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MICHAEL A. FITTS
NAMED DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW SCHOOL

PHILADELPHIA (March 6, 2000) — Michael A. Fitts, Robert G. Fuller, Jr., Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and a member of the Penn faculty for almost 15 years, has been named dean of the school, according to an announcement by University President Judith Rodin.

Mr. Fitts succeeds Colin S. Davis, who stepped down Aug. 15, 1999, after a decade of leadership of the Penn Law School. Charles W. Mooney, Jr., professor of law and associate dean for academic affairs, has served as interim dean through the conclusion of the search.

Mr. Fitts, who was visiting professor of political science at Swarthmore College during his sabbatical leave last year, was associate dean for academic affairs at the Law School from 1996-98.

"Michael Fitts is a first-rate scholar and teacher who is the embodiment of the [Robert G. Fuller, Jr.] chair he holds, which honors legal scholarship and the ability to communicate the essential principles of law and a humanistic understanding of those principles," Dr. Rodin said. "Mike has superb academic judgment and proven leadership and administrative skills.

"Our search committee cast a very wide net throughout the academic world for a person who has a depth of experience in the research enterprise, who has shown a personal commitment to teaching excellence and who was willing and able to devote the energy and commitment that will continue to build our community and, most important, our world-class faculty," she said. "Mike Fitts is that person, and we are absolutely delighted he has accepted this new assignment."

Mr. Fitts was born and raised in West Philadelphia. Mr. Fitts' father, the late Dr. William T. Fitts, Jr., was John Rhea Barton Professor of Surgery and chair of the department of surgery at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine. His maternal grandfather, Joseph H. Willits, Ph.D., LL.D., was a professor and dean of the Wharton School.

He received a bachelor's degree from Harvard College in 1975, where he was the recipient of the Detur Prize and elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He was a Harvard National Scholar. Mr. Fitts received a J.D. degree from Yale University Law School in 1979, where he was editor of the Yale Law Journal.

Mr. Fitts was law clerk to the late Hon. A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, from 1979 to 1981.

From 1981 to 1985, Mr. Fitts was an attorney advisor in the Office of Legal Counsel at the U.S. Department of Justice, where he received a Special Commendation Award from the Attorney General of the United States for his work. The Office of Legal Counsel serves as outside legal counsel to the President of the United States, the White House and various executive agencies.

A member of the faculty since 1985, Mr. Fitts was appointed associate professor of law in 1990, professor of law in 1992 and Robert G. Fuller, Jr. Professor of Law in 1996. His teaching at the Law School has included an interdisciplinary approach to administrative law, election law, government institutions, legislation and regulated industries.

Mr. Fitts has written widely on political institutions, separation of powers, the Presidency and Congress, including "Back to the Future: The Supreme Court's Response to the Changing Goals and Functions of Modern Political Parties," which will be included in the forthcoming book The Supreme Court and the Electoral Process.

Mr. Fitts has been a board member of the Law and Political Process Study Group of the American Political Science Association, where he annually has made presentations and chaired panel discussions. He also has been a consultant to numerous government agencies on administrative law and presidential powers.

Mr. Fitts has served Penn in numerous capacities on a variety of university-wide committees, such as the University’s Committee on Academic Planning and Budgeting (1995-98). He has been active in organizing a number of interdisciplinary programs between the Law School and other schools within the University.

Mr. Fitts also has served on various civic boards, including the Committee of Seventy, a Philadelphia "watchdog" organization.
This issue of the Penn Law journal commemorates a moment in the history of our institution and of the world around us. Only four months ago we bid farewell to the second millennium, free of the glitches that had been so ominously forecast. This Spring, the Law School expresses a more personal farewell to our beloved colleague and teacher Bob Gorman (“Labors of Love, Love of Labor” p.34) on the occasion of his retirement and in celebration of his distinguished career as a scholar, academic leader, and teacher of generations of law students. At the same time we welcome recently arrived professor Howard Chang whose incisive scholarship in economics, immigration and environmental law is profiled on page 32.

Looking to our future, Penn Law’s diverse faculty will continue to produce cutting edge scholarship that captures the interprofessional and multidisciplinary thrust of our academic program. “Penn Law at the Horizon” showcases the complementary fields in which our faculty and alumni are engaged at this moment in history. We compare the endeavors of alumni in related areas with Ed Rubin’s research in law and politics; Jason Johnston’s work in environmental law; and Peter Huang’s scholarship in the burgeoning arena of technology and rights. My analysis of American presidential powers in this election year forms a troika with Jacques deLisle, who speculates about the future of China, and Kim Lane Schepele, who assesses present-day Russia.

Beyond the Law School’s walls we admire how many of our alumni’s careers reflect changes in the profession more generally, moving from one rooted in more traditional firm practice to one more entrepreneurial and adventurous. The diversity of Penn Law’s student body today augurs well for the continuation of this trajectory as we attract students from around the world and from a rich variety of backgrounds, all possessed with boundless intellectual curiosity.

Standing at the horizon we can view both past and future. While we anticipate the 150th Anniversary celebration of our institution in the upcoming academic year, we embrace the future tangibly by introducing this issue of the journal as our first available online. In spite of the shifts and changes in the present day, Penn Law School remains firmly grounded in the confidence of knowing who we are. Our Law School is a collegial community, academically engaged, and intimate in size. It is an institution that has been considered an intellectual home by scholars and students of the law for 150 years. In the coming months I expect to outline some of my thoughts and plans for our future, and hope I can rely on your advice and insight as part of this effort.

It is my distinct honor to serve as Dean of this historic and storied school.
With the flip of a calendar page we find ourselves in the 21st century and the Third Millennium, standing at the horizon of a promising future that defies prediction. At this pivotal moment, the Penn Law School announces the appointment of Michael A. Fitts as its new Dean. The people of the City of Philadelphia have elected a new mayor. Our nation is in the throes of a campaign to elect a new leader. The dynamic of the world order has shifted with the emergence of new leaders in China and Russia. Advances in technology and innovation allow us to manipulate the genetic code, and to transact in a global environment from the comfort of our homes. Either everything’s up for grabs or everything’s within our grasp. That’s the wonder in times of change and transition. In this issue of the Penn Law Journal, we take a snapshot to capture this moment.

The field of law includes both theorists and practitioners — the professors and the professionals. In speaking to the theorists — our faculty — and surveying the practitioners — our alumni — what we find is that the Penn Law School has succeeded in training students in the archetype of the 21st century lawyer — masters of interdisciplinary knowledge and oriented for leadership and entrepreneurial endeavors at home and on the world stage.
CITIES AT THE HORIZON

Considering the horizon that lies before us, we imagine the nature of politics in a post-Clinton era and the nature of governance at the sunset of the "American Century," if it is indeed a sunset at all. Alumnus David L. Cohen L'81 puts it best, "You can't be a first-class nation without first-class cities." Professor Edward L. Rubin theorizes on the future of cities and the present nature of civic involvement, and alumni provide their perspectives from the trenches.

Professor Edward L. Rubin teaches a yearlong research seminar entitled Managing the Future. The course focuses on recent developments in technology that promise—or threaten—to transform the way in which we live, and on our identity as human beings. Taught jointly with Professor Peter Huang's Law and Technology course, students examine political, administrative and personal responses to the oncoming changes. His forthcoming book, Onward Past Arthur, discusses a related issue: the new ways of thinking about law and politics that are required by the advent of the administrative state.

The Revival of Urban Life

The ability to attract people back into the city is a measure of an urban administration's success. There are only a limited number of things an executive official at any level can point to as a sign of success. If you're the president, it's the economy. If you're a mayor, particularly of a midwestern or northeastern city, it's going to be the level of urban revival that occurred during your term in office. Mayors will take credit for whatever policy they instituted that's related to that revival, but it's hard to know whether their policies are really responsible for the result. After all, demographic movements are not necessarily within the control of urban administrations.

Look at Philadelphia. You can take Ed Rendell as an example of someone who has made his reputation as a successful mayor. His success is based on the slight uptick in employment but, more dramatically, it's based on the revival of downtown Philly which means that suburban people are moving back in. But who knows whether Rendell's policies are responsible for this?

People moving back into the cities is one of the demographic trends of the nineties and beyond. People are doing that because they are making balanced assessments of their lifestyles and the services available. I think a whole generation of people has grown up who remember being bored out of their skulls when they were kids growing up in the suburbs, and now they are motivated to move back into the city and give their own kids a different kind of life experience. The interesting thing is that they're making these decisions not as citizens of a fixed jurisdiction, but as purchasers of a particular package of services and opportunities. With respect to the United States, we feel that this is where we live. For most people, it is just a given and it becomes sort of a moral framework in which your whole life gets played out. But I don't think people treat cities that way. With respect to a city, people are really doing what the economists say they're doing, which is making choices between jurisdictions based on a package of services. Many people want to move back into cities but they are not going to exercise that choice if they have to give up too much of what they're used to.

Towards Civic Re-engagement

One problem a lot of people talk about regarding civic engagement is America's notoriously low voter turnout. But there is an element of modern technology that could increase levels of voting tremendously that we haven't taken advantage of. That's not the Internet; it's the telephone. We still insist that people trudge down to voting booths, either because of cynical judgments based on who will be disadvantaged by a low turnout or an atavistic notion that people have to gather in person in order to cast their votes.
Both Mayor Rendell and I continue to talk about the tale of two cities – the exciting, vibrant downtown where you have the Academy Ball and the Convention Center, and then neighborhoods in east North Philadelphia where there’s no insulation, there’s no heat, there’s no running water. People who used to be on welfare are being cut off and told to get jobs, but the jobs that are available are not reachable by public transportation.

It’s a very sad commentary on American cities. Mayor Rendell has said that Europe would never let happen to its major cities what America has let happen to its major cities and I think that’s true. Europeans have a long-standing healthier regard for their cities and they view them as the jewels of their country. There’s more of an explicit recognition that the whole country is driven by the success or the failure of its major cities. You can’t be a first-class nation without first-class cities. On a rational level I think that most policy makers agree with that statement, but on the policy level they don’t act that way.

Penn, under Judy Rodin’s leadership, has forged an absolutely unprecedented partnership with the community. I think it’s a national model for the way in which large private institutions in cities need to work together with government and community-based groups in order to pur a new face on the community. I think it’s a national model for the way in which cities are going to function in the 21st century. Hopefully this will send a message to people that cities are important cultural and vibrant additions to the American landscape and they’re something that we just can’t do without.

One of the reasons why Philadelphia was chosen for the Republican National Convention is because of our belief that, at its best, Philadelphia is a great showcase for the fact that cities do work, the city government can work, and the business community works. In a sense this is a little bit of a laboratory for the way in which cities are going to function in the 21st century. Hopefully this will send a message to people that cities are important cultural and vibrant additions to the American landscape and they’re something that we just can’t do without.

Mayor Rendell has said that Europe would never let happen to its major cities what America has let happen to its major cities.

As far as other forms of civic engagement are concerned, we tend to regard voting and forms of selfless participation, like campaigning, as virtue and self-interested participation, like lobbying, as a sort of a vice. In fact, there are very high levels of engagement of people with government in different capacities. Lobbying is probably the primary way that people are engaged with government. Over thirty years ago, William Riker and Mancur Olson wrote books using a public choice analysis for government. (Riker: The Theory of Political Coalitions, 1962; Olson: The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups, 1965.) They each claimed that small narrow interest groups would dominate the lobbying process, and they based this claim on the idea that you could not only can people vote over it, they can get the kind of information that you couldn’t conceivably communicate face-to-face or in a booklet. People can take the time to look at a Web page, click down and read about the issues. You couldn’t solely rely on the Internet (until everyone has access) but you can begin with using the telephone as a voting instrument and use the Internet as a supplement.

People moving back into the cities is one of the demographic trends of the nineties and beyond.

As far as other forms of civic engagement are concerned, we tend to regard voting and forms of selfless participation, like campaigning, as virtue and self-interested participation, like lobbying, as a sort of a vice. In fact, there are very high levels of engagement of people with government in different capacities. Lobbying is probably the primary way that people are engaged with government. Over thirty years ago, William Riker and Mancur Olson wrote books using a public choice analysis for government. (Riker: The Theory of Political Coalitions, 1962; Olson: The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups, 1965.) They each claimed that small narrow interest groups would dominate the lobbying process, and they based this claim on the idea that you could not only can people vote over it, they can get the kind of information that you couldn’t conceivably communicate face-to-face or in a booklet. People can take the time to look at a Web page, click down and read about the issues. You couldn’t solely rely on the Internet (until everyone has access) but you can begin with using the telephone as a voting instrument and use the Internet as a supplement.
We tend to regard voting and forms of selfless participation, like campaigning, as virtue and self-interested participation, like lobbying, as a sort of a vice.

not get a large diffuse group of people with interests that weren't immediately economic in nature to form interest groups and participate in government.

That theory was empirically invalidated within two years when the consumer movement and the environmental movement got organized. Most of the people involved in the consumer movement are people who don't need consumer protection. They're campaigning on behalf of the poor. Most of the environmental movement is about saving the whales, saving the Alaska wilderness — it's not exactly the immediate recreational opportunities of the people who are campaigning.

These are things that public choice analysts predicted would be impossible. But these movements have become powerful and have been sustained because of people's willingness to become involved. This is really a major part of the political landscape of our era — it's based on involvement and engagement. It's a very intensive citizenship and a very intensive participation.

One of the most rewarding parts of the job of Deputy Mayor was the implementation of new policy directions for the city. I spearheaded the Administration's efforts to force organized crime out of the Fulton Fish Market and out of the garbage business. We were successful at this by establishing a rigorous system of licensing based on background and fitness and kicking out a lot of people who lacked integrity or good character. The results were dramatic.

The city government, for decades, did nothing about it. There was a lack of political will in past administrations to take on such a problem. But this Administration didn't come out of any particular political affiliation and that made a difference. Rudy Giuliani had been a crusading District Attorney. He had both the inclination and the will to break the mob stranglehold.

Randy Mastro was Deputy Mayor of New York City under Rudy Giuliani from 1996 to 1998. In the U.S. Attorney's office in the 1980s Mastro implemented Giuliani's strategy to use law enforcement to dissolve the major organized crime networks in the U.S. Today Mastro is co-head of Gibson Dunn & Crutcher's New York office and co-head of the firm's litigation practice group.

This administration has emphasized public safety, economic growth, fiscal responsibility and, in the area that is most vexing, improving public education. The results are that crime has been reduced by more than fifty percent over the last six years, the murder rate by about seventy percent. The importance of that is that not only have lives been saved, but also New York has become a much more livable city. Rudy Giuliani has also emphasized the social compact that for every right there is a responsibility. He approached welfare reform as an opportunity to help people to help themselves so he implemented wide scale workfare programs, changing welfare centers to job centers, and emphasized trying to help people to find work.

Mayor Rendell (of Philadelphia) and Rudy Giuliani enjoyed a good working relationship with frequent communication. They both share certain common philosophies and they both came out of unique backgrounds that weren't born of politics but of a commitment to public service as a prosecutor (Giuliani) and a lawyer (Rendell). They brought fresh perspectives to the jobs. Each of them, by dint of their strong personalities, has proven that an individual can make a tremendous amount of difference when he sets his mind to it.

I think the next mayor would be wise to continue these policies that have been so successful. In any scenario, some of the things Rudy Giuliani has achieved will become a permanent part of the way New York City does business because they have been so sound and so good for the City.
Coming Up Aces

“I love being Mayor – I’m like a kid in a candy store,” Oscar Goodman L’64, Mayor of Las Vegas, crow. “I’m the luckiest guy in the world.”

But luck had little to do with his success at the polls in the Spring of 1999. A registered Democrat, the renowned criminal defense attorney was a last minute candidate on the Independent ticket. He emerged as the winner from a crowd of nine candidates in the primary election, and in a dramatic runoff against his opponent he won by twenty-seven percentage points.

Observers speculate that his success was due to acing the key issue on the minds of voters – how to manage development in downtown Las Vegas. “It’s like the core of the apple. If it rots it’ll have a ripple effect and the whole barrel will go bad,” Goodman explains.

Nearing its centenary celebration in 2005, Las Vegas is statistically the fastest-growing city in the United States. Aside from the frustrations that might come from managing a growing city’s bureaucracy, the perks of the job of mayor are unparalleled. Wayne Newton entertained at a fundraiser Goodman hosted for a political action committee he is starting up to advocate for Las Vegas in the Nevada State legislature. The producers of the award-winning HBO cable program “The Sopranos” tapped Goodman to play the role of a New Jersey mayor in an upcoming episode.

A Philadelphia native, Goodman’s roots in the City and at Penn run deep. His father, Allan, was a 1925 Wharton grad, and a 1928 graduate of the Law School. His son Eric is a 1999 Law School graduate who is associated with Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll. In 1996, Goodman returned to Penn Law to lecture on his colorful career as a criminal defense attorney to a standing room-only audience.

A cover story in The Philadelphia Weekly (Feb. 2, 2000) asked if Goodman might be the next “America’s Mayor” – playing on President Clinton’s nickname for popular mayor Ed Rendell whose term expired in 1999. Given Goodman’s unforeseen rise as the voice of the people, perhaps he is the archetype of leadership for cities emerging on the national landscape in the 21st century – audacious, entrepreneurial, and unconventional.

His Day at the Races

Urban developer David F. Tufaro has been dedicated to the livelihood of cities since his days at the University of Pennsylvania where he earned a joint degree in Law and City Planning.

Embarking on a new role in community service, he ran as the Republican candidate for Mayor of Baltimore in 1999, losing to Democrat Martin O’Malley. But, statistically speaking, the odds were against his winning – “Nine out of ten registered voters are Democrat,” says Tufaro. “The odds aren’t great that I’ll run again. I’d rather be doing something good. I enjoyed it, but it’s a lot of work. As an outsider you can’t raise money. My opponent raised $1.5 million, I raised $150,000.”

He believes a subtle advantage of his campaign was that Republicans are not usually identified with programs that benefit urban communities. “A city has to build a tax base and has to have employment opportunities. But there’s such a disconnect between the jobs available and what urban residents can do.”

Tufaro states that education and crime issues should be at the top of a city’s agenda but he offers a modification: “I don’t think you can wait the four to eight years of a term of office to address the education issue. Though the Mayor may not have control over the education system, he needs to insert himself to make it a priority. The middle class has a choice. But the middle
class is leaving Baltimore by a thousand people per month. You can say you're going to reduce incidents of crime, but crime tends to be concentrated in the pockets of poverty. It's not the day-to-day concern of people who don't live in those neighborhoods so it's not what drives them out of the city. Inadequate choices for education do."

Tufaro will continue his post-campaign career as a developer. Possessing the expertise of one who plans communities, he is critical of the tendency of city administrators to find a cure-all in the building of stadiums — "That stuff never gets down and benefits the poor of the population — they're so isolated from it. All it does is slow the further decline of the city."

Advocacy and the Law

"When I took the LSAT in 1967 as a senior in college, a number of male students came up to me and berated my girlfriends and me for taking the places of men," remembers Marcia Greenberger L'70. When she joined Kaplan & Drysdale as an associate in 1970, she was the only woman attorney at the firm.

In 1972 Greenberger joined the National Women's Law Center in Washington when it was known as the Women's Rights Project of the Center for Law and Social Policy. The Center lobbies Congress but it is focused on enforcing laws through litigation and getting strong laws in place by doing research into what laws and policies would work for women. One issue that they are working on is how to improve women's economic security through expanded job opportunities and dependable childcare. "We are seeing far fewer explicit barriers than existed for women in the 1970s because many of them have been outlawed. But we see more subtle barriers.

"Law firms are constructed based on work patterns assuming that someone will be taking care of family responsibilities full time. For women who want to have a substantial role in their family lives, they can't work with this model." The Center finds that as women advance in their law careers, fewer and fewer are in place at the top. "They are leaving before they make partner, and few are leading firms."

Greenberger observes that from the Supreme Court to the President's cabinet to the court benches, such "public positions have given us a good practical look at women's contributions to the law. I've seen an enormous amount of progress, but I've also seen that progress hasn't gotten us as far as we hope to go."

"I've seen an enormous amount of progress, but I've also seen that progress hasn't gotten us as far as we hope to go."
The type of civic engagement that Professor Rubin notes was unimaginable forty years ago is at the core of the increasingly more successful merger between environmentalists, communities, regulators, and developers. The environmental movement emerged on the public stage informally in 1970 with the first celebration of Earth Day. Since that time the field of environmental law and community activism has come into full bloom.

In his course Natural Resources Law and Policy Professor Jason Johnston covers not only the law governing the acquisition of private rights in natural resources such as water, timber, and wildlife, but also the law and economics of public resource management. The course analyzes the administrative law of public resource management (such as NEPA and the Endangered Species Act (ESA)), and also explores alternative, market-based management approaches. He analyzes the recent movement toward a transactional approach to environmental protection (such as Habitat Conservation Plans under the ESA) in a forthcoming article “The Law and Economics of Environmental Contracts” in Environmental Contracts and Other Innovative Approaches to Environmental Regulation, editors Dekeletaere and Orts.

Regulators, Developers, and Communities in Accord

With many of the most egregious forms of pollution now reduced, environmental law and regulation is increasingly oriented toward ecosystem restoration and renewal. Environmental contracts are a cornerstone of restoration-oriented environmental law. For instance, under the leadership of Secretary of Interior Babbitt, over two hundred Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) under the federal Endangered Species Act have been negotiated since 1994.

HCPs represent a formal, legally binding agreement between regulators and developers. Rather than simply enjoining development (as the ESA’s private taking prohibition has been interpreted to require in some circumstances), HCPs recognize that development itself may generate the necessary capital to effectively preserve critical species habitat. HCPs represent a compromise, but one in which local environmental groups and local citizens play a much more important role than under traditional regulation. While incomplete, our HCP study so far indicates that you don’t have a successful HCP without some pretty strong local support for preservation of the habitat. Often, an HCP provides general local amenities by preserving open space. As a legal matter, this is not what the Endangered Species Act was targeted to do. As an empirical matter, this is one of the local benefits that predicts when an HCP will be successful and when it won’t.

“Habitat Conservation Plans represent a compromise, but one in which local environmental groups and local citizens play a much more important role than under traditional regulation.”

Brownfields Redevelopment - the redevelopment of land that has been contaminated by hazardous waste - is going on across the country, but Pennsylvania’s Land Recycling Program is a national leader. Like HCPs, Brownfields Redevelopment is fundamentally contractual: in exchange for doing cleanup and exposure-mitigating development today, a developer is given a legally binding assurance that no more mitigation will be required in the future. The idea is that when the land is put back into industrial use, that use itself precludes certain kinds of exposure pathways — such as very young children eating contaminated dirt in a housing development. Plus, you can get a piece of property that’s been off the tax rolls back on the tax rolls providing jobs, taxes and enhanced local public goods. For these reasons, Brownfields Redevelopment has been an interesting issue politically, oftentimes bringing Republican governors together with Democratic big city mayors.
Steven Fischman is part of a team overseeing the development of a three thousand-acre tract in historic Plymouth, Massachusetts that will include housing, two golf courses, a hotel/conference center and a village center. The project is unique because it has evolved through agreements with the state and town to maintain open spaces and to make sure the water serving the golf courses is environmentally acceptable. New England Development has gone so far as to drill a well and install a water treatment plant on the grounds of the golf course to minimize the use of fertilizers to keep the grass healthy.

“This is the first all encompassing performance-based environmental permit in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The State has developed a way to measure the success of the permit against environmentally-based standards,” Fischman says. In return, New England Development was rewarded with a streamlined permit process that expedited their development plans. “This is an opportunity we sought.”

Massachusetts is a difficult jurisdiction to secure the right to build because it is one of the most environmentally concerned jurisdictions. The only way we were ever going to get permits was to sincerely behave in a way that shows concern for the environment,” explains Fischman. “Seventy percent of the Plymouth development will remain open space. We will also set aside areas for hiking trails and nature preserves.”

The majority of the company’s developments are focused on retail districts and mixed-use developments. New England Development has been the largest owner and developer of retail real estate in New England. In addition to Plymouth, New England Development is currently working on mixed-use projects in Boston, New Haven, and Chevy Chase, Maryland. Fischman differentiates between tactics communities might use to employ environmental laws to their favor, and those who use the law as subterfuge. “In Plymouth, those who might oppose you are truly concerned about the environment. With mall development, those who oppose you usually are those who will be your economic competitors. They tend to use environmental statutes to attack competitive development.”
In his article about immigration policy, "The Economic Analysis of Immigration Law" in the forthcoming book Migration Theory: Talking Across the Disciplines, Professor Howard Chang argues that immigrants raise rather than lower the economic status of U.S. natives. His research led him to conclude that once their future earnings and the earnings of their descendants are taken into account, they actually increase national wealth.

Professor Howard Chang

Devuelvan Nuestro Hijo

The interesting thing about this case is that, actually, it's not all that unique. The question is, why is Elián getting such special treatment given the huge numbers of people fleeing oppressive regimes who would like to come to the United States? It suggests there is something of a double standard being applied here.

There are plenty of people fleeing Cuba who are sent back. And there are people fleeing other Communist countries like China, most prominently, where people are turning to smugglers to get into the United States. But we're certainly not welcoming them into the country in the same way we're welcoming Elián. Perhaps this boy is getting special treatment because of the press attention surrounding his rather dramatic story and the existence of a very vocal group of Cuban exiles in Florida who are well organized to orchestrate a campaign to keep him in the United States.

Non-Hispanic whites are destined to be a minority in California and eventually in the United States as a whole, assuming migration trends continue. That prospect causes discomfort for some people.

What's ironic is that the argument for sending Elián back is stronger than in the usual case because he's a six year old boy with a father in Cuba. In this case, I think the policy of reuniting families would take precedence. Given the evidence before the INS, I believe the INS applied the law correctly in reaching the conclusion that it did. It would be hard to see how they would rule otherwise except for the politics of this situation.

Regulating Xenophobia

The trigger for the most recent wave of tighter immigration restrictions came from California with the passage of Proposition 187 in 1994 that sought to exclude undocumented aliens from public schools and other public benefits. When that passed, that sent a signal to Congress which, in turn, passed stricter immigration laws in 1996. Much of the support for more restrictive policies comes from California where you see a lot of anxiety about immigration in general.

Public opinion polls indicate that the majority of people think our immigration laws are too liberal, that we should have lower immigration levels rather than the current levels. Much of that immigration is concentrated in California. The reality is that many of these immigrants are unskilled and relatively poor, and fears that they will burden the public sector have been the source of a lot of the concern in California. There is also a lot of concern about changes in the ethnic composition of the population. Non-Hispanic whites are destined to be a minority in California and eventually in the United States as a whole, assuming migration trends continue. That prospect causes discomfort for some people.
So many people in the Miami community came to the United States under the same circumstances. And, if it’s not their own story, then it’s the story of someone they know,” states Alberto Ibargüen. Born in Puerto Rico of a Cuban father and a Puerto Rican mother, Ibargüen possesses a unique empathy for this scenario that has emboldened the Miami Cuban-exile community and riveted the world to the ongoing serial drama.

For the first week of January a sampling of issues of El Nuevo Herald, Miami’s dominant Spanish language newspaper, showed the wide-eyed expression of Elian González above the fold with a smaller picture of Dan Marino’s season-ending victory for the Dolphins. In its parent paper, the English language Miami Herald, the same images were shown but in reverse proportion. It is a telling illustration of the co-existence of communities on parallel tracks in Miami with different issues of importance to them. Of the city’s 1.4 million Hispanics, more than fifty percent are of Cuban origin.

As a lawyer, Ibargüen understands INS law, but his opinion is that “the Attorney General’s (Janet Reno) statements saying that Cuba is not so bad to return to are uninformed.” As a publisher, Ibargüen has the liberty to examine all sides of this complex and emotional story without choosing sides.

Also, his life has exposed him to a broad range of perspectives that make him an ideal person to run a publishing empire. Ibargüen entered Penn Law School after serving in the Peace Corps in the Venezuelan Amazon where he organized farmers into a cooperative. After graduation he founded the Puerto Rican Center for Justice in Hartford, Connecticut. Career moves with a commercial bank eventually landed him in New York City in the mid-1980s with the task of starting up New York Newsday. In 1998 he was named the first Hispanic publisher of the Miami Herald.

He has far-reaching ambitions for the Herald’s future in Miami—“The key is not to publish a single newspaper, but several papers aimed at all parts of the market. It makes little sense that there would be a paper for the entire community, and then you go home at night and look at fifty television stations for your information.”
The Model of a Modern Media President

A decade from now the presidency of Bill Clinton will be understood to represent the final transition to the so-called modern presidency. Most historians believe the modern presidency originated with Roosevelt, continued to develop with Kennedy, and accelerated its formation with Reagan. Throughout this period, public and political actors increasingly saw the president as legally, politically, and symbolically responsible for the executive branch in particular, and government in general. Clinton exploited all of these changes to his advantage. The singularity and visibility of his office allowed him to effectively reposition the Democratic Party symbolically and programmatically, as well as to bargain effectively with a Congress dominated by the opposition party. Along many dimensions the modern 21st century presidency is stronger today than it has ever been, at least when it is in the hands of a politician who understands how to maneuver on the fast moving political stage.

Yet the problems Clinton has faced as president also underscore the great potential weaknesses of the modern president, especially as we begin the 21st century.

First, despite the potential payoffs, there are great legal and political risks for presidents maneuvering in this highly visible and regulated environment. Modern presidents who are forced to take positions legally and politically on every issue are necessarily caught in political and legal mistakes, and diminished in the public eye. While some of Clinton’s legal difficulties were certainly avoidable, every recent president has faced serious legal and ethical charges, suggesting at a certain level there is something more systemic going on. To the extent this is true, we can expect future presidents to be tap-dancing through a legal quagmire, even if the independent counsel law is not ever officially renewed. “Tricky Dick” and “Slick Willy” may be quite tame labels as compared to future presidential characterizations.

Second, presidents in the early part of the 21st century will not enjoy the automatic political support and moral authority past leaders garnered by virtue of the Cold War. During most of the 20th century, we had an agreed upon external enemy – Communism. Despite our internal divisions, we understood the need for a single individual, the president, to maneuver on the international stage. Given the decline of Communism, and the proliferation of different types of potential threats, that consensus has evaporated, along with the president’s reflexive claim to moral authority both abroad and, in many cases, at home. As we have seen with Bush and Clinton, the president is now constantly in the position of having to generate political support for each new policy and against each new enemy, internationally as well as domestically.

Finally, presidential influence has and will continue to evolve as we move from an era of deficit politics, where the presidential veto was a powerful weapon, to surplus politics. In this new environment, the ability of the president to constrain and direct new congressional initiatives will be far more complicated. Clinton has been successful of late, but the ability to control the agenda is far more difficult when one is pursuing an affirmative agenda than when one is merely blocking change.

Whether future presidents will be able to continue to enjoy the upper hand in the new milieu will depend on many factors, including their intelligence, political creativity, and adaptability. On the one hand, as noted, they may lack some of the advantages on the domestic and international stage they once enjoyed, but be subject to high political and symbolic expectations regarding their performance. At the same time, they will continue to enjoy the substantial legal and political powers of the office. These will be interesting times – whoever takes office next January.
Professor Kim Lane Schepple teaches Post-Communist Law and Society that focuses on the legal changes that have come with the end of the Communist empire throughout Central and Eastern Europe. Her recent publications include "The Inevitable Corruption of Transition" in 14 University of Connecticut Journal of International Law (1999), and "The New Hungarian Constitutional Court" in 8 East European Constitutional Review 509 (1999).

The Money Melee

Contrary to general American opinion, I hope that many of the changes that have happened in Russia over the last ten years don't hold. During that time Russia has gone from an economy in which very few people lived in poverty to one where more than half of the population is below the poverty line.

In the name of democratization, massive impoverishment has been produced in Russia. In the name of reform, a bunch of people stole the state and what was left of the economy on their way out the door leaving hardly anyone investing in the Russian economy for the long term. Russia has become a "kleptocracy" with people who had connections to the old party apparatus who took what they could as they headed for foreign banks, leaving this mass population in a destitute condition.

"In the name of democratization, massive impoverishment has been produced in Russia."

If what happened in Russia happened in the U.S., Americans would have revolted not only against the president but also against the whole form of government. And the fact that Russians haven't, and that there's no sign of that on the horizon, is very interesting. The Russian constitution, even though it is far from perfect, has managed to still govern Russian politics, by and large. I'm not sure whether that is a sign of its strength or its irrelevance.

But a lot of ordinary Russians hold the view that having a constitutional regime is important. The change of power from Boris Yeltsin to Vladimir Putin, the recent elections to parliament, and the Russian election for the presidency are all examples that show everyone's complaints and discontents are framed now in the context of electoral politics. That's remarkable. Russians believe that electoral politics can fix this, if it can be fixed at all. There aren't a whole lot of people arguing to go outside that system. Whoever is going to be the next Russian president cannot squander that resource.

Steps Toward Stability

The model for Russia should be the model of German constitutional law and German legal and economic order that was built out of the moral and political collapse after the Second World War. The U.S. model has never had to cope with fixing the complete destruction of public life. So, looking to America is probably not the best idea for Russians right now. It's not that we don't have a well functioning system ourselves, but rather we haven't been through anything like what Russia has been through. I hope Putin can hold together this constitutional structure.

But Putin could be instead the worst thing that's happened to Russia. Depending on how you read the start of the Chechen War, Putin was the great, strong hero that saved Russia from everyone who's trying to attack them, or he was someone who was willing to sacrifice his own population (both civilian and military) in this war. Some people in Russia even say that he was behind the bombings in Moscow that killed several hundred Moscovites because these people believe that the Federal Security Service (the successor to the KGB, his organization) planted the bombs. At the moment, rumors swirl around Putin, and it will take a while before it is clear who he is and what he means for Russia. Unfortunately, it is likely that we will know only after the election, which may be too late.

"Putin may be the perfect person to ease this transition along, but we don't know enough about him yet. There's something in his background that might provide a basis for a kind of new regime. He's fluent in German, down to the regional dialects. He's lived outside of Russia for some time, so I think he has the resources not to be totally insular. He was deputy mayor of St. Petersburg in charge of luring foreign investors and he did a wonderful job. But Putin may be the perfect person to ease this transition along, but we don't know enough about him yet. There's something in his background that might provide a basis for a kind of new regime."

But Putin could be instead the worst thing that's happened to Russia. Depending on how you read the start of the Chechen War, Putin was the great, strong hero that saved Russia from everyone who's trying to attack them, or he was someone who was willing to sacrifice his own population (both civilian and military) in this war. Some people in Russia even say that he was behind the bombings in Moscow that killed several hundred Moscovites because these people believe that the Federal Security Service (the successor to the KGB, his organization) planted the bombs. At the moment, rumors swirl around Putin, and it will take a while before it is clear who he is and what he means for Russia. Unfortunately, it is likely that we will know only after the election, which may be too late.
A Progression of Reform

By any measure, China has taken great strides on the path of reform over the last twenty years, and the prospects for further reform are fairly bright. While support from the top leadership remains essential, the thirty-something, forty-something generation has played an increasingly important role. Many of them have been educated — in law and other fields — in the West. They have acquired the skills to craft reform laws and policies and, in many cases, openness to ideas of reform that go beyond economics. While there are sprouts of more robust rule-of-law values, the progress of legal reform in China remains driven by economic concerns. For China’s rulers and much of its elite, acceptance of reforms to the political or human rights aspects of law has remained instrumental — judged by its contribution to modernization and development.

Despite this ambivalence about some types of legal reform, law reform has been impressive, especially in the economic realm. There has been a steady march toward market-oriented laws and a system in which laws play a more central role in regulating economic behavior. State-owned public enterprises have been put more and more on a market basis through laws that restructure the system of handing over profits to the state into one where they pay taxes at rates that are set by increasingly uniform rules and that state authorities have had some success in enforcing. State enterprise managers now enjoy considerable autonomy and behave in ways that often respond to market signals. In the vast collective and private enterprise sector that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, the contrast with the socialist past is even starker, although the creation of market-supporting laws has lagged.

Ahead: Not Revolution, But Evolution

Some of the hardest reforms still lie ahead: really restructuring or selling off most old state-owned industries; really laying off tens of millions of their workers; really establishing a social safety net for the newly unemployed; and really reforming the banking sector. There is legislation to address all of this, but some of it has been blocked by opponents, and almost all of it is hard to implement or to fund.

There are signs of a possible change in strategy. Where we used to see incremental, piecemeal legal reform, we now see some moves to create a comprehensive legal framework that applies to economic actors of all types. If China can find the political will and skill to adopt and implement that kind of legal reform, then it will have achieved a qualitative breakthrough for economic reform, for the role of law in regulating the Chinese economy, and possibly for the rule of law in China.

The regime thus faces major challenges, but a failure to handle them optimally is not likely to be fatal. For all of its weaknesses, the PRC’s leadership retains a nationalist mandate and has a record of providing prosperity that the Communist governments in the Soviet world lacked. At the very top, the system has weathered the first true generational transition since the founding of the People’s Republic. The shift from Mao Zedong’s to Deng Xiaoping’s leadership was obviously a hugely important change. It marked the turn to market-oriented policies, the turn toward law, and the turn away from political radicalism. The succession from Deng to Jiang Zemin was far smoother in terms of the substantive agenda, but may have been more significant in establishing the regime’s prospects for durability. They are not out of the woods yet. Jiang presides over a system that is still institutionally weak. That feature may be especially problematic in an era when the unique personal authority of Mao and Deng has passed, when economic growth shows signs of slowing, and when the tasks of legal and economic reform require and depend increasingly upon stable, competent and effective legal and regulatory organs.
The Regulation Quandary

If there are going to be attempts to regulate technological innovation, what you need is something like the World Trade Organization – some kind of meeting of countries where they would adopt some form of uniform standards. But even if they did, that may not be the answer because most people think that when there is going to be some kind of global agreement it’s going to be the weakest form. In other words, if you want all the countries to adopt it then it might be the result of a process known in the U.S. corporate law context as a race to the bottom.

If you carry that metaphor over to both the Internet and to the genetic technology context, what may emerge is that it’s not clear that we want the world to have identical laws because we don’t know what the right laws should be. But by having different countries experimenting with different legal rules and institutions regarding either pharmaceutical companies or Internet startups the laws will get better. If it’s a success, we’ll copy it. If it doesn’t work the market will respond accordingly. We should not rush to regulate but wait and see what other countries are doing well in terms of attracting investors, startups and research and imitate that. In the end, we should avoid having our legal system drive away the thing that we want by regulating it in the name of some kind of quality control.

Frankenstein or Frankenfruit?

Considering the future of technology, one of the major concerns is genetics. Genetic engineering is already here – you can’t keep parents from saying they want their children to have piano lessons or to have better math skills. But where do we draw a line between disease and disability? If everyone is thin and beautiful, then maybe being fat and ugly might be considered a disease and something that some think we should get rid of. In some sense, disease sounds easier to define than it is.

In the United States, how much Americans care about their food being genetically engineered is not a critical issue. A lot of Europeans seem to be much more up in arms about this issue, so there was some pressure to pass some laws. The reasoning in the U.S was if we accepted that genetically engineered food is here to stay, then we should have some quality control and full disclosure so people know what they’re buying.

"By having different countries experimenting with different legal rules and institutions regarding either pharmaceutical companies or Internet startups the laws will get better."

The SEC’s approach to investors in the securities markets is that you should make yourself fully informed and then it’s up to you – you choose, you win or lose. But the view that Clinton had is like the view of the Food & Drug Administration, slightly paternalistic. We don’t trust people’s cognitive skills, judgment, or information processing capabilities when it comes to human cloning or to drugs. So we think we won’t let you have an alleged cure for AIDS or a cancer drug that, in our judgment, has not gone through enough rounds of testing.

The government holds two views: for high tech we should let the markets decide and self-regulation will be inherent in the process of keeping up with the markets. The other view, in terms of genetic engineering and biotechnological innovation, is that we can’t let you decide because we don’t trust your judgment. We think we know better than you do what’s in your best interest. In this country we don’t want a lot of regulation in general especially in today’s political climate that has a very deregulatory attitude. Our country tends to respect individual choices.
"This is an amazing time for biological science," says Elliot Sigal, M.D., Ph.D., senior vice president, Early Discovery and Applied Technology for Bristol-Myers Squibb's Pharmaceutical Research Institute. He leads the company's Department of Applied Genomics that pursues the science that studies genes and their function. Established in 1997, the department applies the rapid advancements in genomic information and disease genetics to drug discovery and development programs.

Charles A. Heimbold, Jr. L'60, Bristol-Myers Squibb Chairman and CEO, and Chairman of the Law School's Board of Overseers, has been the leader on this voyage to the unknown. "Charlie has allowed innovative technology to be brought into the company," says Sigal. "He set a strategy of unprecedented research and development growth. He is an enlightened leader who allows for the creation of challenging issues and risk taking, but with accountability."

Bristol-Myers Squibb has been at the forefront of pharmacogenomics— an emerging field that involves the use of technologies such as transcription profiling, gene sequencing, and genotyping to discover novel targets for the development of new drugs and to identify biological markers that can predict which patients will best respond to different drug regimens. The company has invested millions of dollars into this research with the goal of developing drugs that will take the guesswork out of a physician's treatment. "A major part of Bristol-Myers Squibb's growth is generated by our medicines business. In that business, genomics is having a profound impact on the understanding of modern biology and on the discovery of new drugs," states Heimbold. "Bristol-Myers Squibb is committed to being at the forefront of this revolution, integrating genomics and other technologies to increase productivity at every stage of drug development, from discovery and clinical evaluation to registration and marketing. We're confident that this strategy will lead to greater benefits for patients today and in the future."

Dr. Sigal observes that the field of genomics is evolving in parallel with the law. At the least, "this work raises questions of intellectual property and issues of informed consent." The creation of the Ethical Legal and Societal Implications (ELSI) group emphasizes "the importance for society that we ensure privacy and confidentiality, and guard against discrimination in the use of the genetic information that will be identified."

As Heimbold said in a lecture at the Law School recently (see p.17), "Today, genetic engineering, pharmacogenomics and molecular biology are taking us to new and unimagined frontiers in the fight against AIDS, and diseases of aging, among others."
Fighting Crime Without Borders

“I’ve seen how crime has become international. We should ask ourselves how we can best prepare students for careers in cyber law. There is a lack of attorneys with computer skills who know how to prevent cyber crime and how to trace it.”

An example of that came to the fore in January when a computer intruder tried to extort $100,000 from the company CD Universe. Another example from the same month illustrated how seemingly fragile the Internet is when hackers hampered service delivery of Amazon, E-Bay, and online news networks by bombarding the servers with “e-junk.”

“Janet Reno identifies the number one issue of the present and the future as cyber crime. The number two issue is intellectual property.” The Department of Justice has created a Cyber Crimes section that consults with and advises legislators on Capitol Hill on the laws that are needed. But Ferrer speaks of a generational divide among lawmakers, “The older ones don’t really understand what cyber law or cyber crime is.”

There is the challenge of crafting laws to curb cyber crime that soon become obsolete because of the rapid pace of innovation and the snail-like pace of moving legislation through Congress. Nevertheless, Ferrer is optimistic about what can be accomplished given these challenges. “We’re behind the curve with cyber crime law right now, but I think we can pass some laws to reflect technology progress. For example, to make hacking illegal. We can pass good laws that are broad in perspective.”

But given that international borders are irrelevant in cyberspace, Ferrer concedes that “Getting international cooperation is a challenge. If other countries don’t take intellectual property seriously – with regard to the trade in medicines and faulty parts for autos, for example – what good will they do?”

Ferr er joined the Justice Department in 1995 after serving as a prestigious White House fellow assigned as Special Assistant to U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry Cisneros. Since that time the world has witnessed the explosion of the World Wide Web and Ferrer has experienced the explosion of crimes without borders. “For students who want to get into the prosecutorial area the challenge of the future will be to know how computers work and how to identify cyber crime. On the enforcement side we’re tackling this everyday.”

Silicon Gold

PETER N. DETKIN EE’82, L’85
Vice President Legal and Assistant General Counsel
Intel Corporation

“It’s kind of like the gold rush days – everyone’s out there digging for gold and we’re happily selling picks, and shovels, and blue jeans to everyone who wants to go.” If mining for wealth and innovation in the high tech arena were as simple as taking a pick to ore then Detkin’s advanced lawyering skills wouldn’t be in so much demand, but they are. “What I have become very good at is intellectual property strategies for complex situations.”

While a partner at the Palo Alto firm Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati, Detkin made his reputation trying Lotus v. Borland twice before the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court where landmark copyright law was decided. In 1999, he led the defense in Intel v. FTC in a case that the National Law Journal said illustrated that sometimes “smart lawyering is often pragmatic lawyering.” Of the two major cases of computer giants versus government giants in the 1990s, Intel settled its case with the government, while Microsoft continued its fight and remains embroiled in litigation and fighting off a break up of the corporation.

“There are a lot of people saying that patent laws are falling down on the job and that the patent laws need to be changed. I don’t believe any of that. The patent laws have shown themselves to be remarkably adaptable.” His experience has been that the Internet poses some “fundamentally different issues than our laws can handle. It’s a worldwide marketplace now, with localized laws. Those are the kinds of issues that it will be hard for Congress to keep up with… It’s the Wild West out there with how the law is enforced,” Detkin observed.
Succeeding in the Dot Com Stratosphere

H.S. HAMADEH L'97, W'97
Co-Founder and President, Vault.com

The tassel was barely settled on the other side of his mortarboard when H.S. “Sam” Hamadeh drove to New York to start Vault Reports in 1997 along with his brother Samer and a college friend from UCLA. Today, Vault.com is a web-based company that is an emerging leader in the evolving field of online career management.

Hamadeh’s original plan was to obtain only an MBA degree from Penn. But having learned that “legal strategy is part of business strategy,” he wanted to give himself every opportunity to succeed as an entrepreneur. He committed to Penn Law’s JD/MBA program after he visited the Law School and met with students to learn about their Penn experience. He credits his coursework with Professor William Tyson in Securities Regulation as “instrumental in fund raising” for his start-up venture. Professor Robert Gorman’s instruction in copyright law was crucial to his growing interest in this evolving area of intellectual property. “Someone with a JD can be an entrepreneur as much as someone with an MBA .. I have four former attorneys on staff right now” applying the same skills but using innovative strategies.

Vault Reports was founded in 1997 not only to provide a forum for web surfers to research career paths but also to offer the inside scoop on companies and industries from verifiable insiders. In 1999 the company was renamed Vault.com after a protracted negotiation with a domain “squatter” – one who buys up “dot com” names and holds them hostage until they can sell them back to the trademark owner for a premium. “I learned from scratch about trademark laws that covered domain names,” Hamadeh confesses. Learning, specifically, that the government’s dispute resolution process can take up to three years, stymieing a start-up’s efforts to establish its name.

Hamadeh believes that the technology revolution has only begun. “Outside the rarified world of Penn there are classes of society that have never used the Internet.” He predicts that we will see the democratization of technology in the next decade. With an impact no less than that of Gutenberg’s printing press, the permeation of technology and the accessibility of information to the masses promises to erode the present high tech class system that now exists.
It's always a pleasure for me to "come home" to the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and I'm delighted so many of you have come to hear what amount to some reminiscences of a lawyer who has spent most of his career in healthcare – specifically, medical devices and pharmaceuticals.

I have chosen a 40-year time period for the scope of my talk because exactly four decades ago I was in my last year of studies here at Penn Law – little realizing what awaited me. To set the stage this afternoon, I'd like first to describe a political and social background that will probably sound very familiar to you.

It's an election year. A popular two-term president is winding down his term and spends a bit of his time playing golf. His vice president is running hard to replace him, and the opposition party is fielding several candidates, including a young, attractive politician with limited experience and a famous father. Although times are good – and have been for a while – there is some uneasiness across the land over several difficult social issues, including health care.

Calls go out for politicians to do something – about improving access to health care, including the price of pharmaceuticals. What gets done solves some big problems and creates new, even more pressing ones. Years later, few are happy with the outcome, but even fewer have creative or politically palatable solutions.

Sound familiar? In fact, this is the United States of 1960 I've just described to you – the era of Eisenhower, Nixon and Kennedy. Certainly on the political level, it is – as Yogi Berra would say – déjà vu, all over again! If you look at the transcripts of the Kefauver hearings of 1959-60, for example, you'll see many of the same charges leveled against the pharmaceutical industry that some politicians are using today.

Much certainly has changed since 1960, particularly in the areas of medicine and health care – but maybe not the rhetoric.

Let's look at a few changes. In 1960, the average life expectancy was not quite seventy years. Today it is nearly seventy-seven years. Infant mortality has fallen nearly seventy-five percent. The death rate has declined eight percent. By any measure, Americans in the year 2000 are enjoying longer, healthier lives than Americans in 1960.
While the leading causes of death have not changed much over the last forty years—coronary heart disease, cancer, stroke and lung diseases still top the list—death rates for some of these have plummeted, thanks mostly to advances in therapies, particularly pharmaceuticals.

For example, between 1965 and 1996, deaths from atherosclerosis declined seventy-four percent and for ischemic heart disease, sixty-two percent. On the cancer front, the picture is mixed but still encouraging. The overall survival rate has risen from thirty-eight percent of those diagnosed in the early Sixties to over fifty percent today, and continues to increase.

In fact, we could probably spend all day talking about the life-saving advances in science and medicine that have taken place in the last four decades: beta and calcium channel blockers and ACE-inhibitors to fight hypertension; the unlocking of the DNA code, with a resulting revolution in biotechnology and genetic engineering; the advent of large scale clinical trials; the pursuit of landmark epidemiological studies like the Framingham study; increasing awareness about the dangers of cholesterol; chemotherapies to fight cancer; new generations of antibiotics and psychotropic drugs. The list goes on and on.

All of this was happening within the framework of Medicare, which was enacted in 1965.

That's just some of the good news about improvements in health care over the past four decades. Now let's talk about the bad news. Certainly we continue to face major health challenges such as hypertension, cancer, infectious diseases and other maladies. But equally serious is the problem of costs.

Spending on health care has soared over the last forty years, from $27 billion in 1960—a little over five percent of the nation's GDP—to more than one trillion dollars in 1998, or nearly five percent of GDP. And it will keep going up.

The bite it takes out of the federal budget—largely in the form of Medicare and Medicaid payments—has grown from a paltry $5 billion in 1965—the year Medicare was passed—to more than $370 billion today. Altogether, health-related expenditures consume more than twenty-one percent of the federal budget. Compare that with four percent in 1965.

It is interesting to note that in 1964 the debate over Medicare centered on how well the government could forecast future costs. In a long-range estimate, the total expense for 1990 was projected to be $10 billion. Actually it was $110 billion, eleven times as much! And eight years later, in 1998, the Medicare bill nearly doubled, to $216 billion.

With spending rising so quickly—and budgetary pressures intensifying—politicians have moved just as quickly to assign blame—generally, as far from their corridors of power as possible. In the 1970s and 1980s, when healthcare costs were accelerating at a double-digit rate, physicians and hospitals were the targets. How many times did we hear about doctors ordering unnecessary tests and charging exorbitant fees, or hospitals with staggering daily rates?

Today, the pharmaceutical industry is the bogeyman, just as it was 40 years ago. Some of the polemics haven't really changed. Once again, we hear that prices are too high and even that the industry is too prosperous.
Certainly, it cannot be denied that spending on prescription drugs in the U.S. has increased, particularly in recent years. In 1998, it exceeded $90 billion. Still, it is important to note that eighty percent of this growth has nothing to do with price—it is primarily a result of the increasing number of prescriptions being written, more new products coming to the market, and more older people needing medicines.

In other words, this growth is largely the result of more people taking newer and better medicines to help them live longer, healthier lives. And beyond the savings in human terms, there are tremendous economic savings to society that result from greater pharmaceutical use.

For example, better drugs have helped halve the number of hospital stays since 1964. And the annual cost of combination therapy to treat a patient with HIV/AIDS is between ten and sixteen percent of the cost of treating a patient with advanced AIDS in the hospital.

However, it can't be denied that some people are not getting the prescription drugs they need, either because they can't afford them or they don't have access to insurance coverage that would make them affordable. This is not right, and we strongly support market-oriented approaches to expanding drug coverage for senior citizens and others who cannot afford their medicines.

While statistics tell an interesting story about the use and impact of medicine, we should go behind the numbers to understand the forces that are shaping and directing the drug industry. Above all, we need to understand the tremendous changes that are occurring in this industry so we can more clearly see where the trends are taking us.

The biggest change in the industry has come in the area of research and development. In 1960, research-based pharmaceutical companies committed a little over $200 million—around eight percent of total sales—to R&D. Today, that figure exceeds $24 billion. Even with inflation factored in, this is an increase of monumental proportions.

Whereas the government was the major driver of health-related R&D in the 1960s, today—on R&D—the drug industry annually spends twice what the Congress appropriates to the National Institutes of Health.

Why has pharmaceutical R&D grown so dramatically? Much of it has to do with the changing nature of biomedical research. In the early 1960s, we still relied heavily on screening and serendipity for innovations in cancer, cardiovascular disease and infectious diseases. And we had too little to show for it.

But eventually the march of science propelled us forward. In the 1970s, work on receptors in cells paved the way for the development of alpha and beta-blockers to treat high blood pressure. In the ’70s and ’80s, research focused on enzymes, which led to the discovery of powerful cholesterol-lowering drugs and our breakthrough antihyperensive, Captopril. Today, genetic engineering, pharmacogenomics and molecular biology are taking us to new and unimagined frontiers in the fight against cancer, AIDS and diseases of aging, among others.

"Spending on health care has soared over the last forty years, from $27 billion in 1960—a little over five percent of the nation’s GDP—to more than one trillion dollars in 1998, or nearly five percent of GDP. And it will keep going up."
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These are all exciting developments, but they have come at a price—quite literally. Huge investments in people, technology, and infrastructure have pushed up the average cost of discovering and developing a new drug to around $500 million. They also have increased the average time it takes to bring a new compound to market—from about eight years in the 1960s to fifteen years today.

From the standpoint of patients waiting for new medicines, this is unacceptably long, and we must shorten it. But that involves new costs and risks. So pharmaceutical companies have had to become quite clever at maximizing the impact of costly investments in highly problematical research.

"The biggest change in the industry has come in the area of research and development."

Soaring R&D costs as well as intensified global competition have helped push the industry into consolidation, which it is still experiencing. Still, it is interesting to note how U.S.-centric the pharmaceutical industry has become, despite growing demand worldwide for the newest medicines. This can be attributed largely to the free-market philosophy that guides this country's approach to the way medicines are discovered, developed and sold. We hope it will stay that way.

It should come as no surprise that as European governments put the squeeze on the global pharmaceutical industry through price controls, more and more drug research—and drug researchers—moved to this country. European drug companies now see the U.S. as their most important market.

Nevertheless, the damage of over-regulation has been done: according to estimates of one research firm, by 2002 European companies will be marketing only three of the world's top 25 medicines, while American companies will be selling twenty of them.

These are some of the monumental changes in the pharmaceutical industry as I see them: an ever-increasing focus on R&D; restructuring and consolidation within the industry.

I'd like to conclude with some observations of where I see the industry—and the state of healthcare in this country—heading.

On the political front, I remain concerned but guardedly optimistic. As I mentioned earlier, healthcare costs are clearly exploding, and nothing short of the complete overhaul of the Medicare system will do anything meaningful to reverse this trend. Tinkering with the system only postpones the inevitable—and makes the inevitable much more expensive.

Sadly, to accomplish the Herculean task of reforming Medicare and Medicaid takes great political will—and is virtually impossible in an election year. So I fear that, in the near term at least, the drug industry will continue to be assailed for the prices of its products.

Even if the political rhetoric turns out to be empty, its impact on public health can be devastating. Consider this: expenditures on pharmaceutical R&D in the U.S. have grown at a healthy double-digit clip every year since 1978, with the exception of one two-year period—1994 and 1995—when spending grew at a feeble six and seven percent, respectively.
If you recall, this period coincides with the debate over — and ultimate demise of — the Clinton health care proposal, which included price controls on pharmaceuticals. In that climate of uncertainty, when the growing risks associated with costly research appeared to outweigh the diminishing rewards, R&D budgets suffered. It should therefore be pretty clear how destructive even the threat of price controls can be on R&D expenditures and the development of new medicines.

On the litigation front, I have serious concerns as well. It can be said that mass torts have come of age and “morphed” into an industry potentially more harmful to our society than the ills that the courts intended to remedy. This all reflects the growing role of science in the courtroom, which tracks the rapid evolution in the worlds of medicine and technology.

I also have concerns over the steady erosion in patent protection worldwide. Patents are the anchor of the research-based pharmaceutical industry, and efforts to dilute or weaken them can discourage investment in new medicines.

We know that access to medicines in the developing world remains a serious problem. The best approach here is to look for solutions that are appropriate in resource-limited settings; solutions that deal with the problem medically as well as socially — through partnerships — rather than piecemeal; solutions that keep patent protections intact, so that the next generation of medicines can be found.

Which brings me to my final observation about healthcare trends — the progress we’re making in conquering disease. There is so much to talk about here but I will confine my comments to just a couple of areas.

We certainly face serious challenges on the infectious disease front. We’ve seen the rise or reappearance of all sorts of infectious diseases, including Ebola fever, Lyme Disease, Hantavirus and of course HIV — and that’s only a partial list. Antibiotic resistance is a growing problem whose scope and seriousness is not as widely understood as it should be.

We’ve certainly made tremendous strides in the fight against cardiovascular diseases — and genetic research continues to be a boon to these efforts as well. But much still needs to be done, especially in the area of hypertension. High blood pressure is a persistent and growing problem in this country — especially among women and minorities — and we must attack this crisis with the same diligence that we applied in the struggle to raise awareness about the dangers of high cholesterol.

The statistics tell a sobering story: hypertension affects more than 600 million people worldwide. In the U.S. alone, three out of four people with high blood pressure remain at greatly increased risk of heart attack, stroke, heart failure and kidney disease.

In the minority community — particularly among African Americans — the toll of hypertension is frightening. This is why we’re excited the FDA has granted priority review to our brand-new antihypertensive, Vanlev. As the first vasopeptidase inhibitor, Vanlev uses an entirely new mechanism of action that reduces both systolic and diastolic pressure. And its ability to lower blood pressure in certain minority groups who have not responded to other therapies is of great significance.

Vanlev is also the first cardiovascular drug to receive expedited review, which reflects the great promise this drug holds, in my opinion.

Let me leave you with this final thought. When I left this university forty years ago, a freshly minted LL.B., I never imagined that my career would move in this particular direction — that I would be playing a part — like tens of thousands of my colleagues at Bristol-Myers Squibb — in helping to turn the wonders of science into the reality of a better life for people everywhere.

For me, this has been a journey of tremendous personal and professional satisfaction. There have been occasional bumps and setbacks, for sure, but that is to be expected. I know similarly satisfying and meaningful opportunities await you — in this field and many others — as long as you invest your talents and passions where they can make the biggest difference — in bettering the lives of others.
In January, Richard E. Rosin L'68 addressed Professor Heidi Hurd's first year class in Criminal Law, "I am here today to tell you a story—it is a story in which I participated, not by choice, I can assure you."

Penn has been at the forefront of Rosin's activities since his graduation. Today he is an active and visible president of the Law Alumni Society, having served on the Board of Managers since 1995, as an Ex-Officio member of the Law School's Board of Overseers; the Chair of the Equal Justice Foundation and its highly successful annual auction for the fifth consecutive year; a classroom lecturer; a valued benefactor to Penn Law as a consistent Benjamin Franklin Society Fellow; and as a participant in the Penn Law European Society annual meetings. A lifetime resident of Philadelphia, Rosin graduated from Central High School in 1961 and from the Wharton School in 1965, earning a B.S. in Economics as a Finance major with a minor in Philosophy finishing second in his class in his senior year.

Following his graduation from Penn Law in 1968, Rosin started his career as a law clerk to the Hon. Joseph Sloane, President Judge of Philadelphia Common Pleas Court No.7. In 1969 Rosin joined the firm of what is presently Mesirov, Gelman, Jaffe, Cramer & Jamieson where he aided in setting up an Estate and Trust Department. Rosin recalls, "My mentors were among the finest lawyers I have ever known—Leon Mesirov L'34, Frank Gelman L'35, Paul Jaffe L'50, Harold Cramer L'51 and Jules Silk L'52. Their emphasis was not only upon the development of high legal ability but equally upon integrity, pride in one's work product, courtesy and professionalism, and the importance of serving the community. The firm was like a family, and the values instilled have followed me to this day." In 1977 Rosin departed the firm as a partner to establish his own practice as a sole practitioner. "The firm provided me with a solid foundation, but it was time to control my own destiny and at the same time be in a position to spend more time with my young family, which I did, in abundance."

By 1994 Rosin was semi-retired and seeking meaningful ways to return to the community some of what the practice of law had given him. He had just completed a year of teaching social studies one day a week to 120 eighth graders at the Turner Middle School in West Philadelphia. Rosin was part of a pilot program designed to put lawyers in the classrooms and he worked with former Penn Law Public Service Program Director Judith Bernstein-Baker to insure the success of the program.

It is ironic the effect that West Philadelphia has had on Richard Rosin. First the benefits of the Wharton School, followed by Penn Law School and 26 years later teaching at the Turner Middle School. As Rosin continues... "On August 29, 1994, the most gentle, kindly disposed young man I have ever known was brutally murdered across the street from where he peacefully resided. He was a fourth year
Ph.D. candidate in Mathematics at the University of Pennsylvania. He was 27 years old. He was a brilliant scholar. He had wanted to devote his life to teaching young people. As a result of his unique academic achievements, Penn bestowed his Ph.D. posthumously, for the first time in its history. In the normal course of events, he would have married my daughter Rebecca and become my son-in-law. His name was Moez Alimohamed.

"He was murdered by a group of five who had walked over 20 blocks through West Philadelphia carrying a loaded rifle. Their stated goal was to find a victim. They succeeded. I have since lived with the aftermath of murder and violence. I have experienced the devastating effect it has on too many innocent people. It changes your life forever. No one is immune. We are all at risk," Rosin has since become an advocate and activist for Victims' Rights and for the families that have been irrevocably scarred by the epidemic of violence in our time.

Rosin worked with Philadelphia DA Roger King for seventeen months on the prosecution of the five defendants. "King is one of the finest prosecutors I have ever met, and a true crusader for justice. I came to see, first-hand, the inner workings of the DA's office. It is a dedicated group of people, sensitive to the pain of the victim population it serves. I saw the high standards set and implemented by DA Lynne Abraham, a woman with the highest integrity and principles. I worked closely with Charles Gallagher and John Deaney, Chiefs of the Homicide and Juvenile Units, career prosecutors who are sterling role models for all with whom they work."

In spite of the diligence of King the five-week trial was replete with frustrations and egregious insensitivity that dismayed Rosin and deepened the wounds. In 1996, Rosin began to speak on behalf of Victim's Rights and the co-victims of violence, the surviving families. Through a program called Impact of Crime, Rosin lectures at state prisons throughout Pennsylvania in an attempt to make human and real to the inmates the traumatic and lasting impact of violent crime on innocent people and society. As part of this Pennsylvania Department of Corrections program, Rosin also assists in the training of counselors who in turn set up Impact of Crime programs in their respective prisons.

He has told his story before the National Organization for Victim's Assistance (NOVA) in Orlando, Florida; has presented workshops about the impact of sudden death for Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD); was the keynote speaker at the Conemaugh Medical Center Trauma Symposium; and was featured on "60 Minutes."

The Rosin family established The Rebecca Rosin and Moez Alimohamed Memorial Fund at Penn Law School in 1998. In 1999, in a program designed and administered by Rosin, five Penn Law students served ten-week internships with the Homicide and Juvenile Units of the Philadelphia DA's office while they were exposed to the devastating impact of violence on innocent victims of crime. Lynne Abraham participates in the program and students also spend two weeks working in the Families of Murder Victims program. The program has been well received and interns speak of their professional and personal growth from exposure to an area of society that is in need of such enlightened programs. Jo-Ann Verrier, Assistant Dean of Career Planning and Placement, comments, "We feel that there is great educational value in having our students involved in the real life issues of fellow citizens, and this program is a model of that involvement." The program will continue this summer.

In 1997, Rosin was appointed by Mayor Edward Rendell to co-chair the Mayor's Investigatory Commission on Videotaping, which, after one year of work, resulted in the current videotaping of confessions in homicide cases by the Philadelphia Police Department.

Additionally, in January, after 15 months of planning, Rosin, with Lynne Abraham, established a program at the DA's office whereby senior lawyers in Philadelphia will serve as advocates and provide support and court accompaniment to elderly victims of crime.

Rosin maintains his law practice on a restricted part-time basis, as well as his leadership at Penn Law School; his advocacy for Victim's Rights; his duties as Treasurer and Board Member of the Jewish Community Centers of Greater Philadelphia; participation on the Friends of Stiffel Senior Center Committee in South Philadelphia, where he has served as an advisor for over 15 years; his role as Chair of the city-wide JCC Senior Services Management Committee; and as a Board Member of the Greater Philadelphia Mentoring Partnership, an organization that utilizes mentoring as an intervention strategy for meeting the needs of at-risk youth.

Rosin's wife Barbara is an artist, and their son, Dan L97, a public interest lawyer in the Consumer Housing Unit at Philadelphia Legal Assistance. Dan's wife, Anya, is an attorney in the Appellate Unit of the Philadelphia DA's Office.

When asked why Rosin continues to tell his story, his answer was clear- "It is a story that has to be told. Although painful to tell, its importance can be found in the telling - it must be repeated again and again - our society must learn and understand that violence is unacceptable. This is often best communicated by the relating of a personal tragedy. But there is another aspect to this - there is nothing more devastating than losing control over a part of your life that is of critical importance - violent death, its aftermath, and its randomness is something that no one should ever experience. In reality, though, it does occur too frequently in our society. It is important for those so tragically affected to see that others can and do survive the loss of a loved one, and the inconceivable demoralizing results encountered in our judicial system, which only serve to compound the loss. The pain never fully vanishes, it is unreasonable to expect that it does, but you find a place to put it, you are aware that it is there, and you find other aspects of life to draw upon and to move ahead - it is important for people to hear this, again, and again, and again, until they, in turn, find the source of their own strength and peace."
In September 1976, Professor Leo Levin began his Civil Procedure lecture to an eager group of energetic first-year students. Could he have imagined a young woman, second row on the right, was absorbing his every word? Indeed, she was. “Professor Levin gave me such a sense of joy about the intricacies of the law and the importance of understanding the rules and applying them correctly and creatively. He injected a sense of humor and wonderment and excitement about the law that was unparalleled in my experience. Professor Al Warren brought the same magic to tax law in the next two years.”

Pamela Daley L'79 is a teacher’s ideal student: in her youth she excelled in mathematics and dreamed of becoming a high school math teacher. Later at college (Princeton A.B. 1974), it was a pursuit of a degree in Romance Languages and Literature that reinvigorated a love of languages born of her upbringing and led her to dream of becoming a professor of French.

But, after Princeton, Daley took some time to explore which talents she would dedicate herself to developing. She trained as a paralegal in Philadelphia and worked at Fox, Rothschild, O’Brien and Frankel as an ERISA paralegal for a couple of years before she applied to Penn for both J.D. and M.B.A. degrees.

“The day I got the acceptances both to Penn Law and to Wharton, the joy that I got in opening the letter from the Law School so overwhelmed the other letter, I realized my heart was telling me something,” Daley laughs. In the end, “A lot of what I needed to learn about business I learned either through matters I undertook at the law firm (as a tax attorney at Morgan Lewis & Bockius from 1979 to 1989) or much more concretely at GE,” Daley is Vice President and Senior Counsel - Transactions for General Electric Company. She joined GE in 1989 after departing Morgan Lewis as a partner.

For her next subject she didn’t study history, she became a participant in it – she was a deal lawyer on the first major merger of television and the Internet; the first transaction that would
herald a radical redesign of the aerospace industry in the United States; and a transaction – her first at GE – which at the time was the largest Western investment in Hungary since World War II: GE Lighting’s 1989 acquisition of Tungsram, the state-controlled Hungarian light bulb manufacturer.

“That deal was a wild ride - an amazing cross-cultural experience, coming as it did during the fall of the Berlin Wall and reaching across the Iron Curtain,” Daley recalls. “It was both an exciting global move for GE and a historic moment in the reform of Hungary’s economic system. And as a personal footnote, the deal accelerated my transformation from mostly tax and partly business, to purely business lawyer, which is part of what I was after when I went to GE.”

In a geopolitically related transaction, Daley was GE’s deal lawyer in the 1992 sale of its aerospace business to Martin Marietta (now Lockheed Martin) for $3.1 billion. “That deal represented a dramatic shift in an industry that was reshaping itself to survive the post-Cold War cuts in the U.S. defense budget. Consolidation in the defense industry accelerated dramatically in its wake.”

In a completely different arena, Daley was GE’s lead lawyer in the 1995 joint venture between NBC (a GE subsidiary) and Microsoft that formed MSNBC as both a global 24-hour news and information channel and an interactive online Internet-based news and information service. “While we now take the very existence of the Web for granted, and while we may now consider the convergence of television and the PC inevitable, the GE-Microsoft deal was truly electrifying - it redefined the way people get their news and information,” Daley recalls. “And dealing with Microsoft was another cross-cultural experience!” she laughs.

Daley is awed by the experiences she has had as a lawyer. “I call it the ‘Exploding Universe Theory.’ For me, coming from a wonderful international practice at a wonderful firm, to join a company like GE – the universe simply exploded because we play in every arena in virtually every place around the globe in a remarkable set of businesses. In one company you have literally a whole career’s worth of diversity. Boredom is never an issue.”

Will Daley return to her first love of teaching? After all, most teachers probably daydream about Pam Daley’s life: traveling extensively in Asia, Europe, and the Americas; doing deals that make the front page of The New York Times and finding herself on the cover of The American Lawyer, and standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the leaders of the global Fortune 500.

The answer is ‘yes.’ While in Philadelphia in the 1980s Daley was a lecturer at Penn Law teaching Partnership Taxation for eight years. Based mainly in the Metropolitan New York region, Daley co-taught a class on deals to law and business students at Columbia University this past Fall. The professors taught the theory and issues, then brought in the actual “deal do-ers” to lecture. Daley presented GE Power System’s billion dollar pan-European acquisition of Alstom’s heavy-duty gas turbine business in 1999. “It was a real pleasure bringing the deal world to life for an extremely bright group of students using the Socratic method.”

Keeping homes in New York City, Maryland, and Maine, Daley confesses that her limited leisure time is spent in the main with her husband, Randy Phelps, and her stepson, Nick. Given her whirlwind schedule, it is no surprise that her valuable downtime is spent enjoying the quiet, contemplative pursuits of cooking, gardening, sailing, spoiling her two cats and, of course, reading. And, perhaps daydreaming about a syllabus that would reflect her career accomplishments— if one course could do them justice. The subjects covered might comprise an entire degree.
It was a wise man who once said it is a sign of a finely developed mind if one can hold two opposing thoughts at the same time. Environmental law scholar Jason Johnston is such a person.

Johnston is as likely to pop a recording of Mahler's Third Symphony into the CD player as The Cowboy Junkies most recent release. Between giving lectures around the country on the subject of land preservation and environmental contracts, he may be found fly-fishing on the upper Delaware River or hunting for grouse in rural Pennsylvania.

He embodies the balance that can be achieved between environmental use and preservation. In the reconciliation of seemingly opposite visions, Johnston's scholarship is indicative of the continuing evolution of the environmental law and natural resources use debate since the ecology movement of the 1970s. He sees environmental and natural resources law moving from "first generation" command and control approaches to cutting the most egregious forms of pollution, to a "new generation" of market-based, contractual approaches under which development is regulated to provide the capital for ecosystem restoration and enhancement.

Raised in Suttons Bay, Michigan near Traverse City, Johnston enjoyed the pristine north woods as his playground. "I grew up in a family where we did a lot of outdoor things, so that's surely a reason why I have an interest in the environment." At Dartmouth (A.B. 1978 summa cum laude), cabin and trail sojourns took him into the hills and wildlife of New England, and to the Appalachian Trail. In 1981 he took his J.D. cum laude from the University of Michigan where he also earned a Ph.D. in Economics in 1984.
Johnston has taught environmental law since joining the Penn Law faculty in 1995. He arrived from Vanderbilt Law School where he was on the faculty from 1989 to 1994. Before that, Johnston was a Senior Fellow in Civil Liability at Yale Law School, an associate professor of law at Vermont Law School, and a clerk for The Hon. Gilbert S. Merritt, U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit.

This year, along with teaching a new course in Natural Resources Law and Policy, Johnston has conducted the Seminar on Law and the Environment. It is a yearlong multidisciplinary course that highlights not only the theoretical aspects of law and the environment, but the practical aspects as well. Throughout the year, students are visited by the leading thinkers and innovators in the field. Visiting speakers during the 1999-2000 year included Margaret Bowman, Senior Director of Dam Programs for American Rivers; Delaware Riverkeeper Maya K. van Rossum, Professor of Law (and former EPA General Counsel); Jon Cannon of Virginia; aquatic ecologist David Hart of the Academy of Natural Sciences; and natural resource economist Dean Lueck of Montana State.

In addition to his teaching, in 1998 Johnston embarked on the creation of the Program on Law and the Environment (POLE) at Penn Law. The program promotes multidisciplinary research on environmental law and policy. Its mission is to support faculty research, both directly and by fostering ties between Penn scholars and scholars from around the world, and to provide funding for law students interested in environmental law and policy.

With the belief that the field of environmental law will demand lawyers who have extensive and rigorous training in ecology, economics, environmental science, epidemiology, and history and political science, POLE — with the resources of the University of Pennsylvania to draw on — will provide such training. To attract the best students, POLE will offer generous scholarships to those who wish to enter the environmental field after graduation and who, without scholarship support, would be constrained by loan repayment obligations to take higher-paying corporate jobs.

“We have a great group of students,” Johnston asserts. “We already have more students here who are really interested in environmental law and policy than people realize — they’re very able, and really very committed.” Johnston also notes that with the recent addition to the faculty of environmental law professor Howard Chang (whom he describes as having produced the “best thing yet” on the relationship between international trade and the global environment) Penn now has the core faculty strength to build POLE.

Johnston’s current research spans a number of areas in environmental and natural resource law. On a relatively abstract level, joint work with Rachel Croson of Wharton OPIM (forthcoming in the Journal of Law, Economics and Organization) involves a series of experiments on how people bargain under alternative property rights regimes. Johnston and Croson found dramatically different behavior under regimes that assign clear or definite property rights and those which (like contemporary nuisance and takings law) assign blurry or contingent rights.

A more general, law review - style article, “Decentralization and Development: The Political Economy of Natural Resource Federalism” argues that existing rationales for federal environmental regulation (such as the fear of race-to-the-bottom among States, and concern over interstate spillovers) do not account for the historical pattern of centralized ownership and/or regulation of natural resources in the United States and provide little guidance in determining when federal regulation of natural resource development is appropriate. The paper agrees with the traditional historical story that the increasing scarcity of relatively undeveloped natural resources is a primary reason why the management of those resources has often been centralized in the federal government. But it offers a new explanation of why this has occurred: not to preserve resources, but to develop them when local majorities would not favor such development. The paper also explains how the concentration and geographic distribution of the gains from development affects the likely efficiency of decentralize development decisions. It identifies how the kind of transfer made by developers to obtain local consent to development (e.g. funding for a new school or recreational facility) can be used to make inferences regarding the efficiency of the development decision.

A more directly applied paper, “The Law and Economics of Environmental Contracts” was presented by Johnston at a Fall 1999 Wharton Impact Conference that POLE co-sponsored. This paper, which will appear as a chapter in the forthcoming conference volume New Approaches to Environmental Regulation: European and American Approaches (Kluwer, 2000), sets out an economic framework for evaluating how the process by which environmental contracts (such as Habitat Conservation Plans under the Endangered Species Act, Brownfields redevelopment agreements and in-lieu-fee wetlands mitigation) are negotiated, affects the performance of those agreements.

Johnston is not alone in his enthusiasm for the out-of-doors. He and his wife Beth, a Vice President at Pennsylvania Hospital and a marathon runner, whom he met at the University of Michigan, have an eleven-year-old daughter, Addie. The family enjoys skiing, hiking and playing racquet sports together. Athletics runs in the family, as does an interest in music — while Johnston muses to Mahler, Beth listens to Sting, and Addie to Cristina Aguilera and the Dixie Chicks.

Perhaps disparate tastes, but in harmony, nonetheless. Like Nature itself, and the agents that strive to manage it.
Howard Chang is returning to his roots over many roads. The first American-born child of a Chinese father who immigrated in the 1950s to attend graduate school at Purdue, he has become an expert in the economic analysis of immigration law. And as a child who “grew up all over the Northeastern United States,” he has returned to the East Coast by joining the Law School as full professor in September 1999 following seven years on the faculty of the University of Southern California Law School.

Always interested in public policy, Chang majored in government at Harvard (A.B. 1983). He took a masters in public affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton, where his interest in economics flowered, before returning to Harvard for law school. Then, when a planned clerkship was scuttled by the judge’s retirement, he went ahead with doctoral work in economics at MIT. The following year he interrupted his graduate studies to take a clerkship with Ruth Bader Ginsburg, then on the District of Columbia Circuit bench, before obtaining his Ph.D. in 1992.

At MIT he met his wife, Hilary Sigman, and they both decided to become instructors. “I suppose going into teaching is a way of staying in school forever,” says Chang, “learning new things and thinking and writing about whatever it is you want to think and write about.”
Sigman chose economics for her teaching career. Chang chose the law. At law school, Chang explains, "you have the flexibility of writing in different ways to different audiences, whereas in economics you are confined to writing in a technical mode." On graduation, Sigman was hired by UCLA, Chang by USC. Fortune smiled again when she obtained a position at nearby Rutgers University in New Brunswick, NJ when he joined Penn Law.

Chang finds Penn most to his liking for its interdisciplinary emphasis, not only at the Law School — where he can hobnob with four other Ph.D.s in economics, as well as legal philosophers and historians — but in the close-knit strength of the University's other departments he says, "I enjoy the benefit of strolling over to the Wharton School and attending their seminars."

He views as his most important scholarly work a series of articles on immigration policy, including a chapter in "The Economic Analysis of Immigration Law" for the forthcoming book Migration Theory: Talking Across the Disciplines. In this work, Chang argues that immigrants raise rather than lower the economic status of U.S. natives, by expanding the labor supply and thus reducing the cost of consumer goods; by plowing their earnings back into the national economy, and by contributing taxes. Studies cited indicate that even unskilled immigrant workers — when their future earnings and the earnings of their descendants are taken into account — increase the national wealth.

Chang also shows that native and immigrant workers tend not to compete for the same jobs, so that the adverse effect of immigrants on native workers is generally minimal. He adds that a wholesale reduction of public benefits to immigrants, placed into law by Congress in 1996, further assures that immigrant workers will not become a drain on the economy. Together, he concludes, these factors point to the benefits of liberalizing immigration, rather than restricting it, as has been the trend in Congress in recent years. Chang advocates the liberalization or elimination of immigration quotas, as well as the liberalization of our "guest worker" policies.

In private Chang admits, "Most of my suggestions are not politically feasible at the present time. But as I see it, the role of scholarship is to try to bring about more enlightened views and ultimately change that which is politically feasible." In an ideal world, he says, he would oppose the restrictions introduced in 1996 that excluded immigrants from public benefits, but that, given political realities, "if we must choose between excluding immigrants from public benefits and excluding them from the United States entirely, then I prefer the less restrictive alternative."

For Chang, teaching and scholarship intertwine nicely. "In all my courses I try to bring economic analysis to bear on the laws that we study. It's also the common thread running through my writings, a lens for looking at issues that arise in different areas. I have rather eclectic interests." He has written extensively on international trade regulation and on varied areas of law and economics.

This spring, Chang is teaching environmental law for the first time, although he has written about the subject as far back as his student days. Most recently, he co-authored his first article with his wife, an environmental economist, studying the effects of liability under the Superfund law on incentives to settle out of court. "Our relationship survived it," says Chang, "so we hope to do more collaboration in the future."

Their most meaningful collaboration, however, was Merrick Sigman Chang, a son born last July. The couple is delighted that Chang's two sisters and his father, who live in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, can join in admiring the baby. Endowed with a mind that traverses many scholarly topics, Chang's curiosity will not be disappointed at Penn Law. The Law School delivers endless permutations of diversity in its student body, its faculty, and its program offerings. Chang has the ability to cross bridges into many disciplines simply by walking over to the Penn campus. Some might say that these days Chang just might have the best of all possible worlds.
Slipping into emeritus status this fall after 35 years on the Penn Law faculty, Robert Gorman, The Kenneth W. Gemmill Professor of Law, will be free to laze about and revise his two casebooks; finish up the second edition of his labor law text; teach a course in copyright law; read up on history, biography, music, science and fiction; take courses in literature and history at the College; travel; do a bit of international labor arbitration; take piano lessons for a couple hours a day; read the New York Times cover to cover; and spend more time with his wife, Caryl, a sixth-grade public school teacher, who plans to join him soon in his retired ease.

Though none would deny Gorman the rewards of a well-earned rest, the news of his retirement has prompted accolades and remembrances from 30-plus years of former students who are now established legal experts in their own right. “Bob’s passion for labor law was one of the driving forces behind my becoming a labor lawyer. His passion for people remains a benchmark for which I continue to strive,” says Jonathan A. Segal C’82, I.85, a partner at Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen.

As a Harvard undergrad (A.B. 1958, summa cum laude), Gorman started out a math major. By the time he concluded it was not really his dish, he had “stumbled into a course on American constitutional law.” He shifted to a major in government, taking tutorials with Robert McCloskey, “my patron saint and academic mentor.” A Fulbright Scholarship led him to a year at University College, Oxford, where he studied legal philosophy — “having been trained in neither law nor philosophy” — under H.L.A. Hart, the subject’s major 20th century figure. When Gorman elected to return to the U.S. to join his future wife, Caryl, Hart advised him to apply to law schools rather than extend graduate study. Gorman took his J.D. from Harvard Law in 1962, magna cum laude.

Following a clerkship with Irving Kaufman on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, he was unsure if his future lay in teaching or practice but opted for what turned out to be a short stint with the Proskauer Rose firm in New York. Penn Law had approached him during his clerkship and continued to woo him at Proskauer. In addition, James Freedman, a fellow clerk at the Second Circuit (and later Penn Law dean), told Gorman he
planned to join the School faculty, and Clark Byse, Gorman’s favorite teacher at Harvard Law and a former long-time Penn Law faculty member, nudged him in that direction. “I began at Penn in January of 1965,” recalls Gorman. “I have never regretted for an instant leaving practice.”

Labor law became his primary specialty through a similar combination of coincidence and “the wisdom of having no sharply fixed goals too early in life.” At Proskauer, he spent much of his time on labor cases. When he joined the faculty, Alexander Hamilton Frey, senior instructor in labor law, had recently retired, and Gorman was tapped to fill the gap. Then, while a visiting professor at Harvard Law in 1973-74, revered labor-law professor Archibald Cox — who had been on leave as Watergate special prosecutor only to fall victim to President Nixon’s Saturday Night Massacre — returned with a new interest: constitutional law. He asked Gorman to take over the labor law casebook that he edited with Derek Bok, who had moved on to become president of Harvard.

Gorman’s Basic Text on Labor Law: Unionization, and Collective Bargaining (1976) is the standard in its field: “People tell me that all of the lawyers in their firm’s labor law department have this book on their desk.” He has also edited two casebooks — Cases and Materials on Labor Law (with Cox, Bok & Finkin, 1996) and Copyright: Cases and Materials (with Jane Ginsburg, 1999).

A 1968 recipient of the Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching, Gorman says, “I love teaching and I love to think about teaching and I love to think about how to shape material in a way that is pedagogically sound and useful and stimulating — and fun.” The love affair with Penn Law has been mutual with former students recalling him fondly. “He is the living embodiment of the humanity of Penn Law,” says Lawrence J. Fox C’65, L’68. Students thirty years later agree: “Professor Gorman truly loves teaching — he came alive in front of the class,” remembers Martin Attea L’99.

“In a time when it seems like professionals in all fields travel from place to place constantly searching for a new and ‘better’ opportunity, Professor Gorman has always remained devoted to Penn Law,” Brian Jacobs L’99 states.

No faculty member has contributed more to the School’s administration and educational direction than Gorman, who served as associate dean to Louis Pollak and James Freedman (1976-82) and to Colin Diver (1992-94). Pollak says of him, “Bob was an absolutely central figure, a marvelous teacher and scholar who accepted institutional responsibilities such as I’ve rarely seen.”

Several times chair of the faculty curriculum committee, he has pursued curricular reform with tenacity and zeal for over 30 years. Designated by the faculty a one-man educational task force in 1969, Gorman produced hundreds of pages of surveys, recommendations for a model curriculum, and specific proposals. A major innovation, begun in 1970, was the institution of a required first-year course in labor law, designed to expose students early on to statutory interpretation and administrative law. “I’m heartened when I hear that other major law schools are today considering bringing a statutory course into the first-year program,” he says. “I get a big smile on my face and say, ‘We did that 30 years ago’.”

Gorman lauds both family and faculty for providing inspiration. Two of his three sons, Mark and Andy, were Penn undergrads. Andy L’95 has followed his father’s legal leanings, working in corporate law at Klett Lieber Rooney & Schorling in Philadelphia.

Summing up, Gorman recalls, “I have been blessed to have had colleagues of wonderful ability and amiability and to have had students who are bright and who push you in class, who are friendly, for the most part eager to learn. A hearteningly good number of them are making a contribution to the public good — not that I had anything to do with that, but I may have touched them in a way while they were here.”

In recognition of a career incorporating virtually every aspect of faculty endeavor, Gorman will receive the Law Alumni Society’s Distinguished Service Award on May 19, 2000 during Alumni Weekend celebrations.
The Legal Oral History Project is a collaborative effort by a team of faculty, librarians, and students to record and preserve first-person narratives of graduates and faculty of the Penn Law School. The Program was launched in 1998, and since then fifteen subjects have told their stories on videotape to law students who have transcribed the interviews and presented academic papers that position the subject within law and history.

Since the project focuses on the alumnus/a or faculty member's life and professional experience, students acquire a sense of the breadth of possibilities their legal training will give them, as well as a meaningful relationship with a senior lawyer. By studying their legal accomplishments in a historical context, participants gain a vivid appreciation for how developments in the law have influenced historical events. More important, students gain a sense of how often lawyers have been in a position to shape these events. The Legal Oral History Project is co-directed by Professor Sarah Barringer Gordon and Associate Director for Public Services of the Biddle Law Library, Edwin Greenlee.

Following is an excerpt from a full interview conducted by Catharine L. Krieps L'99 with Judge Dolores K. Sloviter L'56 who served as Chief Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals from 1991 to 1998.

Judge Sloviter has many fond memories of her law school years: "I was very happy at the law school, and I loved the law. I loved everything I was learning." With her classmates, who came from widely disparate social backgrounds from rural Tennessee to the Main Line, she learned rigorous thinking at Penn. According to Judge Sloviter, the Socratic technique taught at that time was a real social leveler, because students were judged based on what they could do rather than where they came from.

She was eager to get a job, but found it to be a very difficult undertaking. Describing this process as "the trauma," Judge Sloviter continued:

Without going into the details of that term, women were not generally well received. My story is the same as the stories we have all heard publicly now from Ruth Ginsburg and ... Sandra Day O'Connor ... We all had the same experience, of knocking on the doors of the big firms and being told, 'We're sorry, we really have nothing for you. Would you like to be our librarian? Would you like to write briefs in the back room?' And the fact that I was Jewish was another obstacle because in Philadelphia firms at that time, about half of them did not take any Jews. Maybe more than half of the large firms, to which you didn't have to bring in business ... I didn't come from an environment or a background in which I would come in with a couple of corporations to bring to the firm, so I was limited in that respect.

Despite these considerable obstacles, she ultimately did find a position with the firm she would have picked at the very beginning: Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish & Green .... [Later as] a partner, Sloviter didn't think of herself as a feminist or a trailblazer. While she was not treated any differently from male attorneys at Dilworth Paxson, in the outside world social restrictions remained firmly in place.

The full transcript for this interview can be read at the website for the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Oral Legal History website: http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/oralhistory/oralhist.htm. A videotape of the interview can be viewed in the Biddle Law Library.
Herewith the final installment in a brief history of the Law School, celebrating the 150th anniversary of its founding and the 100th anniversary of the construction of Silverman Hall.

1952-2000
The Making of Today's Law School

Jefferson Fordham: 18 Years of Progress

Jefferson Barnes Fordham (1905-1997) arrived at Penn in 1952 with a vision for the Law School more ambitious than any Dean since Lewis. A graduate of the University of North Carolina Law School, he had taught at the law schools of West Virginia, Louisiana State, Vanderbilt and at Ohio State University as dean.

Fordham believed Penn Law's student body should grow fifty percent, to 550 and the full-time faculty double to 35. Increasing emphasis on LSAT scores should achieve steadily rising admission standards, and the Law School would attract the best students by raising funds for financial aid. Institutional support for faculty research would further enhance the stature of an appointment at Penn. To accommodate this growth, a long-range development program would provide for the enlargement of the physical plant.

In the decades following World War II, the Law School became a national leader in transnational law and interdisciplinary programs. The first was a bundle of related subjects which had come to the fore with the assumption of international leadership by the United States. The second arose from research which recognized common ground between law and closely related social sciences, such as economics, but which grew to include the behavioral sciences, journalism and urban expansion.

In 1953 Fordham established the Institute for Legal Research to "encourage institutional research activity and provide administrative service for research projects." The Ford Foundation provided a large grant in the 1950s to underwrite international legal studies, legal research and interdisciplinary cooperation.

Expanding Faculty, Diverse Student Body

Two early appointments reflect Fordham's commitment to strengthen the faculty with prominent scholars. Clarence Morris (1903-1985) joined in 1953, produced *Morris on Torts*, and became active in research on law and the behavioral sciences. He subsequently taught and published in legal philosophy, Chinese legal thought and the judicial process. Covey Oliver (1913- ), an acclaimed scholar of international law, moved from Berkeley in 1956 and later co-authored the ALI Restatement of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States (1963) and *The International Legal System* (1973).

Among Fordham's appointments who remained for many years were Curtis Reitz, a 1956 Penn Law graduate, Richard Lonsdorf, who taught psychiatry and law; Howard Lesnick; Almarin Phillips; Robert Gorman; and Robert Mundheim, corporate finance and securities regulation. By 1970 the standing faculty had grown to 29, two-thirds again as large as in 1952.

The goal of 550 students was reached by 1967, when the entering class LSAT scores averaged in the 90th percentile. More than forty percent of the student body enjoyed some form of financial aid. In 1967 the Law School also first committed itself to increasing the presence of women and minorities in the student body. Within seven years, the number of women had tripled and that of minorities had increased seven times over.

A $3.1 million building campaign was inaugurated in 1954. Construction of student dormitories and a dining hall began in 1957, with major assistance from the United States Housing and Home Finance Agency. They opened the following May as the Owen J. Roberts and George Wharton Pepper Dormitories and the Horace Stern Dining Hall.

Three years later, work started on two wings attached to the rear of the main Law School building, housing five amphitheater classrooms, three seminar rooms, twelve faculty offices, and the present administrative office suite. The third and final stage was the renovation of Lewis Hall, the 1900 landmark building. A new moot court and a new faculty lounge were placed on the first floor, along with two seminar rooms and 33 offices. More important, the library was enlarged to five floors with space to house 400,000 volumes.
Consolidation in the 1970s

Though Penn Law faced disruptions in the 1970s resulting from the social upheaval of the previous decade, it continued to move forward as a major player on the national scene. Law School graduate and professor Bernard Wolfman followed Fordham as dean in 1970. "There is no question that students must play an important role in most aspects of their education," he announced. "We have a good working relationship here at the Law School – there is no other law school I know of with so little friction."

Experimentation in the curriculum increased, including eight-week mini-courses and increasing emphasis on small-group work and on writing. The School's involvement in social issues continued with the 1972 establishment of the Prison Research Council. The following year the clinical program came under a single coordinator and new clinical courses were added.

Among the new faculty, criminologist Marvin Wolfgang, a member of the Penn sociology department, accepted dual appointment at the Law School; Judge A. Leon Higginbotham began his long association as a lecturer in 1974; and the School added one of its most storied scholars when Clyde Summers, an expert in labor law and comparative law, came from Yale.

Wolfman's successor, Louis Pollak, had come to Penn the previous year from Yale Law where he had served fifteen years on the faculty, five as dean. Though applications and legal employment were dropping nationally, at Penn Law, placements remained level and applications rose. Pollak's term saw the election to the faculty of the first African American male member, Ralph Smith, in 1975, and the first African American woman, Regina Austin L73, in 1977.

In 1979, the baton passed to Pollak's former student at Yale, James Freedman, who served only until 1982 when he became president of the University of Iowa. A new small business clinic was established and the Institute for Law and Economics (ILE) opened.

Growing into the Present

Following Freedman's move, Robert Mundheim, Penn faculty member and financial law scholar, became dean. His seven-year tenure provided the School with renewed administrative stability. He announced that he would stump aggressively for funding for faculty salaries, financial aid, technology and facilities. The quality of the student body continued to increase. LSAT scores reached the 96th percentile and applications were up, bucking a national drop. By 1985, the incoming class included 42 percent women and sixteen percent minorities.

New faces on the faculty included present members C. Edwin Baker, economist Michael Wachter to oversee the ILE, current Dean Michael A. Fitts, Friedrich Kühler, Charles W. Mooney, Jr., Susan Sturm, Bruce Mann and Stephen Morse, along with Michael Moore and Heidi Hurd in legal philosophy.

Mundheim—a strong proponent of legal ethics—developed a program in professional responsibility and the legal profession for all first-year students. In 1989, the faculty voted to adopt a public service requirement of 35 hours in each of the second and third years—still the most extensive public service requirement of any law school in the nation.

Mundheim also oversaw the start of a capital campaign which, under his successor Colin Diver, who arrived in 1989, financed the $23 million construction of Tanenbaum Hall, a new, technologically wired home for the library, run by professor and librarian Elizabeth Kelly.

Diver came from Boston University, where he had served as associate law dean, then dean. The faculty expanded at a rapid rate. Geoffrey Hazard moved to Penn from Yale in 1994, and the School's strength in international and comparative law was further increased by the additions of Jacques deLisle and Kim Lane Scheppele. Most dramatically, Diver encouraged the assembling of one of the world's most impressive faculties in legal theory and legal philosophy, with the additions of William Ewald, Leo Katz, and Stephen Perry to bolster Hurd and Moore.

Under Diver, a firm believer in community and public service, a series of new academic concentrations took shape, particularly in conjunction with the Wharton School: joint teaching and research, along with dual-degree programs. Graduate studies were put on firmer footing, especially increasing the number and quality of Asian students enrolled in the LL.M. program.

In 1995, University President Judith Rodin requested the development of a long-term strategic plan for each School. Diver promennt Penn Law as the Leadership Law School, a designation which stressed interdisciplinary study and promoted Penn Law as the educator not only of lawyers, but of corporate and civic leaders.

Clearly, the legacies of James Wilson, George Sharswood, William Draper Lewis, and Jefferson Barnes Fordham are being carried forward into the 21st century.
There is no greater measure of success in development than the effective and generous leadership of volunteers who give of their philanthropic resources, their energy and expertise, and their time. Behind every gift to Penn Law, there are numerous relationships that impact our donors’ motivation to give generously. We are proud and grateful to highlight some of our volunteers and the donors they inspired by their leadership.

**New Major Benefactors since July 1, 1999**

The Law School is deeply grateful to these individuals who have endorsed our educational programs by sharing significant philanthropic resources in support of our endowment.

**Robert Potamkin L’70**, Chairman of Potamkin Companies, the automobile, office supply, radio station and real estate conglomerate, has endowed *The Potamkin Scholarship in Honor of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.* with a gift of $250,000. The scholarship will provide financial support to minority law students of exceptional promise or students interested in civil rights who cannot afford the cost of education at the Penn Law School.

“Judge Higginbotham had a great effect on the lives of everyone he touched. And, he had a giant impact on civil rights in this country,” Potamkin remembers. “My hope for this scholarship is to provide financial support to any exceptional student who wants to study civil rights law, or to any exceptional minority student who wants to study the law. It will be open for students to carry on in the tradition of Judge Higginbotham’s teachings and writings.”

Potamkin clerked for the esteemed jurist in 1970 on the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Judge Higginbotham, who died in 1998, taught race and social policy as an adjunct professor at Penn Law from 1970 to 1993. He also served as chair of the Law School’s Board of Overseers and, for three decades, a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania.

In 1935 *Kenneth W. Gemmill* graduated from Penn Law at which time he began his lifelong involvement with Penn Law as one of its most active alumni. In addition to establishing the Kenneth W. Gemmill Professorship in 1973, a chair held by Professor Robert Gorman, the Gemmills also funded scholarships and faculty research at Penn. Several years ago, Gemmill and his wife, Helen, established a Charitable Remainder Unitrust that would benefit the Law School. After their passings in 1999, Penn Law received a gift from their estate of $723,000 that will continue their philanthropy in perpetuity.

The Law School has received a $100,000 gift from Edward I. ’37 and Roseline Adams Cutler. This gift by the Cutler family to their Unitrust, will ultimately benefit Biddle Law Library’s archives. The Cutlers’ dedication to Biddle has allowed us to attract many unique archival resources over the years.

In honor of his 25th Class Reunion from Penn Law, *James R. Tanenbaum L’75*, has pledged $125,000 to Law Annual Giving. A partner of Stroock & Stroock & Lavan in New York City, Mr. Tanenbaum has practiced as an attorney specializing in corporate finance and the structuring of complex domestic and international capital markets transactions.

**Barry Feinberg**, President of the Feinberg Group, a Philadelphia-based retail consulting and investment firm, has made a commitment of $100,000 to the Institute for Law and Economics. An adjunct faculty member in the Marketing Department at the Wharton School, Feinberg’s gift will support interdisciplinary research that analyzes the impact of law on the global economy.
Institute for Law and Economics “Investors”

Founded in 1980, the Institute for Law and Economics at the University of Pennsylvania has an ambitious agenda that is more timely than ever. This cross-disciplinary research center seeks to influence national policy debate by analyzing the impact of the law on the global economy and spotlighting the significant role economics plays in fashioning legal policy. Sponsored by the Law School, in conjunction with The Wharton School and the Department of Economics, the Institute has played a leading role in expanding the field. Each year the ILE programs include roundtables, public lectures, sponsored research and workshops on topics such as Maximizing IPO Value, Labor Law and Close Corporations.

Led by James H. Agger L’61 the ILE has put an aggressive fundraising plan in place in order to expand its work. Agger, the retired Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of Air Products Corporation, serves as the Chair of the ILE Board. In the Spring of 1999 he assembled an advisory committee of the Board to introduce the “ILE Investors” to recognize and thank the Institute’s annual donors. Leading the way, Agger pledged $100,000 to the Institute as its first major benefactor, followed by major commitments from Feinberg, and Paul S. Levy L’72, the Managing General Partner of Joseph Littlejohn and Levy.

Volunteers in the Lead

Each academic year hundreds of alumni volunteers are deployed to raise gifts for Penn Law. This year over three hundred graduates are writing letters and making phone calls to ask classmates, coworkers and colleagues to make an investment in Penn Law, in order to ensure that a Penn Law education is available to today’s most promising and talented students. This year we welcome three volunteer leaders who are beginning new two-year terms. R. Bruce Rich L’73, National Chair for Law Annual Giving, is a partner at Weil, Gotshal & Manges in New York specializing in anti-trust litigation. The Chair of the Benjamin Franklin Society, John J. Clair L’72, is a current member of the Law School Board of Overseers and has previously served on the Law Alumni Society Board of Managers. He is a tax attorney at the firm Latham & Watkins in Los Angeles. Alvin L. Snowiss L’55, has recently agreed to serve as the Chair of the Lewis Legacy Circle, which recognizes those who have made provisions for Penn Law in their estate plans. Also a former member of the Law Alumni Society Board of Managers, Snowiss is a founding partner of Snowiss, Steinberg, Faulkner & Hall in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania where he practices as a trusts and estates lawyer.

Reunion Reflections

Gene E. K. Pratter L’75
Partner, Duane Morris & Heckscher LLP

Reunions provide a focused opportunity for reflection. After 25 years since graduation from the Law School, I can still see (though my glasses help a bit now) Leo Levin leading the “Greek chorus” in our Civil Procedure class with his special humor and grace. The enormity of the Great Hall (now newly refurbished and restored sans the linoleum we tramped on) matched the tasks my classmates and I undertook in the fall of 1972. I wonder if we then fully appreciated the feelings of permanence, history and opportunity that pervaded the Law School. I know I am more appreciative of those qualities now.

Penn was one of the nation’s premier law schools when my class was there. In working alongside alumni who have remained actively connected to the school, I am proud to see that Penn Law has remained among the best. For me, the connection is a rewarding pleasure—Penn Law set me on my way to a fulfilling career at Duane Morris & Heckscher LLP, in a wonderful city here in Philadelphia, amid a host of lifelong friends and colleagues, including at the very top of the list—though I didn’t know it at the time—my husband, a fellow, albeit “older” Penn Law alum.

My Law School class, the Class of 1975, along with all of this year’s reunion classes, has embarked on the quest to raise $1.5 million dollars with sixty percent participation to support our Law School and solidify its place among the nation’s leading institutions. To date, we have reached the $1.2 million mark. The challenge now is to achieve our sixty percent participation goal. When you hear from your own reunion committee members, I hope you will reflect positively on our alma mater and its past as well as its future by contributing to our reunion efforts.
A few years ago now, I began working on my estate plans and asked myself ‘what will I leave behind?’ This led me along a soul-searching journey at the end of which I was very clear that a person is remembered for the weight of his or her character; for marks of accomplishment; for acts of kindness; for compassion; for generosity and for values. At the end of this journey I understood that I wanted to leave a lasting impact on the institution that had shaped my life and to which I wanted to say thank you—Penn Law.

After several conversations with my wife, Jean, and Penn Law School, we determined that a charitable gift annuity would benefit both my family and the Law School. Through this vehicle we were able to ensure our lifetime income and qualify for a current income tax deduction while at the same time meeting one of Penn Law’s most pressing needs—endowed professorships. Jean and I have now established the Alvin L. Snowiss Professor of Law, which will support a leading scholar in fields such as antitrust law, economic regulation, law and economics, environmental law or corporate law.

As the new Chair of the Planned Giving Program, my aim is to encourage growth in this arena. This endorsement provides witness to others that we believe in the future of Penn Law.

---

LOCK IN YOUR CAPITAL GAINS

As the leading stock market indicators continue to go up and down, but mostly up, many individuals are astounded at the rate of growth they have enjoyed. They also ask the question, how can I protect my capital gains?

The Penn Law School is pleased to offer a secure alternative – the charitable gift annuity. The gift annuity provides a way to lock in capital gains and take advantage of an attractive rate of fixed annuity payments.

**BENEFITS INCLUDE:**
- Fixed income for the lives of one or two beneficiaries
- Annuity based on market value of assets contributed
- A current income tax deduction
- Capital gains tax savings
- Low minimum gift of $10,000 per annuity
- Choice of monthly, quarterly, semiannual or annual payments
- Significant, donor-directed support for Penn
- Each annuity contract is backed by the total assets of the University

**Sample Rate Chart for a $10,000 One Life Charitable Gift Annuity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>DEDUCTION *</th>
<th>ANNUITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$ 3,491</td>
<td>$ 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$ 3,488</td>
<td>$ 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$ 3,728</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>$ 4,046</td>
<td>$ 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$ 4,388</td>
<td>$ 820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>$ 4,770</td>
<td>$ 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82+</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$ 5,037+**</td>
<td>$ 950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information call Beth Brown, Director of Development, at (215) 898-4396.

---

* Charitable deduction will vary slightly with changes in the Federal Discount Rate.
** Annuities with an income beneficiary above 82 will receive a higher income tax deduction depending on the age of the beneficiary.
Jacques deLisle
Fifty Years After the Revolution, Op-Ed article in Philadelphia Inquirer (9/26/99).
The Taiwan Question, in Foreign Policy Research Institute (e-note) (1999).
The Chinese Puzzle of Taiwan’s Status, 43 Orbit (Winter 2000).

William Ewald
Cumberland and the Reform of Natural Law, in Jahrbuch für Rechts und Ethik (Forthcoming 2000).

Michael A. Fitts

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.

Peter Huang
The Value of Options Thinking in Corporate Law Teaching, University of Georgia Law Review (Symposium Issue on Teaching Corporate Law) (Forthcoming 2000).

Heidi M.Hurd
Is It Wrong to Do Right When Others Do Wrong?, Legal Theory (2000).
The Revival of Positivism, Mind (2000).

Jason Johnston
The Law and Economics of Environmental Contracts, in Environmental Contracts and Other Innovative Approaches to Environmental Regulation, eds. Deketelaere and Orts (Forthcoming 2000).

Leo Katz
Why the Successful Assassin Is More Wicked Than the Unsuccessful One, University of California at Berkeley Boalt Hall School of Law California Law Review (1999).
Howard Lesnick

Personal Fulfillment in the Changing World of Law Practice: Possibilities and Obstacles, Temple Law Review (Forthcoming 2000).

Charles W. Mooney, Jr.
Relationship Between the Prospective Unidroit International Registry, Revised Uniform Commercial Code Article 9 and National Civil Aviation Registries, Uniform Law Review (1999).


How Successful Was the Revision of UCC Article 9: Reflections of the Reporters, with Steven L. Harris, Chicago Kent Law Review 1357 (1999).

Choice of Law Rules for Foreign Debtors Under Revised UCC Article 9 (Forthcoming 2000).

Michael Moore


Stephen J. Morse


Delinquency and Desert, 564 The Annuals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 56 (July 1999).

Neither Desert Nor Disease, 5 Legal Theory 265 (1999).
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David Rudovsky

Kim Lane Scheppelle


David J. Shakow


Reed Shulddiner

David Skeel

The Rise and Fall of the SEC in Bankruptcy (Forthcoming 2000).

Clyde Summers


Michael L. Wachter
Corporate Law as a Facilitator of Self Governance, with Edward B. Rock University of Georgia Law Review Symposium on Teaching Corporate Law (Forthcoming 2000).


Tailored Claims and Governance: The Fit Between Employees and Shareholders, with Edward B. Rock Employees & Corporate Governance, ed. Margaret Blair and Mark Roe (Brookings Institution: 1999).


Barbara Bennett Woodhouse


**Matthew Adler**

Matthew Adler presented "Implementing Cost-Benefit Analysis When Preferences are Distorted," co-authored with Eric Posner, at the Symposium on Cost-Benefit Analysis at the University of Chicago Law School in September 1999. He also presented "Personal Rights and Rule-Dependence" at Columbia Law School in October 1999. Adler was a co-organizer of both symposia. In addition, Adler presented "Rethinking Cost-Benefit Analysis" at the Public Policy and Management Brown Bag Seminar at the Wharton School in December 1999.

**Anita Allen-Castellitto**

Anita Allen-Castellitto was a panel speaker on "Privacy: Politics and Ideology" at the Wolfson Center for National Affairs of the New School for Social Research on October 11, 1999 and on "Women in Cyberspace" at the Stanford University Law School Conference "Cyberspace and Privacy" February 7, 2000. Also, she lectured at the symposium "Contexts for Diversity, Europe and North America" on September 30, 1999 at the University of Michigan. In September 1999 Allen-Castellitto was awarded the Alain Locke Excellence Award by Howard University for her contributions to legal philosophy.

**Regina Austin**

Regina Austin participated in a program on the Pursuit of Diversity in Science and Technical Education held at Drexel University in October in which she spoke of the roles science and technology have played in perpetuating environmental injustice in Chester, Pennsylvania. In November she delivered a paper "Contextual Analysis, Discrimination, and Fast Food" at a centennial conference at the John Marshall Law School.

**Stephen B. Burbank**

Stephen B. Burbank, David Berger Professor for the Administration of Justice, presented a lecture on “The Class Action in American Securities Regulation” to a group of German lawyers and bankers in Frankfurt, Germany in October, and to a faculty workshop at Boston College Law School in November. The revised lecture will appear (in English) in a German journal on international procedure in March 2000. In November, Burbank served as convener and moderator at a Symposium on Mass Torts sponsored by the David Berger Program on Complex Litigation, the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the University of Pennsylvania Law Review. The University of Pennsylvania Law Review will publish the papers and commentary with an introduction by Professor Burbank. He continues to participate in meetings of the State Department’s study group formed to advise the United States delegation that is negotiating a treaty on jurisdiction and judgments at the Hague and attended the first meeting of the Advisers to the American Law Institute’s Jurisdiction and Judgments Project in November. Professor Burbank is a member of the Executive Committee and Chair of the Amicus Curiae Committee of the American Judicature Society and also serves as Co-Chair of the Society’s Center for Judicial Independence.

**Howard Chang**

Jacques de Lisle

Jacques de Lisle was named a senior fellow of the Foreign Policy Research Institute in 1999. He presented papers on the law and politics of Taiwan's international status at Harvard University's Taiwan Studies Colloquium, Penn's Center for East Asian Studies Social Sciences Colloquium, and the Foreign Policy Research Institute's China series. His commentaries, "Who's Afraid of Falun Gong?" and "The Taiwan Question" were published as Foreign Policy Research Institute E-notes and reprinted in China Online, Free China Journal, Taiwan Security Research and other media. Also, he spoke on "Making the Market in China: Economic Aims, Political Constraints and the Construction of a Legal Framework for Reform and Opening to the Outside World" and gave a series of lectures on Chinese politics at the Center for Asian Studies, Universidade de Aveiro in Portugal.

Michael A. Fitts

This Fall, Michael A. Fitts participated in a panel on Campaign Finance at the American Political Science Association Convention, and in conferences on Law and Political Parties at a symposium at Columbia University Law School, and on Political Parties at a symposium sponsored by the MIT Department of Political Science. On March 6, 2000 he was appointed Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Douglas Frenkel

In September, Douglas Frenkel spoke on "Emerging Ethical Issues for Neutrals and Advocates in Mediation" at a conference sponsored by the American Arbitration Association in Philadelphia. In October, he gave a presentation and training on "Mediating Physician-Patient Disputes" to the Pennsylvania Psychiatric Society in Philadelphia.

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr. serves on the Standing Committee on Practice and Procedure, Judicial Conference of the United States; the American Bar Association's Special Commission on Multidisciplinary Practice, and the ABA's Special Commission to Review Rules of Professional Conduct (the "Ethics 2000" Committee). Also he provided expert testimony for Connecticut State's Attorney's Office. In 1999 he was awarded the Columbia Law School Medal for Excellence, the American Judicature Society's Outstanding Contributions Award, and the Ceremony of Salute from the Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

Peter Huang


Heidi M. Hurd

Heidi M. Hurd, Co-Director of the Institute for Law and Philosophy, testified before the United States Congress House Judiciary Committee in August on federal hate crime legislation. She presented a paper on tort theory entitled "Is It Wrong to Do Right When Others Do Wrong?" at a conference on Conflicts of Rights sponsored by the Institute for Law and Philosophy, and at a Columbia University Legal Theory Workshop. In October she gave a University-wide lecture on hate crime legislation and presented a paper entitled "Moral Rights and Legal Rules: A Natural Law Theory" at the Columbia Law School Conference on Rights and Rules. The latter paper is forthcoming in a symposium issue on Rights and Rules published in Legal Theory. As Co-Director of the Institute for Law and Philosophy, she organized and hosted conferences on "Conflicts of Rights," "Causation in Law and Metaphysics," and "Mercy and Retribution." In February she gave lectures on her recently published book, Moral Combat (Cambridge University Press, 1999), at the University of Erlangen-Nurnberg, in Germany, and at the University of Parma, Italy. She also participated in a Liberty Fund Conference on Natural Law, Moral Independence, and Civil Liberties, in Dallas, Texas.
Jason Johnston

Jason Johnston presented the paper "Why History Matters: An Economic Theory of the Centralization of Environmental Regulation" at the Annual Meeting of the American Law and Economics Association at the Yale Law School. "The Law and Economics of Environmental Contracts" was presented at the Wharton/Penn Law Impact Conference on Environmental Contracting and Other Innovative Approaches to Environmental Regulation, and to the University of Texas Law Faculty Colloquium. "How Does Imperfect Law Alter the Evolution of Commercial Norms?" (commenting on Lisa Benstein) was delivered at the University of Michigan Law School conference on Commercial Law. Under the rubric of the Seminar on Law and the Environment, Johnston brought over a dozen environmental scholars and practitioners to Penn. The Program on Law and the Environment jointly sponsored, with the Wharton School, the Impact Conference on Innovative Approaches to Environmental Regulation.

Leo Katz

Leo Katz presented a talk to the AALS panel on Jurisprudence on the purposes of legal scholarship, "Why We Do What We Do and Why We Do It." He presented "Conflicts of Rights and the Outbreak of the First World War" at a conference held by the Penn Institute of Law and Philosophy; "Why the Successful Assassin Is More Wicked Than the Unsuccessful One" at a conference in honor of Sandy Kadish; "Responsibility and Consent" at the General Aspects of Law Workshop at the University of California Berkeley, and a comment on the relationship between rules and laws at the Mazatlan Conference on Legal and Political Philosophy.

Seth Kreimer

Seth Kreimer served on the Corporate Counsel's Course Planning Committee that in October 1999 presented the Second Constitutional Law Conclave, an authoritative analysis of the most significant United States and Pennsylvania Supreme Court decisions from the previous year and a look ahead to some of the issues in the 1999-2000 term.

Adjunct Professor Harry Reicher is determined to provide a forum for students to objectively analyze and process the horrors of the Holocaust. His passion is equal to his gratification that this course has been anchored at the Penn Law School. "The Law and the Holocaust," offered for the third time in the Spring 2000 semester, examines how the Holocaust was produced by the Nazi party's perversion of the law. As it is a subject that lacks a casebook, Professor Reicher compiled nearly one thousand pages of documents and testimony — including some from the Nuremberg and Eichmann trials — to create one. Since the first year, the course has increased in popularity with students drawn from throughout the University — undergraduates and graduate students alike — and from around the world.

There are many courses on the Holocaust, and even departments and institutes of Holocaust studies, but none of these are based in law schools. What makes "The Law and the Holocaust" one-of-a-kind is that it looks at the Holocaust through the lens of the law with the focus keenly on the legal dimensions of the Holocaust. The University of Pennsylvania Law School is the only law school where this focused scholarship is being taught.

The course begins with an overview of the Holocaust then examines Nazi theories of Race and the State; identifies laws passed to give effect to those theories; offers an exploration of the role of morality in a system of law through a consideration of academic writings and judicial reflection; examines the response of the international legal system through the Nuremberg trials and the evolution of the concept of international human rights; and concludes with a consideration of lessons for the 21st century.

Biddle Law Library has created a website to augment Reicher's course materials, reachable via the Penn Law website (www.law.upenn.edu/bl/law/hoocaust/hoocaust.htm). In addition, the Biddle collection includes videos acquired that relate to the law and the Holocaust, and a bibliography of books about Nazi government teachings.
A. Leo Levin

A. Leo Levin serves on the Planning Committee of the Claims Commission charged with making recommendations concerning the proper disposition of hundreds of millions of dollars being paid, both as restitution and reparations, to survivors of the Holocaust.

Charles W. Mooney, Jr.

Charles W. Mooney, Jr. continues as coordinator of the United States delegation for the U.S. Department of State on the Draft Convention on International Secured Financing of Mobile Equipment, sponsored by the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT). He also serves as an advisor to the standby committee on Uniform Commercial Code Revised Article 9 (Secured Transactions). His works in progress include a paper on “Choice of Law for Foreign Debtors under Revised UCC Article 9,” which he will present at a colloquium at Oxford University in April 2000. He served as Interim Dean of the Law School from August 1999 to March 2000.

Michael Moore

Michael Moore, Leon Meltzer Professor of Law and Professor of Philosophy, is completing his second year as co-director of the Institute for Law and Philosophy. In the Fall semester the Institute hosted roundtables on Conflicts of Rights, and Causation in the Law. Spring roundtables will be convened on the topics of Mercy, and International Law. In September, Moore commented on a paper by Howard Chang in the Law School’s Legal Studies Workshop. In October, Moore presented a paper on causation (to be published in the California Law Review) to a conference on moral blameworthiness at the School of Law, UC-Berkeley. Also, in October he presented a paper (to be published in Social Philosophy and Policy) to a conference on natural law held at the Center for Social Philosophy and Policy at Bowling Green University. In January, Moore defended the first chapter of his recent book, Placing Blame (1999), at the AALS Jurisprudence Section annual meeting in Washington, DC. Also, he delivered a paper on causation at Erlangen University in Germany (to be published in the Encyclopedia of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice). In March, Moore participated in a conference at Penn on leading criminal law scholars centered on Placing Blame. The papers will be published in a conference volume.

Stephen Perry


David Rudovsky

In the past several months, David Rudovsky published annual supplements to his books Police Misconduct: Law and Litigation and Criminal Procedure in Pennsylvania. In October 1999, he was one of the organizers and faculty at the Second Annual Constitutional Law Conclave presented by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute and the Philadelphia Bar Association. In January 2000, he presented a paper on racial profiling at a Conference on Race and Crime sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law.

Louis S. Rulli

Louis S. Rulli, Practice Associate Professor of Law, was a guest panelist at the Temple University Political and Civil Rights Law Review’s Symposium celebrating the Americans with Disabilities Act where he addressed access to justice issues under the employment provisions of the Act. Rulli was a presenter at two major continuing legal education programs for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute discussing lawyering and ethical issues in “The Trial of an ADA Case” and “Ethics, Law & the Media.” Also, he was a guest lecturer in the Law and Social Policy Program at Bryn Mawr’s Graduate School of Social Work. Rulli has just completed his second term as chair of the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Commission on Judicial Selection and Retention.
Kim Lane Scheppelle
Kim Lane Scheppelle gave a paper called “Regimes of Horror and the ‘Not That’ Constitution” at the International Institute of the Sociology of Law in Onati, Spain in September 1999. She presented “The Limitation of Fundamental Rights: Comparing Hungarian and American Jurisprudence” at a conference to honor the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Constitutional Court in Budapest, Hungary in November 1999. She participated in Millennial Philadelphia’s celebration of the new year/century/millennium by engaging in a staged debate with character actors playing Benjamin Franklin, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson in Carpenter’s Hall on New Year’s Eve. Scheppelle was elected to the review panel of the National Science Foundation’s Law and Social Science Division which evaluates grant proposals for possible federal funding. Also, she agreed to serve as program chair for the 2001 joint meetings of the Law and Society Association and the International Research Committee on the Sociology of Law, which will be held in Budapest Hungary in July 2001. She was married to Serguei Oushakine in 1999.

Reed Shuldiner
Reed Shuldiner advised the government of South Africa on the taxation of financial instruments on behalf of the U.S. Treasury Department.

David Skeel

Barbara Bennett Woodhouse
Barbara Bennett Woodhouse, both as a family law scholar and in her role as Co-Director of the Center for Children’s Policy Practice and Research, has worked on a number of projects relating to child protection and children’s rights. She was invited to address the Japanese Diet in November in connection with its review of the first Report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child which reported on Japan’s progress in conforming to the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. While in Tokyo, she also presented a paper on “The Role of Government in Protecting Children’s Rights” at an international conference sponsored by the Ministry of Education and Hitotsubashi University. Professor Woodhouse is serving as a member of the Planning Group for a Kahn Institute project on Re-thinking Childhood, which began its work with a two-day roundtable at Smith College in the Fall. Also during the Fall, she participated in a Capitol Hill Briefing on the proposed Religious Liberty Protection Act’s detrimental effects on enforcement of laws against child abuse and neglect, which was instrumental in mobilizing opposition to the Bill. During the Fall semester she authored two amicus briefs on behalf of the Center: one submitted to the Third Circuit in the case of Brian B., discussing the constitutionality of Pennsylvania’s policy of denying education to youths incarcerated in county jails and the other, submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court in Troxel v. Granville, a grandparents’ rights case, urging the Court to consider the important role of extended family in providing stability for children in state care or at risk of placement. In January, she taped a debate on this controversial case with Professor Katharine Bartlett of Duke University, for the public radio series “Justice Talking” produced by the Annenberg Public Policy Center.

PROFESSOR DAVID SHAKOW TO RETIRE
After nearly eighteen years on the faculty of the Penn Law School, Professor David Shakow decided to retire from the practice of academia effective with the conclusion of the Spring 2000 semester.

Prior to coming to the Law School Shakow served from 1977 to 1981 in the U.S. Treasury Department’s Office of Legislative Counsel. Fellow faculty member Reed Shuldiner said in tribute to Shakow, “David has been a wonderful colleague and teacher to me at Penn. It has been a privilege working with him, and I have enjoyed his insightful comments and his quiet sense of humor.” Shakow will be joining the firm KPMG in Washington, DC in June.
The statistic about the incoming Class of 2002 that stops you in your tracks is the fact that women students comprise fifty-three percent of the class. This is the first time Penn Law has had a female-majority in any class year. This scenario is not unique to Penn Law, however, because the figure reflects a nationwide trend that indicates more women than men are applying to law schools.

Penn Law’s ability to offer multidisciplinary degrees has had the positive effect of attracting a diverse student body and the finest minds to rigorous courses of study. In the first-year class alone, there is a Truman scholar, a Mennonite dairy farmer from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and a woman who was a prison doctor in a male-only sex offender’s prison in New Mexico. The J.D. class size is 249 students, culled from an applicant pool of 3,422 that represents 112 schools and students arriving from twenty-nine States, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and eight countries. The average LSAT score was 166 and average GPA was 3.6. Of the L.L.M. class, sixty-five students from twenty countries were accepted from a pool of 465 applicants.

The 1999/2000 student body is flavored with the presence of five medical doctors who are pursuing J.D. degrees and one student who has undertaken a joint J.D./M.D. degree. One student who arrived at Penn Law with a background in genetic engineering and human organ harvesting is pursuing a J.D./M.A. degree in Bioethics, dividing his time between the Law School and Penn’s Center for Bioethics.

What attracts this diverse group of students to the Law School, aside from the multidisciplinary offerings and a dedicated faculty, is what has attracted generations of students to Penn Law—it is a collegial community, intellectually engaging, and socially comfortable. New students quickly feel at home at Penn Law, have ready access to leading scholars, and are given ample room to shine. In addition, prospective students are drawn to the strategic planning that Admissions officers provide to assist students’ transition from pre-law to lawyers-in-training at the Penn Law School.

To continue recruiting the finest students to Penn Law, Assistant Dean Janice Austin has expanded her visits to undergraduate institutions by five schools per year since joining Penn Law a decade ago. This year she fit in an extra four, to bring the total number of schools visited to seventy-eight. The Admissions Roadshow travels to each corner of the contiguous United States throughout the Fall then comes home to Penn to select the best applicants and close the deal.

Looking around the Penn Law School’s corridors, we can see the results of these rigorous efforts and take pride in the students who have made Penn Law their home.
Judicial Clerkships are among the most prestigious and strategically important assignments that graduating students can obtain. Penn Law School marshaled forces together in the Fall of 1999 with the dual goals of raising students' awareness of these opportunities and increasing the number of clerkships offered to graduates.

The Clerkship committee of Professors Barbara Bennett Woodhouse, Frank Goodman, and Assistant Dean Jo-Ann Verrier of Career Planning and Placement successfully piqued the interest of second-year students in the option of clerking. They then facilitated the efforts of two dozen of their faculty colleagues in writing recommendation letters for the students. Three years ago, Penn Law was the first school to implement the all-in-one presentation of Penn Law students in a cohesive package—students' materials are mailed directly with faculty letters of recommendation. This method has received high praise from judges' chambers. This year, approximately eighty students from the Class of 2001 applied for clerkships in chambers in federal and state courts around the country.

To date, the Class of 2000 boasts forty class members who have received judicial clerkships. As a sample of these plum assignments, Sigal Mandelker will clerk for Justice Clarence Thomas on the U.S. Supreme Court after a year clerking for Judge Edith Jones, USCA 5th Circuit. BLSA president Damon Hewitt will clerk for Judge Eric Clay of USCA 6th Circuit, and Editor in Chief of the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Daniel Garodnick, will clerk for Judge Colleen McMahon on the USDC, SDNY.

But clerkships aren't the only story in Career Planning & Placement. In January 2000, Penn Law alumni hosted law students for a day during Leaders’ Week. Law School Overseers Fred Blume L'66, John K. Castle, Saul A. Fox L'78, Charles A. Heimbold, Jr. L'60, James J. Sandman L'76, and Glen A. Tobias L'66 were among the hosts who gave students a quick immersion course in what awaits them after Penn Law.

The Career Planning & Placement team first reaches out to students upon their arrival at Penn Law. Through the three years of the J.D. program and the one year of the LL.M. program, students participate in orientations, information seminars, mock interviews, networking receptions, resume drafting workshops, and job fairs that prepare them with a knowledge and skill base to launch their legal careers after Penn. An expansive reference library and on-site advisors help focus students’ energies and ambitions in their search process.

Alumni are gratefully welcomed to participate in these and other programs. One can volunteer to be part of the Law Alumni Network, or as a host for a day during Leadership Week, and as a panelist at career information seminars and more. Contact Jo-Ann Verrier to join the effort to mentor Penn Law students. (215-898-6746, or jverrier@law.upenn.edu)
Penn Law’s Bar Passage Rate Makes Headlines

According to the statistics of bar passage rates for 1997 graduates, published in *The Official ABA Guide to Approved Law Schools, 2000 Edition*, the University of Pennsylvania Law School’s graduates had the best bar pass rate at 97%, second only to Yale Law School. Analysis of the bar pass rates suggests that in smaller schools that offer an intimate faculty-to-student ratio, students are given an excellent chance to learn both advanced legal theory as well as skills that are tested on bar exams offered nationwide. Rounding out the top ten in descending order after Penn are the University of Chicago, Harvard, NYU, Cornell, Duke, Columbia, Northwestern, and Georgetown.

Hollywood, Darrow and Penn Law School

“You’re under arrest!”

When Leslie Nielsen entered the Law School on October 25, 1999 he quickly assumed his popular alter ego, Detective Frank Drebin, from the “Naked Gun” film series. In the hallway where students awaited his arrival, he gloated in showing off his law enforcement prowess—or lack thereof, in keeping with the Drebin character. Inside the lecture hall, however, Nielsen showed off his talents as a raconteur, performer and novice scholar of the law in a dialogue with students and faculty. The previous evening, Nielsen performed “Leslie Nielsen as Clarence Darrow,” a one-man performance, at the newly refurbished Irvine Auditorium on the Penn campus.

The afternoon was co-moderated by Penn Law Professor Peter Huang, whose enthusiasm for the subject and his course “Law and Popular Culture” qualifies him as the Law School’s resident expert on the Hollywood firmament, and the University of Pennsylvania’s School of Arts & Sciences Theater Department lecturer Rose Malague. Nielsen spoke movingly about his admiration for the famed lawyer and orator whom he portrayed, “Darrow spoke with such eloquent prose. He would often have the jury and the judge in tears. (Reading the Irving Stone book on which the play was based) I got choked up. I love language.”

What actor would not want to have the audience in the palm of his hand? With little awareness that he was doing so, Nielsen slipped into parts of the Darrow monologue in answer to students’ questions, giving a spontaneous performance that captured the audience. Commenting that he was on hiatus from Hollywood to tour the country with the play, Nielsen explained, “I’m doing Darrow for myself.” Affirming that lawyers are pleased when they see Nielsen’s performance—“Darrow is a good guy,”–he stated that many think Darrow is a good role model for lawyers to follow.

Might lawyers receive even better training through acting, asked one audience member. Nielsen demurred cautioning, “Acting might encourage someone to get caught up in the performance and skip the truth.” As for the inverse, actors playing lawyers, Nielsen quipped that before one walks in the shoes of a historical figure such as Darrow, “First thing: find out his shoe size.”
Anita DeFrantz L'77: Getting the Team to Row As One

“Who would've thought I'd ever be lecturing at the Law School?” Anita DeFrantz L'77 smiled and asked a lecture hall full of students and faculty. As a law student who was also training for the Olympics, DeFrantz may not have had time to consider that ambition. But on November 18, 1999, delivering “Ethics in Sports: Deciding the Game,” the eleventh lecture in the Institute for Law and Economic's Law and Entrepreneurship series, she had the authority, demeanor, and command that would place her among the finest professors at Penn Law.

DeFrantz is a Vice President of the International Olympic Committee and President of the Amateur Athletic Foundation. Arriving in Philadelphia from IOC business in Kuala Lumpur, she undertook a whirlwind itinerary that reacquainted her with Penn Law during her first visit in 22 years. She began the day rowing on the Schuylkill River, then led a seminar for students in the Career Planning and Placement offices, lunched with members of the Black Law Students Association, and joined an evening roundtable with faculty over dinner.

In her second year at Penn Law, DeFrantz was captain of the U.S. Women's Rowing team that captured the Olympic Bronze medal in the 1976 Montreal Games. Her daily routine was to rise before dawn to train on the Schuylkill. She would attend classes at the Law School before training on the river again in the afternoon. At night she worked at "Roundhouse" at Municipal Court making bail recommendations. “I did everything so I could row,” she reflected. After graduation, DeFrantz worked for the Juvenile Law Center in Philadelphia while she trained for the 1980 Olympic games in Moscow. When President Jimmy Carter decided that the United States would boycott the games to protest the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, DeFrantz emerged as the voice of the athletes, filing a lawsuit against the U.S. Olympic Committee claiming the decision violated the athletes' right to compete.

“Sports demands a great deal of thought... it is about decision making. Ethics is part of that,” DeFrantz lectured. As a member of IOC 2000, the Reform Committee put together after revelations of a bribery scandal surrounding the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter games, she has intimate knowledge of the challenges and temptations faced by those in positions of power. In making his introduction of DeFrantz, Professor Michael Wächter, Co-Director of ILE, defined entrepreneurs as “people who are agents of creative and destructive change.” DeFrantz bowed to that definition, stating that “change is good.”

Change may indeed be very good for DeFrantz in the near future – she has been mentioned as a possible successor to International Olympic Committee president Juan Antonio Samaranch when his term expires in 2001 after twenty years at the helm of the organization. That possibility would make her the first woman and the first African American to head the IOC. Her leadership would be grounded in ethics and a sense of responsibility: "Whenever you are a 'first,' you must ensure that you're not the last." With such clear determination, Anita DeFrantz may yet have her second chance at Olympic gold soon.
Conference on the Separation of Church and State

"Church cannot do it alone; government does not have the will. Therefore, a partnership is necessary."
Reverend Floyd Flake, Allen A.M.E. Church, Jamaica, Queens, NY

The University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Anti-Defamation League co-sponsored a Conference on the First Amendment and Government Support for Religion and Religious Institutions on October 22, 1999. Gathering leading thinkers and activists working in the area of the separation of Church and State, the conference offered a forum to debate the use of school vouchers, and the provision of faith-based social services to the underserved, and to review recent court holdings in these areas.

The second panel, “Should the Government Provide Financial Support for Religious Institutions that Offer Faith-Based Social Services?” was introduced by Law School Overseer Glen A. Tobias W’63, L’66, Chairman of the National Executive Committee of the ADL and moderated by the Hon. Louis H. Pollak.

“Do School Vouchers Violate the Establishment Clause? Are They Good Public Policy?” provided a vigorous panel discussion moderated by the Hon. Arlin Adams L’47, HON ’98, and debated by Elizabeth J. Coleman L’74, Law School Overseer and National Director of Civil Rights for the ADL, Professor Steve Sugarman of Boalt Hall School of Law at U.C. Berkeley, Professor Ruti Teitel of New York Law School, Elliot Mineberg of People for the American Way, and Kevin Hasson of the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty. Coleman stated that parents are left with “unpalatable” choices for their children’s education. “Instead of draining money from the schools (for vouchers), we should be spending that money to fix them,” she argued.

The conference concluded with a roundtable discussion, “Have Recent Court Holdings Enhanced or Eroded Religious Freedom for All Americans?” moderated by Penn Law Professor, and former Dean, Colin S. Diver. The panel included Nadine Strossen, President of the American Civil Liberties Union, Professor Ira C. Lupu of George Washington Law School, Melissa Rogers of the Baptist Joint Committee, and Professor Jesse H. Choper L'60 of Boalt Hall.

www.law.upenn.edu/alumnijournal
The Constitutional Law Journal sponsored its Third Annual Symposium in January. The subject of examination was "Race, Crime and the Constitution." Constitutional law expert and Penn Law professor Kim Lane Scheppele moderated the panel on Race and Juries, and Professor David Rudovsky was a panelist on the topic of Racial Profiling. Rounding out the program were panels on the Impact of Morales, and Race and Incarceration. The Hon. Nathaniel Jones of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals delivered the Endnote Address.

The Con Law Journal is devoted to promoting the discussion of domestic and international constitutional issues by providing a forum for the interdisciplinary study and analysis of constitutional laws. To that end, the Journal cultivates innovative scholarship to reinvigorate the traditional study of constitutional law.

Gilbert F. Casellas L'77 Delivers 7th Annual Edward B. Shils Lecture

Former Chairman of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission Gilbert F. Casellas L'77 delivered the 7th Annual Edward B. Shils Lecture in Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution on December 8, 1999. Entitled "EEOC Faces a Future Requiring New Approaches," Casellas spoke of the initiatives he undertook at the EEOC to encourage the use of alternative dispute resolution measures to settle the backlog, as well as the increasing number of employment discrimination claims filed every year.

Named the tenth chairman of the EEOC in 1994 by President Clinton, Casellas discovered that the Commission was suffering under a backlog of cases that had been filed over the years. To begin to address the crisis, he questioned "Should the forum of last resort (federal court) become the forum of first resort?" Casellas led broad changes in the way that the Commission did business, including streamlining its increasingly heavy case-handling systems.

Soon thereafter, the EEOC developed a policy statement encouraging the use of ADR to settle employment discrimination claims through mediation and conciliation in order to free up the Commission to address the more egregious cases. Since this policy was encouraged, said Casellas, "ninety-nine percent of the cases" filed with the EEOC do not go to litigation but are settled without compromise to the claimant.

Casellas is the President and Chief Operating Officer of the Swarthmore Group, an investment and financial advisory firm located in West Chester, Pennsylvania. He is a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, a board member of Prudential Insurance Company, the Puerto Rican Legal Defense & Education Fund, the National Constitution Center, and the American Arbitration Association. In 1999 President Clinton appointed him Co-Chair of the U.S. Census Monitoring Board.

The Edward B. Shils Lecture in Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution was established in 1991 by Edward B. Shils L'86, LL.M. '90, SJD '97 along with friends, family and colleagues.
Young Alumni Celebrate and Reminisce in Philadelphia

Interim Dean Charles W. Mooney, Jr. and LAS president Richard E. Rosin L’68, hosted a reception for Philadelphia area young alumni at the Lobby Bar in the Rittenhouse Hotel in October. This annual event for Penn Law graduates, out of school for ten years or less, included third-year students, faculty and ABA president William G. Paul. Gearing up for Spring reunion celebrations, or in between commemorative years, young alums reconnected with the Penn Law community and used the opportunity to work the room to exchange freshly minted business cards and dot-com addresses.

The Rotkos Tag-Team for Career Planning and Placement

Father and son Penn Law alumni, Michael J. Rotko L’63 and Thomas C. Rotko L’94 spoke to students in February about the trajectory taken in their individual careers in government and private practice. Mike Rotko impressed upon students the importance of seizing opportunities as they arise. He began his career with the desire to be a constitutional law expert, but a job in the Philadelphia District Attorney’s office soon led him to be named Chief of Appeals at the unlikely age of twenty-eight. Some time later, Mike left to start his own boutique law firm but before long he was named First Assistant U.S. Attorney under Michael Baylson L’64. When his term was up, he joined Drinker Biddle & Reath and learned about the other side of crime in his defense of white-collar criminals. He was soon appointed to a U.S. Senate committee investigating the causes and effects of Gulf War Syndrome. Mike encouraged students to avoid taking narrow career paths, and to not be afraid to change course as they gained experience.

Tom Rotko said he knew from an early age that he wanted to be a prosecutor – witnessing his father, there’s no wonder why. Today, having paid his dues moving through the ranks of the Manhattan District Attorney’s office, which he joined in 1994, Tom is an A.D.A. assigned to the Official Corruptions Unit. Ninety percent of his work involves investigating police corruption. To make his point, Tom showed the audience a videotape of a sting operation in progress. Although he concedes a downside of this work is that it makes him unpopular with police officers – valuable sources that tip him off to cases – a perk is that the best defense lawyers the police unions can buy oppose him in court. And, at age 31, this has given him experience that money can’t buy.
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Mass Torts: A Symposium

"Mass Torts: A Symposium," sponsored by the David Berger Program on Complex Litigation at Penn Law and the University of Pennsylvania Law Review in conjunction with the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules was held at the Law School on November 12, 1999. Welcoming remarks were made by Interim Dean Charles W. Mooney, Jr., David Berger C'32, L'36 of Berger & Montague in Philadelphia, and the Hon. Paul V. Niemeyer, Chair, Advisory Committee on Civil Rules.

The two-day program, directed by Professor Stephen B. Burbank, David Berger Professor for the Administration of Justice, offered sessions that addressed federal-state issues, settlements, bankruptcy, and complex litigation matters current in legal discourse and practice. Professor Burbank stated that the goal of the symposium was "to encourage dialogue—not to present 'talking heads.'" Judge Niemeyer congratulated Professor Burbank for assembling "the most eloquent and thoughtful minds working in the area" of mass torts. Among the presenters were Penn Law Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., E. Norman Veasey L'57, Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court, Edward Becker, Chief Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, judges Diane Wood, Stuart Bernstein, Patrick Higginbotham and Stanley Marcus. Papers from the symposium will be published in The University of Pennsylvania Law Review (No. 6, Vol. 148).

Faculty and Alumni Reunite in Washington, DC

In conjunction with the annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) in Washington, DC in January, Penn Law faculty and D.C.-area alumni gathered at a reception at the Hilton Washington & Towers. Hosted by Law Alumni Society president Richard E. Rosin L'68 and Interim Dean Charles W. Mooney, Jr. the event provided a unique opportunity for Law School faculty to convene also with alumni who are faculty members at fellow law schools.

Annual Keedy Cup Competition at University Museum

The Edward R. Keedy Cup moot court finals were held on January 27, 2000 in the auditorium of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archeology and Anthropology. The two teams of third-year law students argued before the Hon. Harvey Bartle, III, L'65, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Hon. Sandra L. Lynch, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and the Hon. Ilana Diamond Rovner, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

The winners of the 2000 Keedy Cup were Stacey Recht and Louis J. Virelli, III, who acted as the petitioners in United States v. Morrison, which concerns a challenge to the constitutionality of the federal Violence Against Women Act, enacted by Congress in 1994. Virelli also won best individual oralist. David S. Leibowitz and Rick L. Swedloff argued on behalf of the respondents, Antonio Morrison and James Crawford. The case rested on two issues: whether Congress exceeded its authority under the Constitution to regulate activities relating to interstate commerce, and whether Congress exceeded its power to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteeing equal protection of the laws when they enacted the federal Violence Against Women Act.
Examining the Legacy of Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.

The 1999 Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. Memorial Lecture was held at the Law School on November 10, 1999. Professor Derrick Bell of NYU Law School gave a talk entitled “Higginbotham’s Legacy: A Help or a Harm in the Racial Struggle?” sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania’s Afro-American Studies Program. Judge Higginbotham was an adjunct professor at the Penn Law School from 1968-1992 while he served on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Third Circuit in Philadelphia. After dedicating both his life and career to working for racial equality, Judge Higginbotham died in December 1998.

This year Robert Potamkin L’70, chairman of Potamkin Companies, endowed a scholarship in memory of Judge Higginbotham, for whom he clerked in 1970. The scholarship will provide financial support to minority law students of exceptional promise or students interested in civil rights who cannot afford the cost of education at the Penn Law School.

The 1999 Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture: “Diversity”

Professor Sanford V. Levinson, the W. St. John Garwood and W. St. John Garwood, Jr. Regents Chair in Law at the University of Texas School of Law, presented the 40th Annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture on October 14, 1999. Professor Levinson is a leading constitutional philosopher and one of the nation’s most prolific and influential legal scholars.

The subject of his lecture was “diversity.” He spoke about “the frustrating arbitrariness of the word” and the concept as a goal. Levinson dissected rulings that have been decided based on arguments for and against diversity, and spoke of attempts to define the value of an individual’s contribution by questioning whether an individual has a constitutional right to make that contribution. “We operate within institutions – families, employers, churches – our value is determined by our value to them.”

The Roberts Lectures Series is supported by an endowment from the law firm of Montgomery, McCracken, Walker and Rhoads of Philadelphia, and is sponsored by The Pennsylvania Chapter of the Order of the Coif, The Law Alumni Society of the University of Pennsylvania, and The University of Pennsylvania Law School. Owen R. Roberts was a professor and dean of the Penn Law School from 1948 to 1951.
The University of Pennsylvania Law School and the Law Alumni Society
Invite You to Attend Reunion Weekend 2000

May 19, 2000

Law Alumni Society Awards Reception, The Law School
Please join us in honoring this year’s award recipients:

The Distinguished Service Award, “The Goat,” is presented to members of the Penn Law community who have distinguished themselves by their outstanding service to the Law School:
Robert A. Gorman, Kenneth W. Gemmill Professor of Law

The Alumni Award of Merit is presented to select alumni for professional achievement and support of the Law School:
William H. Brown III L’55, Partner at Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
The Honorable E. Norman Veasey L’57, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the State of Delaware

The newly created Young Alumni Award is presented to members of the Penn Law community, who have graduated in the past ten years, for professional achievement and service to the Law School:
Wifredo A. Ferrer L’90, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Attorney General

May 20, 2000

All daytime events on Saturday will take place at the Law School (Sansom Street between 34th and 36th Streets).

Registration and Complimentary Continental Breakfast, Kabacoff Reading Room, Silverman Hall

Alumni/Faculty Exchange, Room 240B, Silverman Hall
“Intellectual Property: The Law and Cyberspace”
Faculty members and Penn Law alumni discuss the issues, challenges, and opportunities.
MODERATOR:
Michael A. Fitts, Dean and Bernard G. Segal Professor of Law

PANEL:
Peter N. Detkin L’85, Vice President, Legal, Assistant General Counsel, Intel Corporation
Edward B. Rock, Professor of Law and Co-Director, Institute for Law and Economics
Michael L. Wachter, William B. Johnson Professor of Law and Economics and Co-Director, Institute for Law and Economics

Law School Tours

Town Meeting with President Judith Rodin, 200 College Hall

Reunion Picnic (Families Welcome), Law School Courtyard

EVENING EVENTS

Individual Class Reunion Celebrations, Events will take place off campus and at the Law School
See insert for details.

May 22, 2000

Law School Commencement, Academy of Music (Broad and Locust Streets)
1950
Hon. Melvin G. Levy, Co-Chair
Hon. Joseph T. Labrum, Jr., Co-Chair
Edward J. Cooke, Jr.
Norman C. Henss
Hon. D. Donald Jamieson
Hon. Paul L. Jaffe
Alexander (Andy) N. Rubin, Jr.

1955
Samuel (Bud) Diamond, Chair
Joel C. Coleman
Arthur H. Moss
Hon. Ralph F. Scalera
Alvin L. Snowiss
Norman P. Zarwin

1960
Stanley M. Shingles, Chair
Edward I. Dobin
John F. Dugan
Frank Federman
Mark K. Kessler
Roland Morris
Samuel J. Reich
Vernon Stanton, Jr.

1965
Stephen M. Goodman, Co-Chair
Lawrence J. Rothenberg, Co-Chair
Paul C. Heintz
Alan M. Lerner
Hon. Benjamin Lerner
William J. Morehouse
Harvey N. Shapiro
Stephen R. Wojdak

1970
Franklin L. Best, Jr., Chair
Francis (Kip) J. Burgweger, Jr.
John D. Draghi
Marcia D. Greenberger
William E. Sudow

1975
Gene E. K. Pratter, Chair
Phyllis Gordon Cohen
William C. Crooks
Joseph Goldberg
M. Duncan Grant
Michael Hirschfeld
Myles J. Horn
Donald C. Klawiter
Nancy Loeb Rackoff
Andrea E. Utecht
Sam L. Warshawer, Jr.
Wendy S. White
H. Reed Witherby
Toni G. Wolfman

1980
James P. Golden, Chair
Richard D'Avino
Tai Terry
Elizabeth W. Fox
A. Richard Feldman
Tonny Ho
Margaret R. Alexander
Kenneth H. C. Willig
Marianne Rosenberg

1985
Cheryl R. Saban, Co-Chair
Victor H. Boyajian Co-Chair
Glen D. Blumenfeld
Audrey Caplin Friedel
Reuben C. Warshawsky

1990
Storm D. Wilkins, Chair
Randi Stock-Garnick
John Edward Page
Wifredo Ferrer
Jeanne Cabezas Jackson
Marion Sokol Hubing

1995
Melissa Mary Moriarty, Co-Chair
F. Schott Donahue, Co-Chair
Alan Robert Reifenberg
Andrew P. Deal
Charles F. Connolly
Chonda St. Jane Jordan
Daniel M. Cohen
David Adam Nasatir
M. Elizabeth Brubaker
Elliot C. Fertik
Francis Xavier Taney
Jaimy Levine Hamburg
Latif S. Domar
Magdalen Braden
Paul Sein Auh
Ravi B. Motwani
Sandra Judith Libeson
Stefanie J. Fogel
David B. Hennes
In September 1999, President Clinton appointed David Berger C'32, L'36 to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. Mr. Berger is Chairman and President of Berger & Montague, P.C.

Richard A. Sprague L'53, a named partner with Sprague & Sprague, was named in Philadelphia Magazine’s Power 100 as the 25th most powerful person in Philadelphia.

S. Gerald Litvin L'54, a leading authority on Pennsylvania tort law and the founder of the Academy of Advocacy, was honored as the first recipient of the Third Circuit American Inns of Court Professionalism Award. This award was founded to promote civility, professionalism, ethics and legal excellence.

Stanford Shmukler W'51, L'54, a noted criminal defense attorney, was included in the Marquis publication of Who's Who in America, 2000 Millennium Edition.

The Kanter Family Foundation has established an endowed prize for legal writing in memory of Lipman “Lippy” Redman C'38, L'41. Redman, who passed away in 1997, was a founding partner of the distinguished Washington law firm of Melrod, Redman & Gartlan. He specialized in tax law and was a former chief of the American Bar Association Tax Section. He was Editor-in-Chief of the Law Review in his student years, and as an alumnus served the Law School as a member of the Board of Overseers, acted as class agent and actively participated in numerous fundraising efforts on behalf of the Law School.

We are grateful for the gifts of these donors to the University of Pennsylvania Law School in the period of 1998-99, and deeply regret the omission of their names from our Honor Roll of Donors.

L. Carter Anderson L'59
Isadore H. Bellis L'45
William H. Bolmet L'74
Beverly S. Bond
Taylor Bond
Margery G. Brack
Joseph S. Cain W'55
Gilbert F. Carithers L'77
Mary B. Cox L'79
Jeffrey A. Dalke L'78
Edward S. G. Dent L'73
Burton A. Finkelstein L'62
Henry A. Gaddis L'64
Robert L. House L'55
Jeffrey H. Ingersoll L'82
John Johnson L'77
Ralph Marks Kipnes L'84
Ralph M. Levine L'87
Jay M. Levin L'81
Bonnie Verbis Landy
Joseph E. Landy
Edward W. Medina, Jr. L'52
Delma Marcus L'81
E. Elizabeth McMeen L'72
Sheila Tannen McMeen L'71
Francis M. Millone L'74
Maida Rosenfeld Millone L'82
Richard W. Moore L'75
Beverly I. Moran L'81
William G. O'Neill L'59
James H. Peters L'51
Martin D. Pulcroy L'67
James G. Richards L'77
Scott S. Rosenblum L'74
Richard E. Rain L'88
Michael T. Scott L'76
Charles A. Shaffer L'63
A Gilchrist Sparks III L'73
Edward M. Spector L'39
Alan J. Stover L'49

S. Gerald Litvin L'54
David Berger C'32, L'36

MEMORIAL PRIZE ESTABLISHED
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MEMORIAL PRIZE ESTABLISHED
William A. Whiteside, Jr. L'54, a partner of Fox Rothschild O'Brien & Frankel, LLP, has been appointed by Mayor John Street to serve on the City Work Force Committee in Philadelphia. This committee was created to advise Street with respect to the City's work force and its wages, and benefits and working conditions as they relate to the upcoming collective bargaining situations with various city organizations.

Peter J. Liacouras L'56 stepped down as president of Temple University after nearly two decades of service to the school.

HONORING EXCELLENCE IN THE PROFESSION

Harris Ominsky L'56, a partner at Blank Rome Comisky & McCauley LLP, was presented with the Philadelphia Bar Association's first "Good Deed" Award by the Philadelphia Bar Association's Real Property Section at the Annual Meeting in November. This award will be given annually to honor excellence in the practice of law and legal education. He also led a Commercial Leasing Roundtable Meeting for the Section of Real Property, Probate & Trust Law at the Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association in Atlanta, Georgia. He spoke on "Tenants' Rights to Assign Commercial Leases in Bankruptcy."

In August, E. Norman Veasey L'57 Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, was installed as the president of the Conference of Chief Justices at the organization's annual meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia. He intends to focus on federal mandates to state courts and "best practices" for case management through administration, proper facilities and court administration.


The Philadelphia Geriatric Center in Jenkintown, Pennsylvania has named Edward I. Dobin L'60, a partner with Curtain and Heefner, to its Board of Directors.

William Swain Lee L'60 resigned from the Delaware Superior Court Bench and announced his plans to seek the Republican nomination for the governor of Delaware.

Franklin L. Kury L'61 of Reed Smith Shaw & McClay, Harrisburg, PA, is a member of a team of lawyers who have won the prestigious Award of Outstanding Achievement from the International Association for Continuing Legal Education. The award was in the Best Publication category for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute's book, Pennsylvania Environmental Law and Practice.

John F. Ledwith C'60 L'63, of the defense litigation firm of Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman & Goggin, has been appointed Chairman of the Construction Law Section of the Federation of Insurance & Corporate Counsel.

David H. Marion W'60, L'63, Chairman of Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, LLP, has been re-appointed National Chair of the Attorney-Client Relationships Committee of the American College of Trial Lawyers.
1960s

Judy Flannery, the late wife of Brian Flannery ’64, is being remembered in a documentary film being made by their daughter, Erin. Judy was a five-time World Triathlon champion who was hit by a car while she was bicycling in 1997. The Flannery family seeks finishing funds to complete the film. Classmates and alumni interested in contributing should contact Brian directly: 4103 Woodbine Street, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815, (202) 663-0150. The documentary, “Judy’s Time,” is a non-profit production.

In January, Stephen A. Cozen C’61, L’64 was elected to the Board of Directors of the Regional Performing Arts Center which includes a concert hall for the Philadelphia Orchestra and a recital theater for The Philadelphia Chamber Music Society. He will serve on the Development Committee. Cozen and O’Connor was the first firm in the city to pledge financial support to the Arts Center.

William H. Ewing ’65, a partner with Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot, received the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Fidelity Award.

Sheldon Sandler L’65 was named one of the top five labor lawyers in Delaware by Delaware Today Magazine.

ADVISING THE BULGARIAN EXCHANGE

Jeffrey B. Schwartz L’65, a partner in the Philadelphia office of Fox Rothschild O’Brien & Frankel, LLP has accepted the post of Regulatory Legal Advisor to the Chairman of the Bulgarian Securities & Stock Exchange Commission (SSEC). A former trial attorney for the United States SSEC, Schwartz will work directly with Chairman Tsonchev and other commissioners at the Bulgarian SSEC to review and formulate ordinances and regulations and prepare a training plan for the SSEC staff. He formerly served as Chief Counsel of the Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Samuel S. Pearlman C’63 L’66 chaired a panel at the Cleveland Bar Association’s Real Estate Law Institute. Also, Pearlman was listed in the most recent edition of Woodward & White’s The Best Lawyers in America.

The Greater Philadelphia Chapter of the National Society of Fund Raising Executives, honored Robert I. Toll L’66 and his family with the Individual Philanthropists of the Year Award at the 1999 National Philanthropy Day Awards Luncheon. Toll was also named in Philadelphia Magazine’s Power 100 as the 85th most powerful person in Philadelphia.

Arthur Makadon L’67, a Law School Overseer and a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, was named in Philadelphia Magazine’s Power 100 as the 56th most powerful person in Philadelphia. He is a partner at Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll.

Norman Pearlstine L’67 was honored as one of the top 100 business news journalists of the century at the Business News Luminary Awards ceremony in New York. He is editor-in-chief of Time Inc. and was at the helm of the Wall Street Journal from 1991-92, before which time he served the paper in various capacities as an editor, manager and bureau chief from the 1970s through 1992.

Dennis R. Supplee L’67, partner in Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP, was recently re-appointed State Chair for Pennsylvania for the American College of Trial Lawyers for 1999-2000. Mr. Supplee is a member of the firm’s Litigation Department and the immediate past Chairman of the firm.

Stanton Abrams L’68 sold his company Senior Tour Players, a worldwide combination golf course and condominium development enterprise, in 1999. He is currently developing two golf courses in Northern Virginia.

IMPROVING HEALTH ALONG THE BORDER

President Clinton announced the appointment of Blair L. Sadler L’65 as a member of the U. S. Section of the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission. The Commission is dedicated to finding ways to improve the health status of Americans living along the border. Sadler has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Children’s Hospital and Health Center of San Diego since 1980.

Betsy Z. Cohen L’66, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Jefferson Bank, was named in Philadelphia Magazine’s Power 100 as the 58th most powerful person in Philadelphia. Jefferson Bank grew to 31 branches before its acquisition last summer by Hudson United.

In December, Akin, Gump, Strauss Hauer & Feld, L.L.P announced that partner, Edward F. Mannino C’63, L’66, chair of the litigation section in Philadelphia, was named to The National Law Journal’s list of the ten “Top Trial Attorneys” in Pennsylvania and one of “The Nation’s Top Litigators.”
HELPING REFUGEES IN TRANSITION

Steven S. Fischman L'68 helped organize a summer camp in Cambridge, Massachusetts for Kosovar refugee children. This camp helped to acclimate the children before they started in American schools. Language skills were offered as well as community activities.

George W. Patrick, Jr. L'68 has been named Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of American Water Works Service Company, Inc., the largest and most geographically diverse investor-owned utility business in the United States. Patrick was formerly a partner at Dechert Price & Rhoads in Philadelphia where he specialized in federal securities law, international financing, corporate mergers, acquisitions and disposition.

Nolan N. Atkinson, Jr. GL'69 of Duane Morris & Heckscher planned a seminar on multidisciplinary practice, which was presented by the Pennsylvania Bar Association in September. The seminar followed on the heels of the ABA's report that encouraged accounting firms and others to offer legal services in competition with traditional law firms.

John W. Morris L'70 was appointed by Governor Tom Ridge to the Pennsylvania Judicial Conduct Board, an independent organ of the state government that investigates and prosecutes allegations of judicial misconduct.

Mitchell L. Bach W'68 L'71, a senior partner at Fineman & Bach, became co-chairman in 1998 of the Business Litigation Committee of the Pennsylvania Bar Association’s Business Law Section. Members of the committee, under Bach’s leadership, were involved in the organization and development of the commerce case program.

Alan J. Davis L'71, a partner at Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll LLP in Philadelphia, was appointed Chair of the American College of Trial Lawyers' Federal Rules of Evidence Committee.

Alan E. Casnoff W'66 L'69 is working with Institute for Contemporary Art overseer Peter Shaw to construct a new residential development that will transform a historic block of Society Hill.

Richard T. DeCou L'69, a member of Capehart & Scatchard's Business Department and Estates Group, was a speaker at a seminar focusing on estate planning and wealth maintenance sponsored by Valley Forge Asset Management.

HONORING LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT

At the ACLU's 18th Annual Civil Liberties Award Dinner, Stephen F. Gold L'71 was presented with the Lifetime Achievement Award for his work to promote civil rights and civil liberties. Gold argued for the dignity and full citizenship rights of homeless persons when he convinced the courts to allow homeless men and women to vote even though they lacked residential mailing addresses.

See the Journal on the Web at www.law.upenn.edu/alumnijournal
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John C. S. Kepner L'71 was hired in the business department at Saul, Ewing, Remick & Saul. He will be overseeing the administration of the firm's business departments.

Mark Pollak L’71, GCP’72 has joined Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering in Baltimore, Maryland as a partner.

John W. Carroll C’68, L’72 of Pepper Hamilton LLP in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania is a member of a team of lawyers who have won the prestigious Award of Outstanding Achievement from the International Association for Continuing Legal Education. The award was in the Best Publication category for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute’s book, Pennsylvania Environmental Law and Practice.

Peter Krauser L’72 has been appointed to a seat on the Maryland Court of Special Appeals, the state’s second highest court. Krauser had chaired the state’s Democratic Party for two years.

Elijah Noel, Jr. W’69, L’72 joined the law firm of Apperson, Crump & Maxwell, LLP in Philadelphia. He is a member of the Executive Board of the Memphis Branch of the NAACP and serves as Chairman of its Legal Redress Committee. He was formerly with the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc. in New York City.

Melvin R. Shuster L’72 planned a seminar on multidisciplinary practice, which was presented by the Pennsylvania Bar Association in September. The seminar followed on the heels of the ABA’s report that encouraged accounting firms and others to offer legal services in competition with traditional law firms.

Timothy C. Russell L’73 has joined Spectrator Gadoh & Rosen as an attorney in the firm’s commercial litigation group. Prior to joining, Russell was of counsel to the firm Christie Pabarue Morrensen & Yong, and previously a partner with Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal and Drinker Biddle & Reath.

Ira S. Shapiro L’73 has joined the law firm of Long Aldridge & Norman LLP as partner and head of its international trade practice. Shapiro was with the Office of the United States Trade Representative serving first as general counsel and then as chief trade negotiator with Japan and Canada.

David F. Tufaro L’72, GCP’72 was the Republican party’s candidate in the race for Mayor of Baltimore.

Ian M. Comisky W’71, L’74, a partner in the Tax and Fiduciary Department at Blank Rome Comisky & McNaule LLP participated in the 16th Annual National Institute on Criminal Tax Fraud. He also chaired a panel on Federal Sentencing Guidelines.

Arlene Fickler CW’71, L’74, a partner at the law firm Hoyle, Morris & Kerr, LLP, was elected a Fellow of the American Bar Foundation. The fellows are an honorary organization of people who demonstrate outstanding dedication to the welfare of their communities and to the highest principles of the legal profession.

President Clinton announced in December the recess appointment of Stuart E. Weisberg L’74 as Commissioner of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, which he chaired from 1994-1999.

Michael D. Green L’75, a co-reporter of the ALI’s restatement of torts, helped the apportionment of liability receive final approval at the May 1999 ALI meeting.

In June, Paul F. Lantieri, Jr. L’75 joined the Philadelphia law firm of Bennett, Bricklin & Saltzburg as a partner.

John C. Rother L’75 is the chief lobbyist for the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) in Washington, DC.

Edmund J. Behan L’76 has been named partner at Carter Ledyard & Milburn. He practices trusts and estates law, including personal tax and estate planning and administration of estates.

Bruce S. Katcher W’71, L’76 is a member of a team of lawyers who have won the prestigious Award of Outstanding Achievement from the International Association for Continuing Legal Education. The award was in the Best Publication category for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute’s book, Pennsylvania Environmental Law and Practice.

Janice Bellace L’74, deputy dean of the Wharton School, was named the first president of Singapore Management University (SMU), Singapore’s third university. Bellace will run SMU from Wharton by e-mail, voice-mail and video-conferencing. SMU is Singapore’s first private university, the first with a foreigner as its chief, and the first to use scores from the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) as part of its admission criteria.

DID YOU KNOW, YOU CAN EMAIL YOUR NEWS FOR THE NEXT ISSUE OF THE JOURNAL?
alumnijournal@law.upenn.edu
Lois Kimbol L’76, a partner with Dechert Price & Rhoads in Philadelphia, won the prestigious Award of Outstanding Achievement from the International Association for Continuing Legal Education along with a team of lawyers. The award was in the Best Publication category for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute’s book, Pennsylvania Environmental Law and Practice.

Anita DeFrantz L’77 is president of the Amateur Athletics Foundation in Los Angeles and vice president of the International Olympic Committee. Sports Illustrated Magazine ranked DeFrantz 56th in their list of the 100 greatest female athletes of the century.

James B. Jordan L’77 has been appointed Assistant General Manager of Loss Prevention, Risk and Claims Management SEPTA. Jordan had previously been the Integrity and Accountability Officer for the Philadelphia Police Department.

Richard A. Matasar C’74, L’77, a professor and former dean of the University of Florida’s Frederic G. Levin College of Law, has been named dean of New York Law School.

Irwin “Sonny” Popowsky L’77, the President of the National Association of the State Utility Consumer Advocates, an organization of state utility consumer advocate offices from 39 states and the District of Columbia, testified before the House Energy and Power Subcommittee. He spoke about the need for federal electricity legislation, the specific elements that should be included in any federal legislation, and the provisions of the Electricity Competition Reliability Act of 1999.

Dean Michael A. Fitts and Hon. John Colyer Invite you to attend The Penn Law European Society Millennium Meeting
2-4 June 2000 – Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Friday, 2 June 2000
Welcoming Reception
Hosts: The law firm of Stibbe Simon Monahan Duhot and Peter Roorda GL’79, Hector de Beaufort GL’83, Joost van Lanzoert L’81

Saturday, 3 June 2000
Workshop on Alternative Dispute Resolution at the University of Amsterdam, Oude Maastricht Panelists: Douglas Frankel, Practice Professor of Law and Director of Clinical Education at Penn Law School, Peter Roorda GL’79, partner at Stibbe Simon Monahan Duhot, and Jacqueline Spierdijk GL’87, associate at DeBraue Linklater Alliance
PLES Gala Black-tie Dinner – Hotel L’Europe

Sunday, 4 June 2000
Tour of Amsterdam
Dutch koffietafel (lunch)

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Yvette M.C. van Loon GL’90, Ing Trust, Amsterdam
+31-20-575-3106 – phone
+31-20-664-8336 – fax
yvlooon@freeler.nl

Sheila Rizzo, Stewardship & Events Coordinator Development and Alumni Relations
(215) 898-6303 – phone
(215) 573-2020 – fax
srizzo@law.upenn.edu

www.law.upenn.edu/alumnijournal
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Mark L. Alderman L’78, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen, planned a seminar on multidisciplinary practices, which would allow accounting firms and others to offer legal services in competition with traditional law firms.

Daniel S. Grausz L’78, WG’78 won a seat on the City Council in Mercer Island, Washington.


Bonnie M. (Kistler) MacDougal L’78, recently had her mystery novel entitled Out of Order, published.

James Weinstein C’75 L’78 has been appointed the first Amelia D. Lewis Professor of Constitutional Law at Arizona State University.

Gregory J. Winsky L’78, executive vice president of Franklin Electronic Publishers, is helping to develop software for its own pocket-sized electronic books and a new version of the Physician's Desk Reference that will make it more readily available for use on other platforms.

Jordan E. Yaret L’78 has joined Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison as a partner.

Denise D. Colliers L’79 recently became an elected member of the American Law Institute. The Hoyle Morris & Kerr partner concentrates her practice in insurance coverage, health care and ERISA, toxic torts and general commercial litigation as a member of the litigation department. She was elected in recognition of her professional achievement and dedication to improvement of the law.

Niki T. Ingram L’79 of the Philadelphia defense litigation firm Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman & Goggin, was invited by the Workers’ Compensation Section of the Philadelphia Bar Association to serve as a speaker at its Mental/Mental Cases seminar.

M. Kelly Tillery L’79, senior partner with Leonard, Tillery & Sciolla, was elected to the board of directors of Nacopi Technologies Inc., a company that develops and implements solutions for product diversion and product counterfeiting. Tillery and his team regularly conduct raids of counterfeiting operations throughout the country.

Kenneth Warren L’79 has returned to Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen to head up the environmental practice group.

1980s

Richard Feldman L’80, a partner at Bazelon, Lee & Feldman, Philadelphia, has been named Director of the Corporate Alliance for Drug Education, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania. The Corporate Alliance for Drug Education is a nonprofit organization that provides drug abuse and violence prevention/education programs for children.

Stephanie Middleton L’81 was appointed to the Pennsylvania Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority (PICA) by Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge.

Stephanie Franklin-Suber L’82 was appointed Chief of Staff to Mayor John Street of Philadelphia.

Donald J. Mares L’82 was re-elected Auditor of the City and County of Denver. He was first elected in 1995. Mares is the first Hispanic ever elected as auditor in Denver.


Steven K. Ludwig W’80, L’83, a partner at Fox Rothschild O’Brien & Frankel, LLP, has been appointed to the Board of Trustees of the Women’s Law Project. The Women’s Law Project is a non-profit organization that is a national leader in the field of Women’s Rights.
OVERSEEING PHARMACEUTICAL INNOVATION

In April 1999, Martha E. Manning L'83 was promoted to the position of Executive Vice President and General Counsel at US Bioscience, a pharmaceutical company specializing in the development and commercialization of products for patients with AIDS and cancer. In this position, Manning will manage worldwide regulatory and legal affairs and oversee pharmaceutical science functions for the company, including the company's analytical laboratory.

Edward G. Biester III L'84, a partner with Duane, Morris & Heckscher, chaired a subcommittee of the Business Litigation Committee that wrote draft procedures for the commerce program that were modified and subsequently adopted by the court.

Phyllis Cherebin L'84 received the 1999 Orison S. Marden Award for outstanding service and dedication at The Legal Aid Society's Annual Meeting in October. The Marden Awards were established to recognize excellence and dedication, and to honor the memory of Orison S. Marden, the late lawyer and senior partner of White & Case.

Richard S. Perelman W'79, L'84, WG'84, a member of the Business & Finance Department of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP, has been named partner. Perelman concentrates his practice in banking, bankruptcy and workouts, including national and local workouts and Chapter 11 reorganizations.

Thomas Rapp L'84 was profiled in the Local Angle section of the Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine. He is a lawyer as well as a folk guitarist.

Edward Rial L'84 is now a Deloitte & Touche partner and has made a career change from criminal justice to corporate fraud investigation. He specializes in tracking down corporate fraud, kickback schemes and insurance fraud.

Shanin Specter L'84 was named in Philadelphia Magazine's Power 100 as the 80th most powerful person in Philadelphia.

Philip G. Steck L'84 was elected a representative in Albany County's 15th Legislative District in November. He is a partner in the Albany firm Cooper, Erving, Savage, Nolan & Heller. Steck also is a member of the Board of Directors of the Albany County Bar Association.

Robert M. Wonneberger L'84 has joined the law firm of Shipman & Goodwin LLP as a partner in the business department. He will work out of the firm's Stanford office.

Ronnie Bloom L'85 has been appointed a program analyst in the children, youth and families grantmaking area at the William Penn Foundation. This is the largest of the foundation's three program areas, representing forty-five percent of its annual budget.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation named Teresa Gillen L'85 a fellow with the Urban Health Initiative, which was created to help improve the health and safety of children. Gillen is also a consultant in economic development and project management at the Philadelphia Department of Commerce.

AMJ, Inc., of Gainesville, Florida has named Philip N. Kabler L'85 to be its Senior Vice President. AMJ is a developer, general contractor, realtor, and property manager with operations in Gainesville, Ocala, and Orlando. In his capacity as Senior Vice President, Kabler serves as the company's Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel.

H. John Michel, Jr. L'85 has been named chair of the business and finance department at Drinker Biddle & Reath. He focuses on federal issues, public company securities, and merger and acquisitions.

John G. Sturrock GL'85 has been appointed Queen's Counsel and a Visiting Professor of Advocacy Skills and Conflict Resolution at the Glasson Graduate School of Law in England. His work in Legal Skills training is regarded as groundbreaking and was recognized with an award for the Best Use of Training in the Legal Profession in the United Kingdom.

Matthew Yee L'85 is a cabaret artist in Honolulu, Hawaii. He has just released a CD recording entitled "Every Facet of My Heart."
Dianne A. Meyer L'86 was elected to Wheels Medical Transportation's Board of Directors in Philadelphia.

Mayor John F. Street appointed Kenneth I. Trujillo L'86 City Solicitor of Philadelphia. He is the city's chief legal officer and highest ranked Latino ever in Philadelphia government.

Vernon L. Francis L'87 of Dechert Price & Rhoads in Philadelphia planned a seminar on multidisciplinary practice, which was presented by the Pennsylvania Bar Association in September. The seminar followed on the heels of the ABA's report that encouraged accounting firms and others to offer legal services in competition with traditional law firms.

Eric S. Goodison L'87 was elected partner at Paul, Weiss, Rifkind Wharton & Garrison. He has worked on numerous financings for borrowers and lenders in transactions including acquisitions, divestitures, restructurings, credit enhancements, leveraged leases and project financings.

Barbara G. McClung G'81, L'87 is working for Cygnus Incorporated to help patent a new glucose monitoring device for diabetics, called the GlucoWatch. This device is currently waiting for FDA approval.

James W. McKenzie, Jr. WG'86, L'87 was appointed Senior Vice President and General Counsel by VerticalNet, Inc. in Horsham, Pennsylvania.

Henry Mendia L'87, a former partner at Gunster Yoakley Valdes-Fauli & Stewart, has joined Greenberg Traurig as a shareholder in the Miami firm's litigation department. He will focus his practice on commercial disputes, particularly those involving international litigation.

The State Bar of California Board of Legal Specialization has certified Cheryl S. Orr L'87, a partner of Musick, Peeler & Garrett, as a specialist in appellate law.

Premier Laser Systems named Michael J. Quinn L'87 President and Chief Executive Officer. Premier Laser Systems develops, manufactures and markets diagnostic and therapeutic products for eyecare, dentistry and surgical markets.

Michael A. Smerconish L'87, a member of Beasley Casey Colleran Erbstein, was named in Philadelphia Magazine’s Power 100 as the 81st most powerful person in Philadelphia.

Shauna J. Sullivan L'87 has been promoted to associate general counsel, corporate and securities at Cox Enterprises, Inc.

Frank N. Tobolsky L'87 and wife Jacqueline welcomed their son Justin Blake Tobolsky on December 25, 1999.

Michael J. Yanofsky L'87 published an article entitled “What Does ‘Testing’ Tell Us About the Incidence of Discrimination in Housing?” In the article he addressed the use of paired or matched testers to identify discrimination against minorities in their search for housing.

Jon M. Anderson L'88 was elected to a fifth term on the School's Committee of Pawtucket, Rhode Island. He is legal counsel to the Warwick School district and a practicing lawyer with the firm Edwards & Angell in Providence.

Jonathan Jacobs L'88 has been promoted to special counsel at Fried Frank Harris Shriver & Jacobson. He practices in the litigation department.

Thaddeus J. Weaver L'88 has become a shareholder with the law firm of Christie, Pabarue, Mortensen and Young in Philadelphia.

Adrian Cronauer L'89, a senior lawyer and corporate vice president of Burch & Cronauer, was a guest lecturer at the University of Rhode Island as a part of the fall honors colloquium series, Legacies of the Vietnam War. His experience in the Vietnam War was the subject of the film “Good Morning, Vietnam.”

Anne E. Titterton L'89 was appointed Vice President, Legal and General Counsel of Eos Biotechnology, Inc.
1990s

IS THAT YOUR FINAL ANSWER?

Daniel F. Blonsky L’90 stepped into game-show history when he became the second person to win the $1 million jackpot on the television show “Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?” After using up all three lifelines, Blonsky won by correctly answering the question, “The Earth is approximately how many miles away from the Sun?” (Answer: 93 million). He credited his legal training and a lucky coin for helping him through the questions.

THE GOOD LAWYER/DOCTOR

After practicing in Washington, DC for nearly seven years at Kirkland & Ellis and then Hogan & Hartson, Evan L. Rosenfeld L’91 is currently a fourth year medical student at the Medical College of Virginia in Richmond. He will receive his MD degree in May 2000, after which he will intern in the area of general internal medicine, followed by a three-year residency in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

The Bernard C. Harris Publishing Company will be contacting alumni over the next few months in order to update the Penn Law Alumni Directory.

WATCH THE MAIL FOR YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE ARRIVING SOON!

Ethan D. Civan L’90 was hired as an associate in the intellectual property group at Reed Smith Shaw & McClay, from the patent examiner at the United States Patent and Trademark office.

Andrea Dobin L’90 has been elected a director of Sterns Weinroth, P.C. in the Trenton office. Dobin’s practice focuses on bankruptcy and insolvency issues, including the representation of debtors.

James M. Dworkin WG’89 L’90 has been promoted to general partner at Saunders Karp & Megrue, a firm specializing in growth financings, buyouts, restructurings and recapitalizations, minority capital infusions and joint ventures.

Jay S. Newman L’90 was named partner at Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP. He practices in the Communications Section, focusing on telecommunications, online services, video programming and telemarketing.

William Haller L’91, formerly a labor and employment associate at Willig William & Davidson, has joined Freedman & Lorry as an associate. He will be representing the firm’s union clients as well as plaintiffs in employment-rights litigation.

Aaron R. Krauss L’91 and his wife welcomed the birth of their daughter in October.

Brian Mudge L’91 was elected partner of Kenyon & Kenyon in Washington D.C. His practice involves all areas of Intellectual Property Law, with particular emphasis on procuring, protecting, exploiting and enforcing rights relating to the Internet and developing electronic commerce technology.

Philadelphia’s Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP announced that Barry L. Resfin L’91, a member of the litigation department, has been elected partner to the firm. His practice includes commercial litigation including antitrust, RICO, and securities and shareholder litigation.

David L. Richter ENG ’87, W’87, L’91 has been promoted to senior vice president and general counsel of Hill International Inc., a construction company. He also retains his position as vice president and general counsel of his family’s investment company, R4 Holdings L.L.C.

Michael J. Rivera L’91 has been promoted to special counsel at Fried Harris Shriver & Jacobson. He practices corporate law and has handled securities, regulatory, compliance and enforcement matters.

Tara Scanlon L’91 was promoted to partner in Holland & Knight’s Washington, DC practice in the firm’s real estate group.

Ian Simmons L’91 was promoted to Special Counsel of O’Melveny & Myers LLP, in the Washington, DC office.

www.law.upenn.edu/alumnijournal
Lee Tiedrich '91 has been named partner of Covington & Burling. Tiedrich specializes in regulatory and transactional matters in information technology.

Thomas H. Zellerbach '91 was named partner at Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe. He is an attorney in the firm's advocacy group.

Laura Berezin '92 was appointed partner at Cooley Goodward in the Palo Alto office.

Candace R. Duff '92 an associate at Greenberg Traurig, P.A., has been appointed to the director of the Young Lawyers Division of the American Bar Association.

Jonathan M. Korn '92 was elected chair of the Young Lawyers Division of the New Jersey State Bar Association. He is a member of Blank Rome Comisky & McAuley L.L.P.

1990s

Jeffrey J. Kinney L'97 joined Riley Riper Hollins & Cogargreco in July of 1999 as a member. He will concentrate his practices in the areas of labor law, insurance law and fair employment practice law.

Kevin Valentine L'97 recently joined Saul Ewing Remick & Saul LLP as an associate in the public finance department. His focus is in finance matters and tax exempt project financings.

Gabriel Baker L'98 has joined the Seattle law firm of Lane Powell Spears Lubersky LLP, a full service law firm, as an associate. His practice will concentrate in insurance litigation.

Thomas P. Manning GPU'96, L'98 was hired as an associate at Montgomery McCracken Walker & Rhoads in the litigation department.

Bruce P. Merenstein L'98 has joined Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP as an associate in the litigation department.

Lynn DeSarbo L'99 was the recipient of the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association's 1999 James J. Manderino Award for Trial Advocacy.

Matthew McDonald L'99 has joined Drinker Biddle & Reath as an associate in the corporate and securities group of the business and finance department.

Tara Rachinsky L'99 is an associate in the intellectual property and litigation departments at Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis.

www.law.upenn.edu/alumnijournal

In Memoriam

1926
Frank M. Travaline, Jr.
1927
F. B. Smillie
Frederick H. Starling
1928
Charles Polis
1931
Louis B. Goldberg
G. Burton Pearson, Jr.
1932
Frank J. Strassner, Jr.
1933
Jacob Handloff
1934
Hardie Scott
1935
Grace H. Rodebaugh
1936
Jerome A. O'Neill
1937
Joseph Bell
Hamilton Page
1938
Arnold D. Smorto
1940
Robert D. Branch
Richard M. Dicke
Arthur E. Newbold III
1941
Paul B. Greiner
1943
Allan W. Kensch
Charles M. Kschinka
1944
Sheldon W. Farber
1946
John L. Esterhau
1947
William M. Duffy, Jr.
Henry W. Sawyer III
1948
Michael A. Poppisi
Charles S. Shapiro
1950
Solomon Lubin
1951
Dallett Hemphill
Leo H. Loffel
James Edson O'Connell
Henry P. Sullivan
1953
Donald P. Vernon
Joseph C. Woodcock, Jr.
1957
Irving Morgenroth
J. Earl Simmons, Jr.
1961
Raymond K. Denworth, Jr.
Philip L. Hummer
1966
Evan C. Archer, Jr.
1967
Michael W. Lillie
1972
Don A. Olowinski
1996
Scott Christopher Pugh
Raymond K. Denworth, Jr. '61 died of a heart attack in August 1999 while vacationing in Maine. Mr. Denworth joined Drinker Biddle & Reath in 1961 and retired from the firm in 1997 when he took of counsel status. He specialized in complex bankruptcies and securities litigation. In 1967, Mr. Denworth took a leave of absence from the firm to serve as Assistant District Attorney in Philadelphia for one year. In the early 1970s, he represented the outside directors in class action suits stemming from the collapse of the Penn Central Railroad. After graduating from Wesleyan University in 1954 he served four years as a fighter pilot in the Navy serving with the Sixth and Second Fleets. He continued with the Navy in reserve duty, flying jet fighter planes until 1974. He served as articles editor of the University of Pennsylvania Law Review and graduated magna cum laude in 1961. Mr. Denworth served on the Law School's Board of Overseers, and was a firm solicitor for the Law Annual Giving fund. He is survived by his wife, Joanne R. Denworth '63, two children, and a grandson.

A Law School Overseer from 1978-82, Sir Leon K. Radzinowicz died in December 1999 at his home in Haverford, Pennsylvania. An expert in criminology who was given credit for playing a leading role in establishing the field as an academic discipline, Sir Leon lectured and visited as a faculty member throughout the world, including at the University of Pennsylvania from 1970-73. In 1959 he founded the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge University, England. He was knighted by Queen Elizabeth II in 1970.

Henry W. Sawyer was an antitrust defense lawyer, and former managing partner and head of litigation at Drinker Biddle & Reath from which he retired in 1988. Sawyer argued three cases before the U.S. Supreme Court that earned him a reputation as an eloquent advocate for civil rights. Two of those cases led to landmark rulings in the definition of the boundaries between church and state.

In the 1950s, Mr. Sawyer represented nine officials of a local Communist Party who were accused of "un-American activities." In the 1960 U.S. v. Deutch decision, he obtained a reversal of a contempt of Congress conviction for a physicist, Bernard Deutch, who testified before a Congressional committee about Communist affiliations but refused to inform on others.

In 1963, in Schempp v. Abington School District, the Supreme Court held in an 8-to-1 decision that state-ordered recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible readings in public school classrooms were unconstitutional but that religion could be taught as an academic subject. In 1971, in Lemon v. Kurtzman, in which Mr. Sawyer represented several nonprofit groups and individuals in Pennsylvania, the Court, in an 8-to-0 decision, set forth a three-part test for deciding whether a law or government program that conferred a benefit on religion passed muster under the First Amendment which says that there can be no state-established religion.

Mr. Sawyer began his law studies at Penn in 1940, but left after one year to serve a five-year term in the U.S. Navy, where he rose to the level of Lt. Commander. He returned to Penn Law, served as managing editor of the Law Review, and graduated magna cum laude in 1946. He joined Drinker Biddle & Reath in 1948, and served as a commander with the U.S. Arctic Expedition for the Korean War in 1951. He then served in the U.S. Department of State from 1951 to 1953.

DEAN
Michael A. Fitts
Bernard G. Segal Professor of Law

CHAIR
Charles A. Heimbold, Jr. '60

Hon. Arlin M. Adams '47 *
James H. Agger '61
David Berger '36 *
Fred Blume '66
Melvyn L. Cantor '67
John K. Castle
John J. Clair '72
Sylvan M. Cohen '38 *
Elizabeth J. Coleman '74
Stephen A. Cozen '64
Pamela Daley '79
Saul A. Fox '78
Howard Gittis '58
Paul G. Haaga, Jr. '74
William B. Johnson '43 *
Paul S. Levy '72
Arthur Makadon '67
Michael M. Maney '64
Robert H. Mundheim
Jeanne C. Olivier '79
Helen P. Padlin '74
James J. Sandman '76
Cary M. Schwartz '69
Jodi J. Schwartz '84
Marvin Schwartz '49 *
Robert C. Sheehan '69
Myles H. Tanenbaum '57
Glen A. Tobias '66
Robert J. Toll '66

* emeritus status

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT
Richard E. Rosin '68

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
David Richman '69

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
Stella Ming Tsai '88

SECRETARY
Tai Chang Terry '80

TREASURER
Laura Ross Blumenfeld '73

BOARD OF MANAGERS
Michael M. Coleman '66
Richard D'Avino '80
Wifredo A. Ferrer '90
James Golden '80
Murray A. Greenberg '68
Alina Denis Jarjour '90
Seymour Kurland '57
Ann B. Laupheimer '84
Michael H. Leeds '71
Ralph B. Levy '70
Donald M. Millinger '79
Young K. Park '90
Steven G. Perelman '94
Thomas C. Rotko '94
Cheryl Saban '85
David Silk '88
David E. Simon '77
Hon. Alison W. Turnas '84
Andrea Utech '75

NATIONAL CHAIR OF LAW ANNUAL GIVING
R. Bruce Rich '73

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ALUMNAE ASSOCIATION
Marion Hubing '90

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA ALUMNI SOCIETY
Lisa Holzsager Kramer '70

REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ORGANIZED CLASSES
Jerome B. Apfel '54

PRESIDENT OF THE ORDER OF THE COIF
Alfred W. Putnam, Jr. '78

PAST PRESIDENTS
Robert L. Trescher '37
Thomas Raeburn White, Jr. '36
Henry T. Reath '48
Carroll R. Werzel '30
Harold Cramer '51
Hon. William F. Hyland '49
Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr. '52
Hon. Thomas N. O'Neill '53
Marshall A. Bernstein '49
David H. Marion '63
E. Barclay Cale, Jr. '62
Clive S. Cummins '52
Howard L. Shecter '68
Gilbert E. Casellas '77
John Depodesta '69
Jerome B. Apfel '54
Arthur W. Lefco '71
Arlene Fickler '74

The Law School
Board of Overseers
1999-2000

Law Alumni Society
Officers and Managers
1999-2000

Law Alumni Society
Officers and Managers
1999-2000
Calendar of Events

February 23  Equal Justice Foundation Auction
February 24  Institute for Law and Economics
  Distinguished Jurist Lecture:
  Chancellor William B. Chandler III,
  Delaware Court of Chancery
February 25-26  Institute for Law and Philosophy:
  Conference on Mercy, Drum Moir
February 29  Institute for Law and Economics Seminar:
  Racial Bias in Motor Vehicle Searches:
  Theory and Evidence
March 2  Institute for Law and Economics
  12th Law and Entrepreneurship Lecture:
  Charles A. Heimbold, Jr. ’60
March 30  Institute for Law and Economics Seminar:
  Social Norms and the Legal Regulation
  of Marriage
March 30-31  Journal of International Economic Law Symposium:
  Exploring Legal Boundaries Within Cyberspace:
  What Law Controls in a Global Marketplace
March 31  Law Review Banquet, Speaker:
  The Hon. Louis H. Pollak
March 31  Sadie T.M. Alexander Conference:
  “To Secure These Rights: Moral, Economic
  and International Reasons for Action”
April 7-8  Edward V. Sparer Conference:
  “Prisons and Policing in the
  Age of Globalization”
April 11-12  Law School Board of Overseers Dinner
  and Meeting at the Penn Club, New York
April 15  Reception to honor the Associate Justices of the
  Supreme Court of the United States,
  and Members of the Court of Justice of the
  European Communities at the Penn Club, New York
April 26  Irving R. Segal Lecture: William G. Paul,
  President of the American Bar Association
April 29  Faculty Dinner in Honor of
  Professor Robert Gorman
May 12  Institute for Law and Economics:
  Roundtable Conference on Corporate Law
May 19-20  Alumni Weekend
  Reunion Celebrations for
  Class Years ending in “0” & “5”
May 19  Law Alumni Society Board of Managers Meeting
  Law Alumni Society Awards Reception
May 22  Law School Graduation, Academy of Music
June 2-4  Penn Law European Society Annual Meeting,
  Amsterdam, The Netherlands
June 28  Young Alumni Reception, New York

PREVIEW:
Sesquicentennial
Year 2000-2001
Special Events

October (TBD)  Irving R. Segal Lecture: Walter E. Dellinger, Former U.S. Solicitor General
November 16  Benefactors Dinner
November 17  Penn Law Sesquicentennial Gala Celebration
November 17-18  Family Law 2000 Symposium: Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, Levy Conference Center
December 6  Edward B. Shils Lecture: Hon. Arlin M. Adams ’47
March 1-3, 2001  The 20th Annual Edward V. Sparer Sesquicentennial Conference – Citizens Action: Speaker, Ralph Nader
Spring 2001  Owen J. Roberts Sesquicentennial Lecture: Professor Martha L. Minow, Harvard Law School
  Penn Law European Society Meeting, Philadelphia
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Philadelphia, PA 19104-6204
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