

University of Michigan Law School
University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository

Law School Alumni Survey Class Reports

University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey
Project

Class of 1968 Five Year Report Alumni Comments, Part 2

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.law.umich.edu/alumni_survey_reports

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "Class of 1968 Five Year Report Alumni Comments, Part 2" (1973).

This Response or Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Law School Alumni Survey Project at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law School Alumni Survey Class Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

ITEM X

It took me some time to consider paragraphs A and B of Item VII. Since these paragraphs involve the only subjective responses called for on the questionnaire, I feel that they deserved to be further developed.

My first reaction to VII(A) was to indicate no areas in which offerings should be decreased. I feel that there is proven value in each one of these areas, and in other areas as well. Nevertheless, an obvious problem which must be solved by students and school alike is limiting an individual's workload to a manageable three-year program, so I did indicate my preferred limitations.

Generally, I would limit courses which are not built around reasonably extensive statutory or common law frameworks, or both, which are in turn reasonably distinct from other such frameworks. I would imagine that environmental and welfare law courses would fall well within this limitation.

Welfare law would seem to be especially devoid of any unique legal material, except for certain statutes which any well-trained lawyer should be able to interpret and apply. Both welfare law and environmental law would seem to depend greatly on knowledge of several traditional legal subjects and the administrative and judicial processes. It is these subjects I would stress to someone interested in these areas.

I would expand and encourage any program which develops the skills of research, drafting, negotiating and advocacy and which introduces the student to the professional environment into which he will be placed after law school. I would never abandon those courses which examine and apply the extensive legal frameworks alluded to above.

In sum, it seems to me appropriate to use the school to build an individual's essential legal background first, with only secondary consideration given to those subjects which may be of great interest and importance, but which involve entirely or primarily the application of previously acquired knowledge and do not give great emphasis to the development of the four basic skills noted above.

As you can see from my answers to Item VI, I spend the majority of my time working in areas related to the law of corporations and taxation. Within these areas, the majority of my time is devoted to specialized applications of a very small segment of this law. This is certainly not an unusual experience among lawyers in practice nowadays, but this does not necessarily justify a greater specialization in law school course work. When I

ITEM X
Page Two

joined my present firm I indicated that I was willing to do almost any kind of work available, and I spent more than three years engaged in a great variety of tasks before narrowing my practice somewhat. I would hate to see lawyers' opportunities for choice among the various areas of legal work narrowed by a lack of general legal preparation, rather than by their own choice.

I look forward to receiving the results of your survey and seeing what impact these results have on the future of the law school's curriculum.