Alumni News

Arlind F. Christ-Janer, JD'52, has been appointed president of Boston University, which now ranks as the fourth largest private university in the country. Mr. Christ-Janer became Assistant to the President of Lake Erie College upon his graduation from the Law School. A year later, he began eight years of association with St. John's College, culminating in two years of service as Vice President. In 1961, Mr. Christ-Janer became president of Cornell College, the position he held at the time of his selection as president of Boston University.

Bert E. Sommers, JD'49, is now director of an innovative project called "Law in American Society." The project is a joint venture of the Chicago Bar Association and the Chicago Board of Education. Its fundamental purpose is to assist teachers in elementary and secondary schools in explaining the development and application of the law and the function of the courts. It is hoped that this will result both in an increased respect for the law and willingness to obey it, and an increased sensitivity to individual rights and fair procedure. The staff of the project is developing a wide variety of teaching materials, and will conduct two eight-week summer seminars for teachers on how to use these materials. Briefer workshops will be held during the year for continuing re-evaluation of the program.

Alumni Meetings

In past weeks, Norval Morris, Julius Kreeger Professor of Law and Criminology, has met with three alumni groups. In the autumn, Professor Morris was the guest of honor at a cocktail party held by Law School alumni in Dallas, after which he spoke at a dinner meeting of all University alumni. He spoke a short time later in Houston, to Law School and University alumni jointly. In early February, Professor Morris joined law alumni and their guests at dinner in Miami, just preceding his speech to the University alumni group.

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr., Professor of Law and Administrator, American Bar Foundation, spoke to Law School alumni of Minneapolis-St. Paul on March 9 at a luncheon meeting.

At the Annual Meeting of the Law Alumni Association of New York, Assistant Dean James M. Ratcliffe, JD'50, suddenly discovered that he was the featured speaker when the great blizzard of January 26 made it impossible for Professor Dallin H. Oaks, JD'57, to leave Chicago. Frank H. Detweiler, JD'31, was elected to a second term as president of the New York alumni group.

On March 15, Professor Harry Kalven, Jr., discussed the findings of the School's Jury Project, which he directed, at a luncheon meeting of the Alumni Club of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Meetings in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Denver, and Cleveland, and additional meetings in Washington and New York, are planned for the Spring Quarter.

The Law Review

By Charles Bush

Mr. Bush, of the Class of 1967, is Managing Editor, Articles, of the Law Review

This article first appeared in The University of Chicago Magazine, Volume LIX, Number 4, January, 1967. It is printed here with the permission of the editor of the Magazine and of the author.

Generations of University of Chicago students have dreamt of a learning environment in which they are on a level of equality with their teachers. One of the rare positions where this privilege is attained is on the editorial board of The University of Chicago Law Review.

The Law Review's board of editors operates without faculty interference—and also enjoys a self-perpetuating mandarin bureaucracy. Articles and reviews by students and faculty reside side by side within its pages, and its editors have responsibility for editing, rewriting, and even rejecting articles written by their teachers.

The Law Review publishes four issues a year, each consisting of 250 to 300 pages of articles, comments, and book reviews. Articles and book reviews are written by faculty members at the University or elsewhere, judges, practicing lawyers, or any other persons who can make a significant contribution to legal scholarship. Although articles typically suggest ways in which the law might appropriately be changed, they may be on any law-related subject.

Comments are written by students and tend to be shorter and narrower in scope than articles. Chicago's Law Review, unlike many others, requires the completion of a publishable comment as a prerequisite for election to the editorial board. This is the highest hurdle facing an aspiring editor. A student may write ten or twelve drafts and have these read by six or eight editors and one or more faculty members before a finished comment emerges. To such a great extent are they products of collaborative effort that they are published anonymously—although authors may obtain bylined reprints, useful for impressing prospective employers.

At the beginning of each academic year the thirty Law School students who completed the first year with the highest grade-point averages are invited to become candidates for editorship positions. Those who accept are placed on the masthead as staff members and set to work
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writing comments and discharging other duties, such as “prelimining” topics for comments, proof-reading, and, most dreaded, “cite-checking”—the tedious and demanding researching of every citation of authority in every piece being prepared for publication. Staff members who meet their obligations are elected—generally at the end of their second year—as either associate or managing editors. Associate editors oversee staff members writing comments, perform a wide variety of administrative and promotional functions, and occasionally write second comments. Managing editors, the highest panjandrum of Law Review management, exercise collective leadership over the publication’s range of operations.

At present, the Law Review has six managing editors, including the editor-in-chief, fourteen associate editors, and thirty staff members. None of these persons holds a sinecure. Managing editors and, in particular, staff members find that Law Review work may require twenty to forty hours a week—hours for which no academic credit is given. Despite these demands, most Law Review personnel manage to maintain their grade-point averages.

Of course, Chicago’s Law Review, like others, is not without its critics. Law Review pieces, it has been said, are on subjects so narrow as to be nonexistent; they have more footnotes than words; their style is that of a miser’s telegram. Although these criticisms contain germs of truth, they slight the fact that the narrowest pieces are often the ones most useful to practicing lawyers, who often find the careful organization of relevant authorities into logical footnotes to be the most significant contribution. And the same readers have little time for rambling verbosity.

Yet, even with a tendency toward pedantry, the Law Review plays an important role within the legal world. It is frequently cited in judicial opinions—including those of the United States Supreme Court. It serves more than 1500 lawyer-subscribers. And some of its past articles—such as Malcolm Sharp’s Promissory Liability (1939); Brainerd Currie’s Change of Venue and the Conflict of Laws (1955); Harry Kalven’s and Walter Blum’s The Art of Opinion Research: A Lawyer’s Appraisal of an Emerging Science (1956); and past comments such as Search and Seizure in the Supreme Court: Shadows on the Fourth Amendment (1961)—have contributed significantly to the broadening of the horizons of the American legal mind.

Even more important, however, is its role in furthering the education of future lawyers. David Riesman—an alumnus of the Harvard Law Review—has written that “there is nothing in any other professional group which remotely resembles the law review, this guild of students who, working harder than their fellows, manage to cooperate sufficiently to meet the chronic emergency of a periodical.” Through writing comments, Law Review personnel are forced to think carefully and analytically about significant legal problems, to defend their ideas against unrelenting constructive criticism, and to develop clear, concise writing styles. Through reading court advance sheets and about-to-be-published pieces, they are made aware of the latest developments in the law. And, through editing and rewriting pieces written by others, they are given an opportunity to hone skills of argumentation, organization, and expression which will serve them throughout their legal careers.

Studies in Criminal Justice

The Center for Studies in Criminal Justice was established at the University of Chicago Law School in August, 1965, with a grant of $1,000,000 from the Ford Foundation. Norval Morris, Julius Kreeger Professor of Law and Criminology was appointed Director; Hans W. Mattick, a sociologist who has served as Assistant Warden of the Cook County Jail, was made Associate Director. The Autumn, 1966 issue of the Record reported in some detail on the Center’s staff.

During its first year, the Center’s research activities included, among others, the following:

Swedish Prison System. After a study of the Swedish law and relevant supporting literature, Professor Morris devoted two months to visiting correctional institutions in Sweden with a view to discovering what laws and practices prevailing in the Swedish system might profitably be adapted to our own. An article containing his conclusions is scheduled to appear shortly.

Half-Way Houses. A substantial and continuing study of half-way houses, of which there are three broad types, is under way. First, there are half-way houses which provide a period of control, supervision and assistance in the community for inmates released from institutions. In these situations, inmates receive residential treatment, while they go out daily to work or to school. A second type, closely related to the first, offers similar treatment to those who are on parole, but who require a higher degree of supervision than is usual. The third type is in effect a “day institution,” where offenders live at home but come daily to the half-way house for an intensive rehabilitation program.

The study is planned on two levels. Currently it is focusing on an analysis of the organization of half-way houses, the precepts underlying their programs, the selection of offenders for treatment, and the methods for evaluating the results. When this is completed, the study will move to an empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of one or more such institutions.
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