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The State of The Law Alumni Society
by Bernard M. Borish, President: 1981–1983

Law Alumni Day, April 19, 1983

Founded in 1852, the Law Alumni Society held its first Annual Meeting in 1855. This afternoon the Society holds its 128th Annual Meeting. We are part of a long and proud tradition. The Law School marks its beginnings with James Wilson's first formal lectures in 1790. At the end of this decade we will be entering our Third Century.

Our aim is to advance the interests of the Law School, the Society and its members. We accomplish these objectives in a number of ways which afford opportunities for interchange and communication among Alumni, and between and among Alumni and the Faculty and administration of the Law School and its students.

In particular, this year marks the completion of the transition period during which Dean Robert H. Mundheim actively and vigorously took over leadership of the Law School. With clarity and force he is making the case to insure that we have adequate resources to maintain and strengthen our position as a leading national Law School. Under his aegis, the Law Alumni Society has been more directly involved in the affairs of the Law School. We will seek your approval, later in this meeting, for amendments to the By-laws which will enlarge the Board of Managers and permit a more diverse and geographically widespread Board to be constituted.
This has been a year of substantial progress. We continued successfully the Alumni Luncheon/Forum Series. The first luncheon featured Irving S. Shapiro, well-known as the former Chief Executive Officer of the DuPont Company, now a lawyer again, but more importantly, the new Chairman of the Board of Overseers of the Law School. On November 10, 1982, Mr. Shapiro delivered a fascinating talk on the "The Mid-East Proposal: a Personal View".

This was followed on February 1, 1983 by Professor Clyde W. Summers, Fordham Professor of Law and a nationally recognized scholar in the field of labor law, who delivered a most interesting and contemporaneous talk on "Municipal Employees and Strikes".

We have scheduled for April 27, 1983 a presentation of "Reflections" by the Honorable Samuel J. Roberts, Wharton School 28, Law '31, the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, who also is a member of our Board of Overseers and a distinguished member of the Pennsylvania Judiciary for thirty-one years.

In conjunction with the Law School and the Pennsylvania Chapter of the Order of the Cof, the Law Alumni Society sponsored on October 21, 1982 the annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture which this year marked the homecoming of our own Paul Mishkin, speaking on "The Uses of Ambivalence: Reflections on the Supreme Court and the Constitutionality of Affirmative Action".

We continued to strengthen our network of Law Alumni Clubs around the nation. Dean Mundheim has attended many national, international and regional alumni gatherings, and Bar Association and professional meetings, many of which we have hosted. At some Bar Association meetings we focus upon our Alumni Award of Merit to recognize the accomplishments of distinguished graduates of the Law School.

We did this on October 2, 1982 when we honored Judge Doris May Harris, a distinguished Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas and longtime member of our Board of Managers. It is most fitting that the occasion was the Bench-Bar Conference of the Philadelphia Bar Association in Atlantic City. Because of the moving remarks made by Judge Harris, it was truly a memorable occasion for all who attended. For those of you who did not attend, I recommend that you read the remarks of Judge Harris which appeared in The Law Alumni Journal—Winter Edition 1983.

In various ways, we have maintained an active participation in the life and student affairs of the Law School. These ranged from:

1. The Law Alumni Student Loan Fund, which provides short-term loans at favorable rates.
2. A partial underwriting of the Law School's annual "rites of spring" in which law books are put aside for libretto. I hope you saw and heard the excerpts from Gilbert & Sullivan's Patience, this year's production of the Law School Light Opera Company. One must marvel at the professional manner in which this production was put together and performed.
3. The First Annual Art Show: For two weeks in October the main office and its adjacent halls were graced with a multimedia art exhibit reflecting the creativity of members of our Law School Community, and we participated in that "First". I am moved here to paraphrase Professor Noyes Leech, who asks: why an art exhibit or an opera in a Law School, of all places? He answers: "First, this is a family affair in which we have a great pooling of talent from all the sectors of our life. Second, these performances call on the imagination, on intuition and on observation. Finally, when we enter these buildings we do not enter a legal convent or monastery. These performances demonstrate that lawyers themselves are people whose talents are whole; they are affirmations that this community has a soul."

4. Now, and more mundane, we continued our support of The Law Review and The Report (student year book).
5. We sponsored again the annual reception for law students and Philadelphia Common Pleas Court Judges at City Hall.
6. The Alumni-LL.M. Friendship Program: Over the past few years, the graduate program at the Law School has grown dramatically in size from only a handful of LL.M. candidates to this year's group of 41 young men and women from 22 countries around the world. At Dean Mundheim's suggestion, we created the "Friendship Program" in which 21 Alumni were matched with 36 graduate students to furnish those students from foreign countries a local friend in the legal profession.
7. We continued working with the Placement Office and this year created a Law Alumni Placement Committee, again at the suggestion of Dean Mundheim, to serve as a resource of the Placement Office by liaison through the Faculty/Student Placement Committee. Specifically, the Committee provided invaluable assistance by furnishing information and advice from the "real world of practice."
8. There have been a number of inquiries from Alumni regarding the admissions process; in particular, what the process is in regard to Alumni-related applicants. The Admissions Review Committee was created to examine the Law School's admissions process. This Committee, chaired by David Marion, '63, expects to complete its work soon. It will publish the results of its review in a future issue of The Law Alumni Journal so that all of us will know and understand the manner in which the admissions process works.

One important measure of our success is the continuing upward profile in terms of donors and dollars of Alumni annual giving. While in a financial sense the quality of Alumni support is critical, more is involved. It will depend very much on the kind of commitment all of us have to higher education and, particularly, our commitment to the University of Pennsylvania Law School which will determine what this School will look like at the end of the decade when we begin our Third Century.
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Reunion Weekend
October 14–16, 1983

Exciting events are planned for the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Annual Quinquennial Reunion Weekend when the Classes of 1933, '38, '43, '48, '53, '58, '63, '68, '73 and '78 will gather to reminisce and renew friendships.

A Welcoming Reception and Registration will open the Weekend's festivities on Friday evening, October 14, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Law School's Biddle Library.

On Saturday morning, October 15, after a light continental breakfast from 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m., the Reunion participants will have the opportunity to attend one of three mini-courses scheduled simultaneously from 9:15 to 10:15 a.m. The courses will be instructed by Penn Law School Professors Jan Z. Krazniewiecki speaking on his specialty, Zoning; Richard G. Lonsdorf, M.D., discussing The Insanity Defense; and Associate Dean and Associate Professor Stephan B. Burbank, addressing The Federal Rules of Evidence. From 10:15 a.m.–12:15 p.m., a panel discussion will be held entitled, The Bok Report: A Critique of the American Legal System, the Legal Profession and Law School Preparation—As Viewed by a Law Professor, a Judge and Two Practicing Attorneys. The panelists who are also 1983 Reunion celebrants include: Bernard Wolfman, '48, Fessenden Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and former Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School from 1970–1975; The Honorable Edward J. Bradley, '53, President Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; John G. Harkins, Jr., '58, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz; and David H. Marion, '63, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Kohn, Savett, Marion & Graf, PC. Noyes E. Leech, '48, Ferdinand Wakeman Hubbell Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, will offer background material on The Bok Report and will serve as panel moderator. A question and answer session will follow the discussion.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim will address the Reunion Luncheon which will be held at the Law School following the morning activities.

On Saturday afternoon at 1:30 p.m., Alumni may attend the Penn-Lafayette Football game at Franklin Field or take a guided walking tour of Philadelphia's Independence National Historical Park and Society Hill.

The individual Reunion Classes will gather on Friday and Saturday evenings for private parties to be held at the Law School and at restaurants and hotels throughout the city.

A Sunday brunch will take place on October 16 at Eden, a restaurant at 3701 Chestnut Street from 10–11:30 a.m. after which guided tours of the Philadelphia Art Museum and the University of Pennsylvania Museum will be available.

All members of the Quinquennial Classes have been receiving information and invitations detailing the activities of Reunion Weekend. If there are any questions, please contact the Law School Alumni Office at (215) 898-6321.
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The LL.M.s Annual Trip to Washington, DC

In March, 1983, approximately fifty Law School graduate students visited the nation's capital for three days on a trip organized and conducted by Assistant Dean Alice B. Lonsdorf.

Upon their arrival on Sunday, the group toured the District by bus and later dined in the homes of American families living in Washington. They spent Monday observing the Supreme Court in action and, at one point, met privately with Chief Justice Warren E. Burger. On Tuesday, the LL.M.s visited the White House and, afterward, the Old Executive Buildings on the White House grounds where they met with the Honorable Faith Ryan Whittlesey, '63 Special Assistant to President Reagan as Director of the Office of Public Liaison. In the afternoon, the students went to the State Department where they were received by Alumna, Elise W. duPont, '79, who is Administrative Assistant for Private Enterprises in the Agency for International Development. Mrs. duPont is responsible for promoting American private enterprise and stimulating indigenous private enterprise in developing countries around the world. A tour of the State Department's reception rooms followed the visit with Mrs. duPont.

Our New Annual Giving Officer

Barbara A. Bell replaced Mary Hallock as the Law School's Annual Giving Officer as of July 1, 1983.

Mrs. Bell is highly experienced in the area of fund-raising. She was Assistant to the Director of Annual Giving and Alumni Affairs at the University of Pennsylvania School of Veterinary Medicine prior to her arrival at the Law School. Her Bachelor's degree is from the University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg and her Master's degree from Temple University in Philadelphia.
Miss Arnold Retires as Reference Librarian

Nancy Arnold, a valued friend and member of the University of Pennsylvania Law School Community for forty years, retired her post in late August, 1983.

As the Biddle Library’s Reference Librarian, she was “always there” as a willing source of information for Law School students, Faculty and Administration. Miss Arnold also conceived, organized and mounted most of the exhibits which appeared over the years in the showcases in the Great Hall and at the entrances to the Law School and the Biddle Library. The exhibit in which she took special pride “100 Years of University of Pennsylvania Law School Women—1883–1983”, was on view this past spring and summer.

In the following message, Morris L. Cohen, the Law Librarian at Yale and a former colleague of Nancy Arnold when he was the Biddle Law Librarian from 1961–1971, conveys the sentiments of many at the Law School:

On Nancy Arnold’s Retirement

The satisfactions of librarianship rest on three foundations—on the books we select, acquire, arrange and disseminate; on the users we serve, teach, and hope to stimulate; and on the library colleagues with whom we work and on whom we depend to make our own performance effective. My service at the Biddle Law Library was the most satisfying period of my professional life. It was so because of the collection we helped build; because of our readers—the faculty and students of this Law School; and because of colleagues like Nancy Arnold, with whom I was privileged to serve.

Nancy Arnold has been a very special person in this Law School community. She has been special because she cares. Nancy cares about us, about this place, about these books, and about the work which each of us does here. Caring is part of librarianship—not the only part, but certainly an essential part.

Before computers, there was Nancy—and there were many others like her who loved the literature and made it available to others. In this brave new world of computerized libraries, we must assure the survival of her librarianship and the values she taught us by example. Dick Sloane, Cynthia Arkin and their colleagues are striving to maintain that tradition. With the inspiration that Nancy has provided, we can honor her best by supporting those who continue her work. I can think of no recognition that would please her more.

—Morris L. Cohen
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The Edward V. Sparer Public Interest Law Fund
To honor the memory of Professor Edward V. Sparer, whose untimely death occurred on June 21, 1983, the Law School Community has created the Edward V. Sparer Public Interest Law Fund. The Fund's primary function is to provide financial support for an annual Edward V. Sparer Public Interest Law Conference.

Through Professor Sparer's diligent efforts over the years, the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Annual Public Interest Law Conference has become a successful reality, the second Conference held here at the School in March, 1983. It is appropriate, therefore, that this Conference be renamed as a lasting memorial to its guiding force.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim, in his message to the Law School Community stated, "Ed Sparer made many important contributions to the life of this Law School. One of his most important contributions was to remind us, consistently and strongly, of our obligations as individuals and lawyers to serve the disadvantaged and the overlooked. To institutionalize these passionately held interests, the Law School is creating the Edward V. Sparer Public Interest Law Fund. The income from this fund would be used primarily to provide financial support for a public interest law conference to be held on an annual basis. Since the Fund will serve purposes which are a vitally important aspect of the educational mission of the Law School, the Law School will match the income from the Fund up to an amount of $1,500 annually each year for the next five years."

Professor Sparer's colleagues and friends already have begun to contribute generously and substantially to the Edward V. Sparer Public Interest Law Fund. Contributions to the Fund should be made directly to Don Myers, Director of Development, The Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, I4, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

The Funding of Faculty Research
In its statement of Law School needs, approved in April, 1983, the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Board of Overseers identified as one of the primary needs, the opportunity for Faculty members to have sufficient time for research, reflection and writing. A first step in meeting that need was taken early this summer when an anonymous donor agreed "to fund a fellowship at the rate of $10,000 per year for a period of five years beginning in 1983."

Dean Robert H. Mundheim hopes that the gift would serve as a model for others. "The Law School" says the Dean, "needs money to help fund faculty research assistance and travel, and to give the Faculty some needed time off to do the scholarly writing which allows us to maintain our intellectual leadership in the legal community."

Two New Memorial Funds
The Judge Gregory G. Legakos Scholarship Fund
In memory of the late Honorable Gregory G. Legakos, '38, who passed away in July 1982, a scholarship fund has been established for students of Hellenic descent who reside in the Delaware Valley, Pennsylvania area.

The Thomas J. Oravetz Fund
The friends, classmates and members of the Environmental Law Group of the Philadelphia Bar Association have established a fund to honor the memory of Thomas J. Oravetz, '69, who passed away in June 1981.

The Fund awards a yearly prize to the University of Pennsylvania law student who has written the best paper in the subject area of Environmental Law. It also underwrites the purchase of environmental law books for the Biddle Law Library.
The Lowe Foundation Aids Institute for Law and Economics

The Joe and Emily Lowe Foundation has made a $25,000 grant to the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Institute for Law and Economics. This money will be used for the purchase of books and materials in support of courses to be offered by the Institute and will help furnish the nucleus of a law and economics book collection at the Biddle Law Library.

The 1983 Keedy Cup

The Edwin R. Keedy Moot Court Competition will be held on November 21, 1983 at the University of Pennsylvania Museum. The Honorable Abner J. Mikva of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia will serve as the Competition's Presiding Judge.

Vance to be 1984 Roberts Lecturer

Former United States Secretary of State, Cyrus R. Vance, will deliver the 1984 Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture on February 23 at the University Museum.
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The International Faculty Visits France

The International Faculty for Corporate and Capital Market Law, an outgrowth of the University of Pennsylvania Law School’s Center for Study of Financial Institutions, travelled to Paris in March to sponsor and participate in a colloquium on a Comparative Study of Corporate Governance.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim serves as the head of this group of international scholars from Belgium, Japan, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Brazil and the United States. Among the members are Professor Noyes E. Leech of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and Professor Morris Mendelson of the Department of Finance in the University’s Wharton School. Some twenty members and associates of this group have been meeting since 1975 to study the capital markets in their respective countries, the legal frameworks in which those markets operate, and the regulatory issues attendant upon the growing internationalization of the markets. After a number of annual seminars in which Faculty members were students in their fellows’ home countries, the Faculty has embarked on a teaching phase. Members of the Faculty participated in a major two-day conference in March, 1981, in New York City, on the Internationalization of the Capital Markets, jointly sponsored by the Law School’s Center, the New York Stock Exchange and the American Law Institute.

This year’s conference in Paris was sponsored principally by the Inter-national Faculty, the University of Haute-Normandie (Rouen), the Conservatoire National des Arts et Metiers and the Institut National des Techniques Economiques et Comptables. The principal organizer of the colloquium was Barthélemy Mercadal, the Faculty’s representative from France.

Although solutions differ in various countries, similar questions about the organization of corporate decision-making are being asked around the world. The colloquium dealt with such subjects as the purposes of the business corporation (its private and public responsibilities), the role of the board of directors (active direction; the monitoring of management), the composition of the board and the use of committees, procedures for informing the board, legal responsibility of its members, and conflicts of interests.

The colloquium was addressed not only by members of the International Faculty but also by officials of French corporations and academics (including, among the latter, Professor Andre Tunc of the University of Paris). Bernard Tricot, President of the Commission des Operations de Bourse (the French securities commission) chaired the session of the colloquium addressed by Barbara Thomas, a member of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission. Attending the colloquium were a number of French lawyers, business people and accountants. Selected portions of the colloquium will be published in The Journal of Comparative Business and Capital Market Law, edited by students at the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

—Professor Noyes E. Leech

Judges Learn About Law and Economics


The seminar was planned and presented expressly for the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Sixteen judges of the Circuit attended.

After initial sessions setting forth relevant economic principles, the Seminar discussed application of the principles to specific situations which judges might be asked to consider. Presentations were made by faculty from the Wharton School, the Department of Economics, as well as by members of the Law School Faculty. The program was planned by Honorable Arlin M. Adams, ’47, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; Mr. Edward G. Boehne, President, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia; Professor Jean A. Crockett, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank and Professor of Finance at the Wharton School; Robert M. Landis, ’47, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank and partner in the law firm of Dechert, Price & Rhoads; University of Pennsylvania Law School Dean and University Professor of Law and Finance, Robert H. Mundheim; and Professor Almarin Phillips, Hower Professor of Public Management, University of Pennsylvania Department of Economics.

The Seminar was funded primarily by a grant from the William Penn Foundation.

Thank you ..., Thank you ...

... Thank you for responding so overwhelmingly to our request for voluntary support for The Law Alumni Journal. Your many additional messages of appreciation for our efforts were most heartwarming. It is always encouraging to learn that Alumni are out there reading and enjoying The Journal and are caring enough to want to sustain its high quality and continued publication.

My deepest gratitude to all.

Libby S. Harwitz
Editor, The Law Alumni Journal

More Lost Alumni

Should anyone know the whereabouts of the following Alumni, please write to Lost Alumni, c/o The Alumni Office, The University of Pennsylvania Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104 or call (215) 898-6321.

'03 Waldo P. Breedon
'04 Joseph J. Goodman
'09 George M. Bryson
'10 Samuel Willig
'12 Marc Hess
'15 Louis Winkelmann
'17 John V. McDonald
'P Herbert Reigner
'21 Salvatore Paolini
Stanley B. Rice
'22 Morris S. Gross
'23 Maurice A. Nemirow
H. Lee Ratner
'24 Abraham S. Greenwood
'27 Harry H. Goldstein
John Harper
J. Harry Wagner, Jr.
University Trustees' Decisions Re: The Law School

At their March meeting, the Executive Board of the University of Pennsylvania Trustees took steps—together with The First Pennsylvania Bank—toward the creation of an internal student loan fund reserved for law students—but subsumable under a broader one "should the University develop a more encompassing loan program that would be equal to this program." The Nancy McKean Loan Fund, restricted to Law School use, is available to fund an interest-bearing Loss Reserve so that the University will maintain a balance equal to 15 percent of the total outstanding loans. The program will provide a maximum loan of $20,000 per year for each student borrower at the bank's prime rate plus 1%, with interest payable monthly while the student is in school.

At the May Trustee Executive Committee meeting, it was acted upon that rehabilitation of the Law School cafeteria's kitchen would be completed during the summer of 1983 at an estimated $1,240,000 from the University's Dining Services reserves.

In their June meeting, the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania endorsed the University's statement of development objectives, "Building Penn's Future," including the Law School's planning for a capital campaign, the Law School's financial goals to be determined after further analysis of potential support and success in generating the nucleus fund. Priorities include the expansion of Faculty, the Biddle Law Library, and the strengthening of joint degree and interdisciplinary programs.

Judicial Clerkships 1983-1984

Eighteen graduates of the Class of 1983 and one member of the Class of 1982 are serving as clerks to Judges on Federal, State and Common Pleas Benches.

Federal Courts

Natalie L. Wexler,
Hon. Alvin B. Rubin, 5th Circuit

Thomas J. Eicher,
Hon. James R. Browning, 9th Circuit

William B. Lazerus, '82,
Hon. Oscar H. Davis, Federal Circuit

Ann Laquer Thorn,
Hon. Zita L. Weinshieuk, District Court of Colorado, District 2

Pamela M. Smith,
Hon. Norma Holloway Johnson, District of DC

Margaret M. Sestak,
Hon. Gerard L. Goettel, Southern District of New York

H. Jay Bellwoar,
Hon. Edward R. Becker, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Robert S. Hawkins,
Hon. Alfred L. Luongo, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Joseph G. Maniaci,
Hon. Joseph S. Lord, III, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Amy E. Wilkinson,
Hon. James T. Giles, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Julie R. Fenster,
Hon. John A. Mackenzie, Eastern District of Virginia

Leslie J. Hoffman,
Hon. Richard C. Wilbur, U.S. Tax Court

Brian J. Siegel,
Hon. Arnold Raum, U.S. Tax Court

State Courts

David N. Beckham,
Hon. Jack D. Hays, Supreme Court of Arizona

Thomas A. Isaacson,
Hon. Vincent McKusick, Supreme Judicial Court of Maine

Kimberly Lewis,
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, Jr., Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

Kathy L. Echternach,
Hon. Edmund B. Spaeth, Jr., Superior Court of Pennsylvania

Valerie West,
Hon. Edmund B. Spaeth, Jr., Superior Court of Pennsylvania

Jo-Ann M. Verrier,
Hon. Anita B. Brody, Court of Common Pleas, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania
Regional Alumni “Get-Togethers”

During the Spring of ’83, the Law Alumni Society and numerous University of Pennsylvania Law School Regional Alumni Clubs have organized and hosted receptions, luncheons and dinners in conjunction with the annual meetings of national, state and local Bar Associations and during the meetings of professional organizations.

On April 22, during the New York State Bar Meetings, approximately forty members of the Law School’s New York City Law Alumni Association, organized by William H. Bohnett, ’74, gathered for the Association’s annual luncheon at the Warwick Hotel. The guest speaker was Associate Dean and Associate Professor Stephen B. Burbank.

A Reception honoring Frank B. Boyle, ’47, the newly-elected President of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, was held on May 4 during the meetings of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

Chicago area Alumni attended their fourth annual gathering on May 12 at the Midland Hotel with Dean Robert H. Mundheim present to update the group on “Law School Developments”. Richard F. Kotz, ’65, chaired the event with committee members Carol Kantor, ’81, and Larry G. Skipworth, ’75.

At the meetings of the New Jersey Bar Association on May 13 in Atlantic City, Vincent J. Apruzzese, ’53, the newly-inducted President of that Bar Association, was honored at a Law Alumni Society reception. Professor Louis B. Schwartz addressed the gathering.

The Washington Alumni met on May 20 for their Annual Spring Luncheon Meeting held traditionally during the ALI Meetings. Dean Robert H. Mundheim addressed the group of approximately sixty D.C. Alumni.


On July 31, 1983, during the American Bar Association’s Annual Meeting in Atlanta, the Law Alumni Society sponsored a Reception for Alumni and Friends which was hosted by the Honorable Phyllis Kravitch, ’43, Gail Lione Massee, ’74, and Bernard G. Segal, ’33. Mr. Segal addressed the attendees.

Professor Stephen Burbank with New York Alumnus on April 22, 1983.

Frank B. Boyle, ’47, President of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

New York Alumni E. Ellsworth McMeen III, ’72, left, and William B. Pennell, ’61, right, with Assistant Dean Alice B. Lonsdorf.
The Dean with D.C. Alumni including Bruce Lerner, '82, far left, and Nancy Bregstein, '76, right.

Clive S. Cummis, '52, introducing New Jersey Bar Association President Vincent J. Aoruzzese, '53 during the New Jersey Bar reception in May.


Professor Louis B. Schwartz addressing the New Jersey Bar reception.

Featured Events

**Law Alumni Day: A 100-Year Celebration of Law School Women**

To commemorate the graduation in 1883 of the University of Pennsylvania Law School's first woman student, Carrie Burnham Kilgore, the Law Alumni Society designated Law Alumni Day 1983 as the occasion to honor her and all women graduates of the School.

The Day’s events began with a panel discussion entitled *Conflicts—Compromise—Coping: Women in the Practice of Law*. Joanne Denworth, ’63, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Sugarman and Denworth, moderated the panel which included Alumnae Eleanor W. Myers, ’75, Associate General Counsel at Temple University; Eileen P. Epley, ’79, a sole practitioner in Philadelphia; Marjorie E. Greenfield, ’69, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz; and the Honorable Norma L. Shapiro, ’51, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Following the discussion, the Law School Light Opera Company performed excerpts from its 1983 Gilbert and Sullivan production, *Patience*. Presented in the Great Hall, the Opera Company participants were members of the Law School Community—Faculty, students, staff and their families. Professor Noyes E. Leech, ’48, offered a commentary to the Opera.
At the Law Alumni Society's Annual Meeting, Bernard M. Barish, '43, presented a report of his two years as President of the Society (see pages 1 and 2 in this issue of The Journal), and then publically recognized the outstanding service of the departing members of the Board of Managers. Representatives of the Quinquennial Classes—those celebrating milestone reunions in 1983—reported their planned activities for Reunion Weekend which will be held on October 15-16. Following an introduction of the officers of the Law School's newest Alumni—the Class of 1983, Paul A. Wolkin, '41, the President of the Order of the Coif, presented Professor Louis B. Schwartz, '35, with the Coif's Annual Award for Legal Scholarship.

The Law Alumni Society's 1983-1984 slate of Officers and Board of Managers was offered to the membership by Nominating Committee Chair, Thomas N. O'Neill, '53. They include: E. Barclay Cale, Jr., '62, President; William H. Brown, III, '55, First Vice-President; Stephanie W. Naidoff, '66, Second Vice-President; Gilbert F. Casellas, '77, Secretary; and Clive S. Cummis, '52, Treasurer. Members of the Board of Managers with terms expiring in 1984 are Roxana C. Arst, '39; Gail Sanger, '68; and Thomas Owens, '69. Those Managers whose terms end in 1985 are Richard F. Kutz, '65, and Joseph F. Roda, '74; and those with terms concluding in 1986 are: Mitchell Brock, '53; Richard C. Csaplar Jr., '59; Raymond K. Denworth, Jr., '61; Murray S. Eckell, '59; Gail Lione Massee, '74; and William B. Moyer, '61.

In appreciation of his extraordinary contributions as Law Alumni Society President for the years 1981 to 1983, Bernard M. Borish was presented, by incoming President E. Barclay Cale, with a framed pen-and-ink rendering of the Law School.

Following cocktails and dinner, the Law Alumni Society's newly-elected President, E. Barclay Cale, Jr., greeted the Law Alumni Day gathering and introduced Dean Robert H. Mundheim who then assigned the program to Bernard M. Borish, '43, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen. Mr. Borish recounted the life of Carrie Burnham Kilgore and her ten-year struggle to gain admission as a student at the University of Pennsylvania Law School—a struggle which ended in 1881. Five women graduates of the School then spoke as representatives of the decades succeeding Carrie Kilgore, sharing their experiences as women students and, later, as woman in the legal profession. These participants included Ruth Chase Tomlin, '43; The Honorable Doris May Harris, '49, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Family Court Division; Carolyn England Temin, '58, an associate in the Philadelphia firm of Abrahams and Loewenstein, and a candidate in the November election for Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; The Honorable Margaret A. Burnham, '69, a former Associate Justice of the Boston Municipal Court and, presently, the National Director of the National Conference of Black Lawyers; and Lynn A. Marks, '79, the Executive Director of Women Organized Against Rape, an organization founded to ease the traumas incurred by rape victims and to improve the treatment given to rape victims in the medical, legal, and mental health systems.

"100 Years of Law School Women: Reminiscences and Observations" follows in its entirety:
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Dean Mundheim with Sylvan M. Cohen, '38.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim:
This is a very exciting, very special Law Alumni Day. The occasion marks the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the graduation of the Law School's first woman, Carrie Burnham Kilgore, and we are most fortunate tonight to have in attendance the granddaughter of Carrie Kilgore, Florence A. Hoadley.

This afternoon's program entitled *Conflicts—Compromise—Coping: Women in the Practice of Law* offered a fascinating, eye-opening discussion, and I am sorry that all of you did not have the opportunity to attend.

I would like to remind you that ten years ago, the University of Pennsylvania Law School graduated twenty-eight women; this year, the Class of 1983 will graduate seventy-nine women. Our women graduates, as you would expect, play a vital role in the life of this Law School. Natalie Wexler, '83, is the fifth consecutive woman Editor-in-Chief of the University of Pennsylvania Law Review. Kathleen Lobben, '83, is the third consecutive woman President of the graduating class. She is also the third consecutive woman Editor-in-Chief of *The Report*, the Law School yearbook. Linda Wells, '83, was one of the co-founders of the second student-edited Law Review at the Law School, *The Journal of Comparative Business and Capital Market Law*. Time does not permit me to list all of the women in the Class of 1983 who have made a difference in life at the Law School, but I do want to mention Eleanor Morris Illoway and her work in devising and implementing a program which brings our foreign graduate students more into the mainstream of life at the Law School.

I am delighted to welcome this record crowd of Law Alumni Day attendees to the 100th anniversary celebrating the important part that our women lawyers play and have played in the life of our community. You should know that this program was planned by a very able group of our women Faculty, Alumnae, students and administration. In addition, Bernie Borish, '43, the President of the Law Alumni Society for the past two years, joined enthusiastically in promoting "100 Years of Women 1883–1983" as the theme for this Law Alumni Day. No one could have been a better President for a new Dean than Bernie. He had the enthusiasm, the energy and the imagination to work out a host of activities which have brought the Alumni closer to the Law School, and that has been very good for the Law School. I now present to you Bernie Borish, who will introduce the Law Alumni Day Program.
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law school women: the first

bernard m. borish, '43:
this year marks the 100th anniversary of the graduation of carrie burnham kilgore, the first alumna of the university of pennsylvania law school. it took a ten-year crusade for her to gain admission to the law school in 1881. in candor, i must acknowledge that when i first embarked on this project, i knew nothing about her. i suspect that many of you here tonight are in the same position.

in order to understand mrs. kilgore's struggle and its significance, one must recall that it occurred in the decade when our presidents were ulysses s. grant and rutherford b. hayes. american society was beginning to reflect the economic transformations which began after the civil war. transcontinental railroads were making their spectacular push across the country—and robber barons were ruling the day.

it was in that 19th century climate, that the united states supreme court in 1973 sustained a denial by the state of illinois of myra bradwell's right to become a lawyer. in his concurring opinion in that case, justice bradley concluded with the words, 'the natural and proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfit it for many of the occupations of civil life. the constitution of the family organization, which is founded in the divine ordinance, as well as in the nature of things, indicates the domestic sphere as that which properly belongs to the domain and function of womanhood . . . the paramount destiny and mission of women are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother. this is the law of the creator. and the rules of civil society must be adapted to the general constitution of things and cannot be based upon exceptional cases."

this was the environment in which carrie burnham kilgore had to struggle. she was born in 1838. her father was a native of connecticut, a wealthy woolen manufacturer. her mother, a former schoolteacher, died before carrie was three. after her father's death, which occurred when she was twelve, carrie's guardian declared that "she clearly had education enough for a woman."

carrie, however, had other ideas. when only fifteen years old, she was already a teacher in the vermont schools. three years later, she was teaching greek and higher mathematics in a high school in madison, wisconsin.

in 1863, in order to advance her knowledge of physiology, she entered the hygio-therapeutic medical college in new york city. in 1864, she was graduated with a degree of doctor of medicine, and became a member of the first class of women admitted to the bellevue hospital clinic.

sometime in 1865 she began to read law informally. in 1870, five years later, she formally registered as a law student with the intent to practice. from her obituary notice of june 30, 1909 we learn that "this innovation excited the ridicule of the press and the bar." in 1871, i am sorry to say, carrie burnham kilgore was denied admittance to the university of pennsylvania law school. her petitions to the board of bar examiners in 1873 and 1874 to be given the bar examination were refused. a series of appeals to local courts and to the state legislature for remedial legislation proved fruitless. finally, after ten years of bitter struggle, in 1881, she was admitted to the university of pennsylvania law school and, in 1883, became its first woman graduate.

now, you have to understand, carrie was already thirty-three years old when she first began her struggle for admission. she was forty-three when she was finally admitted to the law school. in 1876, she married a philadelphia lawyer and her two daughters were born in 1877 and 1880. at age forty-five, in 1883, she received her law degree. not one to let any grass grow under her feet, on the day following her graduation, she was admitted to the orphans court of philadelphia. it was not until may 11, 1886, aided by an act of the legislature, that she was able to gain admission to the state supreme court and, thereby, to all the lower courts. the following year, she was appointed the first woman master of chancery in the state.

in 1888, her husband died leaving her with two young daughters and very little money. so, she took over his law practice. in 1890, she was admitted to the supreme court of the united states and became the first woman to argue before that court.

hers was an intrepid spirit. at age seventy, one year before her death, carrie burnham kilgore had a balloon adventure. her obituary noted that "...as a member of the philadelphia aeronautical recreation society, mrs. kilgore made a balloon ascension with another woman and two men from point breeze. when the balloon was 2,000 feet in the air, the gas bag was found to be leaking and it became necessary to pull the valve and make a rapid descent. the party landed in the schuylkill river, and no one was injured. mrs. kilgore's coolness during the trying ordeal was commented upon at the time."

what a splendid piece of work this woman had to be!

she died on june 29, 1909 at age seventy-one, leaving behind a great legacy of achievement that still stands as a model of civic responsibility and professional success. a woman of great elegance and practical ability, carrie burnham kilgore recognized the importance of social reform long before many of her contemporaries. she devoted her considerable talents and energies to the improvement of the community. by her own example of industry, high character, sense of purpose, and dedication to justice, carrie burnham kilgore caused many to reconsider and to amend social customs and legal restrictions that now are commonplace to call indefensible.

in turning now to tonight's program, we should be mindful of the slow progress which followed this beginning. the supreme court of the united states was established in 1789. ninety years passed before the first woman was admitted to the bar of that court, and it took a special act of congress to bring that about. it then took until 1930 for that court to admit the first one hundred women.

as recently as 1960, very few women appeared in the seating charts in law schools around the country. in 1950, one literally could count the number of women on one hand (there were only five) who worked as full-time tenure-track teachers in all aba-accredited law schools. as was mentioned in this afternoon's discussion, these women
were assigned to teach courses in three areas—Family Law, Trusts and Estates, and Legal Research and Writing. As to the job market for women law graduates, a 1963 survey of placement facilities at sixty-three law schools tells the story common in those pre-Title VII days. “All that now lies on history’s scrap heap,” as Ruth Bader Ginsburg elegantly has written in expressing her exhalation at the changes that have occurred. It is fitting now that we should hear from the women who followed Carrie Burnham Kilgore at this School. They will recount what it was like to be a law student at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, how it is to be a woman lawyer, and what it all means.

Law School Women: 1900–1945

Ruth Chase Tomlin, ’43:
After hearing about Carrie Burnham Kilgore, we all must feel like slouches. Mary Barb Johnson’s very fine notes helped refresh my own memory of law school. It has been a long time since the fall of 1940 when 121 students—five of us women—entered the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

The Class was very heavily Pennsylvania in geographic background but a number of other states were represented. Of course, there was a war being waged in Europe, but it had not disturbed our plans as yet. Our first year was great. We were exposed to Keedy on Agency, Chadbourn on Civil Procedure, Reeve on Contracts, Mikell on Criminal Law, Philbrick on Property, and Eldridge on Torts. We women were very serious even then about our career plans, though several of us were asked by Dean Keedy, when we appeared for a personal interview, whether we had come to be a lawyer or to get a lawyer.

We found that the men were as concerned about their subjects that year as we, and our responses as women were no less unlawyerlike than theirs. A la Dean Keedy, we still had to learn “to begin at the beginning”. In truth, the women in my section were very special. Two had been May Queens at large universities and, among us, there were Phi Beta Kappa keys together with Mortar Board and Sphinx and Key Honor Society Awards. We argued cases in the corridors with men and lunched with them at Sargeant Hall, the Women’s Dormitory at 34th and Walnut Streets. The Women’s Law Club gave cocktail parties for the Faculty and organized a winter Law School dance which was held at the Barclay Hotel. Although we had our own law club and the men had theirs, there was really no desire at that time on the part of the women to encroach on the male domain. But we never doubted our position as equals.

The classic prognostication of Professor Foster Reeve was correct—neither the person on our left nor the person on our right returned the second year. The fall of 1941 found fifty-nine in our Class—one-half of the original first-year enrollment—and there were growing concerns about the future. When the radio reported the attack on Pearl Harbor, Herb Tomlin and I were studying Equity in the breakfast room of my parents’ home. The next morning most of us at the Law School were in class physically, awaiting the President’s broadcast. At 10:30, after class, we crowded into Sargeant Hall to hear President Roosevelt’s Declaration of War. That week, many of our classmates with R.O.T.C. training began contacting their senior officers about the immediacy of their military responsibilities. Several members of Philadelphia’s First City Troop were members of the Class of 1940. During the next few months, we saw dozens of our classmates appear in uniform for final farewells before reporting to active duty. Many in the Class found it necessary to register for the draft with the hopes that they might receive classifications which would permit their finishing law school. To help insure this, the Law School organized its first summer session and, as a result, our Class continued taking courses throughout the 1942 year with only a few weeks break in between. It was a unique experience, and we ended up graduating a Class numbering forty-nine—the last to approach normal size for the next several years. The Law Review of which William B. Johnson, Mary Barb Johnson’s husband, was Editor-in-Chief continued to publish but on a greatly restricted basis.

With the men fulfilling their military obligations, great job opportunities became increasingly available to us women. Upon graduation in February, 1943, we were interviewing at many of the best Philadelphia law firms, most of which never before would have considered hiring women associates. Elizabeth Hatton Landis, Mary Barb Johnson and I were “firsts” at the firms where we were hired. (Incidentally, we three married lawyers whom we met at the Law School.) After having raised their families, Betty Hatton Landis and Mary Barb Johnson returned to the practice of law and report that their careers have been most rewarding since that time. Betty Landis is Assistant General Counsel at the SmithKline Corporation in Philadelphia, and Mary Johnson practices law in Chicago, Illinois. These women and I agree that, had we suffered as a result of being female law students at Penn, we were not conscious of it; in fact, the opposite was probably true. The University of Pennsylvania Law School provided a great experience for us.

I would like especially to note some outstanding women who graduated from earlier classes. The first is our oldest living woman graduate, Rose Lerner Perlman, ’16, who entered the Law School in the fall of 1913 with no prior court experience, having never been in a courtroom, and having had no acquaintances among lawyers. Incidentally, Mrs. Perlman’s Class of 1916, was the last one to be admitted without the requirement of an undergraduate college degree. Another well-known Alumna, Sadie T. M. Alexander, ’27, was the first Black Woman to have graduated from the University of Pennsylvania Law School; Anna Hawks Hutton, ’34, is Chair of the Board of the Washington Crossing Foundation and is a Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania; The Honorable Roxana C. Arsh,
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'39, is Judge of the Family Court of the State of Delaware; and The Honorable Phyllis Kravitch, '43, is Judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit.

Law School Women:
1946-1955

The Honorable Doris May Harris, '49:
Fifty-four years after Carrie Burnham Kilgore became the first woman to graduate from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, Sadie Mossell Alexander, '27, became the first Black woman graduate. After a span of twenty-two years, in 1949, I became the second Black woman to graduate from the School.

I believe these simple facts very eloquently demonstrate, to a large extent, the difficulties that women and, in particular, Black women have had in gaining access to a legal education. Both the Law School and women were victims of the bias and the discrimination of the times. Thanks to Carrie Kilgore, I did not have to resort to any court battles to gain admission to the Law School. In fact, Penn was most gracious and generous in my acceptance. The School promptly admitted me after receipt of my letter of application and, without an interview and without the examination requirement (there were no LSAT's at that time, thank goodness!), it granted me a much-needed tuition scholarship.

What I might have in common with Carrie Kilgore and Sadie Alexander is our having experienced a sense of loneliness and alienation which results from being "the first" or "the only" in a situation. Penn law School, in 1946 and for a few years thereafter, had a quota system—three Blacks and three women per year—and, in my case, I was counted twice. Very early in the school year, I discovered myself to be the only Black and the only woman in the Class of 1949. That Class was a very unique one. It was composed of many World War II veterans who were somewhat older than the average law student. My adjustment to that Class was a rather difficult and frustrating experience. It probably would have been worse had it not been for the sensitivity and kindness of Donald Bowman and Buddy Fischer, who invited me to join their study group. This is the first time that I have had the opportunity to say "thank you" to them publicly. Donald often says, when we meet, "Look what I've made out of you!" And, at that point, I always say: "I don't know whether I should kill you or thank you!"

The women law students at that time, numbering in the area of seven or nine, bonded together for mutual support and encouragement in our own organization, the John Marshall Law Club. You see, we were not permitted to join the other clubs. Judge Harriet M. Mims, '49, Catherine G. Barone, '48, and Mildred L. Weisberg, '48—all of whom are present here tonight—were members of the John Marshall Club, and we did the things that Ruth Tomlinson previously spoke of like organized teas, etc., but we also sponsored a few lectures and seminars. Actually, Judge Norma Shapiro, '51, who was a first-year student when I was in my third year, relates that she might have seen the demise of the John Marshall Law Club as a segregated organization. It seems that shortly after my graduation the other clubs, which were all male, became enlightened and invited the women law students to join. Judge Shapiro, who is a Federal District Court Judge from the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, may have been the first woman member of the McKean Law Club.

I felt somewhat separate and apart from the total law school experience—as though I were observing it through a glass window. (This phrase was used once by the late Judge William Hastie in describing a similar situation). I may have felt separate and apart but, like the other students and our former speaker, I considered myself privileged to have been exposed to the great minds of men like Professors Keedy, Reeve, Philbrick and Frye—thus receiving excellent legal training.

After my graduation, the Civil Rights Movement of the '50s and the Women's Liberation Movement of the '60s occurred, and the times and law schools changed. Roughly twenty years after my graduation, the University of Pennsylvania Law School experienced a steady increase in Black female enrollees—from four out of a five-hundred-ten total student population in 1969, to forty-five out of a six-hundred-thirty-five total student population in 1975. However, since 1979, there has been a steady decline. Fortunately, there is a strong commitment on the part of the Law School and Dean Mundheim to assure that the experiences of Carrie Kilgore, Sadie Alexander and Doris Harris not be repeated. I hope that you, the Alumni, will become part of this commitment and will actively support the recruitment and scholarship programs by giving of your time and your money.

If you ask me "Was it worth it?", my reply would be "You bet your life it was!" I've had thirty-three delightful, challenging and exciting years as a lawyer and, then, as a judge. I am sincerely grateful to the University of Pennsylvania Law School and to Carrie Burnham Kilgore for making this possible.

Law School Women:
1956-1960

Carolyn Engel Temin, '58:
My remarks will be more personal and less formal than those who came before me.

I was one of three women students who began with the Class of 1958. One woman was lost within the first six months to marriage; the other became a
psychiatrist and I, therefore, am the only surviving woman lawyer from the Class of 1958. I was also the only woman in my section at the time and remember experiencing strange and uncomfortable feelings on the first day of class. At the end of the first hour, I followed my classmates into the hallway and up the marble staircase, thinking that somewhere at the top was the law library. Actually, I had to stop myself very quickly in order to avoid entering the men’s lavatory.

While I was a student, the construction of a Law School dormitory was being considered. One day, in Contracts class, Clark Byse distributed a questionnaire which would indicate whether a sufficient number of people would be interested in living in the proposed dormitory, should it be built. Mr. Byse then looked at me and said, “Well, Miss Engel, I guess we don’t have to give you one of these questionnaires”. Of course, everyone laughed. Little did we imagine that the day would come when, not only would there be women in the Law School dormitory, but that it would be totally coed. Back in my time, one can be assured, that thought would have been very shocking indeed.

I am not certain but I may have been the first woman student in the Law School to have been pregnant. At the end of my second year, I married someone from the Class of 1957 (as one can see, I followed in the footsteps of many women here) and became pregnant with my first child during the third year. My second son was born before the bar examination results came out, so I was able to give birth to my children prior to seeking employment. Being a parent was very important to me and, although I found law school very enjoyable, I never was certain that, once out, I would actually be able to both practice law and raise a family. I had virtually no role models. There were no women teaching at the Law School other than legal writing instructors, who were part-time practitioners from the outside. The only women lawyer whom I knew was the Honorable Lois Forer. She became the person after whom I modeled myself. Fortunately, she was happily married with children and, therefore, I knew that the same could be possible for me.

I was advised to and, in fact, did volunteer with the Defender Association of Philadelphia, and was given the job of interviewing the women prisoners who were brought to the cell room in City Hall every Friday. I did not interview male prisoners, having been told that “men just could not possibly relate to me nor could I to them”. Little did I realize that several years later, the Supreme Court of the United States would decide Gideon v. Wainwright which created the situation where every criminal case must have counsel. As a result of that case, the Defender Association was granted enough money to expand the staff from three lawyers to fifteen lawyers. The Association made the decision to hire one woman—and I was that woman. Fortunately, at the time, they could not afford to let me just interview or just represent only women prisoners. I was given equal assignments and was placed into the mill with everyone in the office thus proving that women could do criminal trial work on a regular basis and could relate to the kind of people that the Defender Association considered to be its certain profile of client. I later discovered that, had I not been what the Association considered “a happily married woman who had already raised her family”, I would not have been hired. Fortunately, I worked out; otherwise, they probably would have decided that women could not be public defenders and, hence, would not have hired any more of them. As a result many women are staff members of the Defender Association today as well as members of the Philadelphia District Attorney’s Office.

I would like to close by mentioning an anecdote of which I am proud and which relates to Judge James L. Stern, ’33, who is also here tonight. Very early on, I found that there was a Pennsylvania statute—the Muncy Act—which discriminated against women in the area of sentencing. I was shocked to learn that, under The Muncy Act, a woman who was convicted of a felony had to be given the maximum sentence allowed by law for that crime regardless of her background, regardless of whether the crime she committed was a first offense, and regardless of whether there were or were not mitigating circumstances. I wanted to do something about this injustice but could not because in Philadelphia, the Muncy Act could be avoided by getting judges to impose illegal sentences. Women were sent to the Pennsylvania House of Correction because of a special statute permitting sentences of up to five years to be served there. A Philadelphia district attorney discovered what was happening and brought a woman named Jane Daniels back to Judge Stern, who originally had sentenced Miss Daniels for one-to-four years at the House of Correction. When Judge Stern was told that Jane Daniels’ sentence was illegal and that she was to be sent to what was then the State Industrial Home for Women at Muncy, he did just that but, in his opinion, stated that his only reason for sending her to Muncy was because of the Muncy Act and not because he really felt her deserving of a twenty-year sentence. Well, I was given that case because I was a woman. As I mentioned before, although we shared the appellate work at the Defender Association, I still received all of the women’s cases. It was my job to write the appeal brief on the matter but I requested permission to use the case to raise the constitutionality of the Muncy Act. I was given the “go ahead” with the understanding that the odds were against me—the Pennsylvania Supreme Court probably would not buy the argument. Well, the Supreme Court did buy it; in fact, I remember arguing that case before the Court on which Chief Justice Samuel J. Roberts sat.

I am very proud to be a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and am very happy to have heard today’s statistics on not only the number of women in the classes, but on the number of women graduates from this school who have achieved so much.
The Honorable Margaret A. Burnham, ’69:

I am thrilled to be here on this occasion and am thrilled to be back at the School that has meant so much to me in my professional life.

In thinking about this historic gathering on which we celebrate the contributions of women to this institution, I wanted to place my own sweet and sour stories next to the collection of anecdotes that have already been heard and that make up the very fascinating tapestry of the female experience here at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. I must say, I had difficulty in lifting those memories from the deep recesses of my consciousness. The difficulty was not because of my experience as having been one of a very few at the Law School; my experience here was, in fact, a remarkable one. My trouble in reviving the experience speaks as much to the weakness of my own memory as it does to the very peculiar circumstance of having been, like Doris Harris, a doubly rare species at the Law School in the decade of the 1960’s.

I, like Judge Harris, represented a combination that was a particularly troublesome one for my peers, for my colleagues and, indeed, for my professors. To flesh out and to appreciate how to deal with me was brand new territory for them. No one quite knew or appreciated or understood what kind of mold a person like me should be placed since there was not yet a stereotype into which I fit. As Judge Harris stated, there were so few of us. In my Class of 1969, there were two Black women—Alice Graham Rhodes was the other one. And we were constantly confused with one another even though she was a foot taller than I.

But, indeed, for all of the women of our decade—the Black women and the White women—the uncharted nature of the paths that we were called upon to blaze at the Law School was a factor which was part of the ferment and social excitement going on around us in the decade of the 60’s. It was as much that it was a clash between the entrenched traditions of the Law School and the new expectations that we were bringing to it.

So, our generation was a transitional one in the truest sense—a generation that was a transition from the tokenism which was the permissible operative dynamic with respect to women and the law, to the period in which equality in numbers—such as the Law School is now proud to say that it is approaching—was more accepted and more attainable as a goal for women and men in the legal profession.

It was we, the women of the ’60’s and the early ’70’s, who were moving into what was still very much a male domain. This was a time when issues pertaining to women and women’s equity were ones which still generated a lot of false humor among our fellow students and a lot of discomfort among the men with whom we sat in our classrooms. It was we, the women of the ’60’s, who were still too few and too lacking in a feminist identity and self-confidence to form a supportive network among ourselves, although we did “congregate” in the lavatories and the halls. It was we, the women of the ’60’s whose presences, in many respects, were still generating some ill-disguised hostility. Even though the rhetoric of the times was changing all around us, it was changing outside of the walls of Penn Law School. It was we, the women of the ’60’s and the ’70’s, who had to help this institution catch up with what was happening elsewhere. And it was we women who made our way without the full support and encouragement of what was, at that time, a newly-burgeoning and growing women’s movement. While there were strong women’s voices outside, the echo here in the Law School was still dim.

During my three years at the School, a sexually and racially diversified faculty was a laudable goal, of course, but it was not yet seen as an essential element of a good legal education. Legal training to enhance and advance the creation of a gender-neutral jurisprudence was not as seriously considered at that time as it is today at this institution. The environment in which we learned was not a hostile one, but it was sex-blind long before it was appropriate to be so and, I think, to the detriment of women students. Demure, tasteful and, sometimes, even subservient behavior was still rewarded in the classrooms of the ’60’s and, although advanced and progressive in its thinking, the Law School was not immune to this kind of segregation and stratification.

I think it would be interesting to examine the identifiable ways in which we early and transitional women in the law chose our paths and formed our collegial relationships. In what ways do we differ from the women of today who are here in greater numbers? Quite clearly, we are very different animals. We were women for whom defense mechanisms were required aspects of our survival—women for whom assimilation was essential in order that we fit into what was already a too homogeneous community. All of the survival mechanisms used by “tokens” everywhere were utilized by us, but they certainly seem to be becoming less necessary in today’s graduating classes. I think that it would be interesting to catalog the dimensions of some of these differences. Such a survey might shed light on the direction in which all of us need to be heading in our thrust towards a thoroughly integrated bar.

There is one other issue that I would like to mention concerning those of us who are transitional women. Now that we have completed law school and have entered the firms, have taken our places on the Bench and have established our careers—can it be said that there are still areas in the profession where we continue to be excluded? Are we being given the opportunities to realize our highest potentials? Are the doors to the partners’ rooms in the large firms open to us, and are women being admitted to the very centers of power in the profession? Or, in fact, are these doors still tightly closed? This is an issue which we must all concern ourselves with. Betsy Cohen, ’66, President of the Jefferson Bank of...
Philadelphia, is one example of a Penn Law Alumna who has broken these barriers. While many of us are true heroines and have made tremendous advances against obstacles as did Carrie Burnham Kilgore, there also are those of us who are limited to climbing shorter ladders than our male counterparts, and that is because of the pervasive discrimination which continues to exist in our society and in our profession.

**Law School Women: 1971 to the Present**

Lynn A. Marks, ’79:

I have been asked to speak from the perspective of a modern woman lawyer. In trying to portray the appropriate image, I cannot resist repeating the comment that I hear all too often: “but you don’t look like a lawyer...” I resolve that from this evening on, my response to that remark will be: “... but this is what a lawyer looks like”.

I do not consider myself or anyone else representative of my so-called “generation” of law graduates. This is because there are so many more women lawyers doing so many different things today. Unlike those who have spoken this evening and who represent groups of women that were fewer in numbers, women law graduates no longer can be stereotyped.

I am atypical in that my field of work specifically concerns the promotion and improvement of the rights of women. Most University of Pennsylvania Law graduates have chosen to work in law firms or with corporations. My law degree, however, has enabled me to argue a test case before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court on the rights of rape victims, and to work for the passage of legislation that would bring our rape laws into the 20th Century. The fact that I could graduate from law school, lead an organization with a membership of 150 people, and use my legal training and skills specifically to help women, is really a special feature of our time. As you can see, I do not fit the “modern lawyer” stereotype; but, then again, neither do any women lawyers or Black lawyers or Spanish-speaking lawyers. It is only as our numbers grow that the stereotypes will change, and I submit that they will.

Yes, women have come a long way—and a great deal of credit for the change is owed to the women lawyers who have preceded us. When I was at this School, the big issue was not the absence of a women's lavatory (as was the plight of my earlier colleagues who spoke before me this evening; it was unfortunately the need to have our bathrooms locked. When I was a student, the professors no longer automatically referred to us as “Mister”. We were also a little less invisible if only for our numbers—forty percent of the Class of 1979 were women. Today, meaningful numbers of women lawyers are present in all sectors of the legal profession. I would like to acknowledge three women of my era who have distinguished themselves: Helen Nita White, ’78, is now a Judge of the Circuit Court in Wayne, Michigan; Elise Wood duPont, ’79, was appointed by President Reagan to the Agency for International Development where she is responsible for promoting American Enterprise in ten targeted countries; and Isis Carbajal de Garcia, ’79, who as Counsel to the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was recognized for her numerous contributions to civil rights.

But there is a danger in becoming complacent because a great deal of progress has been made. Of course, we must not take the strides for granted; they are to be appreciated and lauded. But still much needs to be done. Equality in mere numbers is not enough. Women must be brought into the mainstream of the legal profession. We are still not represented sufficiently in the judiciary, Sandra Day O’Connor notwithstanding. Women do not share in the profession's most powerful positions nor do we sit on the boards of most corporations. In addition, we are still excluded from some important, private, all-male clubs.

If one looks at the pictures of the former Deans, professors, and noted scholars gracing the Law School walls, one will notice that they are all men. A member of the Class of 1983 mentioned that one woman's picture does hang here. Her place was earned not because she was a lawyer, but because she was a biographer of male lawyers.

Often, women are not taken seriously. Some judges still refer to us as “honey” and comment on our appearances, even in the presence of clients. Clients still ask to “see the lawyer” assuming that the woman present could not possibly be an attorney. I am sad to hear that sexist remarks continue to be made here at the Law School. I understand that, recently, posters belonging to the Women's Law Group were defaced with anti-woman and sexist comments.

Furthermore, there are pressures inherent in practicing law, and they are fundamentally inconsistent with having families. Law firms, corporations and government institutions must grow towards complying with the more flexible schedules necessary for women with such lifestyles. Unfortunately, most have not. I think that accommodating women with families must prove fashionable or, at least, lucrative before these institutions change their procedures. Women, I fear, and also some men feel that they must choose between a career and a family.

When speaking of equality, I am not necessarily implying “sameness”. As one Law School colleague mentioned, women should not consciously try to copy their male counterparts either in the courtroom or in the office. Not until the traditionally “feminine” characteristics such as sensitivity, patience, organization, endurance and graciousness are really valued in the legal profession to the same extent as the traditionally “male” characteristics such as aggressiveness and competitiveness, will I consider women accepted and equal.

*continued...*
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What about tomorrow? Maybe for the 200th anniversary celebration of women at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, the thrust of the tribute will not be on “women”, but rather on “persons” or on “lawyers” or on “all Alumni”. And, perhaps, one-half of these will happen to be women. Do you remember the “reasonable man” who got us through law school—the “reasonable man” who determined negligence in Torts and interpreted Contracts and who was the “standard” that determined and decided all of our legal issues? Well, I think that we are at a point now when the “reasonable woman” could also provide such a standard. In fact, I see no reason why they cannot be the same and interchangeable.

Black Law Alumni Day

The Sixth Annual Law Alumni Day sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania Black Law Students Union was held on April 9, 1983.

Departing from tradition, the BLSU expanded the event this year and offered a full day’s program of activities in which prominent Black Penn Law Alumni participated in a panel discussion and in numerous workshops from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday afternoon. The Annual Cocktail Party and Dinner took place at the University of Pennsylvania Faculty Club beginning at 6:00 p.m.


Michele Tuck, ’83, presents the BLSU Award of Distinction to George R. Burrell, Jr., ’74.
The afternoon program began with a discussion entitled "Serving the Black Community" with panelists George R. Burrell, Jr., '74, Deputy Mayor of the City of Philadelphia; Wendella P. Fox, '76, an associate in the Philadelphia firm of Crawford, Jackson, Evans & Fox; Germaine Ingram, '71, a Clinical Supervisor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School; Buford W. Tatum, II, '71, a sole practitioner in Philadelphia; and Ronald A. White, '76, a sole practitioner in Philadelphia. Four workshops followed the discussion: Judicial Clerkships which featured the Honorable Curtis Carson, Jr., '46, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; Anne Whatley Chain, '76, an associate in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz; and Sarah Wiggins Mitchell, '79, an associate in the Philadelphia firm of Dechert, Price & Rhoads. The workshop entitled Blacks in Corporations included participants George J. Edwards, '74, of the Sun Company, St. Davids, PA; Deborah R. Pierce, '78, who is with the E.I. Dupont Company, Wilmington, Delaware; and Beverly Towns Williams, '78, who is with the Prudential Insurance Company in the Philadelphia area. Interviewing, Placement and Networking featured panelists Shanora Gilbert, '80, who is with the Public Defender Association in Washington, D.C.; Mansfield C. Neal, Jr., '64, Division Counsel of the General Electric Company in Lynn, Massachusetts; and Stephanie Vaughn King, '78, who is an Assistant City Solicitor in Philadelphia. The Sole Practitioner included workshop participants: Dennis J. Braithwaite, '73, of Atlantic City, New Jersey; Hugh C. Clark, '71, of Philadelphia; Paul D. McLemore, Sr., '76, of Trenton, New Jersey; and Vivian Sye-Payne, '80, who practices in North Philadelphia.

Evening activities were held at the University's Faculty Club with cocktails, dinner, and the event's keynote speech delivered by Joanne Doddy Fort, '75, a partner in the Washington, D.C. firm of Hudson, Leftwich & Davenport. The 1983 University of Pennsylvania Law School Black Law Students' Union Award of Distinction was presented by Michele Tuck, '83, to Class of 1974 Alumnus, George R. Burrell, Jr., the Deputy Mayor of the City of Philadelphia.
The Law School's Rain Marshall, Professor Clyde W. Summers, was powerless when a sudden downpour interrupted commencement ceremonies on May 23. Black-robed Faculty and graduates of the Class of '83 and their families took cover in the Law School building until "the alternate plan" was implemented and the ceremony continued.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim greeted the commencement audience and introduced Kathleen F. Lobben, the Class of 1983 President, and Peter Fei Pan, the Representative of the LL.M. graduate students, who addressed the gathering. (Their remarks follow in this issue of The Journal.) The Dean then awarded the Law School's Annual
Honorary Fellowship to Robert M. Hayes, a former associate in the New York firm of Sullivan and Crowneell, who is responsible for having brought a state class action suit that forced the city of New York to provide shelter for its homeless men and women. Mr. Hayes continues his efforts full-time as counsel for the Coalition for the Homeless, an organization which he has established in New York City and, currently, is attempting to replicate in other cities in this country. Mr. Hayes' moving speech to the commencement audience appears in this issue of The Journal.

The 1983 Harvey Levin Memorial Award for Teaching Excellence was presented by Dean Mundheim to Professor Martin J. Aronstein, '65, the choice of the Class of 1983 as the Faculty member most worthy of extraordinary recognition. Dr. Ann Matter, the University's Director of Women's Studies, then honored the President of the Law School’s Student Academic Committee (SAC), Michele L. Tuck, with the Alice Paul Award for Outstanding Student Contributions to the University.

Assistant Dean Alice B. Lonsdorf and Vice-Dean Margo Post Marshall then presented the Class of 1983 to Dean Robert H. Mundheim, who awarded the diplomas. A reception honoring the Class of 1983 followed commencement ceremonies.
A Message from the President:

Kathleen F. Lobben,
The Class of 1983

Well, we made it!! In just a short while we will be Law School Alumni—the 131st class of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Imagine nearly three years ago, on August 27, 1980, 232 of us matriculated. The Law School prides itself on its diverse student body and 1983 was no exception. We came from 29 different states, the D.C., Puerto Rico, and India; we came from 102 different undergraduate institutions. Forty-seven percent of the Class did not come directly from undergraduate schools, another nine percent held graduate degrees and 1983 was no exception. We came from 29 different states, the D.C., Puerto Rico, and India; we came from 102 different undergraduate institutions. Forty-seven percent of the Class did not come directly from undergraduate schools, another nine percent held graduate degrees and, I understand, a number of us are still uncertain as to what we want to do with ourselves after Law School.

Anyway, we came anxious to achieve, believing in ourselves, in our ideals and in the Law School Handbook. Please allow me to quote: “The University of Pennsylvania Law School provides a hospitable and rigorous environment for learning. Its smallness of scale permits easy and frequent contact between students and professors... The positive environment is enhanced by the school’s physical facilities. The Law School is a complete community.” We believed a lot back then.

Now we are about to re-enter the real world—very much poorer financially but allegedly richer in knowledge and strength. The Law School has left its mark on each of us. It has broadened our intellects and has given us a good education by way of the books which we have read, the discussions to which we have been privy, and the experiences which we have had. We have developed a camaraderie among our classmates. But, law school presented us with more than just a rigorous intellectual challenge. It presented us with a more personal challenge to maintain both our identity and sanity. Many of us have successfully met this challenge and are to be commended.

We have reason to be proud of ourselves, having endured and survived a tortuous road to our degrees. Families and friends can share in this pride for many of us might not have made it without their steadfast support and encouragement. For many, sole or supplemental support came from Carney’s, La Terrasse, the Tavern, and various other alcoholic oases throughout the city.

What have we come away with? Well, I think that our characters have been strengthened and most of us would now profess to being capable of surviving just about anything. Nothing can keep us down. We have learned how to challenge and to argue endlessly about the simplest of statements, and we have become expert at responding to questions while dexterously avoiding giving any semblance of an intelligible answer. Beyond that, we have come away with a host of memorable events: That initial fear of being called on in class while unprepared; that initial fear of being called on in class when prepared; that wondrous moment for each of us when the word “pass” came into our vocabulary; Frug fever and Frug’s “con-sideration” of the lawyer’s argument; Haskins’ microphone; and more than one would ever want to know about chickens, the Rules Enabling Act, Sibach, and Palgraph. One thing that I am certain you have all long forgotten but which is etched in my mind, is the memory of the fine snow sculptures that sat in the classrooms from first semester exams until spring thaw—a phenomenon we took for granted but which could never occur in any law school that heats its facility. Remember the get-togethers with our Faculty advisors? Or the surprise that some of us felt after the first-year when we found out that we did have Faculty advisors! Also, some of us remember the fortunes that we forked out in an effort to bribe some Faculty members with all manner of riches like a little red wagon or a preppy poster. How about the money that we spent on text materials? Think what we spent on supplemental materials to aid us in understanding, consolidating, or avoiding the reading of those text materials. Few people have ever seen the Law Review offices, but even fewer have seen copies of the long-awaited law review publication.

The law school experience offered classroom bingo and radiator rallies—a bit of fun for all. Some of us remember a brief introduction to the Law School’s briefest admit when the attention of a classroom was drawn to this gentleman’s brief—his only attire.

Those are but a few of the fond memories which we take from this place. Our Class has shown its spirit, humor, creativity, and many talents by way of participation in the Law Revue show; the Light Opera Company; the Penn Law Forum, our law school newspaper; the many “happy hours”; the Christmas Chorus; and intramurals. Some members of our Class should also be recognized for their contributions to a new Law School baby boom. These women have managed to combine motherhood, law school, and early educational experiences for their children. They deserve our respect and admiration.

We also have left a mark on this School through our efforts to tackle problems encountered during our three years such as charges of racism, sexism, an unresponsive Faculty, and an inadequate placement program. Hopefully our work and our presence has contributed to a better Law School community and a better Law School program.

The Law School should be commended for the many positive aspects which it offers. We are grateful to several dedicated and sincere instructors whom we admire and respect for their impressive intellectual abilities and, more importantly, for their teaching excellence and sincere devotion to the task of sharing their wisdom with us. I must confess a great disen-
chantment with the minimal emphasis which appears to be placed on these characteristics when staffing this facility. My hope, which is shared by many classmates, is that a concerned Faculty and administration will recognize and grapple with that problem in an effort to strive for a superior teaching staff. The quality of education here might be immeasurably enhanced, and students might come away from the experience better prepared not only for a life in the law but with more appreciation and pride in their alma mater if that goal were attained.

The Law School offers some fine clinical programs in the areas of civil and criminal law. Students are presented with the opportunity to combine legal thinking with hands-on experiences. The result benefits the community by providing competent and diligent legal service to those who otherwise could not afford counsel. This experience, in turn, benefits the student by providing him or her with the medium in which to learn and to hone skills being taught and not taught in the Law School. These programs, when combined with standard classroom study, have greatly expanded learning opportunities for the student lawyer. These programs and innovations therein attest to the Law School's continuing commitment to preserve and to expand the diversity of educational opportunities which are available to the student.

Another of the more positive and noteworthy aspects of the Law School experience has been the presence of some outstanding administrative staff who have helped to make the experience a little easier and a little brighter. It seems appropriate and gives me a special pleasure to mention a particular few: Gary Clinton, the Registrar; Ernie Gonsalves, former Registrar and currently Systems Planning Coordinator; Gloria Watts, the Assistant to the Registrar; Sheila Kaiser, the Registrar's office Secretary; Vice-Dean Margo Marshall and Assistant Dean Fran Spurgeon, all of whom have not lost sight of essential human compassion and understanding. They have given us aid and support countless times over the past three years and their presences are a great credit to this institution. On behalf of myself and the Class of 1983, I extend to each of them our deeply felt appreciation.

Soon each of us will have graduated from the Law School and will leave behind the sterility of the classroom and textbooks. Whether we go to work in large firms or small firms, in corporations, in public interest positions or in academia, we will be dealing with real people, real problems, and real stakes.

The influence of an attorney is often tremendous. We work in an area that is foreign to many individuals whose ignorance of the law is often redefined as our wisdom. We have come to recognize that many people out there believe that we know the law in its vast entirety. We are entrusted with their problems because they are incapable of resolving matters themselves, and they depend on each of us to wholeheartedly apply our abilities and our efforts in handling their cases. For us, as lawyers, we will be involved in situations touching the very core of people's lives. Utilization of our skills and talents have earned us both the privilege and the attendant responsibility of serving society. We have a significant capacity to affect numerous lives in substantial ways. As lawyers, we have undertaken the task of serving humanity and each of us is ethically and morally obligated to utilize our skills and knowledge wisely and vigorously on behalf of our clients. We must recognize our professional responsibility to foster a just society.

We must remain forever vigilant against encroaching apathy. I hope that for each of us the true reward of our careers will come from service rather than from the attainment of affluence or power. I hope that each of us will bring to our professions the compassion and concern which can act as catalysts in generating the real power and potential for good when combined with our abilities and knowledge. Be concerned with people—their lives, their aspirations. Try to remember what it is to be afraid and to be unknowledgeable in the law. Try to understand how people work. Sensitivity and tolerance are invaluable characteristics of a good lawyer.

We are capable of building a better tomorrow. Doors are being opened to us and our horizons are filled with challenges. Meet these challenges as you have met others throughout your lives, but always be careful to keep sight of your own humanity and that of the world around you. There will be multitudes of problems to deal with, but, if we utilize our talents and address those problems from a broad, humane perspective, we can overcome them and each of us can become successes in the truest and best sense of the word.

The LL.M. Experience

by Peter Fel Pan, LL.M., '83

Last September, a group of foreign students from fourteen countries came to this Law School. I was one of them. We were a group with different interests and backgrounds, but we were all eager to learn—to learn from the Law School, from the people we met and from this country. Most of us understood that the nine months ahead would be full of surprises, excitement, depression and the unknown, but these experiences were what we came here for, and to face them with the best of our courage, will and dignity, was what we were determined to do.

Nine months is really a very short time to learn what we hoped we could, both from inside and outside the Law School. As far as inside the classroom, the students who came from Civil Law countries could never imagine before coming here that it is the students, not the professors, who are expected to
give answers to issues raised (if the answers ever existed at all!), and that a student may go home after a class with more doubts in his or her mind and be less sure of his or her original ideas than before the class. However, since most of us LL.M:s have taken tough courses and have managed to pass (or even better), we are entitled to be proud of ourselves today.

The other side of our learning experience here was outside of the classroom. The United States is an amazing country, and we are fortunate to have had the opportunity to be here and to learn something about it. Personally, I believe that for a foreign law student who comes from a country of different cultural and social background, learning to understand the American way of thinking and the American standard of valuation is necessary in order to better and clearer realize the spirit and the formation of American Law. Besides, there is so much to see and there are so many things to experience in this country that it would be a shame not to appreciate them. This is a far more enjoyable kind of learning.

There are so many thanks that we wish to offer. First of all, we should give our thanks to the Law School because it made all that I have just said possible. We do hope that we can find better ways of showing our gratitude besides just paying tuition. We want to thank Dean Mundheim and the Graduate Committee. They have provided the best possible for the LL.M's in the past year, and they are still trying to make the LL.M. Program even better for the future. We have to thank the Faculty for everything they have given us, including the examinations and grades, of course. We are grateful for the patience and kindness of the professors and for the most precious knowledge and experience that they have tried to pass on to us. We want to thank the administration for all of their help and support, especially Mrs. Lonsdorf, the "Mother of LL.M's", who did more than we could ask. She was always there to give us the help we needed. And we want to thank all the J.D. students. They have been kind to us, willing to teach us how to survive and to show us how to defend ourselves in our classes.

From them we also learned the etiquette of socializing in American society.

We regret that there was actually too much to learn and too little time to do it. We are sorry that we are leaving so soon and are leaving friendships and memories. But now we can go back to our countries and back to our homes, knowing that we are better in all senses than when we came here. We are proud of Penn. We hope that through us—the LL.M:s—the true spirit and ideals of Penn Law School can be spread to the far corners of the world.

Robert M. Hayes,  
The 1983 Honorary Fellow,  
University of Pennsylvania Law School,  
May 23, 1983

Your achievements on behalf of the dispossessed and forgotten of New York City stand witness to the fact that individual lawyers—even at the earliest stages of their careers—can make a difference in the quality of the society in which they live. Confronted, like so many others, with the stark lives of those who had no place to sleep but the streets, you did not turn away. Rather, you transformed a sense of outrage into a vision of remedy. And through a grueling process of unreimbursed, unrecognized and arduous lawyering, you made that vision a reality. Thanks to your efforts in the courts and the arena of social concern, the City of New York has begun to recognize its duty to provide all of its citizens with a decent life. Today, because of your struggle, the homeless of New York have shelter.

By leaving your law firm and founding the Coalition for the Homeless you have now brought your devotion, energy and talent to the task of representing the least well off in other cities and in broader forums. We hold you in esteem and commend your example to the generation of lawyers who go forth from this school.

—Dean Robert H. Mundheim and  
The Faculty of The University of Pennsylvania Law School
With what I fear is a congenital case of awkwardness, I want to thank you, the Class of 1983, for sharing your commencement with me. I fully recognize that, after the past three years, you may be too exhausted, demoralized, beaten down or, at the very least, too bored to appreciate the accomplishment of a law school graduation. But, whatever else it is, a commencement is a rite of passage, a threshold moment of change in your lives. At least nineteen years of formal education are now behind you, part of your personal histories. And while you are to be commended for avoiding just barely the distinction of being the Orwellian class of 1984, still a “brave new world” awaits you.

For those of you really worried about confronting that new world tomorrow: relax. The bar review course, which most of you will endure, is not of this world at all. John Milton wrote of bar review courses in *Paradise Lost*: “... it may not be hell but, let me say, better you than I.”

Standing here—probably a bit too formally—I find myself in something of a pickle. A commencement address is supposed to be inspiring or, at least, somewhat awesome. I fear that I am a bit too young for either role. It was all too recently that I sat in your seats listening quite inattentively to a commencement address, so it is difficult to believe that you would take my inspiration seriously. Instead, permit me to play a journalistic rather than a pontifical role. I would like to describe how I view this Law School and what I see of America.

I have never been to the University of Pennsylvania before today, the reason having at least something to do with the fact that your admissions office was far more contrary nine years ago than your invitations office was today. Upon reflection I concluded that, however else The University of Pennsylvania is known, it is regarded as a national law school. Does this mean that Pennsylvania students reflect the population of the nation? Of course not. It would be hard to find a more homogeneous crew outside of Brooks Brothers. Does a national law school mean that its student body comes from across the country? No. Does it mean that its graduates will have careers from coast-to-coast? Possibly, but not likely.
So what does it mean to be graduating from a national law school? It means, for better or worse, that each of you and your classmates will have the privileged opportunity to become leaders in business, in the legal profession, in academia, in politics—leaders in the power centers of the nation. Some of you will assume that leadership, that privilege and that responsibility soon. Others may wait a few years. Yet, before long—by the dint of your knowledge of how to refine, manipulate or exploit the rules which govern this society—you will be in a position to lead and to influence.

It is fairly basic knowledge that an indispensable element to competent leadership is information. A national leader, particularly from a national law school, should know something about the state of the nation. Now I know that law school is a bit of a cloister, so it struck me that you may not have been seeing what has happened in your country over the last several years. I want to share with you, as your reporter, the sights of America that I have seen this year. I invite you to look at that America in the eye and then ask yourself: How will I lead? How will I serve?

One of my bad habits is clipping newspapers. Here are some clippings from across our country in 1983:

From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, a headline and story read: "TRANSIENTS SLEEPING ANYWHERE—Park benches, bridge underpasses and the downtown riverfront once again are popular sleeping spots for Columbus's transients since the closing of the city shelter two weeks ago. One former shelter resident, Walter Green, 79, commented, 'I sleep almost anywhere these days'".

From that stronghold of McGovern liberalism, the Boston Globe reports: "The State Welfare Department, responding to angry complaints from legislators, sent an emergency message to its offices late yesterday directing them to drop a practice of refusing benefits to mothers and children with no permanent address."

In an Associated Press story from San Jose, California: "A 'tent city' has sprung up beneath a freeway here, providing a place for about 60 men and 4 women to share warm food and hard times." And from the Denver Post, the headline and story: "DENVER IGNORES SHELTER OFFER DESPITE 'HOMELESS' HUNDREDS. While operators of emergency shelters for the homeless say several hundred people are still without a place to sleep at night, Denver city officials say they see no reason to take advantage of an offer to use federal government buildings for shelters."

A wire service photo. The caption reads: "Despite 17 degree temperatures (with a chill factor of 8 below), long line of jobless people waits at A.O. Smith Corp. auto frame plant in West Allis, Wisconsin, outside Milwaukee. They were waiting to apply for 200 jobs that are available. It was estimated that 20,000 applications showed up to seek work as welders and press operators."

From upstate New York, the Albany Times Union reports on page one: "In the shadow of the Empire State Plaza, men and women wander Albany's streets. In downtown Schenectady, homeless people cast long shadows as they pass crouched against the wind under the dull light of a lamppost. In Troy, as in virtually any urban refuge where there are parks and lights, a growing number of homeless persons—some of them refugees of the economy, others refugees from a society that no longer has a place for them—walk the streets at night, without a place to call home."

And one more. From the New Haven Register, the story begins: "Social service officials say the ranks of the homeless in Connecticut are swelling. They point to the downtown streets of the state's large cities for evidence."

It's a nasty picture. It's a pervasive picture. Hunger, homelessness, deprivation—a new harvest of the grapes of wrath is being reaped from coast-to-coast—from America's seaports, through its heartland to the oil-rich sunbelt. This is the America which you do not have to see. It is one which many, perhaps most of you, will never see. For in our country, the desperate can be hidden, can be contained, can be swept inside. You can drive our interstates and not see our disenfranchised. The Main Line has never stopped at skid row.

It would be bad enough if we simply stood idle, doing nothing, while hunger and homelessness abound in our land of plenty. But our malfeasance, compounding our non-feasance, increases our culpability. To cite a single example, federal tax policy continues to subsidize the purchase of second and even third vacation homes for the affluent. The rule is simple: the richer you are, the larger the tax break. This policy persists, even as our President looks to cut funding for low-income housing, that is affordable housing for the poor, to about two per-cent of where it stood in 1976, the last year of Gerald Ford's presidency. Our national government is not shifting away from a partisan housing program of the party out of office. It is rejecting, with a radical fervor, the housing policies pursued by Presidents Eisenhower, Nixon and Ford. And it hurts. Badly.

It gives one pause to recall the challenge to government expressed not so long ago by an American statesman: "The true test of a government", he said, "is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the children, and how it treats those in the twilight of life, the elderly, and how it treats those in the shadow of life, the frail, the sick and the needy." How do we measure up? In 1983, children are hungry and badly educated; the elderly are discarded; the infirm of mind are exiled to city streets; upwards of two million Americans are homeless. On these counts alone we, as a people, and they, as a government, do not pass muster. We fail the essential test of civilized behavior.
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I do not go on like this merely to stretch you out on a rack of remorse, nor do I look to ruin this day of achievement for you with tales of woe unbounded. I paint this wretched but accurate picture of Americans in misery for a simple reason: because you can make a difference. I reject as heresy the prevailing notion being adopted by our generation that nothing can be done about suffering, about injustice, about wrong. I am not suggesting that any of us—even all of us together—can effect fundamental shifts in our society. I wish we could. What I am suggesting is that each of us, without heroism but with responsibility, can at least alleviate some of the suffering of some of our people. Albert Camus, realist that he was, had only the nerve to have the physician who fought the plague in Northern Africa, cure a single child. We as lawyers are uniquely situated to ply the tools of our trade, to lessen the misery of at least one more child. We must do that at least with some of our time, with some of our skills.

How? It cannot be done with hair shirts or with piety or with pontifications from a reborn Wall Street lawyer. Nor can it be done unless two essential qualities are present: first, you must gain and maintain an awareness of life beyond the narrow confines of daily existence, beyond the myopia which sets all two quickly into our lives. Second, to be useful, that awareness must be combined with something else: a disciplined learning of the crafts of our profession. For only with excellence of execution will you serve adequately whatever client you have—be it the family without shelter, the hungry child, the 85 year old widow cut off from medicare or, for that matter, the oil company without a drilling license.

So, to begin with, I am only saying the obvious, something neither your Dean nor any of your teachers would dispute. You really do not know much about practicing law after three years of studying it. You have to start learning now. And, in order to learn the practice of law well, plan on the next three years as being worse, far worse, than the last three years. Clearly, I am saying something more than just to work hard. I want to pose to you the essential question for any attorney: Will you be a merchant of law or will you be a servant of justice? I submit that the answer to that question does not depend on genetics or geography or political party. It depends on awareness. It simply depends on knowing what goes on in this land. To me it is plain that the most direct route to join the fight as an advocate for justice is to see—close-up—the human imprint of injustice. Stare at it without blinking, and that will fire the sense of outrage smoldering somewhere in each of us. Each of us has a point where the outrage cannot be contained, a point at which we become captive to the moral indignation that no schooling—no matter how advanced—can refine. That outrage will trigger action. And, as lawyers, our actions can cause justice.

For me, as you know, the breaking point came from seeing one too many human beings shivering in the cold because we, as a society, said that there was no room inside. I have seen other people break and respond rightly. For one person, it was a school system rife with inequality. For another, it was a bumbling government bureaucracy tearing down a neighborhood to build a highway. Yet another felt her legal skills should be used to fight, not defend, water pollution. There is no pattern, save one. The common thread is awareness, is sensitivity to what was called over two decades ago “The Other America.” That awareness will not, in most cases, cause a dramatic turn in your life. But it will enhance your life and you, in turn, will enhance the lives of those caught in the cruel binds of “The Other America.”

Our profession is viewed by the public as somewhat less trustworthy than used car salesmen and just barely more trustworthy than politicians. It is probably a fair rap and, as you join the legal profession, take a look at your colleagues and see whether you agree.

In writing on the fall of Athens, Edward Gibbon could have been talking about much of the legal profession, that part which has lost its awareness of what this country really is. Gibbon wrote:

In the end, more than they wanted freedom, they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life, and they lost it all—security, comfort and freedom . . . When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to society but for society to give to them, when the freedom they wished for most was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free.

We young lawyers are like the Athenians, and if we lust for nothing more than security and comfort and blindness from reality and an escape from responsibility we, too, like Athens will be lost.

So I ask once more: Is it your choice to be merchants of law or servants of justice? Your choice will play an important role in alleviating the needless suffering in our country. That I believe. Your choice, too, will have a profound effect on the quantum of personal happiness in your lives. That I know.
The Honorable Samuel J. Roberts, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania

by Bernard M. Borish, '43

Editor's Note:

Chief Justice Samuel J. Roberts, '31, a distinguished member of the Pennsylvania Judiciary for thirty-one years, became Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court on January 3, 1983.

Throughout his over fifty years in the legal profession, the Chief Justice has served on the boards of community, and regional health, welfare and educational agencies. He is a member of the Judges’ Advisory Committee to the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics and, presently, is Vice-Chair of the Council of the American Bar Association's Section on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar, in addition to sitting on that Section's Law School Accreditation Committee. The Chief Justice is Chair of the Judicial Administrative Working Group on Asbestos Litigation, Conference of Chief Justices. He has authored numerous articles which appeared in numerous legal publications.

On April 27, 1983, Chief Justice Samuel J. Roberts delivered the lecture, Reflections, in the third of the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society's Alumni Luncheon Forum Series. What follows is that speech preceded by the introduction of Chief Justice Roberts given that day by Bernard M. Borish, '43, President of the Law Alumni Society.
On January 3rd of this year, the Honorable Samuel J. Roberts took the oath of Chief Justice of Pennsylvania in Erie, his hometown, in the very courtroom in which, thirty years ago, on September 15, 1952, he took his first oath of judicial office as President Judge of the Orphans’ Court of Erie County. The ceremonies were solemnly judicial but touchingly familial, as his grandchildren looked on, beaming with pride. Thus, he capped a distinguished judicial career, by reaffirming the continuing commitment he made in the beginning: to perform his judicial duties to the very best of his ability and to strive always for equal justice under law.

His time as Chief Justice will be short—just one year. That is because he is the last Supreme Court Justice to be elected to a twenty-one year term, which will expire on the first Monday in 1984. Although the State Constitution adopted in 1968 reduced Supreme Court terms to ten years and required Justices to retire at 70, Chief Justice Roberts and others on the Court at that time were allowed to complete their terms.

At the same time, the new Constitution, in the Judiciary Article established a unified judicial system in the Commonwealth, and reposed the supreme judicial power of the Commonwealth in the Supreme Court. Thus, notwithstanding that the Chief Justice is referred to almost invariably as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in reality he is the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania.

Chief Justice Roberts set out at once to demonstrate vigorously that the title Chief Justice means more than just presiding over the Supreme Court. In his inaugural address he said:

Justice is still the highest interest of a free society. The rule of law remains our greatest hope for peace and social progress. Thus, when our court system is confronted with seemingly insurmountable problems, we must not be content to respond with excuses and temporary solutions designed simply to keep the situation from becoming worse. Rather, we owe it to both the society and the cause of justice which we serve to search daily for ways to improve our judicial system and to meet all our challenges with an uncompromising commitment to excellence.

Following his inauguration, in rapid succession, he (I) wrote to the President Judges of all the Trial Courts soliciting their suggestions for improving the system; (II) he met in Harrisburg with the Justices of the Superior and Commonwealth Courts to obtain their support and suggestions; and (III) he set in motion a process to reexamine all Supreme Court Rules for clarity and usefulness. On March 17 he convened in Philadelphia a meeting of the leaders of the Bench and Bar in this City, and presented them with detailed recommendations which he called “absolutely essential if we are to achieve our goal of prompt and equal justice for all.”

Over the years, the Chief Justice has stood out as a learned, courageous jurist who more than carried his share of the Court’s work. Long considered the Court’s intellectual, he often lectures and writes about the legal system. He has exhibited a prodigious and uninterrupted intellectual activity which has taken him into many fields, despite the most exacting demands. At the same time, he has served on the Boards of many community and regional health, welfare and educational agencies.

The Chief Justice is possessed of a keen mind and analytical skill tested by long experience. The combination of this analytical power, with a talent for comprehensiveness and a grace of expression, has given a unique distinction to his judicial work. Knowing how busy he is, when I called to invite him, I did so with some trepidation. He disarmed me instantly by responding “Of course! I love the Law School. I will do anything I can to help.”

A graduate of the Law School in the Class of 1931, a member of the Order of the Coif, and a member of the Law School’s Board of Overseers, it is my high honor and great privilege to present the Honorable Samuel J. Roberts, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania.
Thank you, Bernie. Our Law School really turns out great advocates. I wish that I could believe all of Bernie's exceedingly kind words but to the extent that some of them are true, the Law School surely deserves much of the credit.

As many of you know, I have had a love affair with the University of Pennsylvania Law School for over fifty years, one that has increased in ardor with the passage of time. My enduring admiration for the Law School is based upon more than the memory of the excellent legal education I received, although that would certainly be basis enough. Over the years, I have been able to observe the continued excellence of the Law School from many different perspectives, and I have never failed to be impressed, both with the quality of its students, its Faculty, and its educational program, and with the skill and commitment of its graduates, many of whom I have known as fellow practitioners, colleagues on the bench, and advocates in our courts.
In my praise for this place from which we sprang, I don't want you to confuse me with some athlete selling after-shave on television—I really do use the product. Of the fifty law clerks that I have worked with in my twenty years on the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, thirty-four have been graduates of our Law School. All have been dedicated and extremely talented, endowed not only with impressive legal skills but also with a strong sense of the integrity and the crucial importance of our profession. We have learned much from each other, and I am grateful to have had the continuing opportunity both to tap the Law School's most important resource—its graduates—and, through their insights and observations, to attend the Law School vicariously over the last two decades.

And so, from the unique perspective of having been, in effect, an alumnus and a student of the Law School at the same time, as well as a high-volume employer of its graduates, I would like to reflect for a few moments upon what I consider some of the other unique aspects of my tenure as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Of course, every judge thinks his or her tenure is unique, but in one respect at least my position is secure: I am the last of the Justices on the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania elected to a single twenty-one year term, with the right of retention or reelection. Had I been asked to design a State Court system, I probably would have fashioned one somewhat differently than did the Judiciary Article of the Pennsylvania Constitution, adopted in 1968. For the highest court in the state judicial system—the Supreme Court—I probably would have supported a single fixed term of any number of years with adequate procedures for removal if necessary, rather than imposing the requirement of either a reelection or a retention referendum every ten years. In addition, I would have suggested some method to protect lawyers from constantly being solicited for contributions from candidates seeking judicial office. I also would have provided for an effective method of public exposure of the contributions made to judicial candidates. Our Code of Judicial Conduct, as you know, properly mandates that a judge “be unswayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism.” Surely the temptation to violate this crucial commandment is greater for a judge with one eye on his chances for reelection or retention than for a judge whose sole ambition is a just decision and whose sole accountability is to the constitution, to the law and to his/her conscience.

Another way in which my tenure has been unique is in the remarkable combination of stability and change in the Court's composition that I have witnessed over the years. Coming to the Court in 1963, I sat longer in the junior seat—six years—than any other Justice on the Court in this century. Since then, in the last fourteen years, the seat which I waited so long to vacate has been occupied by twelve different Justices.

The progress of the law itself is, of course, a combination of stability and change, and the last twenty years have certainly seen their share of progress in our Court. My first Supreme Court opinions were published in Volume 409 of the Pennsylvania Reports; I assume that the last will probably appear in Volume 500. Besides the remarkable fact that nearly one-fifth of the Court's published work appeared in the last thirteenth of its 262-year history, I think it is also safe to say that more significant developments in the law have occurred in the law of this Commonwealth in the past twenty years than at any previous time. I am proud to have played a part in these developments, even though the part has been that of dissenter more frequently than I would have liked, and often enough to call my powers of persuasion into question. Thanks to the wonders of LEXIS, I am told that since 1963 I have written some 1200 majority and plurality opinions for our Court, 500 concurring opinions, and over 700 dissenting opinions. I also had the privilege of sitting with the Superior Court on special assignments in an amount just short of 200 cases. Like anyone who has been constrained to disagree with his brethren as often as I, I have found consolation in the observation of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes that “a dissent in a court of last resort is an appeal to the brooding spirit of the law, to the intelligence of a future day.” And sometimes, I am happy to say the appeal is heard. In 1967, I dissented in a case (Argo v. Goodstein) in which a majority of the Court applied a per partes rule that any ex parte communication—even the most innocuous—between a judge and a jury was automatic error requiring a new trial. I was of the view—as I have continued to be—that such a rigid approach to judge/jury communication is utterly unnecessary to the protection of litigants’ rights and leads only to the needless waste of scarce and costly judicial resources. Sixteen years later—just today, in fact—our Court handed down a decision rejecting a per partes rule in such cases and requiring a showing of prejudice. Of course, if I had had my way, the rule would have been put to rest in 1967, but vindication of one's position by “the intelligence of a future day” is sweet whenever it comes.

While the writing of a dissenting opinion is often a painful necessity, the writing of a majority opinion can sometimes be positively excruciating, as I know from having written the majority opinion in three legislative reapportionment cases during my tenure on the Court—in 1964, 1972, and 1981. I do not think that any member of the Court will ever have that experience again. Of course, courts cannot hope to please everyone, but I suggest that there may be no other area in the law in which it is possible to please so few. Thanks to the Law School, however, my task was made far easier than it otherwise would have been. The 1971 Legislative Reapportionment Plan was prepared under the chairmanship of Professor
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A. Leo Levin; the 1981 Legislative Plan, under the chairmanship of our former Dean James O. Freedman. Both plans were thorough and excellent, and both were sustained, even though by a divided Court.

As I look back over the 2400 opinions I have written in the past twenty years, I cannot help feeling a bit proud, but I also cannot help remembering how many of those cases had to wait two years or more before even being heard—let alone decided—by our Court. Thus, I am delighted to say that, by the end of this year, thanks in part to the gradually felt effects of the 1980 Certiorari Bill and to an increased caseload at each of our Court's 1983 sessions, our Court will have the smallest backlog in its history, smaller than the backlog of the Supreme Court of any other comparable state in the nation. Already many appeals filed in 1983 are being heard and decided in 1983. By the end of the year, every appeal filed should receive a briefing schedule within thirty days, with argument and decision following soon thereafter.

Of course, as we all learned in law school, a fast decision is not necessarily a just one, but it is a lesson too easily forgotten. I suggest that now, when more and more members of the public—and members of the legal profession—are clamoring for quick and easy solutions to problems as old as history, we need to reaffirm our commitment to the rigorous, impartial, intellectual discipline we learned in law school. For a legal education—at least the one which I received and which I know Penn Law School students continue to receive—teaches us to confront every issue with an open mind, to challenge all premises, to recognize that there are at least two sides to every question, and to mistrust simple, superficially appealing solutions to complex problems—in short, to approach our lives both in and out of the law with a combination of intellectual tenacity and humility, contributing what we can and learning all we can.

Legal education is, of course, a process—one that only begins with three years of law school. We are presently developing a continuing judicial education program in this Commonwealth which we hope to make the best program of its kind in the nation. If we are to achieve our goal, we must have the benefit of the advice and talent of this distinguished Law School and of every other law school in Pennsylvania. Indeed, if we are to have a unified judicial system of uniform excellence, we need to develop a continuing and active partnership among law schools, the Bench and the Bar, working together in every area towards the goal of equal justice for all.

And now, in the spirit of communication and of shared ideas which are the hallmarks not only of legal education but of all human endeavor, I think it's time for me to stop talking and to say that I will be glad to answer—or try to answer—any questions that you may have.

Question: Your report of the streamlined briefing schedule and the argument and decision program which resulted from the Certiorari Bill of 1980 sounds great. Is there unanimity in the Court to actually carry out the plan?

Chief Justice Roberts: Oh yes. Our schedule has already been implemented. There is virtually no backlog presently in the Western District of Pittsburgh. There is still a backlog here in the Philadelphia area. We, on the Court, are carrying very difficult schedules because when the Certiorari Bill was passed and the Superior Court was expanded, as a result, the understanding was that we would retain all of those cases that were in our Courts rather than transfer them—had been done in several jurisdictions where an intermediate appellate court had been established. A Supreme Court often takes all of the cases that are now eligible to be heard in an intermediate appellate court and transfers them. We did not do that. We continued with our caseload and whittled it down.

Question: Mr. Chief Justice, are there any plans afoot for a more rapid disposition of cases by the Superior Court?

Chief Justice Roberts: That is a very, very good question! I think that what we are trying to develop is a unified judicial system which does justice to all of the cases at hand and which gets rid of what I term "excess baggage", unnecessary procedures which in no way contribute to the quality of the judicial product, to the efficiency of the system or to access to the courts. I am hoping that by setting an example in our Court, we can persuade all of the courts to move more rapidly in the disposition of their cases by really making certain that the resources are efficiently and effectively used. That was one of the missions that I had in mind when, two days after my swearing-in as Chief Justice, I met with the Judges of both the Superior Court and the Commonwealth Court. I tried to engender in them the need and spirit for a quality product and a more rapid disposition pointing out that, as the Judges of those Courts, they have the final word on a greater percentage of
My concern is that we not get diverted into something for the future and allow the present to just drift along. What I attempt to tell the judicial system is that, in my opinion, I do not think that more judges and bigger budgets are the solutions to our problems. We must make what we already have functional. Then, when we are functioning as efficiently as we possibly can, when we are utilizing all of the scarce professional resources that we have, and we still have not attained our desired goals, we should consider other avenues. I fear that frequently dreams of the future can be substitutes for present action.

Question: I do not mean to disagree with you, Chief Justice Roberts, but for the past thirty years numerous proposals have been made for the aforementioned “justice center”, which would include a complete court house in Philadelphia. Presently, the City is spending some $250,000 on another such study. I believe it vital that, for the judicial system to work efficiently in Philadelphia, we must have a justice center. We are scattered now, and I am not hopeful that the City will use its resources to do anything in the future. As the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and as the head of the unified judicial system, is there anything that you can do within the powers of your office and your Court to move that along to reality?

Chief Justice Roberts: I would suppose that those people who have clout to make the ultimate decision about such a plan might be persuaded if it were demonstrated to them that every courtroom in Philadelphia is being used daily from 9:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. and from 1:30 P.M. until 4:30 or 5:00 P.M. and that, despite all of this efficient use, problems still existed. That type of demonstration might result in some affirmative action. You know, lawyers and legal scholars can solve almost any problem. It seems to me that there is sufficient talent in and out of the law schools and in the profession and in the judiciary to plot out a workable, sensible, efficient, economical, reasonable program. To embark on other plans, I think, merely takes away the emphasis and the energy from what we already have. We should make certain that our present resources are being utilized effectively, efficiently and on a full time basis.

By the way, whatever the merits of a centralized trial court, let me state that there is not a scintilla of evidence in this country that an appellate court that has a central headquarters—one spot where all of the judges are housed—either is more efficient, turns out better judicial products or is, in any way, more effective than an appellate court where the judges are scattered throughout the state. The problem is not the physical facility. I am certain that one could find some lovely physical facilities with judicial products that leave a great deal to be desired; and I am sure that one could find some superb opinions coming out of courts where the facilities are old-fashioned.
The Law School’s Admiral McHugh

by Robert G. Fuller, Jr., ’64

Editor’s Note:

Robert G. Fuller, Jr., ’64, is a member of the firm of Pierce, Atwood, Scribner, Allen, Smith & Lancaster, with offices in Portland and Augusta, Maine. Mr. Fuller is a Commander in the Judge Advocate General’s Corps, United States Naval Reserve. Earlier this year, he received orders to perform his two weeks’ active duty for training at Mayport, Florida, where—by chance—the Judge Advocate General of the Navy was conducting a command visit. Discovering that Rear Admiral James J. McHugh, ’54, was a fellow Alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, Mr. Fuller seized the opportunity to obtain an interview. This profile of our distinguished Alumnus and Naval Officer was prepared and written by him.
Mayport, Florida. The words bring to mind sun, sand, palm trees and golf. But Rear Admiral James J. McHugh, Class of 1954, isn't here on vacation. On this sunny day at the sprawling Naval Station in Mayport, home for over twenty ships of the Atlantic Fleet (including two aircraft carriers), Admiral McHugh is on one of his periodic inspection visits to a subordinate command. Up for inspection today is Mayport's Naval Legal Service Office (NLSO) which provides legal services and handles the prosecution and defense of courts-martial involving the several thousand sailors attached to Mayport ships and the so-called "tenant commands" (such as ship and aircraft repair units) at the Naval Station. This NLSO, staffed by eight officer-lawyers and a support group of six enlisted personnel and three civilian employees, is one of thirty-nine NLSOs worldwide for which RADM McHugh is responsible in his capacity as Judge Advocate General of the Navy and Commander, Naval Legal Service Command—the Navy's top legal job.

Mayport's NLSO is growing. It was formerly a detachment of the NLSO based at the Naval Air Station forty miles away on the other side of the St. John's River in nearby Jacksonville. Last year Mayport became a "free-standing" separate command. Just as a senior partner of a private law firm might inspect a burgeoning branch office, so does RADM McHugh inspect this Mayport NLSO to make sure that the growth is properly managed and to discuss any problem areas with the local "partner-in-charge," in this case the energetic Lieutenant Commander who holds the job of Commanding Officer. While he's here, the Admiral will also meet with the skippers of some of the ships and of the shore-based units at Mayport to listen to their perspectives on how well the Navy's legal system is meeting their needs.

A tall, solidly built man with salt-and-pepper hair and an engaging Irish grin, Jim McHugh brings impressive credentials to support the two stars on his shoulder boards. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1951 with honors in English and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. Three years later he earned his LL.B. from the Law School where he continued to display superior academic performance as an Associate Editor of The Law Review. After passing the Pennsylvania bar, he worked briefly for the Philadelphia firm then known as Barnes, Dechert, Price, Meyers & Clark before joining the Navy.

Why, one might ask, would a young man with a Phi Beta Kappa key and Law Review experience, clearly on the fast track to an eventual partnership in a prestigious center city firm, opt instead for a career as a Navy lawyer? "I didn't start out to make it a career," RADM McHugh recalls. "I had been deferred during the Korean War to go to law school and I knew that after graduation I'd be drafted. The Navy offered me an alternative—the opportunity to use the skills I'd acquired at college and at law school, so I applied for Officer Candidate School."

The Navy did indeed make use of those skills, sending the newly-commissioned McHugh first to Naval Justice School and then to duty as Legal Officer for the Naval Air Station at Point Mugu, California. "I had a lot of responsibility as an Ensign in that billet and felt that I was making a very real and direct contribution to the Navy and to the national effort," the Admiral says now. "When my hitch was about to expire, I wrestled long and hard during the dark hours of the night over whether I was going to stay in or go back to civilian practice." The decision was made in 1958 to augment into the Regular Navy. "Believe it or not," says McHugh, "I would've had to take a pay cut if I'd gone back to Philadelphia. With my pay and allowances as a Naval officer, I was taking home more than an associate in a typical downtown firm."

From then on, McHugh served in a number of billets of increasing responsibility, at locations from Washington, D.C. to San Francisco, Hawaii and Alaska. He doesn't appear to have minded the frequent changes of duty station which are the inevitable accompaniment to a Naval officer's lifestyle. His wife, Rita, and their two children, Margaret (who is considering a legal career of her own) and James (an NROTC scholarship student at Penn State), have moved seven times during the Admiral's time in the service. "I wonder if I haven't seen more of the world than some of my classmates who've been riding the Paoli local for the past thirty years," McHugh quips.

Along the way he picked up an M.S. in International Affairs from George Washington University and graduated with distinction from the Naval War College where his thesis, "Forcible Self-Help in International Law," was published in the Naval War College Review.

His job as the Navy's top lawyer gives the Admiral responsibility for over one thousand active-duty Navy lawyers and three hundred active-duty Marine Corps lawyers. He also oversees about nine hundred civilian lawyers who have part-time incarnations as Naval Reserve judge advocates, drilling one weekend a month at local reserve centers and performing two weeks of active duty annually. Admiral McHugh is quick to point out that the active-duty lawyers do much more than prosecute and defend courts-martial. "We have some of the finest admiralty lawyers in the country practicing out of our Washington office," he asserts. In addition, Navy lawyers are heavily involved with international law issues, such as those developed during the recently-concluded Law of the Sea treaty discussions, the law of armed conflict, and the negotiation of status-of-forces agreements with foreign governments hosting United States military installations, where the officer may work in conjunction with the State Department. Other matters handled by McHugh's "firm" include the defense of claims against the Navy (arising out of one of the several federal statutes permitting such claims) in much the same fashion as insurance. 
defense counsel litigate and settle claims involving their carriers. In addition, Admiral McHugh's office provides simple wills, powers of attorney and routine legal advice to Naval personnel, similar to the help provided by neighborhood legal services clinics (except that Navy lawyers usually do not represent sailors in civilian courts).

One other area where the Admiral finds his lawyers on the cutting edge is in environmental law. "We're constantly up to our ears in environmental issues," he says, citing as an example his office's involvement in resolving a potential confrontation between the Navy and environmental activists over San Clemente Island. This island, off of the California coast, had been used for years by the Navy for bombing practice. It was recently found to be the habitat for a rare species of orchid. Unfortunately, it was also the habitat for a herd of wild goats, which munched on the orchids as a part of their diets. The environmentalists demanded that the orchids be protected. "The Navy's initial reaction," McHugh notes wryly, "was to say 'No problem—we'll shoot the goats.'" The environmental groups found this proposed solution lacking in merit and prepared to litigate.
At this point the Navy turned to RADM McHugh's office for assistance. Ultimately, a practical solution was devised. A contract was given to a small, family-owned firm which had developed a leghold trap harmless to the goats. The principal of the firm—a Mr. Clapp and the “Clapp Family Trappers”, as they came to be called around McHugh's office—successfully evicted all of the goats by means of the “Clapp Trap,” to the great pleasure of the environmental groups and, presumably, of the orchids as well.

The Admiral is intensely proud of the caliber of the lawyers he has working for him, particularly the young lieutenants who do the bulk of the trial work and legal assistance. They are the “associates” in this huge, worldwide law firm. Presently, recruiting is not a problem. “They come looking for us,” McHugh says. Competition for places in the Navy JAG student program is keen. Applicants are, almost invariably, in the upper half of their law school classes, and the Navy also looks for evidence of leadership ability and maturity in selecting its lawyers. About 11% of the JAG Corps is female, but, sighs McHugh, “it's tough to keep them on board after their obligated service expires because they are in such demand in the civilian sector. We presently have one female Captain (one step below flag rank) on active duty, and I'd like to see more senior female JAG officers—and more female officers generally.”

In addition to McHugh, there are seven other graduates of the University of Pennsylvania Law School on active duty with the Navy. The senior officer in this group is Captain Ashley Roach, ’63, currently assigned to OJAG’s International Law division, based at the Pentagon. The Admiral remembers his own days at the Law School well. “I picked Penn because I had a good experience at the College and I enjoyed the community. In addition,” he smiles, “they gave me a half scholarship my first year and a full for my last two!” He particularly remembers Professors Paul Mishkin and Louis B. Schwartz. “Mishkin—what a facile mind! I had him for Property in my first year and I'll never forget when he first called on me. It was that old English case of the landowner, the hunter and the fox, and he pressed me for most of the hour (or so it seemed at the time) as to who had the better claim on the fox. I picked the farmer because, as I told him, I thought the farmer had a right to the fox. He drew himself up and said to me sternly, ‘Mr. McHugh, what is a ‘right’? It was a painful introduction to the Socratic method.’”

Schwartz, he recalls, “was very interested in getting you to see not only how the court arrived at the result in a criminal case, but also in getting you to think long-range as to the effects of the decision on the criminal justice system and society as a whole.”

Turning again to one of his favorite subjects—the quality of the lawyers under his command—the Admiral notes that the competition to stay in the Navy has dramatically increased in recent years, as the number of employment opportunities for lawyers in civilian practice has diminished. JAG officers initially receive a Reserve commission and are offered the opportunity to compete for augmentation into the Regular Navy after a period of time spent on active duty. “Our augmentation pool is made up of very capable people,” McHugh says. “All of them have outstanding service records and academic credentials. Unfortunately, we have career slots for only about 20% of those coming into the JAG Corps.” McHugh wants to improve the augmentation process by spotting the best performers early in their careers, informing them that they are being looked at as “partnership material,” and then observing their performance for a total of five years before making the “partnership cut.” Another McHugh innovation has been to develop a five-year management plan for the JAG organization—a somewhat frustrating task, he admits, because of the uncertainty from year to year of the funding levels for his office which Congress must authorize, but one which he insists is essential if the JAG Corps is to efficiently and effectively serve the Navy.

Why, he is asked, should a graduate of the Law School look today on a career as a military lawyer as a possible option, along with private practice, government service, corporate house counsel and the other alternatives? Jim McHugh's eyes stray to the window. Fifty yards away at the pier, a gray frigate tugs impatiently at her mooring lines, eager to be at sea on a training exercise. Dungaree-clad enlisted personnel move rapidly and purposefully about her decks. Officers in khakis direct the loading and stowage of materials. “See that frigate? Some of her sailors are performing their jobs better today because one of our legal assistance officers helped them out of a jam with a landlord or an auto dealer—they have one less thing to worry about. Their officers understand and practice effective disciplinary administration because someone from this office briefed them on what they can and can't do. As a result, the ship as a whole performs her assigned mission better, and the national interest is better served. You can see the results of your efforts every day on this job. To me, it's a worthwhile type of law to practice. The pay is good—you can send your kids to college—and the retirement benefits can't be beat. It's that combination of helping people in a direct, visible fashion and helping the country at the same time which I find particularly satisfying.”
Our Far-Flung Correspondent: Randall M. Weiner, ’84

Journal Entry of May 23, 1983
Juneau, Alaska*

Working in Alaska offers a few experiences seldom found in the “lower 48.” Take this morning, for instance. While walking down the sixty-two steps from our house nestled in the cliffs above Fritz Cove Road, I was suddenly told by Steve, my fellow clerk, to “look up!” There, circling overhead, was a Bald Eagle. Wings outstretched, this magnificent creature descended lower and lower, eventually landing on a nearby tree. A second later, another Bald Eagle alighted from the same tree and began to fly away. The first eagle took off in pursuit, caught up with the second, and dove straight for it. The second eagle quickly maneuvered to escape, and then both eagles disappeared over the trees. Whether they were fighting or mating, I wasn’t sure, but I was thrilled by the spectacle.

As Steve and I drove into Juneau, I concentrated on the beauty surrounding us. The snow-capped mountains, the incredibly clear and fresh air, the blue channel, and the Mendenhall Glacier peering at us from around the bend were reminding me of Juneau, Alaska is no ordinary place. I also began to dwell on the legal work I was in the process of doing. I began to get excited about it, not just because it was new and interesting, but because it is helping to preserve the type of experience I had just enjoyed with the Bald Eagles.

I am employed by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund in Juneau, working on litigation to stop clearcut logging on Admiralty Island—across the channel from where we were driving. Constructing of a million acres, Admiralty Island has more Bald Eagles per square mile than any other place in North America. It is one of the few totally natural ecosystems still in existence, and it’s the home of one thousand Alaskan brown bears (perhaps the largest concentration of “grizzlies” in the world), deer, seal, crab, salmon and other wildlife. One little island with so much natural wealth, and we are fighting to preserve it!

Admiralty Island is more than a habitat for animals; a tribe of the Tlingit Indians dwells there as well. They call their village Angoon, and it is one of the few native villages where the majority of the inhabitants live a subsistence lifestyle. The villagers are determined to keep their lifestyle as it is. They have banned the sale of alcohol in the town (having seen too well what has done to their fellow natives elsewhere in the state) and, although as a village corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) they are entitled to tap the commercial resources in the surrounding area, they have chosen to log and mine off the island. We are representing Angoon, as well as the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, in a suit against the federal and state governments and, ironically, a native corporation.

Shee Atika, Inc., the company attempting to log on Admiralty, is an urban native corporation based in Sitka, Alaska. Sitka is a modern town with a cash economy, and the natives thereon live a lifestyle light years apart from the subsistence lifestyle of the Angoon natives. Under ANCSA, Admiralty Island land was given to three native corporations (none of whose members live on the Island itself) for logging and mineral extraction. Two of the native corporations chose to trade for land on the mainland rather than risk destroying the lifestyle of the Angoon Tlingits. Only Shee Atika (whose members have been feuding with the Angoon Tlingits for centuries) chose to remain and log the island, although there are many other areas of equal commercial value available to them which don’t fall within such a unique native and wilderness area.

The clearcut logging planned by Shee Atika would virtually destroy the Island’s ecosystem and the Tlingit way of life. If completed, it would clear one third of the Island’s old growth timber—the trees that most of the wildlife depend upon to survive. Clear-cutting, itself, is a sickening sight. As I flew into Juneau and looked down upon the clearcut fields, I was reminded of a city I had once seen in southwestern Ohio after a tornado had struck.

In the face of the threat from Shee Atika, the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund embarked upon a comprehensive legal strategy to preserve both the Tlingit culture and the wilderness. Enlisting the support of four law firms on a pro bono basis (Furth, Fahrner, Bluemle & Mason in San Francisco; Choate, Hall & Stewart in Boston; Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering in Washington, D.C.; and Bailey and Mason in Anchorage) and assisted by individual lawyers in Texas, Mississippi, and California, the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund appears to be fighting the great environmental war. I’ve worked fifteen days without a break and have been told not to expect any in the near future (even after the two new law clerks from Harvard arrive), but the thrill of battle is in the air and I awake each morning excited to begin a day of work.

Recently, Shee Atika changed their logging plans. Instead of building a log dump and roads which require (thanks to our past law suits) the completion of an environmental impact statement, they now plan to come in by helicopter and clear the trees. According to one source I contacted, they will probably only take a small portion of what they cut in the hopes that they will be able to build roads to the rest later. In any case, the harm they cause could be devastating. My job has been to write the brief to extend a previous injunction we obtained to cover Shee Atika’s proposed helicopter logging. At least this will give us time to present our case in court while there are still trees to fight over.

The work I am doing is exciting, relevant and, I believe, socially useful. I cannot imagine spending my creative energies in any other way. Certainly this world is facing major threats on many fronts, and it only seems natural at my age to want to counteract these threats where possible. Besides, I am having fun. The work affords me the opportunity to do something worthwhile for society as I enjoy the magnificent scenery which surrounds me.

*Juneau, although the capital city of this state, is only accessible by airplane and ship. There are no roads over the mountains.

Editor’s Note:
Randall Weiner is a University of Pennsylvania Law School student, Class of 1984. He traveled to Alaska this past summer to work with the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund. What follows is a portion of Mr. Weiner’s daily log in which he shares some of his experiences and adventures.
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The Faculty

Assistant Professor Regina Austin's articles "The Insurance Classification Controversy" and "The Problem of the Legitimacy of The Welfare State" were published in The University of Pennsylvania Law Review.

Associate Professor and Associate Dean Stephen B. Burbank is Chair of the Section of Civil Procedure of the American Association of Law Schools. His article, "Sanc­tions in the Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Some Questions About Power", was published this past summer in Hofstra Law Review. Mr. Burbank will serve as the moderator of the panel on Developments in Constitutional Law and as a member of the panel on Developments in the Federal Rules of Evidence at the Third Circuit Judicial Conference in October, 1983.

Professor George Haskins continued his work this past summer on "Recognition of Women's Rights in Colonial America," an article that attempts to demonstrate the existence and expansion of women's rights (property, torts, contracts, etc.) prior to the 19th Century reception of English Common Law in America, through treaties and other media of transformation.

Another of Mr. Haskins' articles on "New England Antecedents of Law in the Middle Colonies" appears in the July, 1983 issue of Law and History at Cornell University.

Vice-Dean Margo Post Marshak will serve on the Steering Committee for the Sixty-First Annual Conference of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association in Philadelphia, September 19-22, 1983. The Vice-Dean also has been elected to the Advisory Board of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Metropolitan Philadelphia Chapter.

Associate Professor Ralph R. Smith was appointed Faculty Master of the Van Pelt College House, one of the six College Houses that accommodates nearly 1,200 University of Pennsylvania students annually. Mr. Smith delivered a lecture entitled "In the Aftermath of the Affirmative Action Cases: Continuing Concerns and Contra­diction" at the Third World Lecture Series at the Har­vard Law School.

Professor Louis B. Schwartz addressed University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni at a Law Alumni Society Reception held during the meetings of the New Jersey State Bar Association in Atlantic City in May, 1983, where the new President of the New Jersey State Bar Association, Vincent V. Apruzzese, '53, was honored. Mr. Schwartz also spoke to the company counsel of Smithkline-Beechman on "New Winds Blowing in Antitrust" on May 26, 1983.
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'32 The Honorable Morris Gerber, of Norristown, Pennsylvania, was honored by the Montgomery County Bar Association on the occasion of his 50th year as a member of that organization.

'36 David Berger, of the Philadelphia firm Berger & Montague, served as a faculty member for "Toxic Tort Litigation: A Primer in Management," a seminar sponsored by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute and the Professional Education Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

G. William Shea, a partner in the Los Angeles firm of McCutchen, Black, Verleger & Shea, was the recipient of the Shattuck-Price Memorial Award, the highest honor of the Los Angeles County Bar Association. The County Bar Board of Trustees presents the award each year to an individual who has shown "outstanding dedication to the high principles of the legal profession, the administration of justice, and the progress of the Los Angeles County Bar."

'38 Sylvan M. Cohen, President of the Class of 1938 and a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Cohen, Shapiro, Shiekhman & Cohen, was presented an award of merit by the University of Pennsylvania to honor his dedication to the University.

'39 The Honorable Roxana C. Arsh, of the Family Court of Delaware, was the subject of an interview in the Winter/Spring issue of the Delaware Lawyer.

John P. Bracken, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Morgan Lewis & Bockius, was Chairman of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association from 1974-1976, and is now a lifetime member of that House. He was President of the American Bar Endowment in 1973-1974 and has been a Director of the Endowment since 1968. Mr. Bracken was on the Board of Editors of the American Bar Association Journal from 1974-76; was Secretary-General of the International Bar Association from 1976-80; was Chairman of that Organization's Professional Ethics Committee and is now a Co-opted Member of its Council. He was a member of the Council of the Inter-American Bar Association from 1957-63, and is a Charter Member of the World Peace Through Law Center.

Mr. Bracken served as President of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce from 1968-70 and was Chairman of its Board from 1970-71. He was the 1972 recipient of the prestigious William Penn Award for outstanding civic and professional leadership.

'41 John R. McConnell, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, has been given the first annual St. Thomas More Award, bestowed upon the member of the Bar or of the judiciary who "exemplifies the application of Judeo-Christian principles in the tradition of St. Thomas More."

'44 Harold Diamond, of Philadelphia, is seeking election as a Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. The only profoundly deaf trial lawyer in the United States, Mr. Diamond is the founder and state Chairman of the Handicapped Voter Registration Project. He has been appointed to the Mayor's Advisory Council for the Handicapped and was honored for his work as an advocate for the handicapped by Pennsylvania Governor Dick Thornburgh. Mr. Diamond has been the recipient of the Legion of Honor from the Chapel of the Four Chaplains and is one of six elected members of the Pennsylvania Lions Hearing Research Foundation. Mr. Diamond is a member of the Executive Board of the Philadelphia Graduate Chapter of Tau Epsilon Rho.

'49 Marshall A. Bernstein, of the Philadelphia firm Bernstein, Bernstein & Harrison, was a lecturer at "Evidence—Part 1," a seminar sponsored by the Trial Advocacy Foundation of Pennsylvania, the educational foundation of the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association. Mr. Bernstein's speech concerned evidentiary problems in " Jury Selection and Opening Statement".

Louis J. Carter served as moderator of New York City's 22nd Annual Community Conference focusing on various aspects of environmental politics in the 1980's. His panel discussed "Nuclear By-products: Can They Be Managed?" as part of the Conference, sponsored by Congressman Ted Weiss of New York's 20th District, and held at Columbia University in March. Former Chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissions Atomic Safety and Licensing Board investigation of the Indian Point (N.Y.) Nuclear Plant, he has served as Chairman of the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission and has taught at the Temple University Law School and the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

'51 Harold Cramer, of the firm of Mesirov, Gelman, Jaffe, Cramer & Jameson, Philadelphia, has been elected a Vice-President of the Boards of both The Jewish Exponent and The Jewish Times of the Greater Northeast.

http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/plj/vol18/iss2/1
'52 Clive S. Cummins was named to the Board of Trustees of the Hospital Services Plan of New Jersey. President of the Newark, New Jersey firm of Sills, Beck, Cummins, Zuckerman, Radin & Tischman, Mr. Cummins is a Trustee of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey and the Newark Museum. He is also a fellow of the American Bar Foundation, a member of the American Law Institute and Associate Editor of the New Jersey Law Journal. Mr. Cummins is a newly appointed member of the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society's Board of Managers.

Joseph P. Flanagan, Jr., a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll, was elected President of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute for the 1983-84 term. A member of that Board since 1976, he has been active in the PBI's Continuing Legal Education activities and has served as Chairman of several Philadelphia Bar Association Committees. As President of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute Mr. Flanagan succeeds his classmate Ira B. Coldren.

Edward W. Madeira, Jr., of the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, served as a faculty member for "Toxic Tort Litigation: A Primer in Management", a seminar sponsored by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute and the Professional Education Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

'53 The Honorable Robert N. C. Nix, Jr., Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, was recently the recipient of the 1983 Outstanding State Appellate Judge Award presented by the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. According to the Awards Committee, Justice Nix was selected on the basis of the quality and clarity of his many opinions in landmark cases in Pennsylvania. Calvin K. Prine of Granville, Ohio, was named Associate to the Dean for Development in the College of Biological Sciences of Ohio State University on June 1, 1983.

'I. Leonard Hoffman became a partner in the firm of Steinberg, Greenstein, Gorelick, Price & Laveson, 818 Widener Building, 1339 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

'59 Robert P. Oberly, of the Philadelphia firm Saul, Ewing, Remick & Saul, was elected a Fellow of the American College of Probate Counsel.

'54 The Honorable Berel Caesar was honored by the Philadelphia Municipal Employees War Veterans Association in May, 1983. A recognized expert in mental health, Judge Caesar delivered an address on the insanity plea as the featured speaker at a forum sponsored by the Unitarian Universalist Church of Delaware County.

Lawrence J. Lichtenstein has become a member of the firm Mesrobian, Gelman, Jaffe, Cramer & Jameson, Fidelity Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where he serves as Chairman of the firm's Insolvency and Creditor's Rights Group.

'56 Howard A. Wiener, a partner in the Alletown, Pennsylvania firm of Wiener & Wiener, was elected president of the Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, Bar Association.

'57 Charles H. Laveson has become a member of the firm Steinberg, Greenstein, Gorelick, Price & Laveson, with offices at 818 Widener Building, 1339 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19107.

Jerrold V. Moss, a partner in the Philadelphia firm Rubin, Quinn & Moss, was cited by the Cheltenham, Pennsylvania Township Board of Commissioners for outstanding public service as Chairman of its Government Study Commission and as a member of its Zoning Hearing Board.

Myles H. Tanenbaum, Executive Vice President of Kravco, Inc., King of Prussia, PA, was the subject of an interview entitled "The Man Who Mailed Us" in the May 8, 1983 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine. Principal owner of the new United States Football League team, the Philadelphia Stars, Mr. Tanenbaum has developed more than ten mall-complexes throughout the greater Philadelphia area.

'58 Howard Gittis, Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, was the subject of an article in the Lawyer's Digest, Volume 1, No. 13, November, 1982, entitled "A Man For All Reasons." A partner in the Philadelphia firm Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, Mr. Gittis was referred to as "perhaps one of the most versatile members of the Bar."

Robert D. Kaplan was appointed Administrative Law Judge, Social Security Administration Regional Office of Hearings and Appeals, 3535 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19101.
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Richard E. Nathan is now a member of the firm Gaston, Snow, Beeckman & Bogue, 14 Wall Street, New York, New York, 10005.

Richard K. Stevens, a former partner with the Philadelphia firm of Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young, has joined the firm of Palmer, Biezup & Henderson, Public Ledger Building, Independence Square, Philadelphia, PA 19106.

'62 Pasco L. Schiavo, of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, has completed two successive three-year terms as a member of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

'63 Joseph M. Bowman was appointed President and Chief Executive Officer of the Wilma, Inc. Real Estate Development Company, 233 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 500, Atlanta, GA, 30303.

Judah I. Labovitz of the Philadelphia firm Cohen, Shapiro, Polisher & Sheikman, & Cohen, has been elected General Counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, Greater Philadelphia Branch, and has been made a member of the Board of the American Civil Liberties Union of Pennsylvania.

'64 H. Robert Fiebach, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, has been elected to the Pennsylvania Bar Association's House of Delegates. Mr. Fiebach is Chairman of the Pennsylvania Bar's Judicial Retention Election Committee and Merit Selection of Judges P.A.C., and is a member of the Professional Liability Committee as well as a board member of the Greater Philadelphia Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. He is also Chairman of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Insurance Committee.

Robert Fuller, Jr., of Augusta, Maine, practices with the firm of Pierce, Atwood, Scribner, Allen, Smith & Lancaster. He, and his great grand-uncle, Melville Weston Fuller, who was the eighth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, were the subjects of an article in the Daily Kennebec Journal.

William Onorato has become a Senior Attorney at the Getty Oil Company, 3810 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90010. Mr. Onorato, who specializes in International Law, resides in Rancho Palos Verdes with his two daughters.

William H. Platt, of Allentown, Pennsylvania, was appointed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Criminal Procedural Rules Committee.

James Strazzella, Professor of Law at Temple University and a former member of the University of Pennsylvania Law Faculty, was awarded the Lindback Foundation Award for Distinguished Teaching at Temple.

Arthur F. Staubitz was appointed Deputy General Counsel and Assistant Secretary of Baxter Travenol Laboratories, One Baxter Parkway, Deerfield, IL 60015.

Robert W. Tollen is with the firm of Bronson, Bronson & McKinnon, 555 California Street, Suite 3400, San Francisco, CA 94104.

'65 Lita Indzel Cohen has formed and is the current President of Orange Productions, Inc., Philadelphia's only full-service national radio syndicators, Orange Productions produces radio programs such as Sid Mark's "Sounds of Sinatra", the Auto Show and others.

Joseph G. J. Connolly is a partner in the firm Hangleys, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102, formerly Goodman & Ewing.

Neil G. Epstein is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Hangleys, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing. The firm, formerly Goodman & Ewing, is located on the Fourteenth Floor, 1429 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

William H. Ewing is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Hangleys, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, formerly Goodman & Ewing, the 14th Floor, 1429 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 19102.

Sheldon N. Sandler, a partner in the Wilmington, Delaware firm of Bader, Dorsey & Kreshoow, was named Chairman of the 1983 Lawyer's Advisory Committee for the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

'66 Michael M. Coleman, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, is Vice-Chairman of the 1983 Federation Allied Jewish Appeal—Israel Special Fund Lawyer's Division, working to conduct informational presentations in local law firms.

Roger L. Goldman, Professor of Law at St. Louis University, was the recipient of an Excellence-in-Teaching award from that school's 1983 graduating class.

William T. Hangley is a partner in the firm Hangley, Connolly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, Fourteenth Floor, 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, formerly Goodman & Ewing.

William A. Mogel, a partner in the Washington, D.C. firm of Ross, Marsh & Foster, was elected a Trustee of Hobart College, Geneva, New York. Mr. Mogel is Editor-in-Chief of the Energy Law Journal.

Peter M. Stern is counsel to the firm of Joseph H. Weiss Associates, 1822 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Bernardt K. Wruble, of Washington, D.C., was elected to the National Board of Directors of the Epilepsy Foundation of America. In addition, he was elected President of the Williams College Class of 1963 and will serve through the Class's 25th reunion in 1988.

'67 Walter W. Cohen, of Philadelphia, was appointed Secretary of Welfare for the state of Pennsylvania by Governor Dick Thornburgh.

Terry K. Glenn joined Merrill Lynch Asset Management, Inc. in New York as Executive Vice-President—Mutual Funds Administration. Former President and Director of Carnegie Capital Management Company and Secretary and General Counsel of Keystone Custodian Funds, Inc. Mr. Glenn was an associate at Hall, McNicol, Maret & Hamilton, New York.
Arthur Makadon, of the Philadelphia firm of Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll, served as a faculty member for "Toxic Tort Litigation: A Primer in Management", a seminar sponsored by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute and the Professional Education Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

John W. Nields, Jr., a partner in the District of Columbia firm of Howrey & Simon, is currently providing legal assistance as the court-appointed counsel in the highly-publicized criminal case of Mary Treadwell, the former wife of District of Columbia Mayor Marion Berry.

Norman Pearlstine is Managing Editor of The Wall Street Journal, where he directs The Journal’s news coverage and news staff. Mr. Pearlstine joined The Journal in 1968 as a reporter. Eight years later he was named the first managing editor of The Asian Wall Street Journal and, in 1982, he became the first publisher and editor of The Wall Street Journal Europe, based in Brussels, Belgium.

Michael Sklaroff, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, was recently chosen Chairman of the newly-founded Real Property Section of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He also serves on the Board of Governors of that Association.

Jonathan Stein was appointed Executive Director of Community Legal Services of Philadelphia. He has served as Chief of Law Reform, Chief of Special Projects, and head of the organization’s Welfare and Health Law unit since joining Community Legal Services in 1968.

'68 William F. Dow III, a partner in the New Haven, Connecticut firm of Jacobs, Grudberg & Belt, P.C., has been appointed to a three-year term on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Committee on Admissions and Grievances.

Donald W. Stever, Jr., is Professor of Law at Pace University School of Law in White Plains, New York. He is also special counsel for environmental matters at the Hartford-Stanford-Boston firm of Day, Berry & Howard. Professor Stever previously ran the Justice Department's Pollution Control and Environmental Defense Sections for four years in Washington, D.C.

Mark G. Yudof, Professor of Law at the University of Texas, recently authored a book, When Government Speaks: Politics, Law and Governmental Expression in America, published by the University of California Press, which examines whether government as a communicator to the people destroys or protects the democratic principles the First Amendment was designed to defend.

'69 Arthur M. Best, of New York City, has been promoted from Associate Professor to Professor of Law at The New York Law School and has been granted tenure.

Harry First received a Fulbright Research Grant to study antitrust law in Japan for the academic year 1983–84, and will also be a Visiting Professor of Law at Sophia University in Tokyo. Professor First teaches at New York University School of Law and co-authored Free Enterprise and Economic Organization: Antitrust (6th edition, 1983), with Schwartz and Flynn.

William R. Powers, Jr., of the Mooresstown, New Jersey firm of Moss, Powers & Lezenby, was elected President of the New Jersey Defense Association. He has served as the New Jersey Chairman for the Defense Research Institute since 1977.

Jeffrey M. Stopford has opened offices at Suite 900, The Bourse Building, 21 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106. He was previously with the firm of Litvin, Blumberg, Matusow & Young.

'70 Mark E. Solomons, of the Washington firm of Kilcup & Wilson & Kilcup, spoke before the Workers’ Compensation and Employers’ Liability Law Committee of the Section on Tort and Insurance Practice of the American Bar Association. A Vice-Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Solomons spoke on congressional and federal programs for asbestos victims and other occupational disease claimants.

Jonathan Vipond, III, former Chief Counsel in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, has been appointed Deputy Assistant to President Reagan in the Office of Public Liaison.

'71 Mitchell L. Bach is a partner in the firm of Hangley, Connelly, Epstein, Chico, Foxman & Ewing, Fourteenth Floor, 1429 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 19102. The firm was formerly known as Goodman & Ewing.

'72 John R. Carroll, of Philadelphia, was appointed to a three-year term on the Lawyers' Advisory Committee for the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

John E. DeWald announced the opening of offices at Suite 700, Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building, 1900 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103. The former Corporate Counsel at Acme Markets, Inc. in Philadelphia, Chief Attorney for Bell Helicopter Textron in Fort Worth, Texas, and General Counsel for International Mobile Machines in Philadelphia, Mr. DeWald is also the Democratic candidate for District Attorney in Chester County, Pennsylvania.


Marc D. Jonas has become senior partner in his own 1-man firm at Suite 400. One Montgomery Plaza, Norristown, PA 19401.

Mark Pollak is a partner in the Baltimore, Maryland office of the firm of Piper & Marbury. He is the father of Joshua David, Age 4; and Jonathan Stephen, Benjamin Eric, and Rebecca Lynn—all age 2.

Lawrence L. Robinson and his wife, Linda S. Robinson, are the proud parents of Eric, age 6, Aviva, age 3, and Mark, born this past March. Mr. Robinson is also marking his tenth year at the law offices of Joseph R. Thompson, Philadelphia.

'73 Regina Austin, Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, was granted tenure in May, 1983. Professor Austin is the second woman and the second Black in the Law School’s 183-year history to be awarded tenure. (See The Faculty in this issue of The Journal).

Edward S. Dennis, of Media, Pennsylvania, was sworn in as United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in May, 1983.
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David L. Kuhns is presently an associate in the New York office of Russell Reynolds Associates, Inc., a leading international executive recruiting firm. A founding partner with the New York firm of Robb & Kuhns, he specialized in corporate, communications and entertainment law, and served as Vice-President and Director of Citicom Radio Corporation. He was Counsel to Home Box Office, Inc., Assistant to the President of Liberty Communications Corporation, and Attorney for the Federal Communications Commission.

Karl K. Lunkenheimer, formerly of the firm of Cozen, Begier & O'Connor, has become associated with Sprague & Rubenstein, Suite 400 Wellington Building, 135 South 19th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Roderick R. McKelvie, a partner in the firm of Ashby, McKelvie & Geddes, Wilmington, Delaware, published the article "Chang­ing Community Attitudes—Changing Community Law" in the Winter/Spring 1983 issue of the Delaware Lawyer.


Marjorie A. Silver was appointed Associate Professor of Law at New York Law School, as of August, 1983.

Alda Waserston, a partner in the Wilmington, Delaware law firm of Kreshool, Nier & Waserston, wrote "Delaware Custody Disputes in an International Setting" for the Winter/Spring issue of the Delaware Lawyer.

John Janic R. Bellace, an Assistant Professor of Legal Studies and Management at the Wharton School of the University of Penn­sylvania, was a participant at the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Women's Law Group Conference—"Changing Labor Laws; Lawyers Working with Working Women", held in March, 1983.

Jonathan W. Delano, of Mount Lebanon, Pennsylvania, was elected Vice-President of the Administrative Assistants Association of the U.S. House of Representatives. Administrative Assistant to U.S. Representative Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania since 1977, he has represented the Pennsylvania/Ohio region on the Board of Directors of that Association for the last three years.

Michael D. Gilmore currently serves as Counsel in the Corporate Law Department of CIGNA Corporation. Prior to joining INA in 1979 as a staff attorney, he was with the legal department of Alco Standard Corporation, Valley Forge, PA.

Elliott J. Hahn, Associate Professor of Law at California Western School of Law in San Diego, was recently appointed Vice-Chairman of the International Affairs Board of San Diego. Professor Hahn taught courses on the Japanese legal system and Japanese law to American Law students studying in Japan this past summer as part of the Santa Clara Summer-in-Tokyo Program. His book, tenta­tively titled Japanese Business Law and Legal System, will be published in 1984 by Green­wood Press of Westport, Connecticut. An excerpt from the book was published by the Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business this fall.

Armie Holland was appointed Division Vice-President of Business Affairs for RCA Videodiscs in New York. Mr. Holland, a member of the New York and California Bars, resides in Westport, Connecticut, with his wife, Carol, and their sons, Jesse, 4, and Sky, 10.

David B. Pudlin, of the Philadelphia firm Hangleby, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, formerly Goodman & Ewing, was the featured speaker at a luncheon sponsored by the Philadelphia Bar Association Section on Taxation. Mr. Pudlin has been appointed as Chairman of the Federal Tax Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association Section on Taxation.

Helen P. Pudlin has been appointed Lecturer in Law in Appellate Advocacy at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. She was a faculty participant in a seminar on complex civil litigation sponsored by the Board of Judges of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the Federal Courts Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

'75 Isaacca Allentuck Lang of Falmouth, Maine, recently published the article "How to Research Energy Law" in 3 Journal of Energy Law & Policy 243, (1983). She and her husband, Michael Lang, '75, also compile the supplements to the Index to Federal Tax Articles.

Michael B. Lang of Falmouth, Maine, recently joined the faculty of the University of Maine School of Law. He published an article on the tax treatment of home offices and vacation homes in the 1981 Utah Law Review. He also collaborated with Boris Bittker in Federal Taxation of Income, Estates & Gifts (1981), and is the International Developments Columnist for the Journal of Real Estate Taxation. He and his wife, Isaacca Allentuck Lang, '75, compile supplements for the Index to Federal Tax Articles.

Alan C. Myers became a partner in the law firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, 919 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.


Gene E. K. Pratter has become a partner in the firm of Duane, Morris & Heckscher, One Franklin Plaza, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

'76 Nancy J. Bregstein has been made a partner in the firm of Shea & Gardner, Washington, D.C.

Andrew D. Pike is Associate Tax Legislative Counsel in the office of Tax Policy of the U.S. Department of Treasury. He and his wife, Barbara Sarshik, '76, reside in Alexandria, Virginia.

Beth C. Ring has become a member of the firm Freedman, Wasserman & Schneider, 90 John Street, New York, New York 10038, where Ms. Ring is engaged in the practice of International Trade and Customs Law.
Barbara Sarshik is associated with Lane & Edson, P.C., in Washington, D.C. She and her husband, Andrew D. Pike, '76, reside in Alexandria, Virginia.

William E. Seals is engaged in the general practice of law with offices at 800 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. Mr. Seals was formerly Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

'77 Daniel B. Evans is associated with the firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Kaufman, 2600 Fidelity Building, Philadelphia, PA 19109.

Karen Iest (L.L.M.) is at the Jurieich Instituut, Turforenstraat 13, 9712 BM Groningen, Netherlands. A former member of the firm Boeke! van Empel & Drilling in Amsterdam, she has been appointed Research Fellow at the State University of Groningen and will do research in comparative labor law.

Frank M. Thomas, Jr., has rejoined the firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA 19109. He was the Divisional Deputy Solicitor for the Law Department of the City of Philadelphia.

Gerald B. Ingram, formerly with the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office, has become associated with the firm of Clark, McEldridge & Seay, Seventh Floor East, Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building, 1900 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Carol A. Springer, M.D., graduated from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine this past May. She is a past recipient of the Dr. Roy G. Williams Prize for research in the basic medical sciences. Dr. Springer has begun her internship at St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City. In July 1984, she will take a residency in Ophthalmology at the Cornell University Hospital in New York City.

'79 Denise Colliers is presently with the Federal Judicial Center, Dolley Madison House, 1520 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Gerald Paul McAllm is associated with the firm of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, 46th Floor, 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071, having completed a judicial clerkship with the Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and having spent seven months travelling around the world.

Jeanne C. Oliver, previously executive Director of The Thomas J. Watson Foundation, has resumed the practice of law in the New York City firm of Shearman & Sterling.

'80 Charles F. Forer is an associate with the firm of Hangesly, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, 14th Floor, 1429 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 19102. The firm was formerly Goodman & Ewing.

Beth Olanoff is associated with the firm of Hangesly, Connelly, Epstein, Chicco, Foxman & Ewing, (formerly Goodman & Ewing), Fourteenth Floor, 1429 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 19102.

Michael S. Raubertas, presently with the firm of Cordes, King and Associates in New Hope, New Jersey, served as a law clerk to the Honorable Oscar S. Bortner, '49.

'81 Jose Tomas Blanco (L.L.M.) recently joined the Caracas, Venezuela firm of Bentata, Hoet and Asociados, "in charge of registering the Foreign Private Debt."

Joan Channick, of Charlestown, Massachusetts, recently designed the lighting for the Belmont Dramatic Club's productions of "H.M.S. Pinafore" and "Aria da Capo", the latter of which was entered in the New England Theater Conference Community Theater Drama Festival. This past summer she designed the lighting for "A Sensation Novel" for the Royal Victorian Opera Company and for "The Gondoliers" for the MIT Community Players.

Peter Dayton is an associate at Oltzinger & Mullendore, Fifth Floor Power Block, Helena, Montana 50631, specializing in Municipal Bonds.

Heather A. Dolins received an L.L.M. degree with distinction in Admiralty from Tulane University School of Law in May, 1983. Ms. Dolins is presently an associate in the Admiralty Section of Lemle, Kelleher, Kohlmeier & Matthews, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Alisa G. Field is associated with the firm of Rotko, Bockel & Creskoff, 1800 Penn Mutual Tower, Philadelphia, PA 19106.

Thomas R. Herwitz, a communications attorney with the Washington, D.C. firm of Hogan & Hartson, was appointed legal assistant to Federal Communications Commission Chairman Mark S. Fowler.


Brian M. Rudnick opened offices for the private practice of law, Fourteenth Floor, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

'82 Dwight Dickinson will join the Washington, D.C. firm of Crowell & Moring, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 following his clerkship on the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Shaunen C. Hutchinson, an associate in the Wilmington, Delaware firm of Morris, Nichols, Arst & Tunnell, wrote the article "Clouded Prophecies" which appeared in the Winter/Spring edition of the Delaware Lawyer.

Dale L. Moore, having completed her 1982-83 clerkship with the Honorable Louis H. Pollak of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, is teaching at the Albany Law School.
IN MEMORIAM: Professor Edward V. Sparer
"a prophet for social responsibility and a champion for the right to live."

1963, Founder and First Director, Legal Services Unit of the Mobilization of Youth, Inc., New York City—the first operating neighborhood law firm for the poor.


"We have got to guarantee that no one will starve and that everyone will have a decent roof over his or her head. And we are going to need a lot more work to give people. Those guarantees, supported by social justice, could transform this nation and make it truly a land of the free."—Ed Sparer

Ed Sparer was a great and wonderful person. He created, almost singlehandedly, a new academic and professional discipline of health and welfare law, and trained and inspired a generation of students, colleagues and teachers throughout the country who, in turn, began to accomplish a long overdue revolution in legal thinking and doctrine in these areas. That revolution still has a long way to go. It would not have come as far as it has without Ed; it will go forward in large part because of the pervasive influence of Ed's spirit and intellect.

That is why Ed was a great person. He was wonderful because he was Ed—honest, caring, loving, passionate, warm, genuine, alive, interested in people and their problems, completely infused with a sense of justice that affected everything he thought and did.

Ed was, in short, an enormously admirable human being. His sudden death was a great loss to the law, to this School, to the University, the city, the nation, and to those of us who loved him. We will try to carry on his work as well as we can, but it won't be the same without Ed.

—Paul Bender
Professor, The University of Pennsylvania Law School

Ed Sparer always struck me as the kind of person for whom the sight of starving children in the midst of plenty is the occasion to change the course of one's life, to reject the role of innocent bystander and to make change aimed at meeting basic human needs one's life work.

For my generation of law students (late 1960's), Ed provided a much needed model of alternative forms of law practice. He was instrumental in generating the strategies and arguments used by him and others to challenge legal rules and practices that relegated many to second-class citizenship and borderline existence. The combination of skill, commitment and activism that made Ed an effective advocate, teacher and scholar is a rich legacy for all of us.

I will remember Ed as an engaging, tenacious man whose energy, intellect and commitment were contagious, and he will always be a source of sustenance and comfort for me.

David Kairys, LL.M. '71
Kairys, Rudovsky & Maguigan, Philadelphia
IN MEMORIAM
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