musical notes which to the initiate, will be recognized as that once popular song: “Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.”

This, then, will be the university of the future, to which those borne in this 75th year of our university can hope to be admitted. Whether this dream—this vision—can be brought to fruition will depend in no small measure on the efforts of all those gathered here tonight. If there were any wine on your tables, I should propose a toast: LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I GIVE YOU THE UNIVERSITY OF 1984! I don’t want it.

The Rieser Society

The Rieser Society, named in memory of Leonard Rieser, a distinguished Chicago tax lawyer who was deeply interested in the Law School and in legal education, continues to make an important contribution to the life of the School. At the Society’s meetings, held four times a year, speakers from outside the Law Faculty address members of that faculty and law students on subjects of interest to lawyers but not of a technical, legal nature. Questions and informal discussion follow each talk.

In the Autumn Quarter, 1965, the Society heard LEONARD BINDER, Chairman of the Department of Political Science, The University of Chicago, who discussed “Regionalism in International Relations.” WILLIAM R. POLK, Chairman of the Committee on Near Eastern Studies, The University of Chicago, spoke on “Problems of Foreign Policy: Intelligence, Analysis and Planning,” at a meeting in early February. The speaker at the Society’s next meeting will be ROBERT M. ADAMS, Director of the Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago.

Laird Bell—1883–1965

To expect that a memorial to a remarkable man will convey a feeling of what he was really like and what the experience of knowing him meant, is to expect the impossible. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon those who admired him to try.

The customary way to begin is to recite the simple, objective facts of his career, what Christopher Fry called “the bare untruth.” Following his graduation from Harvard College, Laird Bell entered the University of Chicago Law School, from which he received the J.D. degree in 1907. He became associated with a law firm then known as Fisher and Boyd. He remained with that firm, now Bell, Boyd, Lloyd, Haddad and Burns, throughout his professional career. While actively engaged in the practice of law, Mr. Bell served also for a substantial period as Chairman of the Board of the Weyerhaeuser Company and as a director of numerous other corporations.

His contribution to the Bar and to the community was reflected in terms as president of the Chicago Bar Association, president of the Chicago Community Fund, and president of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. These are, of course, only examples from a lengthy list. On the national level Mr. Bell was Chairman of the National Navy Price Adjustment Board, and Deputy Director of the Economic Division of the Military Government of Germany, during and shortly after World War II. In 1955 he was appointed Alternate Delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

In the face of all this, the outstanding aspect of his career was the prodigious investment of time and energy in the field of higher education. He was a member of the Board of Trustees of The University of Chicago from 1928 until 1953, and was an Honorary Trustee until his death. In addition, he served as Chairman of that Board from 1949–1953. He was Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Carleton College, the third generation of his family to hold that position, during the period 1943–1955. And, from 1948 until 1954, overlapping the period of both Chairmanships, he was a member of the Harvard Board of Overseers. The gratitude of each of these institutions was expressed in the award of the degree of Doctor of Laws, honoris causa. It is a typical example of Mr. Bell’s dedication and standing that, immediately upon his retirement from active service on the academic boards mentioned above, he agreed to become Chairman of the Board of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

A quiet and persuasive force for excellence within the academic institutions he served, Mr. Bell was also an eloquent and outspoken defender of academic freedom, particularly in those eras in which that position was most difficult and least popular.

It is possible only now to describe Laird Bell as a true
patrician, in the great Periclean tradition. In his lifetime, he would have rejected the term with great annoyance, as an example of the pretentiousness he disliked so much. It is the hope of the Law School that its graduates will demonstrate a high professional competence, a love for the law, and a sense of responsibility for service to profession and community. The life of Laird Bell set a standard which few can fully emulate, but because of it we all may grow a little.

The Twelfth Annual Law School Fund

It is possible to take great pleasure in certain kinds of monotony. To be able to state again that the Annual Law School Fund Campaign exceeded its goal, and that it set new records both for the total amount contributed and for the number of donors, is certainly such a pleasure. The Twelfth Campaign, which concluded last autumn, resulted in a total of $151,092, from 1,659 contributors.

General Chairman of the Campaign was Richard H. Levin, JD'37. William G. Burns, JD'31, was Chairman for Class Organization, Herbert Portes, JD'36, Chairman for Major Alumni Gifts, and Richard F. Babcock, JD'47, Chairman for Non-Alumni Giving (strongly assisted by Arnold I. Shure, JD'28 and Morris I. Leibman, JD'33).

Mr. Burns has agreed to act as General Chairman of the Thirteenth Annual Campaign. Advance gifts to that Campaign have already provided about one-fourth of its goal.

Research, Punishment and Rehabilitation

By Norval Morris

Julius Kreeger Professor of Law and Criminology
The University of Chicago Law School

The article which follows was excerpted from a longer paper called "Prison in Evolution," which appeared in Federal Probation, Volume 29, Number 4, December, 1965, and is reprinted here with the permission of that journal and of the author. In the original paper, Professor Morris first examined the broadening range of available penal sanctions other than imprisonment and the steadily increasing use of such alternative sanctions. He then discussed changes in the concept of imprisonment itself, including the growing variety of penal institutions and the increasing flexibility of approach within such institutions. Finally, in the section appearing below, he turned his attention to the problems and potential of research in this area.

If the above analysis is broadly true, if it is true that we are developing and increasingly applying penal sanctions differing widely from the traditional prison and that prison itself is in a state of flux moving towards a wide diversity of penal sanctions, there are many consequences of policy and practice which should be considered. For example, the task of the prison officer is suddenly one of much greater complexity than the maintenance of security and discipline; inevitably he becomes part of a larger correctional process with institutional and noninstitutional facets, and should play a difficult rehabilitative role in a complex therapeutic community. And he must be better trained and better paid for these tasks. Similarly, there are consequences for the organization and administration of correctional services.

If the above analysis be correct, the pressure towards the consolidation and regionalization of correctional services is great. Only with some administrative consolidation is it practicable to achieve sufficient flexibility of moving criminals through the various institutional and postinstitutional phases of their treatment and of timing their progress and release. Each of these points merits protracted consideration, as does the relationship between the above analysis and the deterrent functions of criminal sanctions, both on the criminal and the community at large, and that between the realities of criminal sanctions and community expectations of and attitudes toward punishment. But not all such implications of the thesis I have offered can be discussed here; one is selected for brief mention because of its importance. We must, in a planned and determined way, commit resources to discovering which of our evolving armamentarium of penal sanctions are effective with various categories of offenders. We must start the important research task of evolving treatment and rehabilitation taxonomies of offenders.

Correctional practices must cease to rest on prejudice, surmise and good intentions. We are under a moral obli-