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SYMPOSIUM

FORTY-YEARS LATER
by George L. Haskins, Algernon Sydney Biddle Professor of Law Emeritus

Last April, Dean Mundheim came to my office to remind me that my “retirement” was not far away, and he courteously insisted that he be allowed to give a small informal luncheon in my honor – “just ourselves and maybe two or three of your lawyer friends.” Under the circumstances, it was difficult to say no. He knew that I, as well as some others, have objected to formal departing celebration dinners and gifts, which in the past have laid unconscionable taxes on other Faculty members and on the staff. I had hoped that in addition to downtown lawyers, a few students might be included at the luncheon, but there was “no room at the inn,” which was already reserved and overcrowded.

I had thought that the occasion would be light-hearted, especially since it broke up a special Faculty meeting, and with that in mind it occurred to me on my walk to the Faculty Club that a short parody, in Latin, of Shakespeare’s speech for Caesar’s funeral might be appropriate if I were called up to salute “amicis, collegis, prosectorum eruditum ignarantes.” However, the Dean was more serious and, being opposed, as he said, to long speeches, he made no reference to my writings or to my contributions to the Bar in antitrust and other cases, but emphasized the joy of teaching and the warm responses of my students. He even told us that one former student had named his son for me. It behooved me to make a more serious, though totally unprepared, response. I said that I had never really believed I would reach the mandatory retirement age at Penn. There had been too many offers to go elsewhere to law schools of highest renown, yet behind me had lurked the constant admonition of Dean Keedy, while living, “Do you really think, George, that the ’X’ School is better than ours? That their students are brighter or more congenial?” The late John Dickinson, the noted lawyer, political scientist and professor of constitutional and administrative law at Penn, as well as Vice President-General Counsel of the Pennsylvania Railroad, had in mind early in the 1950’s that I should follow in his footsteps, as he had followed in the paths of George Stuart Patterson and Henry Bickle, to combine teaching at Penn with an active law practice. A decree, which went forth from the Administration, precluded that route even though for 22 years I was permitted to continue as Consulting Counsel to the Railroad and, hence, to be involved in several rate and antitrust cases (e.g. the Southern and Southwestern Divisions Cases, the Seatrain Lines cases and the Noerr Motor Freight Case). Later, I became a Vice-President and Director of a mutual fund in New York. Law practice, via an occasional invitation to join a private law firm, continued to be tempting – most notably an offer in the 1960’s to become General Counsel of a very large multi-national corporation which wanted me on board before I had completed a book already under contract. Ultimately, the lure of teaching and scholarly writing prevailed. Even when earlier, in the 1950’s Justice Owen J. Roberts assured me that if I would accept an offer to become Dean of the Pennsylvania Law School and that the entire Law Board (then our governing body) would support me, I was not tempted. Somewhat later, Justice Franfurter bluntly told me, when I sought his advice on another matter, that I had a duty to myself “and to this Court” to continue writing and teaching.

The foregoing, much of part of my impromptu speech, is not intended as autobiography, much less an ego-trip, but rather as indicative of temptations that can beset law teachers, and why I did not believe I would “retire.” Even when I was leaving the Army in 1946 at the end of the War, there were five clear options open: to accept an immediate promotion and permanent position in the Army, to return
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to private practice in Boston, to join the foreign department of the Chase Bank in New York and then Paris, to remain in the State Department as special assistant to the Secretary and - least rewarding financially - to join the Law Faculty at Penn. I sought the advice of the late Dean Achenos, who, though he had hoped I would remain at State, said that he believed that teaching would be the wisest choice - "a far, far better thing that I can do," he concluded, paraphrasing a famous phrase of Charles Dickens.

So I am still here, after completing 40 years of teaching, one year as Instructor in the Department of Sociology at Harvard, then thirty-nine steps to statutory senility at Penn. To my credit, I have countless friends and acquaintances among former students in Philadelphia and elsewhere. Always, I have had more friends among present and former students than among the Faculty and, with the former, I tend to lunch or talk between or after classes. Indeed, shortly before his death, George Santayana - then in his late 80's - advised me to "stay with the young, your students. They are more congenial, less arrogant, more stimulating."

Racked up are ten books which I have authored or co-authored, over eighty published articles on legal, political, economic and historical subjects. Four others are now in press, and then there are lectures and addresses I have given, others to be given. Several articles have been quoted from or relied on by other scholars and, even more rewarding, by judges in appellate court decisions. Many of my addresses have been heard and read in English, French or German not only in this country but in Europe from Athens to Vienna, Paris, London and Dublin. In August of this year, I spoke in Stuttgart, West Germany, on the American development of the "rule of law." In January 1986, I delivered a special inaugural address in Atlanta, sponsored by the Supreme and Superior Courts of the State of Georgia.

Much still remains to be done towards horizons whose margins fade forever and forever as one moves. Hence, it is almost impossible to answer the question: "How does it feel to be retired?" I seem to be retired only in name, in that I have no classes to teach, no dreary Faculty meetings to attend and no monthly salary check. I try not to think that I shall soon lose my house in Chester County (one of five that I designed myself and physically helped to build), that my large personal library of 8000 volumes will have to be dispersed and sold. The Law School has never made an exception to precedent, as have some other Departments of the University, and kept on the teaching staff one who has attained the dreaded three score years and ten. To appoint a retired professor, over 70, from another University is not objectionable and is being done here and at other schools. Other teaching openings are turning up elsewhere, however, but, for the present, there are Penn students to advise and consult with, and much writing still to be finished here. Therefore, in the classic sense of 'emeritus' of the older dictionaries (which means 'worn out', with no connotation of merit), I can hardly yet fit that label. Perhaps the 75-hour work-week should be cut to 60, so as to provide time to run by some of the tapes of older memories. It will be rewarding to have time to think back on former colleagues like Jim Chadbourn, Edwin Keedy, and Clarence Morris, and to long evenings with older members of the Bar such as Robert Shaw Barlow, Hugh Cox, John Dickinson, Herbert Goodrich, Sturgis Ingersoll, A. Lawrence Lowell and Owen Roberts. I have consciously tried not to limit my friendships to local academics, and I have sought to enlarge my friendships among foreign scholars and les hommes d'affaires in this country and abroad.

Unless I have engagements with students, I usually have lunch downtown with lawyers or business people before returning to the afternoon's work. Philadelphia social life has resembled too much that of my native Boston, so that I began long since to relish the companionship of fishermen, boat-builders, sea-captains and others in my down-East home in Maine. Though I cherish the accomplishments and traditions of my parents, I have next to no close relatives still alive, so that friendships with others and their children, are taking the place of family ties. For several years I have worked at night on a collection of essays, "Paths to the Sea," and that should be reviewed and completed. Perhaps I should resume sculling on the Schuylkill in a singles shell. I am disinclined to start a new family and to plan on coaching "little league" baseball. I am disinclined to resume sheep-farming, but inclined to serve occasionally as a salvage consultant. There are quantities of general reading still to catch up on, to say nothing of keeping abreast of the doings of J. R. Ewing and the machinations at Falcon Crest. If there are a few old scores still to settle, it is more constructive to look forward with no backward glance at those who have strutted and fretted their hours upon the stage. Itinerant actors tend to disappear and "leave not a rack behind."

If I were to be asked which of the many honors I have felt most privileged to receive while in Philadelphia, there would probably be four: first, to have held the Algernon Sydney Sydney Biddle Professorship, the oldest of the Law School's endowed chairs and given to me by Dean Wolfman; second, to have had the opportunity to write and to have published a portion of the History of the United States Supreme Court, for which I received an award from the Pennsylvania Chapter of the Order of the Coif; third, to have been twice nominated by Dean Freedman for the coveted Lindback Teaching Award; and fourth, for my election to the Legion of Honor of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains for service to all regardless of race or religion.

Hence, with the memories of past and present friendships, of intellectual stimuli continuing and not forgotten, and with the facilities of the Law School still available to me, I regard it as a duty and an affirmation of faith to remain loyal to the Law School as an institution which has helped bring to fruition so many of my professional goals.

From The Law Library Window
by Elizabeth S. Kelly, Director of Biddle Law Library.

How has the Library changed in the past few months? One change is the newly remodeled entrance area: the Sylvan M. Cohen Gateway to Biddle Library architecturally makes a statement about the Library's significance. It says the Library is an important legal research library which is up-to-date, functional and serene. The new Gateway, completed in December 1985, was named to honor Sylvan M. Cohen whose advocacy of the Library's needs has not only been tireless and unstinting, but gratifyingly successful.

Returning Alumni/ae who survey the Sylvan M. Cohen Gateway should understand that it is representative of many other changes, some highly visible and some less obvious—changes made possible, in large part, by increasing gifts made by Friends of Biddle and by greater Law School financial support. The visible changes in the Library include: the new book security system; the reorganized and refurbished Sharswood and Goodrich Reading Rooms; the recently published Library Guide and instructional handouts; the monthly list of new titles in a computer-generated format; the developing video taping and viewing center - courtesy of the Class of 1954 - and the computerized serials and law reviews control system.
On the less visible side a major automation challenge faces the Library. In order to participate fully in the University of Pennsylvania Library Information Network, Biddle must convert its 100 years of typed or hand-written catalog cards to machine-readable form. Fiscal responsibility for this conversion rests with the Law Library. During this past year, the Library was able to allocate about 600 hours of professional time to data conversion. The task which remains, however, is formidable.

Biddle has two kinds of manually created records to convert: 1) We estimate Biddle has approximately 50,000 catalog records which describe monographs or unsupplemented treatises, records which could be converted into machine-readable form for approximately $56,000 by contract with a library data-conversion vendor; 2) Catalog records which describe serial titles and which could be converted over a five-year period for an estimated yearly cost of approximately $40,000.

When the data conversion effort has been completed, the resources of this great Library will be much more fully exploitable by library users without extensive assistance by staff. This is, of course, a major objective of the Library - to facilitate the maximum use by any legal researcher of the rich assembly of legal materials which is Biddle Library; in other words, our goal is to allow the Law School to really get its money's worth out of its book purchase dollar.

There are still (and probably always will be) specific current needs of the Library for help with big ticket purchases. That list includes the microfiche editions of the *Statutes in Force* (Great Britain) at $2,870; the *Archive Publications of the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws* at $850; the newly acquired *U.S. Congressional Committee Hearings Index, 1833-1969* costing $11,880; and additional micro-computers for student use.

The Law School is getting ready for the Super Gala Birthday Party, benefiting the Law Library, set to take place June 7 at the Law School. The Gala Committee, co-chaired by Alma Cohen (Mrs. Sylvan M.) and Lynn Tobias (Mrs. Glen), has put together a Dinner-Dance which will captivate your eyes, ears and palate. Space limitations have dictated that only the first 200 couples can be accommodated. Mark Davis' orchestra will play in a tented Law School Courtyard surrounded by an elegant and splashy black and white decor. I look forward to seeing many of you there.

**The 1986 Roberts Lecture - February 19**

Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., Nathan Baker Professor and Professor of Management, School of Organization and Management at the Yale University Law School and a member of the University of Pennsylvania Law School Board of Overseers, will deliver the Law School's 27th Annual Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture, "Above Principle: Considerations in the Legitimacy of Judicial Law-Making," on Wednesday, February 19 at the University Museum, 34th and Spruce Streets.

Established to honor the late Owen J. Roberts, the 11th Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Lecture is supported by an endowment awarded by the Philadelphia firm of Montgomery, McCracken, Walker and Rhoads, and is sponsored by the Order of the Coif, the University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society and the Law School.

**Placement Director Clark Retires**

After eighteen years of sterling service to the University of Pennsylvania Law School Community as Director of Placement Services, Helena F. Clark retired on December 15, 1985.

Miss Clark began her career at the University of Pennsylvania twenty-five years ago in the Office of the Dean of Women, where, subsequently, she became that Office's Assistant Director of Placement. In 1964, she was invited to organize a placement facility at a university in India, which was founded on the concern that promising Indian students were being lured to foreign countries. Miss Clark succeeded in developing a placement program there that provided access to American companies with branch offices in India.

In 1968, then University of Pennsylvania Law School Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, appointed Miss Clark to head and create the placement program at the Law School, which evolved into one of this country's first professionally-staffed law school placement offices. Miss Clark was the founder and organizer of "Four-in-One," a concept which combined the four Philadelphia area law schools to share placement activities ranging from job fairs to placement conferences, etc. In 1971, she helped to establish the National Association of Law Placement (NAALP), for which she served as President for the year 1974-75 and representative to the College Placement Council from 1976-1981.

Miss Clark's unique abilities over the years enabled the establishment of important inroads in the history of Penn Law School's Placement Program.
Parents and Partners Day
On November 1, 1985, over two hundred first-year students and their parents, spouses and/or friends attended a new program that now will become an annual Law School event. The highly-successful Parents and Partners Day offered families of newly-matriculated law students the opportunity to witness firsthand the Penn Law School experience.

From 9:00 - 10:00 a.m., Professor Clyde Summers’ fascinating class in Contracts was open to the first-year students and their families and guests. Following a refreshment break, the group gathered for Torts Class and the energetic teaching style of Professor Regina Austin, ’73. A panel discussion from 12:00 - 1:30 p.m. featured Professor John O. Honnold who, in the absence of Dean Robert H. Mundheim who was hospitalized, welcomed the guests and described the “Law School and the Legal Profession Today”; Professor Hank Gutman discussed “A Tradition of Excellence and Continuity at the Law School”; Law School Alumnus, Bernard M. Borish, ’43, Olve S. Cummins, ’52, and Ronald White, ’76, offered their experiences in the legal profession speaking on “Life After Law School”; and Class of 1986 third-year students - Patty Shwartz, Joaquin Mendez, Steven C. Baker and Dale Kerester - discussed “The Big Chill” or “Getting There is Half the Fun,” describing their impressions having survived three years of Law School.

A boxed luncheon concluded the activities.

News of the Law Alumni Society

The 1986 Law Alumni Society Luncheon Forum

Mr. Brown, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, chaired the eleven-member Special Investigation Commission which publicly examined the confrontation between the City of Philadelphia and MOVE. In his timely, informative Luncheon Lecture, Mr. Brown shared his experiences as head of the Commission and offered insights into the mechanics of this highly-charged, controversial investigation.

New Society Committees

The 1986 Alumni Placement Committee
Chaired by Paul P. Welsh, ’66, of Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell, Wilmington, Delaware, the Alumni Placement Committee has been restructured to better service Penn Law School students applying for positions. Alumni representing large firms include Lee M. Hymeler, ’69, of Archer & Greiner, Haddontield, N.J.; Pamela D. Kendrick, ’79, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, Philadelphia; and Dale Pennys Levy, ’67, Blank, Rome, Comisky & McCauley, Philadelphia. The smaller firm is represented by Mark L. Austrian, ’70, of Collier, Shannon, Rill & Scott, Washington, D.C.


The 1986 Award Selection Committee
which is chaired by Raymond K. Denworth, Jr., ’61, includes Harry P. Begier, Jr., ’64; Marshall A. Bernstein, ’49; E. Barclay Cale, Jr., ’62; E. Ellsworth McMeen, Ill, ’72; Howard L. Sheeter, ’68; and The Honorable Carolyn E. Temin, ’58.

The Dean Lunches with Past Society Board Members on November 12, 1985.
Dean Robert H. Mundheim met with Law Alumni Society Past Officers and Board Members to apprise them of the present “state of the Law School.” The luncheon, which is the second of its kind, enables former Law Alumni Society officers to remain in touch with the School and its current activities.

The Law Alumni Society Cruise—Sail...Learn...Relax, etc.
The Law Alumni Society has arranged a seminar in the U. S. Virgin Islands departing from Fort Lauderdale, Florida on Saturday, April 12, 1986. Travel will be on the new cruise ship, The Costa Riviera. The price to each participant, including airfare, will be $1,385. Of the price of passage, $285 will be a charitable contribution to the Law School, deductible for federal income tax purposes. An exciting opportunity in the company of friends and colleagues is anticipated by all.

For information, contact:
Stephanie Kallen
Director, Law Alumni Affairs
University of Pennsylvania Law School
3400 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6204
(215) 898-6303

Great Ideas About Giving To The Law School
Put Your Treasures to Work...
A gift of paintings provided important funding for the School of Veterinary Medicine. Jewels helped fund the School of Dental Medicine; antique silver, a clinical center in the School of Medicine. Priceless book collections have enriched Van Pelt Library.

You, too, can put your treasures - paintings, sculpture, antiques, coin collections, or other personal property of value - to work for The Law School and gain attractive tax advantage as well.

If you are considering a gift, please contact Donald G. Myers, Director of Development, University of Pennsylvania Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, 19104-6204.
Alumni Gatherings

During the Fall and early Winter of 1985-86, the Law Alumni Society, numerous Regional Alumni Clubs, some Reunion Classes and the Alumni leadership of various cities sponsored events geared to attracting Alumni and their guests. The “Inside Law School” Program also was taken to the West Coast in January.

In September 1985, Alumnus David H. Marion, ’63, was honored by the Law Alumni Society at a Reception held during the Annual Conference and Exposition of the Philadelphia Bar Association in Atlantic City, N.J. Society President Clive S. Cummins, ’52, presented Gladly Learn and Gladly Teach by Martin Meyerson and Dyls Pegler Winegrad, to Mr. Marion, who served as Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association for the year 1985.

The Class of 1937 held its annual Reunion dinner in October at the home of The Honorable and Mrs. Harry A. Takiff.


Also in October, Dean Robert H. Mundheim was the honored guest at a gala Alumni reception in Tokyo, Japan. Hosted by Toshio Ochi, LL.M., ’84, with the assistance of Kouji Nagao, LL.M., ’84, the event was attended by University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni and their guests who live and practice in Japan.

The Dean also was present at events attended by the Alumni leadership of various cities. On October 2 and December 4, 1985, luncheons with Alumni leaders were held in Philadelphia. Samuel F. Pryor, III, ’53, hosted a successful luncheon attended by the New York Alumni leadership at the Wall Street Club on November 26.

Wilmington, Delaware Alumni attended a Reception at the Rodney Square Club on November 12, 1985. Biddle Library Director, Professor Elizabeth S. Kelly spoke to the gathering and presented the acclaimed Biddle film. Also on the evening’s agenda was the presentation of the Alumni Award of Merit to The Honorable Andrew D. Christie, ’49. Hosts for the event included Wilmington Alumni: O. Francis Biondi, ’58, William F. Lynch, II, ’49, A. Gilchrist Sparks, III, ’73, E. Norman Veasey, ’57, and Paul W. Welsh, ’66.

University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni-in-Teaching and Penn Law Faculty present at the Annual Meetings of the American Association of Law Schools in early January 1986 attended the Law Alumni Society’s Annual Breakfast where, this year, Dean Robert H. Mundheim honored and presented copies of Gladly Learn and Gladly Teach by Martin Meyerson and Dyls Pegler Winegrad, to Alumni who presently serve or formerly have held the office of law school dean.

Dean Robert H. Mundheim and Professor Robert A. Gorman presented the “Inside Law School” Program to Alumni residing and practicing in California. The Program, which has been given previously in New York, Washington, D.C. and Philadelphia, was offered to San Francisco Alumni at a luncheon on January 21, 1985. That evening, “Inside Law School” was presented to Los Angeles Alumni at a Cocktail Reception organized and hosted by Douglas C. Conroy, ’68.


June 7, 1986
Cocktails, dinner and dancing at the Law School

‘Save the date’
BIDDLE LAW LIBRARY CENTENNIAL 1886-1986

New Jersey Alumni Dinner to Feature Senator Lautenberg

University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni and their guests from Northern and Southern New Jersey will join for dinner on Monday, February 24, 1986 at the Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick. Addressing the group will be the United States Senator from New Jersey, Frank R. Lautenberg. Alumni wishing to attend the dinner may call Stephanie Kallen, Director of Law Alumni Relations, (215) 898-6303.

The Overseers’ Meeting—November 1985

The University of Pennsylvania Law School Board of Overseers met on November 19-20 for their annual fall meetings.

At dinner on Tuesday evening, November 19, the Board separated into three committees to hear reports on Placement from Assistant Professor Gary Francione; on Admissions from Assistant Dean Frances Spurgeon and Professor Richard G. Lonsdorf; and on Curriculum from Professor Robert A. Gorman. Selected students from the Law School Community were in attendance at the dinner meetings in addition to some Faculty and administrative staff.

On Wednesday at breakfast in Biddle Library’s Goodrich Hall, the Overseers were presented a report on the progress and future plans of Biddle Law Library by Director, Professor Elizabeth S. Kelly. Dean Robert H. Mundheim offered the Dean’s Report to the Board which was followed by the Development statement by Overseers’ Chair, The Honorable Arlin M. Adams, ’47. James D. Crawford, ’62, the National Chair for Law Annual Giving for the years 1985-1987, presented his report.

The Overseers joined in executive session prior to luncheon at the Faculty Club, where University of Pennsylvania Provost and Professor of Law, Thomas Ehrlich, addressed the group.

The Board’s Annual Spring Meeting will be held on April 2 and 3.

News from the Institute for Law and Economics

Pew Grant Awarded to Institute

The J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust has awarded a grant of $300,000 to the Institute For Law and Economics for use over the next three years.
The Award, however, does involve a challenge: A grant of $125,000 is forthcoming to the first year; $100,000 will come in the second year in receipt of equal funds and, in the third year, $75,000 will be awarded—also in receipt of equal funds. The Trust potentially can generate $475,000 in funds for the Institute.

The "Tax Conference" and "The Roundtables"

The Law School's Institute for Law and Economics sponsored two important and enlightening programs in November 1985. The primary event was the November Law Tax Conference, organized by Law School Professor Harry L. Gutman, to emphasize the importance of pending tax legislation on the business community. The featured speaker was David H. Brockway, Esq., Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Taxation. The Conference Panel, all of whom formerly worked at the U.S. Department of the Treasury for Tax Policy, included William M. Goldstein, Esq., of Drinker, Biddle & Reath, Philadelphia; John M. Samuels, Esq., of Dewey, Ballantine, Bushby, Palmer & Wood, Washington, D.C.; James W. Wetzler, Vice-President, Bear Sterns and Company; and University of Pennsylvania Professor, Alan J. Auerbach. Conference attendees included Chief Executive Officers from numerous Delaware Valley regional corporations.

The Roundtable of November 15 entitled "Issues in Collective Bargaining: The Law and Economics Approach": aimed to merge legal and economic analysis through an examination of Labor Law. Papers were presented by Robert Z. Lawrence, a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institute; Douglas L. Leslie, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia; and Professor Michael L. Wachter, Director of the Institute for Law and Economics.

The spring Roundtable on "Financial Markets Regulation" will be held March 26, 1986 and is being organized by Law School Dean Robert H. Mundheim and Professor Almarin Phillips. These Roundtable programs are funded by the United Parcel Foundation.

The "New" Discussion Paper Series

The Institute is initiating a Discussion Paper Series aimed at gathering a compendium of articles and papers in the many areas of Law and Economics and distributing them to practicing lawyers, economists, policy-makers and academic researchers.

The 1985 Benefactors’ Dinner

Members of the Benjamin Franklin Society and other Law School benefactors and their guests were honored at a gala dinner on Tuesday evening, October 29, 1985.

The Great Hall of the Philadelphia Colleges of the Arts at Broad and Pine Streets was the site of the annual "appreciation" dinner for major donors to the Law School. The Honorable Arlin M. Adams, ’47, the Chair of the Law School’s Board of Overseers, welcomed the gathering in the absence of Dean Robert H. Mundheim, who was hospitalized. Following an elegant dinner, Professor Curtis R. Reitz, ’56, led the group in a spirited, updated Law School version of "Trivial Pursuit" - how many people really knew or remembered Mrs. Falsgraf anyway? Peter Solmsen, ’59, President of the Philadelphia Colleges of the Arts, and Clarissa Solmsen attended the dinner and greeted the guests.

Professor Curtis R. Reitz, ’56, leads a game of Trivial Pursuit at the annual Benefactors’ Dinner.

Perspectives 1985

Dean Robert H. Mundheim and the Council of Student Representatives have initiated a new lecture series aimed at enriching the quality of life at the School, featuring distinguished University Professors, Alumni and other members of the Law School Board of Overseers. The presentations, which are offered to the entire Law School community, have taken the form of large lectures as well as intimate group situations.

The Law School Overseers, who are appointed by the University of Pennsylvania Trustees to monitor the Law School on their behalf, are all law graduates who have built successful careers and are interested in sharing their expertise and interests with the Law School Community. In late September, Myles H. Tannenbaum, ’57, the owner of the Baltimore Stars Football team discussed "Professional Football: Competition on the Field and in the Courts." Stephen A. Cozen, ’64, of the Philadelphia firm of Cozen, Begler & O’Connor, came to the School in October to discuss, informally, his area of specialty, Insurance Law.

Overseer Marvin Schwartz, ’49, Senior Litigator at Sullivan and Cromwell, New York, was the guest at a "brown-bag lunch" answering questions concerning the changing nature of the law firm practices. In late October, Julius L. Chambers, an Overseer who is Director-Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., presented the lecture, "Reshaping the Nation's Civil Rights Agenda." [See reprint of the speech in this issue of The Journal.]

University Professors are individuals recognized by the University of Pennsylvania Trustees as exceptionally distinguished members of the academic community whose interests are not limited to a single discipline. In October, University Professor and Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology, Dr. Robert E. Davies, spoke on "Life and Death: What? Where? When? How? and Who Decide?" in November, University Professor of Psychology and Visual Science, Dr. Dorothy Hurvich-Jameson, discussed "Problems of Perception and How They Relate to Evidence."

The Lectures have been well-attended and enthusiastically received.

The Sylvan M. Cohen Gateway to Biddle Library

 Completed in December 1985, the new Gateway to Biddle Library bears the name of Sylvan M. Cohen, ’38, a loyal, dedicated Alumnus of both the Law School and the College of the University of Pennsylvania. The bronze plaque which graces the Gateway reads: "This information access area, The Gateway to Biddle Library, honors Sylvan M. Cohen, Overseer, Chairman of Friends of Biddle, and tireless advocate of the Law School and the University of Pennsylvania."

A reception and luncheon marking the dedication of the Sylvan M. Cohen Gateway to Biddle Library, given in Mr. Cohen’s honor, was held on December 18, 1985.

Our New Assistant Director of Development

CarolAnn Murray joined the Law School Development Office in October, having replaced Alan S. Corboy, now at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine and Hospital.

Ms. Murray, an Alumnus of Trenton State College, was a Development intern at the College of the University of Pennsylvania prior to her arrival at the Law School. As Assistant Director of Development,
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she is responsible for the Annual Giving Firm Solicitation Program and for staff support for the Clinical Education Program. She also is assistant to the Director in cultivating Major Gifts.

John Peter Zenger: A Symposium to Commemorate the 250th Anniversary of His Trial and Vindication

The University of Pennsylvania Law School, The Philadelphia Bar Association and The Annenberg School of Communications combined forces in October to mark the 250th Anniversary of the landmark Zenger Trial. The Symposium which they presented explored contemporary issues in libel law and freedom of the press.

Symposium organizer, Law School Dean Robert H. Mundheim, opened the program which was held at Penn’s Annenberg School of Communications. Session 1 entitled “Criticism of Government: Zenger Today” featured main speaker, Professor Frederick F. Schauer, of the University of Michigan Law School. Law School Professor Stanley N. Katz moderated a panel which included Professor Vincent A. Blasi of Columbia University Law School and Diana Daniels, General Counsel, Newsweek Magazine. In Session 2, “Government Restrictions on Dissemination of Information,” Professor Cass R. Sunstein of the University of Chicago Law School was the main speaker. The Honorable Louis H. Pollack of the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania moderated a panel which featured Professor Sunstein, Dean Gerhard Casper of the University of Chicago Law School and Chuck Stone, Columnist, The Philadelphia Daily News.

Luncheon speakers were Mari Gursky, Esq., and, Assistant Professor Gary L. Francione of the University of Pennsylvania Law School.


“Private Threats To Free Expression: The Private Sector As Suppressor,” - Session 4 - presented Dean George Gerber of the Annenberg School of Communications as the main speaker. The Honorable Arlin M. Adams, ’47, of the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, moderated panel members Professor Gerber, Professor Stephen Lisl Carter of Yale University Law School and Professor Fred Friendly of the Columbia University School of Journalism.

Substantial funding for the Symposium was provided by the Ida Russell Cades Memorial Fund.

Biddle Library Pre-Gala Events

Lynn and Glen A. Tobias, ’66, graciously hosted a party on the 50th floor of Mr. Tobias’ New York City offices of, Bear Stearns & Company in early November to help generate interest in the June 7 celebration commemorating the Biddle Library’s 100th Gala Birthday Party. Lynn Tobias co-Chairs the gala with Alma (Mrs. Sylvan M.) Cohen. Biddle Library Director, Professor Elizabeth S. Kelly attended the pre-gala party and presented the Biddle Library film to assembled guests.

In late January, Julius and Sandra Newman entertained Law School Alumni, and parents of past and present law students and their friends at a dinner aimed at promoting the Biddle Gala.

The 100th Birthday celebration will be held at the Law School, featuring cocktails in the tented courtyard, an elegant dinner and music by the Mark Davis Orchestra.

Faculty Sabbaticals—The Spring Term

Professor Robert A. Gorman, Kenneth W. Gemmill Professor of Law, is on sabbatical funded, in part, by the Markowitz Fund—established to honor the memory of the late Jerome L. Markowitz, Class of 1953. Professor Gorman will continue his work in the area of Labor Law and related issues.

Associate Professor Regina Austin, ’73, is on spring sabbatical, utilizing the time for the completion of writing projects.

Dean Mundheim Visits China

At the invitation of the Government of the People’s Republic of China, Dean Robert H. Mundheim traveled through Beijing, Shanghai and Xian in mid-October visiting law schools and courts along the way.

Under the auspices of Columbia University’s Committee on Legal Education Exchange with China (CLEEC), the Dean was joined by the law deans of Georgetown, New York, and Stanford Universities, the

The Calendar

Wednesday, February 19
The Owen J. Roberts Memorial Lecture
The University Museum

Monday, February 24
New Jersey Alumni Dinner
Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick

Tuesday, March 18
Washington DC Luncheon
with Dean Mundheim & Alumni

Tuesday, March 18 through Thursday, March 20
Phonothon for Quinquennial Classes

Wednesday, March 26
Institute For Law and Economics Roundtable on “Financial Markets Regulation,” The Law School

Thursday March 27
Law Alumni Society Reception, Chicago

Wednesday, April 2
Board of Overseers Dinner

Thursday, April 3
Board of Overseers Meeting

April
Law Alumni Day Cocktail Reception and Dinner

April
Law Alumni Society Annual Meeting

April
Law Annual Giving Evaluation and Planning Meeting

Thursday, April 17
"Inside Pennsylvania"
1986

Thursday May 1
BFS Reception, New York City

Friday, May 2
Law Alumni Society - sponsored
Third-Year Class Party

Thursday, May 8
Law Alumni Society Reception
at Pennsylvania Bar Association Meetings
Hershey, PA

Wednesday, May 14
Law Alumni Society Luncheon in
Washington, DC during ALI Meetings

Friday, May 16
Law Alumni Society Reception
at New Jersey Bar Association Meetings,
Atlantic City

Saturday, May 17
Quinquennial Reunion Class Open House,
The Law School 1:30-3:00 p.m.
Quinquennial Class Parties, Evening

Monday, May 19
Law School Commencement

May
New York Alumni Chapter Dinner

Saturday, June 7
Biddle Library Gala Dinner Dance,
The Law School

Thursday, June 12
Law Alumni Society Board Meeting,
The Law School

SAVE THE DATE!

JUNE 7, 1986
cocks, dinner and dancing
at the Law School
to celebrate the 100th anniversary
of the Biddle Law Library

University of California at Berkeley and at
Los Angeles, and the Universities of:
Chicago, Washington at Seattle and
Wisconsin at Madison.
"China is interested in American legal
education," says Dean Mundheim "because
it is now rebuilding its legal structure after
the abolition of lawyers and laws in 1966
during Mao's cultural revolution. The
Chinese are even sending students to pursue
J.D. degrees in the United States."
A spokeswoman from CLEC remarked
that the People's Republic is redeveloping a
statute law system based on the Soviet
model. They are looking, however, to
borrow pedagogical elements of American
legal education to use in instructing students
in their new legal code.

University of Pennsylvania Law
Students Aid MOVE Commission
Thirteen Penn Law students volunteered
their services to the Philadelphia Special
Investigation Commission during its Fall
1985 hearings on the confrontation between
the City of Philadelphia and MOVE.
Penn Law School Professor Michael
Madow coordinated the students' involvement
which ranged from stapling and copying to
legal research and analysis. One
of the students was assigned to prepare the
Commission's reply to the challenges made
by the Fraternal Order of Police; another
conducted legal research for the Commission
in the areas of subpoena power, legal
liability and possible challenges to the
Commission's proceedings. Most of the
volunteers received course credit for their efforts.
Convened by Philadelphia Mayor W.
Wilson Goode, the Commission was charged
with determining precisely what occurred
during the catastrophic events of May 13,
1985 that resulted in the deaths of several
MOVE members, and in the devastating fire
that destroyed a three-block area. William
H. Brown, III, '55, who chaired the eleven-
member Commission which included
University of Pennsylvania Law School
Alumnus Henry S. Ruth, Jr., '55, and was
composed of religious, business and
community leaders from the Philadelphia
area, described his experience at the 1986
Law Alumni Society Luncheon Forum

1986 University Award of Merit
Goes to Robert Allman, '42
The University of Pennsylvania's coveted
Organized Classes Award of Merit was given
to Law School Alumnus Robert G. Allman,
'42, during Founders' Weekend on January
17, 1986.
One of six recipients honored with the
Award, Mr. Allman's presence at University
events was cited as a visible symbol of his
Alumni loyalty.

Overseer Higginbotham Receives
Grant for Study of Race and Law
The Rockefeller Foundation has awarded a
three-year $300,000 grant to the Sociology
Department of the University of
Pennsylvania to continue a landmark study of
the effects of the U.S. legal system on
race relations.
The project, which is headed by The
Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham of the
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
and a Law School Overseer as well as
Lecturer in Law and an Adjunct Professor of
Sociology, is expected to last 20 years and
is intended to produce the most
encyclopedic, comprehensive study ever of
race and the American legal system.
Judge Higginbotham has been engaged in
the study since the early 1970's - the first
phase having led to the publication in 1977
of his award-winning book, In The Matter of
Color. The current grant will lead to the
publication of one or two books examining
the details of slave law, state-by-state, in
the South from American Independence in
1776 through the Emancipation of all slaves
in 1865.

The Law School's New Memorial
Gifts Program
In response to an interest expressed by
Alumni, the Law School has begun a
Memorial Gifts Program. Designed in
conformity with the usual approach to such
programs, the Law School's Memorial Gifts
Program is a way of remembering beloved
ones, classmates and colleagues who have
died. Beyond this, however, it is designed to
celebrate joyous occasions such as
birthdays, anniversaries, notable religious
milestones or good fortune.
Gifts may be allocated for general
operations, scholarships, purchase of library
materials or for other purposes. Every
contribution is acknowledged with an official
receipt to the donor and is deductible for
income tax purposes. In addition, a card is
sent to the family of the deceased or to the
person being honored, which does not
mention the denomination of the gift.
If you wish to discuss a particular
allocation, write or telephone the
Law Alumni Day - April, 1986

Distinguished Service Award to be Presented on Law Alumni Day – 1986

The University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni Society’s Annual Law Alumni Day will be held in April, 1986 at the Law School.

Festivities begin with the Law Annual Giving Evaluation and Planning Meeting at 1:30 p.m. At 5:00 p.m. in Room 100, the Society’s Annual Meeting will take place, officiated by President Clive S. Cummis, ’52, who will deliver the Society’s yearly report. Mr. Cummis also will present the Society’s Distinguished Service Award, which is conferred upon University of Pennsylvania Law School Alumni or Faculty whose careers demonstrate those qualities of character, intellect, and social and professional responsibility which the Law School attempts to nurture. The Quinquennial Reunion Classes will report on the progress of their Class gifts, as well as their reunion celebrations which will take place on May 16 and 17. Outgoing Board members will be acknowledged, followed by the election of the new slate of Law Alumni Society Managers.

Cocktails in the Great Hall at 6:00 p.m. will be followed by the traditional Law Alumni Dinner and guest speaker at the Goat at 7:00 p.m.

Reunion Weekend - May 16-17, 1986

Quinquennial Reunion Classes will hold gala parties on Friday and Saturday evenings, May 16 and 17, at the following locations in the Philadelphia area. (The asterisk * denotes Friday evening parties; all other celebrations will be held Saturday evening).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Reunion Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1931</td>
<td>The Locust Club of Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1624 Locust Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>The Palace Hotel of Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18th &amp; The Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>*The Aronomink Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>The City Tavern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd &amp; Walnut Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1961 The Barclay Hotel
Rittenhouse Square

1966 Betsy Z. Cohen’s Farm
Highspire Road
Lyndell, PA

1971 The Warwick
17th and Locust Streets

1976 College of Physicians
of Philadelphia
19 South 22nd Street

1981 The Law School
The Goat and Courtyard

Quinquennial Classes not mentioned are in the process of finalizing their Reunion plans.

Penn Law People in the News

This Journal feature highlights members of the Law School Community (Alumni, Faculty, Overseers, Students, etc.) whose appearances in the news media have come to our attention primarily through the University news-clipping service.

Robert Carswell, member of the Law School Board of Overseers and the Senior Partner heading Shearman & Sterling’s 12-partner management committee, was the subject of an extensive article in the April 8, 1985 issue of The Legal Times of Washington entitled, “Carswell at Helm of U.S.S. Shearman.” Also quoted was Law School Dean Robert H. Mundheim, who served under Mr. Carswell as General Counsel to the U. S. Treasury.


Germaine Ingram, ’71, of the Law School’s Clinical Law Faculty, was the subject of The Washington Post, August 16, 1985, article “Jazz Tap Pyrotechnics,” describing her “alternate” career as a member of the Philadelphia Tap Dancers and that troupe’s appearance at the Smithsonian Institution last summer.


The Honorable Frederica Massiah-Jackson, ’74, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas and a member of the Law Alumni Society Board of Managers, was profiled in The Philadelphia Observer article of May 13, 1985 entitled, “Frankly Speaking.”

Dean Robert H. Mundheim was the subject of The Legal Intelligencer’s “The Philadelphia Lawyer” special feature of August 26, 1985. The article was titled, “Dean Robert Mundheim: A Study in Professional Responsibility.”

The Honorable Murray M. Schwartz, ’55, of the U. S. District Court for the District of Delaware, was the subject of an article entitled, “Schwartz: I Just Call It As I See It,” describing his controversial eleven years on the Federal Bench.

Michele Silverman, ’86, was a subject in “Summer Associate: From Clients to Concerts” which appeared in The National Law Journal article of September 9, 1985, describing her summer work experience in the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis.

Professor Ralph S. Spritzer was quoted in the October 10, 1985 Philadelphia Daily News article “Hard Issues Obscured By Rhetoric,” concerning the MOVE hearings.

Professor Clyde W. Summers was mentioned in “Washington Window,” the February 13, 1985 article which appeared in The Southern California Teamster.

Professor Michael L. Wachter, the Director of the Law School’s Institute for Law and Economics, commented on the emergence of high-tech and service jobs in the New England area in the July 29, 1985 Christian Science Monitor article, “New England’s Once-Faltering Economy is in the Chips.” He also was quoted in the August 1, 1985 issue of The Christian Science Monitor in the article “Postal Workers Put Their Stamp on Wages.” The Wall Street Journal of November 5, 1985 “Speaking of Business” feature quoted Professor Wachter in “It’s Time To Start Thinking About Next Year.”

Professor Alan Watson, was featured in the “Bar Talk” Section of the The Pennsylvania Law Journal Reporter of May 6, 1985.

The University of Pennsylvania Law School Clinical Program and Practice

Professor, Douglas N. Frenkel, ’72, were featured in The Legal Intelligencer article of July 1, 1985 entitled, “U. of P. Law Students ‘Client Conscious’: Clinical Program Handles Real Cases.”
FEATUR ED EVENTS

The Thomas Jefferson Lecture
October, 1985

Professor Spiro Simitis of Johann Wolfgang Goethe - Universität, West Germany, delivered the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Annual Thomas Jefferson Lecture entitled "Reexamining Privacy Concepts in an Information Society."

A leading expert in the area of privacy and a distinguished labor lawyer, Professor Simitis has served as Ombudsman for the State of Hesse in Germany. In that connection, he has been concerned with the protection of privacy in a world in which data-collection and data-dissemination play an increasingly important role.

Professor Simitis stated in his Lecture that "privacy is an old and venerable subject. Generations of lawyers have dealt with its most different aspects. The number of cases is countless; the list of statutes long and impressive. Yet private research only recently described the situation as being in hopeless disarray, the whole debate qualified as ultimately futile."

Professor Simitis further discussed the morality surrounding the issue of data-collection, the modes in which personal information is collected and used, and the roots and history that have led to the situation which exists in modern society.

Continuing the practice of all Thomas Jefferson Lecturers, Professor Simitis remained at the Law School the day after his public lecture to offer and to attend classes, and to meet informally with University of Pennsylvania Law School students, Faculty and Alumni.

Sponsored by the Jefferson Bank and the Philadelphia firm of Spector, Cohen, Gadon & Rosen, the Thomas Jefferson Lecture Series is fashioned after the Olive Wendell Holmes Lectures at Harvard, the William Carpenter Lectures at Columbia and the Thomas M. Cooley Lectures at Michigan. In keeping with the formats of these institutions, a distinguished scholar, judge or legal practitioner is invited to the school to deliver lectures which deal with fundamental questions of law and jurisprudence in addition to meeting with members of the law school community.

The 1985 Edwin R. Keedy Moot Court Competition

The Final Round determining the Annual Keedy Cup Title was held on November 18 at the University of Pennsylvania Museum.

The Court was composed of distinguished justices: The Honorable Alvin B. Rubin, the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth District, presiding; The Honorable Thomas N.

Two State officers received a complaint that target shooting was taking place at a public park. Going to the scene, they heard sounds resembling automatic weapons fire. Morgan was seen loading guns into the trunk of his Cadillac. A bystander told the officers that Morgan had machine guns and other weapons in the trunk, and that he and his companions had threatened to "kill any law that tries to arrest them." The officers thereupon left to obtain reinforcements.

Subsequently, ten officers proceeded to the Morgan home, surrounded it, flooded the house with spotlights and summoned Morgan with a bullhorn. Morgan appeared at the door, pistol in hand. After repeated orders to surrender it, he put it down inside the door and went outside. Morgan was thereupon arrested and the house searched. The only weapon found to violate any statutory firearm requirement was the .45 caliber pistol inside the door.

The United States District Court granted Morgan's motion to suppress the pistol in question, ruling that there had been time to obtain an arrest or search warrant. The Court of Appeals affirmed.

On petition of the government, the Supreme Court has granted review. Petitioner presents the questions of whether law enforcement officers who have probable cause to believe that a suspect committed a felony must obtain a warrant before inducing the suspect to leave his house so that they may arrest him, when the officers effect the arrest without entering the house; whether, assuming that officers violate the Fourth Amendment when they summon a suspect from his house without a warrant, a weapon that the suspect carries with him should be treated as a fruit of the improper arrest; whether the Fourth Amendment exclusionary rule should be modified so as not to bar the admission of evidence seized in the reasonable belief that the warrantless arrest of a felony suspect did not violate the Fourth Amendment.

The briefs and oral arguments presented by both Teams were acclaimed by the Court as "very, very fine" and the decision for the winning side was "very, very close."

The Victors, however, were Harris and Rudolf, who argued for the United States of America, with Lewis and Souza as the Finalists. In his final comments, Judge Rubin remarked how "the quality of today's proceedings far exceeded the performances that he has seen with cases argued by highly-priced counsel. There is no substitute for unstinting, intensive effort."
Conversation with..Professor A. Leo Levin,

EDITOR’S NOTE: Professor Levin, an Alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania Law School Class of 1942, received his BA degree from Yeshiva College. He joined this Law School’s Faculty in 1949 and served as Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania from 1965-1968. Presently the Director of the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, DC, Dr. Levin served as Executive Director of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System from 1973 to 1975. From 1976-1978, he was a member of the Standing Committee on Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States. As Director of the Federal Judicial Center, Professor Levin maintains contact with the Standing Committee, the Rules Advisory Committee and Congressional Committees responsible for oversight of the rule-making process.


University of Pennsylvania Law Alumni regularly ask for and about Professor Leo Levin. What follows is the latest update on his life and his present work directly from “the man” himself.

- LSH

LSH: I once was present at a “classic” Leo Levin classroom lecture. Your energy and vitality level as well as your ability to convey material were astounding. Are you a “natural” or is there a formula for being a good teacher?

Professor Levin: I am complimented at your suggestion that I am a good teacher. For years, we have had and continue to have tremendous students at Penn Law School, and special interrelationships develop between teacher and student that make the job so rewarding. As a former student at the Law School myself, I had the benefit of experiencing some greats as my teachers—some of whom made suggestions as to how I might go about doing the job effectively. The late Jim Chadbourn (Professor James H. Chadbourn), in particular, who was here for many important years in terms of the School’s development (from 1936 to 1950), had the marvelous knack of demanding rigor but making learning fun as well. His methods clearly emphasized skill development and, yet, he did not embarrass or attempt to make anyone unhappy. Chadbourn’s students faced up to difficult, technical questions as well as policy questions but he tried not to make them feel uncomfortable. I always have tried to follow that model. In my early years of teaching, I vividly remember Chadbourn telling me that it was at the informal gatherings of Faculty and students— in those days, it was at law club dinners—that a teacher would find out what was really going on. Students “let their hair down” at these events. Such socialization is an essential and important ingredient in trying to do things that are mutually useful and pleasant, and in developing strong teacher-student bonds.

One other consideration has to do with the people with whom one works. Years ago, Carl Llewellyn once challenged a friend at Columbia to choose, in his own mind, the best member of that faculty. Said Llewellyn, “Without knowing whom you have chosen, I will assert that the worst possible law school is composed of 30 teachers exactly like that person.” He was saying that part of what a law school should seek is diversity, difference in approach and orientation—both pedagogical and substantive. This important factor enables a school’s professors to complement one another.

LSH: You already have indicated Professor Chadbourn as one of your role models. What other memorable Penn Law Faculty were your teachers?

Professor Levin: There were many great ones like: Ned Keedy, who later became Dean of the School; William Mikell, also a former Dean, whose grandson was my student years later, both men were great in the Criminal Law as well as in other areas; and Herbert Goodrich, a former Dean who later went on to the Third Circuit, was a fine teacher.

LSH: How have you and Mrs. Levin adjusted to life in Washington and to high-level government?

Professor Levin: Well, I don’t know that my position requires much adjusting to “high-level government,” but adjusting to any level is a process. We continue to adjust and to deal with the situation. There is a job to be done—and I try my best to do it. People are and have been exceedingly supportive, particularly, the Federal judges and the Justice with whom I work. I guess that if they think that one is trying, they try to help. That is the key.

As far as life in Washington is concerned—socially and otherwise—there seem always to be new and interesting experiences. Nevertheless, my wife and I often tell one another that the most exciting and satisfying feature of the city is that people from all over come to visit, and that includes quite a few of our friends from Philadelphia. We had formed so many exceedingly rewarding and gratifying friendships while living in Philadelphia. One of our sons and a daughter-in-law still live in the Philadelphia area, and there is no way that we can readily forget our pleasant, stimulating experiences as residents of Philadelphia.

LSH: Describe your role as Director of the Federal Judicial Center.

Professor Levin: Basically, the way to describe my particular role is to understand a bit about the structure of the Center. The Federal Judicial Center is divided into four main departments. The division of education serves the 16,000—plus members of the Federal Judicial System, by sponsoring educational programs for appellate judges, trial judges, bankruptcy judges and magistrates in addition to clerks of court, deputy clerks, probation officers, middle level management and others. In addition to facilitating workshops and seminars, we offer publications and, most exciting, an extensive media program with video and audio tapes. Recently, after some very complex, comprehensive crime-control
'42, Director, The Federal Judicial Center

legislation was passed, we presented a four-hour video satellite program on the subject which was telecast to thirty locations. It was viewed by more than 2,200 people and, as part of that program, open telephone lines were available with questions coming into Washington to our faculty who came from as far as California, Texas, the Northwest, the Pacific Northwest and New England to volunteer their expertise. The program was videotaped, and we estimate that it has already been seen by more than 6,000 people. These new audio-visual techniques have become a very exciting aspect of our normal educational offerings.

Our operation also includes a research division in judicial administration. Some of the products of that department include descriptions of various innovations as well as rigorous, empirical evaluations of how certain programs are working.

The Center also has an extensive computer development program. We are at the point of substituting electronic dockets for paper dockets in certain courts, and we have evaluated and approved the use of electronic mail for many of the appellate courts that have three-judge panels with the judges' chambers in as many as three different cities.

We have a support service which offers advisories to the judges on new developments at the appellate level and another that makes it possible for judges to share innovations in case management and office management. We also have developed a computerized index of what we call 'fugitive materials.' These are either unpublished speeches or published speeches that are inadequately indexed; for example, the Chief Justice might cover many topics in one wrap-up report, which is entered into the 'fugitive materials' index. This service has proven quite useful.

Each of the Center's departments is staffed with able, indeed, terrific people. The judges, who receive absolutely no extra remuneration for lecturing, writing and/or reviewing materials for us, have been incredibly supportive. We call on scores of them and so many are willing to help.

I try to keep abreast of the workings of the Center in addition to a fair amount of lecturing and writing. My main task, of course, is administrative - making suggestions for innovations, coordinating programs already in place and keeping the operation moving forward. It is a fun, diverse and challenging position.

Professor Levin: We presently are evaluating a program that had its genesis in Philadelphia. For some thirty years, the State of Pennsylvania has been implementing court-annexed arbitration, which is one popular method of alternative dispute resolution. The Federal Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania began this program about seven years ago, and we did an empirical evaluation of it as well as some other programs. Most recently, the Congress allotted money to the Federal Judicial System in order that the program - with all sorts of variations and on an experimental basis - be expanded to eight additional District Courts. We are going into those Courts attempting to discover how litigants and lawyers will react to this important new trend and development. Both the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Alfred L. Luongo, an Alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania Law School's Class of 1947, and judge Raymond T. Broderick, who serves as the Chairman of that Court's Committee on this project, have lectured rather widely for the Center on how the program works, its advantages, and on what they perceive as some of the ways it has been improved over the years.

A number of other projects in which we presently are involved are simply descriptive of different types of developments. In the past, we have done massive studies of District Court litigation in a District Court Series, and we have written up mediation programs in different places. Out of our Research Division, we have been doing a great deal of work on new statutory developments in the criminal law. One project involves the monitoring and evaluation of programs on drug aftercare in connection with the Probation Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. One of our publications from the Research Division, resulting from recent Congressional legislation in the crime control areas, has been reprinted a number of times. In fact, over 10,000 copies are now in print as a result of the tremendous demand.

We are constantly doing research in the development of computer applications. A massive study was done about a year ago on electronic court reporting, and the use of four-channel audio tapes as distinguished from regular court reporters. The results of this study were significant in that some action was taken by the Judicial Conference on this matter.

LSH: Since the beginning of your tenure at the Federal Judicial Center, what projects in your opinion have made the greatest impact?

Professor Levin: It is difficult to choose. I would say that our educational projects have proven very significant. We constantly are getting positive feedback from judges who have found them extremely helpful and useful in trials of cases, etc. There is no doubt that the automation projects are going to have a lot of impact. Some of the research projects, which were begun prior to my appointment and completed afterwards, have affected the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for example, and have resulted in some amendments.

LSH: How do you view the future of the organization?

Professor Levin: I view it quite optimistically. It is fair to say that we are doing more and more on every level. The judicial system is becoming larger, the number of judges is increasing, the demands on us are increasing, people are constantly giving us feedback that our programs are worthwhile. All of this is the heart of the future of the Center.

LSH: To what extent is your interaction with the Chief Justice?

Professor Levin: We have a lot of contact with one another. As I mentioned before, by statute, Chief Justice Burger chairs the Federal Judicial Center's Board, and he is a very active chairperson at that. He likes to
be kept informed of everything that is going on, has bright ideas on  
judicial  
administration  
and  
has made tremendous  
contributions  
in this area. He believes  
strongly in  
judicial education  
and  
computerization. The Chief  
is an exceedingly  
thoughtful  
man. On a personal level, he  
is very anxious to  
have found it most helpful not to speculate,  
but I  
really do not know. I  
have found it most helpful not to speculate,  
but I  
do love to have people tell me all kinds of  
predictions. All of the present Justices  
have been supportive of the Center in  
various ways - at Center functions, etc. -  
but, personally, I  
do not have the vaguest  
idea of what tomorrow will bring to the  
Court.

LSH: Your involvement in the controversial  
1982 ATO issue represents your continuing  
commitment to the University of  
Pennsylvania. What motivated your  
participation in this difficult situation?

Professor Levin: University of  
Pennsylvania President [Sheldon] Hackney  
and Provost [Thomas] Ehrlich asked me to  
perform the service, and I felt it my duty  
to accept. I understood that a number of other  
very logical and, no doubt, superior  
alternatives to myself were ruled out simply  
because they had been involved in other  
phases of the case. The procedure was set  
up by Judge Lois Forer, of the Philadelphia  
Court of Common Pleas, who really had  
handed down from the Bench a number of  
requirements with regard to the selection of  
the person who was to hear the case and  
with regard to procedures, etc. It was from a  
sense of obligation that I accepted the  
appointment. I felt that if called upon, I  
should respond. I owe a lot to the University  
of Pennsylvania.

LSH: The tribute paid you by the Family of  
Alumnus Stephen A. Cozen, ‘64, (The  
Cozen Family Faculty Development Fund to  
Honor Professor A. Leo Levin), of which the  
Law School is the beneficiary, reaffirms your  
impact as a beloved and popular professor  
for the past thirty-seven years. Although  
you still come here regularly to teach  
seminars, do you miss full-time teaching?  
What courses do you teach?

Professor Levin: First, I want to say that  
Steve Cozen is a very rare, unusual and  
particularly generous person. I was deeply  
touched by his thoughtfulness and  
generosity in including my name on the  
project. As everyone knows, he has been  
exceedingly innovative and creative in his  
particular field of law and is highly regarded.  
I just feel particularly grateful for his having  
included mention of my name as part of the  
Fund.

One of the most gratifying rewards that  
Doris and I count as significant in our lives  
has been our relationships with Penn Law  
School students. We see Alumni from time-  
to-time and are pleased that the bonds  
developed years ago still exist.

The happy thing for me at the Law School  
is that I continue this year to teach not only  
seminars but I am able to enjoy a certain  
amount of classroom work in connection  
with the reading courses. Thanks to Bob  
Gorman [Professor Robert A. Gorman] and  
some of our colleagues, Penn Law School  
was one of the pioneers in developing the  
reading course, and this program has put me  
back into the classroom. Of course, the  
time that I now spend at the Law School  
varies, and the type of traditional teaching that I  
previously did cannot happen. I do miss that  
but, at least, there are some substitutes.  
Each year I fashion my own Law School  
teaching schedule. Sometimes I am here  
more than once-a-week and, at other times,  
there are weeks when it is not necessary to  
come at all. During this Spring 1986  
semester, I am giving a reading course in  
Injunctions and a writing seminar in  
Advanced Civil Procedure which will run all  
this year. On other occasions, I have taught  
a reading course in Judicial Administration  
- a rather exciting subject, I think. Reading  
courses tend to include between thirty and  
fifty students. We meet both individually  
and in class discussion sessions a number of  
times during the semester.

LSH: As an Alumnus of the Law School’s  
Class of 1942, what changes have you seen  
during the past forty-five years, both as a  
Professor and as a graduate of the School?

Professor Levin: Your figures frighten me!  
Basicall,y the School has grown over the  
years in the sense of a much larger Faculty.  
I have the sense that the School has added  
some exciting, high-quality people who bode  
very well for the future. Students change  
almost from year-to-year. One is never quite  
certain how much they are changing  
because the world is changing, or how much  
our perceptions are changing because we are  
bringing different eyes to the same  
phenomena. Most certainly, the Law School  
is changing. I think that we have great  
leadership in Bob Mundheim and the sense  
hazard seems to be that we are ready, as a  
School, for a great surge forward.

Of course, many things did not exist forty-  
five years ago at the School. There have  
been many major developments since that  
time like: the expanded number of Faculty  
teaching a greater variety of available  
courses; new departments in the School like  
the Institute For Law and Economics; the  
Journal of Comparative Business and Capital  
Market Law; the administrative position of  
Assistant Dean for Alumni Affairs; and, of  
course, The Law Alumni Journal. In part,  
these innovations have developed because  
Penn Law School is a national law school in  
a way that it simply was not some forty-five  
years ago, when I registered as a student.  
Demands on it today are so different.

LSH: It seems that the legal profession  
is forever the object of society’s strict  
scrutiny and censure. From your vantage, how  
do you view the worth of the profession today  
and its prospects for the future?

Professor Levin: I have the greatest respect  
for the role of lawyers in our society. If we  
look historically on the impact made by the  
Judiciary - particularly the Federal Judiciary  
- and on the quality of life in this country, one  
can see its enormous, beneficent and  
beneficial contributions. Too often, we do  
do not give credit to the lawyers who make  
these things possible. Under our system,  
cases begin with lawyers. Judges do not go  
roaming around looking for cases and for  
causes. Lawyers bring them to the judges  
and shape their cases creatively. One just  
needs to examine the career of a man like  
our former University of Pennsylvania Law  
School Dean, Judge Louis H. Pollak, of the  
U. S. District Court for the Eastern District  
of Pennsylvania. Judge Pollak’s extraordinary  
career with the NAACP, then, in academia  
and, now, with his work on the Federal  
Bench, is an example of how this runs. But,  
too often, I think that society does not give  
quite enough credit to lawyers - to those  
operating in the vineyards and not  
necessarily working only on social causes.  
Law is not an easy profession. It requires  
rigor and creativity and a sense of justice.  
It is my happy opinion that University of  
Pennsylvania Law Alumni, as a group, have  
made tremendous contributions on a number of  
fronts. They are great people - professiona  
s with a sensitivity and an  
awareness of larger issues, who bring to the  
profession a very high level of quality which  
ultimately makes possible the advancement  
of society.
Reshaping The Nation’s Civil Rights Agenda

by Julius L. Chambers, Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. and member, the University of Pennsylvania Law School Board of Overseers

I appreciate the opportunity to address you this evening. I understand that my presence is to inspire and to motivate, to bring you more in touch with a member of the Law School Board of Overseers and to engage you, at least briefly, in some of the challenging issues facing the legal profession today. I am honored and humbled with the challenge.

A year ago last July [1984], I left the practice of law in Charlotte, North Carolina where I had founded the State’s first interracial law firm. As a result of the previous 20 years of handling civil rights cases as part of my private practice, I have become intimately involved with a number of developing issues of that day and of today. That experience led me to accept the challenge to become Director-Counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in New York. My association with the Fund goes back to 1965 when Marion Wright Edelman and I became the first legal interns under The Fund’s legal training program. Later, I had the privilege of serving as President of The Fund for 10 years. I mention all of this so that you may see the context in which I place the topic of my discussion with you: the efforts and means of the Reagan Administration to reshape the Nation’s civil rights agenda in its own ideological image, using the Justice Department as its principal tool.

This effort is broad in scope and touches civil rights and civil liberties provisions embedded in the Constitution, Federal civil rights statutes, and Executive branch regulations and Presidential orders designed to protect the rights of women and minorities.

Soon after the Administration took office, officials of the Justice Department announced their opposition to traditional remedies in school desegregation and employment discrimination cases. In May 1981, then Attorney General William French Smith came to Philadelphia and spoke against affirmative action measures to remedy employment discrimination. In January 1982, the Administration revoked the IRS ruling which denied tax exempt status to private schools that maintain racially discriminatory practices and policies on the basis of religious doctrines.

Following the 1984 elections, efforts to overturn 25 years of civil rights policies accelerated and broadened. Today, Attorney General Meese justifies his actions on issues of race discrimination with a spirited defense of America’s promise of a color-blind Constitution and color-blind enforcement. This turns civil rights laws upside down and makes a mockery of the spirit and meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment by asserting that it was intended to protect white males from “reverse discrimination.” Rather than debate the merits of affirmative action, the Attorney General compares its supporters with those in the past who defended slavery as “good not only for the slaves but for society.”

When the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights provided testimony to the Congress, showing errors in William Bradford Reynolds’s statements about the Justice Department’s civil rights policies, the Attorney General denounced the civil rights community as a “pernicious lobby;” just as earlier in his career he had denounced the American Civil Liberties Union as a “criminal’s lobby;” in an interview in The U.S. News and World Report, he reflected that only people who are guilty of crimes are police suspects and, therefore, there is no need for Miranda v. Arizona. A number of journals have reported his views regarding so-called “activist” judges and Supreme Court Justices. His notion that the Constitution must be “strictly” interpreted according to the intent of its framers which only he and those who agree with him have been able to divine, and his suggestion that 60 years of precedent holding that the Fourteenth Amendment incorporates certain basic protections of the Bill of Rights against encroachment by the states, rests on an “intelligently shaky foundation” and is “constitutionally suspect.”

Early this month [October 1985], Justice Brennan spoke at a symposium at Georgetown University and, in words far more eloquent than mine, took issue with the views espoused by the Attorney General. Among other things, he said: “There are those who find legitimacy in fidelity to what they call ‘the intention of the Framers.’ In its most doctrinaire incarnation, this view demands that Justices discern exactly what the Framers thought about the question under consideration and simply follow that intention in resolving the case before them. It is a view that feigns self-effacing deference to the specific judgments of those who forged our original social compact. But, in truth, it is little more than arrogance cloaked as humility. It is arrogant to pretend that, from our vantage, we can gauge accurately the intention of the Framers on application of principle to specific, contemporary questions…”

There has been an ongoing debate in The New York Times over the Administration’s policies for selecting judges based on their positions on abortion, affirmative action and school prayer. We have seen a series of new judges of impeccable ideological purity, and some in their mid-30’s with little experience.
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as practicing attorneys, being appointed to the Federal Bench where they will remain well into the next century.

Various of the Administration’s policies have been defended as being no different from policies followed by prior liberal administrations. It is argued that they simply are seeking to redress an alleged imbalance, that if their critics were in office they would be doing exactly the same thing, just on the other side of the ideological fence.

I disagree with this defense of their actions. These ideologically-based assaults are at variance not only with past Democratic administrations, but with the policies and practices of past Republican administrations as well. What is going on now at the Department of Justice is fundamentally different from what has gone on in earlier administrations, whether liberal or conservative. No previous administration has elevated strict adherence to a common ideological approach over important institutional concerns.

The views and policies of the Attorney General raise serious questions concerning the appropriate role that the Department of Justice should play. It has not been the case that diversity on the Federal Bench and appointed more minorities and women than all other presidents put together. That administration, however, had no ideological litmus tests and appointed conservative, liberal and moderate judges. Even Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s court-packing plan had as its target only the Supreme Court. FDR sought to end interference with the exercise of Federal power during the crisis of the Great Depression - the appointees themselves representing a range of views and backgrounds on a variety of issues.

The focus on a particular ideology, to the exclusion of other voices, is what is different about this Administration. An illustration of its effects can be seen in the Government’s *amicus curiae* briefs in the Supreme Court in cases raising civil rights and civil liberties issues. It is a fact that, with a few minor exceptions, this Administration has used its wholly discretionary *amicus* authority consistently to take anti-civil rights and anti-civil liberties positions before the High Court. Just this Term, for example, it has filed *amicus curiae* briefs which have: endorsed, despite its alleged goal of achieving a colorblind society, the power of prosecutors to strike Blacks from juries solely because they are Black; endorsed the technique of defendants in civil rights cases of extorting waivers of attorneys’ fees in exchange for relief to clients; attacked the principle that race-conscious remedies can be used to correct proven discrimination; argued, on the other hand, that if Blacks are able to elect their quota of candidates or one Black official, they cannot prove a violation of the Voting Rights Act; and urged that Roe v. Wade be overruled.

Typically, in past administrations, whether liberal, conservative or middle-of-the-road, there has always been a variety of competing voices. Thus, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, regardless of how liberal the administration was, had an institutional interest in pro-prosecution positions. The Civil Division and the Civil Service Commission (now the Office of Personnel Management) had institutional interests in pro-employer positions in civil rights cases. On the other side, there was the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Finally, there was the United States Civil Rights Commission, an independent agency overseeing the entire Government. Thus, in a particular case, competing interests would be heard and the Solicitor General or Attorney General would resolve the question at the highest level.

In some instances, such as the *DeFunis* case, the EEOC and the Civil Service Commission fought to a standstill and no brief was filed. In other instances, such as the *Bakke* case, the ultimate result of the expression of conflicting opinions was a brief somewhere in the middle but basically supporting the principle of affirmative action.

In the present Administration, however, there are no or very few voices on the civil rights side. This has been true of the Civil Rights Division from the beginning. The Civil Rights Commission now has been destroyed as an effective independent voice and is simply a mouthpiece for the ideological positions of the Administration. The EEOC, after having taken an independent position initially on affirmative action, has now shifted over to the side of Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Pendleton. Competing voices are silenced, shut out or punished. Within the Administration, dissent is limited. Those whose ideological commitment is lukewarm, such as Margaret Heckler, are pushed out. There are concerted attacks on organizations outside the Administration that disagree with its policies and practices. Mr. Meese has made no secret of his desire and efforts to abolish legal services for the poor; he has pushed for legislation that would severely curtail the award of attorney fees to organizations such as The Legal Defense Fund, particularly in cases where the Federal Government is a defendant - although his ardor cooled on this bill until after his private lawyers collected thousands of dollars for defending him against charges of conflict of interest while he was on the White House staff, at which point he reintroduced it. He has been relentless in efforts to end funding for what he terms "left" organizations such as legal defense funds and other groups active in social welfare issues of which he disapproves.

Since the Administration hears nothing but its own views it only takes positions that are consistent with them. The results, however, are bad institutionally. Instead of an Executive (and, possibly, in the future a Judiciary, if the Administration’s views are implemented) that represents the diversity of our society and which hears and weighs competing views, there is a monolithic adherence to one accepted point of view.

In order to fully understand what is going on in the Administration, it is essential to understand the ideology underlying the views advanced in particular cases. Thus, Mr. Meese’s position that the incorporation decisions of the Supreme Court are wrong is much more than a theoretical dispute over the Fourteenth Amendment - a dispute...
which was effectively resolved many years ago. Rather, Mr. Meese does not want the Fourteenth Amendment to incorporate the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and, particularly, does not want the Amendment's provisions applied to the states because he is hostile towards the First, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments. His underlying purpose is to limit the scope and importance of the Bill of Rights, particularly as they affect state practices.

The Attorney General's tactics are new but the conflict itself is an old one. It is between the Jeffersonian ideal of liberty and self-government, and the conservative ideal of government by an elite; between those who favor a limited government in order to protect the rights of minorities, whether political or racial, and those who favor a limited government in order to allow the dominant economic interests to exercise their power free of restraint; between those who believe in the principles incorporated in the Bill of Rights because they believe that a democratic government is founded on an informed citizenry, and those who wish a limited view of the application of Constitutional rights because they do not want an informed citizenry that will oppose its policies. It is, in short, a conflict between those who believe in and those who are hostile to a truly free and democratic society. And, from the perspective of one who has spent over 20 years practicing civil rights law, it seems that we are fighting battles we thought had been won years ago, diverting precious time and resources from the struggle to eliminate today's more complex forms of discrimination.

Just as I believe the law represents the best hope for developing new approaches and new solutions, I know that today's law students represent the best hope for our future success in realizing the ideal of justice in an integrated society. My own experiences have taught and have shown me that the law and lawyers can be effective catalysts in changing the world in which we live. When I graduated from law school, it was commonplace for Blacks and other minorities and women to be passed over for jobs, denied equal chance for education, and told expressly or by implication, that they were incapable of heading a school or a school system, of being a mayor or a governor or a member of Congress, of being the president of a bank or the President of the United States. While we have not reached a millennium, we have made progress in addressing many of these problems and I do not think we will go back to the pre-Brown era.

Our challenge today, however, is greater than any we have experienced since Brown. The need for lawyers who will devote time and energy and who will commit their efforts to civil rights and civil liberties is critical. For this reason I take every opportunity possible to speak to law students and law graduates to plead for their involvement in this effort. Your skills and talents, your energy and commitment can make a difference in making this a better society for all Americans.

---

The Case For Bequests

The greatness of the University of Pennsylvania Law School is due in no small part to the gifts in time and money of its Alumni and friends. Faced with intense economic pressures, the Law School more than ever needs the support of its Alumni and friends to enable it to continue to provide leadership in legal education.

Gifts are needed for endowed and current use purposes. There are many important programs and facilities available for a donor or as a memorial to a loved one. Penn Law School will welcome an opportunity to discuss in confidence with you and your advisors your plans for a gift, life income plan, or a bequest and the significant tax advantages you may achieve.

A bequest in support of the University of Pennsylvania Law School can be as creative as the individual who devises it. In addition to the more commonly willed assets of cash, securities and real estate, the University accepts art works, patent rights, rare books and virtually anything of value.

Your will may describe a specific cash amount or property. It may reserve for the Law School a certain percentage of the total estate value, or it may provide all or a portion of the rest and residue of the estate after provisions for family members are met.

All bequests to the Law School are completely exempt from Federal estate tax and there is no limitation on the value that may be willed.

The information provided below is meant to be used by you in conjunction with your legal advisors. The University's Office of Planned Giving Programs will answer any questions from you and/or your advisors and will provide, upon request, language tailored to meet your specific situation.

An unrestricted bequest to the University of Pennsylvania Law School may be worded as follows:

"I give, devise, and bequeath to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, a non-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the sum of $____ to be used for the purposes of said University's Law School as the Dean thereof shall determine."

A restricted bequest (and/or a named fund) may be worded as follows:

"I give, devise, and bequeath to the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, a non-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the sum of $____ to establish the __________ Fund at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. The property comprising this Fund shall be used for __________."

The more limited the designation of the bequest, the more important it is to add a provision such as the following:

"If, in the future, the Trustees of the University should determine that it is no longer practicable to use this Fund, or the income from this Fund, for this specific purpose, it may be used for other needs of the University's Law School. It is my hope that these new uses will reflect the interests of the donor and the spirit of the original gift."

*If the bequest is for property other than cash, this wording may be replaced by "all my right, title, and interest in the following property: (insert description)." If it is a residuary bequest, one may insert "all rest, residue, and remainder of my estate."

For more information: Donald G. Myers, Director of Development, University of Penn- sylvania Law School, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 (215) 898-7489.
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The Government Rescue of a Troubled Enterprise

by Dean Robert H. Mundheim, University Professor of Law and Finance*

Fortunately for me I do not have the broad brief in comparative law which has been undertaken by some of the previous speakers. I have been given a more modest assignment: to speak about the Chrysler Loan Guarantee program as an example of United States Government aid for the restructuring of a troubled, large multinational corporation. I do not bring to that assignment any specific academic credentials, but I did serve as General Counsel to the United States Treasury and to the Chrysler Loan Guarantee Board during the negotiation of the Chrysler Loan Guarantee program.

Although the United States Government has provided aid to troubled enterprises, the Government’s role in the Chrysler case was relatively unusual and caused substantial debate. Even in the Democratic Carter Administration, the dominant American view was that troubled companies should be subject to the discipline of the market place and not be ‘bailed out.’

The Chrysler restructuring was done outside the bankruptcy process. Chrysler could have been allowed to go bankrupt with the United States Government playing a role in a reorganization managed by the bankruptcy court. This technique was followed in the reorganization of the Penn Central, another major U.S. business failure of relatively recent times. Bankruptcy was not chosen in the Chrysler case, in part, because lenders were uncertain about the status of some of their claims (particularly about the status of their loans to the relatively sound Chrysler Financial Corporation) and were, therefore, not prepared to force Chrysler into bankruptcy. In addition, bankruptcy was seen as endangering the ability of Chrysler to remain as a viable operating entity, with particular damage to its ability to produce and sell its front-wheel drive or K-car. As an economic matter, it was thought that the early production of K-cars for sale in the American market might retain, for American manufacturers, a product which would otherwise be lost to foreign competition.

The Chrysler case was the third of a handful of major troubled situations in which the United States Government intervened before bankruptcy to try to set the failing entity back on its feet. In each of these cases, special legislation authorizing the intervention had to be passed. In other words, in each of these cases both Congress and the President had to agree that governmental intervention was necessary. The first case was the Lockheed Loan Guarantee Program. Under it the United States Government guaranteed $250 million in loans to the Lockheed Corporation, a large defense contractor. The second case involved New York City. Congress authorized Federal seasonal financing for New York City in 1975 and authorized guarantees for longer term borrowings in 1978. Chrysler was the third case, the authorizing legislation passing in December 1979.

In mentioning these three special cases, I do not mean to suggest that there are not other situations in which the United States Government stepped in to provide financial assistance to troubled companies. For example, First Pennsylvania Bank, the oldest bank in the United States and the bank of which I became a Director in 1980, received a package of $375 million of government assistance, $175 million of private bank financing, and a private bank credit line of $1 billion in 1979, at about the same time that the Chrysler loan guarantees were authorized. The governmental financing was provided by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, a federal agency which guarantees payment to insured depositors in the event of a bank failure. The judgement to effect a reorganization in place of liquidation reflected a concern about the ripple effects of a liquidation which would damage other financial institutions and a conclusion that it would be cheaper in the long-run to nurse the bank back to health. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation model raises the question, to which I will return at the end of my presentation, of whether creation of an agency empowered to provide financial assistance to troubled companies would be generally desirable.

Why did the United States Government take the unusual step of supporting legislation to permit intervention in the Chrysler situation? Chrysler was one of the largest U.S. companies. In 1977 it was the tenth largest company in the United States; in 1978 it was the seventeenth largest.

Increased unemployment from a Chrysler bankruptcy (including ripple effects) was projected by then Treasury Secretary G. William Miller to be at least 75,000 in 1980 with an additional 100,000 expected in the following year. Unemployment concentrated heavily in Detroit, Michigan, and among Blacks. I think it not irrelevant that Michigan was to be the scene of an important primary election in which President Carter was particularly interested.

A Chrysler failure also meant that there would be direct governmental expenditures for unemployment compensation, welfare payments and food stamps. There was also a potential need to honor government guaranteed pension obligations to Chrysler workers and a projected loss in tax revenues. The public cost of a Chrysler bankruptcy was estimated at at least $3 billion and probably a good deal more. Thus proponents of federal intervention argued that the Government would have to spend a substantial amount of money, in any event, and that it might be reasonable under the circumstances to invest some in trying to resuscitate the company.

There was also concern about the impact of a Chrysler bankruptcy on the stability of the financial markets. The memory of the disruption in the commercial paper market of the Penn Central failure was still fresh in people's minds.

The loss of Chrysler would also leave the United States with only two major domestic automobile companies, General Motors and Ford. That result posed antitrust-type considerations.

Finally, as I mentioned previously, there was the fear that the United States would permanently lose more of the growing market for front-wheel drive, fuel efficient cars to foreign competition. The market for the purchase of cars is essentially a repeat market. Thus, loss of a share of the market to foreign competition likely would result in a long term loss of customers. Since Chrysler was farthest ahead of the American manufacturer with production of a front-wheel drive sedan, there was a strong
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impetus not to do anything which would delay its availability to the U.S. consumer. Bankruptcy at the very least would delay Chrysler's ability to produce the K-car.

There were other reasons supporting the judgement to have the Government intervene and the legislation passed relatively easily in December 1979. The 271 to 136 margin in the House, and the 53 to 44 vote margin in the Senate contrasted with the one-vote margin in the Senate and the three-vote margin in the House supporting the earlier Lockheed loan guarantee.

I would now like to look at the terms under which government aid was made available. One of Chrysler's early proposals for aid was in the form of a provision to carry back its losses for an extended period and to set it off against previously earned profits, thus entitling it to a refund of taxes paid years before. In effect this proposal would have given Chrysler a blank check; that is, money without any conditions. This proposal reflected Chrysler's preferred alternative. Not surprisingly the government did not look favorably upon this proposal.

The United States Government believed that any help to Chrysler should be on a one-time basis in order to provide a reasonable prospect that a healthy company would emerge. There was a clear determination not to emulate the experience of some countries by embarking on a continuing program of pouring money into an enterprise as a way of keeping unemployment down. In addition, the Government was determined to extend help only as part of a package in which other parties directly interested in the health of Chrysler would also make a contribution. Thus the Government wanted a careful, detailed analysis of how much aid would realistically be needed to put Chrysler back on its feet and a sense that, with such aid, Chrysler could, as a business matter, make a success of it in a competitive environment. The analysis concluded that Chrysler would need $3.5 billion, an amount higher than the early and rather hastily put-together Treasury or company estimates of what would be needed to rescue the company.

The Chrysler Loan Guarantee Act of 1979 created the Chrysler Loan Guarantee Board and authorized it to approve the issuance of up to $1.5 billion in Federal loan guarantees. The Board was comprised of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller General. The authority to issue guarantees was subject to a number of very important conditions. First, Chrysler had to obtain at least $1.43 billion in non-federally guaranteed assistance. Five hundred million dollars of that aid was designated in the statute as being required to come from U.S. banks, financial institutions and other creditors. Four hundred million dollars was to be available in new loans or credits (plus extension of the full principal amount of loans outstanding as of October 17, 1979). In addition, the U.S. banks had to provide $100 million in concessions. The statute also provided that foreign banks, financial institutions and other creditors had to extend $150 million in assistance in addition to extending their loans outstanding as of October 17, 1979. These provisions embodied the principle of proportional sharing of the burdens among the major lenders (although, as you will notice, there was no requirement for concessions from the foreign lenders). In addition, the banks privately agreed that all banks must participate and that no bank would be bought out. The principle of all-or-none was an important response to a situation in which there were hundreds of bank creditors, and in which there was always the temptation for some banks to hold out from a restructuring agreement in the hope that their position would be carefully bought out by other banks who were anxious to conclude the restructuring.

The statute provided that the balance of the $780 million should come from a variety of other sources: $250 million from state, local and other governments; $180 million from suppliers and dealers; $300 million in asset sales; and $50 million from the sale of additional equity securities. The specificity of these statutory requirements was softened by giving the Loan Guarantee Board the right to modify the amount required from any category of contributor as along as a total of $1.43 billion was raised. Although not absolute, the statutorily announced benchmarks provided an important negotiating backdrop. For example, it seemed pretty clear that Congress expected the Board to get the prescribed amounts from the banks and, in fact, their contributions were ultimately valued at $642 million - $8 million short of the expected amount.

The insistence on financial contributions from parties other than the United States Government was designed to serve a number of purposes. For example, the request for new commitments, especially from the financial community, was designed to provide some assurance that private, experienced parties were making the judgment that Chrysler's operating and financing plans made business sense. The force of that consideration was somewhat diminished in light of the fact that the banks put up no new money. The "new" money they did put up consisted of lending interest payments which had not been made or were deferred. In addition, Congress thought it unfair (and politically unthinkable) for only the United States Government to take a risk at this stage of Chrysler's life.

You will have noticed that $1.5 billion plus $1.4 billion do not add up to $3.5 billion. The gap was closed by a provision in the statute which required a substantial contribution from Chrysler's employees. The statute said that $587 million were to be provided from this source, $642 million from the organized work force and $125 million from employees not represented by a labor union. Satisfaction of the requirements of this provision was a sine qua non for the issuance of any federal guarantees. There was no flexibility to modify the requirement in any respect. I am not sure that these amounts could have been bargained out with labor in the absence of an inflexible congressional mandate.

In addition to the mandated non-federal contributions, the statute also contained
provisions which tried to assure that the United States Government would never lose any money as a consequence of its investment. The Congress reasoned that the United States would be the newest risk taker and that, therefore, it should be entitled to a first lien on all of Chrysler's property. The only exception would be in the case of state governments which would also be new lenders to Chrysler and should be given an opportunity, equal to that of the United States Government, to protect their positions. The Government's basic protection was, of course, its view that Chrysler would only be given guarantees if the Board concluded that Chrysler would emerge from the reorganization as a going concern, able to operate profitably without resort to government aid in the future.

This condition would be implemented by requiring Chrysler to submit a satisfactory operating plan for the current fiscal year and for three following years: "demonstrating the ability of the corporation to continue operations as a going concern in the automobile business and after December 31, 1983, to continue such operations as a going concern without additional guarantees or federal financing." This was a rolling requirement and continued until the guarantees were no longer outstanding. This requirement allowed the Board and its staff to review the projected shape of Chrysler's business. Chrysler had the first opportunity to develop the operating plan but it ultimately had to answer the questions of and sometimes make changes to satisfy its "governmental partner." The Government's authority to review and require changes in the operating plan provided leverage to force a downsizing of the Company. Lee Iacocca, Chrysler's President, and the Chrysler management would have preferred to see the Company remain as a full-line automobile company, and they strongly resisted the Government's pressure. Ultimately, however, they had to accede to it. A review of the operating plan also created an opportunity for the staff to create the kind of annoyances to management (e.g., forcing the company to dispose of its corporate jets) which would make Chrysler anxious to pay off the loan as quickly as possible and to discourage others from seeking similar assistance.

The operating plan also was required to be accompanied by the submission of a satisfactory financing plan which met the needs of the corporation as reflected in the operating plan. Prior to issuing any guarantee, the Board had to make a judgement that the prospective earning power of the corporation, together with the character and value of the securities pledged, furnished reasonable assurance that the guaranteed loans would be repaid according to their terms.

The conditions in the Chrysler Loan Guarantee legislation were more precisely defined and more demanding than the conditions in either the Lockheed or the New York City legislation. Thus, even though the legislation was easier to secure than the Lockheed or the New York legislation, it does not constitute an attractive precedent for other troubled companies. Indeed, when Chrysler was getting federal aid, American Motors Corporation and, possibly, Ford could also have used help; however, they did not make a serious effort to acquire it. Similarly when Philadelphia and Cleveland were in serious financial difficulties, the prospect of meeting loan guarantee conditions stimulated the interested parties to work out their own salvation.

I now wish to turn briefly to a question I raised earlier. Does the experience of ad hoc governmental intervention in Chrysler suggest the need for a more regularized governmental approach to the problem of the large troubled company? In the depressed economic conditions of the early 1980's, there were a number of calls for such an approach. For example, Felix Rohatyn, a partner of Lazard Freres, called for the establishment of a Modern Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an adaptation to modern times of an agency created in the 1930's to deal with the need to provide help in several critical areas of the private sector, particularly to banks and railroads. Interestingly, Lee Iacocca has recently embraced this idea. Proponents of the idea look at the experience of Chrysler and conclude that the Executive and the Congress tend to be so swayed by short-term political considerations that they would permit government aid in situations not justified by economics analysis and on terms less stringent than would seem appropriate. They see a tough-minded, investment-banker-like organization as able to respond to requests for aid in a technically expert, business-like fashion. They also believe that such an agency would be a more effective negotiator of the terms on which aid would be extended. My own reactions to this type of proposal is cautious. Institutionlizing the bail-out process would likely encourage it. If a modern Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in place, it is going to try to make deals not to turn them down. In contrast, the ad hoc political response which I have previously described has not led to a series of financial bail-outs.

It is unclear to me whether a first rate staff can be recruited for an agency whose announced purpose is to act only on a standby basis, with a primary mission of discouraging deals. In contrast, at the time of Chrysler when we put together the Treasury team which had the lead in representing the United States Government, there were a number of extraordinarily able people in the Treasury who had experience with work-outs. For example, Deputy Secretary Robert Carswell was the senior partner of a major New York law firm which actively represented banks in work-outs. Luke Lynch, an Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury, had spent a considerable amount of time as a work-out lawyer during his time in private practice. Roger Altman, Assistant Secretary for Domestic Finance, had been a partner in Lehman Brothers and Brian Freeman, who became the Executive Director of the Chrysler Loan Guarantee Board staff, had gained experience in the Lockheed loans. Secretary Miller was an experienced business executive who, as Chief Executive Officer of Textron, had worked on a proposed merger of Textron and Lockheed. In addition to people in the Government who can be called upon to work on such a special project, the Government also can retain needed special assistance from the private sector. For example, Treasury retained the accounting firm of Ernst & Whinney to review the operating and financing plans prepared by Chrysler. It also found an ex- American Motors Corporation Officer, John Secrist, to serve as its expert consultant on the automobile industry. Finally, the Treasury turned to a major New York law firm to help it negotiate and draft the voluminous documentation needed in the restructuring.

Finally, I doubt that the judgements on bail-outs turn primarily on technical points. Whether or not to bail out a specific company or industry embodies important political questions (e.g., should the Government cushion shocks in New York City, Philadelphia, or Detroit; should the United States be willing to lose domestic employment to foreign competition; should the Government support Chrysler and, perhaps, disadvantage Ford or General Motors). The resolution of these questions involves the balancing of interests, and such balancing is best done within and should not be insulated from the political process.
Professor Martin J. Aronstein, ’65, participated in a program on Repurchase Agreements, sponsored by the Banking Committee of the ABA’s Corporate Section in Washington in July, 1985.

Professor Martin J. Aronstein, ’65, participated in a program on Repurchase Agreements, sponsored by the Banking Committee of the ABA’s Corporate Section in Washington in July, 1985.


Professor Robert A. Gorman is now the Law School’s Kenneth W. Gemmill Professor of Law. The second edition of his Casebook, Copyright For The Eighties, co-authored with Alan Lattman and Jane C. Ginsburg, was published in May 1985 by The Michie Company. He was the recipient of a grant for research in labor law, donated to the Law School in memory of Jerome Markowitz by his classmates of the Class of 1953 which will be used for Mr. Gorman’s spring sabbatical. Professor Gorman was a principal speaker at a symposium on legal education held at the New York Law School in April 1985. His comments will be published as an article in the forthcoming symposium issue of The New York Law School Law Review.

Professor Gorman was presented The Philadelphia Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts Meritorious Service Award, principally for offering a Law School course and seminar on Law and the Arts in conjunction with PVLA attorneys.

Mr. Gorman offered a series of lectures for the Law School’s Continuing Legal Education Program on Copyright Law in the fall 1984 semester, and a series of lectures on Labor Law in the spring 1985 semester. Professor Gorman spoke on the subject of legal education and the Law School curriculum to several Alumni gatherings devoted to the "Inside Pennsylvania Law School" program, including those in New York and Washington, D.C.

During summer of 1985, he served as Visiting Professor at the University of Iowa College of Law, where he offered a course on Labor Law. Two University of Pennsylvania Law School Alumni - Richard Matasar, ’77, and Michael Green, ’75, are members of the Iowa Law Faculty.

Professor Gorman has been reappointed to a three-year term as Judge on the World Bank Administrative Tribunal. The Tribunal, created in July 1983, is an international judicial body with jurisdiction to decide employment grievances by staff members of the World Bank. He continues to serve as a member of The Council, the governing body, of the American Association of University Professors, and as a member of the Executive Committee of the University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the AAUP.

Professor Harry L. Gutman participated as an instructor, in September, 1985 at an American Association of Law Schools Workshop on teaching tax law. He addressed the question of how best to integrate tax policy considerations into courses on federal wealth transfer taxation. In October, Professor Gutman was a lecturer at the Wharton School’s "Tax Conference" where he discussed recent legislation regarding employees fringe benefits, interest free loans, limitations on the deductability of expenses for personal use property, cafeteria plans and golden parachute arrangements. He also appeared as an invited witness before the Senate Finance Committee on the subject of individual alternative minimum taxes.

Professor Gutman has been appointed to the Board of Advisors of the Wharton School Tax Conference and the NYU/BRS Continuing Professional Educational Program.

Professor George L. Haskins, Algonquin Sydney Biddle Professor of Law Emeritus, wrote the article "Late Judges and Magistrates" for the Colonial Society of Massachusetts Publication, 1985. His book, Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts, went into revised paperback in 1985 (Early handbook editions and printings were 1960, 1967, 1977). His article "Crisis in Constitutional Law" was printed in 1985 by the Publication Societe Jean Bodin, Brussels, Belgium: "The Rule of Law in Colonial America and Its Antecedents in the English Puritan Revolution," was published by the Tijdschrift Voor Rechtsgechiedenesis, (January 1986, The Netherlands, Volume 54). In August 1985, Professor Haskins spoke before The Association Internationale d’Historie du Droit et des Institutions en Stuttgart, West Germany, in conjunction with the Congress of 16th Historical Sciences, on "The English Puritan Revolution and its Effects on the Rule of Law," to be published in 1986. He spoke in Atlanta, Georgia in January, 1986 on "The Silences of Our Legal Heritage" at the First Annual Lecture on legal history, sponsored by the Supreme and Superior Courts of the State of Georgia. Mr. Haskins has been reelected as the only American Director of the International Association for the History of Law. He will serve a five-year term from 1985-1990.

A volume entitled The Literature of American Legal History by New York University School Professors William E. Nelson and John F. Reid, has been dedicated to Professor Haskins for his efforts at creating "the discipline of American legal history."

Professor A. Leo Levine, Director of the Federal Judicial Center, was the guest speaker at the dedication ceremonies of the Fanny and Samuel Kornman Hillel House of the University of Pennsylvania in September 1985.

Dean and University Professor of Law and Finance, Robert H. Mundheim delivered the paper "Government Rescue of a Troubled Enterprise: An Analysis of the Chrysler Case", to the German Association of Comparative Law at Gottingen. It appears in this issue of The Law Alumni Journal.

In September, 1985, Dean Mundheim was a Faculty member at the Pennsylvania Institute course entitled "Counseling the Board of Directors in the Takeover Situation."

Donald G. Myers, Law School Director of Development, has agreed to serve on the Nominating Committee of the AALS Section on Institutional Advancement.

Professor Clyde W. Summers, Jefferson B. Fordham Professor of Law, addressed the Labor and Employment Law Section of the New York State Bar Association at its 10th anniversary meeting in Bermuda in October, 1985, on the subject of "The Troubling Discharge Statute New York Needs." He was a panelist for the Plenary Session entitled "The Labor Law Curriculum of the Future" - discussing what should be taught in the area of Labor Law in the future - at the Workshop on Labor and Employment Law for the Association of American Law Schools in October, 1985, in Washington, D.C. Also, in October 1985, Professor Summers delivered the David C. Baum Memorial Lecture on Civil Liberties at the University of Illinois College of Law. His topic: "The Privatization of Personal Freedoms and The Enrichment of Democracy: Some Reflections from Labor Law."

Professor Alan Watson was the General Editor heading a team of scholars who translated into English The Digest of Justinian, which is being published in 16 volumes appointed by Justinian I (483–565), the ruler of the Byzantine Empire. The Digest is a streamlined version of works by Roman jurists of the period from the First Century to the Third Century A.D. Professor Watson’s compilation of legal materials, one of the most important in the world, was published in November 1985, in four volumes, by the University of Pennsylvania Press.
This page contains information about various alumni and their achievements. Here are some excerpts:

- **37 Harold H. Hoffman** has been retired since 1975 and resides in Harvard, Mass.
- **28 Guy G. de Foria** is semi-retired and a senior partner in Fornefeld and de Foria of Media, PA.
- **36 Alfred W. Hesse, Jr.**, of Gladwyne, PA, is currently working to rehabilitate the homes of disadvantaged people in South Philadelphia.

Other notable alumni include:

- **2 Edward 1. Cutler**, of the Tampa, Florida firm of Carlson, Fields, Ward, Emmanuel, Smith & Cutler, P.A., has been appointed to the membership of the Florida Board of Bar Examiners by the Supreme Court of Florida.
- **38 James N. Robertson** is currently retired and resides in Media, PA.

Several alumni have been appointed to various positions:

- **47 Robert M. Landis**, of the Philadelphia firm of Dechert, Price & Rhoads, has been reelected to the Board of Directors of the American Judicature Society, a national organization for improvement of the courts.
- **55 Professor Philip Shuchman** was appointed the first Robert E. Knowlton Scholar at Rutgers Law School-Newark and was honored during ceremonies on October 3, 1985. A recognized authority in the field of bankruptcy and creditors/debtors rights, Professor Shuchman received the State University of New Jersey Presidential Award for Distinguished Public Service.

Moreover, **46 The Honorable Berel Caesar**, of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, was presented with the Philadelphia Bar Association's Third Annual Leon J. Obermayer Award by Mayor Horwitz, Chairman of the Obermayer Award Committee, and Frank E. Hall, '55, of Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell & hippel.

- **57 Richard M. Rosenbleeth**, a partner and member of the Management Committee of the Philadelphia firm of Blank, Rome, Comisky & McCauley, was inducted as a Fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers during the Organization's annual meeting in London.

Additionally, **58 The Honorable Carolyn Engel Tomin**, of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia, was presented the Honorable Francis K. McClanaghan Award at the St. Joseph's University Annual Award Dinner in November, 1985 in recognition of his distinguished accomplishments in the field of Law. Judge Simmons was presented the award by his classmate, **The Honorable Stephen J. McEwen**, Jr., '57.

- **60 John C. McCarron**, chairman of the Philadelphia firm of Blank, Rome, Comisky & McCauley, has been appointed a member of the Board of Directors of the American Judicature Society, a national organization for improvement of the courts.

This page also features various alumni profiles and achievements, including professional roles and recognitions. For a comprehensive view, please refer to the full text.
IN MEMORIAM

'13 Emile V. Topkis
Wilmington, DE
January 11, 1985

'24 David F. Maxwell
Sarasota, FL
October 9, 1985

'27 Albert B. Melnik
Cherry Hill, NJ
May 3, 1985

'29 Milton M. Weiss
Philadelphia, PA
September 2, 1985

'31 Alexander L. Nichols
Wilmington, DE
July 10, 1985

'32 David H. Kubert
Philadelphia, PA
December 7, 1985

'33 The Honorable James L. Stern
Philadelphia, PA
September 13, 1985

'34 William E. Elliott
Gladywine, PA
August 6, 1985

'37 Harrison H. Clement
Bryn Mawr, PA
August 16, 1985

'50 John J. Tingling
Ardmore, PA
October 1, 1985

'57 Gerald E. Kandler
Wilmington, DE
October 7, 1985

'59 David L. Miller
Rydal, PA
December 5, 1985

'69 Ray P. Evans
New York, NY
September 9, 1985

'75 M. Kendall Fleeharty
Annapolis, MD
September 8, 1984

Alumni Briefs continued.

H. Ronald Klaske, of the Philadelphia firm of Abrams and Loevewein, has been elected Second Vice-President of the American Immigration Lawyers Association. Mr. Klaske was also the Deputy District Editor of the recent publication Immigration Law and Procedure Reporter (Matthew Bender, 1985).

'75 Jacob G. Braun, has been promoted to the position of Manager in the New York City office of the international public accounting firm of Peat Marwick, Inc.

Medford J. Brown III is a partner in the firm Mabreetisen, Braufeld, Himsworth & Maguire, Norristown, PA, doing primarily defense litigation.

Robert W. Freedman, of Philadelphia, has joined Hansen Properties, Ambler, PA as vice-president of the parent company.

Armond Gaglardi joined the Chase Manhattan Bank as a Vice-President in charge of funding operations in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Professor Michael Green received tenure and was promoted to Professor of Law at the University of Iowa.

Thomas J. Keeloe, of St. Louis, MO, has been named a tax partner in Touche, Ross & Company. He and his wife, Marilyn, are expecting their second child in May, 1986.

Professor Michael C. Lang is a Professor of Law at the University of Maine School of Law and will be a visiting Professor of Law at the University of San Diego School of Law for the Spring 1986 semester, teaching in the graduate Tax Program.

Professor W. Richard Sherman, of Philadelphia, is an Assistant Professor of Accounting at Rutgers University.

'76 James A. Backstrom, Jr., of Dallas, Texas, received a Senior Executive Service Bonus Award in October, 1985 for outstanding performance as Chief of Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice in Dallas, TX.

John F. Cambria, of Brooklyn, NY, is a partner in the New York City firm of Jones, Hirsch, Conors & Ball.

Thomas D. Campbell, of Alexandria, VA, is the President of his own consulting firm Thomas D. Campbell & Associates, Inc. 517 Queens Street, dealing in government relations and publications for major domestic corporations.

Edward H. Merves, of Philadelphia, is Vice-President and General Counsel of Pennvest and Properties, Inc. Radnor, PA, real estate syndication firm.


Andrew M. Urban, of Newton, MA, and of the Washington, D.C. firm of Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Glassy & Popeo, P.C., was named Chairman of his firm's Hiring Committee.

'77 Michael D. Berman has become the Vice-President and General Counsel of Continental Wingate Company, a 20-year old real estate company engaged in development, syndication, management and general counsel (primary multi-family housing).

Gilbert F. Casellas, a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, has been appointed to the American Bar Association's Special Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services.

Gordon E. Goodman, of Tyler, Texas, has been named the new President of Esperanza Transmission Company, a subsidiary of Eskey Inc.

David F. Simon, of the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block & Solo-Cohen was a course planner for "Practice in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas" presented by the Court, the Pennsylvania Bar Institute and the Philadelphia Bar Association.

Mark R. Sussman, of the Hartford, Connecticut firm of Murtha, Cullina, Richter & Pinney has been appointed Chairman of the Connecticut Bar Association's Conservation and Environmental Quality Section.

George B. Wolfe is a corporate partner at Nelson, Mullins, Grier & Scarborough, a firm in offices in Columbus and Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. He serves on the Board of Directors of the Committee of 100 and also on the Columbia Advisory Board for South Carolina Federal Savings Bank.

'78 Thomas C. Bidder, Jr., of Houston, Texas, has joined Mayer, Brown & Platt as partner-in-charge of oil and gas transactions in the Houston office.

Brian P. Flaherty, of Philadelphia, has rejoined the Philadelphia firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen as a member of the firm's Litigation Department.

Henry R. F. Griffin, of Washington, D.C., has joined the Office of General Counsel of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Professor David I. Levine, of Oakland, CA, has been appointed to Associate Professor of Law at the University of California, Hastings College of the Law (San Francisco, CA)

Timothy A. Manzone of Philadelphia, completed his Post-Baccalaureate Premedical Program at Harvard College and is a first-year medical student at the University of Pennsylvania.

James A. Nathan, of Philadelphia, has been named a partner in the hattran law firm of Rosenberg & Estis, P.C.

Kyra A. Goldich, of Philadelphia, is now the Associate Director of the Center for Greater Philadelphia at the University of Pennsylvania.

Cassandra N. Jones of Washington, DC, is a trial attorney in the Tax Division Criminal Section of the U.S. Department of Justice. Her article, "Land Banking and Mr. Laurel B. - Can There Be A Symbiotic Relationship?" appeared in the Spring 1984 edition of the Rutgers Law Journal.

Victoria Lee has joined the New York City firm of Weil, Gotshal & Manages.

Philip R. Recht, of the Los Angeles firm of Marutt, Phelps, Rothenberg, Turney & Phillips, has been elected to the Board of Governors of the Century City Bar Association in Los Angeles County, CA.

Karen Peltz Strauss and Scott Strauss of Washington, DC, celebrated the birth of their first child, Daniel Benjamin, on August 6, 1985.

'82 Ruben Martin, of New York City, works in the South Bronx as a staff attorney at BRN Legal Services. He has a son, Ruben Anthony.

Obenga A. Obegode, LL.M., of Lagos, Nigeria, has joined the firm of Ajumogobia & Okeke, which will, henceforth, be known as Ajumogobia & Okeke & Obegode, 25 Boyle Street, Onikan, Lagos.

'83 James R. Haslem is a third-year banking associate at Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy, New York.

Torsien Lange, LL.M., has recently joined the German multinational corporation BASF at its headquarters in Ludwigshafen/Rhine F.R.G. as manager of its South and East Asia/Australia Division, looking after BASF subsidiaries and joint ventures in that region.

Joan M. Lourd married Timothy Roll in September, 1985 and currently resides in Bala Cynwyd, PA.

Thomas, Virginia and Keith W. Linda works in the

Published by Penn Law: Legal Scholarship Repository, 2014
The Law School Board of Overseers

Honorable A.fin M. Adams, '47, Chair
Richard F. Brown, Jr., '48
Robert Carswell
J. LeVeone Chambers
Sylvan M. Cohen, '58
Stephen A. Cohen, '64
Richard M. Dick, '40
Howard Gittis, '58
John G. Harkins, Jr., '48
Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.
Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.
Leon C. Holt, Jr., '51
William B. Johnson, '43
Anthony Lester, Q. C.
Edward J. Lewis, '52
David H. Marion, '63
Jane Lang McGrew, '70
Samuel F. Pryor, Ill, '53
Honorable Samuel J. Roberts, '31
Edward P. Rome, '43
Marvin Schwartz, '49
Bernard G. Segal, '31
Honorable Norma L. Shapiro, '51
Chesterfield H. Smith
Myles H. Tannenbaum, '57
Glen A. Tobias, '66
Robert L. Trescher, '37
Harold M. Williams

Law Alumni Society Officers and Managers 1985-86

Officers
President, Clive S. Cummis, '52
Past Vice-President, Stephanie W. Naidoff, '66
Second Vice-President, Gilbert F. Cassella, '77
Secretary, Raymond K. Densworth, Jr., '61
Treasurer, Gail Sanger, '68

Board of Managers
Mitchell Brock, '53
Murray S. Eckell, '59
Gail Lione, '74
William B. Moyer, '61
Thomas J. McGrew, '70
Honorable Frederic Massiah-Jackson, '74
Honorable Michael A. O'Pake, '65
Thomas E. Owens, '69
Harvey Batie, III, '65
James Eisman, '86
Robert L. Kendall, Jr., '55
Evan Y. Semerjian, '64
Howard L. Shechter, '68
Morris L. Weisberg, '47
Jerome B. Apfel, '54
Harry B. Begier, '64
William H. Bohnett, '74
Douglas C. Conroy, '68
Lisa Holzager Kramer, '70
Thomas B. McCabe, Ill, '78
Paul P. Welsh, '66
Ex-Officio
James D. Crawford, '62, Chair of
Annual Giving Organization
Lisa Holzager Kramer, '70, Representative to the
Alumnae Association
Leonard Barkan, '53, Representative to the
General Alumni Society
William F. Lynch, Ill, '49, Representative to the Board of Directors of the
Organized Classes
Stephen M. Goodman, '65, President of the Order of the Coif
Robert H. Mundheim, Dean

Past Presidents
Robert L. Tyrrell

Regional Representatives
California
Northern California (San Francisco)
Thomas R. Owens, '69
Southern California (Los Angeles)
Douglas C. Conroy, '68
Harold M. Williams
Connecticut
New Haven
Professor Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.
District of Columbia
Washington
Alan G. Kirk, II, '56
Jane Lang McGrew, '70
Thomas J. McGrew, '70
Thomas B. Wiener, '69
Delaware
O. Francis Bland, '68
William F. Lynch, Ill, '49
E. Norman Veasey, '57
Paul P. Welsh, '66
England
London
Anthony Lester, Q. C.
Peter M. Roth, '77
Florida
Jacksonville
Howard L. Dale, '70
Miami
Chesterfield H. Smith
Tampa
Edward I. Cutler, '37
Richard M. Leisner, '70
Georgia
Atlanta
Gail Lione, '74
Illinois
Chicago
William B. Johnson, '43
Martin F. Robinson, '64
Japan
Tokyo
Toshio Ochi, LL.M., '84
Ikoi Nagao, LL.M., '84
Maine
Augusta
Robert G. Fuller, Jr., '65
Massachusetts
New Jersey
Atlantic City
Honorable L. Anthony Gibson, '64
Lawrence M. Perske, '49
Middletown
Marvin M. Wodlinger, '60
Montgomery
Nancy Gleich, '81
Newark
Clive S. Cummis, '52
William F. Hyland, '49

New York
New York City
William H. Bohnett, '74
Paul S. Borchert, '65
Robert Carswell
J. LeVeone Chambers
Charles J. Cogut, '73
Richard M. Dike, '40
E. Ellsworth McMeen, Ill, '72
Nancy M. Pierce, '74
Samuel F. Pryor, Ill, '53
Gail Sanger, '68
Marvin Schwartz, '49
Richard B. Smith, '53
Glen A. Tobias, '66
Harvey G. Wolfe, '57
Pennsylvania
Allentown
Leon C. Holt, Jr., '51
Ambridge
John P. Knox, '53
Bala Cynwyd
Myles H. Tannenbaum, '57
Downtown
William B. Moyer, '61
Erie
Honorable Samuel J. Roberts, '31
Fairless Hills
Leonard Barkan, '53
Harleysburg
John W. Carroll, '73
Francis B. Haas, '51
Media
Murray S. Eckell, '59
Honorable Melvin G. Levy, '50
Norristown
Andrew B. Canter, '64
Morris Gerber, '52
Paul
Richard L. Cantor, '59

Philadelphia
Honorable A.fin M. Adams, '47
Jerome B. Apfel, '54
Regina Austin, '73
Harvey Battie, Ill, '65
Harry B. Begier, '64
Richard P. Brown, Jr., '48
E. Barclay Cale, Jr., '62
Gilbert F. Cassella, '77
Sylvan M. Cohen, '38
Stephen A. Cohen, '64
James D. Crawford, '62
Judith N. Dean, '62
Raymond K. Densworth, Jr., '61
James Eisenman, '59
Howard Gittis, '58
John G. Harkins, Jr., '58
Honorable A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr.
Robert L. Kendall, Jr., '55
Lisa Holzager Kramer, '70
David H. Marion, '65
Honorable Frederic Massiah-Jackson, '74
Thomas B. McCabe, Ill, '78
Stephanie W. Naidoff, '66
Edward P. Rome, '40
Bernard G. Segal, '31
Honorable Norma L. Shapiro, '51
Howard L. Shechter, '68
Robert L. Trescher, '37
Morris L. Weisberg, '47
Pittsburgh
Edward J. Lewis, '62
George J. Miller, '51
Roderick G. Morris, '53
Reading
Honorable Michael A. O'Pake, '64
Scranton Wilkes-Barre
Honorable Ernest D. Prete, Jr., '65
Vermont
Burlington
William E. Mikel, '53
LL. M. S. in the United States
Philadelphia
David Collins, '81

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 2147
Philadelphia, PA