Albert L. Hopkins, JD'08, speaking in the Lecture Hall named for him.

Puzzle: Who is the former President and who is the current President of The University of Chicago?

Israel's Highest Judge

The Honorable Shimon Agranat, JD'29, has recently been elevated to the Presidency of the Supreme Court of Israel. Justice Agranat entered private practice in Palestine upon graduation from the Law School. He has been a member of the Supreme Court of Israel for several years and was serving, at the time of this appointment, as Relieving President of the Court, the second-ranking member.

The Kreeger Chair

The Julius Kreeger Professorship of Law and Criminology has been established at the Law School in memory of a distinguished alumnus who was, for more than forty years, a prominent practitioner in Chicago.

Norval R. Morris, Professor of Law at the School since the Autumn Quarter, 1964, has been appointed to the chair.

The Kreeger Professorship was established with a gift from Mrs. Arthur Wolf in memory of her late husband, Julius Kreeger. In presenting the gift, Mrs. Wolf said: “I can think of no way more fitting to honor the memory of my late husband. Through the establishment of this professorship, my family and I hope to encourage the study of criminal law and advance the community’s knowledge of how to deal effectively with one of society’s greatest problems, that of criminal behavior.”

Julius Kreeger, born in Chicago in 1896, received both his Ph.B., in 1917, and his J.D., in 1920, from the University. He practiced from 1921 until 1935 with the firm of Felsenthal, Struckman and Berger, and from 1935 until 1946 as a partner of Mayer and Kreeger; in 1946 he opened his own offices.

Mr. Kreeger was president of Motoramp Garages of Illinois, past President of the Standard Club and served on the board of Michael Reese Hospital Research Foun-
Public Law Perspectives on a Private Law Problem: Auto Compensation Plans

By Walter J. Blum and Harry Kalven, Jr.
Professors of Law, The University of Chicago

The material which follows constitutes most of the opening section of the book of the same name, published by Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1963. It appears here with the permission of the authors and of the publisher. The book, in turn, grew out of the Harry Shulman Lectures, delivered, in the authors' words, "jointly, but not quite simultaneously," at the Yale Law School in 1964.

In a general way we intend to discuss automobile accident compensation plans, but the center of our interest is somewhat different from that of others who have written on the subject. We are not responding directly to the practical problem of coping with carnage on the highways; nor are we concerned with the merits of any particular compensation plan. Instead our interest lies in exploring the underlying rationale of tort liability and compensation schemes, and we look upon auto accidents as providing both an active and a finite area for testing liability and compensation theories. Our concern therefore is with policy.

Speaking loosely, the main question is usually taken to involve a single choice between the common law system in which not all victims recover, and where inevitably there is delay in paying claims, and an auto compensation plan under which every victim would get something, including prompt payment of medical and emergency expenses. This is too stark a contrast because of possible variations both on the common law side and among auto compensation plans. Thus if we add to the common law both compulsory liability insurance and comparative negligence—neither of which can now be considered a radical change—we end up with a negligence system under which the vast majority of victims recover something, albeit not promptly. And similarly if we postulate a compensation plan which embodies a low ceiling on damages, we would have a scheme under which victims as a class bear a large part of the losses. Moreover, most of the plans which have been offered resemble the common law to the extent that all losses are thought of as being borne only by motorists and victims of accidents. If we were to conceive of the special combination of tort law and social insurance of the English variety as constituting a plan, it differs both from the common law and from other plans in that the public at large, through tax funds, bears part of the losses. But enough has been said to indicate why our subject cannot quickly be reduced to a simple policy choice.

The idea of a plan for auto accidents has been con-

(Continued on page 31)