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Assistant Dean Mooney Becomes Vice-President at Fairfield University

Christopher F. Mooney, '78, the Law School's Assistant Dean for Alumni Affairs since September 1978, accepted the invitation of Fairfield University, in Fairfield, Connecticut to become its Academic Vice-President. The appointment was effective July 1, 1980.

Dean James O. Freedman praised Assistant Dean Mooney for his "exceptional job in strengthening our alumni organization and in working with our graduate students. He leaves the Alumni Office immeasurably stronger than he found it. Alumni organizations now exist in more than a dozen cities... Alumni participation is at an all-time high."

Mr. Mooney expressed, in a letter to Dean Freedman, that he wished "to return to academic work and to deal once again with those problems of faculty and curriculum which occupied me in the past. The challenge of the job is compelling; and I feel that the time is right for me to undertake it."

We are grateful to Mr. Mooney for the extraordinary service he has rendered the Law School and extend him best wishes in the next stage of his remarkable career.

A Preliminary Progress Report on The Alumni Questionnaire

Last fall, the Law School mailed to all of its more than 6000 Alumni a questionnaire seeking detailed answers to a wide range of questions concerning their education at the Law School. We anticipated that we would be fortunate, given the length of the document and the kind of subjective answers invited, to recover ten percent of the questionnaires, but we were wrong. We have in fact passed the twenty percent mark, and are moving toward 1400 questionnaires completed and returned. There may still be some of you who have kept your questionnaires near the bottom of an ever-taller stack of papers; please complete it, for your experiences at and ideas about the Law School are important to us.

The volume of responses and their thoughtfulness have slowed somewhat the process of compiling and processing the information contained in the questionnaires. It is our hope that within a few months all of the answers can be converted into a computer-readable format and can be stored in a data base which can then, through the wonders of modern electronics, provide us with useful information about the Law School and about you, its Alumni. Most of the questions lent themselves to objective answers, and these are already in the process of being key-punched. Many of the questions, however, invited subjective prose responses. It will take a bit longer to translate these into a form for ready processing, but the task is already underway and will hopefully be completed by the end of the summer.

As soon as we can digest, study and interpret all (or useful portions of) this information, this will be communicated in future issues of The Law Alumni Journal. We are excited at the prospect. We are very grateful indeed for your support of the project and for your continuing interest in the Law School.

—Robert A. Gorman, Associate Dean

Professor Schwartz's Latest Publication

The booklet, Studying Law for Fun and Profit, by Benjamin Franklin and University Professor Louis B. Schwartz is another example of the renaissance of the legal profession, of Philadelphia, and of the University of Pennsylvania. In one aspect it is a unique and thoughtful orientation for law students towards their profession and the educational experience. In the other aspect, it is a light-hearted, enthusiastic personal tour of Philadelphia and environs. Professor Schwartz believes that "to be only a lawyer is to be half a lawyer," (p. 8) and that pride in one's own city and craft need not be parochial and simple.

The 1980 Roberts Lecture

Wade H. McCree, Jr., the Solicitor General of the United States, will deliver the 1980 Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture on September 24, 1980.

Judge McCree's Lecture, titled "Bureaucratic Justice and Early Warning," will be held in the Auditorium of the University of Pennsylvania Museum.

minded. He regards ancient Athens as the exemplar of intense intellectual activity in the context of intense civic commitment, producing a culture that has influenced the whole world for millennia.

Professor Schwartz reminds law students [p. 3] of famous poets (e.g., John Donne, Wallace Stevens, Archibald MacLeish), the novelists (e.g., Henry James, Kafka), the philosophers (e.g., Hume, Bentham), who were law trained, and reviews [p. 23] the remarkable range of activities engaged in by graduates of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He urges the law student to "stretch intellectual horizons and cultivate sensibilities," directs them to exploit the cultural resources of the City and to venture into the hinterlands, including the "beaches and Babylons of the Jersey Coast" and the "well-known suburbs of Philadelphia, New York City, and Washington." He dissects and prescribes for the common sources of discontent among law students [pp. 29 et seq.]: failure to excel in hard competition for grades, career doubts, domestic tensions, a feeling of being the victim of discrimination (p. 30), supposed law school bias in favor of conventional practice in big firms or giant corporations, etc.

Attorneys as well as law students may benefit from the discussion of "A Self-Image for Lawyers" at pp. 22-23:

Law students frequently have a poor professional self-image. There is an age-old, vulgar [but not entirely baseless!], view of lawyers as unprincipled, contentious, pettifogging, and mercenary. Much of this villainous caricature derives from the inescapably adversarial quality of much of a lawyer's work—he or she seems ready to offer services to either side and by the law of averages half of the clients will end up disappointed. How much better off our medical colleagues are! Their clearly identified opponents, illness and death,
always wear black hats. Their young patients almost always recover, whether because of or despite treatment. When their old patients die, nature, God, or the devil gets the blame. How easy it is for a farmer to be a "moral" man; he deals principally with soil, weather, weeds, pests and other non-human adversaries. Thus he is largely immune to the interpersonal pressure and temptations which are the lawyers' entire milieu.

Designed by Philadelphia commercial artist, Sylvia Barkan, the booklet is graced by striking photographs of the School and the City. It is available at $3.00 per copy from the Law School.

Pennsylvania and Paris II
As stated by Dean James O. Freedman, "a most joyous moment in the history of this University" took place on February 4, 1980.

University of Pennsylvania President Martin Meyerson and University of Paris II President, Jacques Robert, placed their signatures on an agreement of "educational cooperation," enabling the exchange of students and faculty between the French university and the Law School.

The two schools have been seriously discussing the "merger" since 1978—the University emissaries then being Law School Professor George L. Haskins and Pennsylvania Professor of Arabic and Oriental Studies George Makdisi, who were in contact with the then President of Paris II, Bertholdt Goldmann. The signing now cements a relationship to which Dean Freedman stated "we are obviously very committed. We, myself especially, intend to actively encourage members of the Faculty and exceptional students to take full advantage of this exciting opportunity."

The International Symposium in Jerusalem
Four members of the Penn Law School Faculty, along with members of the faculties of the Hebrew University, Tel Aviv University, the University of Paris II, and the University of Strasbourg, will participate in an international symposium in Jerusalem in May, 1981.

Professors Henry Hansmann, Daniel Segal, Louis B. Schwartz and Alan Watson will represent the School.

The New Center for Advanced Studies in Legal History
The University of Pennsylvania, in recognizing the special mission of history in a law school curriculum and the need for more humanistic education and the value of an historical perspective, has taken advantage of and has built upon the unique resources of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, through the creation of the Center for Advanced Studies in Legal History.

The Law School Faculty numbers among its members probably the most distinguished group of legal historians of any university in the country. George L. Haskins, Algernon Sydney Biddle Professor of Law, is an eminent scholar of both American and English legal history. Stanley N. Katz, Class of 1921, Bicentennial Professor of the History of American Law and Liberty at Princeton University, joins Pennsylvania every year as a visiting professor in legal history. The Center's new and first director for a three—year term, Alan Watson, was formerly Professor of Civil Law at the University of Edinburgh and is now a permanent member of our Faculty. He is widely regarded as the best younger historian teaching Roman law today. He has branched out into other areas of legal history, including comparative legal history and legal philosophy. Morris S. Arnold is principally an historian of Medieval English Law. The University is fortunate to have as an adjunct professor, the Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, author of In the Matter of Color, Race and the American Legal Process: the Colonial Period.

The new center will bring considerable expansion of the present curricular offerings in the field, and will foster further research in the Western legal tradition from Roman times onwards, encompassing medieval England and Europe, the Law of Reason Movement of the 17th and 18th centuries, the drive for codification in Europe and Latin America, and law in colonial New England and in the more civilian Southwest. Some studies, it is envisaged, will emphasize the relationship between law and society. Through the center, our teaching and research programs will be enriched by the participation of visiting scholars in residence and a visiting professor of legal history each year. Lecture series, annual conferences and summer seminars will bring the work of the Center to other Faculties within the University of Pennsylvania and to scholars outside the University.

1980 Keedy Cup Argument
The final argument of the 1980 Keedy Cup Competition will be held on Monday, November 17. The presiding Justice will be the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren E. Burger. His two colleagues on the Bench will be Justice Samuel J. Roberts, 31, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and Bernard G. Segal, 31.
Graduate Students—1979-80

Former Assistant Dean Christopher F. Mooney led our graduate students, many of them visitors from foreign lands, in a program of activities instituted to enhance their experiences in this country.

In addition to their exposure to both the Philadelphia judicial system and the District and Circuit Courts which take residence in the city, the students, together with Mr. Mooney, visited Washington and the United States Supreme Court.

Each year, this group of international lawyers engage in graduate study here at the Law School, enriching us with their backgrounds and experiences from other legal systems. The graduate program continues to grow as evidenced by the upwards of fifty students enrolled for the forthcoming 1980-81 year.

The Saturday Morning Forums

The Law Alumni Society instituted a new concept in the area of continuing legal education this past spring.

Assistant Dean of Alumni Affairs, Christopher F. Mooney, coordinated the Forums which were held at the Law School on two Saturday mornings in March and April.

The first Forum titled, "The Burger Court and the First Amendment," featured Law School Professor Paul Bender as the main speaker. He was joined by attorneys, Sheldon Albert and Burton Caine, both of Philadelphia, who were panelists.

At the second Forum, Professor Daniel Halperin, United States Deputy Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, spoke on "Taxation and Fringe Benefits" and then participated in a panel discussion with Mervin M. Wilf, '55, and David W. Brenner, a certified public accountant.

The O'Boyle Memorial Lecture

The annual Thomas A. O'Boyle Memorial Lecture was delivered by Arthur Fleischer, Jr., a leading practitioner-scholar in the capital market field, in March, at the Law School. His address was titled "The Role of the Director in Responding to Unsolicited and Unwelcomed Proposals: The Interrelationship of Law and Practice."

The lecture series was established as a memorial to Thomas A. O'Boyle by his friends and colleagues following his
death in 1973. Organized by the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Center for Study of Financial Institutions, of which Mr. O'Boyle was one of the founding members of the Advisory Board, the Lecture series is intended to bring distinguished practitioners to the Law School to deliver scholarly lectures in areas related to the Law and the world of business and finance.

The Black Alumni Directory

Three years of intense effort by members of the Law School's Black Students Union resulted in the first-time publication of a directory recording those black alumni who graduated from the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

The directory, in addition to offering the current whereabouts of black law alumni, "provides a communications medium between black alumni and present law students, career information resources, and the record of career advancement of the black alumni."

A ceremony celebrating the publication of the directory was held this past spring, honoring Sadie Tanner Mossell Alexander,' 27, the first black woman to graduate from the University of Pennsylvania Law School and the first black woman admitted to practice in the state of Pennsylvania. Also in attendance were Dean James O. Freedman, those members of the Law School Black Students Union instrumental in the directory's publication, Professor Ralph R. Smith—a moving force in the directory's conception and execution, and members of the Law School's Alumni Affairs Office.

Persons interested in securing a directory should contact Patricia Petty, '81, at the Law School.

The Dean and the Alumni

This spring Dean James O. Freedman actively continued to fulfill his promise to meet and to become personally acquainted with Penn Law Alumni.

The Dean attended the record number of reunions which were held by our quinquennial classes this spring. In February, he met with Alumni in the Scranton-Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania area. He was hosted by Pittsburgh Alumni in April and attended functions sponsored by Alumni in New York, Delaware, Boston, Chicago, and in the Philadelphia suburban areas of Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery counties in May. Dean Freedman also served as the principal speaker at many of these events. He was present at receptions held by Penn Law Alumni who were attending the Pennsylvania, New Jersey and American Bar Associations.

Quinquennial Class Gifts

On the recent anniversary of their reunions, the Classes of 1930, February 1949, 1954 and 1955 established funds which benefit the Law School in a variety of ways:

The Class of 1930—to honor its 50th Reunion—endowed the School with over $10,000 of unrestricted funds. The gift, presented to Dean Freedman for the School, is to be used at the Dean's discretion.

The Law School's new placement facilities are the result of the 50th Reunion Fund of the Class of February, 1949.

Upon its 25th Reunion, the Class of 1954 created The Legal Studies Seminar and Colloquium Fund which supports gatherings for Penn Law Faculty and other scholars engaged in the production of current legal research.

The Class of 1955 celebrated its 25th Reunion with the establishment of The Louis B. Schwartz International Conference Fund, a conference which would bring together world leaders, Law School and University Faculty members, Philadelphia lawyers, and state and local government officials to discuss significant international problems.

At the ceremony marking the publication of the Black Law Alumni Directory are, from left to right, Assistant Dean Christopher E. Mooney, Professor Ralph R. Smith, Dr. Sadie T. M. Alexander, '27, Dean James O. Freedman, Pat Petty, '81, and Reginald W. Jackson, '80.

Our Faculty at LaNapoule

As part of the agreement of educational cooperation to promote the collaboration of scholarly work made between the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Paris II, five of the Law School Faculty will participate at a conference at Paris II's villa at LaNapoule from October 1-7, 1981. Five scholars from Paris II and six from European universities will attend the conference as well. The sixteen participants will present papers to the conference which will then be published in two separate volumes.

Dean James O. Freedman and Professors Gerald E. Frug, George L. Haskins, Clyde W. Summers and Alan Watson will be the representatives of the Penn Law Faculty to the Conference.

The Edinburgh Conference

Six members of the Penn Law Faculty participated in a conference in conjunction with the law faculty of the University of Edinburgh this past May 20-27.

Professors Steven B. Burbank, Robert A. Gorman, Henry Hansmann, John O. Honnold, Ralph R. Smith and Clyde W. Summers were the Pennsylvania participants.
The Placement Office: A Renovated Facility to Satisfy New Demands
by John A. Terrill, '76

Editor's Note: University of Pennsylvania Law students will be returning this fall to a newly-expanded placement facility, designed to satisfy the increased flow of activity characteristic to the office over the past few years.

Made possible by the generous 30th Reunion gift of the Law School Class of February, 1949, the newly-enlarged structure, on the site of the original placement office, offers a larger reception-work area for students as well as separate offices for Director of Placement, Helena Clark and Assistant Director, Esther Cooperman.

John A. Terrill, '76, together with Linda A. Fisher, '75, co-chaired the Placement Committee of the Law School's Law Alumni Society. John Terrill's discussion with our placement directors and some personal research has resulted in the following report on the placement office and its future.

Over the past several years, the Law School Placement Office has experienced a dramatic growth in demand for its services and, thanks to the generosity of the Class of February, 1949, the placement office facilities have undergone a major expansion and renovation to accommodate this demand.

A number of factors have contributed to the increased demand, three of which stand out: increased law-related summer employment of first year students; constantly expanding demand for on-campus recruiting slots; and an increased case-load of Alumni who seek assistance in so-called "lateral hiring." In large part, these trends are attributable to the superb reputation of the Law School and an expanded recognition of the quality of our graduates.

The expansion of the on-campus recruiting program is a major factor in the need for more and better space. The number of employers seeking inclusion in our Fall program has risen 157% in ten years, to a total of 343 employers participating in 1979. Representing these employers, 556 recruiters conducted over 10,000 interviews.

To accommodate the massive job of coordinating the on-campus recruiting program, and to provide additional access to the library and research materials, the Facilities Development Department of the University began the expansion program in June, immediately after first year examinations were over.

The new facility has expanded along the same corridor where the original office was located. The total square footage has increased from 552 square feet to 892 square feet. Students will have much easier access to the library, and the reading area will triple in size. The office includes a separate reception area where recruiters will be met and briefed after they arrive on campus. This should improve the beginning of the interviewing day over the somewhat chaotic early morning scene which recruiters will remember. The new arrangement for staff offices affords greater privacy for conferences and counseling with students and alumni/ae.

The renovations will be completed by August 1st, just in time for a new season in which a further increase in the total number of employers interviewing on campus is expected.

Several other developments regarding the Placement Office have occurred over the past year. Each year, more and more Law School graduates seek resume and career counseling and "lateral hiring" guidance from the Placement Office. This year the Placement Office inaugurated a monthly newsletter which describes the jobs for experienced graduates which are listed with the office. The newsletter is available at a subscription rate of $10.00 per year, which will include ten issues.

The Law Alumni Society has also become increasingly active in connection with the placement process. Last Fall, Marshall Bernstein appointed Linda Fisher and me to co-chair the Alumni Placement Committee. Linda and I have been working with the Placement Office on several projects this year. During the on-campus recruiting season, alumni/ae recruiters were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning the students and interviewing facilities at the Law School. The results were tabulated and will serve as a valuable resource to the Placement Office. Most interviewers who responded were understanding about the lack of adequate interviewing facilities at the Law School. More importantly, they were favorably impressed with student preparation for interviews. The major concern raised by the respondents was that of students who do not show up at interviews. That concern was communicated to the Student Faculty Placement Committee, chaired by Professor Ralph Spritzer, and a policy is in the works for dealing with the problem.

A principal effort of the Alumni Placement Committee has been to solicit Alumni "resource persons" to provide information about the practice of law in their geographic areas and within their specialties. An initial mailing by Marshall Bernstein to Washington area Alumni resulted in 54 responses. These have been tabulated and are available to students. This initial solicitation has been followed up by requesting similar commitments from Law School graduates throughout the United States. The response is still coming in and is again very gratifying.

Helena Clark, Director of the Placement Office, Esther Cooperman, Associate Director, and the entire staff extend their thanks to the Alumni participating in these various projects and to the Class of February, 1949, for their generous gift to modernize the facilities. They also extend their invitation to Alumni visiting the Law School to drop in and see the new offices.
Featured Events

Law Alumni Day—1980

What do President of Haverford College, Robert B. Stevens, Dr. Sadie T. M. Alexander, Associate Dean Robert A. Gorman and Princess Ida have in common? Answer: They were all part of a very special event—Law Alumni Day, 1980—which was held this year on Tuesday, April 15.

The day’s schedule of activities began in the Great Hall of the Law School at 4:00 p.m. with the presentation of excerpts from the Law School Light Opera Company’s production of Princess Ida by Gilbert and Sullivan. Participants included gifted Penn Law students and Professors Morris Arnold, Paul Bender and Alan Cathcart, ’76. Professor Noyes Leech, ’48, who played trombone in the original presentations of the opera, was narrator.

At 5:00 p.m., the annual meeting was called to order by Marshall Bernstein, ’49, President of the Law Alumni Society. He offered the Society his annual report and then called on representatives of the quinquennial classes for reports on their reunion activities and the presentation of their class gifts. The Class of February, 1949 announced its 30th reunion gift, a Fund enabling the renovation of the Law School’s Placement office. The Legal Studies Seminar was created by the gift of the Class of 1954, while The Louis B. Schwartz International Conference Fund was endowed through the generous gift of the Class of 1955 to honor their 25th year since graduation from Law School.

Robert Kendall, Jr., ’55, the President of the Order of the Coif, was called upon to present that organization’s second Award of Legal Scholarship. This year, Associate Dean Robert A. Gorman was the recipient of this honor which recognized his “written contribution to quality legal scholarship.” The Award recognized Professor Gorman’s book, Labor Law, Unionization and Collective Bargaining.

The Law Alumni Society’s 1980 Distinguished Service Award was presented by Hon. Arlin M. Adams, ’47, to his long-time friend and colleague, Sadie T. M. Alexander, ’27, the first black woman to graduate from the University of Pennsylvania Law School. In a moving ceremony, Dr. Alexander was presented the Hsieh-chai goat sculpture and a scroll honoring “her distinguished service as dedicated lawyer, wise counselor, and outstanding leader.”
Haverford College President Robert B. Stevens delivering his address to the Law Alumni Day gathering.


The Nominating committee proposed the 1980-81 slate of officers: President, Marshall Bernstein, '49; First Vice-President, Bernard M. Borish, '43; Second Vice-President, Robert M. Beckman, '56; Secretary, Linda A. Fisher, '73; Treasurer, Richard L. Bazelon, '68. The Board of Managers—with terms expiring in 1983—were presented as: William H. Brown, III, '55; Richard C. Csaplar, Jr., '59; Murray S. Eckell, '59; William B. Moyer, '61; and Stephanie W. Naidoff, '66.

After cocktails and dinner, the speaker of the evening, noted legal historian and President of Haverford College, Robert B. Stevens, delivered an address on the present state of higher education and the areas in which he believes reform is needed:

There is the issue of tenure. Now I wish it to be noted, lest any of you

have friends at Haverford College, that I have a faculty meeting tomorrow and I am strongly in favor of tenure. Otherwise, I must say that while Haverford prides itself on its Quakerly traditions, all sorts of unquakerly things will be done and said to me. If one looks back at the 1950's, I will remember that one couldn't but be in favor of tenure. I remember the Yale Corporation making sabre-rattling noises about hiring law faculty who were thought to be politically radical. I remember the marvelous case where the University of Illinois fired an assistant professor of English who mentioned the word "free-love." It's an historical anachronism now, but we fought for tenure because we thought it was the right and proper thing. Tenure today, in a shrinking industry, is quite important.

Obviously we still need it. One has to bear in mind that by the year 2,000 the largest age group teaching in universities will be between 55 and 65. In that year, there will be more professors age 66 and over than there will be professors under 35. I hope to reach the age of 66 in the year 2,000 and so I have a vested interest in keeping all those under 35 from taking my job. Tenure is a question I think all of us have to address. It is going to be less important to the law school than it is in the university at large but for us to sit here and not realize the kind of problem we face is a very terrorizing.

We devotees of Newsweek and Time will know that everyone is talking about the loss of a generation of scholars. But it is a big generation. It is going to be a very depressed industry for a long while to come and yet I am arrogant enough to think that higher education, including the law schools, has made a remarkable contribution to this country. But, we are obviously going to have to respond more to the customers. We are going to be in a period when they are going to be a good deal more active in their demands. What we have to do, I think, is to strike a balance between satisfying the customers and defending our intellectual integrity. It will depend enormously upon the quality of alumni support, and I don't mean that in a financial sense—although I am sure Dean Freedman would not deny the importance of that. But it will depend very much on the kind of commitment those of you have to higher education and, particularly your commitment to the University of Pennsylvania Law School, which will determine what this School will look like by the turn of the century.

Mr. Stevens' speech was preceded by the following state of the Law School report presented by Dean James O. Freedman.
Remarks of Dean James O. Freedman on Law Alumni Day—April 15, 1980

This is an important day in the life of the Law School, not only because it is Law Alumni Day but because it is a day on which we choose to honor two very important people, Mrs. Sadie T. M. Alexander of the Class of 1927 and Professor Robert A. Gorman.

We honor Sadie Alexander for her extraordinary career at the Bar and for her contributions to public service. We honor Robert Gorman for his dedicated contributions to teaching and to scholarship. Together, Sadie Alexander and Robert Gorman represent that kind of excellence, that kind of devotion to craftsmanship and to scholarship, that kind of dedication to service, that ultimately is the vindication of a great Law School such as ours. Justice Holmes reminded us that we live by symbols. I think that a law school that can take as its symbols Sadie Alexander and Robert Gorman can be very proud of the mission it performs in society.

I want to talk with you tonight about some new programs that we are establishing at the Law School. As I have met with our alumni during the last year-and-a-half, I have sometimes been asked if I am going to talk about reform of legal education. That question always reminds me of the occasion upon which George Bernard Shaw was engaged in a public debate with an opponent who was thoroughly exasperated by Shaw’s powers of persuasion. As he lost point after point, Shaw’s opponent, in desperation, finally said, “At least you must concede that the proposal I advocate is a reform measure.” And Shaw is supposed to have replied, “Reform, Sir, do not speak to me of reform. Things are bad enough as they are!” So I don’t propose to speak to you tonight about reform. But I do propose to speak to you about change at the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

One of the enduring questions that any law school faces, indeed that any professional school faces, is how to justify its existence in a University devoted to higher learning, in a University devoted to liberal learning. That question is not a new one. It is now more than 50 years since Thorstein Veblen, in his book, The Higher Learning in America, called attention to the possibility that professional education was inconsistent with the proper goals of a university and that professional education, once it gained a place within a university, would soon drive out the liberal learning. Veblen warned that professional schools that taught marketplace skills would ultimately doom the pursuit of the higher learning in institutions of liberal education. The question that Veblen raised is obviously an important one, because law schools, like other professional schools, must justify their right to a place within a university setting if they are to play a proper role within that university.

When one thinks of the great tasks that the law faces, they are the tasks of bringing justice to a society, of bringing order to a society, of bringing decency and fairness to a society. Henry Adams, in seeking to understand the problems of his society, said, “From the cradle to the grave, this problem of running order through chaos, direction through space, discipline through freedom, unity through multiplicity, has always been and must always be the task of education, as it is the moral of religion, philosophy, science, art, politics and economy.” I wish that he had added law, because the tasks that law faces require an understanding of society which must be formed not only by what we learn as lawyers but by what we learn from many other disciplines as well.

This law school has always been devoted to interdisciplinary work. This is the law school, after all, in which Clarence Morris did his pioneering work on law in Imperial China. It is the law school in which George L. Haskins did his important work on the Massachusetts Bay Colony. It is a law school in which, if you look in our catalogue, you will see courses offered to our students on subjects as diverse as Frontiers of Economic Regulation, Experimentation With Human Beings, Racism and the American Legal Process, Socialist Law, Law and Psychiatry, and Federal Tax Policy.

This is also a law school in which students have an opportunity to take joint degree programs with five different disciplines elsewhere in the University. A student who enters this law school can graduate, if he or she wishes, with joint degrees in law and economics, law and city planning, law and public policy analysis, law and business administration, and law and middle eastern studies. Our tradition of interdisciplinary inquiry and of intellectual collaboration with the rest of the University is thus a strong one.

This year the faculty has moved to strengthen and extend that tradition in two significant ways. It has authorized, first, the creation of an Institute for Law and Economics which the Law School will sponsor jointly with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. And it has authorized, second, the creation of a Center for Advanced Studies in Legal History within the Law School. It is our hope in embarking upon these two new ventures to capitalize upon two areas in which this Law School and the University have great intellectual strength. We hope that we will be able to bring to this Law School scholars who will enrich the curriculum that we offer to our students and who will join with members of our faculty in teaching courses and seminars for our students. We hope, too, that we will be able to attract a small group of graduate students to do advanced work in the areas of economics and legal history.

We have also taken a series of important steps this year in still another area in which the Law School has long made important contributions—the area involving the wider world of international law. This is a law school in which important work of the greatest distinction has been done in public and
private international law, international trade law, Common Market law, and United Nations law. I speak, for example, of the contributions of Covey T. Oliver, Noyes E. Leech, John Honnold, and Louis B. Schwartz. This is a law school which has had between twenty and thirty foreign graduate students studying here every year, learning the ways of our legal system and bringing that learning back to their own countries. This is a law school which has regularly invited professors from foreign universities to teach on its faculty. This year, for example, we have with us, either teaching on the faculty or spending a sabbatical year with us as visiting scholars, law professors from universities in Frankfort, Jerusalem, Lublin, Seoul, Sydney, and Warsaw.

The faculty is now moving to extend our possibilities of collaboration with foreign scholars and foreign universities. During the next year-and-a-half, delegations from our faculty will be travelling abroad to participate in four academic conferences that the Law School is co-sponsoring: to Poznan for a conference on international trade; to Edinburgh for a conference with the Edinburgh Law faculty; to Jerusalem for a conference with the law faculties of Hebrew University and Tel Aviv [it may not surprise you that the Israelis chose as the subject for that conference, "Inflation and the Law"]; and to France for a conference with the law faculty of the University of Paris II on "The Rights of the Individual in Associations Public and Private."

I have great hopes that at each of these four conferences our faculty will meet foreign colleagues whom we will be able, in due course, to invite here as visiting professors. I hope, too, that opportunities for our students to pursue graduate studies in foreign universities will grow out of the contacts that our faculty develops at these conferences. And I hope that this law school will become more internationally visible and more deeply involved with an international community of scholars than we presently are.

In short, I hope that in the years ahead this law school will strengthen its traditional links with the rest of the University and nourish its relationships with the larger community of international scholars. These are goals that will enhance our capacity to educate lawyers of the highest quality and to prepare them adequately for the challenges our society faces.

I often reflect upon what seems to me the wisdom of an important statement by Alfred North Whitehead, who said, "The antithesis between a technical and a liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal and no liberal education which is not technical. That is, no education which does not import both technique and intellectual vision." I hope that this law school will always import to its students both technique and intellectual vision. And I hope that it will continue to train lawyers possessing the sense of craftsmanship, of scholarship, and of service that Sadie Alexander and Robert Gorman exemplify. If we do, I trust that this law school will have earned its place in this great University of higher learning.
The Black Law Alumni Dinner

The Black Law Students Union of the University of Pennsylvania Law School held its Third Annual Dinner on Friday, April 18, 1980.

This year, the students paid tribute to the Honorable Richard N. C. Nix, '24, formerly of the United States House of Representatives, for his long and distinguished career in service to this country. Congressman Nix’s son, the Honorable Robert N. C. Nix, Jr., '53, a Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, was in attendance and contributed to the evening with remarks and comments. The keynote speaker was the Honorable Robert Burke Johnson, '27, who was retired from the Supreme Court of New Jersey and is presently engaged in the practice law.

Frances Spurgeon, the Law School Admissions Officer, whose duties include handling financial aid and minority admissions, was also honored by the students at their dinner. Mrs. Spurgeon was awarded a painting in appreciation of her devotion to her work, especially with the Black Law Students Union.

Gail P. Wilson, '80, Chairperson of the Alumni dinner and her committee, were responsible for the success of this event which now promises to be another welcome Law School tradition.

Honorable Richard N. C. Nix, '24, addressing the gathering at the Black Law Alumni Dinner.

Frances Spurgeon, right, receiving an award of recognition from Brian Saunders, '80, at the Black Law Alumni Dinner.

Dean James O. Freedman with Congressman Richard N. C. Nix, '24, center, and his son, the Honorable Richard N. C. Nix, Jr., '53 at the Black Law Alumni Dinner sponsored by the Black Law Students Union.
Editor's Note: The controversy surrounding publication of The Brethren: Inside the Supreme Court, by Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong, brought about a Law School Symposium in which four of the School's Faculty addressed some of the issues raised by the book's content.

Professor Frank Goodman moderated the panel composed of Professors Stephen Burbank, a former clerk to Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, Virginia Kerr, a former law clerk to Justice Potter Stewart, and Ralph Spritzer, a highly-respected appellate advocate and a former Deputy Solicitor General of the United States. Professor Paul Bender, unable to attend due to illness, was also scheduled to participate.

What follows is an edited transcription of this discussion of The Brethren from the scholarly, the practical, and the insider's vantage along with some comments on the institution of the Supreme Court and the relationship between the Justices and their law clerks.

Professor Goodman: Our topic, as you all know, is the book that recently hit the bookstore and the headlines, The Brethren, by Bob Woodward and Scott Armstrong.

The book is, in brief, a description of the first seven terms of the Burger Chief Justiceship. In each of those terms, from 1969-1975, the authors discuss the principal decisions of the particular term from the inside, describing the deliberative process by which the Justices arrived at their majority, i.e. all of the internal discussions and negotiations, and the exchange of memos that led to the formation of the majority.

The authors say that they relied upon 175 law clerks for the information contained in the book. By my arithmetic, there were, in fact, 275 law clerks altogether during the period in question so that 60% or more apparently talked, in one degree or another, to Messrs. Woodward and Armstrong. In addition, they state, with respect to every chamber of every Justice for each of the years involved, that their reliable sources included at least one person and, in many instances, as many as three or four persons from the Justices' chambers.

Considering that each Justice has a total of five employees—three law clerks, one secretary and one messenger, then to have three or four reliable sources, signals what might be called massive leakage or massive overstatement.

The reason for writing the book is stated almost immediately in the introduction and, I think, bears passing along to you. The authors say that for the nearly 200 years in which the Court has operated, it has made its decisions in absolute secrecy, handing down its judgements in formal written opinions. No American institution has so completely controlled the way it is viewed by the public. The Court's deliberative process, its internal debates, tentative positions taken by the Justices, preliminary votes, and various drafts of written opinions, negotiations, confrontations and compromises is hidden from public view. And because its members are not subject to periodic reelection but are appointed for life, the Court is less disposed to allow its decision-making to become public. That is the principal rationale offered by the authors for writing this inside story of the Court.

Now let me suggest that the book raises issues on at least three levels which, I hope, will be addressed in our discussion today. First of all, there is the question: Is it true? Can we rely upon the information contained in the book for an accurate picture of the Court's operation? Secondly, assuming the accuracy of what we are told, to what extent does the information given us tend to change our picture of the Court and, in particular, to discredit the Court? In other words, what questions are raised about the propriety of the Court's actions? The third set of questions are of an ethical nature. What are the justifications for the large-scale breach of what has traditionally been regarded as the confidentiality of the Court? To what extent was it improper or damaging for the sources to disclose what they did to the authors and to what extent was it inappropriate and/or damaging for the authors, in turn, to disclose it to the public? Those are among the questions that I hope we will be discussing.

The format that we have chosen for this panel is as follows: Each of the discussants will give his/her insights about the book and then there will be a brief period of interchange between them. The discussion then will be opened to the audience for questions or comments.

Our first speaker, Professor Ralph Spritzer, is a graduate of the Columbia Law School. He graduated in 1940 and went into the U.S. Army. Once out of the service, he went to work for the Department of Justice, winding up in the solicitor general's office. That office, which most of you know, handles all of the government's litigation in the Supreme Court. After a brief period as General Counsel to the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Spritzer returned to the solicitor general's office, as the First Assistant, the Deputy Solicitor General, and he served in that capacity until 1968—with a brief interlude during that period in which he served as acting Solicitor General. During his period with the government, Mr. Spritzer earned a reputation as being perhaps one of a small handful of the finest appellate advocates either in or out of government. He came to Penn in 1968 and, since then, has been professing criminal law and antitrust law. So he has had plenty of opportunity to observe the Court, if not from a law clerk's eye-view, then certainly from an advocate's eye-view and a commentator's eye-view.

Professor Spritzer: Let me start by trying to say what I think the book does well. I think it does very well in giving a sense of the decision-making process as it works within the Court. Perhaps one isn't confident as to everything that is said, because much of the discussion of how a Justice tried to achieve this, or how another Justice felt a certain way—does depend upon the recollections of the law clerks and the accuracy of their reports. Much of what they say may be affected by the passage of time. Some may be affected by the sense—at least on the part of some law clerks—that they are really more important in the process than they, in actuality, are. A minority of law clerks have more than the usual touch of arrogance that a law graduate develops [laughter]. Even though there may be inaccuracies, exaggerations, and a good bit of dramatic license on the part of the author, explaining what Mr. Justice Powell thought at such and such a moment—or what Mr. Justice Rehnquist said to his law clerk, one does have a sense that the book is fundamentally accurate in giving an account of how many opinions got to be shaped in the way that they did emerge. For example, there is a long section on the Charlotte v. Mecklenburg desegregation case. If one reads that opinion, one has a sense that the Justices were pulling in a good many different directions, that it was written by more than one person, and that there are parts of it that don't seem to fit with others. From the collective memories of those who worked on the case as clerks, one gets an account of what the different pressures were and who was pushing or
pulling in which direction. I think this account of the process is persuasive, interesting, and helpful to a student of the Court, especially in those instances where the authors had, in addition to the various recollections of law clerks, some of the documentation. For example, in the Nixon tapes case, the authors had the benefit of draft opinions that were successively circulated and one can see the emerging pattern—the changes that took place over the course of several drafts. One finds in the book, from this standpoint, a way of getting understanding as to how the collegial process works and how the Court manages, perhaps with considerable strain in some instances, to get a consensus.

Don't expect to find in the book any deep analysis of the issues in the cases. The issues are identified—Mr. Justice so-and so was concerned about this or that—but there is certainly no attempt at a thoroughgoing analysis. Nor does one get much sense of the philosophies of the different Justices. The authors, of course, are not lawyers themselves—and it is probably best that they concentrate on telling how the process works. There are no full, coherent pictures of the Justices' personalities; rather, there are vignettes illustrating their personalities and their attitudes towards particular issues which face them as Justices.

To what extent is there danger that there is distortion or misrepresentation? Let me cite one instance. In connection with a case called Moore v. Illinois—a case which had to do with the application of Brady v. Maryland (whether the prosecution in that case had suppressed certain exculpatory information that might have been of use to the defense), the majority of the Court concluded that the information which had not been given to the defense was not really material and did not affect the result. There was a dissent by Mr. Justice Marshall and, for a time, it appeared that the result might be very close. Indeed, as it turned out, it was a 5-4 decision. Mr. Justice Brennan joined the majority in this instance, and Armstrong and Woodward tell us that Justice Brennan really joined the majority because Justice Blackmun was writing the majority opinion and he, Justice Brennan, found it important at that stage, when several other important cases in which he was interested were about to come down at the end of the term, to maintain his good relations and his favor with Justice Blackmun. So he hesitated to dissent in order to achieve that objective in other cases. I suppose this is perhaps the most
serious charge made against any Justice—the allegation that Justice Brennan voted against his convictions in a criminal case in order to gain something in the disposition of other cases. In the course of describing the incident, the authors say that a clerk from Justice Marshall's office went to one of Justice Brennan's clerks and asked him to talk to the Justice to see if he couldn't bring him around to Justice Marshall's point of view. The authors say that the Brennan clerk went to his Chief and suggested to him that Justice Marshall was right in his view of the facts. The authors then say that the clerk emerged shaken when Justice Brennan indicated that he was going to adhere to his plan to vote with the majority—with Justice Blackmun. Well, Anthony Lewis, who reviewed the book in The New York Review of Books undertook to check this out. He spoke to the men who had served as Brennan's clerks during that term and one of them said that yes, he had indeed spoken to his Justice and tried to persuade him. He denied that he had emerged "shaken." He also denied, as did the other two Brennan clerks, that the Justice had at any point indicated that he would depart from his true convictions. Indeed, the clerk said that Justice Brennan had told him he had read the record carefully and was convinced that Justice Blackmun was right. Lewis then spoke to clerks from other offices to find out if any of them had heard rumors or reports to the effect that Justice Brennan had cast his vote for ulterior reasons. None of the clerks was able to report any such instance or recollection of it. When Lewis taxed Woodward and Armstrong with this information, their reply was, "Well, we didn't say we got the information from the law clerks. It may have been from other sources." Inasmuch as sources often are not cited—and this is true of many of the reports that one finds in the book—one is left in the position of not knowing how to judge the book's reliability and accuracy.

I would like to say a word about how the Court comes off. The newspapers, perhaps, give the impression that the lid has been torn off and now we see that, like other institutions, the Court is far from perfect. But, by and large, it doesn't seem to me that the Court comes off badly. If one approaches the matter believing that Justices are removed from all pressures and all concerns of the world and that the process is pure, then certainly one will be disappointed because it is apparent that there is negotiation and there is accommodation.
In only occasional instances, and then only if the authors are accurate, do the Justices appear to fall seriously short of the mark.

I do hope that Steve Burbank will speak about the function of the Chief Justice, particularly in connection with the exercise of the assignment power, because if there is an arch villain in the Law School, first in his class, in 1973 and then clerked for a year with Justice Robert Braucher of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. He then became a law clerk to Chief Justice Burger. After a year of doing that, he came to the University of Pennsylvania as its General Counsel and, simultaneously, as a part-time member of this Faculty. In 1979, he became a full-time member of the Faculty. Steve has law clerked for the only member of the Court who, in my view, came off in the book unambiguously badly. May I turn the floor over to the counsel for the defense (or the prosecution— if the authors are defendants).

Professor Burbank: From the beginning, one of the lessons that I have drawn from The Brethren is that those who are most helpful with the press are least likely to suffer and vice versa.

I would like to raise and state my views on some of the questions that I see coming out of the book. Very many of these questions are not original—but I do think that some of them are important. I hope that law reviews at this School and at others will take the opportunity offered by the publication of The Brethren to focus on some of the issues, because I think they have implications for the future of the Court that are rather important.

One set of issues about which I am not qualified to speak has to do with the responsibilities of the authors of a book in doing a number of things that I think were done in The Brethren. What, for instance, are the responsibilities of authors to make their sources identifiable? Do these responsibilities differ between persons who are describing events as they unfold and authors who are writing history? The Brethren is, after all, a history. The authors were very careful not to take their investigative work forward beyond the 1975-76 term because of concern that their work might affect cases that are before or soon coming up to the Court.

What are the responsibilities of the authors of a book such as this in using information, some of which—if we are to believe the authors—has been stolen? One just doesn't remove papers from the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Woodward is reported to have responded, when he was questioned about how he acquired information, that "the Pentagon Papers case settled that issue." Well, you and I know that the Pentagon Papers case only settled whether the government could enjoin that particular series of publications. The question of whether the media would be liable for receiving stolen property was not answered. I think this question deserves some thought. Also, what are the responsibilities of the authors of a book in attributing motives and ideas to a person—particularly a person with whom the authors have not spoken and who, in fact, has resolutely refused to cooperate?

Another relevant set of issues—ones which I have had to struggle with—concern the responsibilities of a law clerk. These responsibilities, as far as I know, have not been well-defined. There is a rather meager literature on law clerks—a few articles, a few symposia. I think the publication of The Brethren calls out for a scholarly, thorough treatment of the ethical responsibilities of a law clerk. What information that comes into the law clerk's possession is properly regarded as confidential? Does the Code of Professional Responsibility imply that a Justice is the functional equivalent of a client? Judge [Ruggero J.] Aldisert [U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit], in directions that he gives to his law clerks, says that the judge-law clerk relationship is as sacred as the lawyer-client or the priest-penitent relationship. But if one believes that, what are the implications? In the case of Supreme Court law clerks, one is dealing with a branch of the United States Government. Should the freedom to reveal information be greater, lesser than, or the same as one would exercise in dealing with a traditional client?

These issues were of some concern to me because Mr. Woodward called when he was working on the book asking to interview me. I knew that he was going to call because other clerks whom he had interviewed had contacted me. We had some discussion of what my response should be. I had a great deal of difficulty in my own mind deciding whether or not I wanted to talk to Mr. Woodward. There are many who believe that law clerks, including former law clerks, should not talk to the press about the Court and the Justices. I understand that view, particularly when one considers putting together a former law clerk and an investigative reporter of the quality of Mr. Woodward. In that case, one is really dealing with unequal capacities. [laughter] I think that many people have good reason to want to avoid that sort of a meeting. Mr. Woodward is very clever. He knows his business and is used to getting information out of more closed-mouth people than law clerks generally are. [laughter] However, particularly because I did know something about the book in its formative stages and what it was likely to do to my former boss [Chief Justice Warren E. Burger], I felt that I would be serving neither him nor the institution well if I did not speak to Mr. Woodward at all. So, I said yes.

Of course, once that barrier was crossed, lines had to be drawn. Should there be a distinction between what one can talk about while serving as a law clerk and what one can talk about after having completed service? I thought about the lines that should be drawn and felt that, surely, I ought to be able to talk about information that is in the public domain—information about the Supreme Court that is in Stern and Gressman on Supreme Court practice, or information that is in law reviews which Woodward and Armstrong might not come upon. I felt that I could talk about those things. I also felt that I could discuss the general personality traits of the Justices and their general work habits, since such information could be gained from those not in a confidential relationship with them. Then I came to the decision that I would be willing to talk about information the disclosure of which—even though it was gained in the context of a confidential relationship—would not be harmful to the Chief Justice, to the institution of the Supreme Court, or to the law clerk-Judge relationship. As an example, I felt free, when Mr. Woodward asked me, to elaborate on my general views of the Chief Justice, which are favorable as a person. I do not view the Chief Justice as the pompous, arrogant, awful man that many say he is. Some specifics I gave in defending my judgment had to do with the Chief Justice's treatment of Justice Douglas in his last illness, which forced him to leave the Supreme Court. For instance, Chief
Justice Burger personally supervised the construction of ramps for Justice Douglas. I was convinced in the end that, by telling Mr. Woodward of such incidents, I would better serve my Justice. And I was not worried that he would run with this and somehow be misled to paint a wonderful, rosy picture of the Chief Justice.

There is very little room for disagreement about the fact that a great number of people broke confidences and provided information without restrictions. Why did that happen? Someone asked me if it was simply the fact that the law clerks are arrogant little bastards and, therefore, felt free to talk about anything they wanted. Well, a certain number of law clerks for the Supreme Court have been arrogant little bastards for all time. That hasn't changed. And yet, the record of the Supreme Court in preserving its confidences over the years is pretty good. So I don’t think that that fact alone, whatever one thinks of law clerks, is really the answer. I think a combination of factors was at work. By the time this book was written, we had passed Watergate and were accustomed to the investigative journalism that was a by-product of that era. We were also accustomed to a general attitude that government in the sunshine is the best type of government. Another influence, or lack of influence, was the idea of “professional responsibility,” which was just beginning to rise high in the public consciousness and in the consciousness of the profession. As I pointed out, the norms of professional ethics governing law clerks have never been clear.

Perhaps the most important influence, and one that has been discussed in most reviews of the book, has to do with the changing nature of the institution. The Supreme Court is quite a different institution from the time when Dean Acheson and other people, who have written and talked of the law clerk-justice relationship, served as clerks. In those days, there was one law clerk who worked very closely with a Justice and who had a relatively unharrassed life. The crunch began in the forties when the number of cases which the Court had to decide to hear began to rise. It was at that time that an increase to two law clerks occurred. More recently, there has been an increase to three and four law clerks in some chambers. The result, of course, is that the relationship between a given law clerk on the Supreme Court and a Justice is much different than it used to be. One has far less time to spend with one’s Justice. Two or three other law clerks are vying for the Justice’s time. And that Justice has a thousand things to do and very little time to spend with each individual clerk. The result is that the simple personal relationship is far more distant than it used to be. To the extent that it was a close relationship which cemented the understanding of confidentiality, the cement is no longer present. At the same time, I think, that has exacerbated the tendency, which Professor Spritzer referred to, in some clerks, to think that they really are the judge. When one is out there alone working on one-third or one-quarter of the Justice’s business—and Justices differ on the amount of supervision given to their law clerks—there is a tendency to think of the product as it develops as one’s own. So, I think that a number of forces, grouped under the heading of “an overworked Supreme Court,” were at play, and these forces probably have been one factor in making law clerks feel freer to talk about these matters than former clerks have been.

I have already told you one lesson to be drawn which is that he who is most helpful to the press is least likely to be burned. A second, more serious lesson, I think, is that we need more books—not like The Brethren—but more which are written specifically with the lay-public in mind—and which accurately demystify the institution of the Supreme Court. I don’t think The Brethren will ruin the Supreme Court as an institution by any means. I think it will cause some problems in relationships among Justices. I think it will cause some problems in the relationships between Justices and their law clerks. One of the most disturbing aspects of the book to me, however, is how it misrepresents—through selectivity—“the business” of the Supreme Court. And that’s not very puzzling. It’s the job of journalism and of the media to pick things that they think are going to sell. And the cases that were picked in The Brethren are the big, sexy, important cases. What the reader doesn’t see and what the reader is likely to miss are the run-of-the-mill, often very important, cases—three-quarters of which are not even touched upon in this book and yet which take up so much of the Justices’ time. And finally, it would be possible to go through this book and
not realize that Chief Justice Burger is Chief Justice of the United States. He is required to, and does, spend at least 30% of his time on the business of the Federal Courts—very important business indeed. One would never know this from reading *The Brethren* because he is treated just like the Associate Justices who have only one responsibility.

**Professor Goodman:** Our final speaker is Professor Virginia Kerr, who graduated from our Law School in 1977—very near the top of the class. She spent a year as law clerk to Justice Sidney Schreiber of the New Jersey Supreme Court and then, last term, as law clerk to Justice Potter Stewart. She was not a clerk during the period covered by this book, but she was the assistant to one of the Justices who was then sitting. She comes to our Law School after that clerkship.

**Professor Kerr:** I think that this book might become *The Valley of the Dolls* of literature on the Supreme Court. (laughter) It is written in a very catchy style, it is highly anecdotal and I, as someone who has worked on the Court just last term, found it difficult to put down. To someone who has served as a law clerk, it is a compelling book and, indeed, anyone who is a practicing lawyer or who is interested in the decision-making process on the Court, would find it illuminating. What the book does is really personalize the process. As Professor Spritzer says, there is a great deal of discussion of what Mr. Justice White thought of this, how Mr. Justice Stewart reacted to a particular story that was brought into his chambers, and so forth. Consequently, it is very readable. Yet, precisely because of the fiction-like quality of the narration it seems somewhat suspect. The question about the book's accuracy is a difficult one to discuss. I am not sure whether the process on the whole is really fairly reflected in this book because if, in fact, every case were given the kind of close attention that is described, I am sure the Court would not get its work done. I think that there is a certain amount of distortion that comes from the between-the-lines notion that there is something evil going on. The personality of the Chief Justice is scrutinized extensively and one turns the pages waiting, in vain, to find the "smoking gun." A careless reader then might assume that, in fact, something substantial had been revealed but, in my opinion, that is not the case. The comments on the assignment power are, of course, provocative; but then, when the accuracy of facts is questionable, those comments are difficult to evaluate.

The "evil" innuendos in this work are, in my mind, simple distortion. I suppose the authors proceeded with the notion that the Court really has been damaged as an institution by the arrival on the Court of the Nixon appointees. There is a sense that Nixon, in some way, was successful in subverting to the Supreme Court as an institution. I think if one goes back over time and reads what is available on the members of the Supreme Court, it is very easy to attack that notion. Recently a book has been written about the *Dred Scott Case* by a fellow named Darrenbach. He quotes a number of comments about Chief Justice Taney, described as having an infernal, apostolic manner. Someone likened Taney to the Pope and said that he was always speaking *ex cathedra.* Taney was criticized because he could not achieve compromises on the Court, as evidenced by the number of separate opinions. When one reads those comments about Taney, it is striking to see how similar they are to the comments made in *The Brethren* about Chief Justice Burger—be they accurate or inaccurate. I think it is probably fair to say that all along we have had a Court composed of nine personalities. The Justices are, to be sure, "Justices." But they are also human beings, albeit ones who operate in a rarified environment. The book examines the Justices through a magnifying glass, and imperfections obviously are easy enough to find. The book suggests that this is somehow remarkable, and insodoing, goes too far toward the titillating side of things, which is why the "Valley of the Dolls" analogy seems apt.

I am not intrigued by the question about the propriety of the disclosures made by the law clerks. I am glad that I was not subjected to an interview. My position about my own work last year is that it should remain confidential. I see no reason, however, why law clerks should refrain from making general comments on the Court as an institution. Naturally, the line between appropriate comment and inappropriate disclosure of confidential information is not always a distinct one. I would not like to have to walk that line in a cat and mouse interview with the press. However, I do not think that the proper clerk-justice role, or the issue of clerk confidentiality, is one of great national significance. It is, no doubt, a question of substantial interest to former, future and present clerks themselves—but I don’t find that aspect of this book one of the more significant ones. In my views, the problem with the sources of the book is not that they are not identified, but that the information received from them is not scrutinized very well. The story presented is, thus, bad history and bad anthropology. As Professor Burbank indicated, the clerks tend to form a closed society and their collective and individual perceptions are not necessarily "the word" on what is going on. In fact, probably in lots of instances, the clerks have no idea of what is going on, because Justices don't tell them or they get only part of the story from the Justice. The book's piecing together methodology does not necessarily reflect the whole picture. In sum, Woodward and Armstrong seem to have relied too heavily on the anecdotes that they collected and to have concentrated on stringing them together in an engaging narration, in lieu of the harder but more meaningful task of evaluating the anecdotes in the context of the institutional structure.

**Professor Goodman:** At this point, I would like to throw the discussion open to the group and we hope, through dialogue and discussion, can get to some of the nitty-gritty issues raised in the book.

**Question:** Mr. Burbank, about what was exposed in reference to the assignment power. That struck me as one of the most shocking parts of the book. The book alleges that the Chief Justice would withhold his vote in order to be able to withhold the assignment. Regardless of what you may think about this, it sounds like dirty pool to me.

**Professor Burbank:** I am not free to talk about this matter—but I am happy to tell you that I don't know anything about it anyway, because one of the things that this particular Chief Justice did not do was talk about the conference AT ALL. He regarded assignments as his particular prerogative and he did not share it with his clerks, so even if I knew or were inclined to tell you, I can't.

**Professor Goodman:** I should like to explain to the audience what is being attributed to the Chief Justice. Perhaps the most damaging allegation made against any of the Justices, is the repeated allegation that the Chief Justice manipulated his vote in order to make assignments of who would write opinions. And in some instances, indeed, even
without doing that, he broke the existing rules of the Court concerning assignment so that he could control who wrote the opinion. The established rule is that the Chief Justice makes the assignment of the opinion in all cases in which he is in the majority. If the Chief Justice is in the minority on an issue, then the Senior Associate Justice who is in the majority makes the assignment. But there were instances, apparently, so it is said, in which the Chief Justice tried to make the assignment even in cases in which he was not voting with the majority. He was also accused of withholding his vote in some cases until the last minute so that he could put himself in the majority, if need be, and thereby be able to make the assignment to someone who would presumably write an opinion less strong or significant in support of the view of which he disagreed. This is the criticism that was made.

Steve has pleaded the fifth on it—or ignorance as the case may be. It seems to me a very, very serious charge if true....

Professor Burbank: Now wait a second. (laughter) Since you summarized Woodward and Armstrong on that point, I think you ought to do it accurately. (laughter) In fact, there are a number of allegations about the assignment power—some of which, I think, viewed objectively, are more serious than others. First, Woodward and Armstrong seem to believe that the Chief Justice changes his votes and that he may do that in order to get an assignment advantage. Published histories and biographies of Justices of the Supreme Court indicate that other Chief Justices of the Supreme Court have done exactly the same thing. Whether or not it is done for some evil purpose or because of indecision, is unclear. We do know that Justices change their minds about cases all of the time. And it would be a dreadful thing for the institution if they did not. By the time they sit down and take an initial vote on the case, they really don't have that much information about it. They've seen a petition or a jurisdictional statement, they have seen whatever work their clerks have done on a case, and they have heard lousy oral arguments, generally (except in Professor Spritzer's case and a few others). (laughter) It is only after they get down, with the help of their clerks, to do the serious research that is involved in writing an opinion, that they can tell whether their preliminary impression of the case is a good one.

The more serious allegation is that the Chief Justice voted where his heart did not, in fact, lie; or that, even if he voted in the minority, he attempted to make the assignment. So there are a number of levels of charges made, and they would be very difficult to establish, it seems to me, without being able to pry into the Chief Justice's head. And he is very close-mouthed about matters like that. But I agree to the seriousness of those charges. I also happen to agree, however, with Professor Spritzer that the most serious charge in the book is not leveled against the Chief Justice, but rather against Justice Brennan—the far more serious charge of trading votes when a man's freedom was at stake.

**Question:** Professor Kerr, I wonder if you can comment on how influential the clerk is on the Court?

**Professor Kerr:** I can say that I had no power whatsoever. The clerk-Justice relationship varies depending upon the Justice. Certainly there are law clerks who have exaggerated notions of their influence on the Court. Clerks are obviously important, not simply because they are the primary legal researchers for the Justices but also because they are sounding boards. Just as the clerks, in theory, are not supposed to discuss pending cases with persons outside of the Court—so are the Justices precluded from talking about very important issues and matters with anyone other than clerks or other Justices. So the dialogue that goes on in chambers is an important one. I doubt that law clerks really ever know how influential they are. They are certainly influential to the extent that they are able to express an opinion to a Supreme Court Justice about a pending case. I think I'll pass to Professor Burbank.

**Professor Burbank:** I agree with you that it really depends upon the chambers. One way of answering the question is to recount a little anecdote: Justice Rehnquist, after having clerked for Justice Jackson, in 1957, wrote a rather shrill article in *U.S. News and World Report* saying that liberal law clerks were having a terrible effect on their Justices, with the suggestion that they had far too much power.
Justice Rehnquist was at Princeton after having become "Justice" Rehnquist, he became involved in a discussion with some students. One student admitted, sheepishly, that he had not read Justice Rehnquist's 1957 article about the power of law clerks, and Justice Rehnquist is alleged to have replied, "Well, that's all right. You didn't miss much. Like most young men, I had an exalted view of my own importance."

If this were a serious book about the institution—or one designed to answer the type of questions that we ask, it is inconceivable that Justice Rehnquist would occupy as small a place as he does in this book. Whether one agrees with him or not, he is perhaps the single most energetic, and certainly one of the most intelligent Justices on the Supreme Court. He is also perhaps the most committed Justice to certain points of view, and should occupy a very large place in such a book. The reason, I believe, that he does not occupy a large place in this book is the fact that he is an extremely popular Justice. Everyone likes him. The liberal law clerks come to the Supreme Court prepared to find some sort of a dragon—with forked tongue and tail—and, instead, they meet this very friendly, unpretentious, open person—who is, in contrast by the way with some of his colleagues—one about whom it is very difficult to say nasty things. And he or not, he is perhaps the single most intellectually important—and, consequently, the most dangerous—Justice on the Supreme Court. He plays a far larger role—as there are, of course, idealized. I do not think, for the public to know concerning what goes on behind the scenes in the Court and its competence emerges from it.

Professor Goodman: First let me say that I came to this book with a strong predisposition against it, and with strong traditionalist views about what is proper for the public to know concerning what goes on behind the scenes in the Court and what is proper to be disclosed. I must say that, after having read it, I came away with a much more favorable impression of Justice Rehnquist, from his colleague's estimate of his ability, than one might have had without having read the book. **Question:** What do you think of the book, in general, and what picture of the Court and its competence emerges from it?

Professor Goodman: Sometimes Justices White and Blackmun were also people who could be attracted to the center on particular decisions. The last phrase in the book, I think, conveys to me what might be one of the book's themes: "The center was in control."

Justice Stewart seems to regard Justice Rehnquist as a centrist—not in the sense that his votes put him there, but more in the sense that his analyses in the circulated memos were extremely useful to the members of the center. They had great respect for his analyses and waited to read them, before taking their final positions. So one comes away with a much more favorable impression of Justice Rehnquist, from his colleague's estimate of his ability, than one might have had without having read the book.

**Professor Burbank:** Somewhat like a Harvard Law Review chart, 

Professor Goodman: Yes, and I think you will find that about four or five Justices raised questions or at least are said to have questioned both the intellect and the industry of Justice Marshall, although both the Justices and the authors have a lot of good things to say about Marshall's understanding of life and his zealous defense of civil liberties. By and large, the other Justices come out pretty well, I think. Stewart certainly does; Powell is very respectfully treated; Rehnquist is surprisingly so.

Professor Burbank: I think we ought to talk about that. I did mention earlier that Justice Rehnquist had a relatively small role in the book. In spite of this, he really did come off quite well, and I think we ought to pursue why.

Professor Goodman: Maybe it is because those closest to the press are least likely to be burned. In any case, Brennan comes out with plusses and minuses—but, on the whole, a strong Justice. Holdovers of the Warren Court are, of course, idealized. I do not think, however, that one gets a negative picture of this Court on either an intellectual or on moral grounds. And I think there is hardly any episode in the whole book which brings the Supreme Court into disrepute.

**Professor Clarence Morris** (from the audience): I would like to make one statement. Looking a long way back to when I graduated from law school, I don't remember if there were any law clerks who were law school graduates. There may have been one. The clerks then consisted of the nine old men. And among the nine old men, the one who took the first clerk, if I remember, from a
Professor Burbank: It was Horace Gray.

Professor Morris: How long back does that go?

Professor Burbank: 1882. He was the only one—and Holmes was the only one for a while after that.

Professor Morris: Well, it does not say in the Constitution that the Supreme Court Justices have to take their clerks from Harvard, Yale, Penn and Columbia. It does not say that in the statute book. And if enough of these books like *The Brethren* are written, and they get under the Court's skin enough—you can look forward to a time when the United States Supreme Court may not have law students as their clerks.

Professor Burbank: Where will they get them?

Professor Morris: I can't look forward that far—but certainly there are places where they can get older, more-experienced people. And certainly it is possible for them to develop a more selective process in getting people. I do think this book might be the beginning of a kind of clerk irresponsibility which may change greatly the character of the clerkship selection process.

Professor Spritzer: I think the book is informative largely in terms of giving a sense of how the collegial process of decision-making works. The authors have done an unusually effective job of reporting and taking countless bits of information, and then piecing them together in a mosaic to illustrate the manner of the process. That they do more effectively, I think, than the biographers of Brandeis or Frankfurter have done in the past. Certainly, other biographies which have drawn on a single Justice's papers or diaries give one some sense of the process. However, from my point of view, giving a fuller and more detailed sense of the decision-making process is the one prime contribution of the book.

Professor Goodman: I would just like to say that I deem the book rather unique in a particular way. I think, and indeed I might say Anthony Lewis, in his review of it in *The New York Review of Books*, emphasized that the book does something that is totally different from what anyone has done before with the Court. The authors have literally described the detailed negotiations and behind-the-scenes interplay with the Justices on virtually ALL of the important cases in a seven-year period. There are very, very few books—biographies or histories, for example—that have accomplished that, even in retrospect, on the basis of published material. With respect to a very few cases—like Mason's biography of Stone or the Frankfurter reminiscences or Alex Bickel's unpublished decisions of Brandeis—they don't come as close as this one with respect to the cases discussed in the book. Here we are talking about present members of the Court, of recent cases, and of information that does not come out of written sources but comes, in great volume, from the mouths of participants. I can't think of any book of history about an institution that has done anything like this.

**Question**: Although *The Brethren* presents a comprehensive account of the interplay between the Justices, if one looks at Frankfurter's diaries, one finds some places where there are eight pages right out of a conference.

Professor Goodman: Yes.

Frankfurter told what he knew. But, in *The Brethren*, one is told, with respect to many of these cases, what each one of the Justices was thinking at a given time.

I would like to raise one question, however. What damage is this book likely to do to the Court and in what ways? One problem which has been suggested is that Judges will now clam up, not only with one another, but also with their law clerks. One can certainly see how that might occur. I was impressed, however, with something that Professor Kerr has said: How would the Court be damaged if, in fact, the Judges might not be as informative to their clerks as they have been in the past? The usual fear with respect to confidentiality is that if what superiors disclose to subordinates is given to the press, the subordinates will, henceforth, not be quite as candid as they had been previously.

Professor Spritzer: Also, there is the question of whether the dialogue between the Justice and his clerks will be more inhibited because the Justice may be fearful that his openly expressed reactions might land in *The Washington Post*.

Professor Burbank: The problem, frankly, is that it is very difficult for people who are conducting busy lives, and relationships within the context of those busy lives, to parse the relationships finely. I agree that, theoretically, it should not have much effect because the nature of the law clerk relationship could be such that the clerk is simply carrying out directions from the judge. The fact is that some Justices look to their law clerks for much more than just to carry out orders, and they might not be able to parse the relationship in such a way that they get the type of effective help from the clerk that they might need and still carry on the other parts of the relationship. They might not be able to draw the line. So I worry about an overreaction.

Professor Kerr: I think an overall effect cannot be predicted. Maybe it is going to depend on how a particular Justice sees himself as having come out of this book. I think that the book will certainly have some effect on the clerks. Last year, we were anticipating publication of the book, and we used to ask one another from time to time whether there was any news about when it was going to come out. There was a lot of apprehension in our chambers and in other chambers about what this book was going to say—about whether there would be something in there about our Justice which would embarrass us and make us feel uncomfortable. This might have caused us to become very stilted in our own communications to the Justice. So it may not be entirely true that the law clerks—after this book—will continue to be as open and straight as they have been. For example, I don't know what it would have been like working for the Chief Justice this year.

Professor Burbank: Not much different, because he does not share information with his clerks about the conference or about the assignment power—so you get down to working on actual cases and there he is not sharing the negotiation process with his clerks.

Professor Spritzer: More broadly, one may ask, how will the book affect the public's perception of the Court? The advance publicity and the tone of the book suggest an expose. But on the hard evidence, the Court stands up well as a responsible institution.
Professor Morris S. Arnold received the annual Harvey S. Levin Award for recognition of teaching excellence from the Class of 1980.

Vice-Dean Phyllis W. Beck is a board member of the Community Legal Services of Philadelphia. She was a panelist at a University of Pennsylvania Medical School roundtable on "Medicine, Ethics, and the Law: The Use of Genetic Screening Solely to Determine Fetal Sex." Mrs. Beck is Chair of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court Committee on Evaluation of Student Practice Rule.

Professor Paul Bender spoke at the annual John Cest Forum sponsored by the St. Thomas More Society of Philadelphia in April on the topic, "What Do You Do When the Supreme Court is Wrong?"

Mr. Bender became Chair of the Faculty Senate and of the Steering Committee of the University Council in May, 1980. He is also a member of the Consultative Committee to choose a new president of The University of Pennsylvania.

His book review of The Brethren appeared in the recent University of Pennsylvania Law Review. Professor Bender spoke on "The Burger Court and The First Amendment" at a University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society Saturday Morning Forum in March.

Mr. Bender argued and won Roe V. Casey in the Third Circuit Court, holding unconstitutional the Pennsylvania Legislature's refusal to fund Medicaid Abortions.

Assistant Professor Stephen B. Burbank participated in an international conference at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland in May, 1980, together with five other colleagues from the Penn Law Faculty.

Professor Alexander Capron will be taking a two-year leave of absence from the University to serve as Executive Director of the recently established President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The Commission, which is chaired by New York lawyer and former Brandeis University President Morris B. Abram, was established by Congress to recommend changes in the regulations of all government departments and agencies involved in research with human subjects and to study issues in the delivery of health care, the confidentiality of medical records, informed consent for research procedures and treatment, genetic counseling, screening and education, and the definition of death. The Commission can also study other issues, at the request of the President or on its own initiative, dealing with medicine and research.


Helena Clark, Director of Placement, has been reappointed by the National Association for Law Placement, to represent them on the College Placement Council.

Miss Clark was 1979-1980 President of the Women's Committee of the Big Brother/Big Sister Association of Philadelphia. She is also Chair of the Alumni Awards Committee of the University of Delaware.

Dean James O. Freedman was one of four University of Pennsylvania Law School participants—along with Professors Louis B. Schwartz, Noyes E. Leech, and John O. Honnold—in "Interface two," a conference on East-West trade relations at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Poland, in early June. At the conclusion of the conference, Dean Freedman lectured on American administrative law to the Faculty of Management and Administration at the University of Warsaw, the Faculty of State and Law in Warsaw, and the Faculty of Law at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin.

In August, Dean Freedman attended a Conference on Genocide, sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania and Tel Aviv University, at LaNapoule, France. He was one of three University of Pennsylvania representatives to the conference.


Associate Dean and Professor Robert A. Gorman delivered a talk before the second annual conference of the Philadelphia regional office of the National Labor Relations Board in October, 1979, entitled "Emerging Rights Under the National Labor Relations Act Against Unfair Dismissal." He was a member of the committee to nominate officers and executive committee members of the Association of American Law Schools in October, 1979, and served on a workshop panel for the Section on Teaching Methods at the annual meeting of that Association. In January, 1980, he spoke on the developments in Legal Education at Penn Law School at a luncheon given for the New York State University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni. He continues to serve as a member of Committee N (Representation of Economic and Professional Interests of the Faculty) of the American Association of University Professors, and became Chair of that Committee in November, 1979.

Mr. Gorman spoke on curriculum development and reform of legal education to the faculty of the University of Texas School of Law in Austin in late winter, 1980, and is a member of the University of Pennsylvania Provost's Committee on Undergraduate Education, to pass upon proposals for reform of the undergraduate curriculum and to distribute grants from the Exxon Undergraduate Academic Development Fund. In March, 1980, he was elected First Vice-President of the American Association of University Professors.

Professor Gorman received the Pennsylvania Chapter of The Order of The Coif Award for Distinguished Scholarship for his basic text on labor law: Unionization and Collective Bargaining (1976) in April, 1980. Together with members of the Faculty of Penn Law School and the University of Edinburgh, Mr. Gorman participated in

Professor Henry Hansmann has been appointed Director of the Law School's newly-created Institute for Law and Economics. He published "The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise," 89 Yale Law Journal, 835-901 (April, 1980).

Mr. Hansmann presented the paper "Rationalizing the Basic Legal Framework for Nonprofit Enterprise" at the Law and Economics Workshop at the University of Chicago Law School in March, 1980; he also presented a paper on "The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise" at the Law and Economics Seminar at Harvard Law School, in April, 1980.

In May, Professor Hansmann presented the paper, "Objectives and Methods of Public Support for Nonprofit Arts Organizations" at the Eastern Economic Association Annual Convention (in the session on Indirect Support to the Arts: Issues in Economics and Law) in Montreal. In Boston, he presented a paper on "Exemption of Nonprofit Organizations From Corporate Income Taxation" at a meeting of the Committee on Urban Public Economics. He spoke on the role and regulation of nonprofit enterprise at the University of Pennsylvania/Edinburgh University Law Faculty joint conference in Edinburgh on May 21-23.

Professor George L. Haskins, who submitted the manuscript of his book "John Marshall: Foundations of Power" (U.S. Supreme Court History, Volume 2, Part II) in June 1979, has just received the galley proofs. The publishers, Macmillan in New York, still expect to publish the 600-page work in 1980.

Although unable to attend the Fourth International Congress of the Italian Society for Legal History in Naples, President Paradisi invited Professor Haskins to submit his intended speech for December publication. The speech is entitled "Gli Sviluppi Della Consuetudine in Assenza Di Potere Centrale."

Professor Haskins continues as vice-Chair of the Committee on Legal History of the American Bar Foundation, with Professor Stanley N. Katz, Chair. He helped to select seven candidates in April, who will receive stipends for research in legal history during 1980-81.

Professor John O. Honnold participated in the University of Pennsylvania/Edinburgh University Law Faculty joint conference in Edinburgh, Scotland in May, 1980. He also attended the 'Interface Two' Conference on East-West Trade in Poznan, Poland, in June.

Professor Noyes E. Leech was one of four participants from the University of Pennsylvania Law Faculty in "Interface Two," a conference on East-West trade relations, in Poznan, Poland this past June.

Professor A. Leo Levin delivered the Seventh Annual Walter M. Jeffords, Jr. Distinguished Lecture at New York Law School in April. Professor Levin also received an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree from New York Law School at that time.

Professor Emeritus Clarence Morris and his son, Professor of Law C. Robert Morris of the University of Minnesota, have published the second edition of their book, Morris on Torts. Foundation Press, Mineola, New York.

Fred Carr Professor of Law and Financial Institutions Robert H. Mundheim was named a University Professor of Law and Finance at the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Mundheim was guest speaker at the annual spring luncheon meeting of the Washington, D.C. area Alumni of the University of Pennsylvania Law School in June.

Professor Carl W. Schneider was a participant at the Twenty-First Annual Columbia Law School Symposium in March. He was a panelist at one of the symposia entitled "The American Law Institute Securities Code."

Professor Louis B. Schwartz attended the "Interface Two" Conference on East-West Trade in Poznan, Poland in June. He presented a paper on "Antitrust and Trade With Centrally-Planned Economies." While in Poland, Professor Schwartz conferred with the Ministers of Finance and Foreign Trade as well as the American Ambassador.

Mr. Schwartz served as the first Merriam Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at the Arizona State University College of Law, Tempe, Arizona. He addressed the Arizona State Bar Workshop on Antitrust Law while in Arizona.

Professor Schwartz's booklet, Studying Law for Fun and Profit, With An Appendix: Exploring Philadelphia has been published by the Law School [See Symposium] and is available at $3.00 per copy.

Professor Ralph R. Smith participated in the Edinburgh Conference in Scotland this past May with members of the combined faculties of the Penn Law School and the University of Edinburgh.

Professor Clyde W. Summers was a participant in the Edinburgh Conference, which was held this past May in Scotland. Mr. Summers joined five other colleagues from the University of Pennsylvania Law School and members of the faculty of the University of Edinburgh.
'27 Sadie T. M. Alexander of Philadelphia continues as Chair of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging. In addition to being the first black woman in the United States to receive a Ph.D. and to earn a law degree from this Law School, Mrs. Alexander was also the first black woman to practice in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to be elected President of the Philadelphia Bar Foundation.

'29 Irvin Stander's article on "The Future of Workers' Compensation" was published by the Medicolegal News, sponsored by the American Society of Law and Medicine of Boston, Massachusetts. This marks the third noted medical journal that has published Mr. Stander's workers' compensation articles. Philadelphia Medicine, the journal of the Philadelphia County Medical Society has published several of Mr. Stander's articles, and the next issue of the Ear, Nose and Throat Journal will carry his article on "Occupational Hearing Loss."

The publication of his articles have been heralded as "evidence of the furtherance of medicolegal education on a cross-disciplined basis; an effort which should be encouraged by the two great professions."


He is a Workmen's Compensation Referee, and is also Chair of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Workers' Compensation Committee.

'31 Bernard G. Segal of Philadelphia was conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, at Villanova University on Friday, May 16, 1980 at that institution's commencement exercises.

'33 Joseph M. Leib of Philadelphia, practices in the areas of personal injuries and decedent's estates, but his avocation has been to sit as arbitrator in labor grievances for the American Arbitration Association. He is presently on a panel of arbitrators dealing with postal employees. Mr. Leib was recently added to the roster of Arbitrators of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

'36 George C. Laub has been practicing law in Easton, Pennsylvania, since his admission to the Bar, with the exception of some military service in World War II. He has been active in community affairs and with the Northampton County Bar Association, and has been a Director of the Easton National Bank and Trust Company for 14 years, serving on its Executive and Trusts Committees. Mr. Laub is active in the affairs of Lafayette College, his undergraduate alma mater, as a Life Trustee since 1958, as Secretary of the Board since 1959, and as Counsel for the College since 1965.

William J. O'Brien of Philadelphia, has been elected to one of the five seats on the Philadelphia Bar Association's Board of Governors.

'38 Bernard Frank, of Allentown, Pennsylvania, has been bestowed the Order of the North Star, Grade of Commander, by the King of Sweden. The Order is conferred for services to science, art, literature or civil merit. Mr. Frank is Chair of the International Bar Association Ombudsman Committee and the Federal Bar Association Ombudsman Committee. He is Vice-President of the International Ombudsman Institute in Alberta, Canada.

'39 John Bracken, of Philadelphia, has been selected as a Distinguished Pennsylvanian by the William Penn Committee, for his contribution to the growth and development of Pennsylvania.

'41 Lipman Redman, of Washington, D.C., served as Chair of the Section of Taxation of the American Bar Association for the year 1978-1979. He is presently serving as Chair of the Conference of Section Chairmen of the ABA. He is also a member of the Advisory Group of the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service and of the Advisory Committee of the Tax Division of the Department of Justice.

'48 Hon. James C. Crumlish, Jr. was sworn in as President Judge of the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania on April 8, 1980.
Charles S. Shapiro, of Rydal, Pennsylvania, has been appointed director of public relations of Graduate Hospital. Mr. Shapiro was formerly with the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas as its public information officer.

'49 Marshall A. Bernstein, of Philadelphia, and President of the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society, has been elected to a three-year term as a member of the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.


William J. Davis has been elected President of the Bradford County (Pennsylvania) Bar Association.

Hon. Louis G. Hill was elected to the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas in November, 1979. Despite his not having been endorsed by either political party, he led the entire ticket in both the primary and the general election by substantial margins. Judge Hill had previously served in the Pennsylvania State Senate for eleven years, in the Philadelphia Municipal Court for two years, and as a partner in the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Kauffman for twenty-one years.

Hon. William F. Hyland, former Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, was elected to the Board of Directors of Fidelity Union Trust Company, of Newark, New Jersey. He was the recipient of the 1979 award of the Advertising Club of New Jersey as the "Outstanding Citizen of the Year." In addition to his position as senior partner in the Newark, New Jersey firm of Riker, Danzig, Scherer & Hyland, Mr. Hyland continues to serve as Chair of the New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority and as a member of the Board of Directors of United States Tobacco Company.

'52 Ira B. Coldren, Jr., of Uniontown, Pennsylvania, has been elected by the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute to the office of Secretary for the 1980-81 term.

Clive S. Cummis was selected by New Jersey Governor Brendan T. Byrne for membership on the Board of Trustees of the College of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. He was also elected a Fellow of the New Jersey American Bar Foundation.

Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr., of Philadelphia, has been elected by the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute to the office of Treasurer for the 1980-81 term.

Anthony S. Minisi of Paoli, Pennsylvania, has been named to the Trustee Board of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.

'53 Hon. Edward J. Bradley was reelected to another five-year term as President Judge of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. He has served on the Bench since his appointment in August, 1965 by Governor William W. Scranton. Judge Bradley is the first President Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas to be reelected for a second term since the consolidation of the Court in 1969.


Harry F. Klein, Jr., has been elected Senior Director of the Northumberland County (Pennsylvania) Bar Association.

'55 Hon. Charles D. Lemmond of Dallas, Pennsylvania, was appointed by Governor Dick Thornburgh to fill a vacancy on the Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas.

Barry B. Wohlman of Philadelphia, has been appointed Chair of the Subcommittee on Practice and Procedures of the American Bar Association Committee on State and Local Government Bargaining of the Section of Labor Relations Law. The Subcommittee is in the process of preparing its annual review to be published and distributed to all Section members at the ABA annual meeting in August.

'56 Harris Ominsky, of Philadelphia, is past Chair of the Professional Education Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He has become a Board Member of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute, the organization responsible for Continuing Legal Education throughout the state of Pennsylvania for the Pennsylvania Bar Association.


'58 John A. Carpenter has been elected Vice-President of the Northumberland County (Pennsylvania) Bar Association.

Stanley Frank announces that the name of his firm has been changed to Frank and Freedus, Central Federal Tower, 225 Broadway, Suite 900, San Diego, California 92101.

Howard Gittis, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Shorr and Solis-Cohen, has been elected to the Board of Trustees of Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia.

'59 Alexander A. DiSanti was presented the "Man of the Year" Award by the Delaware County (Pennsylvania) Bar Association.

'60 John A. Aponick, Jr., of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, was elected President of the Pennsylvania Defense
Institute at the group's annual convention in Hershey.

**Mark K. Kessler**, of Philadelphia, was elected to the Board of Trustees of International House of Philadelphia, in May.

**Hon. John A. Walter**, of Lebanon, Pennsylvania, is serving a three-year term on the Board of Governors, Philadelphia Unit, Shriner's Hospitals for Crippled Children. He was inaugurated in May for a two-year term as President of the Alumni Association of Lebanon Valley College, and he is in his second two-year term as Senior Warden of the St. Luke's Episcopal Church. Judge Walter is Chair of the Resolutions and Memorials Committee of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges.

'61 **Lawrence Corson**, of Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, exhibited his watercolor paintings in the sixth "Discovery Series" show at the University City Science Center in June and July. This was Mr. Corson's first one-man show, although his work is represented in various private collections. He is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Corson & Getson.

**Hon. Lawrence Wood**, of West Chester, Pennsylvania, has been sworn in as a Chester County Common Pleas Court Judge. He was formerly Controller for Chester County, Pennsylvania.

'62 **Barbara Berman**, formerly a member of the New Jersey General Assembly, announced the opening of her offices for the General Practice of Law at 103 East Gate Drive, Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08034.

**E. Eugene Brosius** has been elected Secretary-Treasurer of the Northumberland County (Pennsylvania) Bar Association.

**Robert Philson**, of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, has been elected President of the Somerset County Bar Association.

**Clayton H. Thomas, Jr.**, of Philadelphia, announced the opening of his offices at 1521 Locust Street, Suite 505, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102.

'63 **David C. Auten**, of Philadelphia, was elected to a three-year term as a member of the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute.

**Arnold Machles**, of Philadelphia, has been elected Chair of the Family Law Section of the Philadelphia Bar Association for the year 1980.

**Christian H. Miller** announced the formation of his law partnership under the firm name of Miller, Schreiber & Sloan, with offices at 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

**Louis H. Nevins**, of Washington, D.C., currently vice-President and director of the Washington office of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, has been appointed Senior Vice-President and Director of the Washington office.

**Robert J. Stern**, of Philadelphia, has been elected one of the five members of the Board of Governors of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

'64 **Eugene E. Fike, II**, of Somerset, Pennsylvania, has been elected Vice-President of the Somerset County Bar Association.

**Robert G. Fuller, Jr.** and **Robert A. Fuller** were among 88 person selected out of 177 eligible for promotion to Commander, Judge Advocate Generals Corps in the United States Naval Reserve. The two classmates continue to parallel their careers which began mirroring one another upon their matriculation at the University of Pennsylvania Law School in 1961.

**Wallace A. Murray, Jr.**, of Norristown, Pennsylvania, has been appointed to the Executive Committee of the Montgomery County Bar Association Board of Directors for the year 1980.

**James A. Strazzella**, Professor of Law at Temple University in Philadelphia, has been reappointed Chair of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Criminal Rules Committee. He has also been named to represent the Pennsylvania Bar Association on the Pennsylvania Joint Council on Criminal Justice. In addition, Mr. Strazzella has been appointed to the Judicial Council, which serves as an advisory arm to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Mr. Strazzella was Vice-Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School from 1969-1973.

'65 **Lita Indzel Cohen** has been elected Vice-President and general counsel of radio stations WHAT and WWDB in Philadelphia.

**William H. Ewing**, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Goodman & Ewing, was the subject of an article in the Chestnut Hill Local, a newspaper which comes out of the Chestnut Hill community in which Mr. Ewing and his family reside. The article lauds Mr. Ewing's accomplishments as a civic leader and as president of the East Mount Airy Neighbors, which led to his having been the recipient of the Commission of Human Relations Award for "his work in attempting to clean up real estate practices in northwest Philadelphia." He also more recently received the Edgar Baker Award from the East Mount Airy Neighbors (EMAN).

**Paul Heintz**, of Haverford, Pennsylvania, has been nominated and confirmed by the Pennsylvania Senate to a six-year term on the State Transportation Commission. Mr. Heintz is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell & Hippel.

'66 **Robert N. Bohorad**, of Pottsville, Pennsylvania, was elected to the Board of Directors of the Schuylkill County Bar Association.

**Robert P. Lawry**, of Shaker Heights, Ohio, was promoted to Professor of Law with tenure at Case-Western Reserve School of Law in the spring of 1979. Professor Lawry also signed a contract with West Publishing Company to coauthor a text for first-year law students on "Institutions and Methods of the Law."

**Edward F. Mannino**, of Philadelphia, was appointed Chair of the Litigation Department in the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish & Levy, where he oversees 45 lawyers. He was also appointed one of eight charter members of the Advisory Committee to the Department of History at the University of Pennsylvania, from which Mr. Mannino graduated in 1963 with distinction and with major honors in History. The Advisory Committee's function is to advocate the History Department's interests in both the University as a whole and with various governmental and private organizations in the city of Philadelphia.

**R. Martin Reiley**, of Bedford, Pennsylvania, has been elected Treasurer of the Bedford County Bar Association.

**Palmer K. Schreiber**, of Philadelphia, announced the formation of his law partnership under the firm name of Miller, Schreiber & Sloan, 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

**Gurney P. Sloan, Jr.**, of Philadelphia, announced the formation of his new firm, Miller, Schreiber & Sloan, with offices at 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 19102.

**Paul W. Tressler**, of Norristown, Pennsylvania, has been appointed First Assistant District Attorney by Montgomery County D.A. Joseph A. Smyth, Jr.

**Richard N. Weiner**, of Philadelphia, has been elected Treasurer of the Philadelphia Bar Association.
'67 **Ira Brind**, Chair and President of the Brind Leasing Corporation, Philadelphia, has been named Chair of the Board of Philadelphia College of the Performing Arts. He has also been named to the Airport Task Force of the city of Philadelphia.

**Norman Pearlstine** has been appointed National News Editor of *The Wall Street Journal*. He is a former executive editor of *Forbes Magazine*.

**Bernard C. Topper, Jr.**, of Darien, Connecticut, has been appointed Assistant General Counsel-Tax in the Legal Department of General Telephone & Electronics Corporation. He previously practiced in the firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy, New York City.

'68 **Lawrence I. Abrams** has formed the firm of Abrams, Kovacs, Westermeier & Goldberg, 1735 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006. For the past six years, he has specialized in federal energy law (mandatory petroleum allocation and price regulations) before the FEA/DOE.

**Richard Beattie** has been appointed Director of Transition in the Department of Education by U.S. Secretary of Education, Shirley M. Hufstedler.

**Gilbert E. Delorne**, of Washington, D.C., was appointed General Counsel of the Perpetual Federal Savings and Loan Association. He also served as Secretary of the Association.

**Murray A. Greenberg** has been appointed First Assistant County Attorney for Metropolitan Dade County (Greater Miami), Florida. He also serves as a faculty member at the University of Miami Law School, teaching state and local taxation.

**David I. Grunfeld**, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Steinberg, Greenstein, Gorelick & Price, has been named Editor-in-Chief of *The Retainer*, the Philadelphia Bar Association's bimonthly newspaper.

**John O. Shirk**, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, of the firm of Barley, Snyder, Cooper & Barber, has been named President of the United Way of Lancaster County for 1980.

**Norman B. Skydell** has formed a firm engaged in the general civil practice of law named Skydell, Sigall, Rosen & Zich, P.C., 310 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

'69 **Arthur A. Dornbusch, II.** of Pelham, New York, has been appointed Vice-President and General Counsel of the Minerals and Chemicals Division of Engelhard Minerals & Chemicals Corporation. His responsibilities are in the Division's legal and patent departments.

**Richard P. Sills**, a partner in the Washington, D.C. firm of Ginsburg, Feldman, Weil & Bress, has been named by the District of Columbia Bar to teach a course in its Continuing Legal Education program entitled "Taxation for the General Practitioner." In June, Mr. Sills spoke at the Estate Planning Institute at Grossinger's, in New York State, on the topic of Recent Developments in Estate Planning.

A. Raymond Randolph, Jr. has been serving as Special Counsel to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (the House "Ethics Committee"). Mr. Randolph, who is a partner in the Washington, D.C., firm of Sharp, Randolph & Green, previously served as a Deputy Solicitor General of the U.S. In March, Mr. Randolph presented a paper and an address on "The Lawyer as Corporate Watchdog" at a conference on "Corporate Counsel and Client Confidences," held in Washington.

'70 **Joseph C. Bright, Jr.**, of the Philadelphia firm of Drinker, Biddle, and Reath, has been appointed Chief Counsel for the Department of Revenue and Deputy Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

**Marlene F. Lachman** served on a panel conducted by the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers' Association at Delaware Law School. The Seminar, entitled "Brigging the Gap," discussed the transition from law school to actual practice.

**Steven R. Waxman** was elected Assistant Secretary of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

'71 **William C. Bullitt**, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Drinker, Biddle & Reath, has been appointed to the Board of Managers of Pennsylvania Hospital.

'72 **Joseph H. Cooper**, Editorial Counsel of *The New Yorker*, has just completed his first year as Visiting Lecturer and Guest Fellow at Yale. His Seminar is titled, "The Right to Write and the Perils of Print."

**Mike Fain**, in a three-way primary election, was nominated by the Democratic Party for election as Judge of the Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Ohio, to succeed a retiring judge. He won the primary by 1,813 votes out of over 80,000 votes cast. Mr. Fain says, "The November election contest will be difficult, but, needless to say, I am very excited at the prospect of launching a judicial career at the appellate level."

**Paul S. Levy**, of Valley Stream, New York, has been Vice-President—Administration and General Counsel of Quality Care, Inc., the nation's largest independent home health care. Mr. Levy's responsibilities include supervision of personnel and general services, and coordination of all legal matters.
John E. McKeever became a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Schneider, Harrison, Segal & Lewis as of January, 1980.

Donald E. Miller, of Providence, Rhode Island, has become a member of the firm of Temkin, Merolla & Zuerier, Ltd., 20th Floor, 40 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903.

David S. Petkun has become a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Schneider, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, 1719 Packard Building.

Kenneth I. Rosenberg has become a member of the firm of Mesirov, Gelman, Cramer & Jameson, 15th Floor, Fidelity Building, Philadelphia, PA 19109.

'73 Kenneth E. Aaron is a partner in the Philadelphia law firm of Davidson, Aaron & Tumini. He was elected Vice-Chair of the Haverford Township Planning Commission.

Mark I. Bernstein has formed a partnership for the practice of law under the name of Berson, Fineman & Bernstein, 300 Three Penn Center, Philadelphia 19102.

Edward S. G. Dennis, Jr., has been named Chief of the Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Section of the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C. Mr. Dennis, an Assistant United States Attorney, is charged with developing and implementing policy on criminal enforcement of federal drug laws in his new position.

John B. Herron has become an associate in the firm of Blank, Rome, Comisky & McCauley, 4 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia 19103.

Steven A. Kauffman is a principal shareholder in the Philadelphia law firm of Kauffman & Van de Ven, P.C. The firm specializes in taxation and has offices at 1419 Spruce Street and 8618 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia. Mr. Kauffman previously served as Commissioner of the Continental Basketball Association.

Roslyn Goold Pollack has become a member of the Philadelphia firm of Cohen, Shapiro, Polisher, Shickman & Cohen, 22nd Floor, PSFS Building, Philadelphia 19107.

Aidek Wasserstein, of Wilmington, Delaware, has become associated with the firm of Bader, Dorsey & Kreshool in Wilmington.

Consuelo S. Woodhead has become a member of the firm of Blecher, Collins & Hoecker, 612 South Flower Street, Suite 800, Los Angeles, California 90017.

'74 Geoffrey M. Duffine has recently joined the firm of Aronoff, David, Harvey, Hagner & Kuney, 1120 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. The firm specializes in commercial real estate, federal income tax, and corporate law.

Frederica Massiah-Jackson, of Philadelphia, has been appointed Counsel to the Pennsylvania Senate Insurance Committee.

Robert J. Murphy, Jr., of Philadelphia, has been appointed by the Board of Directors of Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company to the position of Assistant Vice-President and Associate Counsel.

David Pudlin has become a member of the Philadelphia firm of Goodman & Ewing, 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 19102. He has also been appointed by the Philadelphia Bar Association Section on Taxation as its representative to the Executive Committee of the Young Lawyers Section of the Bar Association.

Sandor K. Mayuga has become associated with the Century City, Los Angeles, California office of Finley, Kumble, Wagner, Heine & Underberg as of February, 1980.

'75 Vance Fort, of Washington, D.C., has been appointed the Executive Assistant to Civil Aeronautics Board Member Elizabeth E. Bailey. Before his Civil Aeronautics Board service, Mr. Fort was an Attorney-Advisor in the General Counsel's Office of International Law at the Department of Transportation.

James D. Morris has been transferred from the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania office of the Department of Environmental Resources (where he drafted amendments to state statutes concerning mining to avoid pre-emption by the federal government under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977) to the Department's Philadelphia office. He is a full-time litigator here concentrating in the fields of non-coal mining sewage industrial waste and anthracite coal mining enforcement. He addressed the 1978 Pennsylvania Bar Institute Seminar on Mineral Resources Development in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on the topic of state programs under the Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. He was invited to give a similar presentation to the AII/ABA Seminar on Legal Issues in the Eastern Coal Industry at Lexington, Kentucky in June, 1980. He also addressed the 1979 annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General/The Committee on the Attorney General at Scottsdale, Arizona, concerning environmental enforcement and the Bankruptcy Act.

William L. Phillips, of Chicago, Illinois, was appointed General Attorney, responsible for federal matters relating to the restructuring of the Milwaukee Road, Chicago.


Rick Levine has been associated with the firm of Orrick, Herrington, Rowley & Sutcliffe in San Francisco, California, since July, 1979. He was previously associated with the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen.

Margaret Mary Maguire announced the formation of her partnership under the name of Masterson, Braunfeld, Himsworth & Maguire, 702 One Montgomery Plaza, Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401.

Michael P. Malloy, of Washington, D.C., has published an article in the Brooklyn Journal of International Law on "Objections to Adjudication before the International Court of Justice." He is presently an Attorney-Advisor with the Office of Foreign Assets Control, United States Treasury Department.

'77 Gilbert F. Casellas has completed a two-year clerkship with Judge A. Leon Higginbotham of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He has rejoined the Philadelphia law
Suzanne Curran Donovan has been associated with the firm of Bader, Dorsey & Kreshool, Wilmington, Delaware, since January, 1980.

Alfredo Toro-Hardy, of Caracas, Venezuela, has been appointed Legal Counsel to the Vollmer Organization, Venezuela's leading private financial and industrial group. He is also a member of the Board of Directors of Computer Sciences Corporation of Venezuela. Recently, Mr. Toro-Hardy was appointed Professor of International Business Law at the Center for Post-Graduate Studies of the Central University of Venezuela.

Leslie E. Kivitz has been associated with the Philadelphia law firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen since December 1, 1979.

Gerald P. McAlinn distinguished himself in the athletic arena this past year by winning a 'blue' as Cambridge University's heavyweight contestant in the annual Oxford-Cambridge boxing match. Even though Jerry has not boxed for several years, he was thought to be in some danger when his Oxonian opponent stepped into the ring. The other heavyweight, an American who plans to play professional football next year, appeared to tower over Jerry. The faithful were, however, vindicated, as Jerry ducked under the Oxford man's jabs and knocked him out 35 seconds into the first round. Ringside spectators reported that the loser was lifted six inches into the air by Jerry's left hook, a weapon that earned Jerry the appellation 'pocket battleship' from the London Times. [We wish to credit Peter Solmsen, '80, for his explicitly detailed report of Mr. McAlinn's extraordinary international success.]

Donald M. Millinger, of Philadelphia, has been associated with the firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen, Twelfth Floor, Packard Building, Philadelphia 19102, since December 1, 1979.

Mr. Millinger has written two articles: "Copyright and the Fine Artist" was published in the George Washington University Law Review, March, 1980, and "Legal Rights of the Fine Artist" will appear in The Journal of Communications published by the International Communications Association, this Autumn, 1980.

Pamela J. Murphy has been appointed to teach Legal Research and Writing at the Paul M. Hebert Law Center of the Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge for the 1980-1981 academic year.

Suryia Kumar Parmanand is serving a two-year period, expiring in August '81, of "Articles" with the commercial law firm, Leandy & Partners. She then plans to form a partnership and practice law, or to join a university as a lecturer. She is writing two articles for publication—"Brainwashing & The Law" and "Sentencing in South Africa & America's Punishment Model." Ms. Parmanand was married in June, 1979 and is expecting her first child in December, 1980.

Benjamin Slotznick has become associated with the firm of Mesirov, Gelman, Jaffe, Kramer & Jamieson, 15th Floor, Fidelity Building, Philadelphia 19109, as of January, 1980.

Shelley J. Winkler is associated with the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen.

Daniel Zucker is practicing law as an associate with the Philadelphia firm of Mesirov, Gelman, Jaffe, Kramer & Jamieson.
Henry Mitchell, the sculptor who, in 1962, executed “The Goat”—the Hsieh-Chai bronze statue which stands in the main lobby of the School—died on April 4, 1980.

Professor Emeritus Clarence Morris said of Mr. Mitchell, “Our goat is part of his large legacy of wit, skill, and art that adorns this world.”

1980—The Year of the Reunion....

The Alumni Office has been a busy one this spring. A record number of quinquennial classes celebrated their reunions in a variety of ways, and we were there to support in whatever manner we could.

The Class of 1930 commemorated its 50th Reunion on May 2nd with a dinner at the Raquet Club in Philadelphia. The Class of 1940, on May 17th, gathered at the Law School for an evening of dinner and reminiscence. The Class of 1950 members celebrated their 30th Reunion with two days of festivities: On Saturday evening, May 3rd, a dinner-dance was held at the Law School and, on Sunday, a sumptuous brunch was graciously held at the home of Marianne and Charlie Mayer.

The weekend of April 26 was a busy one, with two classes holding reunions. Members of the Class of 1955, with the able and creative planning of classmate Bob Kendall, had the opportunity to participate in a myriad of activities. On Friday evening, tickets were available for Hay Fever, the Annenberg Theater offering. On Saturday, the Penn Relays were being held and, on Saturday evening, a gala reunion dinner-dance was held at the Pennsylvania Historical Society. A Sunday brunch, hosted by classmates Miriam and Bud Diamond at their center city residence, completed the weekend’s activities. Also, on the evening of April 26, the Class of 1960 met at the Law School for their 20th Reunion, under the leadership of Charlie Kopp. On May 31, the Law School was the spot for the return of the Class of 1965. Music for that 15th class reunion was provided by the Harriet Fay Jazz Ensemble with a little help from 65 classmate Steve Goodman.

On May 10th, the Class of 1970 gathered at the Law School for its 10th—a Saturday evening cocktail party-reunion, of which Marlene Lachman was the moving force. Members of the Class of 1975 celebrated their 5th Reunion with a cocktail party at the School and, on the following day, many 75 classmates gathered with their families at Hill Field—across from the Law School—for a picnic.

Still to come is the 45th Reunion of the Class of 1935. They will be holding a dinner at the Law School to take place September 6.

... So How About ’81?

The Quinquennial Classes of 1931, 1936, 1941, 1946 1951, 1956, 1961, 1966, 1971, and 1976 are in line for reunion celebrations this year. The Class of 1951 has already organized and reserved June 6, 1981 as the date for their reunion dinner to be held at the Law School.

Initial letters regarding the planning of reunions have been sent to class presidents and/or representatives. If you have not responded, please do so at your earliest convenience. For those who have not heard, please contact Libby Harwitz at The University of Pennsylvania Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104 or call (215) 243-6321.

You owe it to yourself to maintain contact with your friends and former colleagues.

Have We Heard From You?

We want “all the news that’s fit to print” about you—professionally or in general. The Journal’s Alumni Briefs section is the perfect forum for keeping in touch with classmates and with other Alumni. Information as well as your informal photographs are welcome. Please use the space below:

Name and Class: ____________________

What’s New: ______________________

_________________________

Return to:
The Law Alumni Journal
The University of Pennsylvania
Law School
3400 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
In Memoriam

'11 Maurice R. Metzger, Middletown, Pennsylvania, January 18, 1980

'12 Philip Diamond, Ventor City, New Jersey, 1978

'14 Edwin H. Burgess, Baltimore, Maryland, April 14, 1980

Yale L. Schekter, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 24, 1979


'17 Albert J. Marks, West Hartford, Connecticut, October 10, 1979

Marshall H. Morgan, LaJolla, California, December 15, 1979

'20 Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, New York, New York, April 24, 1980

'22 Honorable Leon P. Miller, Welch, West Virginia, February 4, 1980

C. A. Patterson, Sun City Center, Florida, December 1979

'27 Alvin W. Carpenter, Sunbury, Pennsylvania, August 28, 1977

John F. Headly, West Grove, Pennsylvania, March 27, 1980


'30 Lee Wainer, Los Angeles, California, November 11, 1979

'32 C. Max Ivins, Wynnwood, Pennsylvania, December 29, 1979

Richard D. Walker, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, December 26, 1979

'34 Morris Smith, Chester, Pennsylvania, June 8, 1978

Henry Thalenfeld, Kingston, Pennsylvania, September 1978


John Ross, Doylestown, Pennsylvania, November 28, 1979

'36 Jack J. Connell, Trenton, New Jersey, January 20, 1980


'38 Stanley A. Yesukiewicz, Enfield, Connecticut, January 5, 1980

'39 Thaddeus J. Wassel, Scranton, Pennsylvania, September 14, 1978


'41 Alvin E. Heutchy, Larchmont, New York, February 10, 1980

'42 John M. Musselman, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, January 13, 1980

'43 Honorable James S. Bowman, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, February 15, 1980

Daniel W. Daly, Jr., Bradford, Pennsylvania, March 13, 1980

'54 James P. Markle, Upper St. Clair, Pennsylvania, April 13, 1978

'67 Joseph B. Dunigan, Freeport, New York, June 4, 1979
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