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Comments - Class of 1963

1. The first year was unnecessarily intimidating. There is no clear rational for 3 classes of 250 students each (Contracts, Crimes, Property) with only a single final which is geared to writing ability-A subject not taught.

2. Class standing has created a grotesque elite which becomes self perpetuating. "Law Review," "Coif" and other badges of rank are worn with the bravado of Soviet Medals throughout careers. Merit can and should be reorganized-but in a manner that permits subsequent achievement to be equally valued. NOTE: Students aren't told of the critical nature of class standing to career success.

3. Student housing/facilities/transportation/dining are VERY critical elements to law school success. Special attention MUST be given to the environment of each first year student.

4. Politics of success and class position detracted from a truly enlightening school experience. I don't see how cut throat competition is supposed to build professional integrity or ability.

During the period of my attendance at the University of Michigan Law School, the most striking aspect of the institution was the arrogance and self-important pettiness of 1) the administration, 2) the faculty, and 3) the student body, (in that order).

I have been opposed to "affirmative action" programs (however labelled) if they result in "reverse discrimination," as per "Bakke."

U of M Law School had and still has excellent reputation. Graduation from U of M (as opposed to lesser schools) has been beneficial both career-wise and otherwise.

Firmly believe law school valuable education regardless of ultimate employment.

A graduate of the law school should have some exposure to the practice of law, clerkship of such.
A lawyer admitted to practice in this state should first serve an apprenticeship in the practice of same type. (Michigan)

I think this survey is over extensive and do not really understand the purpose or value—especially with the quality of a law school such as the Univ of Mich.

My career is not primarily involving the conventional practice of law. Engaged in investments—real estate—finance. I am involved in practice approximately 25% of the time.

I believe that the case method should not be relied upon to the extent that it was (i.e., nearly 100%), especially for introducing 1st year students to the law.

I believe that some professors who had scholarly reputations were not effective in class. I think the law school must insist on both qualities—scholarship and teaching ability.

I believe that efforts should be increased to expose the faculty, administration, & student body to the private bar and businessman's points of view.
I have been pleased and proud of my Michigan Law School education and from what I have read and heard, the School has kept pace with our changing society and changing legal environment. I do believe one non academic area of importance which received little or no attention while I attended was the area of public responsibility of the lawyer. i.e. our state legislatures and Congress and various bureaus are heavily represented by lawyers. I wonder if the fine law schools should not recognize this—not in a pure lawyer (legal education) sense but as a unique function of the "lawyer class" in our society. What rights & responsibilities go or should go with this? 

More practical experience during school, perhaps via some apprenticeship program, would be of substantial assistance to those who intend to engage in private practice upon graduation.

I have been impressed with UM graduates who have worked under my supervision, and I try to get more.

Hope the survey proves informative. A good idea.

I was in private practice with a law firm in Denver from graduation until July, 1975; firm was 75 lawyers when I left; 30 when I started. Left to join business client (corporation) in non-legal role.

Because of the nature of my practice (trial work, mostly) and the realities of legal work in most situations, I have often thought that perhaps greater emphasis could be given to oral examinations. The ability to write under pressure, emphasized in both law school and on the bar exam, does not serve any purpose in the real world. I do not mean to suggest that lawyers should not develop a writing ability but I believe it is more of an English language than a legal problem.

My answer to F above, is qualified: I would not recommend the study of law as a way to make a living BUT—the study of law at U/M is of great value in becoming well-educated.

I do not hope for my children to study law because of the crowding in the profession. Were they to choose law, I would hope they would select Michigan.

My experience was perhaps unique. I had always aspired to practice law, but all pre-law education seemed pointless. My undergraduate experience was a disaster. Through a series of fortunate events, I was able to enroll at U-M Law School during the summer. The training was outstanding, although it took some 4-5 years for the benefits to become recognizable. I know that criteria must be established in student selection, but I often wonder how one effectively measures the desire of a prospective student. Grades and the LSAT don't always tell the whole story.
I am basically a tax-trial lawyer. After graduating from U-Mich Law School, I went to N.Y.U. and got married. At NYU I did much better than at U-Michigan, partially because I was married, partially because I liked the subject matter, but most importantly because I liked the problem method of teaching better than the case method I had while at U-M-LS. I taught corp. tax (Tax II at U-Wis LAW School in 1970-1971, using the problem method exclusively. The students loved it, and I had a good time too.

To be a good tax lawyer, one must be a good lawyer. U-Mich Law School gave me an excellent and thorough education in law. NYU gave me a specialty. I believe it could have been done in 3 years total, but I am not unhappy over the result and the extra 4th year.

Re XVI - Cannot fault any aspect of my legal education (courses on legal writing and trial practice were available but should be emphasized more) ie the importance of same brought home to the students.
Re XV - Wanted to practice antitrust law ended up in labor civil rights field for management - I am satisfied.
Re general - keep up your excellent work - I am very proud to say I graduated from UM Law!

I believe that law school training was very adequate so far as legal theories are concerned. I believe, however, that there was too much reliance upon the case method approach. I believe that law school does not provide sufficient practical training that would be of benefit to those lawyers who enter private practice. There should be more emphasis upon proper drafting of documents, writing of briefs, and preparation of opinion letters, etc. If suitable and feasible arrangements could be made, I believe there should be some clerkship program before graduation to allow students exposure to the private practice of law. This might assist a young lawyer in developing a proper attorney-client relationship. I recognize that legal aid programs and other programs are not utilized considerably more than when I was in law school.
I also believe more attention should be focused upon the teaching of ethics, both as it pertains to the client as well as in dealings with other lawyers.

I consider the U. of Mich. Law School to be the most important & productive educational experience which I have had.

It was my greatest privilege to have been accepted and graduated from the University of Michigan Law School.

I spent three very rewarding & happy years in Michigan School not only laid the groundwork so that I am a competent practitioner - but more important my associations in school gave me the depth & understanding to know myself & those around me making my life fuller & more meaningful.

The University of Michigan Law School experience was invaluable and the memories of it are cherished. One area where the school could have aided me was in counselling about career opportunities. In 1963 I simply did not understand the extent of the opportunities available and also did not
understand the inner dynamics of law firms. Fortunately everything has worked out well, but the placement process (in 1963 at least) did NOT reduce the "mystery" involved in dealing with (and understanding) law firms. I have the impression that the greater opportunities for junior clerk positions have been very helpful to law students having to make career decisions in their senior year.

To XV: I hoped to become a practicing lawyer upon entering law school. However, during law school I became interested in international business, law, and taxation, all of which have been part of my professional career, first, for an international CPA firm and now, for an international publishing company.

I look back on my time at the law school as the finest part of my education—the U of Michigan was the most outstanding institution I attended both in terms of academics and treatment of its students. I really cannot say enough in praise of the law school.

Greatest shortcoming of my legal education, in my judgment, of that offered by the school was in legal writing. Short of law review, there was little, if any, teaching of how to write.

I liked U of M Law School & feel very grateful for the education and financial assistance, and for the guidance and help received from Mr. Proffitt.

I do think that the legal intern programs I see law students participating in now, which we did not have then, would have been of value to me.

I have no regrets about my years at U of M Law. I have many fond memories of this time.

In the fifteen years, a change has occurred in the private practice. The economics of practicing puts considerable pressure on the private practitioner. How to operate efficiently in order to provide a thorough service to a client at reasonable cost. Very tough to do.

The positive benefits I gained at U of M Law School were mainly the result of interaction & discussion with other law students in the Law Quad. The classes merely established the high level of intellectual rigor that was expected. The opportunity to be a part of a large & diverse university community was very important to me. My teachers generally were distant & unapproachable figures.

Overall, I feel that I received a very good training in the basics of the law, but little feel for the pragmatic aspects of law practice. I do have very positive memories of my 3 years at U of M & made several lasting friendships there.
I believe that the Law School at the University of Michigan has a generally fine curriculum and excellent student applicants. I am concerned however that many of the faculty members have complexes that force them to be less than compassionate to the students. It is my suggestion that faculty members be selected from practicing lawyers of 10 years or more experience so as to bring a modicum of reality to the classroom. 

This questionnaire could be better focused on the quality & efficiency of the teaching (vs the course subject matter), and its relevance to practice, or life in general (not to mention bar exams). For example, it is time for law schools to consider teaching students on the basis that the vast majority will be counselling business or government officials, & not writing appellate briefs or teaching for a living; and that "case law," plays an increasingly minor role in many regulated areas in proportion to (poorly-drafted) rules, regulations and statutes, and that business need intelligent choices and guidance, not arguments or orders from overly egotistical attorneys.

Found U. of M. Law School to be overly "good job" oriented & insufficiently learning oriented. Nevertheless, positive experience.

I had a difficult time in law school as my grades show. I know I worked hard and learned a great deal because of it. Although certainly knowledge is important I believe the most important role of the law school is to develop legal skills specifically how to find, interpret and use the law. Knowing is a static condition upon which counsel must act using his skills. I believe Michigan excels in this important area, however, I also believe additional emphasis should be specifically placed here particularly for those interested in trial work, if Michigan graduates are to continue to be as productive in law as previously observed nationally.

There are not enough jobs at this time to justify the cost of a legal education.

I think a short required course on law office management including record keeping, work processing and financial matters would be helpful. I don't think the law school should become a Trade School, but I think some instruction on how to interview a client, draft correspondence, and commence legal proceedings would be helpful to the student who does not intend to join a large law firm.

Mich. was a great experience and trained me well for the future. Not having a family law background, I was not fully prepared for how the private law firm operates. In struction in the realities of facing this would have helped me considerably. Also economic information would have helped. It took me 2 or 3 years to find out what was really going on in the firm.
I owe a great debt to the U of M Law School—one which I can never hope to repay. It was one of the definitive formative experiences in my life and opened doors for me which I otherwise would not even have known enough to approach. I loved my years in Ann Arbor and it was my experience in Ann Arbor that prepared me for my career and strongly influenced my philosophy in life.

"If I did it over again" category in law school, I would recommend:
1) Get an MBA concurrently—this should be promoted, expanded.
2) Do more in accounting.

Field of law is becoming too complex. Too many federal & state regulations arising so you are never satisfied that advice given has not been superceded.

I have found the practice of law to be sometimes challenging, frequently mundane and rarely creative. Its major rewards are a) financial b) high degree of personal freedom c) occasionally actually helping somebody. Its major deficiencies are dealing with people who are frequently less than candid and employees who are less than adequate.

Having received my law degree from the Univ. of Michigan has probably had the greatest impact on my success of any single factor.

The longer I practice law, the more I appreciate law school.

I find that my experience at U of M adequately prepared me for the practice of law. I most appreciated those courses which forced me to analyze problems and probe for additional issues.

I can tell immediately when I face a graduate of Michigan Law School. They appear to be more competent than most.--I feel others feel the same about me.

The practice of Law and particularly Admiralty Law is the most challenging, satisfying, exciting and fulfilling occupation of which I am aware.

Too many people going into law schools - for wrong reasons: a) money vs service b) Lack of prof outlook c) too litigation minded.

I felt that U. of M. teachers, especially my first year, were outstanding! Especially Pierce - Julin - George - Cooperider.

Though I occasionally feel I'm not making enough money, I enjoy the freedom of being a sole practitioner and the variety of practice and experience I have had. My career could be more satisfying if I were willing to leave Tucson.
The caliber of teaching at the law school during my years in attendance was outstanding. The Socratic method is an effective way of teaching law. I do feel that law school did not adequately prepare me for my bar exam in Illinois in that it failed to teach the proper way to analyze a problem on an exam and how to write an answer. This could be done during the first semester of law school as part of a required course. I also feel there is insufficient emphasis on how to tackle the nitty gritty problem of setting fees and approaches to use with clients in this regard. Most lawyers seem to learn this the hard way, and I feel the law school should assume a role in this regard. The only other major criticism I have of the law school is that the placement office when I was there was terrific in placing law review students and woefully inadequate in placing the rest. The test of a placement office's effectiveness should be based upon how hard it works at placing "the rest."

One of the essential ingredients of any type of work, but especially law, is a person's ability to relate and interrelate well with other people. No matter how skillful or intelligent a person may be, if that person cannot communicate with others, gain their respect and confidence, they're lost.

Emphasis should be made both in pre-law and law school studies to develop the skill of people dynamics.

I was apparently well prepared by my college and law school as I have been relatively successful in other than monetary senses. I left a lucrative practice in Akron, Ohio, in December, 1977, to take up a "relaxful" practice in the "wilds" of Idaho.

I have four children, and would hope one or more enter the law.

I believe the case law system as prevailed at the Law School while I was there, could be beneficially modified to more emphasis on texts, etc.

Although students entering law school should have good writing skills, many graduate from law school without such skills. Creative writing as part of pre-law study should be encouraged. Additional study in traditional logic would also be worthwhile.

Why couldn't practicing lawyers take depositions in actual cases before groups of students? At a certain stage in the study of probate, students should review an actual court file in an instructive probate case. They should see the practical side of law, to the extent possible. They should get down to the courthouse.

Private practice for a small firm is a jungle. Too many young lawyers on the street willing to work for overhead expenses only, hoping for a big case to walk in. I fear for the future of the country as law schools produce lawyers with 7 years invested in an education who cannot find work as an employee and cannot support themselves in private practice. How will they vent their frustration? How do you relate to the world when clients who are executive secretaries & truck drivers earn more than their lawyer?
I guess the most appropriate thing I could say is thank you. As I sit here in my office on the 9th floor of the Stoddard Bldg. in Lansing looking out my window to the Capital, realizing I'm the president of an eleven man growing law firm, with origans as a railroad signal maintainers son, I catch a glimmer of the impact the law school has had on my life. If I had time, I'd write more, but today, I'm very busy. If the work is not performed, someone may invoke the "Peter principal" and the next report I delay in sending you may reflect my proven lack of promptness.

I've chosen college business law teaching as my "specialty." My experience has been that Michigan has really made a difference for me. I've been able to move from E.M.U. to Bemidji State University in Minn. and now to Univ. of Northern Colorado--always to a better position. In the last year, when I was applying for jobs I received offers (or) paid trips to campus to: Univ. of Mississippi, Univ of Miami (Fla), Calif State Univ-Fresno, Arkansas State, Montana State and Univ. of Northern Colorado. In almost every case the deciding factor in my receiving an offer or being a top finalist was MICHIGAN. But, I guess that's not news to you or the 5000+ that apply every year. GO BLUE!

My comments about curriculum change would not relate as much to course designation as content, emphasis and method of teaching. Most of the changes I favor have occurred since '63 including a softening of reliance only on case method and the introduction of new clinical opportunities.

Most graduates lack drafting ability.

I would not promote law as a career for my children because I have mixed feelings about the profession and my own career in it. However, I would be pleased if one or more of my children selected law as a career after a careful and independent evaluation. On the other hand, I believe the study of law could be beneficial for a number of business-oriented careers.

I believe that the primary purpose of the law school is to teach legal methods of thought. What substantive material is used in achieving this purpose is not particularly important. I do favor, however, a diverse curriculum with the number of offerings in each field sufficiently limited to result in required diversification. I oppose "practice" or "clinical" courses which attempt to provide the type of experience which is quickly gained in practice.

The law school curriculum (1960-63) was basically outmoded and irrelevant. Most professors had no practical experience and were obtuse. "How many angels can you fit on the end of a pin?" The case method has its place but not in every course--every day! Several of my classmates and I made this point during recorded conversations with Dr. Watson around 1960-61. Today I know that we were correct. Much wasted time in law school. A real Ivory Tower!
I think appreciably more emphasis on legal research, with emphasis on writing memoranda of law, briefs, contracts, etc., would be very helpful. I have some difficulty with the "all or nothing" exam approach, perhaps because I wasn't particularly adept at working within the time frame provided.

Freshman Property - particularly considering the significant of the course - was largely wasted in "future interests" (e.g. springing and shifting usee, etc.) and other areas which could have been more effectively treated in a legal history course.

My work, which has not really been described to this point, involves responsibility for informational, technical assistance and continuing legal educational services to Michigan's 550 prosecuting attorneys and assistants, and _____ --attorney members of their staffs.

I think the one outstanding characteristic of a good lawyer is his ability to be pragmatic when the situation so dictates. I do not think that this is developed sufficiently in the law schools, and, as a consequence, many inexperienced new lawyers waste their time and their clients' money by "overworking" a given problem.
18. A. The totality of the experience of entering the University of Michigan Law School without having been exposed to the discipline of legal analysis and then emerging from the law school as a graduate, eligible to take the Bar and be licensed as a lawyer is what contributed to my "present job ability." In essence, the question asked: "What has the University of Michigan Law School done for you?" To fully answer that question, one must understand the professional prospects which I brought to the law school: I was 29 years old, married and the father of two children, a book salesman in the Caribbean and South America for Prentice-Hall International, and one who had never been greatly exposed to lawyers and the law, and a member of a family which had never produced a member of a profession.

What graduating from the University of Michigan Law School did for me was to catapult me and my professional prospects onto a higher plateau which I am convinced I would never have achieved without graduating from the law school. I often state that working (Roy Proffitt, please note: and borrowing) my way through the law school is the most difficult and important thing I have ever done.

B. See above.

C. See attached resume.
XVIII. Postgraduate Information  
A. What of your Law School training is contributing most meaningfully to your present job ability?

The training which enabled me to think as an attorney.

---

Defining issues and problem solving. Concentration, inspiration, solution, result application of rules, policies to fact situations.

---

Long hours of drudgery. Skills not honed at Law School. Law School gives vocabulary, work habits and operating areas.

---

Negotiation tech & logic.

---

Ability to analyze all sides of a given situation and arrive at a decision.

---

Integrated Procedure Courses (Trials and Appeals, etc.) - Administrative Law courses which dealt with regulatory schemes.

---

Analytical skills/perspectives on legal education/ sensitivity to lawyer's role in society; law review experience in writing and editing.

---


---

Good overall substantive & procedural knowledge & reasoning ability.

---

Determination of the issue or issues involved and possible alternative resolutions (?) of the same. Ability to analyze a problem.

---

Legal methods of thought.

---

In general, the analytical skills developed through rigorous classroom work under superior professors.

---

Evidence, torts.

---

Exposure to talented professors & students. The course material contributed little to the practice of law.

---

Ability to recognize problem.

---

The ability to identify significant facts, evaluate probably consequences of available actions, and make decisions--derived largely from the case method of instruction.

---

Antitrust courses.

---

High quality of faculty, fellow students.

---

Legal reasoning and the practical application of the result.

---

The law school faculty and curriculum.

---

The teaching of Legal Analysis, thought and expression.
Property, Tax I & II, Seminar on Aspects of Property Contracts, Legal Accounting, Ethics, Torts.

Cannot attribute specific subject - General education proved valuable.

Ability to reason analytically.

Training to reason and think in a logical manner.

Think & reason.

Case analysis, research techniques, case club program.

Bus Org., Antitrust, Evidence, Procedure.

Freshman Property because it was the first most analytical.

Top notch competition--excellence of substantive courses.

Basic knowledge of contracts, torts and evidence.

Thinking/writing ability.

Legal thinking processes.

Legal reasoning.

Writing.

Estate Planning seminar, Taxation, Future Interests, Property.

Discussion of law with fellow students and as led and stretched by teachers.

The method of approaching legal problems that was taught by the majority of the teachers.

I learned how to read in law school by all the wading through the turgid syntax of all the cases.

The development of an approach to legal problems which requires your best effort--i.e. don't stop short of a full & complete job.

The gaining of ability to the concisely on my feet.

General training received during law school--i.e., the rigors of the curriculum and competition which taught a certain thinking process and discipline.

Logical thought processes.

Taxation, legal analysis training.
Ability to discipline thought, reasoning & expression.

Contract & corporate law. Living & participating in schooling & activities. with other future attorneys. Interrelating.

Just general legal training.

Law Review, Moot Court.

Reasoning and judgment.

All aspects.

Learning to think quickly and objectively--learning to see the issues--"All" basic course materials used on a regular basis.

The ability to absorb, digest and use large blocs of legal information, The ability to understand the philosophy & trend behind naked legal rule.

Probably the Socratic method which presumably helped in developing the ability to "think on your feet."

Training in analysis-ability to reason-dissect a problem.

Those courses where case book method used.

Criminal law, constitutional law, Evidence.

General training in thinking.

Necessity for self-discipline, courses in contracts, evidence, taxation, securities.

Not specific courses as much as the experience and the exposure to faculty and other students.

Thorough legal analysis.

Participation in class discussion.

Analysis of problems from numerous positions.

General approach to the law and ability to analyze issues.

Sound reasoning ability.

Law Review.

Contracts, Commercial law, Taxation.
Those generalized parts of classwork where we were made to "think like lawyers." However, I feel I learned much more about lawyering—speaking, writing, procedures, etc.—in my first year out of school than in all three years there. Someone like me needed a mandatory course in courtroom practice. I never saw a courtroom until I started practice.

Contracts—property—creditors rights—securities.

Contracts, constitutional law.

Actually, my graduate law work (at Michigan, and my outside reading (and the challenging atmosphere) while there.

Ability to recognize & analyze problems - to think logically.

Good teaching and all-round education.

Training in discipline and ability to see issues.

The ability to explain US legal practices to non-Americans.

Problem analysis.

The disciplined approach to a set of facts.

Analytical thinking processes.

Courses in torts, procedure, and evidence.

The method of teaching—to recognize a problem and how to go about solving it.

Contracts.

Factual and legal analysis; precision in writing and speaking.

Trial procedure.

Learning to think like a lawyer - realizing that the other side has positions too.

Ability to analyze problems.

Classroom discussions.

General legal education—good solid background in fundamentals.

General concepts of legal analysis & structure.

The ability to think about and analyze legal problems and applying some of the rules of law learned.

Ability to analyze a problem & offer meaningful solutions to the problem.
Analytical -- writing.

Contracts & remedies.

The ability to think & analyze.

Training in analytical and logical thinking.

Commercial Law courses; Contracts and Remedies.

Diligent work habits.

Law Review; Case Club and National Moot Court Team Competition; Legal writing courses.

Torts, Trial Practice and over-all hard work.

General understanding of legal principles and legal reasoning.

Law Review.

Contracts, Taxation, Analytical Ability, International Law.

The ability to think on one's feet. The thinking process itself once basic information is learned.

Law Review writing experience, general logical and problem solving discipline.

Estate Planning, Taxation.

The ability to see all the facts of a problem.

Synthesize.

Coping with the competition.

Law Review.

Tax, Property, Con Law, Contracts & Ucc, Reed's courses.

Knowledge of the reasons for Common & Statutory Law.

Analysis under pressure--I guess that came from any classroom and various exams--Labor Law, of course, the integrated procedure courses and Dr. Watson's Law & Psychiatry seminar.

Exposure to Cosmopolitan student body and excellent faculty.

General training in legal reasoning.

Law Review; Trial Practice; procedure and Evidence; Contracts; torts; business associations.
General legal education, particularly 1st year courses.

Basic courses i.e. Real Property, T & E, Contracts, Con Law, Evidence, J & J.

Courses in commercial transactions--contracts, property, secured transactions.

Courses in Unfair Trade Practices & Antitrust--expectations at U of M of intellectual clarity & ability, program in Moot Court.

Over-all training.

Legal analysis; special program in procedure.

Intensive familiarization with case method of dealing with and solving legal problems.

Very little directly.

Development of work habits.

Can't really answer this in any meaningful way--it is the totality of the experience which is crucial.

Reed's Evidence; Moot court competition; Cooperrider's jurisdiction & Judgments.

Legal analyses.

Ability carefully to analyze facts & law. Also substantive law.

Ability to think clearly and analyze issues.

General background in any field of law has been helpful.

Study methods and exam taking methods.

Legal analysis.

Ability to analyze legal problems in a meaningful way.

Anti-trust law course & seminar, trade regulations and patent law.

Ability to analyze issues & derive issues from facts.

Contact and competition with other students.

Rather than any training, it was the ambience at the Law School that has left the greatest mark.

Analytical training.
Ability to analyze problems & situations & find their components—determining the important issues in these problems.

General stress on careful analysis of law & good legal writing.

Analytical style, generally—writing specifically.

The discipline (mental & physical) of hard work and attention to detail; legal writing; whatever in law school taught us to explore all facets of a problem; legal research.

General training in legal analysis & basic courses.

Knowledge of law.

Enhanced ability to think, see problems and opportunities.

I have an eight person law firm with some CPA applications—I suppose the entire Law School training comes to bear at one point or another.

Use initiative—devise novel solutions to legal problems.

Socratic Method—ability to define & solve problems.

Tax courses.

Legal writing, case analysis.

Critical thinking.

Training in a systematic approach to solving legal problems, training in the history, evolution and structure of our and other legal systems.

Ability to reason.

The emphasis on preparation, analysis and assembly of facts has contributed most meaningfully.

Analytical approach to analysis of issues and problems.

Business-related courses—contracts, commercial, taxes (at law firm, appellate work & litigation in large contract cases).

The ability to think through multi-issued problems and discard the unimportant facts.

Legal research and understanding of the legal system.

Classroom teaching.

The ability to analyze a factual situation and pinpoint the relevant and important issues.
Refinement of problem solving attitude towards work duties.

Overall quality.

All aspects.

Discipline.

Overall education.

Research training.

Courses in taxation.

General ability to reason thru problems; ability to write solutions.

Analysis required by Prof. Bishop--Admiralty, Int Law & Con Law & Labor Law courses.

Tax courses.

Law Review was very important. General attitude of first year teachers was very important.

Probably the daily grind of reading and analyzing cases, trying to pass the courses and graduate.

Discipline, organization, writing.

Emphasis on ability to reason--use logic & practical persuasion.

Legal reasoning and writing.

Training in analytical method derived from basic curriculum courses, moot court and Law Review.

All the traditional substantive courses, plus exam and paper writing.

Analytical skills.

Tax Class.

Basic legal training in general--evidence, etc.

The law school experience itself.

Discipline.

Ability to analyze complex situations.

The ability to effectively utilize imaginative and resourceful thinking.
Trained me to think legally i.e. in a disciplined and dispassionate matter; and instilled a sense of what is & what is not fair play.

Ability to analyze problems, organize issues & present responses, both verbally & in writing, in a coherent fashion.

Ability to analyze and recognize legal issues; in other words, the development of the thinking process itself.

Training in analyzing of problems to arrive at the heart of the problem.

(1) Training to reason out problems; (2) Solid substantive law background, and (3) Law Review writing & editing experience.

Law Review; general classroom instruction.

Nothing in particular.

Approaching Problems logically, with careful analysis.

Complete & thorough analysis of problems-isolation of legal issues- Law School's approach to problem solving-discipline of daily study habits and need to be well prepared.

Identification of issues, sorting out real from theoretical problems, clarity of thought.

Study discipline of sticking with difficult or unpleasant tasks until resolved.

The development of the ability to analyze conflicting or varying fact situations and arrive at supportable conclusions.

Clear & logical thinking.

Ability to think logically.

Legal thinking, reasoning.

Constitutional law, case clubs, torts, contracts.

Law Review.

All of it but particularly corp & anti-trust from content standpoint but analytical thinking & questioning learned at law school are most important too.

all.

Development of analytical thought processes; issue discrimination; sense of relevancy.

Reasonably well balanced.