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Entering students who were recipients of National Honor Scholarships from their respective colleges and universities, following a luncheon in their honor. In the 1955 entering class, there are National Honor Scholars representing the following institutions: Albion College, Amherst College, Antioch College, Beloit College, Bowdoin College, Brown University, Colby College, Colgate University, Dartmouth College, DePauw College, Hamilton College, Harvard University, Haverford College, Knox College, University of Maine, Maryville College, Michigan State University, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Pomona College, Reed College, St. Olaf's College, Southern Methodist University, Swarthmore College, Syracuse University, Trinity College, Wabash College, Wesleyan University, Whitman College, Whittier College, Wittenberg College, and Yale University.
The Class of 1958

At the beginning of the Autumn Quarter, The Law School welcomed its largest entering class in many years. One hundred and thirty-two students, chosen from among 432 applicants, began the work of The Law School.

Considerable interest has been expressed by alumni in where our students come from, in terms both of their home communities and of the schools from which they received their undergraduate training. The student body currently numbers 311; these students have attended 159 different colleges and universities located in all sections of the United States and overseas. Institutions currently represented in our student body are:

University of Alabama
Albion College
Allegheny College
Amherst College
Antioch College
University of Athens
Aurora College
Austin College
Baghdad Law School
Bard College
Bates College
Beloit College
Boston University
Bowdoin College
Bradley University
Brandeis University
Brigham Young University
Brooklyn College
Brown University
Bryn Mawr College
University of Buffalo
University of California
University of California (L.A.)
Carleton College
Central State College
University of Chicago
Clark University
Colby College
Colgate University
University of Colorado
Columbia University
University of Connecticut
Cornell University
Culver-Stockton College
Dartmouth College
DePaul University
DePauw University
Drake University
Earlham College
Far Eastern University
George Washington Law School
Georgetown University
Goethe University
L’Université de Grenoble
Grinnell College


University of Hamburg
Hamilton College
Harvard University
Haverford College
University of Hawaii
Hebrew University
Hobart College
Hope College
College of Idaho
University of Illinois
Illinois Institute of Technology
Indiana University
John Marshall Law School
Joliet Junior College
Kalamazoo College
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
Kenyon College
Knox College
Lafayette College
Lake Forest College
Lincoln University
London School of Economics
Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
Loyola University
Macalester College
University of Maine

Continued on page 14
The Wormser Scholar, Robert V. Zener, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, B.A. University of Chicago.

The Ecko Foundation Scholar, John G. Satter, Jr., Vermillion, South Dakota, A.B. University of South Dakota

The Phi Sigma Delta Scholar, Lewis Ginsberg, Chicago, A.B. University of Chicago.

Law Revision as a Teaching Tool and Public Responsibility of a Law School

By ALLISON DUNHAM

[This is the substance of a talk which was prepared for delivery at the alumni meeting at the American Bar Association convention in August.]

From the beginning of the modern university law school, it has been a factor in statutory reform. In 1901 Dean Ames of the Harvard Law School in his address on "The Vocation of the Law Professor" spoke of the "wholesome influence which the professor may exert as an expert counselor in legislation, either by staying or guiding the hand of the legislator." Even a partial list of the state and national legislation of which a law professor was a counselor or draftsman is an impressive demonstration of the impact of the professor on law reform. Thus from our own law school we have the Uniform Trust Act and the Uniform Conditional Sales Act by Professor Bogert; the Uniform Illegitimacy Act and a proposed city charter for Chicago by Professor Freund; the Uniform Trust Receipts Act by Professor Llewellyn; and the Uniform Commercial Code drafted by many professors, among which were Llewellyn, Mentschikoff, and Dunham of our law school. This is not a complete list even of our own school's contributions, but it is sufficient to illustrate the point. Dean Ames envisioned this part of the law professor's occupation as primarily the personal activity of an individual professor of law and not as an organized institutional function. And such it has been with a few notable exceptions. Thus the Legislative Drafting Fund of Columbia Law School in 1911 is largely responsible for the Office of Legislative Counsel in each of the houses of Congress and of the similar agencies in some forty or more state legislatures. The thrust of the Columbia project and of the official agencies thereafter established was that expert draftsmen could ease the burden of the individual legislator and result in at least better-drafted legislation.

Almost simultaneously with the movement for legislative drafting services for legislators, however, came new insight into the legislative process: the sponsoring legislator was not the law-writer. The real proposer of legislation introduced by a particular legislator was some executive agency of government, a judicial conference, a civic group, or a trade association. These sponsors not only do not have access to the expert official draftsmen in the Office of Legislative Counsel but do not have their own expert draftsmen but must rely on a lawyer or a law professor who, even if not serving in a pro bono publico capacity, finds law revision only one among many activities. Thus the official drafting agencies do not provide for the real sponsors and drafting agencies the expert drafting services which it was thought that the legislators needed.

As I said before, Dean Ames regarded law revision as individual effort. He did not regard legislation and legislative drafting as part of the teaching process. It is true that the individual activity of a professor often resulted in employed or volunteer student assistants of the professor receiving training in statutory drafting. The courses on legislation first introduced to the law curriculum some forty years ago by Professor Freund of our law school have not had as their main emphasis working out principles of legislative drafting. For the most part these courses have been designed to train students in the art and professional skill of statutory interpretation and in the formalities of legislative enactment. These courses have not had the same emphasis on principles of legislative drafting and the application of such principles to particular legislative proposals as the more traditional law-school courses have had under the case method. Professor Freund was a notable exception. His book in 1916 on legislative drafting and its principles is almost the last and only book on this subject attempted in the United States.

During the last three years the Law Revision Group at The Law School has undertaken a pilot experiment in organized law-school activity in the service function of law revision. It has appeared to us that on the service side we have the most to contribute if we provide legislative drafting facilities for the judiciary, executive departments of government, and civic and trade associations that do not have access to the services of official legislative agencies. It further appeared to us that, the more student work in drafting approximated real-life experience, the better the training. Thus it would be better for students to work on legislation which is being prepared for introduction into a legislature than it would be for them simply to work on drafting model legislation embodying the "better" view of a particular legal problem. Thus the service function and the training function should and could be closely integrated.

In our pilot experiment we undertook to do drafting for the judiciary, for an executive department, for civic associations, and for trade associations in order to get some idea of the need for this service and also in order to get some idea of the problems involved when a law-school institution drafts for groups and persons who have more or less control over policy decisions inherent in any legislative drafting. We also undertook to offer each year three seminars in legislative drafting in which the students could get training in drafting real legislation.

The Law Revision Group consists of a faculty committee of which I am chairman and a legislative draftsman. The pamphlet entitled Law Revision Studies No. 1, which some of you have seen, embodies some of the results of our work over the last three years. This pamphlet
contains a study and statute undertaken at the request of a member of the judiciary and a study and statute undertaken at the request of a civic group. The subject of the former was a new habitual offender act for Illinois, and the subject of the latter was a new type of eminent domain proceedings for Illinois. These studies were taken up by other agencies. The Joint Committee on the Criminal Code of the Chicago and Illinois State Bar Association became interested in the habitual offender act, and the Attorney-General became interested in the eminent domain act.

In addition to these two acts, we drafted other legislation. As a matter of fact, there were four bills in the Illinois legislative session of 1955 which were ours, and one of these passed. The one which passed was our most ambitious project—a complete revision of the Building and Loan Association Act of Illinois, which had been revised last in 1919. We did this act for the Illinois Savings and Loan League. We also did a rather ambitious job which is about to be introduced into the City Council of Chicago—a proposed housing code for the city of Chicago.

Each time a proposal has been submitted to the staff for consideration we have determined whether it was one which could be used for student drafting. The criteria of selection have been worked out from experience and need still further consideration. It would appear that the best proposals for student drafting are those which (1) need not be done under too much pressure; (2) will require consultation with the groups of the sponsoring organizations; and (3) are small enough in scope so that each student may do the entire act as a drafting exercise. In these seminars we have done work on a proposed uniform act for charitable trusts for the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the Council of State Governments and a uniform postconviction act for the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

We hope this fall to have a seminar on a proposed uniform formula for allocation of income to a state for income tax on a multistate business. This is being done for the Council of State Governments. We also hope to work with students on a proposed administrative procedure act for Illinois, which is being done for a committee of the Chicago Bar Association.

My own assessment of the project to date is that the experiment has been very successful on its service side and less successful on its pedagogical side. On the service side we have convinced ourselves, I believe, that there is a real need for a drafting agency to serve civic and trade associations and that we can successfully immunize ourselves from a role which we should not assume—that of promoting the passage of any legislation drafted. Our unique location near the American Bar Association headquarters and the headquarters of a host of public service agencies in the Public Administration Clearing House aids in our acquiring projects to work upon.

On the pedagogical side we have not yet tried to work out principles of legislative drafting which the students could apply in their legislative drafting, and we have not received projects with sufficient time to work upon them so that the students can participate in the meetings with the policy groups of the sponsoring organizations.

I think, however, that the financing of this pilot study made possible by alumni contributions has indicated that there is a real place for law revision in the activities of a great university law school.
Supreme Court Lecture Series

During the Autumn Quarter, 1954, and the Winter Quarter, 1955, The Law School sponsored a series of lectures on Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. Lecturers were biographers of the Justices concerned or had served them as law clerks. The series was so favorably received that the School presented, this autumn, three additional lectures. Professor William Winslow Crosskey opened the series with a paper on Chief Justice John Marshall, as a part of the School's observance of the National Marshall Bicentennial Celebration. Professor Allison Dunham spoke on Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone. Professor Dunham had served as Chief Justice Stone's law clerk. Mr. John P. Stevens, of Rothschild, Stevens and Barry, lectured on Justice Wiley Rutledge. Mr. Stevens has taught at The Law School and was law clerk to Justice Rutledge. Following Professor Crosskey's opening lecture, the Faculty was host to the entering class of students at a reception at Beecher Hall, The Law School Dormitory.
Blum on Tax Policy

[The following is a summary of the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, United States Congress, by Professor Walter J. Blum.]

Over the years our income tax has become one in which special preferential treatment has become the rule rather than the exception. We now have a large assortment of provisions giving preferences to particular kinds of taxpayers, to certain types of receipts, to some categories of business expenses, to certain forms of personal consumption, and even to particular kinds of savings. The result is that it is very hard to compare the tax burdens of different people.

There are no general data on how this patchwork of special provisions affects the over-all morale of taxpayers and their advisers. Of course the taxpayers who come out ahead as a result of their preferences are not likely to be unhappy about them. And there is little doubt that some preferences have wider popular appeal than others. But the important morale question is how the whole network of preferences affects the morale of the taxpaying public. On this issue we are able to form only some partial conclusions.

We can be certain that the host of special provisions complicates the tax. This puts a greater load on taxpayers who make out their own returns and causes many to turn for help to advisers—ranging from fully qualified professionals to store-front "tax experts." These self-styled experts often operate in a manner which is hardly calculated to improve their customers' respect for our income tax.

We know that the complications make the income tax less intelligible to taxpayers. There are signs that some people have come to doubt the fairness of the tax in part because they cannot understand it.

We are sure that the special provisions cause a great
deal of time and energy to be spent in tax planning. Most of this is wholly unproductive, and it often produces behavior which, taxes apart, might not be advantageous to the taxpayer or to society.

We have evidence that special provisions sometimes are temptations to loose reporting practices on the part of taxpayers and nonprofessional "tax experts." There is an understandable pressure to stretch preferences to cover one's own situation even when it falls on the wrong side of the arbitrary line by which the special treatment is defined.

We can be confident that the complexities accompanying the conglomeration of preferences have increased the difficulty of enforcing the tax. More taxpayers seek assistance from the government; more mistakes are made in preparing returns; more chances are taken by taxpayers in interpreting the preferential provisions to suit their needs; and more unintended loopholes are unearthed as tax planning expands in breadth. These handicaps to enforcement in turn are likely to cause taxpayers to run even greater risks in helping themselves to unauthorized benefits in computing their taxes.

Finally, we are becoming aware that the receptivity of Congress to special legislation has contributed to making competent tax advisers cynical about the justice of our system. Some have become special pleaders to such an extent that they are unable to identify themselves with the interest of the whole public in tax matters. Not only is their usefulness in improving our tax system impaired but their cynicism is easily caught by susceptible clients.

These are dangers to taxpayer morale from crisscrossing our income tax with special provisions. Whether they are offset by the good will and appreciation on the part of the beneficiaries of the preferences is an open question. Certainly the advisability of any particular preference should depend primarily on considerations of equity and economic or social policy. But the dangers pointed out should not be overlooked. While no single special provision is likely to produce them, a large collection of preferences is clearly capable of doing so.

In this connection what is perhaps most important is that almost every preference tends to breed progenies. If the history of special provisions shows anything, it is simply this: whenever a preference is given in one situation, there will always be taxpayers who can plausibly claim that their case is analogous and therefore also deserves special treatment.

And so in passing on the merits of any suggested preference, two general considerations are worth keeping in mind. (1) A large body of special provisions might well have undesirable effects on the morale of taxpayers as a whole. (2) Any body of preferences will always tend to grow unless the legislature has a strong policy against them.

Law School Alumni at a luncheon-meeting held in Philadelphia in connection with the Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association; Glen A. Lloyd, '23, and Dean Edward H. Levi were the principal speakers.

Alumni Notes

The Record is pleased to note the appointment of Norman F. Arterburn, JD'26, to the Supreme Court of Indiana. Justice Arterburn has practiced in Vincennes, Indiana, since his graduation. He has served on the Board of Managers of the Indiana State Bar Association and on the State Board of Law Examiners. In 1949 and again in 1953-54 he was a visiting professor of law at Indiana University.

Leon Gross, JD'30, has been appointed assistant to the president of the Shampaine Company of St. Louis. Previous to this, Mr. Gross served for seven years as manager of the Hawaii Office of Alien Property, U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. Gross calls to our attention the fact that Law School alumni, in the persons of Justice Ingram Stainback, JD'12, and Justice Philip Rice, JD'16, now make up two-thirds of the Supreme Court of Hawaii.

Mrs. Fannie Novick Perron, JD'30, has been appointed assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chi-

A dinner meeting of Kansas City alumni and their wives; Professor Sheldon Tefft was the featured speaker.
Moot Court

The Law School's Moot Court Team, composed of Lewis Ginsberg and Lawrence Rubinstein, is continuing the record of achievement established in the last four years. Messrs. Ginsberg and Rubinstein recently won the Regional Competition, defeating the University of Illinois in the final round. They also won the additional Regional Competition based on quality of brief alone. They represented the School in the national competition held in New York in mid-December under the sponsorship of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Both Mr. Ginsberg and Mr. Rubinstein are residents of Chicago and graduates of the College of the University of Chicago.

The Class of 1915 Scholar, Dallin H. Oaks, Spanish Fork, Utah, A.B. Brigham Young University.

Progressive Taxation

Not long ago, anyone who questioned the theory of progression was risking whatever reputation he might have as a professional or business leader. . . . A few hardy souls, however, took the risks, and now find their views receiving respectful attention. . . . Credit goes to Professors Walter J. Blum and Harry Kalven, Jr., of the University of Chicago Law School, for their meticulous exposé, "The Uneasy Case for Progressive Taxation." Whether or not accepted by contemporary college economists, the teachings of this book should not be lost as regards oncoming economists whose attitudes may be better attuned to the essential elements of a free, dynamic economy. The book should be high on the reading list of every college course on taxation.


Class of 1915 Reunion

The fortieth reunion of the Class of '15 surpassed even the highly successful event held five years ago on the thirty-fifth. More than half the members of the class came from all over the United States for a Friday evening dinner downtown and a Saturday spent at The Law School. Once again, the meeting was organized by Morris E. Feiwell, President of The Law School Alumni Association, and Henry F. Tenney, Trustee of the University.

The classmates toured The Law School, had lunch there, and heard Dean Levi report on the current state of the School and its plans for the future. This was the first class reunion without George M. Morris, former president of the American Bar Association and well known alumnus of The Law School.

Phi Alpha Delta Returns

The School welcomes back to active status the Marshall Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta, one of the large national law fraternities. The University of Chicago Chapter is one of the five charter chapters of the national fraternity, having been established here only weeks after the founding of the School itself. In common with the other law fraternities once represented at Chicago, the chapter was not re-established after the war years. The School is pleased at its return. Its officers are: Richard Hansen, Justice; John Radcliffe, Vice-Justice; Richard Berryman, Clerk; Peter Sivasian, Treasurer; and John Alex, Marshal. Other members include Ronald Aronberg, Stanley Block, George Cowell, Curt Everett, Lee Huszagh, Howard Krane, Dallin Oaks, Harold Shintaku, David Smith, Albert Swan, Neil Twomey, and Frederick Yonkman.
Lecturers in Law

The School is happy to announce the appointment of the following Lecturers in Law for the academic year 1955-56:

William G. Burns, Esq., JD'31, of Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd.
Alex Elson, Esq., JD'28.
George E. Frost, Esq.
Leonard M. Rieser, Esq., of Sonnenschein, Berksen, Lautmann, Levinson and Morse.
Roger L. Severns, Esq., JD'39, of Isham, Lincoln and Beale.

Mr. Burns will teach a Seminar in Securities Regulation; Mr. Elson a Seminar in Federal Regulation and Statutory Interpretation; Mr. Frost a Seminar in Patents; Mr. Rieser a Seminar in Problems of Taxation; and Mr. Severns a Course in Public Utilities.

Legal Ethics

In past years lawyers and judges have spoken to luncheon meetings of first-year law students from time to time about the practice of law. This year these meetings have been made more frequent and used as a framework for a luncheon seminar on the ethical problems of law practice. The class has been divided into four groups, each of which will meet six times during the school year at the Quadrangle Club. Practicing lawyers are invited to participate (not to make a speech or give a lecture) in the discussion of ethical problems raised in an outline distributed to the students and the visitor in advance of the meeting. In leading these discussions, I try to allow them to follow the lines of interest of the group, keeping only within the general outline of the topic. The visitor adds enough illustrations from experience, and practical wisdom, to make them into good “bull sessions” on the always interesting problems of the conflicting loyalties and duties of lawyers.

The subject matter of the series of meetings is organized according to the various functions of lawyers and the ethical problems implicit in those functions. For example, the problems of the ethics of advocacy for the courtroom lawyer are now being discussed. Later we plan to take up some of the problems of advocacy before other tribunals (e.g., administrative agencies and legislative committees) and to discuss problems in other roles of the lawyer—the ethics of negotiation and problems of the adviser and draftsman.

There is no attempt to make a detailed study of these problems; but we hope to raise many of the major questions as well as to provide a forum for discussion and analysis of the ethical problems which the students see in their new profession.

F. B. McKINNON
Visiting Professors, Summer Quarter

Brunson MacChesney, of Northwestern Law School, Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Chicago, Summer Quarter, 1955.

B. J. George, Jr., of the University of Michigan Law School, Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Chicago, Summer, 1955.

Delmar Karlen, of New York University Law School, Visiting Professor for the Summer Quarter, 1955, at the University of Chicago Law School.

Robert M. McClure, of the University of Minnesota Law School. Visiting Professor of Law, Summer Quarter, 1955.
Federal Tax Conference

The Law School's Eighth Annual Federal Tax Conference took place during the last week of October. Attendance at the three-day meeting numbered more than three hundred lawyers, accountants, and business executives concerned with tax matters. Members of the Conference were drawn from all over the United States. Again this year, plans for the Conference were made by a joint committee of Chicago lawyers and accountants and members of the Faculty. The Planning Committee for the Eighth Annual Conference consisted of:

Planning Committee

William N. Haddad, Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd, Chairman
Walter J. Blum, Professor of Law, The University of Chicago Law School
Frederick O. Dicus, Chapman and Cutler
William M. Emery, McDermott, Will and Emery
James D. Head, Winston, Strawin, Black and Towner
Paul F. Johnson, Ernst and Ernst
Robert R. Jorgensen, Sears, Roebuck and Company
William A. McSwain, Eckhart, Klein, McSwain and Campbell
James M. Raycliffe, Assistant Dean, The University of Chicago Law School
Frederick R. Shearer, Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown and Platt

Michael J. Sporrer, Arthur Andersen and Company
Harry B. Sutter, Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, Owen and Mulroy

The program was as follows:

Address of Welcome, George H. Watkins, Vice-President, The University of Chicago

Administrative Policy: Tax-Fraud Problems

The Government Lawyer: His Relation to the Government, to the Taxpayer, and to the Taxpayer's Representative, John Potts Barnes, General Counsel, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C.

Rights and Remedies of Taxpayers Suspected of Fraud, Spurgeon Avakian, Phillips, Avakian and Johnston, Oakland, California

Panel Discussion of Tax-Fraud Problems, Mr. Avakian; Charles W. Davis, Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, Owen and Mulroy, Chicago; Leonard Rieser, Sonnenickein, Berkson, Lautmann, Levinson and Morse, Chicago; and William N. Haddad, Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd, Chicago, Moderator

Trusts and Estates; Estate Planning

One Year of Trust Income Taxation under the 1954 Code, Austin Fleming, The Northern Trust Company, Chicago

Taxation of Trust Income to Grantors and Others as Substantial Owners of the Property, Willis D. Nance, Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin and Ellis, Chicago

Tax Aspects of Providing for Minors in Family Property Arrangements, Roland K. Smith, Isham, Lincoln and Beale, Chicago

Corporate Distributions and Adjustments

Stock Redemptions and Constructive Ownership Problems, George W. Windhorst, Jr., Bell, Boyd, Marshall and Lloyd, Chicago

Divisive Reorganizations and Corporate Contractions, John S. Pennell, McDermott, Will and Emery, Chicago

Contributions and Distributions of Property in Kind to and by Corporations, William L. Kumler, Dempsey, Thayer, Deibert and Kumler, Los Angeles, California

Corporations and Shareholders; Employee Problems

Purchases and Sales of Corporate Businesses, Frank H. Urill, Pope and Ballard, Chicago

Tax Aspects of Buying Loss Corporations under the 1954 Code, Albert E. Archit, Benge, Fox and Arnet, Washington, D.C.

Insurance, Annuities, and Other Employee Benefits from the Executive's Point of View, Middleton Miller, Sidley, Austin, Burgess and Smith, Chicago

Business Problems; Tax Accounting

Tax Considerations in Business Lease Arrangements, Vance N. Kirby, Ross and O'Keefe, Chicago

The Past and Future of Deferring Income and Reserving for Expenses, Michael J. Sporrer, Arthur Andersen and Company, Chicago

Depreciation for Tax Purposes, Thomas J. Graves, Haskins and Sells, Washington, D.C.
Regulations; Round Table of Selected Problems:
The Preparation and Promulgation of the Treasury Regulations under the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, Laurens Williams, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Legislation, Washington, D.C.

Round Table of Selected Problems: An informal discussion of selected problems conducted by a panel consisting of Walter J. Blum, Professor of Law, University of Chicago, Chairman; Frederick O. Dicus, Chapman and Cutler, Chicago; William M. Emery, McDermott, Will and Emery, Chicago; Paul F. Johnson, Ernst and Ernst, Chicago; Frederick R. Shearer, Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown and Platt, Chicago; and Harry B. Sutter, Hopkins, Sutter, Halls, Owen and Mulroy, Chicago.

Faculty Notes
Professor E. W. Puttkammer was selected last spring by the University of Arkansas to serve as University Distinguished Lecturer for 1955. Professor Puttkammer spoke on “Universities as Factors in International Understanding.”

Wilber G. Katz, James Parker Hall Professor of Law, spoke this autumn at Wesleyan University on “The Profession of Law—a Social Accounting.” Under a joint arrangement between Wesleyan University and The Law School, a member of this Faculty delivers a public lecture at Wesleyan each year. Professor Katz’s lecture was the third in this series.


Mrs. Raya S. Dreben, Bigelow Fellow for 1955-56, has been named winner of the 1955 Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition, conducted by the American Society of Composers and Publishers. Mrs. Dreben, Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Radcliffe College and an alumna of the Harvard Law School, wrote her prize-winning paper on “Publication and the British Copyright Law.”

On the occasion of the annual meeting of the Association of General Counsel, Professor Bernard Meltzer arranged for a Round Table on Selected Collective-Bargaining Problems. In addition to presiding over the round table, Professor Meltzer acted as a commentator on the discussion concerning “Defensive and Bargaining” Lockouts under the Taft-Hartley Act and Antitrust Legislation.” Earlier in the quarter, Professor Meltzer spoke to members of the Illinois State Bar Association on the subject of “Employer Free Speech and the National Labor Relations Board.”
In terms of their home communities, the current student body represents thirty-five states, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and nine foreign countries, as follows:

**United States:**
- Alabama
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Utah
- Virginia
- Washington
- Wisconsin

**Foreign Countries, U.S. Territory:**
- England
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hawaii
- Iraq
- Israel
- Japan
- Jordan
- Philippines

---

Dallin Oaks, right, being congratulated by Assistant Dean Ratcliffe on his receipt of the Joseph Henry Beale, Jr., Prize, which is awarded annually to the first-year student whose work in the tutorial program is judged by the Faculty to be most worthy of special recognition.
A Journal of Law and Economics

The Law School has received a grant from a foundation to make possible the inauguration of an annual journal in law and economics. The journal will be edited by Professor Aaron Director and will have a distinguished board of advisers. The publication of the journal will be the natural outgrowth of the School's research and teaching in the field of law and economics. This program has been developed over a twenty-year period, beginning with the pioneering work of Professor Henry Simons and Professor Wilber Katz. In the last few years the program has been greatly aided through grants from corporations and foundations. Representative of the work of the Law School in this area is the work of Blum and Kalven in the field of progressive taxation. Their book on The Uneasy Case for Progressive Taxation has received widely favorable reviews. Also representative of the present program are the essay by Robert Bork relating to problems of vertical integration; Ward Bowman's recent study on the "Prerequisites and Effects of Resale Price Maintenance"; the research of John McGee into price discrimination, soon to be published; and the work carried on under the direction of Professor John Jewkes of Oxford University into the correlation between large-scale enterprise and the development of inventions.

It is believed that the new journal will be of interest to teachers of law and of economics. The journal will contain each year a critical review of the literature and theories advanced in some segment of the law-economics area. It will critically re-evaluate some of the assumptions and theories which have been developed, and it will contain also a critique of law-economics measures which may have been taken in the preceding year in England, Europe, and the United States.