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From The Dean

I am pleased that you have come back to the School today because it has given us the opportunity to share with you the intellectual ferment and excitement which is at the heart of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Bernie Wolfman said earlier that he would love to be a law school student today, and I would welcome him back—that is if he could afford the tuition. Arnold Ginsburg, '39, who attended Steve Burbank's mini-course on Evidence this morning said to me, “You know, I thought I knew a great deal about that area of the law, but listening to the professor speak from his point of view convinced me that there is much to learn that is new and different.” May I add that Arnold Ginsburg has been practicing law for over forty years.

With Bernie's and Arnold's comments in mind, I would like to touch on one aspect of the Bok report that was not dealt with during this morning's very interesting general discussion. In addition to its other obligations, our Law School also has an obligation to play an active role in the continuing education of the legal community of which it is a part. Many of you have told me that in your legal practices you find that you are learning more and more about less and less. There is little time to keep up with some of the important changes which are occurring in the law and to relate your practice experiences to broader developments. Perhaps that is why Bernie Wolfman wants to come back to the Law School.

To meet that problem, we are bringing the Law School to the Philadelphia legal community. This past Fall we put together a program of twenty-five courses, including microeconomics for lawyers, comparative labor law, problems in professional responsibility, counseling directors, and antitrust for the non-antitrust specialist. These courses are being given in one-and-one-half hour sessions held from 8:00 to 9:30 in the morning or from 4:30 to 6:00 in the afternoon. The bulk of the sessions are held in downtown Philadelphia so that practitioners can attend the courses with a minimum of inconvenience. The courses are taught exclusively by Law School Faculty. The purpose of the Program is to develop ideas and to encourage discussion, not to emphasize a mass of detail or to impart enormous amounts of information. In other words, we are teaching these courses as we teach law school courses to our regular students. We want to help the practitioner recapture the excitement of learning the law—that is what makes law school such a special experience.

In addition to our new CLE effort, we also offer substantive programs to Alumni who reside inside and outside of Philadelphia. Our Faculty members are visiting Alumni gatherings in other cities. Paul Bender, for example, addressed Washington alumni on the Canadian Bill of Rights. After his presentation, an Alumnus commented: “I never imagined that the Canadian experience could offer so much to the understanding of our own country's laws.”

Here, in Philadelphia, our Alumni Luncheon Series features lectures by Law School Faculty and Alumni. The annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture is an event which is meant for both the Law School and Alumni communities. Cyrus Vance, our former Secretary of State, will present that Lecture on February 23, 1984. Our academic year 1984-85 Roberts Lecture, to be held in November of 1984, will feature Helmut Schmidt, the former Chancellor of West Germany. Geoffrey Hazard, the new Director of the American Law Institute, will be the Roberts Lecturer in the Fall of 1985.

In addition to these programs we are also eager for Alumni to learn what is happening at the Law School. To help in this effort we are presenting a series of “Inside Pennsylvania Law School” sessions, to which Alumni are invited to learn about curriculum, admissions, financial aid and placement. We also view these sessions as providing an opportunity for the Alumni to give us their thoughts on how we can make the Law School a more effective educational institution.

I hope that your morning here gave you the opportunity to recapture the sense of excitement very evident at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. As Dean, it is my job to see that it remains a vital place, and that it retains the reputation for excellence which Alumni expect of it. Conversely, you as our Alumni remain an important part of our School. You carry our reputation and are our main liaison with the outside world.

I want you to come back here as often as possible. But, now, I will let you go to cheer the Phillies in the World Series, to cheer Penn at the football game, or to cheer Sylvan Cohen and me as we face the Class of 1953 tennis challenge at the Levy Tennis Pavilion.
Law Alumni Day and Quinquennial Reunion Weekend to Combine in April 1984

The Law Alumni Society and The Law School will offer a greatly expanded three-day program in 1984 which will include the honoring of Quinquennial Reunion Classes: 1934, '39, '44, '49, '54, '59, '64, '69, '74 and '79.

The full weekend of activities will begin on Friday, April 13 with the Inside Pennsylvania Law School Program from 2:00 to 5:00 pm. The Law Alumni Society's Annual Meeting, scheduled for 5:00 pm, will be followed at 6:00 pm by the 1984 Alumni Day speaker, Myles H. Tanenbaum, '57, owner of the U.S. Stars Football Team and Executive Vice-President of Kravco, Inc. Cocktails and "hearty" hors d'oeuvres will be served after Mr. Tanenbaum's presentation.

Fans of the Law School Light Opera Company may attend Gilbert and Sullivan's The Pirates of Penzance, the Company's 1984 production, at 9:00 pm Friday evening at The University Museum, 34th and Spruce Streets.

On Saturday morning, April 14, all Alumni are invited to the specially-planned Quinquennial Reunion Program which will include a choice of mini-courses offered by Professors Stephen J. Schulhofer and Ralph R. Smith, to be followed by a panel discussion featuring Alumni participants led by Professor Curtis R. Reitz. Luncheon with Dean Robert H. Mundheim will take place after the morning sessions.

A guided walking tour of Independence National Park and Society Hill will be available on Saturday afternoon from 2:00 to 3:30 pm.

On Saturday evening, the Quinquennial Reunion classes will join together for private celebrations. The Class of 1934, as a result of much planning by co-chairmen Arthur Miller and Leon Mesirov, will gather for their 50th reunion dinner at the Four Seasons Hotel in Philadelphia. After the guided walking tour of Society Hill, the Class of February 1949 will assemble for cocktails at the center city home of Classmate Marshall and Gladys Bernstein and then will go on to dinner at The City Tavern. The Class of June 1949 will celebrate at The Barclay with cocktails and dinner, as planned by Louis Carter. By arrangement of Museum Director and Classmate, Robert Montgomery Scott, the Class of 1954 will hold a gala dinner-dance at the Philadelphia Museum of Art with a tour of the Museum's exhibition of Dutch Painting and Tiles as part of their evening's festivities. The Class of 1959 will celebrate its 25th Reunion at Philadelphia's Locust Club, while the Class of 1964 will gather at the Top of Center Square. The home of Meg Greenfield in East Falls, Philadelphia, is where the Class of 1969 will hold its Reunion party, while the Class of 1974, through the planning of Manny Sanchez and Michael Furey, has engaged The Warwick Hotel and discotheque, Elan, for their grand celebration. The Class of 1978 will gather at the Law School—near the Goat—for a Chinese Banquet.

On Sunday, April 15, all Reunion Classes and Alumni are invited to Brunch at Eden from 10:00 to 11:30 a.m. to be followed by a guided tour of the Philadelphia Museum of Art at 12:30 p.m.

The new Law Alumni Day and Quinquennial Reunion Weekend format promises to be most exciting. Please watch for forthcoming spring mailings.

How to Benefit the Law School AND Yourself

This fall, the University of Pennsylvania Law School launched a planned giving program, aimed at providing information to Law School graduates on ways that individuals can benefit themselves and their favorite charitable organizations through imaginative gift techniques. To communicate information about these techniques, the Law School began a newsletter entitled "Estate and Financial Planning," the first issue of which was mailed to approximately 3,200 Law School graduates in early October, 1983.

The first issue of "Estate and Financial Planning" broadly described a panoply of giving techniques. Subsequent issues of "Estate and Financial Planning" will focus on specific gift planning techniques and recent developments in the charitable gift planning area.

Topics will include the use of charitable trusts to reduce taxes and to pass assets to family members; giving techniques for closely held business owners; charitable tax planning techniques with real estate; and the use of charitable gifts to increase retirement income.

The purpose of "Estate and Financial Planning" is to help Law School graduates better serve their clients, as well as provide information that will be helpful to Law School graduates in planning their own charitable gifts.

Please let Don Myers, the Law School Director of Development, know if you would like to be put on the mailing list for "Estate and Financial Planning."

The Light Opera Company Presents "The Pirates of Penzance"

The Law School Light Opera Company, now in its seventh year, is an ever-growing organization composed of law students, Faculty, Alumni and their families and friends. The Company provides an outlet for the Law School community's talented members and serves as a respite from the pressures of study and professional pursuits. Over the years, the Light Opera Company has cultivated appreciative audiences who anticipate the Company's highly-acclaimed annual productions.

This year's presentation, The Pirates of Penzance, by Gilbert and Sullivan, will be performed on April 11, 12 and 13, 1984 at the University Museum, 34th and Spruce Streets. Tickets will cost in the area of $6 per person.
Assistant Dean Maguire Retires After 17 Years

In January, Assistant Dean for Business Affairs and Graduate Studies, Robert F. Maguire, '51, retired from his duties at the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Mr. Maguire was Managing Editor of The Law Review while a student at this School and was elected to the Order of the Coif upon his graduation in 1951. He then served as a member of the Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, prior to his joining the Law School. From 1957 to 1962, he was assigned to the Judge Advocate General's School at the University of Virginia as an Instructor and Chief of the Military Justice Division. Thereafter, until his retirement, he served as full-time circuit-riding military judge, first in the Far East and then in the northeastern part of the United States.

In 1967, Mr. Maguire “retired” from the United States Army at the behest of then University of Pennsylvania Law School Dean, Jefferson B. Fordham, and came to the School to direct the Legal Research Program. Sometime later, when Vice-Dean Theodore H. Husted, Jr. left the Law School, Mr. Maguire agreed to manage the School’s Business Affairs and Graduate Studies Program.

What follows is a short history of Mr. Maguire’s 17-years at the Law School together with his plans for the future.

—LSH

... Thoughts Upon Retiring by Robert F. Maguire, '55, Assistant Dean

I did not view my having left the Army after almost 27 years as an actual retirement; it was merely a change of jobs. As a matter of fact, I had no intention to leave the military until Jeff Fordham asked if I would come back to the Law School. This time, however, I really am retiring. Has this Law School changed over the years that I have been here? One thing that I have learned is that no one really can describe this School. In one sense, there is no University of Pennsylvania Law School and, in another sense, there are hundreds of University of Pennsylvania Law Schools. Almost everyone who comes into contact with the School has a different perspective. If one asks random students or Alumni or administrators or Faculty how they view it, there would be as many different descriptions as people queried. So there is a danger in generalizing about “the Law School” since it takes on the character of the different people who inhabit it.

The School is changing, however. I do see a broad technological evolution taking place. Ernie Gonsalves, who is assuming my function as business manager, has been working for the last 1½ years toward bringing the School into the computer age. We presently are making good use of word-processing equipment and will be making further changes as well in this area.

The size of the Law School’s administration has increased tremendously since I came here as a student. In the mid-1950’s, the administration consisted of a Dean and his secretary, a Vice-Dean, and a Registrar with an assistant. That was it. During my time here, I have seen the Registrar’s Office increase to three full-time staff people. The Admissions Office has increased similarly. Until seven years ago, the Alumni Affairs Office consisted of two people; now there is a much larger staff. The School had no Placement Office or Director when I first arrived and, when one was appointed, her entire staff consisted of one secretary. Each of these activities, of course, has increased the scope of services offered by the School. There is no doubt that definite changes have occurred in the area of Law School administration.

I do look forward to the leisure time that retirement will provide and can hardly wait to do what I like whenever I want. I have been working on a book for some time and hope to finish it. We plan to do some travelling and probably will divide our time between our two homes in the city and at the seashore. I would like to play a lot of golf—assuming my health remains good. There is the possibility that, in six months, I may find myself bored silly. That problem will be faced should it occur, but it certainly will be fun trying to fulfill my other plans.

Cyrus R. Vance Delivers Roberts Lecture on February 23

Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, the 1984 Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecturer, will address the issue “Redressing the Balance: Congress and the President Under the War Powers Resolution” at the annual event to be held at 5:30 p.m., The University Museum, 34th and Spruce Streets.
The University of Pennsylvania Law School Comprehensive Law Alumni Directory Planned

"Let's keep in touch." Whenever Penn Law graduates meet—at a convention, a reunion or on a trip—they are most likely to part with those words. The bonds forged during the law school years are strong and the benefits derived from professional friendships and continuing contacts are well-known. But there can be a problem: it's all too easy to lose track of people as they move along the professional route.

Starting in Winter, 1985, however, keeping in touch with fellow graduates should be much simpler. It will be as simple as ordering a book, keeping it on your desk and reaching for it to locate a colleague, make a referral, or refresh your memory of classmates before going to a reunion or a professional meeting. . . . Yes, a comprehensive alumni directory has been scheduled. With so many Alumni expressing interest in the whereabouts of classmates, the school has made arrangements with the Harris Publishing Company to produce this special publication.

The directory will be divided into four sections. The first part will contain interesting pictures and information on the School and will be followed by an alphabetical section with individual listings on each Alumnus. Entries will include: name, class year, and professional information such as area of practice, position or academic title, law firm or employer name, office address and telephone, as well as home address and phone. The third section will list Alumni by class and the last index will list Alumni geographically with law specialty for easy reference.

The directory information will be researched and compiled by Harris Publishing Company before publication. The data will be obtained through brief questionnaires sent to Alumni in Spring, 1984, and will be followed up by telephone verification in Fall, 1984. During the telephone contact, each Alumnus will be given an opportunity to order his or her personal copy of the directory. (Circulation will be limited to Alumni only.) Your cooperation in providing updated information will help insure the success of this fascinating and comprehensive alumni directory.

The entire project will be undertaken at virtually no cost to The University of Pennsylvania Law School. The Harris Company will finance the project through the sale of directories to Alumni. The Law School will not benefit financially from the directory sales but will derive substantial benefit from the completely updated Alumni records.

The publication, which has been planned as a personal and professional reference volume, is scheduled for release in Winter, 1985. Progress on the project will be reported in upcoming issues of The Law Alumni Journal.

"Inside Pennsylvania Law School"

In an effort to better acquaint University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni with the School and its operations, Dean Robert H. Mundheim has instituted a series of programs entitled "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" where he, together with Faculty members and administrators, explores in-depth such subjects as Admissions, Curriculum, and Placement with invited Alumni.

The first of these programs, which was held on November 5, 1983, featured Professor Robert A. Gorman, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Educational Programs, and Douglas Frenkel, the Director of the Clinical Program, who discussed Curriculum; Professor Richard G. Lonsdorf, Chair of the Faculty Admissions Committee, Frances E. Spurgeon, the Assistant Dean for Admissions and Financial Aid, and Professor Martin J. Aronstein, Chair of the Faculty Financial Aid Committee, who addressed the topic of Admissions and Financial Aid; Professor Jan Z. Krasnowiecki, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Placement, and Helena Clark, the Director of Placement, who spoke on Law Placement; and Associate Dean and Associate Professor Stephen B. Burbank, Chair of the Library Faculty Committee, who discussed the Biddle Law Library. The Alumni who attended "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" eagerly participated in the discussions which followed each presentation and found the sessions to be "interesting and exciting."

The second "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" took place on February 3, 1984, and the third will be held on April 13, 1984 from 2:00 to 5:00 p.m. as part of the Law Alumni Day Program. All Alumni are encouraged to attend on April 13, since the sharing of ideas and information is essential to the continued well-being and growth of the Law School.

At Long Last, A Goat Paperweight

Remember the Goat? Hsieh-Chai, the mythical Chinese bronze sculpture that graces the University of Pennsylvania Law School's main lobby?

The Alumni Office has ordered a quantity of Hsieh-Chai paperweights which are available at $15.00 each, including tax and postage. The paperweight depicts the Goat in a fine line drawing on metal which has been mounted on a walnut base.

To purchase the paperweight, send checks for $15.00 payable to: "The University of Pennsylvania Law School," 3400 Chestnut Street/14, Philadelphia, PA 19104. Attention: Goat Paperweight.
The Annual Common Pleas Judges’ Reception


President Judge Edward J. Bradley, ’53, addresses the Annual Reception with host, Judge Doris May Harris, ’49.

The 1984–1985 Roberts Lecturer: Helmut Schmidt

The Law School’s Annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture will be delivered by Helmut Schmidt, the former Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany in November, 1984.

The Law School’s New Continuing Legal Education Program

A unique and highly successful program in continuing legal education, conceived by Dean Robert H. Mundheim, was launched by the University of Pennsylvania Law School in September (See “From the Dean” on page 1 in this issue of The Journal.)

The goal of the program is to establish more active ties between the Law School and Philadelphia area law firms, corporations and financial institutions, by offering professionals the opportunity to take enrichment courses taught exclusively by University of Pennsylvania Law School Faculty and instructors. The Faculty participants seek to develop underlying concepts and to discuss problems in the law rather than to lecture. They include Professors Martin Aronstein, Sheldon Bonovitz, Paul Bender, Alan Cathcart, Frank Goodman, John Honnold, Virginia Kerr, Jan Krasnowiecki, Seth Kreimer, Dean Robert H. Mundheim, Almarin Phillips, Curtis Reitz, David Shakow, Ralph Spritzer, Clyde Summers and Alan Watson. Among the courses available are micro-economics for lawyers, collective labor law, current tax developments, professional responsibility and real estate in bankruptcy.

Thirty-nine organizations have subscribed to the program. Seventeen of these are law firms, sixteen are corporations and six are financial institutions—all located in or near Philadelphia.

Visitors to the Law School

The Law School and Dean Robert H. Mundheim have hosted numerous international guests this past semester.

A delegation of German Jurists including Professor Ernst Benda, the President of the Federal Constitutional Court, the Federal Republic of Germany, met with Dean Mundheim and observed Law School classes in September, 1983.

Christopher McMahon, the Deputy Governor of the Bank of England, and Dean Robert H. Mundheim.
Alumni Gatherings

During the Fall of 1983, the Law Alumni Society and numerous University of Pennsylvania Law School Regional Alumni Clubs hosted and organized receptions, luncheons and dinners sponsored in conjunction with the annual meetings of national, state and/or local bar associations and during the meetings of professional organizations. Many Regional Clubs held annual events independently in an effort to maintain contacts with area Alumni and friends.

In September, on the occasion of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference of the Philadelphia Bar Association in Atlantic City, New Jersey, the Law Alumni Society held a gala reception honoring twenty-nine of its Alumni who sit as Judges on the Bench of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. Law Alumni Society President, E. Barclay Cale, Jr., '62, presented each of the Judges with a copy of *Gladly Learn and Gladly Teach*, a book about the University of Pennsylvania written by former President Martin Meyerson and Dilys Pegler Winegrad.

On September 27, Dean Robert H. Mundheim was the guest at two Regional Club Events. The first, a luncheon of the Berks and Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania Alumni, was held in Reading and was hosted by Senator Michael A. O'Pake, '64. On that same day, Dean Mundheim addressed Lancaster/York Alumni in Lancaster at a dinner organized by Alumnus Joseph F. Roda, '74.

Washington, D.C. Area Alumni attended a luncheon meeting in October at Trudie Ball's Empress Restaurant where Professor Paul Bender spoke on the two-year old Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Thomas B. Wilner, '69, organized that event.

On October 27, the Central and Northern New England Regional Alumni held their Annual Fall Cocktail Reception at Michael's Waterfront in Boston. The event, which was organized and hosted by Paul D. Pearson, '64, featured Associate Dean and Associate Professor Stephen B. Burbank who offered an “update of Law School happenings” to the attendees. Mr. Burbank presented the Law Alumni Society's Award of Merit to Chief Justice Thomas R. Morse, Jr., '51, of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, who also addressed the gathering.

The Northern New Jersey Regional Alumni luncheon meeting on November 2, 1982, took place at the Essex Club in Newark, New Jersey. Dean Robert H. Mundheim attended the event which was organized by Alumnus Clive S. Cummis, '52.

Dean Mundheim was present at a Luncheon sponsored by Pittsburgh,
Symposium

Pennsylvania Area Regional Alumni in November 1983, at the Rivers Club. Pittsburgh Alumni George J. Miller, '51; Robert J. Dodds, Jr., '69, John F. Dugan, '60, and Roderick G. Norris, '53, organized that event. Later that day, the Dean addressed the South Central Pennsylvania Area Alumni Club Dinner in Harrisburg, which was hosted by Regional Alumni Francis B. Haas, '51, and John W. Carroll, '72.

Morris Arnold Returns

Professor Morris S. “Buzz” Arnold has rejoined the University of Pennsylvania Law School Faculty, having spent the past three years at the University of Arkansas Law School in Little Rock as the Ben J. Altheimer District Professor. Dr. Arnold originally came to the Law School in 1977 as Professor of Law, was made Associate Dean in 1978 and, then, was appointed Executive Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of the President of the University of Pennsylvania, Martin Meyerson, in 1979. His diverse academic background includes a bachelor's degree in electrical engineering; a law degree from the University of Arkansas, where he served as Editor-in-Chief and Note Editor of the Arkansas Law Review; and LL.M. and S.J.D. degrees from Harvard.

Professor Arnold teaches American Legal History, English Legal History, Real Property, and Transmission of Wealth.

The Third Annual Public Interest Law Conference will be held on March 23–24, 1984. The Conference's Friday Night Keynote Speaker will be the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, the former United States Representative from Brooklyn, New York. For further information on the Conference contact Deborah Kolodny at (215) 222-6617.

A Dinner in London for Professor Honnold

The panelled Bencher's Room of the 19th Century Great Hall of Lincoln's Inn provided the splendid setting for a dinner held in June, 1983 by Alumni and friends of the University of Pennsylvania Law School in Britain in honour of Professor and Mrs. John Honnold. Mr. Honnold was spending the academic year in England as Goodheart Visiting Professor of Legal Science at the University of Cambridge. English Alumni of the Law School (and one who flew to London from Holland specially for the occasion), former instructors from Oxford on the legal writing program, visiting academics and American attorneys in London, combined for what is believed to have been the largest gathering of associates of the Law School organized outside the United States.

At the conclusion of the four-course dinner, Mr. John Colyer Q.C., proposed the toast to John and Annemarie Honnold, to which Professor Honnold responded. University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni present for the occasion were: Barbara Hauser, '76; Karen Iest, '77, LL.M.; Guy Leigh, '70; Helen Milgate, '82, LL.M.; Richard Oughton, '77, LL.M.; Frederick Pettit, '61; Martin Reeve Smith, '79; Peter Roth, '77; Richard Toub, '68; and Helma Zebregs, '79, LL.M. The evening was organized by Richard Oughton and Peter Roth and was so much enjoyed that it is hoped that further gatherings of friends of the Law School will be held in Britain in the future.

Incidentally, the Court page of the London Times printed an announcement of the dinner, and the society page of the Times wrote a brief account of the event.

—Courtesy of Peter Roth, '77

Published by Penn Law: Legal Scholarship Repository.
Quinquennial Reunion Weekend: October 14–16, 1983

University of Pennsylvania Law School Classes commemorated their milestone reunions on the weekend of October 14–16. At that time, the Classes of 1933, '38, '43, '53, '58, '63, '68, '73, and '78 gathered to celebrate and to renew friendships which were made during their years at the Law School. Alumni from California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, the State and City of New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Upstate Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Vermont, Virginia and Washington, D.C. returned to the School for the gala weekend.

On Friday evening, October 14, Alumni gathered from 5:30-7:00 pm for a wine and cheese Reception held in the Biddle Law Library. A number of the attendees then regrouped at the Society Hill home of Eddie and Debby Robinson, '53, to continue the evening's festivities and to watch the 1983 World Series Baseball Game. Meanwhile, the Class of 1933 was celebrating its 50th Class Reunion with a dinner at the Locust Club of Philadelphia. The gala was planned by '33 classmates, Robert J. Callaghan and Jerome L. Markovitz. The Class of 1938, at the same time, gathered for their 45th Reunion at the Rittenhouse Square home of Classmate Sylvan and Alma Cohen. Carton M. Dittman, Jr. co-chaired that event.

The next morning, Saturday, October 15, after coffee and croissants, the Reunion participants chose to attend one of three mini-courses: the Federal Rules of Evidence offered by Associate Professor Stephen B. Burbank; Zoning by Professor Jan Z. Kraznowiecki; and the Insanity Defense led by Professor Richard G. Lonsdorf. From 10:15 am to 12:15 pm, a panel discussion was presented entitled: "The Bok Report: A Critique of The American Legal System, the Legal Profession, and Law School Preparations—As Viewed by Two Practicing Attorneys, a Judge and a Professor of Law."
Law School Professor Regina Austin, '73, right, with Classmate, at the Opening Reception, Friday, October 14, 1983.


The panelists, all members of 1983 Quinquennial Reunion Classes, included John G. Harkins, Jr., '58; David H. Marion, '63; The Honorable Edward J. Bradley, '53; Professor Bernard Wolfman, '48; and Professor Noyes E. Leech, '48, moderator. The text of the panel discussion appears in this issue of The Law Alumni Journal.

Following Luncheon with Dean Robert H. Mundheim (whose message to the Quinquennial Classes appears in "From the Dean" in this issue of The Journal), Reunion celebrants either attended the Penn-Lafayette Football game at Franklin Field or the World Series Baseball game; went on the pre-planned guided walking tour of Independence National Historical Park and Society Hill; or gathered at the Levy Tennis Pavillion on the University of Pennsylvania Campus to cheer a round-robin tennis match between Class of 1953 members and the team of Dean Robert H. Mundheim and Sylvan Cohen, '38. An account of the Class of '53—Mundheim/Cohen Tennis Tournament by an important eyewitness appears on page 38 in this issue of The Journal.

Professor Richard Lonsdorf conducts his Insanity Plea mini-course for Re­union participants.

The Amsterdams—Gustav, '33, and Valla—participating in the Insanity Plea mini-course.

(Continued on following page . . . )
Quinquennial Reunion Weekend

The Quinquennial Reunion Classes enjoy Luncheon with The Dean.

Toasting their 50th Reunion are Chairmen of the event, Jerome L. Markowitz, right, Robert J. Callaghan, left, and classmate William C. Wise, center.

Alumni Observers at the Bok Report Presentation.

Howard Gittis, the Class of 1958 Reunion Chair, with Dean Mundheim.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim compares members of the Class of 1938—then and now—at their Reunion party which was held at the home of classmate Sylvan Cohen, right.
Dean Robert Mundheim accepting the 1943 Scroll of Immortals as classmates Elizabeth Hatton Landis, center left, Mary Barb Johnson, center right, and Bernard Borish, right, listen.

Class of 1953 members Judge William W. Vogel, left, Jane C. Nusbaum, center left, Senator James Cafiero, center right, and John T. Acton celebrating at the Faculty Club.

1943 Classmates Bernard Borish and William B. Johnson at their 40th Reunion party.

I. E. "Eddie" Robinson presenting Dean Mundheim with the "grand prize" for having won the Class of 1953—Mundheim/Cohen Tennis Tournament.

Dean Mundheim greets Alumnus John G. Harkins, '58, right, and Bonnie Harkins, center right, at the Class of 1958 festivities at the Hilton Hotel.

Donald F. Berlanti, '63, with Dean Robert H. Mundheim at the Reunion party held at the Rittenhouse Club.

(Continued on following page . . .)
Quinquennial Reunion Weekend

On Saturday evening, the Quinquennial Classes assembled at restaurants and hotels throughout the city for their private celebrations. Dean Robert H. Mundheim visited each class Reunion celebration, greeting Alumni and offering good wishes.

The Class of 1943, as a result of the planning of Classmate Bernie Borish, gathered at the Hilton Hotel of Philadelphia for a 40th Reunion Dinner. Joseph Shanis, a member of the Class of '43, presented Dean Robert H. Mundheim with The Scroll of Immortals, which was that Class's written commitment to remember the Law School in their future plans. At the University of Pennsylvania Faculty Club, the infamous Class of 1953 reveled until the early hours of Sunday at a dinner-dance planned by Classmate Len Barkan. I. E. "Eddie" Robinson, who organized the Class of '53—Mundheim/Cohen Tennis Tournament, presented the "Victor's Award" to Dean Mundheim who accepted on behalf of the winning Mundheim-Cohen Team. The Hilton Hotel of Philadelphia was the site of the Class of 1958 25th Reunion celebration, planned by Chairman Howard Gittis, while The Class of 1963 held their 20-year gathering at the Rittenhouse Club on Rittenhouse Square. Arnold Cohen chaired the '63 Reunion. The Class of 1968 attended a cocktail party at the Top of Center Square, through the careful planning of classmate Peter C. Glenn. The Law School was the setting for the Classes of 1973 and 1978. Regina Austin, Peter Nelson, and Stephen Popielarski organized 1973's 10th Reunion dinner buffet which took place in the Goat area of the School while Class of 1978, under the able leadership of George Shotzbarger and Tom McCabe, held their event in the Student Lounge. Later in the evening, the Classes of '78 and '73 gathered jointly for dancing at the Goat.

On Sunday, October 16, Reunion celebrants enjoyed Brunch at Eden, a campus restaurant, and went on to the Philadelphia Museum of Art for a free guided tour.
Featured Events

The Dean and Dr. Lowenthal, J. D., '78.

Members of the Class of 1973 celebrate at "The Goat."


The Reunion Brunch at Eden on Sunday, October 16.
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The 1983 Edwin R. Keedy Moot Court Competition

The final argument of the annual Edwin R. Keedy Cup title was held on November 21 at the University of Pennsylvania Museum.

The distinguished 1983 Bench was comprised of Judge Abner J. Mikva, United Stated Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, presiding; Judge Walter K. Stapleton, United States District Court for the District of Delaware; and Judge James T. Giles, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

John Doe et al. v. Selective Service Systems et al., Appellants, the 1983 case for argument, involved the issue of the Constitutionality of the Solomon Amendment which ties Federal Financial Assistance for college students to draft registration.

Plaintiffs John Doe and others—male citizens of Minnesota—failed to register for the draft and then intended to seek financial assistance from the federal government in order to pursue college educations in their home state. In their complaint to the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, the Plaintiffs alleged that the Solomon Amendment is unconstitutional in that (1) it constitutes a bill of attainder, (2) it violates the privilege against self-incrimination and (3) it denies equal protection of the laws. The District Court granted a preliminary injunction against enforcement of the Solomon Amendment and the government defendants—the Selective Service System et al.—appealed directly to the Supreme Court.

The Keedy finalists were Jane G. Beddall, Alexander Dranov, Paul Gagne and William Hoffman, all members of the Class of 1984. The arguments presented by both teams were acclaimed "superb," the finalists having "handled themselves with great aplomb, poise and grace . . . always in control." The team of Beddall and Gagne, who argued for the Selective Service System, the appellants—emerged the victors.

Professor Ralph S. Spritzer, the Moot Court Faculty Adviser, developed the case for the 1983 competition.
The Bok Report: A Critique of the American Legal System, The Legal Profession and Law School Preparation—As Viewed by Two Practicing Attorneys, a Judge and a Professor of Law

Editor's Note: The following is the transcribed text of the discussion presented on Saturday morning, October 15, 1983, as part of the Law School's Annual Quinquennial Reunion Weekend. The panelists were five University of Pennsylvania Law School Alumni—John G. Harkins, Jr., '58; David H. Marion, '63; The Honorable Edward J. Bradley, '53; and Professor Bernard Wolfman, '48. Professor Noyes E. Leech, '48, introduced the program and was its moderator.

(Continued on following page . . .)
Professor Noyes E. Leech, ’48:

In his annual report to the members of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University for the academic year 1981-82, President Derek Bok chose to address the larger problems of the legal profession and the role that legal education should play in addressing those problems.

The report received a good deal of publicity last spring. Many of you may have read the report or press summaries of Bok’s observations. Shortly, I will present a precis of the report to refresh your recollections and to inform those of you who are not familiar with what he has had to say.

Four colleagues will comment on President Bok’s criticisms of the legal profession and of legal education. Each of the commentators is an alumnus of the Law School and is a member of one of the quinquennial classes being honored this Reunion Weekend. They are John Harkins, ’58, Co-chairman and a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz and a specialist in litigation; David Marion, ’63, Vice-President and Director of Kohn, Savett, Marion & Graf, P.C., specializing in business litigation, antitrust and communications law; Edward J. Bradley, ’53, a former Deputy City Solicitor for the City of Philadelphia, a former private practitioner and, now, the President Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; and Bernard Wolfman, ’48 my classmate and, as you know, a former Professor of Law and Dean of this School. He is now the Fessenden Professor of Law and Dean of this School. He is also a practicing lawyer, specializing in taxation, before entering the academic profession.

Here are the salient points of President Bok’s report.

First, the legal profession is a “flawed system.” In his words, “There is far too much law for those who can afford it and far too little for those who cannot.” Bok emphasized two themes: cost and access. Our laws are too numerous, litigation is increasingly complex, and the number of lawyers and legal expenditures are increasing. (One collateral cost of this system is a “massive diversion of exceptional talent” into the legal profession.) He says that the complexity of laws and procedures, and increased costs deny access to the legal system for the poor and the middle class. He asserts that the major cause of this state of affairs is an excessive reliance on the adversary system, a system that is both elaborate and expensive. Those who work in that system look only at the individual case, not at the consequences of rules and decisions in their wider contexts. Laws and jurisdictions multiply; no one is responsible for the system as a whole and the capacity of law to affect human behavior is exaggerated. What is needed is greater access to the system and its simplification. Access and simplification go hand-in-hand.

The entire legal profession is responsible for curing this situation but, looking solely at the task of the law schools in improving the system, President Bok calls for the schools to engage in research into the costs of our present system and into the development of knowledge about methods to increase the system’s efficiency. Legal scholars must take the lead in this endeavor.

Bok then looks at the teaching of the law and concludes that law students should not concentrate, as they excessively do at the moment, on the adversary system. Law students should be taught the skills of mediation, negotiation, conciliation and compromise. They should learn how to create new institutions for delivery of legal services to the poor and the middle class.

Finally, his report reviews nascent efforts at the Harvard Law School to address some of the problems, such as the institution of courses in the economics and sociology of the legal profession and courses in mediation and negotiation, as well as increasing opportunities for practical legal experience.

In sum, Derek Bok sees the Harvard system as moving away from concentration on training lawyers for practice, to teaching law students about the larger problems of the profession.

This precis is a bare-bones description of the report that has omitted the flesh and blood illustrations substantiating Bok’s thesis. As our panel members present their views, they no doubt will address some of his more detailed reasoning and argument.

In closing, I will quote from the report once more, “The blunt, inexcusable fact is that this nation, which prides itself on efficiency and justice, has developed a legal system that is the most expensive in the world, yet cannot manage to protect the rights of most of its citizens.”
John G. Harkins, Jr. ’58

I think the Bok report is of importance because of its author and not because of its specific recommendations of which there are very few. The importance of the report rests on the fact that it is a statement of concern by the President of a very distinguished university who is himself a distinguished scholar, teacher and former dean of a leading law school. The concern which animates the report is very clearly expressed in President Bok’s conclusions which I would like to examine.

Bok draws the following conclusions: (1) that there is wide discontent with all of our major professions; the criticism is not limited to the practice of law or the legal profession. He cites the medical profession as well as others. Bok goes on to observe that (2) “the public seems critical of all institutions and increasingly concerned that the country is no longer working well.” He then states (3) that universities cannot hope to solve all of the social ills which may provide reasons for his concern and for the concern of the populace generally, but (4) their faculties can, in cooperation with other institutions, supply knowledge that is often vital to the development of sound solutions and can also prepare people with a broad view of their professions. However, (5) instead of meeting this challenge, most professional schools have concentrated “on training practitioners for successful careers while failing to acquaint them with the larger problems that have aroused such concern within the society.” Finally, he says, “Harvard Law School has, at long last, shown a disposition to break out of this narrow mold, enlisting faculty and students in a common concern for the failings of a costly and often inaccessible legal system.”

Before undertaking a more substantive response, I think it important to make a couple of general observations to afford some context. First, while there is indeed discontent with our major institutions and professions, I invite some historical perspective on Bok’s exact phraseology. His words are that “the country is no longer working well.” Before introducing the words “no longer” to that context, one might reflect for a moment on our nation’s history. Going back to the Jefferson and Hamilton era, one recalls that Jefferson and the Jeffersonian Democrats thought that Hamilton and the Federalists were wrecking the Republic. The vitriolic response was that if Jefferson’s policies were followed, the Republic—young as it was—would fail. Indeed, I suspect it was perceived by a good percentage of the population, at that time, that “the country was not working well.” Thereafter came the corruption of the early part of the nineteenth century and the Civil War with all of its agony. Meanwhile, the hazards of everyday life were intensified by the breakdown of humanism that occurred during the industrialization of this country. The cries of the Muckrakers, the horror of the Depression, the upheaval of the ’60s and the burning of our cities during the Civil Rights demonstrations; the Watergate fiasco—all of these reflect the difficulties which our country has had to survive. Remember our feelings of impotence when Americans were held hostage by the Iranians? I think it is wrong to say that our country is “no longer” working well and, upon analyzing his conclusions, I do not think that Derek Bok really feels that way either.

As a second general observation, in my opinion, President Bok does himself, Harvard Law School and many other law schools an injustice in suggesting that they, “at long last,” are awakening to the problem of a costly and inaccessible legal system. In 1955, when I enrolled as a student at this Law School, Clarence Morris and Paul Mishkin taught an introductory course which addressed this subject, among others.

As Professor Leech indicated, a considerable part of the Bok report is devoted to an analysis of the ways in which the legal system is seen as growing more cumbersome, complex and costly. One of the effects of that costliness, Bok says, is the possibility that, in important respects, justice or legal representation is being denied to the poor and, indeed, to the middle classes, however they may be defined. One could spend hours analyzing the causes of the perception that the system is more complex and more costly. Some part of the perception is based in reality and a part is based in myth. President Bok himself cites one misperception, the suggestion that our society is becoming a more litigious society when, in fact, as he points out, the number of cases litigated year-by-year has probably not risen in proportion to the growth of the population.

President Bok also points out another paradox when he suggests that if we fund access of every citizen to the courts to litigate every dispute that the citizen might need to..., other problems would be solved. One could spend hours analyzing the causes of the perception that the courts can solve the problems of our society when, in fact, as he points out, there are many other problems besides the availability of legal representation that our society must face.
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wish to litigate, such funding would itself drive up the cost of access to the system enormously. It would cause, to quote the tax lawyer, a grossing—up of the cost which would be self-defeating. In short, one must be very careful about generating suggestions in reference to cost, complexity and access—and, in fact, President Bok is very conscious of this.

Let us stand back for a moment. Flawed though it may be, we do have a judicial system which on the whole cares about individual rights, which protects citizens against the excesses of government and other citizens and which seeks, as an objective, even if it does not always attain that objective, the provision of a fair, unbiased hearing. In this connection, we should recognize that a striving for “due process” frequently means more process and more careful process, and thus more time and more costs and complexity.

As Bok notes, much of the litigation in the courts and in the administrative process involves trivial matters. He cites examples in his own experiences in the labor-management relations area and there are numerous other examples to illustrate his point. A certain amount of this triviality stems from unnecessary law and regulation or unwisely drafted law and regulation, and a certain amount of it stems from the infinite capacity of lawyers and litigants to draw shades of difference between the last precedent and the latest case.

Recognizing all of this, I would still make the following points. First, our judicial system is, and is espoused as, a peaceful means of reducing conflict and redressing wrongs which, on the whole, works well. Of course, one hears criticism. Some say judges are too activist, while others complain that judges are insufficiently activist. There is criticism that our courts become clogged, are inefficient, and may, in some extreme cases, be corrupt. There is also criticism that lawyers are selfish or greedy, or inadequately trained, or too mesmerized with being litigators rather than negotiators or conciliators. As Bok sums it up, lawyers focus too narrowly on the specific disputes before them to be able to look at the system as a whole.

Yet despite the criticism, the judicial system does, in fact, aid substantially in supporting that fragile human ice. Clients demand it and the system requires it. In that connection, we should encourage, not disparage, the formation of plans to render services to disadvantaged persons on terms which they can afford or, when necessary, without cost. At the same time, we should strongly urge that legislators and regulators exercise their wisdom by not legislating and not regulating where needs do not clearly exist and by legislating and regulating far more carefully when needs do exist. Moreover, as Bok points out, judges must be ever conscious of the fact that in departing from precedent in the hopes of resolving a particular case more wisely, they should weigh carefully the destabilizing and unsettling affect that the resulting uncertainty in the law creates.

How, then, does all this relate to the law schools? President Bok treads lightly on this subject, but there are several levels of problems. First, it is evident that there are too many law schools turning out too many graduates who in turn must seek new and different ways to justify their existence, thereby adding to the sheer weight of the system and, therefore, its cost. The difficult issue, of course, is to decide which law school is the one too many and which prospective law student is the one who should not be added to the stream of graduates. Some would answer that the law of the marketplace should regulate. Supply and demand will reach equilibrium at some point and artificial restraints should not be imposed. Underlying this observation is a fear of elitism and of discrimination and a kind of populous instinct that each locality, each school, should be able to make its own decisions to create or not to create more law graduates.

I am frank to say that I have no really satisfactory answer to this problem. I recognize that many graduates are imperfectly trained, that there are too few highly qualified law professors to teach the hoards of law students and too much emphasis on what might be described as a trade school mentality in some places. My hunch is that the law of the marketplace will in fact operate, and that as college students perceive that law graduates are not obtaining challenging jobs, those students will look elsewhere. In the meantime, we would do better to turn to the subject of what law schools ought to be doing with their students.

Here, I depart somewhat from President Bok, although I defer to his greater wisdom with respect to legal education. President Bok urges the law schools to examine carefully what it is they are emphasizing. I recognize that many law schools are turning out too many graduates who in turn must seek new and different ways to justify their existence, thereby adding to the sheer weight of the system and, therefore, its cost. The difficult issue, of course, is to decide which law school is the one too many and which prospective law student is the one who should not be added to the stream of graduates. Some would answer that the law of the marketplace should regulate. Supply and demand will reach equilibrium at some point and artificial restraints should not be imposed. Underlying this observation is a fear of elitism and of discrimination and a kind of populous instinct that each locality, each school, should be able to make its own decisions to create or not to create more law graduates.

I am frank to say that I have no really satisfactory answer to this problem. I recognize that many graduates are imperfectly trained, that there are too few highly qualified law professors to teach the hoards of law students and too much emphasis on what might be described as a trade school mentality in some places. My hunch is that the law of the marketplace will in fact operate, and that as college students perceive that law graduates are not obtaining challenging jobs, those students will look elsewhere. In the meantime, we would do better to turn to the subject of what law schools ought to be doing with their students.

Here, I depart somewhat from President Bok, although I defer to his greater wisdom with respect to legal education. President Bok urges the law schools to examine carefully what it is they are emphasizing. If the whole thrust of legal education is simply to turn out better gladiators, immune to the problems of the judicial system, then society is diserved and the judicial system suffers. With this point, I am in agreement. There must always be a sensitivity to the larger concerns of justice and the judicial system and not merely to the acquiring of narrow skills. Because of his focus on the costliness of the legal system, President Bok recommends more courses in negotiation and conciliation and more interaction between legal scholars and social scientists in order to examine more precisely the problems of the system, the standards by which the system ought to be judged and the likelihood that particular options would provide meaningful solutions. As
a footnote, one should realize that our law school is in
the forefront of this kind of interdisciplinary study.

One illustration of the value of interdisciplinary effort
is Bok's interesting suggestion that theories of cognition
ought to be explored in conjunction with evidence
questions as a means of judging the rationality of our
rules of evidence. Bok also goes on to cite what he
perceives to be the benefits of clinical problems which
might equate with the clinical aspects of medical train­
ing; and he encourages studies that legal scholars are
instituting into such subjects as the adversary system,
alternative dispute resolution techniques and new
organizational forms for the delivery of legal services to
the poor.

I accept all of this, but I sense that in part it misses
the point. At bottom, the success of a legal education in
terms of creating a lawyer who cares about the larger
concerns which occupy President Bok lies in the excite­
ment created between the professor and the student
and the quality of the use of educational time to inspire
and lead. It does not follow that by creating more
courses, more clinics, more negotiation demonstrations,
and more projects, that anyone will come away a more
complete lawyer in the Bok image. Indeed, as the cur­
riculum becomes fragmented there is a real tendency
on the part of many students to look upon the how-to­
do-it courses as a trade school promise to give them an
advantage over some future opponent.

Part of the problem I am describing stems from the
fact that so much of the curriculum is self-selected by
the law school students themselves. In fragmenting the
curriculum and allowing self-selection, the law schools
contribute substantially to the failure to produce the
type of lawyer which President Bok seeks. Put dif­
frently, if one is to provide an educational vehicle
likely to create what Bok would describe as whole
lawyers able to see above the day-to-day concerns and
able to contribute to long-run solutions to problems,
the curriculum must be far more integrated and better
directed and the quality and enthusiasm of teaching
and leadership must be prized and encouraged. I am
pleased to say that Dean Mundheim and the rest of our
Faculty are addressing these issues and have set very
high goals for the School.

David H. Marion, '63:

It is a long-held theory in the world of show business
that the worst acts to follow are children and dogs. In a
panel on legal issues, John Harkins is a tough act to
follow. He made many of the points I would have
made, only much more articulately. Therefore, I will
attempt to approach the issue from a slightly different
angle.

There is an old story about a Rabbi who acted as a
judge in a small town many years ago. He was
approached by two townspeople who requested him to
resolve a dispute which existed between them. He
listened to the first-party's story and said, "You know,
you are absolutely right." He then turned, listened to
the other party's tale, pondered it and said, "You know,
you are absolutely right." The Rabbi's wife was present
and she tugged on his sleeve and said, "You heard the
first person's story and said that he was right; you
listened to the second man's story and you said that he
was right. How can they BOTH be right?" The Rabbi
stared at his wife and said, "You know, you are ab­
solutely right!" I feel the same way. Much of what I
read in the Bok report, I think, is absolutely right. At
the same time, I also agree with John Harkins' com­
ments about the report.

Earlier, I spoke with Carolyn Temin, who mentioned
that she had been asked to speak for five minutes on
the issue "Does Our Legal System Work?" Carolyn said
she was wondering how she might say slowly—in five
minutes—"sometimes." Yes, sometimes the legal system
works, and, if my role here is to bring the reaction of a
practicing lawyer to the issues raised by the Bok report
and to the question "Do we have a legal system that
works?" I would have to say sometimes it does and
sometimes it fails miserably.
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The Bok Report

In my own practice, which takes me to federal and state courts here in Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania and throughout the country, I see the legal system from both the plaintiff and defense sides. Frequently, no matter who "wins," the litigation is often an absolute disaster when one considers the results as against the expense, the time, the agony, and the burden of both parties. Yet there are those exceptional occasions when I walk away from a case thinking, "This is a great example of justice. I wish that critics of the system could see what this judge did in this case to move it in a way that was sensible and beneficial for both sides."

What is it that marks the difference between the shining examples of justice in action and the all-too-frequent disasters? Short of drastic changes in the law schools or in our basic institutions—which I think neither Derek Bok nor John Harkins propose—as a practicing lawyer I believe the answer lies in the judicial system and with the judges themselves. We have recently seen numerous critiques of lawyers and their courtroom performances, most prominent of which were Chief Justice Burger's comments about how many lawyers are not capable or prepared to practice in the courts. As was mentioned by John Harkins, there is a check in the marketplace over the lawyering process. The public is attracted to the best and the most successful lawyers; presumably, those less capable are less successful. At least the public does have a choice. I submit, however, that the consumers of legal services do not have the choice of which judges will hear their cases; nor do they have any real choice of which judges will sit in the courts at all. Even in jurisdictions like Pennsylvania, where judges are still elected, the public does not have the means or the ability to really choose and elect the best judges to the Bench.

Often, a good judge can take up the slack for an inadequate advocate by taking over questioning of witnesses, encouraging stipulations or facilitating a fair settlement. It is much more difficult, if not impossible, for good lawyers in an adversary system to overcome inadequacies of a trial judge. Furthermore, it is the judges and not the lawyers who frequently determine whether, how fast and how well a particular case will move along. It is the judges whose orders and opinions determine the development and progress of the law in meeting the changing demand of our society.

When we talk about law schools and whether they are doing a sufficient job to train lawyers, and whether they are doing a sufficient job to cure the ills of a legal system that sometimes does not work—and certainly is perceived not to work in many cases—I think of the question which is not in the Bok report and which should be addressed. What are the law schools doing and what should they be doing to insure that we have on our Benches the very best judges that society can provide? Our system is one which selects its judges from the ranks of practicing lawyers. What training, experience and skills should be required before a judge goes on the Bench? Is having a license to practice, some years of experience as a lawyer and some political connections proper and sufficient training for one to go on the Bench? In some countries, becoming a judge is something decided by educational expertise. Perhaps a notion to be considered would be the offering by law schools of a Master's Degree course on becoming a judge in order to teach the techniques of mediation, negotiation and other skills deemed necessary to judging, which are not always needed or possessed by practicing lawyers. Judges have to be mediators if they are going to be good judges. They have to be administrators if they are to be good judges. Our President Judges and Chief Judges have to run their courts like businesses and, in many jurisdictions, this is not being done.

We need to make the system we have work and, in my opinion, in order for this to happen, more attention has to be focused on the judges before and after they ascend to the Bench. They are the difference, in most instances, as to whether the system does or does not work. Until we have "take-charge" judges who know how to administer their calendars, how to mediate, how to bring parties together, how to streamline the cases before them (as well as possess the skills of a practicing lawyer), and until we have administrative and President Judges who will press for developing rules and procedures within their courts that will achieve results, we cannot have a legal system that will work for any great percentage of the time.
President Judge Edward J. Bradley, '53:

In line with David Marion's comments I am reminded of a story told by the comedian, Danny Thomas. He was appearing before a large audience and after having held them enthralled with his wit for about an hour another comedian, Joey Bishop, followed him. Knowing that he could not top Thomas' humor Bishop said, "Everything he said, I agree with." He then walked off. So, as far as I am concerned, everything the previous speakers said, I was going to say—only probably more eloquently.

My comments will be specific, from the point of view of the President Judge of a trial court in a large city. We are faced with a number of problems of the kind President Bok discussed and, sometimes it seems, they are almost insoluble. He refers to the fact that discovery and pre-trial procedures complicate our handling of cases, making them very expensive. It is interesting to recall that when discovery rules were first introduced, they were looked upon as methods for simplifying and making our handling of civil cases easier and more expeditious. I believe that they have, in fact, served that purpose. I do agree with President Bok, however, that we must have tools to measure exactly the impact of rules of this type. We have been inundated with a host of new areas of civil litigation which did not exist fifteen or twenty years ago. Medical malpractice cases, legal malpractice cases, and product liability cases are handled now as adversary cases. There are, however, other ways in which these areas of litigation should be considered. They can be comparable, for instance, to the procedures introduced in Workmen's Compensation Law.

We in the court system have tried to introduce techniques to simplify the handling of categories of cases. For example, our compulsory arbitration program now deals with approximately 25,000 cases per year in the City of Philadelphia, where the amount in controversy is $20,000. or less. What should be considered is whether the limits of compulsory arbitration should be raised to the level of $40,000 or $50,000. Legislation to that effect is presently pending before the Pennsylvania State Legislature. I personally favor that legislation for, without the compulsory arbitration system that is in effect now, our court system simply could not handle its civil case load. It is noteworthy that the cost of dealing with the aforementioned 25,000 cases, is one million dollars per year in terms of arbitrators' fees, a fraction of what it would cost to try these cases in court. A number of lawyers who regularly appear in arbitration cases have questions about raising the limit to $50,000. They also have questions concerning the qualifications of the arbitrators and the bias and the manner in which they are selected.

In the criminal court we are also inundated with cases. There have been some efforts at trying to cope with this problem; for example, some 15,000 minor criminal cases no longer go to trial but go through a procedure called Pre-Indictment Probation (also known as A.R.D.—Accelerated Rehabilitation Disposition), wherein the defendant is put on probation for a period of six months to a year without a trial. If the defendant is not arrested subsequently during that probationary period, his/her record is expunged. We have been compelled to implement this program in order to cope with the flood of more serious criminal cases.

President Bok referred to Chief Justice Warren E. Burger's comment that we need better trained trial lawyers and pointed out that, paradoxically, such lawyers probably would increase the length of time necessary to try a criminal case because skilled counsel will resort to every legitimate device in defense of his/her client. There is no question that the trial of criminal cases, at least for the 18 years that I have been on the bench, has become tremendously more complex. A few years prior to my appointment to the Bench, a judge would dispose of a list of 15 or 20 cases—and I mean dispose of them. In those days, defendants pleaded guilty and, in many cases, did not have attorneys and were unaware of their rights as to demanding waiver or jury trials. Now defendants are given elaborate explanations of their rights, which can sometimes take longer than the time it takes for some judges to try a case.

We now have exclusionary rules applying to state courts which did not exist before I went on the Bench. I think their impact on the conduct of police deserves study and wonder about the impact of the rules on the conviction rate obtained by district attorneys. I do not think, however, that anyone would suggest that these "complicated" procedures be abandoned. They make our jobs tremendously difficult, they lead to appeals, and they lead to post-conviction hearing procedures. But there is no question that these exclusionary rules
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are important in protecting the rights of individual defendants.

Incidentally, in the criminal area I think it is the middle-income defendant who is the most disadvantaged in terms of the delivery of services and the ability of litigants to afford legal representation. For example, in the City of Philadelphia, the budget of the District Attorney's office is approximately 14 million dollars. The budget of the Defender's office is close to 9 million dollars and, in addition to that, the courts pay private counsel approximately two and one-half million dollars per year for cases where the Defender Association cannot represent indigent defendants. Therefore, the Defender Association and the private counsel budgets almost equal that of the District Attorney's Office. In light of the financial aid available for legal representation, indigent defendants are not disadvantaged. It is the middle class defendant who is not eligible for representation by the Defender or court-appointed counsel; that person must cope with the expense of employing private counsel. This is an area which needs consideration.

Another problem which the courts are confronted with is the proliferation of asbestos cases. In Philadelphia alone, we are now faced with 3,000 civil asbestos cases. There are some 20,000 cases nationally and the volume appears to be an insufferable task for the courts. It may require a social solution—a solution that the courts and traditional methods of litigation are not able to handle.

I would like to mention briefly the topic of the selection of judges. The performance of judges on the litigation, conciliation, and administrative levels is crucial to the operation of our legal system. David Marion previously emphasized the question of training lawyers to be judges but, I think more important than that, the question of the selection of judges—certainly on the state level—is most important. There is considerable debate developing concerning the merit selection of judges. No matter how well attorneys are trained in the art of becoming a judge, unless the right lawyers are selected—and selected by a rational procedure—there will not be good judges. It seems to me that the present method of selecting judges for the state courts in Pennsylvania simply does not work well. Do not misunderstand. As one of them, I do not mean to denigrate the calibre of Pennsylvania's judges. I think that the procedure by which our judges are selected and retained on the Bench simply is irrational. Generally, in the first instance, a judge is appointed to the Bench by the Governor as the result of the existence of a vacancy. That judge must then stand for election within a few years of his appointment. The voters usually do not know anything about the judges for whom they are voting, and it is accidental and certainly fortunate when the nominees on both tickets are worthy of being elected. The time has come when some form of merit selection has to be considered. There are many sincere opponents of merit selection who think that it will lead to an elitist type of selection procedure or that bar association or law office politics will be substituted for partisan politics. These matters must be addressed, and I do want to reiterate that the present system does not work. Responsibility must be focused on the Governor of our state to appoint capable people and to make certain that the judges so selected will not be required to engage in partisan elections. Personally, I will argue for a system closely analogous to the appointment of Federal judges in which the responsibility is on the President of the United States who, in appointing judges for life, takes the appointment very seriously, as does everyone concerned. I think that the system for appointing state court judges should be comparable to federal procedure where the initial responsibility would lie with the Governor and the approval of a majority of the Senate would be required before appointment to the Bench. There is still the sense that some democratic voter input should be part of the process. I believe that this could be accomplished by the requirement of a retention election to take place two or three years after the Governor has appointed the judges. In this manner partisan politics does not have to enter into the procedure. If our judiciary is going to merit the respect that it deserves, a system must be established which produces capable and rationally-selected judges.
Professor Bernard Wolfman, '48

It is a great pleasure to be back home both in Philadelphia and here at the Law School, and I am delighted to be a part of our Reunion Weekend Program. I will not concentrate on the issues brought forth by John Harkins, Ed Bradley and David Marion but will say that, like the Rabbi, I agree with all of them. I also want to say that Noyes Leech did a masterful job in summarizing the Bok statement analytically and concisely.

The Bok statement is a document that is provocative in its identification of these major concerns: excessive costs and delays in our legal system; inadequacy of representation for the poor and the near-poor; the hit-or-miss approach of the adversary system to achieving justice and providing broad, long-term solutions to the societal problems that it addresses; and the failures of law schools and lawyers to seek correction and to make fundamental analyses of the profession and the legal system that the profession operates. In identifying those issues, the statement makes a positive contribution.

In addition to being provocative, however, the Bok statement is provoking and not very lawyerlike. I feel that it bears the markings of the chief executive officer of a large and wealthy corporation, Harvard University in this instance, who is frustrated by the barriers and delays that have interfered with some of his decisions and timetables. Bok alludes, in the report, to the union problems he is encountering at the Harvard Medical School, and the delays that Harvard has had to face in beginning the operations of some energy systems which the community of Brookline has opposed on environmental grounds. Not atypical of people in positions where the power they wish to exercise is sometimes frustrated, Bok lashes out at those near to him who are identified with the impediments to his goals—the lawyers and their legal system. His statements of cause and effect were less than careful; his failure to recognize that law and its purveyors may be reflecting fundamental drives, needs and failures in society generally—is disturbing, to put it mildly. Bok seems to ignore the constructive, architectural role of the office lawyer who helps build transactions, whose work makes for predictability, and who provides a degree of certainty and assurance to the parties that litigation will not result. He also seems to ignore the fact that litigation may be the result—at least in significant part—of market failure and breakdown; and that litigation—long and costly to be sure—nevertheless provides an orderly resolution of interparty tension with enough justice in both results and process to gain widespread acceptance.

As with all institutions operating in a competitive, free economy, there will be periods of excessive cost, inefficiency, and then, correction. The move to in-house counsel is a positive, healthy sign that lawyers are not monopolists, that they are subject to market forces in which the consumers of their services are moving quite powerfully to make more efficient use than before of the legal services they buy. In unplanned economies like ours, correction of excess after the fact is the norm. The personal computer field is now going through costly correction because of excessive entry. Should we condemn the actors for not having conspired to limit production and entry? Obviously not. Then why are lawyers condemned on that score?

The complaint of a university president that law schools have taken too many of the best and the brightest students is unworthy. His criticisms of law school curricula are superficial. Should schools reject the ablest applicants in order to force them back into physics and philosophy and French when those fields, in a free and open economy and academic universe, have not provided the necessary attractions? It is too bad that these fields are hurting, but the solution should be sought—not assumed. The condemnation of law schools for accepting the ablest students is self-evidently pernicious. The problem lies in the economy and the society that sensibly or foolishly has chosen not to pay for future economists and historians, but has placed large carrots in front of potential lawyers. Again, however, the economy is changing and applications to law schools are on a downward trend. This is not because of the schools, anymore than it was the law schools that a few years ago were fundamentally responsible for attracting the great numbers.

Enough of my criticisms of Derek Bok and his less than cogent presentation and on to his main themes which have moved me quite positively. First, I agree that the historical failure of academic institutions—and this includes law schools as well as departments of economics, sociology, etc.—to study the organization (Continued on following page . . .)
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and operation of the legal profession is most unfortunate. Bok points out that Harvard Law School has now begun the study in a serious, comprehensive manner with large resources dedicated to the undertaking. What will come of it remains to be seen. It is always possible that one of the reasons that law schools have not studied the profession is that we are not equipped or competent to undertake that kind of empirically-based study. This does not explain why sociologists and other empirical scientists have not studied the profession more than they have. But since they have not, I think it right that we attempt the study even though I am not sure that we are the best ones to do it. I am hopeful that the academic branch of the legal profession will prove to have more competence in areas that we have not yet entered than history would suggest.

Secondly, Bok rightly points to the costs and delays in our legal system which, I think, are huge. In a broad sense, however, society is responsible. Lawyers have been irresponsible for not taking the lead in seeking to remedy the situation and streamlining the process. They are, after all, closest to the system. Instead, for much too long, lawyers have defended bans on advertising, minimum fee schedules, restrictions on entry, opposition to no-fault, etc. Those areas of lawyer activity are not to our credit.

Thirdly, the adversary system only sometimes satisfies the longings for justice which, I think, we share as a society. Instead of seeking alternatives when the adversary system works poorly or haltingly, the organized bar seeks to preserve it, wanting "zeal for client" to dominate over broader responsibilities to law, to decency, to a perception of right and wrong that client zealotry may subvert. In my view, what the American Bar Association did in cutting back the goals presented by the Kutak Commission was a step backward.

Fourth, the inability of the poor and near-poor to see the law and lawyers as working for them—not always against them—is a burden that lawyers must bear heavily. There is a marked failure in the legal market, and our lobbying efforts to get the federal government to intercede effectively have been neither sustained nor adequate. We should be shouting from the rooftops against the burlesque, the travesty that has become the National Legal Services Corporation. Sadly, however, we watch and say, "Tut tut" as President Reagan seeks to destroy the one anti-poverty program that has been effective.

So my message is: Give Derek Bok a passing grade for his paper as written, but an "A" for identifying concerns that should attract our attention today. Let us work toward their resolution before others less informed than we take the matter out of our hands and produce solutions that may prove to be far less salutory than we and society would want.
This Reunion Didn’t Just Happen.
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A COMMITTEE REPORT TO ALUMNI

By David H. Marion, '63

Last year, former President of the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society Bernard M. Borish created the Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee to review and monitor the admissions procedure and offer suggestions from the perspective of Law School Alumni. There are many myths and misconceptions about law school admissions processes, in general, and ours in particular. The Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee initially attempted to learn about and understand the operation. The Committee met with Frances E. Spurgeon, the Dean of Admissions, and several members of the Faculty committee which supervises the admissions process chaired by Richard G. Lonsdorf, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry and Law. As the Committee began its work, numerous questions and areas of inquiry were suggested by its members. The Committee concurred on one early and unanimous conclusion: that most Alumni are completely unaware of the present operation of the Law School admissions system and that a first imperative would be to inform interested Alumni of how that system works. Hence this article.

In the past, Alumni have shown little interest in the Law School admissions process, except when the child of an Alumnus applies for admission to the Law School. Short of adopting a rule which cannot seriously be suggested—that all children of Alumni be admitted automatically—it is inevitable that some of our number may be painfully disappointed at that critical time. The weight, if any, to be given the status of an applicant who is the child of an Alumnus is one of a number of questions which our Committee will explore. We would like to think of the entire selection process as an open one, not subject to whim and caprice, and as rational and fair as possible. We invite the comments and suggestions of interested Alumni on ways in which the process can be made more accurate, more rational and more equitable.

Applications Then and Now
It is difficult to ascertain the standards of admission used in the past, but it is obvious that the process was simpler, if only because of the relatively small number of applicants. For example, in 1927 (the first year for which records are readily available), 319 people applied for admission to the Law School. Thirty-eight of these applications were incomplete and never were considered, and 43 people withdrew before their applications could be acted upon; as a result, 238 applications remained for processing. Of these, 14 applicants were rejected because of failures at other schools and 20 were rejected for "other reasons." Eighteen were accepted but chose not to matriculate, and the remaining 186 comprised the Class of 1930. Of the 186 admittees, 105 were graduates of the University of Pennsylvania. Ninety-two listed Philadelphia as their homes, 74 lived in Pennsylvania but outside of Philadelphia, and 20 resided outside of Pennsylvania. The criteria used to decide which applicants were accepted and for what reasons are impossible to fathom from the still-existing records, but it seems reasonable to assume that rejecting less than 7% of those who applied was an easier task than our present dilemma of selecting a class of 225 from twenty times that many applicants.

In 1947 a group of legal educators created the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) in order to establish a uniform national examination for admission to law school. The test was designed to measure abilities in reading, understanding, and reasoning which are considered important in the study of law. In 1948-1949, very few law schools used the LSAT as an admission criterion and fewer than five thousand people took the test. Today, virtually all accredited law schools require the LSAT and 111,600 people took the test from June 1982 through June 1983.

In June of 1982, the Law School Admissions Council revised the content of the LSAT and changed the score scale from the old range of 200-800 to a new range of 10-50. The old LSAT scores scale will be our reference in this article as it is presumably more familiar. The admissions formulas have, of course, been altered to reflect the new range.

The phenomenal increase in the number of Law School applicants has made the need for a screening formula imperative. Twenty-five years ago, 619 people applied for admission but, by the time incomplete and withdrawn applications were eliminated, the total had shrunk to 394. By 1960 that number had increased to 751 applications and, by 1970, it was 2,655. In 1980, 3,823 applications were received; the number of applicants rose to 4,538 in 1982 and, last year, the first decline in twenty years occurred when 18% fewer people applied. Our peer schools have had similar experiences with huge application increases in the past twenty-five years and marked decreases in 1983. Both Harvard and Yale reported a 20% drop in applicant numbers and Stanford reported a decrease of 22%. We can only speculate on explanations for this. The number of persons taking the LSAT has not diminished; it is possible that the year 1983 may have been a statistical peculiarity which will correct itself when potential law students recognize that they may have better chances than they thought at the "top" law schools.

The Krieger Formula
The screening formula used at our Law School has evolved from Faculty decisions on the desired composition
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of our student body. The main concern is a record of academic excellence. The search is for students who are intellectually strong, and who exhibit evidence of maturity, leadership skills, ingenuity, creativity and independence. The college transcript and LSAT score are obviously the best available aids in measuring academic ability. Letters of recommendation from former and current professors and employers, as well as the applicant's personal statement, provide information on more subjective qualities. Personal interviews are not part of Penn Law School's admissions process, nor are they at any of our peer schools. Applicants are encouraged to visit the School, sit in on classes and talk to current students. Admissions office personnel are always willing to make appointments to answer applicants' questions, but these meetings have no bearing on the student's admission.

The admissions process is comparative and highly competitive. Because so many applications are received for so few seats, applications are first sorted on the basis of a numerical index which attempts to weigh the factors which best predict the applicants' ability to handle the Law School workload. The three factors in this index are the LSAT score (the average if there are more than one), the undergraduate rank in class, and the "quality" of the undergraduate school attended as determined by the mean LSAT (MLSAT) of all students from that particular college who took the test. The index used at Penn, which is called the "Krieger" or "K number" after the person who devised it, is crucial in determining admission.

**Automatic Admits**

The Faculty has mandated that about half of the class be admitted automatically based solely on the Krieger index. For the last full year in which the old LSAT scale was in use, the base line for the automatic admits was 4.9000 on the Krieger scale. These students, comprising half of the entering class, are truly first-rate academic achievers. For example, a Krieger of 4.9000 translates into someone from Harvard whose rank in class was no lower than the 75th percentile (25% from the top) and whose LSAT was no lower than 730 (the 95th percentile); such a person would just make it into the automatic admit category. One from a school with a lower MLSAT than Harvard's, of course, would have to have done better in either class rank, individual LSAT or both. Each automatic-admit student file is carefully read by a member of the admissions office staff and, as long as no question is raised by the letters of recommendation, the applicant's statement or the college dean's statement, the applicant is offered a position in the new class.

**The Eligible Pool**

The second group of candidates considered are those placed in the "eligible pool." There are several different ways to enter the pool. The first group put into the pool are those applicants whose "K number" is just below the group of automatic-admits. Those next placed into the pool have extremely high LSAT scores or extremely high class rankings, regardless of their "K numbers." Thus, applicants whose LSAT's are in the upper two percent of all who took the test (an LSAT of 750 or higher) are included in the pool regardless of their rank in class or the indicated quality of their college. Also included in the pool are those who rank in the upper 2% of their college classes without regard to their other statistics, as well as those applicants who are in the upper 8th of their college classes and are in the upper 8th of the LSAT group for that year, also without regard to the colleges they attended.

The balance of the eligible pool is made up of seriously handicapped applicants and those applicants who are designated as "discretionaries." Discretionaries are applicants, usually older than the average, who have some unusually interesting background or work experience. Since many of these people have been out of college for several years, their transcripts are more difficult to evaluate and their LSAT scores are not as predictive. If, after reading these applications, the admissions staff feels that these students could contribute to the diversity and intellectual atmosphere of the Law School, the files are given to the chair of the admissions committee. With his approval they also are placed in the eligible pool. All applications in the eligible pool are then referred to the admissions committee.

**The Admissions Committee**

The admissions committee is composed of nine Faculty members appointed each year by the Dean, and two students selected by the Council of Student Representatives. The committee reviews the admissions process, conducts validity studies, and recommends policy changes to the Faculty. The Faculty members read and vote on the applications in the eligible pool. In 1982-1983 over 800 applications were sent to the admissions committee. Each file was read separately and voted on by three Faculty members. These three votes determined whether a student was either accepted, wait-listed or rejected.

The readings take time and result in a slower admissions process; however, the Faculty member who reads the files is able to consider more carefully the subjective factors about each applicant, so that the incoming class is not selected solely on numbers, statistics or the index. Numbers, of course, are considered but the Faculty readers are also asked to consider carefully the extra-curricular accomplishments of the applicant, his/her personal statement, letters of recommendation, the extra- and post-college career of the person, the applicant's relationship to a Law School Alumnus or a Faculty member of the University of Pennsylvania, the geographic mix of the incoming class and of the presently existing classes, and any
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factors indicating that the applicant will contribute to the quality and diversity of the Law School and of the legal profession.

**Minority and Women Applicants**

The Law School has a long-standing commitment to a strong minority presence in the student body, and this is a very important part of our admissions process. A subcommittee of the admissions committee, composed of three faculty members and five minority students (3 Blacks, 1 Latino, and 1 Asian), reviews all applications from minority students and recommends to the full committee a final decision on each applicant. The factors deciding minority admission are identical to those used in selecting non-minority candidates from the eligible pool. In 1960 there were no minorities in the entering class; in 1970 there were 20 and, in 1980, there were 24. The Class of 1986 will have a total of 37 minority students (16 Blacks, 5 Latinos, 4 Asian-Americans and 2 Native Americans) representing 16% of the class. The number of women attending all law schools has increased dramatically in recent years. Our Law School enrolled six women in the entering class in 1960. In 1970, there were thirty-three women in the class (14.5%) and, in 1980, eighty women (34%) matriculated. There are ninety-four women enrolled in the Class of 1986 (43%). The percentage of women admitted has always been in close approximation to the percentage of women who have applied.

There also has been a large increase in the number of students who do not come to law school directly from college. Currently almost half of the student body falls into this category. This is seen by the faculty as a positive development since they find such students, generally speaking, to be mature, committed and able to draw on wide-ranging experiences in contributing to classroom discussions.

In addition to the students admitted to the first year of law study, approximately fifteen students are accepted each year as transfers from other law schools. These students come at the beginning of their second year and graduate with our degree. The standard used by the admissions committee in accepting such transfers is whether, based on all available data, they can be predicted to rank ultimately in the top one-third of the class. Not surprisingly then, these transfer students often turn out to be among our best.

The balance of the student body is composed of six or seven non-matriculating students and 40 or so candidates for the LL.M. degree. The typical non-matriculating student is someone who has completed two years at another law school and seeks to attend the University of Pennsylvania Law School because, for example, his/her spouse may have been transferred to the Philadelphia area. Such “hardship” cases are considered individually and, as long as it is felt that the student can do qualified work and the space is available (usually because some of our own students “non-matric out”), permission is granted. These students, of course, receive degrees from their original schools.

**The Resulting Student Body**

The present University of Pennsylvania Law student community is the product of the efforts of the admissions staff and committee who have sifted through 12,229 applications, an average of 4,076 for each of the three years. A total of 2,481 individuals were accepted, of which 636 have matriculated. Of this number, 252 are women and 98 are minority students. The average LSAT of this group is 724 (95th percentile) and the average college grade point average is 3.67.

Speaking geographically, the state of Pennsylvania is still best-represented, supplying the school with 27% of its students; not surprisingly, runner-up states are New York with 22% and New Jersey with 13%.

But Penn Law School, nevertheless, is hardly a “local” school. The student body represents 39 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Canada and Japan. There are 19 J.D. candidates from Florida, 18 from California, and 10 from Illinois. Other states represented are Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, New Mexico, Montana, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin.

One hundred and forty-nine different colleges and universities are represented in our student body. The University of Pennsylvania is still our leading “feeder” school, with 95 of our 636 students coming from Penn. Cornell is second with 45, followed by Yale (23), Harvard (21) and Princeton (18). But we also have J.D. candidates from virtually every American college or university one might think of, as well as from the American University of Beirut, the Electrical Engineering Institute of Leningrad and the University of Moscow.

It appears that our admissions process has resulted in a student community that is intelligent, accomplished and diverse in terms of background, experience and geography. Our Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee is greatly impressed with the efforts of the Law School Faculty and staff to rationalize, humanize and evaluate the admissions process. We intend no denigration of those who have administered and participated in the process or those who have been selected as students, when we raise questions about the procedure and inquire into the ways that Alumni can make positive contributions.

**Questions Raised By The Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee**

Members of the Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee** have devoted much time, effort, creative thought and analysis to the admissions process and have posed a number of possible questions for further review and study. The following (Continued on following page . . .)
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is an outline of the questions which have been raised:

A. Are the admissions process and the assumptions underlying it fair?

1. Composition of Admissions Committee:
   (a) Faculty role, generally.
   (b) Input of Administration, Overseers, Alumni, students.

2. Weights used in Krieger calculation:
   (a) Use as determinant of automatic admission and criterion for inclusion in pool.
   (b) Rationale for weights assigned to LSAT, rank in class and MLSAT; does MLSAT factor assign too much weight to the undergraduate institution as a criterion for admission?
   (c) Are there other factors that should be included in the Kreiger number?

3. Automatic admissions:
   (a) Should there be automatic admissions—extent to which they are an administrative convenience or serve other goals.
   (b) Effect of automatic admissions on policy goals such as geographical and other diversity.

4. Pool admissions:
   (a) Criteria for inclusion in pool—do they make sense; are there other categories of applicants who should be included?
   (b) Percentage of class drawn from pool—should it be greater or less?
   (c) Criteria for selection from pool—what factors are considered; are there others that should be weighted?
   (d) Procedures for selection from pool—use of different panels of Faculty members to review batches of applications; is the evaluation too subjective (should the weights to be assigned particular factors be quantified or otherwise specified)?
   (e) Effect of pool selection process on policy goals such as geographical and other diversity.

5. Minority admissions:
   (a) Extent to which minority status should be given weight in admissions process—should a specific portion of class be reserved for minority applicants, or should preference be given in some other manner?
   (b) Percentage of class drawn from minority admissions—should it be greater or less?
   (c) Goals served by minority admissions—extent to which such admissions serve those and other goals such as geographical diversity.
   (d) Fairness of minority admissions process.

6. Treatment of Alumni and Faculty-related applicants.

7. Discretionary category—does it make sense?

8. Are guidelines needed for Admissions Committee members?

9. Should interviews play a role?

10. Should there be an early-decision process?

B. Does the process work?

1. Does it serve the aims of the Law School?

2. What kind of student body does it produce?
   (a) Does it produce geographic diversity?
   (b) Other diversity (e.g., social, political, age, prior background, etc.)?

3. Is there or can there be objective evidence validating the process?

C. How does our process stack up against our peer schools?

D. What role for Alumni?

1. Pre-admission:
   (a) Recruitment of applications.
   (b) Interviewing.
   (c) Evaluation of applicants.

2. Post-admission:
   (a) Take-up rate—Alumni contacts with accepted applicants.
   (b) Effective communication of rejections.

3. Dissemination of information about admissions process.

4. Assessment of fairness of process.

Having read through this article, you now know the situation facing the admissions staff, the levels of applications present and past, the inner workings of the present process and the questions that the Law Alumni Admissions Review Committee believes should be explored. To repeat, the purpose of this article is twofold: that you be informed and that you be in the position to contribute your comments and suggestions to the Committee. We hope you will do so promptly by writing to David H. Marion, Chairman, The Alumni Admissions Review Committee, The Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Improving Our Quality of Life: Childbirth and Childrearing Leaves

by Alan M. Lerner, '65

Editor's Note: Alan M. Lerner, '65, is a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Cohen, Shapiro, Polisher, Shiekman & Cohen.

On Law Alumni Day in April of 1983, I was privileged to hear a discussion concerning the emerging role of women in the law. Panelists and audience participants identified a number of bases, or supposed bases, for the problems which women lawyers continue to face when they choose to devote some of their time to childbirth and childrearing. Law firms balk at giving a woman these opportunities, we were told, because of the economics of the law firm practice, the question of her "commitment" to the firm, and her availability to her clients in the dual role as lawyer and mother. I believe that none of these issues is at the heart of the problem, but that more subtle forces are at work. My conclusion is based on fifteen years of experience and observation as an associate and partner in a firm.

Devoting part of one's time to childbirth and childrearing generally raises the question of maternity and/or "personal" or "childrearing" leave, return to parttime work after the leave, and restrictions on work assignments upon one's return. Each of these exceptions to the norm of unlimited time commitment and devotion to the firm in pursuit of professional development, partnership and income (assumptions generally applicable to practice in private law firms), give rise to different problems but not, in my view, insoluble ones.

Maternity leave is, in fact, less potentially problematic than its legal parallel-disability leave. Illness or injury causing disability usually occurs without warning and without opportunity to plan, and is more indefinite in duration than maternity leave. Consequently, there is no basis to claim that leave due to pregnancy and childbirth poses any greater problem of expense or availability to clients than does other short term disability. Since hardly any law firm would consider not having a short term disability leave, maternity leave should not pose any particular problem.

Personal or childrearing leave can potentially create some problems for a firm. Since "leave" assumes that the firm will hold a job for the person taking leave, the employer whose workload does not decrease during the employee's absence has to produce the same amount of work with one less employee. Others must carry that person's load. At the same time, the firm continues to pay rent on an office which, presumably, will be used in the future upon the person's return.

Steadily increasing amounts of business may require a firm to restructure its hiring policies with respect to attorneys taking childrearing leaves. Many larger firms that make hiring decisions a year or more before new associates are to begin work, do exactly this. Some firms, however, are reluctant to assume steady increases in work when considering an application for extended leave. Thus, the question of childrearing leave poses a potential problem for some firms, the significance of which will vary depending upon the size of the firm and the nature of the work being done by the person taking the leave.

Many firms, even those without formalized personal leave policies, have permitted attorneys to take leaves of up to two and three months in order to deal with personal or family crises. Firms have allowed their
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members longer periods, some up to one year, in order to run for political or bar association office, to accept an appointed position in government or to teach. Leaves of absence in this group are usually seen as potential enhancements to the firm’s prestige and power and, thus, are viewed at “investments.”

Emergency leaves are seen simply as necessary evils, required as a matter of human relations and purely involuntary in origin. While childrearing leaves may appear distinguishable on the surface from emergency personal leaves, there are some very real similarities. Some people elect not to have children and, thus, having children is not, in a given case, wholly voluntary. Yet, most adults do desire to have children and to be parents. Moreover, from the point of view of the community as a whole, it is certain and, indeed, necessary that some of us have children. So if we look at the problem of time away from work required by childbearing and childrearing other than from the purely parochial view of an individual firm, it is involuntary. Given our knowledge of the importance of parent-child bonding, parental care and instilling in infants and small children the feeling of being loved and secure, time away from the office to nurture an infant is no less necessary or humane than time off to assist a parent or spouse taken ill or, indeed, time away to deal with one’s own psychic traumas.

On the other hand, childrearing leave and its “successor-in-interest,” the return to work parttime, begin to look openended. That is, one may decide that his or her child needs a parent at home fulltime for six months (instead of six weeks) post-delivery and halftime until the child, at the age of five or six, enrolls in school on a fulltime basis. Even then, the parent may feel it necessary to be home between five or six o’clock each evening until the child is eight or nine years old.

This open-endedness, in my view, is what triggers the anxiety reaction to childrearing leave and to part­time reemployment among most law firms. Why?

The income/expense formula is not the reason. The part­time employment of attorneys can be profitable for a firm. Take the example of the attorney who is out of school for four years and is earning $40,000 per year with a billing rate of $80 per hour. Should that person work three days per week, it would not be unreasonable to pay him or her $27,000 per year and to expect that person to bill at least twenty hours per week.

Working a conservative forty-six weeks per year (four weeks vacation plus two weeks of legal and firm holidays) still produces 920 billable hours per year. At $80.00 per hour, that person would bill $73,600 or more than three times his or her salary. Since the overhead for such an attorney (e.g. secretary, pension plan and perhaps other benefits) would not be the same as for a fulltime attorney, the parttime attorney would certainly be profitable in any but the most inefficient of firms.

Can a parttime attorney be productive and useful in a “big firm” practice? Can he or she provide the service that clients demand? In the City of Philadelphia, part­time attorneys have been and are engaged in major litigation and in business practice in large and small firms. Of course, some degree of scheduling flexibility must be required of that person, since emergencies do arise and trials, depositions, conferences, negotiations, etc. can frequently run longer than anticipated. For the responsible person, however, this flexibility is hardly impossible. Reading and written work can be done at home, as we fulltimers (and our spouses) know only too well. Most of us have phones at home and, if necessary, can find time to speak with a client, co­counsel or opposing counsel even on a “day off.”

Will the parttime attorney expect to move up in the firm and become a partner in the same time frame as the fulltime attorney? I would expect not. Too much of the skill and professional judgment of accomplished lawyers is the direct result of “on-the-job training”—of actual experience practicing law—to expect that one can work essentially half as much and still develop the requisite knowledge, experience and judgment in the same period of time. But, as with fulltime lawyers, this, too, will vary from person to person. In any event, the desire to work parttime for some period of years need not forever preclude partnership.

Is the parttime attorney sufficiently committed to developing the highest level of professional competence? Even recognizing the extent to which professional competence as an attorney is developed in time on-the-job, there is simply no basis to assume that one who, for a time, practices only parttime is not as dedicated or committed as is the fulltime practitioner to developing his or her legal skills to the fullest extent possible.

Finally, is the “parttimer” sufficiently committed to the firm? Answering that question requires a refine­ment of the question. What is “commitment” to the firm? Why do we require it? And how much is enough? I think it is easier to define some things that are not part of commitment. Hopefully, it is not simply doing whatever is necessary to advance the firm financially. The Code of Professional Responsibility, as well as personal codes of ethics and decency, provides some countervailing force which may prevent us from maximizing earnings. Yet “commitment” to the firm should never require violating those precepts.

Does commitment to the firm mean that we must bill two thousand hours per year—year in and year out? Law firms, perhaps more than most businesses, relate their incomes directly and observably to the hours worked by their professional staff. As businesses, the law firms and their members look to the “bottom line,” the income produced for the partners. That being the case, it is perfectly appropriate to reward hard work and a high number of billable hours.

Two thousand billable hours per year divided among
forty-six weeks is approximately forty-four billable hours per week. In order to bill that number of hours honestly—week in and week out—one must spend upwards of sixty hours per week working at the office or at home. Add commuting time and the result approaches twelve hour days per week.

Aside from the threats to one’s physical and mental health engendered by such a schedule, and the likelihood that a reputation for that approach would soon discourage applications from the most desirable candidates, we realize that there is more to life than this year’s income. There are, for example, relationships with one’s spouse and friends; the nurturing of children; an occasional trip to a concert or to the theatre; activity in the school’s parents’ association; physical activities like playing squash or tennis; the training for and running in the Bar Association Marathon; and, for me at least, watching the Phillies. There is also participation in the various political, civic, educational and charitable organizations without which most of us would feel like so many unfulfilled, unproductive “Babbitts.”

Most firms, in fact, encourage—if not require—associates and partners to engage in a broad range of professional, civic and business activities. Admittedly, much of that arises out of the belief that the contacts and public exposure which result from such activities help to attract new business. Nevertheless, few of us would assert that such activities are undertaken without any sense of civic responsibility. And what could be more responsible and civic-minded that nurturing one’s own children to grow up feeling loved, wanted and respected? How better to provide the next generation with creative, energetic leadership, and a community-minded, law abiding, hard working citizenry?

It seems to me that, as lawyers, we have created a mystique about how many hours we bill each year. It is part of our “macho” self-image. We learned it as young, upward-striving associates, and have come to accept as gospel that “real lawyers” bill 2,200 hours per year. In that regard, it may resemble an unfortunate and never outgrown adolescent personality trait developed to camouflage some nagging self-doubt. Maybe someone told us that this was “the way” when we, as young associates, had no right to question. Perhaps we are reacting now like fraternity members who, having gone through pledging and “hell week,” decline to eliminate the process because those coming after should not have it any easier than we did lest it “cheapen” the significance of membership in the brotherhood. Perhaps we feel that having worked those hours when we were associates in order to support partners and, having become partners ourselves, we now are entitled to expect that the current crop of associates will contribute to supporting us in the manner to which we would like to become accustomed.

The various “movements” of the last twenty years, most particularly the women’s movement, have increasingly urged us to stop and reexamine our career assumptions, and to consider the quality of life that we are permitting ourselves and our families to live as compared to the quality of life that we could enjoy. The legal profession has largely ignored that urging. Those within and without our profession who, as parents, have tried more active participation in childbirth, nurturing and childcare have found it vastly rewarding for both parent and child. It is no wonder that more and more women want to devote more of their time and energy to the experience. Could it be that our male-dominated profession sees this as the place to attack the growing influence of women and of women’s desire to share in the power, prestige and money that go with a successful practice? Or is there the fear that the young men may follow the lead of the women and want to divide their time and energies more equally between lawyering and being husbands and fathers? Or is it merely an unwelcome threat to the assumptions upon which we have relied in allocating our own time and energies between home and office? And what does that imply for life as we have chosen to lead it, or for the legal profession, or for the image we have of ourselves as hard-driving, tough-minded, “successful” lawyers; or for our incomes?

I do not mean to suggest that hard work, diligence, and a responsible attitude toward one’s firm and its clients should not be required of every associate and partner, and, also, appropriately rewarded. Rather, I suggest that a successful career as a lawyer, including a high degree of professional competence and partnership in a prestigious firm, should not be reserved for the single-minded, mono-dimensional person.

Viewed in this light, as I believe it should be, the issue is not simply a women’s issue arising out of childbearing and motherhood. Rather it is an issue of how all of us choose to divide our time between serving our clients and firms in return for dollars, power and prestige; and serving our families, communities and ourselves in return for deep and fulfilling personal relationships. At the same time, it is an issue of whether our firms, our profession and our society and, ultimately, we ourselves will make the choice free from artificial, unnecessary constraints.

It would be most unfortunate if our profession could not find some way to adapt to and actively encourage lawyer-parents, both male and female alike, to devote time and energy to the nurturing and rearing of their children. Maternity leaves, childrearing leaves and part-time work schedules for parents of young children may help to provide the opportunity for younger lawyers to have multi-dimensional lives, with time and energy to become outstanding, creative lawyers as well as available and involved spouses and parents, and well-rounded, fulfilled human beings.
An Appreciation

Editor's Note: Over the past twenty years, thirty-four graduates of the University of Pennsylvania Law School have served as law clerks to Chief Justice Samuel J. Roberts, '31, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

In January 1983, as the Chief Justice entered his final year on the Bench, thirty-six of the aggregate fifty “Roberts’ Clerks” assembled in Philadelphia to honor the man they all refer to with respect and affection as “The Judge.”

James A. Strazzella, '64, professor of law at Temple University and Chief Justice Roberts’ second full-time law clerk, served as the evening’s organizer and master of ceremonies. He introduced former clerk Harry First, '69, professor at New York University Law School, who brought greetings from the N.Y.U. Appellate Judges Seminar, of which Chief Justice Roberts has been a leading faculty participant for many summers. Professor Harold Greenberg, '62, of the Indiana University School of Law and Chief Justice Roberts first full-time clerk, paid tribute to Mary Alice Whalen, the Chief Justice’s secretary for twenty-three years.

Professor Strazzella then offered a toast: “To Chief Justice Roberts. The Judge is a complicated man. To toast him is a large task that deserves the help of others. So, in looking at the many facets of The Judge, and in taking notice of his very special characteristics, I would like to recognize several former Roberts’ clerks: Bernie Chanin, '65, Steve Friedman, '71, Leslie Neustadt, Dennis Haines, Jake Hart, '67, and Alex Kerr, '70, who will speak for all of us about the Chief Justice—the jurist, the judicial administrator, the scholar, the teacher of law clerks, the person. To the way we have always known him—to The Judge.”

What follows are the tributes delivered by Bernard Chanin, '65, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr, & Solis-Cohen; Steven L. Friedman, '71, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Kauffman; and Alexander P. Kerr, '70, of the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Snow—three Roberts’ clerks who are University of Pennsylvania Law School Alumni. Their messages are most timely since Chief Justice Samuel J. Roberts recently stepped down from the Bench of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in January, 1984, after fifty years of service to the legal profession.

SJR, The Jurist
Bernard Chanin, '65

I feel privileged at the opportunity, on the occasion of this tribute to The Judge (here again I seek the indulgence of referring to you, Mr. Chief Justice, in terms that are so reminiscent for me), to speak for those of us here this evening of our clerkships and of the heady pleasures of those days. And heady they were in the joy, excitement and challenge of that fortunate association that scholarship and good luck had brought to us.

We are here to honor you, Judge, in no small measure because you taught us that a person could achieve renown without renouncing common decency. You calmed our fears and made us feel part of a great and grand intellectual adventure. You were warm and kind and considerate to all of us. While that would be sufficient to warrant this gathering, our purpose goes beyond the acknowledgment of personal debt, for we are present in recognition as well of your public role as one of the most distinguished jurists in the long history of this Commonwealth, a judge regarded by legal scholars and lawyers alike as one of the outstanding jurists of our times.

You have, by the depth of your intellect, the force of your personality, your wisdom, compassion and practical judgment, established yourself as a jurist who understands the complex and subtle process by which cases are soundly decided and public policy is wisely pronounced. In so doing, Judge, you have helped to enhance the role of the law as an instrument of effective and decent social policy.

In the twenty some years that you have sat on the Bench of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, first as an Associate Justice, now as Chief Justice, you have been a vital force in the advancement of the most progressive development in the law. Indeed, while we are dutifully respectful of the other distinguished jurists who have shared your tenure on the
Court, we are openly and avowedly partisan, and say that you were the vital force in the battle to bring the Court into the mainstream of American law.

In *Griffin v. United Airlines* (1966), one of your earlier major opinions, you introduced modern choice law into the jurisprudence of this state. Not long after that decision, you won the fight to abolish the anomalous rules or vertical and horizontal privity in breach or warranty cases in *Kasab v. Central Soya* (1968) and *Salvador v. Atlantic Steel Boiler* (1974). No discussion of civil practice would be complete without mention of your celebrated opinion in *Niedleman v. Brodsky*, a 1970 decision abolishing the impact rule and allowing litigants to recover for fright and shock in appropriate circumstances. I am certain that if there is a heaven, Justice Musmanno would have rejoiced with delight (marked, of course, by a twenty page expression of his joy).

Many of us are aware of how your long-standing commitment to the orderly processes of the law (and your abhorrence of the wasteful practice of retrials because of carelessness or incompetence) motivated your fight to rid our jurisprudence of the “fundamental error” rule which allowed jury instructions to be challenged on appeal notwithstanding the failure to object below, a battle won in *Dilliplane v. Lehigh Valley Transit* in 1974.

Your commitment to piercing the shibboleth of the law prompted your opinions in *Ayala v. Philadelphia Bd. of Education* (1973), abolishing the doctrine of governmental immunity (and thereby bringing this jurisdiction into conformity with the other 25 jurisdictions which had similarly acted), and in *Mayle v. Dept. of Highways* (1978), abolishing the doctrine of sovereign immunity, a landmark of judicial scholarship, notwithstanding the legislative timidity which prompted a partial restoration of the doctrine.

In an analogous vein, in *Hack v. Hack*, a 1981 decision, you wrote the opinion of the Court abolishing the archaic rule of interspousal immunity, again bringing the Court to join some 27 other jurisdictions which had previously done so.

In the area of constitutional law, you wrote the opinion for the Court in *Commonwealth v. Tate* (1981), vindicating the right of citizens to peaceably distribute political literature on the common areas of a private college campus, reversing convictions of criminal trespass in the process. You helped balance the scales fairly in that delicate realm where First and Sixth Amendment claims compete in *Philadelphia Newspapers v. Jerome* (1978), where you sustained the right of a trial judge in a criminal proceeding to limit access to a pretrial hearing on a motion to suppress in order to secure the defendants a fair trial.

Other significant constitutional decisions for which you wrote the opinions were *National Wood Preserves v. Der*, a 1980 decision construing and sustaining the constitutionality of the Clean Streams Law, and *Bacchetta v. Bacchetta*, a 1982 decision sustaining the constitutionality of the new Pennsylvania Divorce Code and the application of the equitable distribution provisions to marital property acquired prior to the effective date of the law. No list of constitutional accomplishments would be complete without reference to *Butcher I and II*, landmark cases of judicial reapportionment of the State Legislature, a herculean task accomplished with judicial impartiality in the highest tradition of the law.

A public official’s office was inadmissible. In *Commonwealth ex rel. Washington v. Maroney* (1967), you helped define the concept of effective assistance of counsel in criminal trials and, in *Commonwealth v. Alvarado*, 1971, you wrote the opinion ensuring a remedy for criminal defendants when the prosecution fails to keep a plea bargain promise. In *Commonwealth v. McCusker*, a 1972 decision, you helped introduce modern concepts of psychiatric knowledge into the law of this state when you wrote the opinion which allowed psychiatric testimony for the limited purpose of determining whether the defendant acted in the heat of passion. One of the seminal opinions of your tenure came down in *Commonwealth v. Archambault* in 1972. There you ruled that the trial judge’s expression of opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant constituted an impermissible invasion of the jury function. No less an advancement of a rational system of criminal jurisprudence was your important opinion in *Commonwealth v. Riggins*, a 1977 decision requiring the sentencing judge to state on the record a reasoned basis for the sentence. Finally, in *Commonwealth v. Story*, a 1981 decision, you vindicated our fundamental abhorrence of the retroactive application of the criminal law by refusing to permit the death penalty to be imposed where the homicide occurred prior to the enactment of the law imposing the penalty.

This list is not exhaustive, but is intended to merely be illustrative of your achievements and your contributions to judicial scholarship and to the law of this state. Time and the circumstances of this occasion afford me the opportunity to mention but few of your significant achievements.

Indeed, our common experience has taught us that many of your contributions occurred in the conference room as you fought to enlist your colleagues in the struggle for a sound jurisprudence. It is apparent to your peers that your twenty years of service to this Commonwealth

The litany of your contributions in the criminal area is no less impressive. In *Commonwealth v. Simula*, a 1969 decision, your opinion defined, fairly and consistent with its purposes, the concept of custodial interrogation under *Miranda*, holding that a confession obtained without warning from a youthful offender in leaves a legacy of jurisprudence that has advanced the law in profound and extraordinary ways.

Kenneth Clark, in his marvelous

(Continued on following page . . .)
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account of the history of civilization, stated that societies thrive only so long as citizens have faith in their institutions. We are all in your debt. By your example of distinguished public service, you have reinforced our faith—a faith that good men doing good works can advance the public good.

We are proud to have served as your law clerks; we are honored to be joined with you as colleagues in the service of the law.

SJR, The Judicial Administrator
Steven L. Friedman, '71

We are all here tonight as part of a grand tradition of the Pennsylvania Judiciary—participants in and great beneficiaries of the wisdom and experience of a Justice Roberts clerkship. We all have warm recollections of the tremendous experiences of chambers, the meaningful dialogues with the Chief Justice, the active and lively debates over various cases; and, most significantly, being part of a vital judicial and intellectual tradition—the participation in the constant flow of brilliant, well-crafted, well-reasoned opinions by then Justice and now Chief Justice Samuel Roberts. The tradition of the Roberts’ clerkships and the lessons learned in chambers were many.

One of the underlying themes of the Judge’s judicial craft, opinions, and decision-making was the demand for a higher level of performance by all participants—lawyers, judges and administrators.

Judicial administration is a hot item in the news media today. This is no mystery to anyone. Especially here in Philadelphia, there has been an ongoing raging media debate about the quality of the administration of the Philadelphia court system. The public confidence in the judicial administration of the court system is in serious jeopardy. The challenge to Chief Justice Roberts is paramount.

He has already, in his few weeks of tenure as Chief Justice, serenely accepted the challenge and immediately has begun to quell the controversy and return to the job of efficiently and effectively improving judicial administration all over the state and, especially, in Philadelphia. The recent appointment of Judge Abraham J. Gafni as the new Court Administrator was immediately hailed by the media as a very significant step in the right direction. At his swearing-in ceremony, Chief Justice Roberts declared his intention to sit down with the President Judge and fellow brethren of the Commonwealth and Superior Courts to review the state of the judiciary and areas where judicial administration and rules can be improved. This commitment sent tremendously reassuring signals throughout the entire judiciary in all of Pennsylvania. In an incredibly short period of time, the Chief Justice has begun to calm the turbulent waters of controversy and to reassure all participants and observers that a calm and confident hand is at the tiller. This in itself, given the unfortunate level of controversy, is an amazing achievement in so short a period of time.

However, none of us is surprised at how effectively and quickly the Chief Justice has moved in this vital area of judicial administration. Throughout his career, he has made many significant addresses and written many significant articles in which he set forth profound observations and thoughtful recommendations for the improvement of the administration of the judiciary. Perhaps his unique background as former trial judge and practicing lawyer has given him a unique perspective on all the elements of the judicial system. I can always recall his unique insights, for example, into the intricacies of a trial record; in fact, the Chief Justice always had very cogent and profound messages and observations for the trial judges.

In a speech he delivered at the February, 1982 Judicial Orientation Seminar in Philadelphia, he praised the trial judge for his difficult but essential role as the ultimate arbiter of justice “in the pressure cooker world of the trial courtroom” who, on a daily basis, “comes face to face with individuals whose rights, freedoms, even lives may depend on what [he/she] decide[s].” In the same speech, the Chief Justice made the types of points that he would make to us in chambers—the importance of the development of an adequate record and the assurance that the record is complete whether on the voluntariness of a guilty plea or the factual foundation for the admission or non-admission of expert testimony, etc. He also exhorted the trial judges to be more careful in their use of appellate authority, making sure that the decisions being relied upon were truly precedent as opposed to being only plurality decisions. He also urged the local trial judges to become more actively involved in local rulemaking and day—to—day administration in the Courts of Common Pleas. Finally, he indicated that every new proposal designed to improve the administration of justice must be subject to this following litmus test:

“Examine carefully each new proposal in terms of the following standards: Does it advance the quality of justice, improve the judicial product, facilitate access to the courts, or increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our court system? If a
proposal does not advance the quality of justice or its efficiency, it may well be just an unwise and unnecessary bureaucratic burden, 'excess baggage' imposed on the function of our judicial system. Examine, too, the cost of the proposal not just in terms of money but in terms of human rights. Now more than ever when emotions are running high and the temptation to apply ill-considered, band-aid solutions to our system is strong, judges-of all people—should view these solutions in light of Thomas Jefferson's prophetic warning that 'a society that trades a little liberty for a little order will deserve neither and lose both.'

I believe that eloquent quote from the Chief Justice's speech sums up his philosophy and his exacting standards for improvement of judicial administration. It is with great reassurance and with great excitement that we all will watch your tenure as Chief Justice. Though it may be short in comparison to others, you have already given strong evidence that it will be one of the most significant tenures in recent decades.

In conclusion, I want to end up with a quote from one of my own personal heroes in history, Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, who once ruminated on the significant difference between leadership responsibility and being number one, two, or three. "In my long political experience I had held most of the great offices of State, but I readily admit that the post which had now fallen to me (prime minister) was the one I liked the best. Power, for the sake of lording over fellow-creatures or adding to personal pomp, is rightly judged base. But power in a national crisis, when a man believes he knows what orders should be given, is a blessing. In any sphere of action, there can be no comparison between the positions of number one, number two, three or four. . . . At the top there are great simplifications. An accepted leader has only to be sure of what it is best to do, or at least to have made up his mind about it."2

It is with great pride that we all wish to honor the Chief Justice as number one in the Pennsylvania judiciary. With your strong sense of judicial craft, your untiring commitment to improving the quality of justice, and your thoughtful creative input on the quality of judicial administration, we all know that your tenure as Chief Justice will be long revered in the history of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

Please accept my congratulations and best wishes.

To SJR, A Presentation
Alexander P. Kerr, '70

If you think it is difficult to describe the many faceted aspects of the life, scholarship, and judicial accomplishments of the Judge, you ought to try to find one gift from all of us that appropriately symbolizes his service and our relationship to it. The task has not been an easy one, and I want particularly to thank Steve Friedman, Bernie Chanin, Jim Eiseman, and Jim Strazzella for their valuable advice and assistance in this matter. Since the rest of you have no idea what it is you are giving, sit back and enjoy the presentation along with the Judge.

This has been a special and unique evening. It has been a time of renewing old acquaintances, swapping stories and, in general, recalling what was for all of us an extraordinarily special time in our lives and professional development. There was the hard work, the excitement of the conferences, the satisfaction when one of the Judges' opinions turned from a rigorous dissent into a persuasive majority but, most of all, there was the friendship that developed out of becoming a member of the Roberts' family. It was this aspect of the clerkship that we will all treasure most. So tonight is, first and foremost, a family reunion, and it is that special sense of family which we all carried away with us.

Chief, now I would like you to come to the front of this distinguished group, because this is something that we have to open together.

What I have here is a book. We believe it is a special book, one of two written by another noted jurist, former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court John Marshall. This is a first edition of his History of the American Colonies. We are told by those far more knowledgeable than we that it is in extremely good condition, and a rare find of this particular volume. As you can see, we have had a case for the book constructed, and within the case is a scroll which bears the names of all your clerks and commemorates the occasion of this presentation. It reads: "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

The reasons for our choice of this volume are many, but foremost perhaps is a recognition that your tenure as Chief Justice will, due to the accident of statute, be limited to one year. We all look forward to a year of singular accomplishment and reform of the Supreme Court, and the administration of the judicial system generally in Pennsylvania. We know your vigorous leadership will accomplish great and sweeping changes. But when that Term is over, we hope this volume will be an inspiration to you to turn your considerable talents for teaching and scholarship to writing, so that you can share with all of us some of the ideas which have been articulated in your opinions and have been chronicled so carefully here tonight.

Thus, this first edition of John Marshall's work is presented to you with friendship, love, affection, and gratitude from your chambers, and out of an anticipation of things to come.

The Law And Tennis Or A Different Approach To The Courts

It all happened on Friday evening, October 14, 1983. The occasion was the Quinquennial Reunion gathering of several classes of our Law School, some of which chose to hold social functions on Friday rather than Saturday evening.

Our illustrious Dean, Robert H. Mundheim and his adorable wife, Guna, after visiting a few reunion gatherings, arrived at our home in center city where my dear wife, Alma, and I played hosts to members of the Law Class of 1938 and their spouses. The air was filled with excitement—45 years of reminiscing—those who had retired, those who had donned judicial robes, those who were involved in pursuits other than the law, those who were active as ever in practice and, sadly, the memory of those who were no longer among the living.

I was riding high when Dean Mundheim cornered me with this query: "How would you like to be my partner tomorrow afternoon at the Levy Tennis Pavilion in a tennis doubles challenge from members of the Law Class of 1953?" My immediate response was affirmative. How could those thirty year Alumni have the temerity to think that they could defeat the combination of Mundheim and Cohen? I did not sleep well that night. The law of averages
demonstrated that the 1953 challengers were at least six years younger than the Mundheim-Cohen team. Would we be able to withstand the onslaught of these younger athletes who expressed confidence in advance over ultimate victory?

I attended the fascinating Saturday morning sessions at the Law School, the first—a mini-course on the Insanity Defense. I was almost alone in challenging the report of the committee on which Professor Lonsdorf served. If I lost this battle, I was determined not to lose the afternoon tennis match. Then came an inspiring discussion on the Bok report. There kept running through my mind the relative importance of the Bok report and the afternoon sporting event.

After lunch, Dean Mundheim and I made a bee-line for the Levy Tennis Pavilion on campus. My wife sat in the balcony to make certain there were no bad calls by our opponents. The Dean and I exchanged pep talks in the locker room. We proceeded to court #3 and identified our opponents as Bill Mikell and Al Feldman, the formidable Class of 1953 representatives.

We warmed up. By this time, at least 300 spectators jammed the balcony. They were obviously members of the Class of 1953, their families and friends. In the course of warming up, I whispered to Dean Mundheim: “These fellows are no amateurs; they hit the ball well.” The match was tight for the first few games. Despite the fine calibre of play of the 1953 team, Mundheim and Cohen shattered them with a 6-2 victory.

We thought it was all over when Ed Robinson (otherwise known as Captain Robinson, U.S. Naval Reserve) accosted us with a challenge by himself and Lee Nutt. The first set was won rather handily by the “older” folks (6-1). The Class of ’53 insisted on a second set. The result was devastating—Mundheim and Cohen by a score of 6-0. Silence reigned on the balcony except for some boos to our team.

As we walked off the court displaying signs of victory while heading toward the locker room, Captain Robinson blocked our way. “Wait a minute!” shouted Ed, “It is not over. We have inducted Don Ringgold into the Class of 1953 as an honorary member.” How could they have done this? What had happened to the ethical and moral principles of the Class of 1953? Despite our protestations, we were hooked. Now 500 friends of the Class of 1953 gathered on the observation balcony. They were screaming and beaming with expectant delight. Don Ringgold is a former Penn State tennis star, a professional at the Levy Tennis Pavilion and elsewhere. He covers the court like a gazelle and has a shattering serve. He strokes the ball with perfection. His partner was Lou Levy of the Class of 1953, a tiger at the net.

The match started. The Dean and I exchanged worried looks. We dug in—it was do—or—die. The thundering enthusiasm of the gallery gradually melted into a sea of silence. Mundheim and Cohen won by a score of 6-3. We had mixed emotions—elated over the victory, but truly sorry for the disappointed “kids” of the Class of 1953.

I suppose there are several lessons to be learned from this experience. First, as good lawyers, study your opponents’ moves carefully before you take them on. Secondly, respect experience, especially when it is accompanied by expertise. Finally, fight hard, but play the game straight.

A final observation. One would think that appropriate prizes would have been awarded the winning team. The rubbing liniment, gift wrapped and formally presented at the Class of 1953 Reunion party on Saturday evening, was all very well. We are, however, anxiously awaiting our silver trophy!
The Faculty

Professor Martin J. Aronstein organized and chaired a program on Revised Article 8 of the UCC, presented at the ABA Annual Meeting in August, 1983. Professor Aronstein was the Reporter for the ABA Committee on Stock Certificates, which proposed broadening the UCC to cover uncertificated securities. He was the principal draftsman of the 1977 Amendments to the UCC, which have been adopted by at least eight states, including Delaware, New York and Texas, and are under consideration in a number of other jurisdictions.

Professor Paul Bender was the guest speaker at the Washington, D.C. area Alumni luncheon in October, 1983. He discussed the two-year old Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms with which he became involved during its drafting stages. Professor Bender also delivered the first of the Law Alumni Society's 1983-84 Luncheon and Lecture Series in November, on "The Thornfare Case: The Equal Protection Challenge to the Pennsylvania Welfare Reform Act." At the close of Mr. Bender's presentation, Jonathan M. Stein, '67, the Executive Director of Community Legal Services of Philadelphia, awarded Bender with a lithograph entitled "Justice For All" by Philadelphia artist Sam Maitin. The print was commissioned by CLS expressly "to be given to friends like Paul as an expression of our gratitude. He has been helping us over the years in many ways that have not been publicized. Paul has given us a good deal of time organizing moot court arguments and offering consultations with briefs, etc. This very unique and much appreciated help has proven invaluable to us."

Associate Professor and Associate Dean Stephen B. Burbank conducted a mini-class on the Federal Rules of Evidence during the Law School's Quinquennial Reunion Weekend in October, 1983. Also in October, he made remarks at the Law Alumni Society's annual reception of Central and Northern New England Regional Alumni in Boston, honoring Chief Justice Thomas R. Morse, Jr., '51, of the Massachusetts Superior Court. In November, Professor Burbank made a presentation on the Biddle Law Library at the "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" program and was the guest speaker at the joint Penn-Cornell luncheon in Rochester, New York. He chaired a program entitled "Dispute Resolution: Alternatives in the Courts" at the annual meeting of the American Association of Law Schools. Professor Burbank's article, "The Federal Judicial Discipline Act: Is Decentralized Self-Regulation Working?", appears in the October, 1983 issue of Judicature. At the Annual Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit held in Williamsburg, Virginia in October, Professor Burbank spoke on "Recent Developments in the Federal Rules of Evidence."

Ronald Day has succeeded Nancy Arnold as the Biddle Law Library's Reference Librarian. Mr. Day was Biddle's Documents Librarian for seven years prior to his new appointment.

Clinical Director Douglas N. Frenkel addressed the Family Law Section of the Philadelphia Bar Association at the annual Bench-Bar Conference in September 1983 on the topic, "Principles of Negotiation." He participated in a panel discussion on "Private Bar Delivery of Legal Services to the Poor—Ethical Problems" at the National Legal Aid and Defender Association's annual convention in Philadelphia, also in September.

Professor George E. Haskins has been invited to represent the University of Pennsylvania and to deliver an address at the Sixth International Congress on Land Registration in Spain, at Madrid, in 1984. His subject will be the Recording of Deeds Under Typical American Statutes. Mr. Haskins has published articles on that subject and on title search, and he is presently serving on a Committee of the Maine Bar Association relating to Title Standards in real estate transactions.

Professor John O. Honnold, the William A. Schnader Professor of Commercial Law, addressed the United Nations Convention on "Contracts for the International Sale of Goods" in October, 1983 on the topic "Risk of Loss." The Convention was planned and sponsored by the Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law, in cooperation with the American Association for the Comparative Study of Law, Inc., the Columbia University School of Law, and the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Assistant Professor Seth F. Kreimer commented on Third Circuit Court decisions in the area of "Federal Practice and Procedure" at the Annual Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit held in Williamsburg, Virginia in October.

Professor A. Leo Levin, Director of the Federal Judicial Center, delivered the keynote address at the 53rd Annual Judicial Conference of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in June, 1983. Pertinent to the Conference's theme, Professor Levin pointed out that "from 1972 to 1982, the cost for legal services in the United States had increased at an average rate of 48.8% per year." Mr. Levin lectured on "Contempt" as part of the District Court Workshops for the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits which were held jointly in November, 1983. Professor Levin has been named the hearing Officer for the court-ordered rehearing of the Alpha Tau Omega Case now in progress at the University of Pennsylvania.

Professor Richard G. Lonsdorf, M.D. conducted Grand Rounds at the Medical College of Pennsylvania in August, 1983. In September, Dr. Lonsdorf lectured the staff of the
Chester-Crozier Hospital on "Informed Consent and the Right to Refuse Treatment;" and addressed the National Association of Mental Health at their meeting in Chicago on "The Insanity Defense." In October, he participated in a conference sponsored by the Pennsylvania Association on Probation, Parole and Correction on Mental Health Issues in Corrections and addressed the topic "The Perplexities of Psychiatry." Also in October, Dr. Lonsdorf presented a mini-course on "The Insanity Defense" at the Law School's annual Quinquennial Reunion Weekend. On November 9, 1983, as Chair of the Law School's Faculty Admissions committee, he discussed Financial Aid and Admissions as part of the "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" program.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim was named the University of Toronto's Jack Kimber Fellow for 1983. As part of this designation, he delivered a public lecture on "The Board of Directors of the Business Corporation." In addition, he addressed the Toronto Stock Exchange and the Ontario Securities Commission. He also participated in classroom discussions on Securities Regulation at Osgoode Hall Law School.

Mr. Mundheim chaired a panel which examined the issues of duty of care and duty of loyalty in the context of hostile tender offers at the American Bar Association's National Institute on the Dynamics of Corporate Control in New York, December, 1983.

Dean Mundheim was the co-chairman and co-organizer of the International Faculty's Conference on International Debt Problems, held in October, 1983, at Arrowood, New York, the new conference center of Citibank. The conference brought together 35 persons from around the world to discuss the pressing problems of our time. Included among the participants were Hans Angermueller, Vice-Chairman, Citibank; W. P. Cooke, Director of Banking Supervision, Bank of England; Robert R. Douglass, Executive Vice-President, Chase Manhattan Bank; Frederick Heldring, Deputy Chairman, Philadelphia National Bank; Dr. Wolfgang Jahn, Member of the Managing Board of Commerzbank, Dusseldorf; Dr. Manfred Meier-Preschany, Member of the Managing Board, Dresdner Bank, Frankfurt; Eugene Rotberg, '54, Vice-President and Treasurer, The World Bank; Anthony M. Solomon, President, Federal Reserve Bank of New York; and Dr. Ulrich Weiss, Member of the Managing Board of Deutsche Bank, Frankfurt.

Also under the auspices of the International Faculty for Comparative and Capital Market Law, Dean Mundheim will participate in an international symposium to be held in Geneva this March. The symposium will discuss the Swiss Draft Bill on Insider Trading, comparing it with foreign legislation and experiences.

Donald G. Myers, the Law School's Director of Development, is an executive committee member of the proposed Section on Institutional Advancement of the Association of American Law Schools.

Professor Stephen Schulhofer has completed work on three articles. His empirical study, "Is Plea Bargaining Inevitable?" will be published in the March 1984 issue of the Harvard Law Review; his paper on "The Economic Theory of Crime" will be published in the 1984 volume of NOMOS, the Journal of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy; and his article on "Federalism in American Criminal Procedure" will appear as a chapter in a volume entitled European Legal Integration in Light of the American Federal Experience, to be published by the European University Institute of Florence.

In October, 1983, Professor Schulhofer spoke on "New Directions in Criminal Justice Research" at the AALS Criminal Justice Workshop in Chicago. He will spend three weeks this spring at the Max Planck Institute in Freiburg, Germany, participating in a conference on comparative criminal law theory.

Professor Richard Sloane, the Librarian of the Biddle Law Library, will be retiring at the end of the 1983-84 academic year to complete work on the medical-legal dictionary which he is writing.

Associate Professor Ralph R. Smith was recognized by Philadelphia School Superintendent Constance E. Clayton as "the person most responsible for drafting the voluntary public school desegregation plan" which had been accepted by the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission after 12 years of litigation and controversy. Professor Smith, in affiliation with the Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia, worked as special counsel to the Congressional Black Caucus and acted as special counsel and legal consultant to the Philadelphia School Board.

Professor Ralph S. Spritzer discussed "Significant Developments in Constitutional Law as Reflected in Supreme Court Decisions of the 1982 Term" at the Annual Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit held in Williamsburg, Virginia in October, 1983.

Marta Tarnawsky, Assistant Librarian for Foreign and International Law at the Biddle Law Library, is the author of an annotated bibliography "German Books on American Law" published in the June-August 1983 issue of the International Journal of Legal Information. This 30-page bibliography is a continuation of two previously published installments on the same subject. Mrs. Tarnawsky continues her work on this project, hoping to have it published eventually as a book.

Professor Alan Watson delivered a lecture at the invitation of the government of Andorra in July, 1983, on "The Law of Andorra" to the members of that government and to the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates. In October, 1983, Mr. Watson gave the concluding address at celebrations marking the centenary of Dalhousie Law School, Canada's oldest common law school. He spoke on "The Future of Common Law." Professor Watson's book, Sources of Law: Legal Change and Ambiguity, has been accepted for publication by the University of Pennsylvania Press. This year, that same Press will publish four volumes of the translation of Justinian's Digest for which Mr. Watson was the General Editor.
'08 Leon J. Obermayer, of the Philadelphia firm of Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell and Hippel, was honored by the Philadelphia Bar Association as the "first and only member" of their Diamond Jubilee Club.

'25 The Honorable Louis A. Bloom, Senior Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Delaware County, Pennsylvania was re-elected President of the Advisory Board of Penn State's Delaware County campus. Judge Bloom began his 17th year as its President.

'27 Albert Bair Melnik is a semi-retired member of the Haddonfield, New Jersey firm of Melnik, Morgan & Klein.

'28 Nathan L. Edelstein, his son Edward L., '55 and his grandson Jay L., '79, comprise the only three generation family of lawyers in Philadelphia in active practice at the same time and associated with the same firm: Margolis, Edelstein, Scherlis, Sarowitz & Kraemer, 1315 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

'29 The Honorable Kendall H. Shoyer was the presiding jurist in the "Will Contest and Mock Trial," which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

'32 The Honorable Morris Gerber and his wife, Frances, of Norristown, Pennsylvania, celebrated their 50th Wedding Anniversary on October 15, 1983 at a luncheon hosted by their children and grandchildren at the Philmont Country Club.

'33 David H. Rosenbluth has been counsel to the Philadelphia firm of Stradley, Ronon, Stevens & Young since January, 1981.

'35 Maurice S. Williams has become counsel to the firm of Able & Coleman, P.C., 4350 First City Tower, Houston, Texas, 77002. During his career, he has worked in the pipeline construction business as well as a business consultant.

'37 Edward I. Cutler, of Tampa, Florida, is president-elect (1983-1984) of the American College of Real Estate Lawyers, and is Chairman, of the National Conference of Commissioners on the Uniform State Laws Drafting Committee on the Uniform Personal Property Leasing Act. He has completed seven years, the last three as chairman, on the ABA's Committee on Federal Judicial Improvement. Mr. Cutler is now a member of the ABA's Bankruptcy Task Force and Committee on Legal Aid and Public Defenders.

Morton S. Freeman of Bala-Cynwyd, PA, retired in August, 1983 as Director of Publications of the American Law Institute-American Bar Association (ALI-ABA). He has written several books: The Grammatical Lawyer, a national award-winning book on word usage, grammar, punctuation and related matters and A Treasury for Word Lovers, published by ISI Press, Philadelphia. The book has been widely-received and is an alternate selection of the Book-of-The-Month Club and the Quality Paperback Book Club. The foreword was written by Edwin Newman.

Lester E. Kabacoff was named one of the top ten business leaders and entrepreneurs in New Orleans, Louisiana by CITIBUSINESS. He was honored during a luncheon co-hosted by CITIBUSINESS and the Sales-Marketing Executives Association of New Orleans.

The Honorable Harry A. Takiff of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, was appointed to the position of Court Administrator by President Judge Edward J. Bradley, '53. Judge Takiff has served on the Common Pleas Court Bench for 10 years.

'38 Irving R. Segal has been appointed Chairman of the American College of Trial Lawyers' Committee on Award for Courageous Advocacy. He has also been appointed to his fifth year as a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Federal Judicial Improvements. Mr. Segal's firm, Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, has relocated to Suite 3600, 1900 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19103.
'39 Leon S. Forman, of Philadelphia, was presented the Award of Special Merit at the meetings of the American Bar Association in July, 1983.

'41 The Honorable Paul M. Chalfin, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, participated in the seminar entitled "Medical Witness Committee and Status of New Inter-professional Code" during the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September, 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Michael C. Rainone, of Philadelphia, is serving his second term as Assistant Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Philadelphia Bar Association for 1984. He is also that Board’s Parliamentarian as well as Chairman of the 1984 Philadelphia Bar Association Bench-Bar Conference. Mr. Rainone is president of the Lawyers’ Club of Philadelphia and is a member of the Judicial Selection Commission. He recently was listed in Marquis’ Who’s Who in American Law and serves as a Trustee on the Board of Directors for the Community College of Philadelphia.

'43 Bernard M. Borish of the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, chaired the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Appellate Courts Committee’s luncheon in October, 1983.

'45 Jane Mahady McIntyre of Silver Spring, Maryland, retired from the practice of law having served as Assistant Chief Counsel for Litigation and Policy Programs at the USA Office of Chief of Engineers.

'47 Robert M. Landis, Chairman of the Philadelphia firm of Dechert, Price & Rhoads, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the American Judicature Society. He was Chairman of the Governor’s Board of Ethics from 1973 to 1978, is a past Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, is a past President of the Pennsylvania Bar Association and the National Conference of Bar Presidents and has served on the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. He is also Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

'48 John M. Bader organized the Class of 1948's 35th reunion in Wilmington, Delaware which was held one weekend in November, 1983.

Harry M. Grace, has been counsel to the firm Harter, Secrest & Emery, 700 Midtown Tower, Rochester, NY, 14604 since July 1983.


Edward W. Jones II of Dallas, PA, has become counsel to the firm of Griffith, Aponick & Musto located at 39 Public Square, Wilkes-Barre, PA, 18701. He was previously Vice President in the Trust Division of the United Penn Bank in Wilkes-Barre, PA.

Jay H. Rosenfeld is counsel to the firm of Parker & Rutstein, North American Building, 121 South Broad Street, 20th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

'51 Arthur R. Littleton was a guest speaker in the seminar "Ethical Considerations When Employing a Paralegal," which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

The Honorable Thomas R. Morse Jr., was named Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts by the Supreme Judicial Court in July 1983. Chief Justice Morse was an Associate Justice of that court for ten years prior to his elevation. In October, Chief Justice Morse received the University of Pennsylvania Law School Alumni Society’s Award of Merit at the Central and Northern New England Alumni Reception on October 27, 1983 at Michael's Waterfront in Boston, MA.

'52 The Honorable Paul Ribner of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, presided at a mock trial "The Verdict is Yours," in October, 1983. Sponsored by the Philadelphia Bar Association, the trial was designed to bring the justice system to the community.

'53 Lee F. Driscoll, Jr. of Philadelphia joined the firm of Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll on January 1, 1984. He was formerly General Counsel and Chairman of ARA Services, Inc.
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Donald R. McKay of Sharon, Pennsylvania, is trial counsel to Cusick, Madden Joyce & McKay, and Counsel and Director of McDowell National Bank. A fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers, he is also a Director of Union National Corporation, the Bank holding company of Pittsburgh, PA.


The Honorable David N. Savitt of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas has recently published Pennsylvania Grand Jury Practice, a manual which is being received by the Bench and the Bar as the definitive word on grand jury practice and procedure in Pennsylvania. Judge Savitt was the Supervising Judge of the first two grand juries convened under the Investigating Grand Jury Act of 1978. The Judge is a former Pennsylvania state legislator.

Gertrude Strick of Rydal, PA has written a play entitled "As Dawn is to Birds," to open this spring in New York City at the Theater for the New City and in Washington, DC at the Source Theater.

'54 Judge Berel Caesar, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas received a Certificate of Completion for Decision-Making: Process, Skills & Techniques-Graduate session held in June 1983 at the National Judicial College on the campus of the University of Nevada-Reno. Judge Caesar was elected a Zone Representative to the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges.

S. Gerald Litvin of Philadelphia, contributed to the seminar "Video-tapes for Evidentiary Use at Trial" during the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

The Honorable Albert R. Subers was elected to the Bench of the Court of Common Pleas of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania for a ten year Term beginning January 1984.

'55 Samuel Diamond, of Philadelphia, participated in the seminar "Client Confidentiality: An Evolving Concept," which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held September 1983. Mr. Diamond teaches at the University of Pennsylvania Law School's innovative clinical course "Counseling Small Businesses"—a program unique in the nation.

Alvin L. Snowiss of the Lock Haven, Pennsylvania firm of Snowiss, Steinberg and Faulkner, has been elected Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Trustees of Lock Haven Hospital, having completed six years as chairman of that hospital's board of trustees. He is also a member of the Board of Governors of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

'56 Donald K. Bobb of Reading, Pennsylvania, was elected President of the Berks County Bar Association for 1984.

Seymour Kanter is Chairman of the Fee Disputes Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association and was that Committee's Vice-Chairman during 1983.

Charles E. Mather III of Philadelphia is Chairman of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts.

The Honorable Edward S. Pawelec of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas was a presiding jurist in the "Will Contest and Mock Trial" that was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

'57 Henry A. Clay of Detroit Michigan is the administrative partner at Dykena, Gossett, Spencer, Goodnow & Trigg, Michigan's largest law firm.

Richard S. Cohen, is a managing partner at Greenstein, Gorelick, Price, Silverman & Laveson, the new location at Two Penn Center, Philadelphia, PA.

Edward M. Medvene of Los Angeles, California, is litigation partner for Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp, 11377 West Olympic Boulevard, 7th. Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90064.
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Michael L. Temin of Philadelphia was the moderator for the seminar "The Impact of Bankruptcy on Civil Litigation and Business Decision Making," which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

The Honorable Ronald P. Wertheim, of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, completed the course for general jurisdiction judges at the National Judicial College in Reno, Nevada. Judge Wertheim was appointed by President Carter to the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board in 1979 and by President Reagan to the D.C. Superior Court in 1982.

'58 Marcia L. Alexander, M.D. has opened an office for the practice of Psychiatry at 450 Warwick Drive, Wyomissing Hills, PA 19610.

The Honorable Richard E. Brandow is President Judge of the Forty-Eighth Judicial District, of McKean County, Pennsylvania.

Stanley Frank is a partner in his new firm Frank, Roseman, Freedus & Mann, Wells Fargo Building, 101 West Broadway, Suite 1100, San Diego, California 92101.

James A. Loughran practices with the American firm of Kilpatrick & Cody, Bouverie House, 154 Fleet Street, London, EC4A 2DQ.

Lieutenant Colonel James A. Mounts, Jr. is a Senior Judge in the United States Army Court of Military Review.

The Honorable Carolyn Engel Temin was elected to the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County in November 1983.

'59 Robert P. Oberly of the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, was elected a Fellow of the American College of Probate Counsel.

Jack A. Rounick, of the Norris-town, PA firm of Pechner, Dorfman, Wolfe, Rounick and Cabot, was appointed to the Supreme Court Domestic Relations Committee. He is also the proprietor of Hallowell Art Gallery in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.

Peter Solmssen, the former United States Deputy Ambassador-at-large for Cultural Affairs and President of Arts International, became President of the Philadelphia College of Art in August, 1983.

Thomas L. Stapleton, of New York City, has been appointed vice-president and tax director of Metropolitan Insurance Company, serving as senior tax officer of the company and as head of a newly established tax department. Prior to joining Metropolitan in 1973, Mr. Stapleton was Assistant Chief of the Appellate Section, Tax Division, of the U.S. Department of Justice.

'60 David S. Shrager of the Philadelphia firm of Shrager, McDavid & Loftus, was installed as the Association of Trial Lawyers of America's 38th president during ATLA's Annual Convention in July. Mr. Shrager addressed attorneys from around the country during the ATLA sponsored "Proof of Damages" seminar in Boston, November 11-12, 1983, discussing "Establishing a Damages Theory for Your Case" and hosting the President's Luncheon. Mr. Shrager's article on "The Right to Trial by Jury Being Unnecessarily Attacked" appeared in the September 1983 issue of Trial, ATLAs national legal magazine. Mr. Shrager lectured on "Jury Selection and Voir Dire," the "Opening Statement," and demonstrated the opening statement in November 1983 at a six-day Basic Course in Trial Advocacy at National College of Advocacy in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

'61 Paul R. Anapol is senior partner in the firm of Anapol, Schwartz, Weiss & Schwartz P.C., 1900 Delancey Place, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

The Honorable Arthur J. England Jr., of the Miami, Florida firm of Steel, Hector & Davis, has been elected President of the Florida Bar Foundation.

Irwin H. Haut of New York City has published Divorce In Jewish Law and Life, published by Sepher-Heron Press, Inc. Rabbi Haut is also the author of The Talmud as Law or Literature and numerous articles which have appeared in The New York Law Journal, the Israel Law Review and Tradition.

Peter Hearn of the Philadelphia firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz, moderated the first Joint Session of the 46th Annual Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit of the United States in October 1983.

The Honorable Charles K. Keil was appointed Judge of the Family Court of the State of Delaware by Governor Pierre S. duPont, IV and was confirmed by the State Senate for a twelve-year Term. For the past twenty years, he has been a member and director in the law firm of Bayard, Brill & Handelman, P.A., Wilmington, DE.

The Honorable Jack K. Mandel, the Presiding Judge in Family Law for the Superior Court of Orange County, was appointed to the Faculty of the 1983 California Judicial College. The Judge also serves as a lecturer in family law for the California Continuing Education of the Bar.
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Robert A. Rosin of Philadelphia was a co-coordinator for the ten-session Continuing Professional Education Course entitled “Psychiatry and the Law” held at the Philadelphia Bar Association Headquarters, 1339 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA.

'62 George R. Beck was promoted to the position of senior patent attorney for the Nutrition Chemicals Division of Monsanto Company, Saint Louis, Missouri.

Richard R. Block, of the Philadelphia and New Jersey firm of Beitch and Block, is Chairman of the Family Law Section Arbitration Committee of the Philadelphia Bar Association. Mr. Block has crafted a Model Arbitration Program, which is the first in the nation, offering to the public the benefits of an alternative method of dispute resolution without requiring that the parties give up the protection of private legal counsel. In support of the program, Block has embarked upon a speaking tour pointing out the risks of divorce mediation and the advantages of divorce arbitration. Mr. Block also participated as counsel in “Negotiation Sessions With and Without Clients,” which was part of the 25th Annual Philadelphia Bench-Bar Conference held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, NJ.

E. Barclay Cale Jr., President of the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society for 1983-84, was elected to a fourth term as General Counsel to the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Cale’s firm, Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, has relocated after 55 years to One Logan Square, Philadelphia.

Kenneth M. Cushman, a partner in the Philadelphia law firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, was elected National Chairman of the Construction Committee of the Litigation Section of the American Bar Association at the ABA’s Annual Meeting in Atlanta in August, 1983.

Joel Paul Fishbein of Philadelphia participated in the seminar “Individual Judge Calendar Program: What is it? How does it work? Here are the Rules” which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference of the Philadelphia Bar Association held in September, 1983 in Atlantic City, NJ. Mr. Fishbein was also a course planner for the seminar “The Anatomy of Voir Dire-Civil Trial”.

Bernard R. Gerber, a senior partner in the Reading, Pennsylvania firm of Gerber & Linton, P.C., has been appointed to the National Hearing Committee relative to charges and protests for the American Horse Shows Association. The administrative hearing body decides charges against amateur and professional horsemen relative to violation of the rules of the American Horse Shows Association, particularly involving the use of drugs at recognized horse shows.

John E. Gillmor of Nashville, Tennessee has been named executive vice-president and general counsel of HealthAmerica Corporation, one of the nation’s largest investor-owned HMO managerial companies. Mr. Gillmor is responsible for all legal and personnel matters.

Andrew W. Hiller, Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Queensland Law School, St. Lucia, Queensland, Australia, has written a book entitled Public Order and the Law, published by Methuen L.B.C. Ltd. The book, soon to be released in North America, is selling in England, New Zealand and Australia to universities, police departments, government departments and agencies, practicing lawyers and corporations. The writing of the book was inspired by Professor Louis B. Schwartz’s U.S. Law Enforcement Handbook, The Police and Criminal Justice System.

Leigh S. Ratiner of the Washington, D.C., firm of Dickstein, Shapiro and Morin, was mentioned extensively in a two-part article entitled “The Law of the Sea” in the July and August, 1983 issues of New Yorker Magazine. The articles relate to Mr. Ratiner’s work as Chief Advisor to Assistant Secretary of State James L. Malone.

Arnold Zenker has published the book, Mastering the Public Spotlight, Dodd, Mead and Company, New York. His firm, Arnold Zenker Associates, Inc., 101 Tremont Street, Boston, MA 02108, teaches public communication and media skills to executives and professionals. Mr. Zenker has been featured in articles in Forbes Magazine, Newsweek, Patient Care and on the television show, 60 Minutes.
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'63 Steven A. Arbittier of Philadelphia was a guest speaker in the seminar “Individual Judge Calendar Program: What is it? How does it work? Here are the Rules.”, which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference of the Philadelphia Bar Association, held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, NJ.

Robert P. Browning is in practice at Price & Rhodes, Suite 300, 220 Penn Avenue, Scranton, PA 18503.

Michael A. Grean of Rye, New York married Maureen Ronai on October 5, 1983. A. Richard Caputo '63, Mr. Grean's classmate, was best man at the wedding.

Gerald M. Levin, Group Vice-President-Video of Time Inc., has become a member of that company's board of directors. Mr. Levin joined Time, Inc. in 1972 as a Vice-President of Home Box Office and became President and Chairman of HBO prior to his present position. Mr. Levin is a director of Little, Brown and Co., a member of the board of The National Council for Children and Television, a Trustee for Hampshire College, a member of the University of Texas at Austin Advisory Council for the College of Communications and a director of the International Radio and Television Society. Mr. Levin was the subject of a New York Times Sunday Magazine article entitled “HBO Moves to Hollywood,” June 12, 1983.

The Honorable Faith Ryan Whittlesey, the White House Director of Public Liaison, was Master of Ceremonies at the 200th Anniversary of the Treaty of Paris Celebration at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in September, 1983.

'64 Peter F. Axelrad, of the Baltimore, Maryland firm of Frank, Bernstein, Conaway & Goldman, is a member of the Litigation Section Council of the Maryland State Bar Association as well as a member of the Judicial Selection Commission Trial Courts Nominating Committee, Eighth Circuit, Baltimore City.

The Honorable L. Anthony Gibson of the Superior Court of New Jersey, assigned to the Chancery Division (General Equity), was appointed by the Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court as one of three judges authorized to hear all exclusionary zoning challenges under Mt. Laurel II.

J. Gordon Hansen of Salt Lake City, Utah, is a member of the firm of Hansen, Jones, Maycock & Leta, 12th Floor, Valley Tower Building, 50 West Broadway, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101, specializing in business law, and particularly in federal income tax, securities, real estate and bankruptcy reorganization.

Melvyn B. Ruskin, a senior partner in the firm Ruskin, Schlissel, Moscou & Evans, P.C., has relocated his main office to 170 Old Country Road, Mineola, New York, 11501, but continues to maintain his Manhattan office at 950 Third Avenue. The firm practice includes general corporate, commercial, real estate and litigation with special areas of practice in matrimonial, criminal, environmental, health and computer law.

James A. Strazzella, Professor of Law at Temple University, Philadelphia, received the 1983 Christian R. and Mary P. Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching.

'65 Malcolm M. Blumberg, has opened offices at Suite 1229, Public Ledger Building, Philadelphia, PA 19106.

Gordon H. Buck of Farmington, Connecticut has published a new book, The Real Estate Brokers' Common Interest Community Handbook. He has been inducted into the American College of Real Estate Lawyers, and has organized and presented several panels on condominium topics for the American Bar Association, the Connecticut Bar Association and the Community Associations Institute.

Lita Indzel Cohen is President of Orange Productions, Inc., Narberth, PA., syndicators of packaged radio programs and other short-form radio specials, including the only radio program endorsed by Frank Sinatra, Sounds of Sinatra, hosted and produced by Sid Mark. The show is presently heard in more than 25 cities throughout the United States.

Stephen M. Goodman is now a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, in their Corporate Department.

Richard Gordiner is a founding partner of the CPA firm Rivero, Roberts & Gordiner, Tampa, Florida.

Sheldon N. Sandler, a partner in the Wilmington, Delaware firm of Young, Conaway, Stargatt and Taylor, was appointed Chairman of the Third Circuit Lawyers' Advisory Committee.

Harvey N. Shapiro and Henry A. Stein, partners in the Philadelphia firm of Mesirov, Gelman, Jaffe, Cramer & Jamieson, have formed an affiliate firm, Stein & Shapiro, 900 Kings Highway North, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034. Mr. Stein and Mr. Shapiro maintain offices in both Philadelphia and Cherry Hill.

'66 Marvin S. Goldklang has become Senior Executive Vice-President of Integrated Resources, Inc., New York, a public company engaged in the financial services business. He will continue as counsel to the New York firm of Cahill, Gordon and Reindel.
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Edward F. Mannino of the Philadelphia firm of Dilworth, Paxson, Kalish, Levy & Kaufman, is Chair of the Advisory Board of the University of Pennsylvania History Department. He is also a member of the Advisory Committee of the University of Pennsylvania Law School Continuing Legal Education Programs; a lecturer and course planner for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute Program in 1983 on Emerging Areas of Litigation Affecting Banks and Financial Institutions; and a Lecturer and Course Planner for the 1983 ABA Federal Appellate Practice Program. Mr. Mannino has authored "Defending Antitrust Class Actions" 3 The Review of Litigation 365 (1983) and "Effective Appellate Argument," 7 ABA Course Materials Journal (No. 5, p. 7) (April 1983).

Robert I. Toll of Horsham, PA, was named "Manager of the Year" by Forbes Magazine. His company, Toll Brothers, Inc., a construction company, was highlighted in Forbes' April 11, 1983 issue. Mr. Toll is a member of the Board of Directors of Colonial Bank and of the Beth Shalom Synagogue, Elkins Park, PA.

'67 Charles P. Reilly of Los Angeles, California, has been appointed to the Board of Directors of American Medical International, Incorporated. He is that company's executive vice-president and director of corporate development.

Paul E. Shapiro, the managing partner of the West Palm Beach office of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, was appointed Chair of the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Legal Assistants, overseeing the accreditation of schools that offer paralegal training.

Jonathan Stein became Executive Director of Community Legal Service in Philadelphia in May, 1983.

'The Honorable William J. Manfredi has been appointed Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Thomas D. Henderer is head of the Legal Division in the Trust Department of the Wilmington Trust Company, Wilmington, DE.

Frank A. Orban III, of Lancaster, PA, Senior Attorney/International Counsel of Armstrong World Industries, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the American Lung Association of Lancaster County.

Mark G. Yudof, Professor and former Associate Dean at the University of Texas, was elected to membership in the American Law Institute. Professor Yudof received the Scribes Book Award from the American Society of Writers on Legal Subjects for the "Outstanding Law Book of 1983" for his book, When Government Speaks. Professor Yudoff was appointed to the James A. Elkins Centennial Chair at the University of Texas Law School and has assumed the duties of Deputy Dean of that School.

'69 Henry Y. Goldman is a member of the new firm Goldman and Kippel, 262 South Sixteenth Street, Suite 200, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

Jeffrey A. Less and Richard L. Bazelon, '68, have formed the new firm of Bazelon, Less & Price, with offices at Two Penn Center Plaza, 17th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102, concentrating on commercial litigation and management-labor relations.

Robert I. Toll of Horsham, PA, was named "Manager of the Year" by Forbes Magazine. His company, Toll Brothers, Inc., a construction company, was highlighted in Forbes' April 11, 1983 issue. Mr. Toll is a member of the Board of Directors of Colonial Bank and of the Beth Shalom Synagogue, Elkins Park, PA.

'71 Stewart A. Block is a partner at Sidley & Austin, 1722 Eye Street NW, Washington, DC 20006. He and his wife, Sondra, are the proud parents of Joshua and a newborn daughter, Emily.


Steven R. Waxman, of the Philadelphia firm of Bolger & Picker, is Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Philadelphia Bar Association for the year 1984.

'72 The Honorable Tama Myers-Clark was elected to a ten-year term as Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas in November, 1983.
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Martin I. Darvick has become senior counsel at General Motors Corporation, New York City, specializing in corporate finance and securities.

John E. DeWald of Philadelphia and West Chester, PA, has been appointed to the Council of President's Associates, LaSalle College. He is chairperson of the Effective Signage Program, a diversified community group inspired by the Art Directors Club, which works to improve the aesthetics and accuracy of directional and informational signs in the Philadelphia area. Active in Philadelphia Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts, Mr. Dewald is technical legal advisor for the day-time serial "One Life to Live." He co-chaired the 1983 Philadelphia Lawyers Art Exhibit.

Peter F. Marvin is managing partner in the Philadelphia firm of Miller, Schreiber & Sloan, 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102.

David L. Millstein of Fort Lee, NJ, has been named tax partner-in-charge in the Newark office of Coopers & Lybrand, the leading accounting and consulting firm.

David M. Narrow of Washington, D.C., has been senior staff attorney in the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Competition, working in the area of antitrust and health care. He and his wife, Carol, are the parents of a daughter, Rachael Elizabeth.

'73 J. St. Girard Jordan is General Counsel, AHP (Animal Health Products Group of Companies), at SmithKline Beckman Corporation, Philadelphia.

Cole H. Oran, established an accounting firm in New York City in July, 1983 concentrating on taxation.

Jon M. Waxman has formed a partnership for the general practice of law, including entertainment law under the firm name Baumgarten, Swiedler & Waxman, 291 Broadway, New York, NY 10007.

John Michael Willmann, of Philadelphia, is Television News Producer at KYW-TV 3.

'74 Dr. Janice R. Bellace, Assistant Professor of Legal Studies at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, recently authored "A Right of Fair Dismissal: Enforcing a Statutory Guarantee," which appeared in the winter issue of the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform. In July, 1983, she visited England on a British Council grant to study employment protection legislation in preparation for an article on job security which she is writing for the Stanford Journal of International Law.

George L. Burrell, Jr., the former Deputy Mayor of Philadelphia, was the featured speaker at the opening of the nonprofit Political Participation Center in the Houston Hall Mall, the University of Pennsylvania. The Center serves as a clearinghouse for information on political candidates, issues and activities.

Elliot J. Hahn, Associate Professor of Law at California Western in San Diego, lectured in Japan, Hong Kong & South Korea this past summer. His book entitled Japanese Business Law and Legal System will be published in early 1984 by Greenwood Press.

Marilyn Z. Kutler was appointed Philadelphia's City Solicitor by Mayor William Green until he left office in January, 1984. Ms. Kutler was the first woman to serve in the City cabinet since it was created in 1951.

'75 Robert W. Freedman of Philadelphia was married to Karen B. Adelman on July 31, 1983.

Howard E. Mitchell Jr., of Princeton, New Jersey, has been appointed Corporate Secretary and Legal Counsel for City Federal Savings and Loan Association. He will provide in-house legal counsel to the Association as well as being responsible for matters relating to corporate insurance banking and securities regulations and filing and employment law.


The Honorable Frederica Massiah-Jackson was sworn in as a Judge of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas on January 9, 1984.

Joseph F. Roda of Lancaster, PA and his wife are the proud parents of a son, Joseph Nast, born on October 8, 1983.

Mark N. Steinberger is Vice-President and Assistant General of Pitaicair Inc., Jenkentown, PA. He and his wife are the proud parents of Sara Gail Steinberger born on May 14, 1983.

(Continued . . .)
Andrew R. Urban is scheduled to become a partner in the Boston, MA firm of Ulitz & Lewis in April 1984. James A. Young, III, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell and Hippel, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Urban League of Philadelphia.

'76 Sheryl L. Auerbach of Philadelphia participated in the seminar "Motion Court Status Report," which was part of the 25th Annual Bench-Bar Conference of the Philadelphia Bar Association held in September 1983 in Atlantic City, NJ.

Robert L. Gorman opened his practice in October, 1982 at Three Nineteenth Street NW, Washington, DC 20036. Donna R. Lenhoff, the Associate Director for Legal Policy and Programs for the Women's Legal Defense Fund, was mentioned in the article "Who's Defending Women?" in the August 1983 issue of Vogue Magazine.

James J. Sandman has been elected a partner in the Washington, D.C. firm of Arnold & Porter. He currently practices in the firm's Denver, Colorado office.

Honorable Jerome B. Simandle of Moorestown, NJ, was selected a full-time United States Magistrate for the Federal Court in Camden, NJ.

Lawrence V. Stein has become a partner in the Washington firm of Arnold & Porter.

Joan Salwen Zaitz of Hartsdale, New York, has opened her own office, where she specializes in estate law and matrimonial law. She has a son, Jacob Salwen Zaitz.

'77 Marina Angel, LL.M., Professor of Law at Temple University, was appointed Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and External Programs at that law school.

Gilbert F. Casellas, of the Philadelphia firm of Montgomery, McCraken, Walker & Rhoads, became the 1984 president-elect of the Hispanic National Bar Association at its annual convention in Washington, D.C. in October, 1983. He automatically will become President of that Association in January 1985. Mr. Casellas serves on the Executive Committee of the Young Lawyers Section, Philadelphia Bar Association and is Vice-President of the Hispanic Bar Association of Pennsylvania.

Kenneth S. Gallant was appointed Attorney-in-Charge for Special Litigation at the District Attorney's Office, Philadelphia.

Robert D. Lane, Jr., who practices real estate law at the Philadelphia firm of Fox, Rothschild, O'Brien & Frankel, has been appointed Chairman of the Committee on Zoning and Land Use for the Philadelphia Bar Association.

'78 Mary C. Helf, an associate with the Philadelphia firm of Mesirow, Gelman, Jaffee, Cramer & Jamieson, has been elected General Counsel, Secretary, and a member of the Executive Board of Directors of the Philadelphia Finance Association. She has also been appointed Chair of the Lawyers' Campaign for Women's Way.

Donald E. Keener and Thajauna D. Miller, of Philadelphia, are the proud parents of Elizabeth Anne Miller Keener, born July 8, 1983.

Richard R. Riese of the Pittsburgh, PA firm of Thorp, Reed and Armstrong, was re-elected President of the Pittsburgh Dance Alloy, a professional contemporary dance reper­toiry company. He also was elected President of AC-ACLD, the Allegheny Chapter-Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities.

Christopher M. Trett became a partner in the Philadelphia firm of LaBrum & Doak, 1700 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

'79 Lillian Fernandez was appointed Executive Director of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Inc. in Washington, DC. She previously directed the Hispanic Voter Education Project in New York City.

Richard S. Green is now an associate at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, 919 Third Avenue, New York, NY, 10022, specializing in corporate and banking matters.

J. Morgan McClintock, LL.M., transferred from Ulster Polytechnic to Teesside Polytechnic in Cleveland, England, as Principal Lecturer in Business Studies and Public Administration. Mr. McClintock is now the co-ordinator responsible for all courses leading to the higher Na­tional Awards of the Business Education Council.
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Merrill N. Rubin's new firm, Silber and Rubin, P.C. at 177 Prince Street (Soho), New York 10012, concentrates on the defense of citizens accused of crimes. He was married in 1982 to Lise Newcomer, a semiretired modern dancer-message therapist.

Martin R. Smith is now practicing with the firm Linklaters & Paines, Barrington Howe, 59-67 Cresham Street, London, England.

M. Kelly Tillery, a partner in the Philadelphia law firm of Leonard, Tillery & Davision, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts.

'80 William Castro of Miami, Florida is a sole practitioner, dealing exclusively with criminal cases on a federal and state level. He is representing defendants "falsely" accused of drug trafficking.

David M. Chavez of Farmington, New Mexico, opened an office for the general practice of law. Mr. Chavez and his wife, Grace, are the proud parents of a ten month old son, Dominic.

Neil J. Hamburg of Philadelphia is an Assistant in the Office of the General Counsel of the University of Pennsylvania.

Roberta Rosenthal Kwall is an Assistant Professor of Law at DePaul College of Law in Chicago, Illinois. Professor Kwall has written an article entitled "Is Independence Day Dawning for the Right of Publicity?" to be published in the spring 1984 issue of the University of California Davis Law Review.

Dorothy A. Malloy of Philadelphia is an Assistant in the Office of the General Counsel of the University of Pennsylvania.

Robert A. Wilson, Assistant Counsel for SEPTA, was married to Rhonda Fleming Hill, Esq., in September 1983. A student at the Eastern Baptist Seminary as a Presidential Scholar, Mr. Wilson is licensed by the Baptist ministry to preach at Mt. Camel Baptist Church.

'S1 Samuel A. Abady founded the firm of Abady, Kaplan & Jaffe, 535 Fifth Avenue, 35th Floor, New York, NY, concentrating in the areas of general litigation, national and international law, corporate and real estate.

Nina J. Lahoud has accepted a post as Legal Officer for Unifil—the United Nations Interim Force in Naqura, Lebanon. Ms. Lahoud, the only woman in the Force resides in Nahariya, Israel and crosses the border daily into Lebanon.

Andrew T. Lamas is a staff director for PACE—The Philadelphia Association for Cooperative Enterprise—133 South 18th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Leslie C. Nixon, an associate with the Manchester, New Hampshire firm of Brown and Nixon, was reappointed to the New Hampshire Bar Association Committee on the Federal Rules of Evidence. The Committee has recommended the adoption of the Federal Rules in New Hampshire and has published a volume of the rules with comments and annotations to New Hampshire case law. Ms. Nixon also has published a commentary on the rules in The New Hampshire Trial Lawyers Association Newsletter. She earned the status of Diplomate of the Court Practice Institute having attended the National Trial Advocacy Seminar in December, 1983. Ms. Nixon was married to Lee C. Nyquist, an attorney with Devine, Millimet, Stahl and Branch in Manchester, New Hampshire.

Lloyd A. Sanders is an Associate at the Boston law firm of Palmer & Dodge, One Beacon Street, specializing in real estate.

'82 Babette L. D'Amelio previously an associate with the New York firm of Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander joined the offices of Russel H. Beatie Jr., 10 East 53rd Street, Suite 3200, New York, NY, 10022.

Olusogbemiga A. Oyebode formerly with the New York firm of White and Case, is currently working for the Gulf Oil Company (Nigeria) Limited in Lagos, Nigeria.

Joel D. Rosen is associated with the firm of Corr. Stevens & Fenningham, Suite 113, Three Neshaminy Interplex, Route 1 and Old Lincoln Highway, Trevose, Pennsylvania 19047.

'83 Evan K. Aidman has become a judicial law clerk for the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, 112 One East Penn Square, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

Frank D. Burt is an associate at Nutter, McClennen & Fish, 600 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, MA 02210.

Chris M. H. Chao is practicing in the firm of Lee and Li, Suite 470, 3 Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, California 94111.

Ruth E. Cornfeld is an associate at the Denver, Colorado firm of Davis, Graham & Stubbs.

Michael P. DiBiase is practicing in the Providence, Rhode Island firm of Edwards & Angell.

D. Scott Hargadon, is an associate with the Chicago firm of Bell, Boyd & Lloyd, working in the Labor and Litigation departments.

Robert M. Jarvis, is practicing with the New York firm of Haight, Gardner, Poor & Havens. He received first prize in the New Jersey Sea Grant Law Contest for his paper on coastal oil pollution which will be published in the Gonzaga University Law Review.

Peter Fei Pan is an associate at Lee and Li, Suite 470, 3 Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, California 94111.

Steven A. Roseman, an associate with the Beverly Hills, California firm of Ervin, Cohen & Jessup, won the $500 first prize in the Law School’s Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition. Mr. Roseman’s winning essay is entitled “Protection of Computer Programs in Object Code.”

Masatomo Suzuki is practicing in the New York firm of Wender, Murase and White. Mr. Suzuki and his wife have given birth to a son, Hisamichi George Suzuki.
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In Memoriam

'14 Louis Levinson
Bala Cynwyd, PA
October 25, 1983

Mark T. Milner
Harrisburg, PA
October II, 1983

'15 Bryan A. Hermes
Philadelphia, PA
April 10, 1983

'19 Jacob Hagenbuch
Caldwell, NJ
May 9, 1983

'20 Eugene H. Southall
South Glastonbury, CT
June 28, 1983

'23 Seymour M. Heilbron
New York, N.Y.
December 1, 1983

'24 Hazel H. Brown
Philadelphia, PA
December 29, 1983

'25 Frank G. Streeper
Linwood, N.J.
July 2, 1983

'26 James M. Mallie
Philadelphia, PA
unknown

'27 J. Harry Wagner, Jr.
Philadelphia, PA
November 15, 1983

'28 Joseph A. L. Errigo
Dover, DE
August 26, 1983

Gerald D. Prather
Meadville, PA
September 30, 1983

'29 E. Humes Garber
Wayne, PA
December 31, 1983

'31 Arthur W. Bean
Norristown, PA
December 19, 1983

Kellogg W. Beck
Philadelphia, PA
September 6, 1983

Edwin S. Heins
Newton Square, PA
September 16, 1983

Shalon Ralph
Chevy Chase, MD
July 20, 1983

C. Dudley Saul, Jr.
Medford, OR
May 25, 1983

M. Robert Beckman
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
December 6, 1983

Harold M. Rappeport
Philadelphia, PA
November 23, 1983

William M. Roosevelt
Fort Washington, PA
July 1, 1983

'33 Morris Cohen
Wilmington, DE
November 11, 1983

William H. Doerr, Jr.
Bala Cynwyd, PA
September 16, 1983

'34 Wilson C. Baily
Westtown, PA
June 20, 1983

Josiah E. Dubois, Jr.
Pitman, NJ
August 1, 1983

'35 Viddie L. Waytel
Wilkes Barre, PA
October 25, 1983

'36 Edgar M. Church
New York, NY
May 5, 1983

'37 Frederick E. Lark
Shamokin, PA
January 13, 1984

Victor J. Roberts
Pottstown, PA
November 21, 1983

'38 Charles M. Menapace
Mt. Carmel, PA
June 26, 1983

'40 Arnold F. DiSilvestro
Woodcrest, NJ
October 20, 1983

Harold I. Eaton, Jr.
Margate City, NJ
1981

John L. McDonald
Mountaintop, PA
July 24, 1983

'41 Dr. Eugenett Richardson, Jr.
Gurnee, IL
January 21, 1983

'44 Edward V. Ryan
Camp Hill, PA
October 23, 1983

'49 Edgar D. Free
Camp Hill, PA
July 18, 1983

'51 Edward R. Carpenter
Media, PA
December 1, 1983

Gerald J. Haas
Wyndmoor, PA
January 1, 1984

Daniel J. Hanlon
Narberth, PA
October 13, 1983

'52 Robert E. Knowlton
Fayetteville, AR
July 6, 1983

'53 Lewis P. Mitrano
Philadelphia, PA
November 24, 1979
Dean Mundheim:

Tomorrow will be my last exam at Penn Law School. As exhausted as I now am, I want to share my parting thoughts with you. In what seems like many years ago, I had the opportunity to choose between Penn and several other fine law schools. What sold me on Penn was what I perceived to be its feeling of “humanity,” the low-key atmosphere which both the administration and the students try to establish. Having labored through the years at Penn, I can see that my original hunch was on the mark. Besides the excellent education I have received, Penn has introduced me to hundreds of fine people, down to earth and considerate as well as learned. I will never say that I “enjoyed” my stay in law school (at least the way I enjoyed college!), but I cannot imagine a better atmosphere anywhere for “learning to love the law.”

I just wanted to let you know how I feel; it seems that too often we exercise our right to complain without taking a minute to exercise our appreciation in the good things in life.

Thank you and Happy Holidays.

Sincerely,
William F. Reyes, ’84
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