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Mr. President:

This is the fourth, and presumably the last, of my annual reports to the President of The University of Michigan. As of course you are aware, I have asked to be relieved of my duties as Dean of the Law School not later than June 30, 1971. Under these circumstances it is probably inevitable that a part of what I shall say will have the sound of a valedictory statement. I hope that I may be forgiven if, in this submission, I fall into a more personal expression than might otherwise be appropriate.

One who awaits the termination of his duties as dean of a great law school finds himself thinking about the future of the school and of those needs and conditions that must be satisfied if his institution is to serve and flourish in the years ahead. The University of Michigan Law School has such needs, and responding adequately to some of them will not be easy. Virtually every necessary innovation in legal education being developed by this School requires substantial reductions in our present student-faculty ratio. This is true whether what is being contemplated are programs of clinical education, individual student research and honors work, the development of new areas of instruction and faculty research (including interdisciplinary areas), small-group teaching in the first year, or a host of other urgent matters. That these developments may be seriously obstructed by University and legislative policies which have emerged as products of the fiscal...
stringencies afflicting higher education in these times, is a disturbing possibility.

There are other problems. Legal education in the United States faces an intellectual crisis. This crisis is sufficiently identified by putting the question: Can legal education adapt to the needs of the present and those of the next half-century, and, at the same time, retain the intellectual rigor and intellectual integrity that have constituted its chief strength and attraction in the past? I believe this can be done, and, indeed, would argue that the former cannot be achieved without the latter. Regrettably, not all those associated with the American law schools reveal this commitment. We have had occasion to discover that there are colleagues in some other institutions who are prepared (and, in fact, eager) to sacrifice a great part of the intellectual content of law study, and to do so in the name of "innovation." No one could reasonably dispute the importance of educational innovation in this era. I am afraid, however, that among those seeking to map out the future of American legal education, there are a few in danger of disregarding the admonition of Mr. Sammler, as reported by Saul Bellow. Mr. Sammler suggests, you will recall, that a map maker should not regard the task of locating the Mississippi River as an occasion for the display of his originality.

Important as are these problems to the future of this School and of legal education generally, they are not the most important. The questions of overarching significance, and which relegate all other problems and doubts to positions of secondary concern, are those that center on the future of the American university. If the American university falters or is submerged in the crises of these times; if it loses a sense of its proper mission or is prevented from achieving it, legal education may be rendered undeserving of attention by able and serious young people, and in consequence our society will be deprived of contributions important to its survival and well-being.

This organic relation of legal education to higher education has not always existed. True enough, legal studies were an important preoccupation of continental medieval universities from at least as early as the twelfth century. No comparable development occurred in the common-law system, however; and a prominent English legal historian could assert that common-law practitioners
were “hermetically sealed from all communication with the outer world.” As recently as the turn of the present century the Dean of the Harvard Law School threatened to withdraw the services of one of his faculty members, earlier offered to assist in the founding of a new law school in the middle west, because the new school threatened to include in its curriculum such heretical unorthodoxies as criminology, administrative law, and federal jurisdiction. The success of his school, said Dean Ames, was the product of “its concentration upon the work of teaching the law pure and simple.”

It has been a very long time since thoughtful persons associated with the American law schools assumed that their function consisted of teaching “pure” law, if by that is meant a view of law separated from the social and ethical context in which legal problems arise or isolated from the social and scientific disciplines cultivated by the modern university. Certainly that time has passed at the University of Michigan Law School. Recent years have brought an impressive thrust toward the association of the Law School with the intellectual life of the University. This impulse already constitutes one of the most important and valuable characteristics of the Law School; and I have no doubt that, events permitting, it will come to even richer fruition in the future. I mention these facts to underscore the involvement of the Law School in the destiny of the University. Our futures are inextricably intertwined. Moreover, our mutual involvements are not simply fiscal and administrative, but are intellectual and philosophical as well.

*The universities and political action.* That the nature and course of legal education will be profoundly affected by the ways in which the crises now surrounding American higher education are resolved, is perhaps an entirely self-evident proposition. If so, the preceding brief comments may have been unnecessary. Assuming, then, that a retiring law dean possesses sufficient standing to express concern, which of the issues involving the American university should be identified and addressed?

For me the starting point is clear. I begin by noting a peculiar hiatus in discussions now going forward on university campuses. My complaint, of course, is not that there is an absence of talk. On the contrary, this is a time when fierce and raucous contentions
rage on the campus and in which universities are receiving noisy and unflattering attention from persons not associated with higher education. Appropriately enough, there is much talk on the campuses about the great issues of domestic and international policy. We debate questions of student participation in university administration and we contend over faculty prerogatives. These also are important matters deserving discussion. In fact, we talk copiously about almost everything except those things that are of the most fundamental importance to university people: What is a university, and what are its vital missions in these times? What are the minimum conditions necessary to be insisted on if the university is to fulfill its mission and realize its purposes? What forms of activity and commitment must be rejected by the university because they obstruct or prevent the realization of its purposes? I find these questions rarely discussed, and even more rarely, discussed persuasively and helpfully. Whatever the reasons for this strange silence in a noisy age, the consequences are becoming increasingly clear. I breach no confidence when I say that a good deal of nonsense is being spoken on the campuses these days. Although many, and I hope most, of those comprising a university community recognize this talk for what it is, nonsense often goes unchallenged, and has often achieved a kind of validity for want of challenge. One suspects, also, that not infrequently in recent years universities under pressure have accepted inimical solutions, in large part because of the absence of a clear and workable conception of the nature and purposes of a university.

Young people express much concern today about the perversion of institutions. The general point is sound, and it applies to universities. Universities, perhaps even more frequently than some other institutions, face periodic crises in which fundamental questions must be put if futility or worse is to be avoided. The quality and intensity of these crises have differed considerably over time. Today the crisis is acute, and in large measure involves questions of the proper relation of the university to "politics" or political action. Like so much modern talk about important topics, the discussion of the university's relations to political action is marred by sloganeering. On the one hand, many students and some faculty members call stridently for the "politicizing" of the university. Like other campus slogan-words, the content of this term
defies precise definition. Presumably what is being called for is a greater involvement of students, faculty, and even the institution itself in political action, controversy, and propaganda. On the other hand, an increasing demand, no more precise in meaning, is being expressed by public figures and the news media that the university confine itself to “intellectual pursuits” (including, presumably, intercollegiate athletics) and forswear “politics”.

A moment’s reflection reveals that what is involved in this controversy is nothing less than the problem of defining the relations of the university to the larger society. This has always been a task of great delicacy and complexity, and the difficulties are not reduced by the crises of modern society. Thus it is surely fatuous and mistaken to assume that the intellectual concerns of the modern American university can or should be separated from the problems and issues that make up contemporary politics. This is true because so much that is of profound human concern is encompassed in today’s political struggles. Today “politics” encompasses issues of life and death, justice and inequity, the beautiful and the ugly, affluence and want. Unless the university is to be reduced to mere intellectual needlework, concern for various aspects of the political context will characterize almost every one of the university’s departments and units. Moreover, the university is one of many institutions coexisting in a political society. As such it must engage in certain sorts of “political” activities to secure its operating resources, to assert its valid prerogatives, and to protect itself from attack and unwarranted aggression.

To say that the university is inevitably concerned with “politics” in its intellectual life and in its institutional operations is to say that the university cannot achieve its purposes separated from the society of which it is a part. It is essential, however, that there be a clear conception of what the university’s principal purposes are; for these purposes ought ultimately to determine the nature of the university’s relations to politics. The argument I am making is based on the proposition that a university’s principal purposes are the discovery and accumulation of knowledge, and the transmission of knowledge. By knowledge I do not mean simply “facts.” The discovery of knowledge encompasses the identification and analysis of values, for example, and contributions to aesthetic sensibility. The transmission of knowledge includes the
communication of professional techniques. I say that these are the principal purposes of the university, not simply because this has been a traditional view of the university's functions, but because they are increasingly vital to this society and because, as yet, we have devised no other institutions capable of performing any substantial part of the university's task. Any institution as complex as a university has many goals and activities. I do not assert that a university can or should be concerned only with the discovery and transmission of knowledge; but I do contend that the university cannot properly undertake functions and commitments that obstruct the realization of its principal purposes.

If what I have said is true or substantially true, I believe it follows that a university must not be converted into a political party or action group, on the one hand, or into an agency for dispensing welfare services, on the other. This is not because political action is useless or necessarily evil, or because welfare is to be scorned. It is, rather, because these are commitments incompatible with the university; and their incompatibility resides partially in the fact that they tend to destroy that freedom which the university must possess to realize its principal purposes. It is no fortuity that some of those seeking to “politicize” the university also frankly acknowledge a purpose to destroy it. The means are appropriate to the end; and hence what is at issue is the survival of the university.

“Politicizing” the university. Although one is aware these days of a widespread belief that there is nothing old under the sun, there is, in fact, nothing new about efforts to “politicize” the American university. These efforts may have sources either within or outside the university. The threat of external political interference with the university is a continuing reality in American life. There are always sinister figures in the wings eager to “politicize” the campus when provided opportunities to do so; and no one who was associated with higher education during the Joseph McCarthy era is likely to discount this possibility or its dangers. Despite the threat of “external politicizing,” a structure of academic freedom was erected in this country which has ordinarily proved sturdy enough to resist the worst manifestations of external political harassment. In many ways this is a remarkable achievement. Inevitably, views will be expressed on the campus that are unpopular with large and powerful segments of the
community. This circumstance produces grumbling and occasional efforts at retaliation at budget time; but in most instances academic dissent has been tolerated and the freedom of the campus defended.

How can the phenomenon of academic freedom be explained? One cynical response might be that until recently the university has not been regarded as important or dangerous enough to warrant the hostile attention of powerful political forces. This scarcely squares with history, however; and, in any event, it is far from the whole truth. It comes closer to the truth to say that academic freedom gained public support because of a widespread belief that the inconveniences associated with the expression of views thought by some to be dangerous and mistaken, are outweighed by advantages derived from free inquiry on the campus. It should be noted, however, that this tolerance is founded on the assumption that the inquiry protected is, in fact, free, and that the university is not simply a political faction espousing objectives and employing means repugnant to persons called upon to give financial and moral support to it. The most effective way to destroy the foundations of academic freedom is to persuade the community that it has been naive in accepting earlier assurances of the university that objective inquiry, while difficult, is possible, and that great social gains result from its pursuit. If objectivity and disinterestedness are shams and charades, and if the university is converted into an instrumentality for direct political action, on what ground can the university claim immunity from political retaliation to which all other political factions are subject? What is the intellectual and moral basis for resisting external political interference or control? One very important reason for repudiating efforts at “internal politicizing” of the university is that they hasten, and may make inevitable, the “external politicizing” of the university.

The tyranny of politics. There are other considerations less frequently voiced. “Great minds need elbow room,” wrote Cardinal Newman over a century ago. “And so indeed do lesser minds, and all minds.” And later: “If we reason, we must submit to the conditions of reason. We cannot use it by halves.” There is surely grave cause to assert that the conditions of reason are being widely disregarded on the campuses today. The problem goes
beyond the fact that contentions and disorder distract, and sometimes physically prevent, thought, research, and teaching. This has occurred, and gives rise to the genuine possibility that in the years ahead much of the serious thought of the nation may be pursued in institutions other than universities. Direct interference and distraction are only part of the problem, however. A climate pervades the campuses which seriously restricts that freedom and scope for minds that Newman identified as essential.

In times like these it is not easy to write critically of political commitment. The political furor that has overtaken the campuses and our entire society reflects unsolved problems that are real and almost overwhelming. Some encompass threats to our very survival. There are few responsible members of today's society who either can or wish to insulate themselves from these issues, and few would be disposed to deny either the propriety or the urgent necessity of direct political action to cure or ameliorate our social ills. The very importance of many of the issues that are contested in modern politics, however, is a source of peril; and the peril is particularly acute for the universities. The obvious importance of politics is in danger of paralyzing our critical capacities, and there have been few periods in which it has been more vital that these capacities be kept intact and functioning.

Recognizing the necessity of political action and political participation by responsible individuals should not cause us to ignore the fact that the practice of politics, even in behalf of liberal causes, is often illiberal and inhumane. Recent manifestations of political commitment on the campuses abundantly illustrate the point. Too often politics, both on and off the campus, seeks the capture of minds, not their liberation. Its methods are those of oversimplification, sloganeering, mindless chanting, derision, and conscious distortion. Its appeal is essentially anti-intellectual and anti-rational. It seeks first to stimulate, then to recruit, basic human emotions—pride, envy, anger, fear, and ultimately terror. Its tendency is imperialistic in that it attempts to dominate all things human, including the aesthetic and the intellectual. Fortunately for those who retain hopes for a liberal and democratic society, the objectives of political action can be achieved and the worst extremes of political practice contained, if our understanding is clear and our will is strong. The university has a part to
play in achieving this objective, but it must be a part consistent with its nature. The methods of politics are not the methods of free inquiry; and it is free inquiry for which the university stands. Efforts to impose the methods of political action on the university, therefore, threaten its fundamental character. None of the university's contributions to the political life of the nation is more important than its role as a critic of politics. Politics tends to excess; and this tendency is especially strong when, in times like these, political movements arise supported by adherents indisposed to question the virtue of their cause or the truth of their perceptions. Performance of this important critical function by the university presupposes not only that the university is free from overt coercion, but also free of binding commitments that limit the play of skeptical intelligence.

I regret to say that, in my judgment, there has been a net loss of liberty on the campuses, a constriction of the elbow-room for minds, in the years since the second world war. More courage is now required than formerly to raise certain questions publicly, or to pursue certain lines of inquiry. Prominent figures are effectively denied forums in the universities by threats of insult, disorder, or worse; and this in institutions which fought hard and costly battles to establish the principle that the university is a place where all views, however uncongenial to the larger community, must be given opportunities for free expression. Other less obvious losses of freedom are also the product of political contention and political commitment. Hamlet concluded that "conscience does make cowards of us all;" but commitment can also make men timorous. With increasing frequency in recent years persons on the campus have been deterred from speaking plainly about disturbing and important matters for fear that what they say will be put to improper political uses by persons they regard as political opponents. The result has been silence when speech was needed, a decline in truth-telling by the universities, and a loss in the quality of freedom on the campuses.

It is not my intention in these comments simply to mourn the loss of a golden age on the campus. In one of the novels of E. M. Forster a character is made to say: "You use the intellect, but you no longer care about it. That I call stupidity." Perhaps this is the malaise that constitutes the heart of the crisis confronting the
American university. It is not a new illness, however: it did not suddenly reveal itself in the decade just past. While the origins of the problem could probably be traced to a much earlier time, I am inclined to agree with those who regard World War II as the source of much of our difficulty. It was in those years that the universities demonstrated their enormous utility as creators of military weapons and as contributors to industrial production. The university thus acquired prestige, not primarily as a place where intellect is cultivated and honored, but as an invaluable utilitarian instrumentality. One might find much to applaud in the denunciations of campus reformers who protest the uses to which our society has put the university during the past generation, were it not so apparent that these critics reveal the same stupidity that Forster perceived and which has been revealed by others in practice. The critics' complaint, as I understand it, is not that the university has failed to display a sufficient concern for the intellect, or that we are guilty of attempting to "use reason by halves". Rather, the position reaffirms in even stronger terms a view of the university as an instrumentality of political and economic power, and objects only that, at present, it serves as handmaiden to the wrong masters. It seems apparent that if this dangerous and perhaps fatal stupidity is to be escaped, the premise must be rejected.

I hope I do not underestimate the practical difficulties encountered in making this escape. One of these relates to identifying the distinction between political commitments of students and faculty members when acting in their personal capacities (which must at all costs be respected) and the obligations of those same persons acting as and for the university. The line is not easy to draw, and at times the distinctions may appear narrow and even metaphysical. For all who have a stake in the future of the university (and this excludes few in our society), it is of the highest importance, however, that this line be conscientiously drawn and strongly maintained.

FACULTY

For a moment I should like to return to a theme developed in the preceding remarks: the relations of legal education and the universities. It is apparent to anyone familiar with existing con-
ditions on the campuses that the current unrest claims a significant and increasing amount of faculty time. The diversion of faculty effort from teaching, research, and public service into campus committee work, negotiations, and administrative assignments, is one of the serious, if unmeasured, costs the universities are sustaining today. The social costs may even be larger, for one consequence is that involvements of university faculties in the immediate crises lessen the contributions universities might otherwise make to the more rational handling of problems that have not yet descended upon us in full force, but which are approaching just beyond the horizon.

What is sometimes overlooked even by many on the campus, however, is the peculiar vulnerability of law faculty members to diversion from their teaching and research obligations in this period, and the very heavy burden of committee work they bear, not only in their own school but for the university as well. Law faculty members are obviously in demand for precisely the sorts of chores that proliferate in a period of crisis and unrest. This has been most emphatically demonstrated here. Something of the Law School's University-wide contribution can be gathered by noting the University involvements of our faculty in the year just ended. I emphasize that the list is far from complete: Associate Dean Julin is Chairman of the Committee on a Permanent University Judiciary. Professor St. Antoine is a member of the same Committee, and also served as Chairman of the University Council. Professor Knauss was elected Chairman of the Senate Advisory Council on University Affairs. Professor Kennedy was Chairman of the Search Committee for the Selection of a Vice President for Student Services, and also served as Chairman of the Senate Advisory Review Committee. Professor Wright was Chairman of the University Board for Student Publications, a position held by a Law faculty member for many years. Associate Professor Siegel was Chairman of the SACUA Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty. Professor Carrington was Co-Chairman of the Civil Liberties Board, and Assistant Professor Donahue served as a member of the same Board. In the Spring I chaired a committee appointed by the President to develop a University strike policy. Professor Jackson was on the By-Laws Committee of the Academic Senate. Professor Pierce was a member of the Rackham Board of Inquiry and
advised on problems of student discipline. Professor Bishop served
on the Committee on Distinguished Professorships and on Distinguished Achievement Awards.

Although I have not made a scientific survey, I do not doubt
that, relative to the size of the Faculty, the Law School contributes far more services of this sort to the University than any other school or unit on the campus. It is, of course, a matter of pride and satisfaction that this School has been able to serve the University’s interests in this important way. One could wish, however, that these honors were conferred on us with greater moderation. In all seriousness, the performance of these University obligations creates a genuine problem for the academic and research programs of the School. I believe this is a factor that should be given sympathetic consideration whenever staffing of the Law School is under discussion.

In the University year, 1969-1970, the faculty consisted of fifty-one persons at the rank of assistant professor or higher. This figure does not include emeritus members of the faculty, of whom there were five, but does include visiting faculty during the regular terms and several who were on full-time administrative assignment with the Law School or the University. A number of our regular faculty members divide their teaching between the Law School and other units on the campus.

An important contribution to the academic program of the School is made each year by the Instructors, who, in most instances, come to the School for a period of one year soon after receiving their law degrees. The group in residence in the year just past impressed me as especially helpful, cooperative, and enthusiastic. They were: Patricia Blair, George L. Dawson, David Joswick, and Craig Norville. In addition, Virginia Davis Nordin, Associate Director of the Institute of Continuing Legal Education, helpfully devoted part of her time to the School as an Instructor.

The School over the years has benefitted from having on its faculty as visitors members of the faculties of other American law schools and of foreign universities. In the University year, 1969-1970, we were fortunate to have with us Professor James A. Rahl of Northwestern University who taught a course and seminar in antitrust law during the winter term; Assistant Professor Grant S. Nelson of the University of Missouri who was with us all year
and taught courses in Constitutional Law and Civil Procedure; and Professor Sergio Rodriguez-Restrepo of the Faculty of Law, Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia. Visitors in the summer terms of 1969 included Professor Ronan E. Degnan of the University of California at Berkeley, Professor Edward H. Cooper of the University of Minnesota, Professor Howard R. Williams of Stanford, Assistant Professor Vincent A. Blasi of the University of Texas, Associate Professor Robert A. Burt of the University of Chicago, Associate Professor Tom J. Farer of Columbia, and Mr. Eugene Gressman of the District of Columbia Bar.

One of the greatest satisfactions I have experienced as Dean of this School is to have observed and participated in the building of what, in my judgment, is one of the finest young faculties ever to be assembled by an American law school. We were fortunate this year in adding five outstanding younger people. Associate Professor Vincent A. Blasi comes to the School from the University of Texas, following a visiting year at Stanford University. He was graduated from the University of Chicago Law School in 1967, and will teach Constitutional Law and in related areas. Associate Professor Robert A. Burt attended Princeton University and Oxford, and received his LL.B. degree from Yale in 1964. He served as law clerk to Chief Judge David Bazelon of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; was Assistant General Counsel in the Office of the President’s Special Representative for Trade Negotiations; and served as Legislative Assistant to Senator Joseph D. Tydings of Maryland. From 1968-70 he was on the faculty of the University of Chicago. His primary interests are in the fields of Legislation and Family Law. Associate Professor Craig Christensen received his J.D. from Northwestern in 1964. He was in private practice in Chicago for two years; served as Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the Board and President of the Chicago and North Western Railway Company; and for three years was Director of the National Institute for Education in Law and Poverty. He will teach half-time in the Law School and will also serve as a legal advisor to the President of the University. His interests are in Administrative Law and Poverty Law. Associate Professor Harry T. Edwards was graduated from this School in 1965, and for the intervening five years practiced law in Chicago. He will teach courses in Labor Law. Assistant
Professor James A. Martin was graduated from this School in 1969 and returned following one year as law clerk to Judge Harold Leventhal of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He will be teaching Civil Procedure and Commercial Law.

I regret to report that after fourteen years of service as an administrator in the Law School, Professor Roy F. Proffitt decided to lay aside his duties as Associate Dean. Roy Proffitt's contributions, first as Assistant Dean and later as Associate Dean, were many and of great value to the School, but none exceeded his services as a wise and compassionate counsellor to many generations of Michigan law students. Fortunately he has decided to retain his position on the faculty, and is dividing his time between various administrative tasks in the Law School, including direction of the Law School Fund, and his new duties as Associate Director of the Institute of Continuing Legal Education. Many of the functions performed by Roy Proffitt as Associate Dean have been transferred to Assistant Dean Bailey H. Kuklin, who joined our staff in the late Spring. He was graduated from the Law School in 1966, and returns to the School following a tour of duty in Nepal with the Peace Corps and a period of service in this country with a legal-aid program in the State of New York.

Finally, I regret to report the death of Assistant Dean Kenneth Yourd. Dean Yourd, who joined our staff in 1966, was much admired by the students of the School in whose interests he worked well and diligently. His duties as director of student financial assistance have been taken over by Assistant-to-the-Dean Ronald M. Battles. Mr. Battles, a graduate of the University's Business School, joined us in March.

**STUDENT BODY**

The statistics of the Law School student body in 1969-70 are very similar to those of other recent years. There were 1,046 degree candidates enrolled. Of these, 71 were women, and 30 were foreign students. Our efforts to recruit minority-group students in recent years resulted in there being 39 black degree candidates in the student body. Students came to the Law School from over 230 undergraduate colleges in this country and overseas. More
than sixty states, territories, and foreign nations were represented in the student body. As has been true in recent years, there was again a substantial upsurge in the number of candidates seeking admission to the School, and the credentials of those enrolling were very high.

The year just past provided many distractions, but some of the most encouraging developments involved student initiative. It should be reassuring to those who have expressed doubts about the present student generation to observe numbers of our students displaying their interest and concern about the difficult problems of these times by establishing voluntary activities involving the application of sound and constructive professional skills. Without faculty urging, a substantial number came together as an Environmental Law Society, did hard and effective research on technical legal issues involving environmental problems, brought speakers to the campus, and otherwise contributed usefully to the life of the School and of the University. Another student group, again on their own initiative, organized themselves as the student Legislative Aid Bureau. These students, perceiving that legislation provides one of the most useful and effective methods for bringing about social changes, set themselves the task of learning and practicing the difficult arts of legislative drafting, and volunteering their services to groups and agencies that might benefit from them. The organization has already established an impressive record of achievement. Motivations and actions of these sorts give substantial basis for optimism about those who will be entering the legal profession and the promise of a responsible and constructive profession in the future.

LIBRARY

The growth of libraries, like the growth of population, while once the cause of celebration is more likely today to be viewed with consternation and dismay. Nevertheless, it was an event of real importance in the history of the School when the holdings of our Library reached the 400,000 mark early this spring. Mere size is not by any means the primary claim to distinction by the Library: the uniqueness of many of its collections, the range of the services its dedicated staff provides, and the intelligence of its acquisition policy over the years are all factors of much greater
significance. Nevertheless, size and range of holdings are one dimension of the Library's greatness.

The Library is, however, faced with grave problems which must speedily be attended to. Space needs are critical. The Library has outgrown its facilities, and this is true whether one considers shelf space, equipment, work areas for the staff, or study and research areas. One measure of the last-mentioned problem is the fact that the Library received 91 applications for carrel space from persons satisfying the School's requirements for such assignments, but only 53 carrels are available to the Library for assignment.

The problem goes beyond mere space considerations, however. The Legal Research Building, while in many ways magnificent, was planned in an earlier day and reflects conceptions of legal education and library operations now outmoded. The Library staff has shown great initiative and ingenuity in adapting the facility to current needs. Thus, at one time only the 19,000 volumes in the Library reading room were available to the students on an open-stack basis. Today by reason of planning and adaptation, over 110,000 volumes are available to users on this basis. Although this represents a splendid achievement, no one is more aware than the Library staff that the situation remains far from satisfactory for a School as large as ours and in which the demands for library use are as great as ours.

The needs for additional library facilities and better planned facilities are clear and present. No less pressing is the necessity of increasing the allowances available for book acquisitions and of reversing the decline in accession figures that has occurred over the last four years. In my judgment the solution of the Library's problems is a concern of the highest priority for the seventies. The Law Library is one of the University's greatest assets, and neither the University, the Law School, nor the alumni can afford that it become a wasting asset.

**STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

In the year February 16, 1969 to February 15, 1970, the Law School provided scholarships, moral obligation awards, and loans to our students in an amount totaling $535,915. The total for the comparable period in 1968-69 was $510,874. In addition to the
funds made available by the School, our students received at least $440,032 from outside sources in 1969-70. Thus, in the year just completed, the total of financial assistance received by Law School students, of which we have knowledge, was $975,947.

These are substantial sums, but I regret to say that the needs for such assistance are rapidly outdistancing our resources. Thus, in the period from 1966-67, when I first assumed my present duties, tuition fees in the Law School for Michigan residents have increased nearly 54 per cent. Tuition for non-residents nearly 87 per cent. No comparable enlargement of our funds available for student aid occurred during this period. The reasons for the increases in fees are well known; it is apparent that The University of Michigan, like all other American institutions of higher education, has been required to reflect its fiscal stringencies in rising tuition levels. These increases, as well as the rise in cost of food, lodging, and other student necessities, have had an immediate impact on programs of student financial aid. In the Law School the problem has been made even more acute by the relative increase in the percentage of our students requiring substantial financial aid. In the past our alumni have responded impressively to these needs. As a result, we have been able substantially to insure that no student will be denied a legal education at Michigan on financial grounds alone. I hope the graduates of the School will continue and increase this indispensable support. It seems clear, however, that other sources of support will have to be uncovered which are capable of bearing a larger fraction of this burden than in the past. The need is urgent both to avoid denying worthy students the support necessary for their professional education, and to prevent the kinds of diversions of the School’s resources into financial aid that impair the quality of its academic program.

**LAWYERS CLUB**

I am happy to report that, with very welcome support from the University, we have completed the basic renovation of the living units of the Lawyers Club, begun four years ago. These repairs were limited to such matters as heating and plumbing, however. Much remains to be done if the Club is to be rehabilitated and converted into a modern residential facility. The contributions of the Lawyers Club to all aspects of the School’s life, including the
academic, have been substantial over the years. To insure these contributions in the future will require a significant measure of support for this purpose from graduates and friends of the School.

PLACEMENT

Something of the pace of our placement program is communicated by a brief observation or two: Although, because of attrition produced by the draft, the senior class in 1969-70 was substantially smaller than in the two previous years, the number of placement interviews rose from 3,299 in 1968-69 to 5,108; and the number of interviewers visiting the campus increased from 272 to 320. As of May 29, 1970, 167 seniors had reported their plans to the Placement Office. Of these, eighty had accepted positions with private law firms; twenty were hired by corporations, two by banks, one by an insurance company, and three by CPA firms; nineteen had accepted clerkships in the state or federal courts; eleven received fellowships. Other plans included teaching, military service, legal-aid activities, and several other categories. The range of starting salaries in law firms was from $8,400 to $16,000. The average such salary was $13,017. The average salary paid by corporations, banks, and CPA firms was $13,937.

Although the problems of defining the proper role and scope of placement services are persistent in these times, several facts emerge rather clearly: Employment opportunities continue at very high levels, and our graduates suffer no competitive disadvantages in this respect with those of any other school. Of equal importance is the fact, however, that these opportunities are not restricted to those in the upper levels of the class as determined by academic records. Although students who distinguish themselves academically enjoy advantages in the job market (and the situation could hardly be otherwise), persons completing their law studies at all levels of the class standings find employment, and many are effectively assisted in their efforts by the Placement Office.

PRIVATE GIFTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

In recent years I have said a great deal about the importance of private giving to the Law School. In a letter to Mr. John S.
Tennant, the distinguished and highly successful National Chairman of the Law School Fund, I wrote: "Excellence, of course, requires more than will or resolve; it requires resources. The contributions that the Law School Fund has made to the quality of the University of Michigan Law School in the decade of the sixties can hardly be overestimated. The needs in the seventies are and will continue to be even more acute. The importance of the Law School Fund has never been greater."

This was a momentous year of achievement for the Law School Fund. At the conclusion of the campaign on January 31, 1970, $283,683.29 had been collected as a result of the efforts of Mr. Tennant and his national organization of alumni and friends of the School. Total gifts numbered 4,302. Thus in the ninth year of its history the Law School Fund exceeded the quarter-million mark, and did so by over $30,000. This is an achievement of great significance in the life of the School. My thanks and those of the faculty and students are warmly given to all of those who assisted the campaign in any way.
I shall not repeat again what I have said in the past about the critical contribution made to the Law School by private financial support. There is a matter to which I should like to address a word in these closing remarks, however. In the furor and distractions of these times alumni of universities are, naturally enough, bewildered and concerned, about events on the campuses. I have said enough in this report to reveal my own concerns. Some few alumni become disaffected and withdraw or threaten to withdraw support from their schools. Universities in many parts of the country are reporting this phenomenon. In some cases—fortunately not ours—this withdrawal of support threatens great damage to the schools affected. It is a curious fact that there are alumni of these schools who seem willing to do the work of that small group on the campuses who have announced their purpose to destroy the American university. I have no hesitation or embarrassment in saying that the Law School requires the moral and financial support of its alumni as never before. I would add that the School has earned in the past and proposes to earn this assistance and support in the future. I believe that the University of Michigan Law School is one of the soundest and most constructive influences in American higher education today. I also believe that its greatest days still lie ahead.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis A. Allen

Dean
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"The New Tax Reform Act: Charitable Contributions and Accumulation Trusts"

"The Marital Deduction and the Executive’s Estate" (Second Annual University of
Statement on Proposed Federal Estate and Gift Tax Reform. Hearings. (Comm. on
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"Litigation and Mediation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964” in
Proceedings of the ABA National Inst. on Equal Employment Opportunity
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Michelman).

"Federal Grants and the Reform of State and Local Government” in Crecine, ed.,
"Comment on Powell v. McCormack” in Symposium, 17 UCLA L. Rev. 164-74
"The Limits of Municipal Power Under Home Rule,” 48 Minn. L. Rev. 643 (1964),
excerpts reprinted in Sato and Van Alstyne, eds., State and Local Government

Statement to Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, Senate Comm. on the Jud.,
Hearings on the Nonjudicial Activities of Supreme Court Justices and Other

599-611 (1969) reprinted in Senate Comm. on the Jud., Hearings on Nonjudicial
Activities of Supreme Court and Other Federal Judges (1970).

PROFESSOR JOSEPH L. SAX

"Slumlordism as a Tort” reprinted (abridged) in 5:5 Trial 24 (August-September,
1969); reprinted (abridged) in Dodyk, ed. Law and Poverty: Cases and Materials

"Civil Disobedience” reprinted in Amend and Hendrick, eds., Readings from Left to
Right. (The Free Press, New York, 1970); reprinted in Brignan and Vanderoef,

"The Public Trust Doctrine in Natural Resource Law: Effective Judicial Inter-

"Legal Redress of Environmental Disruption in the United States: The Role of Courts" (delivered at Inter. Symp. on Environmental Disruption in the Modern World, Tokyo, 1970).


PROFESSOR STANLEY SIEGEL
Revised Michigan Corporation Law, Chapters 1-5 with comments and source notes. (First Draft).
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PROFESSOR ERIC STEIN

PETER O. STEINER
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1970 Supplement to Michigan Will Manual (Blackemore & Gathright, Louisville, Ky.).

PROFESSOR JAMES J. WHITE

PROFESSOR L. HART WRIGHT
Faculty Activities, 1969-70

Dean Allen during the course of the year spoke to audiences in Detroit, Ann Arbor, Dearborn, Chicago, San Francisco, Portland (Oregon), Seattle, and Washington, D.C. Associate Professor Layman E. Allen served as a member of the Legislative Drafting Advisory Committee and the Research Committee on Law and Technology of the ABA. He was Consultant to the Mead Data Corporation on the design of an information retrieval system for the Ohio Bar Association. Professor William W. Bishop, Jr. ended his long editorship of the American Journal of International Law in April. He served as Honorary Vice-President of the American Society of International Law and as a member of that organization’s Board of Review and Development. He was a member of the Water Pollution Committee of Institut de Droit International, and of the international law committee of the Michigan Bar, the International and Comparative Law Section of the ABA, and the International Law Association (American Branch). He was also a member of the University-wide committees on Distinguished Professorships and on Faculty Distinguished Achievement Awards. Dr. Vera Bolgar addressed the Foreign Relations Section of the American Association of University Women and was listed in the 1970 edition of Who’s Who of American Women. Professor Olin L. Browder, Jr. prepared a report on “Further Trends in Perpetuities” as Chairman of the ABA Committee on Rules Against Perpetuities. He drafted amendments to the Michigan Powers of Appointment Act for the Michigan Law Revision Commission and testified on this subject before the Michigan Senate Judiciary Committee. Mrs. Elizabeth H. G. Brown was re-elected Secretary of the Building Authority, City of Ann Arbor. Professor Paul D. Carrington was on leave during the winter term and engaged in research in Mexico and Colombia. He is a member of the AAUP Committee on State Legislation Affecting Academic Freedom, and Draftsman of that organization’s Statement on Anti-Riot Legislation. He served as Vice-Chairman of the ABA Committee on Civil Rights and Responsibilities and Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider Joint Statement on Student Rights. He is a member of the Boards of Directors of the Washtenaw County
Chapter and of the Michigan Civil Liberties Union, and holds memberships in the American Judicature Society and the American Law Institute. He was Director of the Curriculum Study of the AALS funded by the Ford Foundation, and prepared the "Report on American Legal Education to Colombian Law Deans and Professors." He delivered an address entitled "Educating Lawyers for Social Change in North America" in Bogota, Colombia.

Assistant Professor David Chambers has acted as Consultant to Senator Abraham Ribicoff in developing amendments to proposed welfare legislation in the United States Congress.

Lecturer Robert A. Choate spoke on "Basic Anti-Trust Policy vs. Commercial Use of Patent Grant" at the Annual Meeting of the Antitrust Section and Patent Law Section of the Michigan State Bar.... Professor Alfred F. Conard is President-Elect of the Association of American Law Schools. He continued his service as Editor-in-Chief of the American Journal of Comparative Law and was Chairman of the AALS Committee on Research. He was a member of the ABA Section of Corporation, Banking, and Business Law of the Council on Law Related Subjects and of its Executive Committee, of the Board of Trustees of the Law and Society Association, and of the Joint Committee of the AALS on Summer Program on Social Science Methods in Legal Education (SSMILE).... Professor Luke K. Cooperider served as a Member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Police-Community Relations for the City of Ann Arbor, drafted that Committee’s Interim Report and its report on grievance procedures, and presented these reports to the Ann Arbor City Council. He lectured before the ICLE Michigan Negligence Law Seminar in Ann Arbor and Caberfae.... Professor Roger C. Cramton served as a member of Governor Milliken’s Administrative Law Commission and participated in the drafting of Michigan’s new Administrative Procedures Act. In his capacity as consultant to the Committee on Judicial Review of the Administrative Conference of the United States he prepared reports on several subjects and testified on the doctrine of sovereign immunity before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice. He also served as Program Coordinator for the 1969 Annual Meeting of the AALS in San Francisco and as a member of the Committee on Public Lands and Waters of the ABA Administrative Law Section.... Assistant Pro-
Professor Charles Donahue, Jr. served as a Consultant to the United States Post Office Department. He prepared a draft CATV Ordinance for the City of Ann Arbor, and participated in the Economics of Public Utilities Financing Conference at Stanford. He served as a member of the Residential College Committee on History of Ideas, participated in the Planning Conference for the Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies at the University, and addressed the University of Michigan Mediaeval Studies Group on the "Alexandrine Consent Theory" ....Professor Samuel D. Estep is serving as a member of the Panel on Communications Policy of the American Society of International Law....Professor Roger A. Cunningham was appointed to the Committee on Legal Studies of the Highway Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. During the course of the year he completed his research on "Roadside Advertising Signs - Legal and Valuation Problems and Procedures" for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program, which is sponsored by the Highway Research Board of the National Research Council, Washington, D.C. His report on legal problems will be published as a part of the over-all study of legal and valuation problems and procedures sometime during the 1970-71 academic year....Professor Whitmore Gray continued his service as a member of the Board of Editors of the American Journal of Comparative Law and of the AALS' Readings in Contract Law. He was a member of the Committee of the AALS on the Orientation Program in American Law for foreign students. He spoke to the Michigan State Bar Committee on International and Comparative Law on the topic "Legal Education in Eastern Europe" ....Professor Robert J. Harris served throughout the year as Mayor of Ann Arbor....Professor Carl S. Hawkins was Chairman of the Michigan State Bar Committee on Civil Procedure until September, 1969, and was appointed Executive Secretary of the Michigan Law Revision Commission. He lectured on "Torts-Causation" for the PLI in New York, Las Vegas and Miami Beach. He lectured on "Michigan Negligence - Premises Liability" for ICLE in several locations in the state....Professor Jerold H. Israel was Chairman of the State Bar Committee on Implementation of the President's Crime Commission Report, and was member of the Governor's Special Study Committee on a Commission on Investigation. He
addressed several groups throughout Michigan on the proposed Criminal Code, spoke on “Preventive Detention During Riots” at the University of Chicago Conference on Preventive Detention, on “The Chicago Trial: Is Our Judicial Process in Trouble?” before the Economic Club of Southwestern Michigan, and participated in a television series on “Drugs and the Law” produced by the University of Michigan Television Center.

Professor John H. Jackson was a member of the ABA Section of International and Comparative Law, Sub-Committee on GATT and Tariffs; of the Board of the Washtenaw County Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union; and of the University Academic Senate By-Laws Committee.

Associate Dean Joseph R. Julin served as Chairman of the University Committee on a Permanent University Judiciary, and of the Executive Committee of ICLE. He was a member of the National Trust School Faculty, and of the Continuing Legal Education Committee of the ABA Section of Real Property, Probate, and Trust Law. He continued his weekly program on “Law and the News” produced by the University Broadcasting Service.

Professor Douglas A. Kahn was a member of the ABA and the Federal Bar Association. He lectured on real estate transactions in a four-day ICLE seminar.

Professor Yale Kamisar was Chairman and Moderator of the AALS Round Table on Capital Punishment, Chairman of the Committee on Rights of the Accused, ABA Criminal Law Section, and member of the Advisory Committee on the ALI’s Model Code of Pre-Arraignment Procedure. He addressed the annual meeting of the Philadelphia Bar Conference in Atlantic City.

Professor Paul G. Kauper was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Heidelberg, Germany. He delivered the Greenlaugh Lectures at Nashota House, Nashota, Wisconsin, on the subject “Freedom and the Public Interest: Shifting Boundaries.” He also spoke on “The Rule of Law” at Spring Arbor College in Michigan. He served as Consultant to the United States Commission on Obscenity and Pornography and prepared an extended memorandum on the constitutional aspects of the problem; as one of two American delegates at the Consultation on Church Law and Polity held at Helsinki, Finland under the auspices of the Department of Theology of the Lutheran World Federation; as a member of the Executive Committee of the National Order of the Coif; and was elected to the Editorial Coun-
cil of A Journal of Church and State published at Baylor University. Professor Thomas E. Kauper spent the year on leave as Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, United States Department of Justice. Professor Frank R. Kennedy served as Chairman of the Drafting Committee of the National Bankruptcy Conference; of the Independent Bankruptcy Court Committee; as a member of the Executive Committee and of the Committee to Correlate the Uniform Commercial Code and the Bankruptcy Act. He was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities of the Committee on Civil Rights and Responsibilities, ABA Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities. He was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Secured Transactions of the ABA Section of Corporation, Banking, and Business Law. His other Chairmanships included that of the AALS Visiting Team to the University of Toledo College of Law; of the AAUP Organizational Relations Committee; of the AAUP Investigating Committee at the University of Florida; of the University Search Committee for the Selection of a Vice-President for Student Services; and of the University Senate Advisory Review Committee. He is Reporter for the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules of the Judicial Conference of the United States. He addressed groups in Michigan and throughout the United States on consumer protection, bankruptcy, creditor's rights and related topics. Professor Robert L. Knauss was elected Chairman of the University Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs. He is a member of the Committee on Federal Regulation of Securities of the ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law. He served as Rapporteur of the Panel on Capital Formation of the American Society of International Law. He appeared on continuing legal education programs in Ann Arbor, New York, Las Vegas, and Daytona Beach, and delivered a talk on “Patterns of Securities Regulation” at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Assistant Professor Richard O. Lempert presented a paper to the Housing Section of the 1969 Meetings of the American Sociological Association. He was an advisor to the Family Law Committee of the Michigan State Bar. Assistant Dean Matthew P. McCauley was a member of the Finance Committee of the Law School Admission Test Council, and of the Board of Directors of University Cooperative, Inc. He
served as Secretary of the Washtenaw County Legal Aid Society. Professor Arthur R. Miller was Director of the AALS Project on Computer-Assisted Instruction, and Chairman of the Panel on External Affairs of the Interuniversity Communications Council (EDUCOM). He was a member of the Panel on Legal Aspects of Information Systems, Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, Federal Council for Science and Technology; Special Decennial Census Review Committee, United States Department of Commerce; National Advisory Panel of the Project on Computer Data Banks, National Academy of Sciences; ABA Committee on Scientific and Economic Proof; and the ABA Special Committee on Complex and Multidistrict Litigation. He served as Advisor to the Michigan State Bar's Special Committee on Computer Research. He testified on the subject of credit bureaus before the Finance Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and delivered the Law Day address at Iowa State University. Professor Marvin L. Niehuss was Legal Consultant to the Special Michigan Senate Committee on Campus Disorders, and was Legal Counsel and member of the Board of Trustees of the Michigan Health Council. He served on the Board of Trustees of the American Academy of Transportation, and was a member of the Encyclopedic Survey and of the Development Steering Committees of the National Association of College and University Attorneys. Instructor Virginia Davis Nordin was a Council member of the Corporation, Finance and Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan and edited that Section's newsletter. She served on the Subcommittee on Architectural Barriers of the Ann Arbor Mayor's Committee on Problems of the Handicapped. She is a member of the ABA Sections of Antitrust and Corporate Law. Professor George E. Palmer served this year as a member of the Washtenaw County Interagency Committee on Mental Retardation. Professor William J. Pierce is Executive Director of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, Chairman of the ABA Committee on Legal Research Methods and Materials, and of the Ann Arbor Drug Committee. He is a member of the Governor's Commission on Mental Health, the Rackham Board of Inquiry, the School of Natural Resources Policy Committee, and of the Council of State Governments. Professor Marcus L. Plant received the Distinguished
Alumni Service Award from Lawrence College. He participated in a Seminar on “Informed Consent to Medical Treatment” at St. Louis University, and delivered lectures at the University of Michigan Dental School and the School of Public Health. Professor Alan N. Polasky is an honorary member of the Council of the ABA Section of Real Property, Probate, and Trust Law, and of the Committees on Scope and Correlation, Budget and Finance, Liaison, Disclaimer Legislation, Property Problems of the Migrant Client, Revision of the Model Probate Code, Study of Gift and Estate Tax Changes, and of the Committee on Committees. He is also a member of the Committees on Court Procedures and of Federal Estate and Gift Tax of the ABA Tax Section; of the Special Committee on Income Tax Problems of the Multi-State Tax Compact; of the Committee on Relations with the Bar of the Michigan Society of C.P.A.’s; and is participating in the ALI’s Federal Estate and Gift Tax Study. During the course of the year he spoke before a large number of professional audiences throughout the country. Associate Professor Beverley J. Pooley delivered a paper on “Corruption in Ghana” at the African Studies Association in Montreal. He also read a paper on “Military Rule in Ghana” to the Conference on African Armies in Politics and Nation Building at Georgetown University. Professor John W. Reed served as a member of the ABA Special Committee on Specialization, of the AALS Committee on Continuing Legal Education, and of the Association of Continuing Legal Education Administrators. He is President of the Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board of the American Baptist Convention, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the First Baptist Church of Ann Arbor, and member of the Board of Trustees of Kalamazoo College. He addressed audiences throughout the country on legal and professional topics. Assistant Professor Donald H. Regan continued his work on his doctorate in philosophy. He was a participant in the Conference on Strict Liability in Law and Economics at Estes, Colorado. Professor Theodore J. St. Antoine was secretary of the ABA Section of Labor Relations Law. He served as Chairman of the University Council, and as a member of the Ann Arbor Human Relations Commission, and of the Committee on a Permanent University Judiciary. He spoke on “Litigation vs Mediation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act” before the ABA Section, and on
“Public Employee Bargaining” before the Second Annual Conference on Collective Bargaining in New York. He also addressed the Michigan State Labor Relations Law Section, the Michigan Municipal League, and the Public Labor Relations Association....

Professor Terrance Sandalow served as a member of the AALS Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and on the same organization’s Local Government Law Round Table....Professor Joseph L. Sax was on leave throughout the year in Washington, D.C. engaged in research on environmental law problems. He is Legal Advisor to the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President; Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Waters of the ABA Administrative Law Section; Treasurer and member of the Board of Trustees of the Center for Law and Social Policy in Washington, D.C., and a member of the Panel of Scientific Consultants, United States Senate Committee on Public Works....Associate Professor Stanley Siegel was Consultant on Postal Reorganization, United States Post Office Department. He served as Chairman of the SACUA Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty, and as Reporter on Corporate Law Revision for the Michigan Law Revision Commission. He spoke on “Declining Protections under State Corporation Laws” before the Corporations Section of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; on “Progress on Revision of the Michigan Corporation Law” at the Annual Meeting of the Michigan State Bar; and on “the Proposed Revision of Michigan’s Corporation Law” at the Kalamazoo Attorneys Trust Conference. He participated in the four-day ICLE program on “Contemporary Problems in Business Planning”....Professor Russell A. Smith participated in panel discussions of “Mediation, Fact Finding and Arbitration in Public Employment” at a meeting of the Public Labor Relations Association; of “The Arbitration Process” before the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations; and of “The Arbitration Process – Public Sector” at the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations....Professor Eric Stein participated in the Study Group on Treaties, sponsored by the American Society of International Law; spoke on “Harmonization of Company Law in Western Europe” at the Comparative Law Panel at the AALS Annual Meetings in San Francisco; participated in a discussion on “Does the United States Have a Commitment under International Law in
the Middle East?" at the annual meeting of the Michigan State Bar; served as Moderator at a discussion of "Legal Aspects of the Arab-Israeli Dispute" at a meeting sponsored by the Student International Law Society; and presented conclusions of his new book on Harmonization of European Company Law before the Study Group on International Organization of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Geneva, Switzerland. He was elected a member of the Board of Review and Development of the American Society of International Law; participated in the Panel on Trade Policy of the American Society of International Law; and served on the Panel on Regional Organization of the American Society of International Law.

Professor Peter O. Steiner spoke on "Conglomerate Mergers and the Public Interest" at the University of Chicago; on "Marginal Cost Pricing of Telephone Calls" at Dartmouth University; on "Legal and Economic Perspectives on a Policy Problem: Automobiles, Accidents, Pollution" at Knox College; on "Some Second Thoughts on the Theory of Oligopoly" at the University of Arizona; and on "Public Expenditure Budgeting: Some Further Thoughts" at Indiana University. He is now Chairman of AAUP Committee Z, and participated in the 21st Advocacy Institute on Automobile Product Liability, sponsored by ICLE in Ann Arbor.

Assistant Professor G. Joseph Vining is a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Facilities of the Law Library of the Library of Congress and of the Committee on Alcohol and Drug Reform of the ABA Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities. He is a Consultant to the Judicial Review Committee of the Administrative Conference of the United States, and is Secretary and Member of the Board of the American Friends of Cambridge University.

Dr. Andrew S. Watson was a Commissioner on the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice; a Consultant to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; and a member of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. Professor Richard V. Wellman was Chief Reporter of the Uniform Probate Code, which was published by West Publishing Company in the spring. He was appointed Commissioner on Uniform State Laws for the State of Michigan. He addressed professional groups throughout the country on probate and estate problems.

Professor James J. White was a member
of the AALS Committee on Women in the Law, and of the Michigan State Bar Committee on Group Practice. He addressed audiences in Chicago, Cleveland, and Boston. Professor L. Hart Wright pursued his research on the tax systems of western European countries while on leave in the winter term. He discussed various topics relating to tax law and its administration before the National Association of Tax Administrators, the Michigan Municipal League Annual Tax Conference, the Annual Meeting of Organization Executives of Michigan, the Annual Conference of Michigan County Officials, and the Michigan Conference of Assessors. He is Chairman of the University Board for Student Publications.