There has always been about Jim Freedman a certain elegance, a certain grace.

I say always even though I have only known him for the past seventeen years. A style like his could hardly have sprung into being without a long period of antecedent development. A style like his could hardly have been contrived; it had to stem from years of basic decency and respect for the feelings of others. My professional training tells me this. But far more important, my experiences with Jim over these seventeen years give me all the evidence anyone could ever want of the unaffected genuineness and civility he possesses in such quantity.

I cannot quite recall the day we first met. It was not long after he came to Penn that we began to explore the possibility of teaching together. Administrative law has always been Jim's major interest and he was then teaching a course and a seminar in that subject. He filled in the rest of his teaching load with Family Law, a subject with which I had had some previous experience and in which I have had a continuing interest. We started with a seminar in certain selected areas of the field, but it was not long before we both taught the entire course. Jim was not the first law professor I ever taught with, nor will he be the last. I have spent varying times in the classroom with (having counted them) twenty-three different law teachers, but never more successfully or enjoyably than with Jim.

We worked well together; the evolution of the Family Law course demonstrated this. We began by each playing a role we assigned to ourselves: he the law professor, I the commenter on matters psychiatric, sociologic, nonlegal. It did not last. Neither of us stuck to our assignments, and by the time we had completed the eleventh tour of the material in the spring of 1978, both of us taught everything, commenting freely on one another's thoughts and ideas, neither of us in a narrow groove, both of us wandering over the entire terrain, truly cooperative and co-taught. It could not have been more fun, and only his duties as Dean and my re-
sponsibilities to the Mental Health Association and the Psychiatric Society caused the enterprise to be suspended. Each of us has said we will resume it some day; neither of us believes it will ever really happen.

Such successful collaboration called for more, and there was more. We taught a course in Interviewing and Civil Commitment to the Reginald Heber Smith fellows in the OEO program Penn put on for two summers. We twice taught a course in Law and Medicine in Modern Society to a selected few medical students who could squeeze time in their schedules to participate in what was really an engrossing seminar. That course worked so well we repeated it twice more at Norristown State Hospital as part of their continuing medical education series. And, together with others, we participated in courses given at annual meetings of the American Psychiatric Association.

The course we had the most fun with was a year-long reading, writing, and running-around seminar we devised that we called Asylums and Jails but that was promptly dubbed "Shrinks and Clinks" by the students. The seminar consisted of a series of full day visits to various psychiatric and correctional facilities, some as far away as Menlo Park, New Jersey or Patuxent, Maryland, with appropriate readings and then papers on a subject selected from among the many moral, psychiatric, and legal questions stirred up by the readings and the visits. Unhappily, when Jim became Ombudsman of the University, the extensive traveling required by the seminar made its continuance no longer feasible.

Administration became an increasingly important part of Jim's life during the 1970's, and our working together became more indirect as he proceeded to move into more and more responsible and demanding positions. First as president of the Mental Health Association, then during a three-year stint as University Ombudsman, a shorter tour as Associate Provost of the University, and finally as Dean of the Law School. I watched in admiration as his skills widened and grew. Because we were such close friends, we often discussed the many knotty problems that arose in all of those jobs, and I had much chance to see just how wise, judicious, and kind he could be in dealing with the many human and technical problems that are such a part of any administrative post. If anyone has ever been well prepared to be the president of a major university, it certainly is Jim.

But the one adventure I most treasured was that which came during the sabbatical year he spent with his family in Cambridge,
England in 1976, the year he produced his magnum opus Crisis and Legitimacy.¹ We began a correspondence; at first it was just a few newsy little letters to report the latest gossip around here and to give a brief description of the new environment over there. But the letters gradually broadened out and became more like essays: still filled with news, but expanded to comment on whatever seemed of interest. The only thing that amazed me more than how much I looked forward to receiving those letters was how much pleasure mine were to write. I have trouble remembering which I enjoyed more—reading his witty and charming pieces or writing my own views knowing that they would be read, appreciated, and responded to. The breadth and depth of Jim's interests never ceased to amaze me: his range was wide, his concerns deep. He cared about books, he cared about politics, he cared about events, he cared about people, and most of all, he cared about ideas. He cared and he could and did write knowingly and feelingly on all those subjects and more. And always with grace, decency, elegance, compassion, and charm. I was almost sorry to see the year end.

And now he leaves here to assume the Presidency of the University of Iowa. I hope that the University of Iowa knows and appreciates what it is getting. I certainly know what it is that I am losing. It is far more than the dean of my law school. It is nothing less than one of my closest and best friends.