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This is an occasion which we celebrate annually to welcome the newest recruits to the ranks of University of Chicago lawyers. What I have to say will be mainly directed to the new first-year class, but I hope it may also have some relevance for our friends who have come from abroad or from other law schools to spend a year with us and to whom we extend an equally enthusiastic welcome. It is an occasion of welcome, but it is more than that. We hope you will take from this gathering not only a sense of our pleasure in your arrival but also some notion of our pride in you, our confidence that you have the qualities required for success here, and our hope that you will find in the life of the School and in your careers thereafter the challenges and rewards that have come to a long line of your predecessors.

Perhaps I need especially to emphasize the confidence we have in you. This is not because I doubt that you bring with you a proper measure of self-confidence but because all experience suggests that in the weeks and months ahead it will have to survive severe strains. There will be times, I am afraid, when some of you will feel that one of our chief aims (or worse, chief pleasures) is the destruction of your self-confidence. Your reaction will be natural, though quite mistaken. I doubt that anything I may say now can wholly inoculate you against it, but perhaps you will try at such times to remind yourselves that our attitude toward you is a mark of high respect. If law school is in some ways an intellectually rough and aggressive place, as it is, part of the reason is that the faculty regard you as hardy stock. You will come closer to being treated as the intellectual equals of the faculty
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I first met Laird Bell in April, 1929, under circumstances embarrassing to us both.

The occasion was the Board meeting at which I was to be elected President of the University. After a pleasant luncheon in the Chicago Club, Laird was asked to take me to another room and talk with me a few minutes while the Board gave routine assent to the recommendation of its nominating committee.

The minutes grew into hours. The shadows lengthened, and the evening fell. Our conversation languished and became at times touched with hysteria. When we were finally released, we had covered all conceivable subjects, some of them several times. As our talk ended, it was as though we had known each other for many, many years. The most notable aspect of this remarkable conversation was that it was the only one I ever had with Laird in which I got him to say anything about
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himself. This gives the measure of his desperation.

I never dared inquire what happened at the meeting in the other room. To those who delayed my election I owe a debt of gratitude for laying the foundation, under forced draft, so to speak, of a friendship that illuminated my life for more than a generation.

From my arrival in Chicago up to and after the Great Santa Barbara Fire, Laird and Nathalie Bell watched over me. Laird regulated my affairs, edited my writings, and tried to civilize my conduct. He came to be the criterion by which I measured plans, policies, and proposals. I would have been wiser, I see now, if I had always substituted my judgment for my own.

When Roosevelt was campaigning for a third term, Laird came out of a meeting in which everybody else had attacked the President, and Laird had defended him. He said to me, "I am against Roosevelt when I am alone." Mob scenes were unattractive to him. He had to point out there was another side.

He could not stand the falsehood inherent in exaggeration. When I told him, as I always did, that somebody I was proposing for the faculty was the best man in the world, he always asked me how I knew. But he was very far from that high British civil servant who was described as an inverted Micawber, always waiting for something to turn down. Exaggerated fear, exaggerated adherence to the status quo, were as repugnant to him as exaggerated salesmanship. His struggle was for balance, for fairness, in a word, for justice.

It has been said that all the progress in the world has been made by one-eyed men. But we have learned of late to take a somewhat skeptical view of progress. The products and by-products of technology, with which progress has been identified, carry their own doubts with them. The mushroom cloud over Hiroshima and the bank of smog over Los Angeles suggest it might be better if those who make technical decisions were as resolutely stereoscopic as Laird Bell. Since he saw life steadily and saw it whole, it came to be his function to correct astigmatism and to restore sight to the half-blind.

He could help other people become stereoscopic even when their view was clouded by emotion and their vested interests. One of the old forgotten battles of long ago is the fight over the Rush Medical College. It took ten years out of my life. The association of Rush with the University was one of Mr. Harper's few mistakes. I was determined to end it. But the faculty of the Rush Medical College and the trustees of the Presbyterian Hospital were involved. The latter were citizens quite as prominent as our board. The former were the leading physicians and surgeons of Chicago, and every member of our board, or so it seemed to me, had one of them as his personal doctor. It took ten years, and I began to think that like the Depression, another great event of my administration, it would never end, when Laird decided it had gone on long enough. He wrote an elaborate memorandum so clear and so judicious that it had to be accepted by all parties. Singlehanded and overnight, he had solved the great Rush problem.

A civilized man has been defined as one who will give a serious answer to a serious question. Laird was civilized because he was serious. In a period in which the most overworked word in the language is "image," and when the universal desire is not to be good but to look good, Laird cared little for appearances. He was always slightly scornful about public relations. He was convinced that if the University was good it would eventually look good. If it looked good and was not, it was not worth bothering about.

Laird Bell was a serious man, but he was the rarest of that rare breed. He was serious without being solemn. The 22 years we spent together in Chicago were not the most cheerful in American history. They consisted entirely of the Depression, and the pre-war, war, and immediate post-war periods. I can remember a meeting of the finance committee at which it was generally agreed that it might never be possible to raise money for the University again. Yet Laird Bell's gaiety suffused and transformed it all.

Last week I had a letter from one of Laird's admirers, Thornton Wilder. He wrote, "Gaiety is not a function of animal spirits; that is frivolity or clowning around. True gaiety is the reward of rigorous work in which one feels a daily increment of progress."

Laird Bell made us believe we were engaged in rigorous and important work and helped us think we saw a daily increment of progress. We were rewarded by his gaiety and became gay ourselves.

Laird had one of the quickest and most cultivated minds I have ever seen. But, like Socrates, who also had a considerable mind, he used to insist on his ignorance and say that all he knew positively was that we were under a duty to inquire. Like Socrates, he asked embarrassing questions that had great ophthalmological consequences. But one of his favorite lines was that he always agreed with the last man he talked to. Though this was not true, as I often found out when I was the last man, it reflected the essential humility of his character.

Two years after I left the University he made a speech to the faculty and trustees in which he gave a far too generous account of my administration. He said he was pleased that an anonymous donor had given a distinguished service professorship in my name. He said he thought it was fine that my name was attached to the professorship instead of the donor's. I do not agree; for the donor was Laird Bell.
David Riesman has written of the "gay arrogance" of those days at the University of Chicago. I hope I may accept the adjective and reject the noun. I should like to think we were independent, rather than arrogant. This was the tradition of the Board. The University was independent of the Board, as the community and its whims. The faculty was independent of the trustees. Most important of all, the university was independent of the community and its whims. The faculty was independent of the trustees. So important a matter as the relocation of the bachelor's degree was reported to the Board for its information, not for action. As to such subjects the Board was self-denying ordinance limited itself to criticism. By statute, all matters affecting education and research were left to the faculty.

So Laird Bell said to the Citizens Board, a group of businessmen, in 1953, "It is not easy for businessmen to accept the idea that a university is, unlike a business, not an organization of employees responsible to a hierarchy of bosses. It is a community of scholars."

This position was at that date the unanimous view of the Board, but unanimity had not been painlessly achieved. The Board was large and representative. It was not to be expected that all of them would view the activities of all the faculty with equanimity. And all of them did not. The first time I met with the committee on the presidency, in 1928, a prominent member told me in the presence of his colleagues that a present senator from Illinois, then a member of the faculty, should be lined up against a wall and shot. When I inquired what the professor had done to merit such punishment, the reply was that he did not believe in the capitalistic system.

Later the leading lawyer of his vintage in Chicago, a member of the Board, demanded the expulsion of the same professor because he had said it might not be wise to turn over the public transportation of Chicago to a perpetually franchise to Samuel Insull.

Later still there was a meeting held because a trustee wanted to overrule the Dean of Students, who had granted a student organization permission to invite Earl Browder to the campus. This was the occasion on which this trustee, whose emotions sometimes got the better of his vocabulary, made a remark I have always cherished. He said, "I know the faculty of the University of Chicago. They are not strong and virulent men."

Nevertheless, the record is clear. The position Laird enunciated in 1953 had been the policy of the Board since the foundation of the University, in spite of the opposition of a small and dwindling minority. By the time he spoke it had become, largely because of his influence and that of Harold Swift, the unanimous view of the trustees.

So at the time of the legislature investigation of 1936 the Board moved into the fray with all colors flying and brought the affair to successful conclusion under the leadership of Laird Bell and A. T. Carton of Gardner, Carton and Douglas. In 1949, once more under Laird's leadership, the University went into battle with the bigots in the legislature and emerged victorious. These hearings were profitable to me. Laird offered me $100 if I would make no wisecracks during my testimony, with $25 off per wisecrack. He paid me the full $100—a triumph of avarice over art.

The conventional picture of a university trustee is that of an overstuffed corporation executive telling the faculty and students to behave themselves on pain of losing financial support. The trustees of the University of Chicago have never conformed to this picture. Yet even among them I find Laird Bell remarkable. Consider his last words to the faculty and trustees.

He said, "I think I shall take the occasion to say that my most serious concern is about our general spiritual health. I frankly am afraid that in public we neglect the very things that have entitled us to be proud of the institution."

Of the principle that defined these things he said, "I can find no words to describe that principle except the trite ones—insistence on the highest standards of scholarship and an atmosphere of freedom, not merely what is called academic freedom, but freedom to explore, and try, and fail, and try again. Courage should be added, too, in full measure; the courage to be different, and to be unpopular."

I think it safe to say that no other chairman of the board of any other university in history ever called upon the academic body to have the courage to be different and to be unpopular.

Provost of the University and Professor of Law Edward H. Levi, JD'35, speaking at the Dedication. On the platform, left to right, Glen A. Lloyd, JD'23, former Chairman of the Board of Trustees, George W. Beadle, President of the University, and Phil C. Neal, Dean of the Law School.
Laird, in his characteristic, self-depreciatory way, always gave his partners credit for his public service. He said if they had not done his work and their own too he would not have been able to devote himself to the University and the other public activities in which he was involved. Though this statement was not wholly true, it was not wholly false, either. The Bell firm deserves the thanks of Harvard, Carleton, the National Merit Scholarships, and the whole Chicago community for helping Laird in his public duties. They were, as this list indicates, manifold. Apart from those he brought on himself, there were those Nathalie brought on him; for the extensive Fairbank connection had been active in every good work around Chicago for generations. A great number of eleemosynary institutions, including the University, were, in effect, Laird’s clients without fee.

Laird was a lawyer. He was a noble lawyer. He never forgot he was an officer of the court and a member of a learned profession. He included in his stereoscopic vision the public good as well as the interests of his clients. And he went to some trouble to find out what the public good was. He never stopped learning. He and Nathalie were members of the Great Books group that Mortimer Adler and I led at the University Club. There, as in meetings of the Board of Trustees, he gave the impression that he was waiting for the rest of us to catch up.

Laird used to say that what he liked best in any speech was the phrase, “And now in conclusion.” I am sure he would welcome it particularly in any speech about himself.

And now in conclusion, therefore, though Laird would have taken special pleasure in pricking any balloons sent up in his honor, I believe this dedication and its meaning for the future would have given him a certain quiet satisfaction. Prospective leaders of the profession he honored, studying in the university he loved, will be reminded as they walk through this quadrangle of the things he stood for.

Let us invoke his spirit to guide them as they go.

Coming Events

The calendar for the Spring Quarter is already crowded and varied. The Visiting Committee of the Law School, under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Walter V. Schaeffer, JD’28, Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court, will hold its Annual Meeting at the School on April 7.

The C. R. Musser Lectureship is awarded from time to time for a public lecture on some phase of the problems of government by an experienced citizen who has held public office. The Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Attorney General of Massachusetts, will deliver the Musser Lecture on April 26.

On May 5, a national meeting of the Board of Directors of the Law Alumni Association will be held as part of the annual Alumni Day program. Peter N. Todd-Hunter, JD’37, is president of the Association.

Also on May 5, Milton Friedman, Paul Snowden Russell Distinguished Service Professor of Economics, The University of Chicago, will deliver the Henry C. Simons Memorial Lecture. This biennial lectureship, in the field of law and economics, was established in 1955 in honor of Henry C. Simons, for many years a distinguished member of the Faculties of the Law School and the Department of Economics.

Finally, on May 11 the Law Alumni Association will hold its Annual Dinner.

The Laird Bell Quadrangle

One of the memorable events in the history of the Law School occurred on October 12, 1966, when the complex of buildings housing the School was dedicated as The Laird Bell Quadrangle.

Phil C. Neal, Dean of the Law School, presided at the ceremonies. Speakers included George W. Beadle, President of the University, Edward H. Levi, JD’35, Provost of the University, Professor of Law, and former Dean of the School, Glen A. Lloyd, JD’23, Life Trustee of the University, former Chairman of its Board and law partner of Mr. Bell, and Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and former Chancellor of the University.

An outline of Laird Bell’s remarkable career has appeared in an earlier issue of the Record. An eloquent description of him and of his service to the University and to society generally, may be found in Mr. Hutchins’ Dedication Address, on page 1 of this issue.

Following the Dedication Ceremonies, George W. Beadle, Mrs. Laird Bell, and Robert M. Hutchins gather in front of the Laird Bell Quadrangle.
and of each other than in any previous part of your education. You will, I hope, have faith that our estimate of you is justified; if you do, you will end by knowing a surer sense of self-confidence than you enjoy even now.

I should not want to leave the impression that self-confidence is the only quality you will need here. But I believe that properly understood this is perhaps the most important attribute you can have. Perhaps what I have in mind is not so much self-confidence in what you now are as a proper awareness of what you can be if you have the will to be it. The fact is that the limits of self-development are much more distant than we habitually assume. That is true of all of us. I was told recently by an athletic coach that the fact that new records are made each year, records which would have been thought impossible only a few short years earlier, is to be explained more by the mental conditioning of the athletes than by any physical facts. What is true, or may be true, of physical accomplishments seems to me even more obviously true of mental accomplishment. The lives of most of us could be written as a record of potentialities not fully exploited. What law school has most to offer is the opportunity for channeling your full energies toward a well-defined goal, perhaps for the first time in your lives—the goal of achieving real mastery in whatever subjects of the law you choose to make your own. It offers even the possibility that in some one or more corners of the field you can become more of a master than anyone else has yet been.

It will help you realize such a goal, I think, if you can keep in mind a general view of the aims of legal education. In trying to suggest what such a view might be, I am walking on dangerous territory. There are different ways of looking at it, and each of many ways in which it might be put has its partial truth. None is the whole truth, not even the classic and still highly useful proposition of Mr. Justice Holmes that the whole aim of the study of law is the prediction of the future incidence of the public force—to gather from the "sibylline leaves" of reported cases "the scattered prophecies of the past upon the cases in which the axe will fall." On this question as on every other problem in the law school you must form, you will form, your own opinion, and you must take what I say as at best only a half truth and a first approximation.

I would begin and very nearly end by saying what a legal education is not—or, less dogmatically, by distinguishing it from another view of it that you may hold. You will discover that this is a favorite method of procedure in the law. It is easier to get an idea of what a trust is, for example, by seeing the ways in which it differs from other kinds of relationship than by trying to define it.

My proposition is that the aim of the law school, at any rate, of this law school, is not to train lawyers. I can see the jaws of some of our alumni beginning to harden at this heresy, so let me hasten on. The aim of the law school is not to train lawyers, but to educate men for becoming lawyers. There is a vast difference, although it is one that is not always sufficiently appreciated by the bar in general, by students, and sometimes, I think, not even by those of us on the faculties of law schools. It is a difference that divides the preparation of lawyers today from that of a century ago. It is a difference that I think very largely distinguishes preparation in our field from that in the medical schools of today. It is a difference that emphasizes the division of labor between ourselves on the law faculty and the men sitting among you under whose tutelage you will have to come after you have left our hands and before you are really fit to call yourselves lawyers.

Time was when the training of lawyers, like training for many other trades, took place by means of the apprenticeship system. A young man would go at once into the office of an older lawyer; there he would learn simultaneously by "reading law" and by doing the things that lawyers do. It was not a bad system and it is still a conceivable system. It is still the system, very largely, by which men today are trained for the English bar. But in this country a different system came to prevail. I shall not attempt to discuss the reasons for the change or to defend, except by implication, the superiority of our present system. You will notice that I have not said that we abandoned apprenticeship or substituted law school education for it. The real change was not substitution but addition. We developed the view that there is a dimension of preparation for the law that can best be acquired through formal study in a university setting. It would be
a mistake to pretend that we had carried over into the university setting all that the apprenticeship system had attempted to do. In fact, apprenticeship still goes on, as it must. The chief difference is that we no longer acknowledge it as such because now, instead of paying for the privilege of being one, each of you will be able to command as an apprentice something like $8,000 a year. It is not easy for practicing lawyers to accept the fact that they must pay a price like that for the privilege of being your teachers. But it is part of the price for a hard-won status. The real significance of the establishment of law schools in this country was its acknowledgment that the law is, whatever else it may be, a learned profession.

How much of such learning does a man need? Three years is a long time, and it is safe to say that before they are over many of you will feel that you are ready for a different kind of adventure. I wish that I could offer a more confident justification for the fact that it is three years, and not two and not four. You must not look for logic to explain legal education any more than to explain the law itself. We cannot claim that three years will give you a comprehensive and systematic view of the whole corpus of the law. We have lost, and for good reasons, the faith that enabled Holmes, in the famous lecture I have referred to, to say, "The number of our predictions when generalized and reduced to a system is not unmanageably large. They present themselves as a finite body of dogma which may be mastered within a reasonable time." Lacking this faith we sometimes tend to fall back on the rather lame explanation that we teach method, or skills, or approaches, or how to think like a lawyer, or inculcate some other sort of virtue disembodied from knowledge itself. But I think that our real faith is deeper and more old-fashioned. We believe that to know a continent you must know some parts of it and keep adding others, that the process of becoming educated is a process of reducing the areas of our ignorance, that the man who has explored deeply some areas of the law will meet new problems and new fields with a subtlety and perspective that the less educated man cannot hope to match. It is not because the field of the law is finite that you must spend three years studying it, but rather because it is infinitely vast, complex, and changing.

Is three years longer than is necessary to enable you to start being a lawyer? Of course it is. We could turn you out much sooner without grossly increasing the risks to the innocent public. Is a lifetime of study too short to make you masters of your chosen field? Of course it is. And so you will do well, I suggest, to accept gratefully the three years that our folklore has allotted for the undiluted pursuit of knowledge, and to crowd what you can into them.

I have said that I was offering only a partial view, and I am sure you will find much in the life of the Law School that may seem to qualify my statement of our aims. You will find, I hope, that to be theoretical is not the opposite of being practical, and that most of our teaching deals with real life and with practical problems. You will find that the members of this faculty bring a wealth of knowledge of the world to the understanding of their fields. You will find that we do put a high value on the cultivation of such arts as speaking cogently and writing well, and that we do try as often as we can to make you see your problems as a counselor, a draftsman, or a litigating lawyer would have to view them. We do not disdain the aims of apprenticeship insofar as formal education can make an efficient contribution to those aims. You will also have abundant opportunities in various activities that go on here, and in the work experience that your summers will offer, to get a glimpse and a taste of some of the many paths that will be open to you when you reach the end of the three years. The law school is not an ivory tower; it is as open to the world as its glass walls suggest. But I hope you will remember that the books in the library are the best symbol of what you are here for, and that there are times in a man's development when the inward view should predominate.

I also hope that you will carry with you a proper sense of pride in this Law School, in its faculty and students, and in what it stands for in American legal education. You will come to understand this heritage better and to absorb its spirit as the months go by. But let me say a few words that may help you toward an appreciation of it.

If the creation of university law schools was the first great revolution in legal training in America, and the introduction of the case system of study about 1875 was the second, a third revolution was a revolution in outlook. This revolution, a quieter and slower revolution that is still going on, had its beginnings around the turn
of this century and was associated with emerging broader views about the nature of law itself. If I may go back once more to Holmes’ famous speech, The Path of the Law, delivered in 1897, one finds there some prophecies whose fulfillment could be seen in the founding of this law school half a dozen years later. Let me quote a couple of striking passages.

For the rational study of the law the black-letter man may be the man of the present, but the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics.

And again,

I look forward to a time when the part played by history in the explanation of dogma shall be very small . . . and we shall spend our energy on a study of the ends sought to be attained and the reasons for desiring them . . . The present divorce between the schools of political economy and law seems to me an evidence of how much progress in philosophical study still remains to be made. In the present state of political economy, indeed, we come again upon history on a larger scale, but there we are called on to consider and weigh the ends of legislation, the means of attaining them, and the cost. We learn [and here Holmes struck a note whose resonances you will surely encounter at Chicago today] we learn that for everything we have to give up something else, and we are taught to set the advantage we gain against the other advantage we lose, and to know what we are doing when we elect.

The University of Chicago Law School had its birth in an uneasy but successful partnership between men at Chicago, notably President Harper and Professor Ernst Freund, who held a Holmesian view of legal education, and Professor Joseph Beale who brought from Harvard a vigorous tradition of narrowly professional instruction. You can read the story of these interesting beginnings in Professor Richard Storr’s new book, Harper's University. Not surprisingly, the offspring of this somewhat miscegenous union was an institution with some new and strong characteristics and with its own special vitality. You can see the marks of this vitality in some of the ways in which this law school has been a leader. It introduced the subject of Administrative Law to the American curriculum. It was the first to teach Legislation as a subject in its own right. The first chair of Comparative Law in an American law school was established here, and we have been the first school to make intensive study of civil law systems available in this country. The now common pattern of tutorial work in legal research and writing was an invention of this faculty. The idea that a knowledge of accounting should be a standard part of a lawyer’s equipment was first acted upon here. Ours was the first school to appoint economists as full-time members of the faculty, and to infuse the teaching of economics into the regular curriculum (with such effect that George Stigler has recently referred publicly to Professor Kurland as a “great economist”!). During the past decade this school has pioneered in an attempt to bring experimental and statistical methods of research to bear in understanding the behavior of legal institutions, an effort that has recently borne major fruit in the publication of Kalven and Zeisel’s study of the American jury. It is currently providing leadership in the effort to understand more about the causes of criminal behavior and the ways in which law can deal more effectively with it, and to bring the resources of psychology and sociology to the service of this inquiry. Perhaps the day will even come when we can find or provide a more adequate body of political theory to illuminate our understanding of the proper distribution and exercise of official power in a free society, as economics has illuminated other areas that are the law’s concern.

I have heard of law schools of which it is said that they teach no law or that they teach nothing but law. If such places still exist (as I find hard to accept) I can at least say that there is one law school that has never been able to see its mission in any such terms. This law school has never seen the universe of the law as being at war with the universe of social fact and theory out of which law grows and which it helps to shape. It has been our long and steady conviction that a lawyer is not less fitted to represent clients because he is also something of a social scientist and something of a humanist, and that he is not less fitted to be a servant and leader of the public because he accepts the discipline of his own professional craft and has mastered the technicalities of its subject matter.
Three Distinguished Journals

One of the distinctive contributions of The University of Chicago Law School to legal education and research is its role as the home of three major scholarly journals. The University of Chicago Law Review is edited by members of the student body. A more detailed description of the organization and purpose of the Review may be found on page 12 of this issue of the Record. The contents of the Autumn, 1966 issue were as follows:

Laird Bell, Edward H. Levi
Precedent and Policy, Walter V. Schaefer
Suitcase Divorce in the Conflict of Laws: Simons, Rosenberg, and Borax, David P. Currie
The Conscientious Objector and the First Amendment
Picketing the Homes of Public Officials
The Constitutionality of Statutory Criminal Presumptions
Selective Detention and the Exclusionary Rule
Forum Commission Enforcement of Foreign Workmen's Compensation Acts
Marital Privileges and the Right to Testify

Professor Ronald H. Coase has assumed the editorship of The Journal of Law and Economics from Professor Aaron Director, its founder. A recent statement by Professor Coase described the function of the Journal as follows:

"The Journal of Law and Economics is published annually by The University of Chicago Law School. In the main, the articles which appear in the Journal deal with the interplay between the legal and economic systems. What influence does the legal framework have on the operations of the economic system? How far are existing, or proposed, laws appropriate to bring about an efficient working of the economic system? These are the underlying questions to which articles in The Journal of Law and Economics are directed.

These articles are sometimes concerned with clarifying the issues and improving the analysis; sometimes with the history of important doctrines and institutions; but more often they are concerned with how particular market or governmental institutions actually operate and therefore with providing the basis for an informed discussion of issues of public policy."

The most recent issue of the Journal was made up of the following articles:

Rationing Justice, Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.
Entry in Commercial Banking, Sam Peltzman
Oil and Gas Licensing and the North Sea, Kenneth W. Dam
The Structure of National Time Rates in the Television Broadcasting Industry, John L. Peterman
Promises Respecting the Use of Land, Allison Dunham
The Dominant Firm and the Inverted Umbrella, George J. Stigler
Monetary Rules: A New Look, M. Bronfenbrenner
Occupational Self-Regulation: A Case Study of the Oklahoma Dry Cleaners, Charles R. Ploot

The Supreme Court Review was established to provide continuing, responsible and scholarly criticism of the work of the Supreme Court of the United States. Professor Philip B. Kurland has been editor of the Review since its inception. Contained in the 1966 issue were the following:

Felix Frankfurter: A Lesson of Faith, Archibald MacLeish
The Obscenity Cases: Grapes of Roth, C. Peter Magrath
The Voting Rights Cases, Alexander M. Bickel
The Albertson Case: Conflict between the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination and the Government's Need for Information, John H. Mansfield
Kent v. United States: The Constitutional Context of Juvenile Cases, Monrad G. Paulsen
Elfbrandt v. Russell: The Demise of the Oath?, Jerold H. Israel
The Union as Litigant: Personality, Pre-emption, and Propaganda, Alfred Kamin
Graham v. John Deere Co.: New Standards for Patents, Edmund W. Kitch
The Origins of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Covetpacking Plan, William E. Leuchtenburg
Two Related Conferences

As readers of the Record may recall, in November, 1965 students of the Law School planned and conducted a Conference on Consumer Credit and the Poor. It is a pleasure to report that the second student-run conference, on the Landlord-Tenant Relationship, was held in November, 1966, and was equally successful.

The theme of the opening session of the Conference was “New Approaches to Changing the Landlord-Tenant Relationship.” GILBERT CORNFIELD, JD'54, of Kleiman, Cornfield and Feldman, Chicago, spoke on “Tenant Unions.” NANCY E. LeBLANC, Assistant Director, Legal Services Unit, Mobilization for Youth, New York, discussed “Problems in Public Housing.” A paper on “Legislative Remedies,” by the Honorable ROBERT E. MANN, JD'56, Chairman of the Legislative Housing Commission of the Illinois General Assembly, was followed by comment on all three talks by JOHN E. COONS, Professor of Law, Northwestern University, the Honorable RICHARD H. NEWHOUSE, JD'61, member of the Illinois Senate, and EUGENE SMOLENSKY, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Business, The University of Chicago.

The afternoon was devoted to workshop sessions. One group of workshops was concerned with “Tenant-Initiated Remedies”; discussion focused on four papers; “The Common Law Background,” by GEOFFREY A. BRAUN, “Rent Withholding,” by EDWARD H. FLITTON, “Tenant Unions,” by Peggo A. HILLMAN, and “The Model Lease,” by WILLIAM J. BOWE. The general topic of the other group of workshops was “Governmental
and Institutional Entry into the Field.” Providing the basis for discussion were papers on “Remedies Through Private Institutions,” by Arthur W. Friedman, “Receiverships,” by Charles M. Pratt, “The Federal Government and Low Rent Housing,” by Edward A. Christiansen, and Mr. Flitton’s rent withholding paper. Authors of all the working papers are current students in the Law School.

The dinner session heard Julian H. Levi, Professor of Urban Studies, The University of Chicago, discuss building code enforcement. The general session in the evening consisted of a panel discussion of “The Allocation of Risks and Duties.” Panelists were John Baird, President, Baird and Warner, Inc., Gary Bellows, Deputy Director, California Rural Legal Assistance, Ronald H. Coase, Professor of Economics, The University of Chicago Law School, and Professor Smolensky. Moderator of the panel was Allison Dunham, Professor of Law, The University of Chicago Law School.

The final session, held the following morning, was again devoted to workshops.

The student committee which planned and ran the Conference was made up of Bernardine R. Dohrn, Philip N. Hablutzel, Philip W. Moore and Frank E. Wood, Executive Committee, and Richard H. Chused, Peter H. Darrow, George P. Felleman, Philip A. Mason, Elwood T. Olsen, David L. Passman and Michael L. Stein.

Immediately upon the conclusion of the Conference on the Landlord-Tenant Relationship, another Conference began in the Law School Auditorium. This was a Conference on Law and Poverty, sponsored by the Legal Defense Fund of the NAACP.
Alumni News

Arland 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

(Continued on page 14)
Wig and Robe was a legal fraternity with a long and honored history at the University of Chicago Law School. The upper photograph was taken at a meeting of the fraternity in 1925. Forty-one years later, the lower photograph was taken at a fraternity reunion. Those shown in the more recent picture, sitting, left to right: Martin Weisbrod, Edward Blackman, Milton Gordon, Thomas Carlin, Maurice Shanberg and Samuel Kane; standing, left to right: Meyer Edelman, Howard Oberndorf, Leo Aronson, Irving Senn, Lester Abelson, Philip Toomin, and Harvey Horwitz.
writing comments and discharging other duties, such as “preliming” 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 panjandrums 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 Kreiger 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.
Civil Legal Aid in the Cook County Jail. It is generally believed that the preservation and strengthening of a prisoner's community and family ties while he is in jail will help substantially in his rehabilitation. With the approval and cooperation of the Sheriff of Cook County, the Warden of the Jail, and the Chicago and Illinois State Bar Associations, the Center has established a civil legal aid service in the jail. Prisoners tend to have the same sorts of civil problems, marital, landlord-tenant, and installment contract, to cite three examples, as do the clients of legal aid services generally. The Center now has a full-time legal aid director at the Jail, assisted by two Center "interns," graduate and professionally admitted lawyers who are devoting half their time to this project and half to academic work leading to advanced degrees.

Deterrence—The Effect of Sanctions. Professor Morris has stated: "A serious gap in legal theory is the scant information available on the effects of legal sanctions on the community at large—their deterrent, educative and habituative roles." As a result, it is extremely difficult to decide what is most likely to work. The Center is conducting studies so extensive in this area as to suggest a detailed report in a subsequent issue of the Record.

Compensation to Victims of Crimes of Violence. Professor Morris was appointed by the Governor of Illinois to serve as one of the five public members of a fifteen-man Commission on this question. As one of the three members of the drafting sub-committee, he assisted in the preparation of a bill which will go to public hearings shortly.

Indigent Appeals Manual and Check List. A report of the Center's Director states: "The recent sudden upsurge in legal assistance to indigent persons accused of criminal offenses, and the increasing involvement of lawyers aiding indigent convicted persons in their appeals, have created an urgent need for guidance to lawyers undertaking appellate work in criminal cases who lack experience in it." With judicial support and with the approval of the organized Bar, the Center has prepared a manual and check list for lawyers representing indigent persons on appeal in Illinois.

Continuances. The purpose of this study is to analyze the function of continuances in Cook County Criminal Courts and to determine the costs to the administration of justice of granting multiple delays in the processes of trying a case. Very substantial studies of the juvenile court system, and of the use of non-professionals, including some rehabilitated former convicts, as probation case aids, are being planned and will soon be implemented.

It should be noted that more than twenty published articles have come out of the above projects and other activities of the Center. The teaching functions of the Center have, to date, involved 1) the work of three graduate student interns. Each of these young lawyers devotes one-half his time to a Center research project and one-half to curricular work at the School. 2) It is planned that senior officials, both from the United States and from abroad, might come to the Center for special advanced training. Mr. ATSUSHI NAGASHIMA, senior prosecutor and administrator of the Japanese Ministry of Justice, is currently in residence under this program. 3) A six-week institute for criminal law teachers will be held in the Summer Quarter of this year. 4) The Center is regularly involved in offering classes in the Federal Probation Training School.

Since it must be borne in mind that this report is far from exhaustive, it would seem clear that the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice has made a remarkable beginning.

Two Distinguished Visitors

At the Autumn Quarter Convocation, the University of Chicago awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws to H. L. A. Hart, Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford University. Professor Hart was presented for the degree by Sheldon Tefft, James Parker Hall Professor of Law. The citation for the degree read in part: "Barrister, philosopher and professor of jurisprudence, in recognition of his contributions to the education of lawyers and philosophers." Professor Hart, one of the world's most distinguished legal philosophers, shared the Ames Prize in 1966 with Professor Grant Gilmore of the University of Chicago Law School.

Professor J. N. D. Anderson agreed to answer questions after his public lecture, and here appears to have received a beauty.
During his stay in Chicago, Professor Hart joined Professor Harry Kalven, Jr. in teaching his class in Elements of the Law, and joined Professor Gerhard Casper in his seminar on Jurisprudence. He also spoke informally with students in the Green Law Lounge, and lunched with a group of Chicago lawyers and judges downtown.

Shortly after the first of the year, the School enjoyed a too-brief visit from J. N. D. Anderson, Professor of Oriental Law, Head of the Department of Law of the School of Oriental and African Studies, and Director of the Institute for Advanced Legal Studies, all of the University of London. While at the University of Chicago, Professor Anderson gave a public lecture on "Law Reform in the Muslim World."

---

The Dominant Firm and the Inverted Umbrella*

By George J. Stigler

Charles R. Walgreen Professor of American Institutions
The University of Chicago

This article first appeared in The Journal of Law and Economics, Volume VIII, October, 1965. It is printed here with the permission of the editor of the Journal and of the author.

When United States Steel Corporation was founded in 1901, it contained plants producing a large share of the nation's output of basic steel and fabricated steel products. The share of output of steel ingots was sixty-six per cent in 1901. During the next two decades the firm's share of output fell gradually, reaching forty-six per cent

Open House for College Students

Two of the most difficult problems confronted by many college students are the question of whether or not to study law and, if the answer to that is affirmative, which law school to attend. In the hope that it might help in answering one or both questions, the Law School held an open house and luncheon for college students in December, 1965. Student response was so enthusiastic that a similar meeting was held on December 21, 1966.
in 1920 and forty-two per cent in 1925. Declines (usually of lesser magnitude) took place in the company's share of other products. These facts are not in serious dispute.

The interpretation of the facts enjoys no such unanimity. Two rival hypotheses for the formation of the combine will be tested in this note.

The first hypothesis is that a large, perhaps primary, purpose of the merger was to sell securities to untutored investors. The book value of assets of the constituent firms was written up from some $700 million to $1.4 billion when the new corporation was formed, and the common stock then issued is a classic example of watered stocks in the literature of corporation finance.

On this view it was incidental to the motives for the merger whether any important economies in production or any important monopoly power in the market was achieved. If U.S. Steel was not more efficient, or if it could not control entry, its share would decline with time, and the higher prices it may have set would provide an 'umbrella under which more efficient rivals would flourish and their shares would gradually increase. This aspect of the theory was not elaborated, because the focus was on the promotional profits in the original stock sales.

The second hypothesis is that provided by the theory of the dominant firm. This theory assumes that U.S. Steel was formed for the monopoly power it achieved. The dominant firm will set a profit-maximizing price such that its marginal revenue equals marginal cost based upon its demand curve (the industry demand curve minus the amount supplied by others). The profit to be maximized is long run (actually, the sum of discounted future profits) so account will be taken of the rate at which rivals enter and expand. Nevertheless, the dominant firm will find, usually, that it is profitable to yield up some share of the industry, for higher prices may more than offset the decline in share. (Continued on page 18)

The program was extremely informal. Following lunch, Professor Bernard D. Meltzer spoke on the study and practice of law. Guests had the opportunity to talk with members of the Faculty, with students currently enrolled in the School, and with alumni of the School, preponderantly those graduated in the last four years. Tours of the Laird Bell Law Quadrangle were provided by current students and recent alumni. Some 240 college students, currently enrolled in seventy-eight undergraduate institutions, attended.
Neither theory denies the decline in share which after all is a well-known historical fact. They differ on the wisdom of purchasing the stock of U.S. Steel when it was first offered: the former theory says this was an unwise purchase; the latter does not.

The purpose of this note is to investigate the financial returns to investors in U.S. Steel common stock and in that of other steel companies. On the former theory, the investors should have purchased stock in other steel companies; on the latter theory, U.S. Steel should have done as well as other steel companies.

The financial returns of an investor are in principle easily determined:
1. Buy a block of stock in a company at a given date,—say $10,000 worth.
2. Reinvest all cash dividends in the stock.
3. Calculate the market value of the stock (including stock dividends) at any desired subsequent date.

This is in effect our procedure, and it yields the returns reported in Table I.**

The experience of investors in the various companies whose stocks were traded is presented graphically in Figure I. The current market value of the shares obtained with an initial investment of $10,000, and with reinvestment of all earnings, is given for each year from 1901 to 1925. Since the figure is semi-logarithmic in scale, rates of increase can be read directly. The figure is sufficient to reach the main conclusion: the stockholders of U.S. Steel did better than those of any of the other companies except Bethlehem Steel. The average value of the investments in the other companies was below that of U.S. Steel in 16 of the 18 years after 1905. At the end of the period the accumulated market value of United States Steel was twice that of the average of the other companies.

The evidence seems conclusive that the exploitation of stockholders by promoters did not take place. The formation of United States Steel Corporation must therefore be viewed as a master stroke of monopoly promotion; and it is churlish of the literature to complain at the $62 million of stock given to the Morgan syndicate for bringing it about.

*Aaron Director proposed the study, and Richard West, then a graduate student, performed the work under my negligent eye. Director refuses co-authorship, on grounds I find unconvincing: West has been given no chance to do so, on the ground that he has since become a professor and will now hire research assistants. As the middleman in this venture, I assume no credit and all blame.

**(Table I, omitted here, reveals that an investment made in the manner described in U.S. Steel stock would have been worth $101,039 in 1925, in Bethlehem Steel $115,453, and in the average of the major steel stocks excluding U.S. Steel, $55,514. Editor.)

### The Annual Fund

The Thirteenth Annual Fund Campaign, which closed last November, again demonstrated the continuing progress which has become the outstanding characteristic of the Annual Fund. Under the leadership of William G. Burns, JD’31, General Chairman, Jean Allard, JD’53, Chairman for Annual Alumni Giving, and Norman H. Nachman, ’32, Chairman for Major Gifts, more than 250 alumni worked for the campaign. The results were impressive: $155,239 from 1,725 donors, both new highs. Also worthy of note is the fact that 44.2% of the School’s alumni made contributions, also a new record.

The Fourteenth Annual Fund is off to a most promising start, with Keith I. Parsons, JD’37 serving as General Chairman, Edward W. Saunders, JD’42, as Chairman for Annual Alumni Giving, and John D. Schwartz, JD’50, as Chairman for Major Gifts.

### The Summer Fieldwork Project

*Taken from a report to the Faculty by Professor Dallin H. Oaks and Assistant Dean George E. Fee, Jr.*

The Council on Education in Professional Responsibility has awarded grants of $40,850 to the University of Chicago Law School to finance summer fieldwork training projects the past three summers. The objects of the
Project have been fourfold: (1) to give law students direct exposure to and broaden their understanding of important social problems not emphasized in the formal curriculum; (2) to give students an opportunity to apply their legal skills and to obtain training and experience in legal or semi-legal activities; (3) to broaden students' range of career choices; and (4) to give the Dean and Faculty of the Law School additional information and experience on the advisability of including fieldwork or clinical training in the formal curriculum.

During the past three summers, the Project has directly involved forty-one students. It consisted of clinical training—fieldwork during the summer and curriculum application during the Autumn and Winter Quarters. During their fieldwork the students, supported by fellowship grants, worked with supervising organizations chosen by them and approved by the Project Director. During the Autumn and Winter Quarters the students utilized their fieldwork experience in some portion of the existing law school curriculum. No academic credit was given for participation in the fieldwork project, but most of the students arranged to make formal application of their experience in existing curricular activities for which academic credit is given.

One of the most noteworthy features of this Project has been the extraordinary degree to which it has responded to the interests and preferences of the students. The Law School's desire for such a program was provoked by repeated expressions of student interest. The idea of having students locate their own summer clinical training opportunities challenged students to cultivate their own fields of interest in whatever geographical areas they preferred. When the students returned from their summer activities, they were asked to make their own proposals on the portion of the Law School's curriculum in which they would make formal application of their experience. At each stage the student choices were subject to the approval of the Project Director, who spent considerable time counseling them about their proposals. With but few exceptions, however, the student proposals have been thoughtful and sound. It is fair to say that the program described here is almost exclusively a response to the ideas and proposals of the students themselves.

At the conclusion of the summer training period, the supervisors reported on the students' work. All expressed enthusiasm for the program and high praise for the students who had worked for them. Several of the organizations expressed willingness to receive additional students next summer.

As might be expected, the final reports of the students expressed approval of the privilege of choosing their own activity, appreciation for the opportunity of participating in problems or aspects of a lawyer's work that are not emphasized in the normal law school curriculum, and enthusiasm for the practical experience and insights they had gained. Most of the students also noted that the summer's experience had affected their career objectives. For some, who indicated that their experience had made them resolve to pursue the same activity after their graduation, the effect was profound. For most others, it was more subtle. Several students described how they had acquired a basic understanding and a sense of responsibility toward the solution of social problems of whose existence they had barely been aware at the beginning of the summer. Another student, on the other hand, felt that his summer's experience had caused his previous desire "to be continually involved with the legal problems of the poor" to dwindle, although he still felt a keen responsibility to contribute his services on a part-time basis after he become a member of the Bar.

The following excerpts from student's final reports are illustrative: "... the experience of working for the Chief Counsel of the NYC poverty program has increased my interest in law and quickened my enthusiasm for practice. The areas I discovered seem vital and full of interest and possibilities for me; I plan to return to New York and to be involved in the type of work I did this summer.

"On a subjective level as well, I must add my unreserved enthusiasm for the NCLC financing of the summer internship program. The administration of the program was excellent and uncumbersome; the program is the finest means I know of permitting students to explore areas of interest to themselves while being of use and feeling a part of the legal world." "... The significance of my summer fieldwork project was that it enabled me to work in an area of the law which is neglected in the law school curriculum. The function of legal research is to find the law; the function of investigation is to find the facts. The blending of the two—the acceptance of some facts and the rejection of others because of the law—was the area in which I worked. I had to discover the probative value of a given set of facts: What did the content of the facts prove? Was the source of the facts an objective party or an interested party? Could the witness withstand the scrutiny of cross-examination? ..." "... It would be hard to think of a summer's experience that would be more interesting to a law student. My activities on the project give me a fine opportunity to study real cases and to observe practical court procedure. The work is always interesting. Most important, I have the feeling that I am participating in a useful activity and that I have accomplished something. Whereas I never previously considered a career in criminal law, I am considering it now. Even if I never practice criminal law, this summer's experience will be invaluable to me as a lawyer."
Attorney General Clark

The Law School takes great pride in the recent appointment of the Honorable Ramsey Clark, JD'51, as Attorney General of the United States.

After practicing law in his native Dallas, Mr. Clark served as Assistant Attorney General, Lands Division and, during Professor Nicholas deB. Katzenbach's tenure as Attorney General, as Deputy Attorney General. Mr. Clark has been Acting Attorney General since Professor Katzenbach's appointment as Undersecretary of State.

It is an additional pleasure to note that the Attorney General will be the principal speaker at the Annual Dinner of The University of Chicago Law School Alumni Association on May 11.