of 3 men from each state until only 13 were left. The method, apparently patterned after Grenville's Act for deciding disputed parliamentary elections, was dubbed "knocking the brains out of the committee."

The tribunal convened in Trenton in November of 1782. At one point Connecticut pleaded that their original Indian deed had been lost and submitted a copy. Later the original deed appeared. Wilson traced the development of the two states, offered 39 Indian deeds of his own, and alleged that Pennsylvanians had settled the disputed area 20 years before the New Englanders. The Court found for Pennsylvania, marking another milestone on behalf of national level judicial review.

Mr. Karpoff's fascinating account of the life of James Wilson will be concluded in the next issue of the Journal.

A graduate of Drew University, Karpoff is currently in private practice in Carlisle, Pa., to which vicinity James Wilson also ventured some 209 years ago.

ALUMNI NOTES

1902
HON. EDWIN O. LEWIS, of Philadelphia, celebrated his ninety-third birthday on July 12. He is slated to receive the Park Ranger Award, the highest honor the National Park Service bestows.

1908
LEON J. OBERMAYER, of Philadelphia, was one of four members of the class of 1904 of Philadelphia's Central High School who attended the class' 68th annual reunion in May. The others are ISSAC ASH, '08, ABRAHAM E. HURSHMAN, '10 and THOMAS M. HYNDMAN, '11.

1921
ARMAND L. KOETHEN, of Louisville, Ky., has become an honorary life member of the Kentucky State Bar Association and of the Louisville Bar Association.

1926
F. M. TRAVALINE, JR., of Collingswood, N.J., has been appointed a member of the Board of Trustees of Camden County College.

1930
HON. BENJAMIN R. JONES, of Philadelphia, Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, is one of five alumni who hold membership in the new 15 member Judicial Council of Pennsylvania. The other alumni are RICHARD HENRY KLEIN, '24, of Sunbury, Pa.; HON. CLINTON BUDD PALMER, '40, President Judge of the Northampton County Court of Common Pleas; HON. JAMES S. BOWMAN, '43, Judge of the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania; HON. D. DONALD JAMIESON, '50, President Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; and JAMES STRAZZELLA, '64, vice dean of the Law School.

LAW ALUMNI JOURNAL
BERNARD G. SEGAL, of Philadelphia, has been elected to the board of directors of the Industrial Valley Bank and Trust Company.

NATHAN C. STALLER, of Wildwood, N.J., was appointed Judge of the Cape May County Court in 1970.

SYLVAN COHEN, of Philadelphia, reports that the class of 1938 held a reunion at the Merion Golf Club in May. Among those in attendance was the HON. GREGORY LAGAKOS, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

JOHN P. BRACKEN, of Philadelphia, received the William Penn Award of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, for his “long and continuing years of leadership given and being given not only to Greater Philadelphia but the nation itself.” He was also named to the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission.

FRANK C. P. McGILINN, of Philadelphia, has been promoted to executive vice president of The Fidelity Bank. He is also serving as chairman of the Pennsylvania Finance Committee for the Reelection of the President.

JULIUS MAYNOR, of Charlottesville, Va., has become manager contracts/legal of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.
ALBERT E. TURNER, III, of Dallas, Pa., who was superintendent of claims for Pennsylvania Millers Mutual Insurance Company and worked at WBRE in Wilkes-Barre on weekends, is now expanding into private law practice.

PETER M. WARD, of New York City, has become president of the Board of Trustees of St. George’s School in Newport, R.I.

FREDERICK C. N. LITTLETON, of Philadelphia, has been promoted to senior vice president of The Fidelity Bank.

ALVIN DIAMOND, of Willow Grove, Pa., has become counsel for Foodarama Supermarkets, Inc., which operates 70 supermarkets in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

GORDON CAVANAUGH, of Bethesda, Md., has become executive director of a newly-formed Housing Assistance Council funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of conducting national programs to improve the production of low income housing in rural areas and small towns.

CHARLES B. STROME, JR., has been elected vice president and counsel for the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

S. DONALD WILEY, of Fox Chapel, Pa., has been elected senior vice president, secretary and general counsel of the H. J. Heinz Company and has also been elected to the company’s board of directors.

EDWARD J. BLAKE, of Philadelphia, has been appointed a judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. He is also court administrator for the Common Pleas Court.

MANUEL H. GREENBERG, of Atlantic County, N.J., has been appointed judge of the Atlantic County Court by New Jersey Governor William T. Cahill.

PETER J. LIACOURAS, of Gladwyne, Pa., has been named dean of the Temple University School of Law.

HARRIS OMINSKY, of Philadelphia, has been appointed membership chairman for the Jewish Ys and Centers of Greater Philadelphia (JYC).

BENNETT I. BARDFELD, of Vineland, N.J., reports that his wife gave birth to their third child, Lisa Jennifer, in July of last year. The Bardfeld’s have two other children, a son Leonard, 6½ and a daughter Kim, 5.

JOHN J. GRAUER, of East Cain, Pa., has become executive vice president of the American Acceptance Corp.

ELWOOD J. HEERWAGEN, JR., has become attorney for Nuclear Fuel Services, Inc.

WILLARD D. LORENSSEN, has been appointed dean of the West Virginia University Law School.

CHARLES E. MATHER, III, of Philadelphia, has been elected director of Central Penn National Bank.
FRANK C. McLAUGHLIN, of New York City, has joined Fleming, Berger, Kent and Company as a general partner. He served as vice chairman of the 25th annual conference of the Financial Analysts Federation, where he spoke on “The Practicability of Managing Other People’s Money.”

1960

JOHN A. WALTER, of Lebanon, Pa., has been elected Illustrious Potentate of Rajah Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S., Reading, Pa. and its 8100 nobles. Together with its 172 sister Temples in North America, Rajah will celebrate 100 years of shrine this year as the 19 orthodox hospitals and 3 burns institutes the Shrine owns and operates in Mexico, the United States and Canada continue to benefit from the efforts of over 900,000 Shriners.

RONALD ZIEGLER, of Philadelphia, has been elected chairman of the Public Utility Law Section of the Pennsylvania Bar Association. He was formerly assistant counsel to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and is now a partner in the firm of Tubis, Schwartz & Ziegler.

1961

ARTHUR J. ENGLAND, JR., of Tallahassee, Fla., has become consumer adviser and special counsel to Florida Governor Reubin Askew. He previously served as special tax counsel to the Florida House of Representatives.

DAVID F. NORCROSS, of Moorestown, N.J., has been appointed special assistant to New Jersey Governor William T. Cahill. He had previously served as the Governor’s assistant counsel.

1962

LEIGH S. RATINER, of Annandale, Va., has been appointed to the new position of director for ocean resources in the office of Hollis M. Dole, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources. He was previously staff director of the office of ocean affairs for the Secretary of Defense. In the new position, he will have responsibility for developing and recommending policy regarding the rights of the United States to develop ocean resources in the context of negotiations leading toward new international treaties.

1963

CHARLES A. PRICE, of Minneapolis, Minn., formerly antitrust counsel to 3M Company, is now associated with the St. Paul, Minn., firm of Oppenheimer, Brown, Wolff, Leach & Foster.

FAITH RYAN WHITTLESEY, of Haverford Township, Pa., has won the Republican nomination to the Pennsylvania Legislature from the 166th district, beating out her six male opponents.

1964

BERYL RICHMAN DEAN, has become pre-law advisor in the Vocational Advising Center of the University’s Dean of Students’ Office.

JEROME J. FORMAN, of Browns Mills, N.J., announces the formation of the new partnership of Apell, Forman and Howard with offices at Lakehurst Road, P.O. Box 95, Browns Mills, N.J.

WILLIAM T. ONORATO, of London, England, has been awarded a Ph.D. in International Law from the University of Cambridge. His study was made possible through the grant of a Gowen Graduate Fellowship by the Law School from 1965 to 1968. Topic of his
thesis was "Apportionment of an International Common Petroleum Deposit;" it will be published next year.

JAMES ROBERT PARISH, of New York City, is the author of "The RKO Gals," to be published by Arlington House, and is editor of "An Index to Major Performers' TV Credits," to be published by Scarecrow Press.

1965

I. JOSEPH FRANKEL, of Newark, N.J., has been promoted to assistant general counsel by the Prudential Insurance Company, Newark, N.J.

DAVID D. HAGSTROM, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., has become associated with the Poughkeepsie firm of Van DeWater and Van DeWater. He was previously an attorney in the law department of Diamond Shamrock Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio.

PETER HANKS, of Melbourne, Australia, will be visiting Europe (Max Planck Institute, Heidelberg, and Cambridge University) and North America (York University and the University of Pennsylvania) during 1972-73 and reports that he is anxious to make contact with friends from the classes of 1965, '66 and '67.

1966

STEPHEN BRETT, of Denver, Colo., has become associated with the Denver firm of Dawson, Nagel, Sherman & Howard.

MICHAEL M. COLEMAN, of Philadelphia, is now associated with the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz.

MORTON GOLDFEIN, of Morristown, N.J., has become a member of the Morristown and East Orange firm of Telser & Greenberg.

EDWARD F. MANNINO, of Philadelphia, has become a member of the firm of Dilworth; Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Coleman.

RICHARD ROYAL WIER, JR., of Wilmington, Del., has been appointed state prosecutor for Delaware by Attorney General N. Laird Stabler, Jr.

RICHARD N. WEINER, '66, an assistant attorney general of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and chief counsel to the Pennsylvania Securities Commission, has been elected chairman of the executive committee of the Young Lawyers Section of the Philadelphia Bar Association. At the same time, MARJORIE G. MARINOFF, '69, was elected vice chairman; HENRY A. STEIN, '65, was elected secretary, and LOUIS N. MARKS, '69, was elected treasurer.

1967

JOHN C. FOX, of Somerville, N.J., has been elected a director of GarDoc, Inc., a New Jersey corporation specializing in graphic media.

ROBERT C. OZER, of Buffalo, N.Y., has been appointed attorney-in-charge of the United States Department of Justice Strike Force Against Organized Crime and Racketeering in Buffalo, N.Y.

STEPHEN SCHOEeman, of New Rochelle, N.Y., ran unsuccessfully as an independent progressive candidate for the New Rochelle city council.

1968

MURRAY A. GREENBERG, of Miami Beach, Fla., announces the formation of the Miami Beach firm of Greenberg & Greenberg. He was formerly an assistant Dade County attorney.

THOMAS D. HENDERER, of Wilmington, Del., has become an assistant secretary of the Trust Department of Wilmington Trust Company.

DAVID LISSY, of Washington, D.C., has become special assistant to the Secretary of State.

RICHARD N. TOUB, of London, England, has announced that he will continue the practice of United States and international law at 55 Park Mansions, 149 Knightsbridge, London, SW1X, 7QT.

NOLAN N. ATKINSON, JR., of Ardmore, Pa., is director of the Ardmore Community Development Corporation, which plans to build 16 condominium units in South Ardmore. When they are completed, they will be the first new housing for blacks in South Ardmore in this century.

THOMAS R. OWENS, of Oakland, Cal., announces the formation of his partnership with Steven H. Goldfarb under the firm name of Goldfarb & Owens, with offices at 1970 Broadway, Suite 1045, Oakland, Cal. 94612. He also writes that he is interested in forming a local chapter of the Law Alumni Society in Northern California and invites alumni in that area to contact him.

THOMAS E. DORAN, of Philadelphia, has become associated with the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Coleman.

STEPHEN G. YOUNG, of Philadelphia, is currently serving as director of research of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Criminal Procedural Rules Committee. He earned an L.L.M. from the New York University Law School.

1970

STEVEN STONE, of Philadelphia, was elected Democratic committeeman of the 8th division of Philadelphia's 5th ward.

EDWARD H. WEIS, of Philadelphia, is now assigned to the Federal Courts Division of the Defender Association of Philadelphia.

JOHN MICHAEL WILLMANN, of Philadelphia, has become public relations coordinator and press secretary for the Pennsylvania Committee for the Reelection of the President. He was previously Deputy Court Administrator for Public Information and Planning in Philadelphia Common Pleas Court.

1971

ROBERT B. LAMM, of New York City, was married in January to the former Carol Ann Lew, a 1968 graduate of the University.

LAW ALUMNI JOURNAL
JOHN M. CUNNINGHAM, of Washington, D.C., has become an assistant to the director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission.

JACK W. TAPPER, of Marlton, N.J., has become associated with the Mt. Holly firm of Dimon, Haines and Bunting.

WILLIAM J. MOSES, of Philadelphia, has been appointed corporate counsel of Lincoln Bank. He previously served as law clerk to Hon. John J. Kitchen, U.S. District Court, Camden, N.J.

SANDRA SHERMAN, of Menlo Park, Calif., is now employed at the Nuclear Energy Division of General Electric in San Jose, Calif. She had spent 11 months in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

PATRICK R. RILEY, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and his wife, Margaret, are the parents of a boy, Stephen Francis, born May 7. Riley writes "Stephen considerably waited till his dad finished exams before making his appearance."

FACULTY & STAFF NOTES

ALEXANDER M. CAPRON became assistant professor of law on July 1. A 1969 graduate of the Yale Law School, he spent the past two years as a lecturer and research associate at Yale. Prior to that he clerked for a year with Chief Judge Bazelon of the D.C. Circuit Court. His principal interest is in the field of law and medicine, particularly the legal and ethical questions surrounding genetics, transplants and human experimentation.

STEPHEN J. SCHULHOFER has been appointed assistant professor of law. A 1967 summa cum laude graduate of the Harvard Law School, he served two years as law clerk to the late Justice Hugo Black.

Since then he has been practicing at Coudert Freres in Paris. His principal teaching and research interests are in substantive criminal law.

J. LeVONNE CHAMBERS, senior partner in the Charlotte, N.C. firm of Chambers, Stein, Ferguson & Lanning will be a lecturer at the Law School during the spring semester giving a seminar on civil rights. The Chambers firm was the first interracial law firm in North Carolina.

In 1971, Chambers received the Honorary Fellowship at the Law School's commencement exercises. That year he had argued before the U.S. Supreme Court the case in which desegregation, with the use of busing, was ordered for the schools of Charlotte and Mecklenberg County, North Carolina.
DAVID SLAWSON, professor at U.S.C., who is currently on leave serving as General Counsel to the Price Control Commission, will be at the Law School during the coming year teaching Corporations and a seminar on Wage and Price Control.

FRANKLIN E. ZIMRING, a member of the Chicago faculty, will be at the Law School in the fall teaching and doing research in areas of substantive criminal law.

WILLIAM W. VAN ALSTYNE, of Duke University, will be a visiting professor during the spring semester, teaching one section of Constitutional Law.

Professor GEORGE L. HASKINS spent a week in London early in June for conferences with members of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts with respect to its methods of indexing and preserving legal papers and local court records. Professor Haskins, who is president of the American Society for Legal History, anticipates that a comparable nationwide effort will soon be made in the United States—

with a goal of preserving legal and historical papers—as the result of the May 16 resolution of the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission. The resolution, which was unanimously adopted, was originally sponsored by several organizations including the American Society for Legal History.

Professor Haskins also reports that he spent a considerable amount of time in London at the British Museum and the Public Record Office doing research on early English sources of American colonial law.

He has been appointed to serve on a newly formed Law School Advisory Council to the ABA’s Committee on the Uniform Probate Code.

ARNOLD J. MILLER, assistant dean for admissions and student aid, was on the administrative staff of the National Institute for Trial Advocacy whose first four-week summer session was held in Boulder, Colorado June 25 through July 21.

HON. ARLIN M. ADAMS, ’47, Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, will offer a seminar on The First Amendment in the fall.

HON. A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, JR., judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, will offer a year-long seminar in Racism and the American Legal Process. He has previously taught a seminar at the Law School on Blacks and the Law.

ILOCHI A. OKAFOR, currently a candidate for the S.J.D. degree at the Law School, will offer a course in African Law during the spring semester. He has his LL.M. degree from the Law School.

SHARON KAPLAN WALLIS, ’67, currently head of the North Philadelphia Tenants’ Union, will offer a course in Women’s Rights next spring. She is planning to open a private law firm specializing in cases involving women’s rights.

Returning to the Law School after leaves of absence are BRUCE ACKERMAN, who was visiting at the Yale Law School faculty; ROBERT GORMAN, who taught at U.S.C. and LOUIS SCHWARTZ, who was doing research in France on multi-national corporations.

PAUL MISHKIN will spend the fall as visiting professor at Berkeley and the spring on sabbatical, doing research on the Supreme Court at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto.

LAW ALUMNI JOURNAL
JOHN M. STEADMAN will spend the coming year as visiting professor at the Georgetown Law Center.

ROBERT MUNDHEIM will be on sabbatical for the coming year, doing research here and in Japan, primarily in the area of financial institutions. He has been invited to give a series of seminars on American securities regulation by the Japan Securities Research Institute in Tokyo during the first week of October. The seminar will be held for representatives of leading Japanese financial institutions and the most influential Japanese scholars in the corporate and securities field. Mr. Mundheim has also been invited to address the Osaka Stock Exchange in Japan.

Dean BERNARD WOLFMAN addressed the Maine Bar Association in Kennebunkport, Maine on June 26. His topic was “New Trends in American Legal Education.”

Professor BRUCE H. ACKERMAN presented a speech in June to the United States Judicial Conference for the Second Circuit on “The Future of Environmental Law.” He has been asked to serve as program chairman for the 1973 meeting of the American Society for Legal and Political Philosophy.

PIERRE BONASSIES, of the Faculty de Droit, Universite Aix-Marseille, will be a visiting professor during the fall semester, teaching one course in Comparative Law and another in the European Economic Community.

FAIRFAX LEARY, JR., professor of Law at the Temple University School of Law, will be Visiting William A. Schnader Professor of Commercial Law for the coming academic year, teaching courses in Consumer Law and Creditors’ Rights. He spent the past year in Washington serving as Ralph Nader’s adviser on consumer protection.

MIRJAN DAMASKA, who had been a visiting professor of law, has joined the full-time faculty. He formerly taught at the University of Zagreb in Yugoslavia. He came to the Law School in 1966-67 and again last year to teach comparative law. Next year he will teach criminal law.

Necrology

1909
RICHARD T. McSORLEY, Drexel Hill, Pa., March 14.

1910
J. ERNEST NACHOD, Glenside, Pa., February 16.

1916
HON. CHARLES A. WATERS, Margate, N.J., May 23.
BENJAMIN B. HOAR, Philadelphia, June 11.

1917
EDWIN A. LUKAS, Villanova, Pa., April 5.
PAUL E. THOMAS, Meadville, Pa., February 8.

1922
ARTHUR B. VAN BUSKIRK, Ligonier, Pa., April 6.
RAYMOND P. LEEHUIS, Erie, Pa., July 4.

1923
HON. GEORGE W. GRIFFITH, Ebensburg, Pa., March

1926
LEON SACKS, Philadelphia, March 11.

1927

1928

1933
EDWARD G. TAULANE, JR., Haverford, Pa., June 19.

1936
ROBERT G. KELLY, Wynnewood, Pa., February 20.

1937
RANDAL MORGAN, Chestnut Hill, Pa., July 4.

1948
HARVEY B. LEVIN, Philadelphia, May 7.

1957
RICHARD M. NEVILLE, Cork, Ireland, April 27, 1971.

1959
JOHN B. MAYBEE, Dover, Del., April 13.
The Law Review is now taking subscription orders for Volume 121. Representative articles and comments planned for the 6 issues of this volume include:

Sale of a Law Practice.
A Statutory Definition of Death.
"Constructive Concerted Activity" and Individual Rights: The Northern Metal—Interboro Split.
Retroactive Application of Ameliorative Criminal Legislation.
Nits, Grits and Soft Information in SEC Filings.

Why not join your many fellow alumni who have found the Review to be a valuable practical tool and one that offers stimulating insights into developing legal concepts and trends?

Please enter my subscription for Volume 121.

Name ....................................
Address ..................................

☐ Enclosed is my check for $12.
☐ Please bill me.

Return to: University of Pennsylvania
Law Review
3400 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104