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Karl Llewellyn was appointed to the law faculty in 1951. Soia Mentschikoff and Karl Llewellyn were the first choices of the law faculty for the distinguished appointments promised by Mr. Hutchins. They were the obvious appointments to make. But, as is true of most universities, Chicago has a rule against the appointment of husband and wife to the same faculty. Happily an exception to the rule was allowed. When I wired Karl and Soia my delight at their acceptance of Chicago’s offer, Karl wired back “With good luck this may turn into something very nice.” It did.

Karl was attracted to Chicago for many reasons. I believe the most important influence in his decision was his vision of a great new law center in the middle west. Karl was a unique combination of vision, genius and power. He was lawyer, scholar and poet. He was enormously professional. But above all he was a teacher. He was interested in subject matter and student. The points had to be driven home, understood and the student changed into craftsman. He said he did not believe in ragging students, and I am sure he didn’t, but in his zeal to teach he was willing to make an example of the individual student. He was interested in the average student and in the average thought because he could find in both qualities which lesser men missed. His range of historical knowledge about the law was enormous. I recall listening to an impromptu lecture on the history of the doctrine of consideration given at an informal gathering of students in the Llewellyn home. The lecture given in Llewellynese, which he used to illuminate the forgotten and unrecognized aspects of accepted ideas, could have been published as given. He was a scholar whose interest in law—an interest in its complexity and workability—never diminished. He never lost his sense of delight at the patterns of judicial and lawyer behavior which he found himself discovering, but he never forgot either that law was to be fashioned in a craftsmanlike way to meet social ends, and this not only in great constitutional cases but in law for the everyday which interested him much more. He was anxious to capture for the law student and for the literature of the law a telling analysis of the workmanship of judge and lawyer. He knew, if he could manage it, there was in him a great book which would exemplify these patterns. The doubt was in him as to whether he could accomplish this, but so were genius, power and drive.

Karl’s many-sidedness was reflected in the radius of his influence at Chicago. He had done much of the pioneering work on the relationships between law and sociology and law and economics. At Chicago he gave the protection of his boldness to the law and behavioral science program and the guidance of his insights gained from his seminal study of the creative power of the sense of justice reflected in the law ways of an Indian tribe. He had played a leading role in the great disputes on legal realism. His “Bramble Bush” was a classic. The students at Chicago received from him a more sophisticated and mature view of law but with the same fire and poetry. Students could not be indifferent to him. Some disliked him because they could not understand him. But those who were touched by him, and they were many, were from then on changed. When he came to Chicago, his knowledge of commercial law was prodigious; his major task of fashioning the Uniform Commercial Code was near completion. His influence was strong for instruction in draftsman ship. His concern for instruction in the skills of the craft produced the course in advocacy, which he taught, and gave impetus to student work in moot court and legal aid. Karl was interested in the organizations of the bar. He was interested in many law schools. I think it is right to say he was in love with Chicago. He was enormously stimulated by the exciting atmosphere of the school close to the bar and judiciary and yet so much an integral part of a university with an unparalleled tradition and practice of interdisciplinary research. But Karl was scornful of those who could find no value in the smallest and, he would say, least prestigious of schools. Perhaps his view was clouded by romanticism. He was impatient with the failure of law schools to collaborate on great enterprises which he thought were theirs for the asking. He was one of the few American law professors who, before the scholars came to us from abroad, could operate with knowledge and authority in the civil law. This made him a creative factor in our foreign law program and a tough mentor for graduate students. Karl was frequently impatient. He could be attracted by like-mindedness, or his desire to improve the ordinary. But he recognized and admired tough-mindedness and power, even when possessed by those who did not agree with him.

In the last year of his life, his book The Common Law Tradition: Deciding Appeals was published. It was
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Neal New Dean!

As the Record went to press, the appointment of Professor Phil C. Neal, of the Law Faculty, as Dean of the Law School, was announced by George W. Beadle, President of the University. A detailed story will appear in the next issue of the Record.
At the time of his death he was Reporter on Agency of the American Law Institute. He was president for several years of The University of Chicago Settlement.

Among Professor Mechem's most notable works was his *Treatise on the Law of Agency* (1889, revised in 1914) which—more than any other similar work—is believed to have shaped the law of Agency in the United States. Another major work was his *Treatise on the Law of Sale of Personal Property* (2 volumes, 1901).

The Shure Research Fund

The University of Chicago Law School Library recently arranged an exhibit of books representative of those added to its collection through the Frieda and Arnold Shure Research Fund. The books were on exhibition from late November through early January in the James Parker Hall Concourse of the Law Buildings.

The Shure Fund was established at the Law School in 1945 by Arnold I. Shure, Class of 1929, and by Mrs. Shure. Supplemental gifts have been added during the ensuing 17 years. The Fund is administered by the University of Chicago Law School as an endowed fund, income alone being expended.

Income from the Fund has been utilized in part for support of research projects, and in part for the acquisition of more than 900 legal research books for the Law Library. The exhibit referred to consisted of thirty-one volumes in fifteen fields of law, illustrative of the broad scope of acquisitions made through the Shure Fund.

The Law School Library is one of the most distinguished in the United States. In addition to serving students and Faculty, it is a research facility of the American Bar Foundation, which is located in the American Bar Center, immediately adjoining the Law School. The physical capacity of the Library was more than doubled when the new, Saarinen-designed Law Buildings became available three years ago.

The Friends of the Law Library are presently engaged in a campaign to enlarge the Library's collection through creation of a Special Library Fund. Individual and corporate gifts, endowment funds, contributions of law books and historic legal documents to the Special Library Fund are being sought.

The Law School takes great pleasure in announcing that Lee B. McTurnan, of Bloomington, Illinois, A.B., Harvard University, has been appointed law clerk to Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg of the U.S. Supreme Court for the year 1963-64. Mr. McTurnan, a member of the Class of 1963, is Editor-in-Chief of the *University of Chicago Law Review*. Additional details will appear in the next issue of the *Record*.