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Report to the President of the University for the Year 1973-74

UNIV. OF MICH.
APR 30 1975
LAW LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL
Mr. President:

By now most Americans, and not least the lawyers, would probably like to forget all about Watergate. But its reverberations pervaded the Law School during the past year, and I think a few further observations are in order. This seems especially appropriate because a growing number of signs indicate that the ultimate meaning of this painful episode may be quite different from the initial perceptions. An affair that many persons thought demeaning to the whole legal profession could yet prove, in retrospect, the fitting climax to two decades in which the law and lawyers occupied stage center on the American domestic scene. From the School Desegregation Cases in 1954, through the resignation of a President some twenty years later, the legal system was called upon to meet a staggering array of societal needs: civil rights, reapportionment, peaceful protest, public order, personal privacy, equality for women, a healthy environment, and finally, and most fundamentally, the preservation of constitutional government itself. That a few holders of law degrees were implicated in the sorry events that led to this last and severest test of our legal institutions would seem of little moment when set against the system’s effectual, if perhaps not totally triumphant, response.

Watergate and its aftermath nonetheless sounded at least two significant warnings for the legal profession and the law schools. The country’s long preoccupation with the unfolding scandal of break-in and cover-up served to divert attention from several fast-developing, world-wide problems that were even graver and more basic: the energy crisis, the food crisis, the population crisis, and, as
a function of those three, the economic crisis. Most of the great public issues with which the law has dealt since 1954 have been, at bottom, ethical issues. Lawyers, rightly or wrongly, feel at ease with such questions. But lawyers can claim no special competence when it comes to marshalling scarce natural resources or fine-tuning the economy. While lawyers will undoubtedly be involved in putting together government and business programs for treating these new problems, they will often have to yield primacy of place to the nuclear engineer, the agronomist, the economist, and the international banker. More than ever before, it becomes incumbent upon legal education to equip its graduates to work effectively with experts in a variety of disciplines. At the same time, the law schools must realistically anticipate getting a somewhat smaller share of exceptional intellectual talent in the years ahead, as more of the ablest young people are drawn off to master the arts of human survival.

A second cautionary message goes to the moral obligations of our profession. Elsewhere I have contended that it would be simplistic to think that the burglaries, perjuries, and other misdeeds of the Watergate law graduates could have been averted by required courses in legal ethics. On a deeper level, however, the bar and legal educators are culpable. We have not addressed ourselves sufficiently to some of the principal responsibilities of the profession. Specifically, we have concentrated too much on the negative injunctions against solicitation of clients, conflicts of interest, and other crass misconduct. We have paid too little heed to the positive role of the lawyer in our society, and to the noble mandate of ensuring adequate legal representation for every citizen. Both altruistic professionalism and legitimate self-interest call for a closer look at these latter failings.

The legal services shortage and the lawyer surplus. At the present time, approximately seventy percent of the population is not receiving needed legal services. The richest ten percent can afford lawyers. The poorest twenty percent is at least partially served by legal aid societies, public defenders' offices, and so forth. This leaves some 140,000,000 Americans of "moderate means" (defined in 1970 as those with incomes between $4,000 and $15,000) who are often unable to pay standard attorneys' fees and thus may have to go without necessary legal advice.

Ironically, this deficiency in the delivery of legal services exists side by side with a growing surplus of lawyers. Following the spectacular upsurge of interest in legal studies during the last half dozen years, the law schools of the nation have been graduating between 30,000 and 35,000 young lawyers annually—about ten percent of
the total practicing bar. If this pace continues, the number of lawyers in the country could be doubled in less than fifteen years. Yet the American Bar Association reports that there are only 16,500 openings each year for employment in a legal capacity. Half the annual crop of law graduates must seek jobs elsewhere.

The paradox of deprivation amidst plenty can be explained in several ways. The middle class has perhaps failed to recognize its own need for legal counsel in purchasing a house, registering a consumer complaint, or seeking relief from a recalcitrant bureaucracy, or at least it has not thought legal assistance in such situations worth the cost. Until lately, neither the organized bar nor the legal scholars have focused on the problem of the fair distribution of legal services among all elements of the population. Probably most important, however, have been the strictures of the canons of ethics and other bar association rules against advertising, competitive fee policies, and group prepaid legal services plans.

These restrictive canons are a sensitive issue. For many lawyers, they undoubtedly represent a sincere effort to maintain the dignity and independence of the profession, and to prevent the fomenting of litigation or the indulging of temptations to sharp commercial practices. In a simpler age, the canons may well have served such purposes. But in today's anonymous urban society, there is increasing evidence they tend to erect artificial barriers between lawyers and potential clients. If the bar itself does not respond to these changed circumstances, it runs the risk of losing the initiative to other public instrumentalities in channeling important new developments in the format of legal representation. The Supreme Court, for example, has struck down as unconstitutional a number of limitations on the use of counsel employed by civil rights groups and labor organizations to handle litigation on behalf of their members. The Justice Department has charged that minimum fee schedules are violative of the antitrust laws. And in the Pension Reform Act of 1974, Congress overrode all state bar rules forbidding lawyers to participate in so-called “closed panel” group legal services programs, insofar as they are established through collective bargaining between unions and employers.

Fortunately, there are indications of a much greater receptivity these days on the part of the organized bar toward fresh approaches in the delivery of legal services. The leadership of the American Bar Association has favored liberalizing the canons of ethics to accommodate a wider range of group plans, the most promising device yet proposed for bringing legal representation to the mass of the people. Many local bars have eliminated mandatory minima for fees.
The expanding movement for specialization has been accompanied by a growing willingness to let lawyers classify themselves by area of expertise, thus enabling the uninitiated public to make a more intelligent choice of attorney.

The time is ripe for the practicing bar and the law schools to cooperate in promoting what seems a happy confluence of their own and the public's best interests. The bar does not wish to be overwhelmed by a flood of new lawyers far exceeding the absorbent capacities of the current market. The law schools do not wish to see their graduates going unemployed. Presumably, all wish the public to have adequate legal representation available at a reasonable cost. The challenge is to devise new structures for bringing together the many would-be lawyers without clients and the many would-be clients without lawyers, and to shape those structures in keeping with the spirit of the profession's finest traditions, if not the letter of its antique laws. I could easily imagine a highly rewarding law school seminar built around this theme. Further along, I could also imagine law students testing out proposed solutions through appropriate clinical projects. At any rate, I am satisfied it is in some such fashion, rather than in lecturing students on the evils of criminal behavior, that legal education will respond most profitably to the lessons of Watergate.

Law school autonomy and bar admission requirements. In the two exciting decades that saw the law rechart the course of our society, dramatic changes also took place in legal education. As set forth in prior reports, these included the expansion of the curriculum, both through the addition of novel subject matter in a relatively conventional format, and through the introduction of wholly new interdisciplinary offerings and clinical programs. Recently, a revolution of a different sort occurred when the doors of the law schools swung open to welcome such previously underrepresented groups as women and minorities. It may be symptomatic of the rather less glamorous role I foresee for lawyers in the post-Watergate world that two of my major concerns of the past year were throwbacks to the more mundane (albeit critical) problems of an earlier day—preserving the autonomy of the Law School, and securing adequate funding for its programs.

Several American jurisdictions have either adopted or proposed rules making it a prerequisite for admission to the bar, or for admission to practice in the trial courts, that applicants complete a prescribed list of courses, sometimes with a specified number of credit hours for each course. No one can quarrel with efforts to improve the quality of the practicing bar. Serious questions must be raised,
however, about this particular method of achieving that objective.

Law schools, especially the best law schools, are unusual amalgams of training institutions and research centers. Law teachers have a vital role to play as constructive critics of the legal system, in addition to being instructors in law for their students. The students in turn should not only be learning the skills of their craft as future client counselors, but should also be preparing themselves as future lawyer-citizens, with special obligations to society at large. In fulfilling this broader social and professional mission, especially, the law schools must be accorded the same freedom of inquiry that characterizes any other reputable academic institution.

The attempted encroachment on the traditional prerogatives of law schools to determine their own curricula may stem in part from hostility toward the attention being paid in legal education today to less conventional subject matter, including the use of other disciplines to reexamine basic legal postulates. Should this be true, it constitutes a dangerous threat to the wide-open debate that seems to me essential if the law schools are to come to grips effectively with the pressing legal and social issues of the day. Moreover, I see no signs that the widening of law school horizons in the last few years has impaired the professional quality of the product. The same spirit of inquiry that has led legal educators to look beyond traditional legal materials toward other disciplines has also led them to look beyond appellate case analysis toward such eminently utilitarian endeavors as courses in business and estate planning, seminars in negotiating techniques, and a variety of clinical offerings in trial and appellate practice. Today’s graduates, I am convinced, are better prepared in all respects to start practicing than my contemporaries and I were when we emerged from law school some twenty years ago.

Highly practical considerations also militate against outsiders’ intrusions, either direct or indirect, in determining law school curricula. So far, there has been no uniformity among the proposed lists of mandatory courses. If this pattern continues, the result could be a crazy quilt of varying prescriptions. Students uncertain about where they were going to practice (probably the norm in a national law school like Michigan) would wish to retain their options by taking all the courses required by every jurisdiction in which they might be interested. The major portion of their schedules could be filled with prescribed courses, leaving little room for individual selection and the enriching experience of exploring unmapped terrain. Even if there were more uniformity in the stated require-
ments, it would be like chasing quicksilver to try to pin down and label the variegated curricula of the country’s many law schools in terms of a standardized formula. Courses similar in name differ in content; courses similar in content differ in name; and courses similar in both name and content differ in length and hourly credit. Should all these definitional hurdles be cleared, there would still remain a weighty substantive objection. Inevitably, a strait jacket would be imposed on the healthy experimentation that now goes on constantly in law school, as courses appear, expand, contract, merge, divide, and evaporate, in blithe disregard of the catalogue listings, all in the hope of a more effective and congenial treatment of the subject at hand.

Prescribed curricula could have disastrous cost implications. One recent major proposal called for a clinical course in trial advocacy as a condition for admission to practice in the trial courts. Now, clinical instruction is an unusually expensive form of legal education. As I calculate it, the costs are three or four times as great as the average for all other forms of instruction, including both lecture courses and seminars. At Michigan the bill for our principal clinical program amounts to over $100,000 annually. Only a quarter of our students can take this course. A fourfold expansion to accommodate the entire student body would probably up the total cost to between $400,000 and $500,000 a year. This would constitute almost twenty-five percent of our current instructional budget of around $2,000,000 (not counting the library). I see no available source for new money of this magnitude. Any effort to reallocate existing funds to finance such an expanded clinical program would, needless to say, be simply devastating for elements of our present curriculum that have long been deemed fundamental to a sound legal education.

Finally, in my view, a significant matter of principle is at stake here. Of course the bar is entitled to insist upon the highest standards for admission, and I would have no objection to the most rigorous testing of candidates on all appropriate subject matter. But legal educators, too, have their special province, and, as someone who has not yet spent as much time in teaching as in active practice, I have no hesitancy in asserting that they are in the best position to decide on the most desirable components of preparatory training for the practice of law. I share their skepticism that any particular constellation of law school courses is uniquely successful in fashioning capable practitioners. Although I would not suggest for a moment that it is unimportant what substantive material we cover, I firmly believe that the primary function of law school is not
to inform but to acculturate, not to convey a set body of knowledge but to develop a certain way of looking at legal problems.

Adventuresome course offerings are often a mark of the better law schools, and adventuresome course selection is often a mark of the better students. If bar examiners or particular courts are dubious about the qualifications of the products of more innovative programs, they have every right to demand a suitable demonstration of the candidates' capabilities. What should be maintained is the salutary distinction between the bar's responsibility for the evaluating of applicants for admission, and the law schools' responsibility for the educating of students.

**Law school funding.** Law schools have long operated on the basis of mass production. Despite the current popularity of clinical work, seminars, and other forms of small-group instruction, the classical setting for legal education is still the large classroom, with one teacher holding forth in front of a hundred or so students. This has meant that legal education, for all its excellence, has been cheap education, perhaps the cheapest of all graduate and professional education.

At Michigan, I estimate that the total annual cost of maintaining the Law School, in rough, round figures, is now five million dollars. That includes two million dollars for the operating budget of the School itself, and almost three-quarters of a million dollars for the operating budget of the Law Library. Financial aid requires another three-quarters of a million dollars, and research support is approximately half a million dollars. Building maintenance, depreciation, and general University overhead add at least one more million. Since we have the equivalent of about 1200 full-time, year-round students, the cost per student of running the Law School, counting all the charges just listed, is approximately $4200 a year. Our nonresident year-round students pay tuition that is within a few hundred dollars of that amount, although our residents pay substantially less than half. All told, tuition accounts for somewhat over half of our funding, with state and private sources responsible for about a quarter each.

Law schools are seriously underfunded by comparison with other professional schools. Michigan is relatively well off, thanks in large part to the generosity of William W. Cook and an extraordinarily loyal body of alumni. Yet even here the outlay for a law student is less than a third as much as for the average medical student. Legal education is a victim of its own past efficiency. What other graduate or professional school would accept a twenty-to-one student-faculty ratio as a norm? And indeed at Michigan, over the last several
years, the ratio has ranged above that level, from about 22:1 to about 24:1. These figures mean that we are handicapped in trying to provide the small-group instruction required by new teaching techniques and innovative subject matter, and in trying to break down the barriers of distance and alienation that so beset student-faculty relations in larger educational enterprises these days.

Legal education has now entered the laboratory stage of its development. If we are to cope with the increasingly complex demands placed by society on legal scholars and active practitioners, there must be many more opportunities for teachers and students to work closely together, both to improve the art of lawyering, and to probe deeply into the major law-related problems of our time. That is going to be expensive education. As we place our requests for realistically increased funding before university administrators, however, the response is much as if the medical schools went in to ask for up-to-date electronic diagnostic equipment, and were told that a few extra lectures by Galen would have to suffice.

This brings me to a troubling question. Anyone who carefully examines the figures I set forth a few paragraphs back on the cost of a Michigan legal education may wish to challenge the attribution to a paying student of the expense of the Law School's research program or its financial assistance to other students. If those charges are disallowed, it could well be that nonresident students are actually paying more than the pro rata cost of a legal education. At the very least, I am prepared to say that our students are paying a disproportionate share of the cost of their education, by comparison with other students in the University.

The implications of all this, I realize, touch a sensitive nerve. The closer any university might come to correlating the allocation of funds to the amount of tuition generated in any given unit, the harder it would be for society to get sufficient numbers of such highly desirable but expensive products as brain surgeons and percussionists. Nonetheless, if a period of belt tightening is in store for us, I feel this issue must be faced. In the years when all of higher education was being treated generously, the percentage of general university funds coming to the law schools may not have been so important. But if budget cuts, or at least a reduction in the rate of annual increases, is impending, then a fresh examination of the allocation is called for. In my view, the law schools are not receiving from their universities an amount that bears an appropriate relationship to the moneys generated by them in student tuition. To leave this imbalance unredressed is to risk the future health of legal education.
FACULTY

Paul G. Kauper, the senior member of the active faculty in length of service, died on May 22, 1974, following a short illness. He was sixty-six years old, and had spent thirty-eight of those years teaching law at Michigan. For generations of graduates, he was the embodiment of all the best the Law School had to offer—impeccable scholarship, quiet command of the classroom, and unfailing courtesy to everyone whose life touched his. In memorializing him, a faculty resolution stated: "The Law School lost a precious asset and the legal profession lost a master of constitutional law. Law faculties occasionally have great teachers or great scholars, but only rarely are great teaching and scholarship combined in the person of one man as they were in Paul . . . Paul's death was a great loss to the Law School because he had fruitful years to come, but his life was a permanent contribution of incalculable value to the life of the Law School."

Professor Kauper was succeeded by Professor Alfred F. Conard as Henry M. Butzel Professor of Law.

Fifty-nine persons held professorial appointments in the Law School during the University year of 1973-74. Included in this total are five visiting or part-time faculty members, and two full-time University administrators. Not counted are five emeritus professors, and several professors from other University departments who taught in the Law School.

Professor Cornelius J. Peck of Washington was a year-long visitor. He handled torts, administrative law, and labor arbitration. Another visitor for the entire year was Professor Lawrence W. Waggoner of Virginia, who taught trusts and estates, future interests, estate planning, and estate and gift taxation. Professor Harrison C. Dunning of the University of California at Davis joined us in the fall to teach property. A second fall visitor was Professor Morgan E. Shipman of Ohio State, who offered a course in investment securities and a seminar in partnership planning. In the winter term, Hobart Birmingham of the San Francisco bar taught international trade and investment. Clinical law was under the direction of Adjunct Assistant Professors Edward B. Goldman and Steven D. Pepe. Stuart M. Israel of the Detroit bar was in charge of criminal appellate practice.

Visitors during the summer term of 1973 included Deans Arnold N. Enker of Bar Ilan University, Israel (evidence) and Joseph R. Julin of Florida (oil and gas), and Professors Barbara B. Croft of Emory (torts), Joseph J. Kalo of North Carolina (clinical law), Robert C. Means of Texas (enterprise organization), William A. Reppy, Jr. of Duke (trusts and estates), John A. Sebert, Jr. of
Minnesota (commercial transactions), and Marshall S. Shapo of Virginia (products and the consumer). William E. Knepper of the Columbus, Ohio bar gave a course in trial practice.

Three full professors resigned their posts in the Law School during the year. Professors Robert J. Harris and Stanley Siegel left to enter private practice, although they will continue with us in an adjunct capacity. Professor Richard V. Wellman accepted a chair as a distinguished professor at the University of Georgia School of Law.

Offsetting these losses were two exceptional new professorial appointments. Professor Lawrence W. Waggoner accepted a permanent position following a visiting year at the Law School. He holds a business degree from Cincinnati, a law degree from Michigan, and a doctorate in philosophy from Oxford. Before coming here, he taught at Illinois, Northwestern, and Virginia. His major fields of interest are trusts and estates and taxation. Assistant Professor Gerald M. Rosberg attended Harvard College and Harvard Law School. He clerked for Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the District of Columbia Circuit, and for Justice William J. Brennan of the United States Supreme Court. Thereafter he worked with a prominent law firm in Washington, D.C. He will teach civil procedure and conflicts.

Assistant Dean Charles W. Borgsdorf was chosen to take on the important task of supervising some two dozen case club senior judges in an expanded first-year program in legal writing and advocacy. Dean Borgsdorf received degrees in economics and law from Michigan, and then practiced two years with a Wall Street law firm in New York City. Before returning here, he also taught business law at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario.

In addition to the usual Law School offerings, the annual Thomas M. Cooley lectures were presented by Professor Norval Morris of the University of Chicago Law School. He spoke on “The Future of Imprisonment.” Professor Nathan Glazer of the Harvard Graduate School of Education delivered the William W. Cook Lectures on “The American Ethnic Pattern: A New Phase?”

STUDENT BODY

Unofficially, 1973-74 was “the year of the woman” at the Law School. Four of the top five persons academically in the senior class were women, as were the top junior and the top summer starter. The editor-in-chief of the Law Review was a woman. And so was the President of the Student Senate. In all, 1,102 students attended the regular session. Of this number, 178 were women and 111 were
members of minority groups. A total of 230 colleges and universities and 61 states, territories, and foreign countries were represented in the student body.

The President of the Law School Student Senate was Barbara Klimaszewski, a dynamic advocate of student interests. Other important posts were held by Christina L. Whitman, editor-in-chief of the Michigan Law Review; Lawrence R. Mills, editor-in-chief of the Journal of Law Reform; Ronald E. Van Buskirk, Campbell Competition chairman; Alan S. Miller, chairman of the Environmental Law Society; Estelle C. Chandler, president of the International Law Society; Melissa N. Lee, president of the Women Law Students Organization; Gregory Coggs, chairman of the Black Law Students Alliance; Felipe Ponce, president of La Raza Law Society; Barry L. Zaretsky, president of the Legal Aid Society; and O. Tim Kenney, administrative director of the Michigan Inmate Assistance Program.

Justice William H. Rehnquist of the United States Supreme Court presided over the final round of the Campbell Competition. William C. Blanton and David J. Buffam were the winners, with John T. Kolinski and Alan M. Weinberger the runners-up.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The Law School furnished 365 students with $773,035 in scholarships and loans during the financial aid year, which ran from February 16, 1973 to February 15, 1974. Nearly all this assistance was packaged as half-grant, half-loan. It was a tribute to the efforts of John A. Mason, Financial Aids Officer, that in a year of financial stringency the amount supplied represented a substantial increase over the $709,705 provided in 1972-73.

Over half of all student financial aid comes from outside sources, such as state and federally guaranteed student loans from hometown banks, private foundations, the "G.I. Bill," and the work-study program. In all, 663 law students received a grand total of $1,685,196 from all known sources of assistance, internal and external. Unhappily, this represented a 2.5 percent decline from last year's total, and, more ominously, a rather substantial dip in the amount of outside funding.

PLACEMENT

The sellers' market for lawyers, which has prevailed for the past several years, came to an end in 1973-74. Even so, Nancy Krieger, Director of Placement, was able to report that by May 31, 1974,
270 of the 356 seniors (including August graduates) had found employment. The placement rate of 75 percent actually reflected an improvement over the 72 percent placement figure of the previous year.

As usual, the largest single group, 164 (60 percent), chose private law firms. Next in popularity came federal and state government, with 26 placements, and judicial clerkships, with 25. Corporate legal departments, banks, and CPA firms took 20 graduates. Thirteen went with legal aid, public defenders, prosecutors, or VISTA. Other choices included foreign fellowships, graduate study, teaching, and JAG. The range of starting salaries in law firms was from $9,600 to $18,500. The average was $15,480, up from $15,197 a year ago. Corporations, banks, and CPA firms paid an average salary of $15,912, almost $1,000 over last year's $14,971.

LIBRARY AND LAWYERS CLUB

Bleak economic conditions prevented any formal opening of a capital fund-raising campaign to ensure new Law Library facilities and a refurbished Lawyers Club. But a dedicated Alumni Development Committee met regularly to lay plans for the drive. John H. Pickering of the Washington, D.C. bar was named National Chairman. To provide professional guidance, Robert A. Jones, a Michigan business graduate, became the new full-time Director of Law School Development. The internationally known architect, Gunnar Birkerts, was selected to design the new library and office building.

In the 1973-74 fiscal year, 12,668 volumes were added to the Law Library. Total holdings now stand at 441,111. Inflation has struck especially hard at book prices, and, with all types of legal publications continuing to proliferate, it is clear that the maintenance of the Law Library as a great national collection is going to require increasing vigilance.

PRIVATE GIFTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Malcolm L. Denise of Dearborn assumed command of the Law School Fund this year as National Chairman, and proceeded to turn in another record performance. The number of contributors rose to an all-time high of 4,479, and the proportion of alumni contributing went up to 42 percent. A small drop in the total amount contributed to the Fund, from $416,022 in 1972 to $411,037, was more than offset by several large gifts that were earmarked for capital development.
In submitting his report, Chairman Denise commented: "Its most important message is this: Our school continues to enjoy a measure of support by its alumni and friends unmatched by any other public law school. . . . The best news is the increased rate of alumni participation. This is the single most important factor in the long-term success of the Fund." In today's depressed economy, Michigan could ask for no greater bulwark than the kind of alumni allegiance spoken of, and exemplified by, Mr. Denise.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Theodore J. St. Antoine
Dean

December 31, 1974
Faculty Activities, 1973-74

Professor Francis A. Allen continued to serve on the Council of the American Law Institute and on the Research Committee of the American Bar Foundation. During the winter term of 1974 he was a Visiting Professor at Boston University Law School. . . . Professor Layman E. Allen remained a member of the General Accounting Office Task Force on Legislative Classifications, and of the HEW Secretary's Advisory Committee on Automated Personnel Data Systems. . . . Professor William W. Bishop, Jr. spoke on various aspects of the international law of the sea and the forthcoming United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea to the Law School's Committee of Visitors, the International Law Committee of the State Bar of Michigan, and other groups. He continued as a member of the Board of Editors of the American Journal of International Law, as Honorary Vice President of the American Society of International Law, and as Chairman of the Society's Panel on State Responsibility. . . . Professor Vincent Blasi was Reporter for the Committee on Newsman's Privilege of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. A weekly radio program, "Law in the News," which he hosts for 100 stations on National Public Radio, was awarded the ABA Gavel Award for "Distinguished Contribution to Public Understanding of the American System of Law and Justice." Professor Blasi spoke in the Calvin College Lecture Series on Freedom of the Press and at the State Bar of Michigan Conference on Freedom of the Press. He delivered a paper before an international conference on the legal rights of researchers held in Bielefeld, West Germany. . . . Research Associate Vera Bolgar lectured at the Detroit College of Law on "The Semi-Public Corporation in Western Europe" and "Current Trends in Strict Liability and No-Fault Insurance." . . . Professor Olin Browder was the Law School's representative in the University's Senate Assembly. . . . Research Associate Elizabeth H. G. Brown was Secretary of the Old Ladies Home Association of Ann Arbor and continued as Secretary of the Building Authority of the City of Ann Arbor. . . . Professor Robert A. Burt was appointed Professor of Law in Psychiatry in the University of Michigan Medical School. He delivered the Ohio State University Law Forum Lectures on "Biotechnology and Anti-Social Conduct: Controlling the Controllers." He participated in conferences in New York, Dallas, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco on the Legal Rights of the Mentally Handicapped. Professor Burt was elected a Fellow of the Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences, Hastings-on-the-Hudson, and continued serving as a member of the Committee for
the Study of Inborn Errors of Metabolism, National Research Council-National Academy of Sciences, and as Co-Reporter, Volume on Child Abuse and Neglect, Juvenile Justice Standards Project, Institute for Judicial Administration-American Bar Association. . . . Professor Paul D. Carrington was a member of the Executive Committee of the Advisory Council on Appellate Justice, and Program Chairman for the National Conference on Appellate Justice. He spoke on “The Future of Legal Education” at Indiana University, on “Specialization of Trial Lawyers” at Southern Methodist University, on “Class Actions” before the Federal Bar Association of Detroit, and on “Paraprofessionalism in Higher Education” at the University of Denver. . . . Associate Professor David Chambers was Reporter for, and a member of, the Michigan Supreme Court Committee to Draft and Recommend Commit­ment Rules. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the Washtenaw County Legal Aid Society, and of the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners Blue Ribbon Committee on Cor­rections. . . . Lecturer Robert A. Choate spoke on “What the General Practitioner Should Know to Distinguish Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Considerations” and on “Intellectual Property Rights as Aspects of An Estate” before the Institute of Continuing Legal Education. . . . Professor Alfred F. Conard remained a member of the Council on Law-Related Studies, of the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences of the National Research Council, and of the American Law Institute. He continued as an associate of the International Academy of Comparative Law, as a trustee of the Law and Society Association, as Consulting Editor of the American Journal of Compara­tive Law, as Chief Editor for Volume XIII of the International Encyclopedia of Comparative Law, and as Chairman of the Editor­ial Advisory Board of the Bobbs-Merrill Company. He was a member of the Research Committee of the American Judicature Society, and Chairman of the University of Michigan Medical Center Review Committee. . . . Professor Luke K. Cooperrider continued as a member of the University’s Senate Assembly, of the University’s Budget Priorities Committee, and of the Senate Tenure Committee. . . . Professor Roger A. Cunningham participated as a panel member and speaker at a legal seminar sponsored by the Outdoor Advertising Association of America in Atlanta. He remained a member of the Advisory Committee, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, National Research Council. . . . Professor Charles Donahue, Jr. was a member of the Program Committee for the 1974 Meeting of the American Society of Legal History, of the University Council on Ethics and Religion, and of the Medieval and Renaissance
Collegium Advisory Board. He was a commentator on three papers on medieval marriage at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. He presented lectures on "Anglo-American Property," "Legal London," "Legal Education in England," "Medieval Paleography," "Legal Education in the Middle Ages," and "Medieval Marriage," as well as a series of lectures on various aspects of Roman law. . . . Professor Harry T. Edwards was Visiting Professor of Law at the Free University of Brussels. He was a hearing officer for the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, and a member of the Nominating Committee of the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution. He served on the University’s Advisory Committee on Recreation, Intramurals, and Club Sports. . . . Professor Samuel D. Estep remained active in the University Club after completing his term as the Club’s President. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Michigan Memorial Phoenix Project and of the Executive Committee of the University’s Telecommunications Policies Project. He was also a member of the Atomic Energy and Space Law Committee of the Michigan State Bar Association. . . . Adjunct Assistant Professor Edward B. Goldman was Secretary of the Washtenaw County Building Authority. . . . Professor Whitmore Gray was Chairman of the Soviet Law Committee of the ABA International Law Section. He spoke on “American Commercial Law” at Yahata University, Kitakyushu, Japan. . . . Professor Jerold H. Israel was Executive Secretary of the Michigan Law Revision Commission. He continued as Co-Reporter for the NCCUSL Committee on Uniform Rules of Criminal Procedure, and as Reporter for the Michigan State Bar Committee to Revise the Code of Criminal Procedure. He was Vice Chairman of the Committee on Reform of the Federal Criminal Law of the ABA Criminal Law Section. He participated in a training program for new prosecutors in Michigan. . . . Professor John H. Jackson remained on leave of absence, serving as General Counsel and Acting Deputy Special Representative of the President’s Office for international trade negotiations, working with the Congress on the Trade Bill. He was co-chairman of the ABA Committee on Tariffs, Customs, GATT, and Regional Trade Arrangements. . . . Professor Douglas A. Kahn was a Visiting Professor of Law at Stanford Law School during the fall term. He was Chairman of the Subcommittee on Lifetime Transfers of the Estate and Gift Tax Committee of the ABA Section of Taxation. . . . Professor Yale Kamisar served on the Editorial Advisory Board for the Criminal Law Bulletin, and on the Advisory Committee of the ALI’s Model Code of Pre-Arraignment Procedure. He continued as Co-Reporter for the NCCUSL Committee on Uniform Rules of Criminal Procedure. . . .
Professor Paul G. Kauper delivered, at the Old North Church in Boston, the first in a series of lectures by distinguished scholars to commemorate the United States Bicentennial Anniversary in 1976, speaking on the rule of law in a revolutionary society. He remained a member of the Advisory Board of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, of the Board of Directors of the University Musical Society, and of the Commission on the Future, appointed by the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. . . . Professor Thomas E. Kauper continued on leave to serve as Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Antitrust Division. . . . Professor Frank R. Kennedy completed his service as Executive Director of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States. He was Chairman of the Uniform Commercial Code Committee of the ABA Banking and Business Law Section, and Chairman of the Drafting Committee and a member of the Executive Committee of the National Bankruptcy Conference. He continued as Reporter for the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules of the Judicial Conference of the United States. He spoke on the proposed Bankruptcy Act in Washington, Ann Arbor, Southfield, Atlanta, New York City, New Orleans, Williamsburg, Columbus, and Morgantown, West Virginia. He spoke on the Bankruptcy Rules in Iowa City, Detroit, New Orleans, Tempe, St. Louis, Birmingham, and Mobile. . . . Associate Professor Richard O. Lempert served on the Board of Editors of the Law and Society Review. He served on the Advisory Committee to the Wetland Ecosystems Project. He spoke on impeachment to several civic and student groups. . . . Associate Professor James A. Martin spoke before the Corporation, Business, and Finance Law Section of the Michigan State Bar Association. . . . Lecturer Virginia B. Nordby continued as a member-advisor of the Stanford Law School Board of Visitors Advisory Committee on the Status of Women in the Law. She was a consultant to the Michigan Women's Task Force on Rape, and a speaker and resource person at the Fifth National Conference on Women and the Law in Austin, Texas. . . . Associate Dean William J. Pierce continued as Executive Director of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Institute of Continuing Legal Education. He was a member of the Council of the Probate and Trust Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan, and a member of the Committee on Suggested State Legislation of the Council of State Governments. . . . Professor Marcus L. Plant delivered three lectures on "Law and Medicine" at the University of Michigan Medical School. He addressed the Joint Meeting of Bar Associations and Medical Societies of Charlevoix and
Cheboygan Counties, and spoke before the Toledo Society of Ophthalmologists. . . . Professor Alan N. Polasky was a member of various committees of the ABA Section of Real Property, Probate, and Trust Law, and a member of the Advisory Council on Appellate Justice. He spoke on estate planning, evidence, and tax matters in Boston, New York City, Washington, Charleston, Miami, New Orleans, San Francisco, Denver, Chicago, Phoenix, and various other cities. . . . Professor Beverley J. Pooley continued his service as a member of the University Council. . . . Professor John W. Reed continued serving as a trustee of Kalamazoo College, as President of the Baptist Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board, and as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Army JAG School. He was on the Michigan State Bar Standing Committee on Legal Publications and Legal Education. He addressed various professional groups in a number of cities throughout the country. . . . Associate Professor Donald H. Regan read a paper at the 1973 Ripon Conference on Moral and Political Philosophy. . . . Dean Theodore J. St. Antoine was appointed Chairman of the Michigan Governor's Workmen's Compensation Advisory Commission. He was elected President of the Resource Center for Consumers of Legal Services. He completed his service as a member of the Advisory Employment Relations Committee of the Michigan Civil Service Commission. He continued serving as a member of the Steering Committee of the University's Office of Budgets and Planning. He spoke at numerous alumni and professional meetings around the country. . . . Professor Joseph L. Sax was a member of the Michigan Environmental Review Board, of the Board of Directors of the Environmental Law Institute, of the National Council of the Federation of American Scientists, of the National Assembly of the Institute of Ecology, and of the Board of Advisors of the National Campus Alliance for Amnesty. He continued serving as a member of the Advisory Board of the Ford Foundation Energy Policy Project, of the Board of Trustees of the Center for Law and Social Policy, and of the National Advisory Board of the Ecology Law Quarterly. He was Regional Governor of the International Council on Environmental Law. He spoke on environmental law, the energy crisis, and public interest law practice at Ghost Ranch and Dickinson College and in Knoxville, Louisville, Des Moines, San Diego, Victoria (British Columbia), and Banff (Alberta). . . . Professor Stanley Siegel was a Visiting Professor of Law during the fall term at Stanford Law School. . . . Professor Eric Stein addressed the University Research Club and participated in meetings of the American Society of International Law. He was on the editorial boards of the American Journal of International Law, of the Common Market Law Review (Leiden), and of Legal
Issues of European Integration (Amsterdam). He was a member of a study group on long-range arms control policy established by the Council on Foreign Relations, of the Executive Committee of the University Center on Western European Studies, and of the Advisory Council of the Institute of European Studies of the Free University of Brussels. . . . Professor Peter O. Steiner continued as Chairman of the University’s Department of Economics. . . . Associate Professor G. Joseph Vining continued as Secretary and Director of the American Friends of Cambridge University, as a member of the University’s Senior Scholarship Committee, and as a member of the Senate Advisory Committee on Academic Affairs. . . . Professor Richard V. Wellman was Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Georgia School of Law for the year. He was Rapporteur and a member of the United States Delegation to the Diplomatic Convention on International Wills. He continued as Educational Director for the Joint Editorial Board for the Uniform Probate Code. He testified on the Uniform Probate Code before the state legislatures of New Jersey, Illinois, and California. He spoke on the Code and other topics in Honolulu, New Orleans, Williamsburg, Athens (Georgia), Mexico City, New York City, Washington, Kansas City, Atlanta, Dallas, and Bismarck (North Dakota). . . . Professor James J. White was a Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard Law School in the fall term. He completed his service as Executive Director of the National Institute for Consumer Justice. He spoke on “Recent Developments in Commercial Transactions” in Detroit and on “Breach of Contract in a Shortage Economy” in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York City. . . . Professor L. Hart Wright was a member of the Advisory Board of the International Bureau of Fiscal Documentations in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. He served on the University’s Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty. He spoke before the Taxation Section of the Michigan State Bar Association.
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