Modern Legal Education:
Keeping Pace with a Changing Society
Contents

2 Modern Legal Education
3 An overview of curriculum innovations and teaching methods used today v. yesterday
Alumni News and Notes
6 Annual Dinner, Class reunions; Bar Exam results
Legal Briefs
8 What's happening with our classmates and fellow alumni
Alumni Chapter Activities
10 Orange County and Riverside/San Bernardino Chapter Events
On Campus
11 300-year-old Lawbook donated to Law Library
Board of Governors
12 Upcoming election information; new committees formed
Board of Visitors
13 New members join Board; Orientation meeting held
The California Determinate Sentencing Act:
The Problem of Vagueness
In-depth analysis of sentencing revisions and related constitutional issues
by Professor Gerald R. Uelman
Faculty Forum
20 Activities and accomplishments of Loyola faculty members
The focus of this issue of the Loyola Lawyer is on the Law School curriculum. The lead article provides a brief, but balanced, overview of key historic developments in law teaching as well as an explanation of notable techniques currently in use. While many changes in legal education have occurred during the past ten years, there exists the possibility of far more dramatic change in the not too distant future because of several national studies that are currently in progress.

Speaking broadly, these studies are expected to provide a detailed examination of the processes and products of legal education. They promise to clarify the transition from student to lawyer. Three examples will illustrate the work being undertaken. One project is examining the teaching processes in law school and the effects of these processes on students' professional expectations, their attitudes toward the profession and the law, and the development of skill and role competencies. Another study is examining the practicing bars' views of legal education, including its relationship to career development. Particular attention will be given to the role that law schools have had, and should have, in the development of skills important to the practice of law. Finally, another project is examining the development of law teaching materials — especially, the casebook — in historical context and will review the current state of the art and conclude by making recommendations for the direction that experiments with the production of instructional material ought to take over the next few decades.

The impact, if any, of the information and recommendations produced by this research and analysis remains to be seen. The important point to note is that, for the first time in the history of American legal education, a significant effort is being made to introspectively analyze the contribution that law schools make in the training of lawyers. It will be some time before this work is completed. Once published, time will be needed to critically evaluate these studies with a view toward examining the need for change in curriculum and methodology. It may be that the fierce debate sparked by the introduction of the case method a century ago will be insignificant when compared to the debates which undoubtedly will follow the completion of these important works.
Modern Legal Education
Curriculum Responsive to a Changing Society

The past decade has been a period of unprecedented growth and adaptation in the field of legal education. American law schools have responded to the demands of over a million college graduates annually, an increasing percentage of whom are now seeking post-graduate and professional education. The law schools have also felt a need for bridging the ever-increasing gulf between conventional academe and a rapidly changing urban society. Add to that the professional requirements of the practicing legal community and it creates a situation significantly different than most law schools were originally designed to serve.

Law schools in general have responded to their changing role in a variety of ways. Legal education has undergone a remarkable transition to fill the gap caused by the "legal explosion" of the 1960's whose after-shocks are still shaking the foundations of most institutions. The principle modus operandi adopted by many schools to meet the challenge of modern legal education has been a revamping, updating, and re-directing of curriculm, often in a haphazard manner. Loyola Law School has certainly not been immune to the pressures of modern legal education, but we have attempted to plan curricular changes with a policy of controlled growth.

Until the early 1960's, Loyola offered only a basic core curriculum of some 30 courses. The type and number of classes available have increased steadily, and today we have developed more than 100 required and elective courses and have established a growing reputation as a leading exponent of urban law. Practical and theoretical courses are blended to enhance the law student's ability to develop professional skills based upon sound legal reasoning. Professors approach students in their first year of law school using the Socratic method - which increases logical and thorough understanding of legal principles. In later semesters, this basic framework is expanded through the student's choice of a wide variety of elective options which can focus on specialized areas of law.

Students are required to successfully complete 87 total semester units in good standing in order to graduate from Loyola, of which the majority — 51 units — are in required courses. These required classes constitute a "core curriculum" which is designed to give the student a solid foundation in the major areas of the law, on which the student may build in the later years of law school and for the entirety of his or her professional career. The required curriculum consists of Civil Procedure, Civil Procedure Workshop, Contracts, Criminal Law, Property and Torts, all taken during the first year; Constitutional Law, Corporations, Criminal Procedure and Evidence in the second year; and Legal Ethics and a course of a statutory nature, typically taken during a day student's third and final year. The evening student must take the same required courses, but they are spread over a four-year period. The remaining 36 units of electives, often times involving specialization in a particular area of law, are chosen with the assistance of a faculty advisor who is assigned to the student at the outset of the first year of studies.

Loyola Law School is dedicated to giving its students a comprehensive education so that its graduates may function effectively as attorneys in today's society.

Loyola has been fortunate to have a Jesuit heritage which forms the foundation for outstanding legal education. Perceiving the curriculum and practical applications of theory is an ethical standard, a system of values and moral order. This heritage is the quality which makes Loyola Law School special in comparison to other law schools.

This heritage is also evident in the fact that Loyola is one of the oldest law schools in Southern California, and is the direct descendant of St. Vincent's College, the first institution of higher education in the area. It was founded as the St. Vincent School of Law and began offering evening classes in September 1920. This post-World War I period marked the end of a turbulent era in American legal education which brought about the acceptance and institutionalization of a revolutionary method of teaching law — the "case method."

Legal education in America, in its recognizably modern form, began with Dean Christopher C. Langdell's introduction of the "case method" to the Harvard Law School in 1870. Langdell pioneered the concept that the law was a science, that this science consisted of relatively few principles, and that these principles could be apprehended through reading the judgements of appellate courts, which contained the laboratory materials of the law.

The "case method" transformed an historically diversified entre into the legal profession and generated heated controversy and extensive debate among the law faculty of the era. Over the years, the so-called "Harvard system" of legal education went through fierce criticism and gradual change through partial accommodation to the views of critics. Much of the development of American legal education in this...
The historical roots of legal education extend, of course, much further back in time. Law, as one of the three oldest learned professions, along with medicine and theology, serves as an excellent illustration of the old adage, "The more things change, the more they stay the same." It is, perhaps, curious to note that law schools today are again stressing many of the practical applications of legal training which have been the primary source of teaching since the time of Socrates.

For thousands of years students of the law were, in essence, serving an apprenticeship to a learned master of the already complex body of socio-religious dogma, codes, family, property, and trade laws which abounded in the ancient Mediterranean cultures. A student learned the law through experience, not formal education. Babylonian, Egyptian, and Greco-Roman law were interpreted and transmitted through the generations not by way of a university classroom, but through the close personal training of a seasoned legal practitioner who guided the aspiring law student in the practical and philosophical aspects of the law as applied to their society. This was particularly true until the time of the Romans who made one of the first successful efforts to construct a system of law which was codified and binding on the citizens of the Roman Empire.

During the Middle Ages, the volume of written legal documents and precedent were compiled and codified in the Canons of the Church. Monastic training developed the formal, theoretical legal education which gradually evolved during the Renaissance period into a formalized curriculum. Classroom lecture and theoretical knowledge superceded the practical method of teaching which the legal profession had relied upon for centuries.

The Anglo-American tradition of Common Law promulgated a system of legal education which stressed lecture and legal points of issue based upon a strictly theoretical classroom approach. Legal education in America became probably the only professional training which was entirely based upon theory, with little or no practical links to the outside world. American law schools during the 18th through mid-20th centuries graduated lawyers who had never entered a courtroom. It was felt by many in the field during this period, and to some extent even today, that this purely academic approach to legal education was proper and necessary to impart a sound basis for legal analysis to a student. After graduation, the new attorney was traditionally hired by a law firm and "learned the ropes" of practical legal areas through many years of gradual training by other members of the firm.

Times have changed, however, and we have witnessed a transition in legal education which has come nearly full-circle in the past decade. Law school teaching methods in general have begun to emerge from pure theoretical models back into the "real world" of current social issues and practical training for the students in specialized areas of the law.

This has become a sensitive and vital area of legal education today, partly influenced by the large number of law graduates, and the selective tendency of law firms to hire and train only the top students in each class. Also, with pressure being exerted by various professional organizations and prominent members of the bench and bar calling for more accountability on the part of law schools to provide not only the theoretical base of knowledge but also to insure the practical
competence of graduates, law schools are faced with an ever-increasing share of responsibility in the training of students and practicing members of the legal profession to help them keep pace with rapidly changing realities.

This emerging trend in modern legal education is evidenced at Loyola Law School in three areas, each of which represents novel means of increasing relevancy of the curriculum. These three areas are: Trial Advocacy Courses; Clinical Programs; and a practicum of Continuing Legal Education.

The Trial Advocacy Courses involve a simulation of an actual courtroom situation, in which the student can practice actual trial techniques. Loyola offers two different forms of Trial Advocacy as a basic teaching and learning tool for advanced students. Civil Trial Advocacy and Criminal Trial Advocacy are three-unit courses offered in multiple sections, each of which allows a maximum enrollment of only 25 students in order to keep the student/faculty ratio as low as possible.

Students are assigned individual cases for simulated litigation which allows them an opportunity to analyse all aspects of a trial, including pre-trial motions, trial briefs, the voir dire, settlement negotiations, jury selection tactics, opening statement, order of proof, direct and cross examination, closing arguments, and sentencing.

Student performances in these sessions are video-taped using a remote-controlled video/audio recording and playback system. This allows the professor and fellow students an opportunity for close scrutiny and critique of each student's courtroom manner.

Professors in the Trial Advocacy classes also have the option of using outside guest lecturers in areas such as commercial litigation, malpractice, and other specialized fields of law. In addition to refining practical courtroom skills, the courses also raise questions of ethical conduct by counsel. This practical learning experience builds upon a thorough theoretical education in the classroom, the traditional courses in Civil Procedure, Criminal Law, and Evidence are each prerequisites to the Trial Advocacy classes. The Trial Advocacy Courses themselves devote additional time to theoretical matters which, when combined with the direction of the Trial Advocacy faculty and the audiovisual critique capability, produce a high degree of personal improvement and professional motivation in the students.

A factor which makes this course particularly beneficial for the student, and a feature which is indeed unique to Loyola is that a student who has completed the Criminal Trial Advocacy course is eligible to participate in the District Attorney Practicum offered through the Clinical Program; this allows for even further melding of the theoretical and practical aspects of legal education.

The concept of Clinical Education is now a decade old and still rapidly developing. Some controversy is generated in the legal community and amongst law school faculty about this pragmatic approach to legal education, but it is clearly a significant trend in modern law curriculum which is being evaluated and adopted on a large scale across the United States.

Loyola Law School provides its students not only with a theoretical understanding of legal concepts, principles, and precedent but encourages them, through an extensive clinical program, to utilize this knowledge.

The Loyola Law Clinics is an in-house proprietary law firm founded in 1969, and staffed by five full-time attorneys who carry the title of Clinical Professor. Several specialized practicums have been developed at the in-house clinics, with the principle
concentration devoted to law as applied to an urban society. Students in other clinical programs are placed with various state and federal public law offices, judges, and administrative agencies.

Students enrolled in the Law School's clinical program receive a wide variety of exposure to the practical side of law. Students handle assigned cases and represent clients in judicial proceedings. Some students also receive limited trial experience under supervision of an attorney as permitted by the State Bar's Rules for the Practical Training of Law Students.

Students are given a choice of wide variety of clinical experiences. The Loyola Law Clinics expose students to the general practice of law in a community setting. Clinics in Trial and Appellate Advocacy enable students to participate in civil and criminal trials and in law reform litigation.

Administrative Agency Practicum gives students an opportunity to participate in the legal work of important government agencies from the inside. Judicial Clerkship practicum offers the student the opportunity of working closely with a judge in order to gain a greater appreciation of the court system from the judge's perspective. All of these programs are tied to academic components in which the legal and social significance of the student's experiences can be discussed and analyzed.

Loyola Law Clinics by area of concentration are:

A. CIVIL LAW
- Civil Division, Loyola Law Clinics
- Civil Litigation
- Consumer Affairs
- Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles (Alvarado)
- Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles (East Los Angeles)
- Prisoners' Rights and Remedies (Frontera)

B. TRIAL ADVOCACY
- County Public Defender
- District Attorney
- Drug Abuse Division, Loyola Law Clinics
- Federal Public Defender
- Juvenile Division, Loyola Law Clinics
- Los Angeles City Attorney
- State Public Defender
- U.S. Attorney

C. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY
- California Department of Corporations
- Environmental Protection Practicum
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
- Securities Exchange Commission
- Small Business Administration

D. LOCAL GOVERNMENT
- Civil Practice
- Governmental Internships

E. JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
- Court of Appeal
- Los Angeles Municipal Courts
- Los Angeles Superior Courts
- U.S. District Court Magistrates

It is anticipated that as our urban society changes and new needs are to be confronted, other clinics may be established and operated for the benefit of the community and as part of the educational process for the student.

These innovative forms of curriculum have been specifically oriented to the law student. However, various professional organizations and law schools have begun to recognize the crucial need for providing effective Continuing Legal Education for the practicing bar. For this reason and as a service to its own alumni, Loyola Law School initiated an extensive CLE program in Fall 1975 which offers courses of timely and growing concern to the legal profession. New issues in California general corporation law, real property, lessor remedies, architects and engineers liability, criminal statutes and other developing legislation, have been the topics of the Loyola CLE program to date.

Continuing Legal Education is seen as an area of growing concern within the profession. The ABA, various State Bar's, and other professional organizations have engaged in a serious debate on the direction and purpose of CLE. Most call for a greater emphasis on CLE to keep the practicing bar informed concerning the constant, if not overwhelming revision of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations.

Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren E. Burger recently focused on the need for CLE to overcome the alleged incompetence of American trial advocates. In whatever way the continuing debate is resolved, it has become clear that CLE will become an integral part of many law school's curriculum as a commitment to modern legal education.

Loyola's CLE program is helping to meet the needs of hundreds of attorneys and alumni in Southern California by offering both Spring and Fall classes. It is planned that the Loyola CLE program will continue to grow in the future as a vital part of its educational mission.

What else does the future hold in store for Loyola Law School, and how will the school's approach to legal education and curriculum change with the times? These are questions of vital interest as new innovations already on the horizon indicate the increased use of computerized legal classroom training, the effects of declining college enrollment, the ever-changing role of the bar and the judiciary, and other significant social variations which will alter the traditional faculty/student relationship, perhaps as drastically as the innovation of the "case method" a century ago.

How well Loyola Law School faces up to these demands on modern legal education will determine the future growth and development of the Law School. Loyola has already responded by building a core curriculum of traditional courses supplemented and balanced by a full range of courses which allow the student to blend the theoretical with the practical. Future adaptations will be carefully evaluated and skillfully implemented as the school attempts to formulate plans for the direction of private legal education at Loyola in the 1980's and beyond.
Alumni News and Notes

A Toast to the Bar—Alumni enjoy the festivities at the second annual reception for graduates who passed the California Bar Examination in 1977. The event was hosted by the Loyola Law School Alumni Association on February 23 at the Los Angeles Athletic Club.

Bar Examination Results

Results of the July 1977 State Bar Examination indicate that Loyola Law School ranked fourth among all California law schools in the percentage passing rate of those taking the exam for the first time. Test data released by the Committee of Bar Examiners in San Francisco show that 240 out of 283 Loyola Law School graduates taking the test passed. This is a success rate of 84.6%, a slight improvement over our score the previous year at this time.

Loyola graduates scored considerably higher than the statewide average passing rate of 54.6%, and were nearly 10% better than the 75.4% first-time passing rate of the other 14 ABA accredited law schools in California.

Still unofficial statewide rankings of the top ten law schools show:
- McGeorge School of Law: 91.5%
- Whittier College: 87.2%
- Boalt Hall: 85.9%
- Loyola: 84.6%
- USC: 81.9%
- UCLA: 78.1%
- UC Davis: 77.5%
- Stanford: 77.1%
- U of San Diego: 76.0%
- Santa Clara: 74.9%

The Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California announced in December that a record 7,246 candidates took the General Bar Examination and that 3,958 passed the first time.

A reception was held February 23 at the Los Angeles Athletic Club for the Loyola Law School graduates who passed the California Bar Exam in 1977. Some 125 new Loyola Lawyers enjoyed the annual festivities hosted by the Alumni Association.

Alumni Banquet

The Loyola Law School Alumni Association sponsored the Annual Alumni/Advocates Dinner Dance on Friday, April 14 at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. Over 200 Law School alumni, friends, students, and guests attended this gala event which for the first time featured a combination of the traditional Alumni Association and The Advocates banquets.

Cocktails and dinner were served in the Le Petit and Le Grand Trianon rooms, followed by awards ceremonies honoring several distinguished members of the Law School community.

Master of Ceremonies for the evening was Laurence G. Preble ’68, president of the Alumni Association, the Invocation was given by Rev. Donald F. Mennifield, S.J., president of Loyola Marymount University, and Frederick J. Lower, Jr. ’64, dean of Loyola Law School, presented a profile of the Law School today and future plans for development.

Co-Honorees for the dinner were Fritz B. Burns, president of Fritz B. Burns and Associates of Los Angeles, and Theodore A. (Ted) Von der Ahe ’31, chairman of Von’s Grocery Company, El Monte. Both of these men have a long association with Loyola Marymount University, and serve as Honorary Co-Chairmen of the Loyola Law School Board of Visitors.

Two faculty members received special recognition for 25 years of service to Loyola Law School. Professors Clemence M. (Clem) Smith ’48 and Lloyd Tevis ’50 were honored for their years of teaching a generation of law students.

The Annual Alumni Association Award was also presented at the dinner to Michael F. Newman ’78, past Student Bar Association — Day Division President, for service to the Law School.

Serving on the Alumni Association Board of Governors Special Events Committee which coordinated the dinner were David M. Finkle ’67, chairman, and Alvin N. Loskamp ’68.
Class of 1952 Reunion

The Loyola Law School Class of 1952 held their 25-Year Reunion on October 28, 1977 at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles. Alan R. Woodard, chairman of the Reunion Committee, announced that a class gift amounting to $16,500 was pledged at the event to establish an endowed class fund for the Law School.

Assisting Woodard in the successful quarter-century celebration attended by 29 alumni and guests were Odra L. Chandler, Richard L. Franck, Kenneth W. Gale, Thomas E. Garcin, Merle H. Sandler, and Marshall Schulman.

Also at the reunion were Dean and Mrs. Frederick J. Lower, Jr., '64, Professor and Mrs. J. Rex Dibble, Professor Clemence M. (Clem) Smith '48, Mrs. Sidney Morgan, former Registrar at the Law School, and her husband, John Morgan.

Class of 1942 Reunion

Law School alumni from the Class of 1942 gathered at the California Club in Los Angeles on October 5 to celebrate their 35th Class Reunion. Arthur B. Willis, partner in the Los Angeles law firm of Willis, Butler, Scheifly, Leydorf & Grant, served as chairman for the Reunion Committee. Assisting Willis on the Reunion Committee were Carl M. Gould and Robert Nibley, both with the Los Angeles firm of Hill, Farrer & Burrill.

Classmates joining the organizing committee at the affair were Jack Carlow, Deputy City Attorney, City of Los Angeles; Mark Mullin, attorney at law; C. Arthur Nisson, Jr., partner in the firm of Miller, Nisson & Kogler, Los Angeles; and Clement F. Von Lunenschloss, attorney at law.

Dean and Mrs. Frederick J. Lower, Jr., '64 attended the banquet along with Professor and Mrs. J. Rex Dibble.

The Class of 1942 has pledged over $9,000 to establish an endowed class fund at the Law School. It is planned that additional pledges and gifts will increase this endowed class fund in the future.
**1930's**

Hon. Walter S. Binns '39 is supervising volunteer attorneys who practice in the Harbor area now serving as judges potem in the Los Angeles Municipal Court, Division 88 in San Pedro. Hon. Thomas W. LeSage '37 has been assigned to handle civil jury and non-jury actions in the Central District Superior Courthouse. Hon. John A. Shidler '35 has been assigned to the Southeast District Superior Court, Norwalk.

**1940's**

Hon. Thomas C. Murphy '40 has been assigned to the North Central District Superior Court, Burbank and Glendale. Hon. Burch Donahue '46 has been assigned to the Southwest District Superior Court, Torrance. Hon. Carroll M. Dunnum '46 has been assigned supervising judge for the second year to the South District Superior Court, Long Beach. Hon. Ernest L. Kelly '48 has been assigned to the South District Superior Court, Long Beach. Hon. Robert C. Nye '48 has been assigned to handle civil jury and non-jury action in the Central District Superior Courthouse. He was also presented the Alfred J. McCourtney Memorial Award by the Los Angeles Trial Lawyer's Association at their annual installation dinner. Hon. Raymond R. Roberts '48 has been assigned to the Northwest District Superior Court, Van Nuys. Paul Caruso '49 has been elected president of the newly-formed Italian-American Lawyers Association. Justice Lynn D. Compton '49 has been elected installing officer for the Culver City Bar Association. Hon. Otto M. Kaus '49 was the guest speaker at a seminar sponsored by the Planning and Training Division of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. Hon. L. Harold Chullie '49 has been elected presiding judge of the Imperial Municipal Court system.

**1950's**

Jason J. Gale '50 has been installed as second vice-president of the South Bay Bar Association. Hon. Francis X. Marnell '50 has been assigned to handle civil jury and non-jury actions in the Central District Superior Courthouse. Mark P. Robinson '50 has received the American Board of Trial Advocates "Most Outstanding Trial Attorney" award at the organization's annual dinner. He has also addressed the San Diego Lawyers Association on questions relating to Evidence Code Sec. 352. Hon. August J. Goebel '54, Los Angeles Superior Court, was among the roster of seminar panelists at the California Trial Lawyers Association in San Francisco. He has been assigned to the Southwest District Superior Court, Torrance. Hon. Eugene McClosky '51 has been assigned to handle civil jury and non-jury actions in the Central District Superior Courthouse. Hon. J. Wesley Reed '52 has been assigned to handle civil jury and non-jury action in the Central District Superior Courthouse. Hill Sayble '57 addressed a luncheon meeting of the Lawyers Club on "Evaluation of the Profitable Case." Hon. Robert C. Todd '57 has been appointed to the Orange County Superior Court by Governor Edmund C. Brown, Jr. In addition he has been appointed by the California Judges Association Executive Board to fill the unexpired term of Judge Robert E. Rickles, who was elevated to the Orange County Superior Court. Also, he has been appointed presiding judge of the Orange County Harbor Municipal Court. Daniel W. Holden '58 has been elected Director from the North Orange County Judicial District to the Board of Directors of the Orange County Bar Association. He has also been elected president of the Orange County Bar Association. Hon. Roy L. Norman '58, Rio Honda Municipal Court, has been selected as secretary-treasurer for a new organization formed by the presiding judges of the Municipal Courts of Los Angeles County. The purpose of the organization is to solve the problems that mutually affect the individual court districts. Tom R. Breslin '59 has been installed as the first vice-president of the Glendale Bar Association. Robert R. Waestman '59 has recently been installed as secretary-treasurer of the Long Beach Bar Association.

**1960's**

Herbert G. Blitz '60 has been elected president of the Criminal Court's Bar Association. He also recently addressed new admits at a seminar sponsored by the Criminal Bar Association on "Voir Dire and Jury Selection." Hon. Peter S. Smith '60 was appointed presiding judge of the Superior Court, Juvenile and Mental Health Department, for a second year. Ralph W. Miller Jr. '61 has been promoted to Senior Counsel in the corporate Law Department of Dar Industries, Inc. Loren A. Sutton '61, assistant district attorney of Santa Barbara County, was the master of ceremonies at the Board of Governors of Legal Secretaries, Inc. Loren Miller, Jr. '62 has been appointed to the Los Angeles Superior Court Bench by Governor Edmund G. Brown. He has been assigned to the East District Court, Pomona. Mary F. Beaudry '62 and Joanne S. Rocks '70 presented an estate planning seminar at the Loyola Marymount campus on March 8. Johnnie L. Cochran '62, criminal defense attorney, has been named "Criminal Trial Lawyer of the Year" for 1977 by the Criminal Courts Bar Association. He has also been named assistant district attorney, the third highest post in the district attorney's office. John P. Killeen '63 authored "The 20-Day Preliminary Notice in Private Construction Work" in the August 1977 issue of the L.A. Bar Journal. He authored "Owner Liability for Construction Costs" in the November/December 1977 California State Bar Journal. Frederick J. Lower, Jr. '64, Dean of Loyola Law School, has been selected as a Fellow by the American Bar Association and has been appointed to the newly formed Executive Committee of the Committee on Legal Education of the State Bar. James Krueger '65 has been elected president-elect of the Western Trial Lawyers Association; is the second lawyer in Hawaii to be inducted into the International Society of Barristers, and has been appointed to the Board of Barristers of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. Joseph C. Battaglia '65 is the new first vice president of the Italian-American Lawyers of California. Patricia A. Lobello '67 has been
elected treasurer of the Italian-American Lawyers of California. Lynne D. Finney ’67 is the first woman to be appointed Director of the Office of Industry Development of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a regulatory agency for the savings and loan industry. W.C. Fields, III ’68, the comedian’s grandson, is the proud father of W.C. Fields, IV, who made his debut in September 1977 at seven pounds and fourteen ounces.

Wayne K. Lemieux ’68 authored “Land Use Control by Utility Service Moratorium: The Wrong Solution to the Right Problem” in the November 1977 L.A. Bar Journal. Laurence G. Preble ’68 was master of ceremonies at the Loyola Law School Alumni luncheon of the State Bar Convention. Benjamin Aranda III ’69 has been elected president of the National La Raza Bar Association. He has also been elected Trustee of the L.A. County Bar Association. Kenneth Lee Chotiner ’69 has been elected treasurer of the Black Attorneys of Los Angeles. John L. Guth ’70 has opened his office for civil litigation offices in Encino. John F. Benson ’71 has announced the opening of his corporate law, securities regulations and international business law and international business. Donald Peckner ’76 has edited, in conjunction with E. I. Sherman, Handbook of Stainless Steels. Donald is the associate editor for Encyclopedia of Engineering Materials & Processes. Christopher Rea ’76 has announced his appointment with the firm of Morgan, Wenzel & McLennons in Los Angeles.

Gibbons ’75 has announced his partnership in the firm of Billbary, Gibbons & Pitaro in Las Vegas, Nevada. Jeffrey G. Sheldon ’75 has been elected secretary-treasurer of the Pasadena Young Lawyers. Jess J. Araujo ’76 has been elected vice-president of the Mexican-American Bar Association. He is also searching for heirs in a $400,000 land dispute in Texas. Kathryn A. Balsson ’76 authored the article “A Warning to United States: A Hollow Victory for the Jeopardy Tax Payer” in the July/August 1977 Beverly Hills Bar Association Journal. Patrick L. Garofalo ’76 has opened law offices in Beverly Hills. James R. Gotcher ’76 has announced his association with David L. Shapiro, forming the firm Gotcher & Shapiro. The firm will emphasize immigration law and international business. Donald Peckner ’76 has edited, in conjunction with E. I. Sherman, Handbook of Stainless Steels. Donald is the associate editor for Encyclopedia of Engineering Materials & Processes. Christopher Rea ’76 has announced his association with the firm of Morgan, Wenzel & McLennons in Los Angeles. Laurie J. Bernhard ’77 has won second prize in the 1977 Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition. Her winning essay was entitled, “Infringements & Damages in Violations of Copyright Monopolies: Protection for the Musical Artist.” Peter L. Clino ’77 has been appointed as assistant to the chairman of the Board of the investment banking firm of Cantor, Fitzgerald & Company.

In Memoriam

Condolences are extended for Robert D. Lynch ’72 who was fatally injured by an intruder in his Pasadena home on February 13, 1978. Mr. Lynch is survived by his widow, Heidi, two small children, and his brother, Patrick S. Lynch, a member of the Loyola Law School adjunct faculty. Mr. Lynch had been named as a partner in the firm of Agnew, Miller & Carlson, Los Angeles, effective January 1, 1978. Funeral services were held at St. Bede’s Catholic Church on February 16, burial was at Holy Cross Cemetery.

At the request of his partners, classmates and friends a memorial fund will be established. Additional information regarding this fund will be forthcoming.

1970’s

John L. Guth ’70 has opened his office for general practice in Yuba City. Joanne S. Rocks ’70 and Mary E. Beadnry ’62 presented an estate planning seminar at the Loyola Marymount campus on March 8.

Gary M. Butterberg ’70 has announced the formation of the law offices Butterberg and Tanzman in Los Angeles. Cynthia M. Ryan ’70 has been appointed to the position of vice-president and general counsel of California Life Insurance Company, a subsidiary of California Life Corporation. Stephen C. Taylor ’70 has been elected treasurer of the San Fernando Valley Bar Association. Kathryn Doi Todd ’70 has been appointed assistant prosecutor in the district attorney’s office. Gordon S. Benson ’71 has announced the opening of his corporate law, securities regulations and civil litigation offices in Encino. John E. Sawyer ’71 has been named new director of the Orange County Bar Association’s Lawyer Referral Service. Herbert F. Blaich ’71 has been installed as first vice-president of Phi Alpha Delta, Los Angeles Alumni Chapter. Richard Douglas Brew ’71 is engaged in International Business Law and Finance, the first to be based in London, England. Gary E. Overstreet ’71 has been installed as marshall of the Phi Alpha Delta, Los Angeles Alumni Chapter. Rosemary Garcia ’72 has been nominated to the National Science Foundation’s Committee on Science Education. Michael C. Mitchell ’72 authored “Not Separate But Equal: Community Property and the ‘Reformed’ Marital Deduction” in October 1977 L.A. Bar Journal. Susanne C. Wylie ’72 was one of the co-editors of the symposium issue of the Los Angeles Bar Journal, September 1977. Mark P. Robinson, Jr. ’72 Thomas E. Coleman ’73 was the main speaker at the January meeting of the Gay Law Students Union of Los Angeles. Dr. Selwyn Rose ’73 addressed the California Attorneys for Criminal Justice on “A Psychiatrist Looks Back at the Attorney and the Judge Looks at Both.” Carol E. Schatz ’73 has been installed as the corresponding secretary for the Women’s Lawyers Association of Los Angeles. David E. Tripp ’73 was the first place winner in the Third Annual West Publishing Company Lawyers Art Contest. Mr. Tripp was the winner of the first contest held in 1975. Richard W. Wright ’73 has been appointed assistant professor at Yeshiva University’s Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, New York. Keith G. Burt ’74 has been elected treasurer of the Black Attorneys of San Diego County. Teresa P. Carr ’74 has announced her association with Shephard & DeGraw in Huntington Beach. Timothy D. Takata ’74 has authored his first novel, The Last Exam, a story of the making of a lawyer. Stephen A. McKee ’74 has been appointed by City Attorney Burt Pines, assistant supervisor of the Van Nuys criminal branch. Ronald K. L. Collins ’75 has chaired a two-day constitutional law conference at Southwestern Law School. He is presently collecting essays for a forthcoming book. Carol S. Frederick ’75 is the co-editor of the California Women Lawyers’ Bulletin, and convention chairperson for the Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles. Joanna Bockian ’75 recently opened the firm Bockian & Hanifan. She was erroneously identified as James Bockian in the Winter 1977 issue of the Loyola Lawyer. Our apologies to Ms. Bockian. Mark W. Gibbons ’75 has announced his partnership in the firm of Billbary, Gibbons & Pitaro in Las Vegas, Nevada. Jeffrey G. Sheldon ’75 has been elected secretary-treasurer of the Pasadena Young Lawyers. Jess J. Araujo ’76 has been elected vice-president of the Mexican-American Bar Association. He is also searching for heirs in a $400,000 land dispute in Texas. Kathryn A. Balsson ’76 authored the article “A Warning to United States: A Hollow Victory for the Jeopardy Tax Payer” in the July/August 1977 Beverly Hills Bar Association Journal. Patrick L. Garofalo ’76 has opened law offices in Beverly Hills. James R. Gotcher ’76 has announced his association with David L. Shapiro, forming the firm Gotcher & Shapiro. The firm will emphasize immigration law and international business. Donald Peckner ’76 has edited, in conjunction with E. I. Sherman, Handbook of Stainless Steels. Donald is the associate editor for Encyclopedia of Engineering Materials & Processes. Christopher Rea ’76 has announced his association with the firm of Morgan, Wenzel & McLennons in Los Angeles. Laurie J. Bernhard ’77 has won second prize in the 1977 Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition. Her winning essay was entitled, “Infringements & Damages in Violations of Copyright Monopolies: Protection for the Musical Artist.” Peter L. Clino ’77 has been appointed as assistant to the chairman of the Board of the investment banking firm of Cantor, Fitzgerald & Company.
Orange Grooves—Everybody had a good time at the banquet sponsored by the Orange County Alumni Chapter. The annual event honored six Loyola Law School alumni who are currently serving on the bench in Orange County. Dean Frederick J. Lower, Jr. '64 presented an informative overview on the current state of the Law School and future trends in legal education.

Orange County Alumni Event at Country Club

The Loyola Law School Orange County Alumni Chapter held their annual social event January 31, 1978 at the Big Canyon Country Club in Newport Beach. Forty-two alumni, along with spouses and friends, attended the event.

Chairperson of the Orange County Alumni Chapter, Mrs. Sheila P. Sonenshine '70, served as master of ceremonies for the proceedings which honored six Loyola Law School alumni for their service on the Bench in Orange County.

Recognition was extended to the Hon. Robert L. Cormian '39, retired Superior Court Judge; Hon. Luis A. Cardenas '68, Municipal Court of the North Orange County Judicial District; Hon. Samuel Sonenshine '70, served as master of ceremonies for the proceedings which honored six Loyola Law School alumni for their service on the Bench in Orange County.

Serving as master of ceremonies for the evening was the Hon. J. Steve Williams '41, Superior Court Judge of San Bernardino County.

Featured speaker for the event was Loyola Law School Dean Frederick J. Lower, Jr. '64, who attended with his wife, Virginia.

Planning the event were Philip B. Wagner '57, president of the alumni chapter, and his committee which included Gerald O. Egan '51, James L. Liesch '60, Justin M. McCarthy '53, Victor G. Tessier '54, and Judge Williams.

Riverside-San Bernardino Alumni Event

The Riverside/San Bernardino Alumni Chapter held a successful first annual alumni event at the Smugglers Inn, San Bernardino, on January 27, 1978.

The banquet was attended by 20 Loyola Law School alumni and their guests.

Alumni Chapters Formation

As reported in the Winter 1977 issue of the Loyola Lawyer, 18 new Alumni Chapters have been organized within California in order to effectively unite Loyola Law School and its alumni in a working relationship. The respective chairpersons and their addresses were listed to facilitate your contact and involvement with the Alumni Chapters. A chapter has now been formed in the West San Gabriel Valley. The chairman is John H. Brink '58 of Irselfeld, Irselfeld & Younger, 7060 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1011, Los Angeles, California 90028, (213) 466-4161.

We now have more than 4,200 members of the Alumni Association. The Alumni Chapters have been formed to increase communications and to organize various social, educational, and liaison activities within your communities. Your interest and participation are welcome.

Alumni are now scattered throughout the United States; however, nearly 80 percent of your classmates reside and practice in California. Following is a brief demographic profile of each chapter to acquaint you with the number of alumni in your area.

Alumni Chapter

261 Beverly Hills/Brentwood/Westwood
18 Central Coast
38 Central Valley
346 East San Fernando Valley
129 East San Gabriel Valley
210 Long Beach/San Pedro
495 Los Angeles
300 Orange County
261 Pacific Palisades/Santa Monica
71 Palos Verdes
95 Riverside/San Bernardino
70 San Diego
90 San Francisco/Sacramento
24 Santa Barbara
265 South Bay
40 Ventura/Oxnard
294 West San Fernando Valley
299 West San Gabriel Valley
Legal Education: the Progressive Tradition

Loyola Law School has established a reputation for excellence in many areas since our founding in 1920. We have been fortunate to have the opportunity and commitment to build a progressive tradition of academic and professional expertise during our 58-year history of service to the legal community. All of our students, faculty, alumni, and staff have contributed in their own way to this fine and growing reputation, and the results are self-evident.

Each year Loyola Law School graduates consistently show better results on the California Bar Exam than graduates of other schools. Indeed, they receive ten percent higher passing average than other ABA accredited law schools in California. Did you ever wonder why? What is it that makes the Loyola Law trained attorney better than average ... the answer is simple. It is the Loyola Law School educational program.

This program of teaching and learning is unique to our area. It is one which not only provides the comprehensive and in-depth review of the law itself, but also emphasizes the practical aspects of the law by offering the student exposure to the law at work through a multi-faceted law clinic program.

In today's society much of the "law explosion" is related to the changing complexities of our urban centers and Loyola Law School has been and continues to be an urban law school, stressing the problems of the urban centers of California, the nation and around the world.

It is the continuation and enhancement of these programs that keeps Loyola Law School in the forefront of legal education. The flexibility to change or add to the curriculum, the clinical program, the constant review of urban problems with the accompanying addition and/or deletion of course material allows Loyola to provide its graduates with the adaptability to cope with these ever changing and challenging problems when entering the legal profession.

The ability to meet these changes and challenges with viable educational programs now and in the future will continue only with the support of the Loyola Law School alumni and friends ... your unrestricted gift now to Loyola Law School will provide the support needed to continue and enhance the educational programs which make Loyola Law School an important force in legal education.
A Guide to Tax Deduction and Charitable Gift Citations

Citations of Authority

The Federal government encourages gifts to schools, churches, hospitals, and other public supported charities such as Loyola Law School by allowing charitable deductions for a variety of gifts to non-profit institutions. Below is a listing of relevant court citations, Internal Revenue codes, Treasury regulations, and revenue rulings directly relating to the various forms of charitable giving.

We hope it will serve as a ready reference guide for your personal and professional consideration.


**Securities and real estate held long-term (1 year or longer)** — Deductible at the full present fair market value, with no capital gain on the appreciation. IRC §170(e). Deductible up to 30% of adjusted gross income. IRC §170(b)(1)(D)(i). Five-year carryover allowed for any “excess.” IRC §170(b)(1)(D)(ii).

**Unrelated Gifts:** If the gift is unrelated to donee’s exempt function, deduction is fair market value minus one-half of the appreciation. IRC §170(f)(1)(B)(i). Deductible up to 50% of adjusted gross income. IRC §170(b)(1)(A). Five-year carryover allowed for any “excess.” IRC §170(d)(1).


**Capital gain implications.** Cost-basis of property must be allocated between portion of property “sold” and portion of property “given” to charity on basis of fair market value of each. Appreciation allocable to sale is subject to capital gains taxation; appreciation allocable to gift is not IRC §1011(b).

**Caveat:** Outright gift of mortgaged property is considered a bargain sale. Reg. §1.1011-2(a)(2).

**Treasury requirements Substantiating charitable deductions.** See Reg. §1.170A-1(a)(2).

**Deduction Dates**

A gift is deemed delivered for determining valuation and year of deduction. Reg. §1.170A-1(b).

**Securities — If mailed, date of mailing is delivery date; if hand delivered to charity, date received by charity is delivery date. If securities delivered to donor’s bank or broker (as donor’s agent) or to the issuing corporation (or its agent) instructing corporation to reissue in charity’s name, delivery date is date securities transferred to charity’s name on corporation’s books (date on new stock certificate having charity’s name).**

Check — If mailed, date of mailing is delivery date; if hand delivered to charity, date received by charity is delivery date.

**Art works and other tangible personal property — Date property received by charity is delivery date.**

**Real Estate** — Date charity receives property executed deed is delivery date.


**Determing fair market value — Gifts of securities — When there is market for securities on a stock exchange or over the counter:** Fair market value is mean between highest and lowest quoted selling prices on date of delivery. Reg. §20.2031-2.


**Closed-end investment company shares:** Valued the same way as securities traded on a stock exchange or over-the-counter. Reg. §20.2031-2.

**Real estate, works of art and other property not traded on an exchange or over the counter** — Fair market value is price at which the property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller, neither being under any compulsion to buy or sell and both having reasonable knowledge of relevant facts. Reg. §1.170A-1(c). Determined by expert appraisals. Cost of appraisal deductible as IRC §212(a) deduction, thus percent of adjusted gross income ceiling inapplicable. Rev. Rul. 67-401, 1967-2 CB 125. For guidelines to be used in making appraisals, see Rev. Proc. 66-49, 1966-2 CB 1257.


**Patron’s gifts — Contribution is amount transferred by donor less value of theatre ticket, meal or other privilege donor receives.** Rev. Rul. 67-246, 1967-2 CB 104.

**Installment obligation — caveat** — Gift of installment obligation (taxpayer elected on sale to pay gains tax in installments under IRC §453) accelerates remaining deferred gain in year of gift. Rev. Rul. 55-157, 1955-1 CB 293.

**Depreciable personal property — Contribution deduction reduced by what would have been taxed as ordinary income (under IRC §1245) if property had been sold. IRC §170(e)(1)(A).**

**Depreciable real property — Contribution deduction reduced by what would have been taxed as ordinary income (under IRC §1250) if property had been sold. IRC §170(e)(1)(A).**

**Life Insurance** — Donor names charity beneficiary and irrevocably assigns incidents of ownership to it.


Gift of fully paid-up policy. Income tax deduction is generally replacement cost. Reg. §25.2512-6(a).

**Endowment policy.** Charitable deduction for value minus amount which would be taxed as ordinary income on a sale. IRC §170(e)(1)(A). But see Reg. §1.170A-4(a).

**Caveat:** Donor has ordinary income of difference between cost and maturity value in year charity receives proceeds. Rev. Rul. 69-102, 1969-1 CB 32, Friedman, 41 TC 428.
Charitable Remainder Trusts

Charitable remainder unitrust — Specifies that income beneficiary is to receive annual payments determined by multiplying a fixed percentage (at least 5%) by the net fair market value of the trust assets, as determined each year. On death of beneficiary (or survivor beneficiary, if more than one) charity gets the remainder. IRC §664(d)(2).

A variation calls for trustee to pay out income if actual income is less than stated percent. Deficiencies in distributions (i.e., where trust income is less than stated percent) are made up in later years if trust income exceeds the stated percent. Another variation provides that deficiencies are not to be made up. IRC §664(d)(3), Reg. §1.664-3(a)(1)(1)(ii).

Charitable remainder annuity trust — Specifies a fixed dollar amount (at least 5% of initial net fair market value of transferred property) which is to be paid annually to income beneficiary for life. On death of beneficiary (or survivor beneficiary, if more than one) charity gets the remainder. IRC §664(d)(1).

Payments taxed to recipient — for unitrusts and annuity trusts amounts paid to the recipient retain the character they had in trust. Each payment is treated as follows: First, as ordinary income to the extent of the trust ordinary income for the year and undistributed ordinary income for prior years, Second, as capital gain to the extent of the trust capital gains for the year and undistributed capital gains for prior years, Third, as other income (e.g., tax-exempt income) to the extent of the trust’s other income for the year and undistributed other income for prior years, Fourth, as a tax free distribution of principal. IRC §664(b), Reg. §1.664-1(d).

Unitrusts and annuity trusts are exempt from taxation — But a trust is not exempt in any year it has income which would be taxable unrelated business income if trust were an exempt organization. IRC §664(c). Payments to income beneficiary taxed as described above.

Governance of instrument requirements — To assure charitable deductions and avoid adverse tax consequences, governing instrument must contain specific provisions. See Reg. §1.664-4 through §1.664-3, IRC §508(e), IRC §6497(a)(2), Rev. Rul. 72-399, 1972-2 CB 340.


Capital gain — No capital gain incurred on transfer of appreciated assets to trust. Rev. Rul. 55-275, 1955-1 CB 295, Rev. Rul. 60-370, 1960-2 CB 203. Nor is there capital gain to donor on a sale by trust (except as taxable under another tier system, above). Exception: Gain taxable to donor if trust assets sold and invested in tax-exempt securities pursuant to express or implied agreement between donor and trustees. Rev. Rul. 60-370, 1960-2 CB 203.
Who are the Advocates?

Alumni, faculty, friends, parents, corporations and foundations donate annually to The Advocates! The Advocates, established in 1961, is the Law School’s annual support group. It was originally devoted solely to providing scholarships for students in need of financial assistance. In later years, however, The Advocates expanded the use of funds raised to include such necessary items as assisting with the development of a comprehensive legal curriculum, attracting and retaining outstanding faculty, acquiring needed books and equipment for the Law Library, and providing academic research assistance.

Why the Advocates?

Loyola Law School is a private law school and therefore requires financial support of concerned benefactors if it is to maintain its position as a leader in legal education. We must look to alumni and friends for support. For 1977-78, the Law School’s operating and salary budget is $4.2 million. Tuition, which provides the major portion (87%) of the Law School’s income, will never provide 100 percent of the budget’s income unless increased to a prohibitive level. Therefore, the difference must be made up from other income sources, including annual gifts.

To illustrate the importance of gifts through The Advocates, if 50 percent of the Law School’s 4,200 alumni each contributed $50, that would total $105,000, almost four times the amount our alumni donated last year. Secondly, the percentage of participation is important. Other potential donors like foundations and corporations have programs to support higher education, but they want to know that the principal beneficiaries of the Law School’s efforts — its alumni — support their professional school. If 50 percent of the alumni feel compelled to make a gift through The Advocates, the chances are other non-alumni will respond in kind and generally contribute at the level requested. This type of support is vital to Loyola Law School’s future well-being.

What Benefits Accrue to Me?

- The personal satisfaction of helping to provide a quality legal education for today’s students.
- Contributing to the already fine and growing reputation for excellence in legal education that Loyola Law School represents.
- Knowledge that my gift will help to make it possible for the Law School to receive additional contributions.
- An investment which will continue to pay you professional dividends in the future.
- Your gift is tax deductible.

In recognition of your annual gift, you will receive an Advocates membership card which also identifies the level of financial support, i.e., Donovan Fellow ($1,000), Dibble Fellow ($500-$999), Cook Fellow ($250-$499), and Advocate Fellow ($100-$249).

We look to you! If you have not yet contributed this year, we have provided an attached envelope for your convenience. Please consider using it to support your alma mater.
Berman Lecture

Professor Harold J. Berman of Harvard Law School presented a lecture on February 16 at Loyola Law School on the topic of "Human Rights in the Soviet Union: Some Current American Fallacies." Some 100 persons attended the informative discussion which was sponsored by the school as part of a guest lecture program. Berman is a noted scholar and authority on International Law and the Soviet Union. He earned his LL.B. from Yale in 1947, graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science, served on the executive committee of the Russian Research Center since 1952, has been a visiting scholar at the Institute for State and Law in Moscow, a Rockefeller Fellow for the study of East-West Trade, a Ford Fellow for the study of Soviet Law, and is currently an Ames Professor at Harvard Law School.

300 Year Old Lawbook

Law for the Ages — This 300-year-old law book was recently donated to Loyola Law School by Mrs. Richard M. Gleason of Los Angeles (left). Looking over the rare book are Dean Frederick J. Lowen, Jr. and Law Librarian Frederica M. Sedgewick. The book is titled "Officina Brevium," sub-titled "Select and Approved Forms of Judicial Writs, and other Process with their Returns and Entries in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster. As Also Special Pleadings to Writs of Scire Facias." The book was printed in 1679 in London and contains 438 pages of Latin text; the original tan calf covers have been detached, but overall condition is very good. Mrs. Gleason is an interested friend of Loyola Law School who wished to donate this family heirloom because, she said, "Sharing is what life is all about." The early history of this book, how it crossed the Atlantic from England, and its possible contributions to American jurisprudence are unknown. However, Mrs. Gleason's grandfather, David R. Woods, inherited the book in 1880 and brought his treasured library from New Brighton, Pennsylvania, to California at the turn of the century. The book will be placed on display in the Loyola Law School library.

Casino Night

Jackpot — Professor Steven Hirschtick served as one of the Blackjack dealers at the annual "Casino Night" sponsored by the Loyola Law Students Partners Association held January 14 at the University's Westchester campus. All proceeds from the event, which features modified Las Vegas style gambling and entertainment, go to a scholarship fund for a married law student.
Alumni Directory

Loyola Law School is currently planning the publication of a Law Alumni Directory. This will be the first time such a directory has been compiled, and the Alumni Relations Office is seeking preliminary information for its files. To insure that we have your correct address and professional information, please fill out the sheet below and return it to us as soon as possible in the enclosed business reply envelope. Since the value of any Alumni Directory is the publication of correct and updated information, your cooperation and prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Loyola Law School Alumni Directory Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Initial</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Professional Occupation</th>
<th>Current Business Title</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm Name

Business Address

Residence Address

I prefer receiving alumni mail at my [ ] Business [ ] Residence

Board of Governors Committees

The Loyola Law School Alumni Association Board of Governors has formed eight standing committees and one ad hoc committee pursuant to their responsibilities as outlined in the By-Laws adopted on September 15, 1977, according to President Laurence G. Preble '68.

The 19-member Board has organized the following committees: Alumni Chapters, Career Planning and Placement, Special Events, Awards, Class Correspondent, Law Review, Advocates, and Class Reunion. The ad hoc Nominating Committee was also recently formed.

Committees which are now active include the Alumni Chapters Committee, chaired by Vincent W. Thorpe '59, which is responsible for assisting the Law School Development Office in establishing and supporting the 18 Alumni Chapters in California and assuring that each remains active and effective, the Career Planning and Placement Committee, headed by Alvin N. Loskamp '68, assists the Placement Director in helping students and alumni identify and achieve career opportunities and goals. This committee is also responsible for conducting a Career Planning Seminar held each Fall at the Law School.

The Special Events Committee coordinates the annual reception for those graduates who pass the California Bar Examination, an alumni luncheon at the State Bar Convention, a reception for third and fourth-year students, and the Annual Alumni/Advocates Dinner Dance. This committee is chaired by David M. Finkle '67. The Awards Committee is responsible for selecting individuals to receive the Alumni Association Award at commencement, honorees at the Annual Alumni Dinner, and other citations given by the Alumni Association. Sheldon I. Lodmer '70 is chairman of this committee.

The following committees are in various stages of formation at this time. The Class Correspondent Committee assists the Development Office in gathering alumni news for publication in the Loyola Lawyer. The Law Review Committee is responsible for assisting and supporting the Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review. The Advocates Committee has the responsibility for insuring the adequate financial support for the Law School, and the Class Reunion Committee assists the Development Office in planning annual reunions for the 10, 20, 25, 35 and 50-year classes.

The Nominating Committee reviews and recommends candidates for nomination to the Board of Governors, fills any Board vacancies, and is responsible for organizing and conducting the election process.

All active members of the Alumni Association are eligible to serve on Board Committees.

For further information on the Board of Governors of the Loyola Law School Alumni Association, contact Pamela Gleason, Alumni Relations Office at (213) 642-3549.

Board of Governors Elections

Elections for positions on the 1978-79 Board of Governors of the Loyola Law School Alumni Association are slated for June. If you are interested in being nominated for election to the Board, it is necessary to submit a nominating petition stating your intent and signed by at least 20 members of the Alumni Association. Nominations will be accepted through the June 1, 1978 deadline by mailing them to Mr. Laurence G. Preble, c/o Loyola Law School, Alumni Relations Office, 1440 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, California 90015.

There will be five open positions on the Board to be filled for a two-year term of office beginning on July 1, 1978, as provided in the By-Laws. All members of the Alumni Association are eligible for nomination.

General alumni election ballots will be mailed on June 15. Please return them immediately since final tabulations will be held on June 30. Official results will be announced in the September issue of Loyola Lawyer.

Serving on the Board of Governors Nominating Committee are chairman Lawrence W. Cristo '61, Thomas E. Garcia '52, Sheldon I. Lodmer '70, Alvin N. Loskamp '68, Laurence G. Preble '68, and Vincent W. Thorpe '59.

For further information on the elections, contact Pamela Gleason, Alumni Relations office at (213) 642-3549.
In January, the Visitors met at the Law School for a half-day orientation session and first meeting of the full Board.

The orientation program included a tour of the campus, and a series of presentations by members of the faculty and administration to better acquaint the Board of Visitors with Loyola. Preliminary plans to improve the Law School's facilities and continue its position as a leader in legal education were also unveiled.

Following the afternoon program, the Visitors met at Times Mirror Square for cocktails and dinner. Joining Board members at Times Mirror were Bernard J. Bannan, chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, Rev. Donald P. Merrifield, S.J., president of Loyola Marymount University, Rev. Charles S. Casassa, S.J., University chancellor, and Charles R. Redmond '74, assistant to the president, Times Mirror Corporation.

Since the last issue of Loyola Lawyer, several individuals have joined the Board of Visitors. They include:

**John E. Anderson '50**, a partner in the Los Angeles and Santa Ana law firm of Kindel & Anderson. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a master's in business administration degree from Harvard Business School.

Anderson serves on several corporate and civic boards, including Claremont Men's College (vice chairman), Saint John's Hospital and Health Center Foundation (president), and the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) Metropolitan Los Angeles.

**Joseph A. Ball**, partner in the Los Angeles law firm of Ball, Hunt, Hart, Brown & Baerwitz, earned his law degree at the University of Southern California after completing his undergraduate studies at Creighton University (Omaha).

Ball is a past president of the State Bar of California and the Long Beach Bar Association. He is a member and past president of the American College of Trial Lawyers and the International Academy of Trial Lawyers. Ball was counsel to the Commission to Investigate the Assassination of President Kennedy.

**William H. Doheny, Jr. '75** received his bachelor's degree from Stanford University. In 1976 Doheny joined the investment firm of Scudder, Stevens & Clark (New York) and is an investment counselor for the company's Los Angeles office.

**M. Louise Eason** is a senior vice president, director, and a member of the executive committee of California Federal Savings and Loan Association (Los Angeles).

Mrs. Eason is on the advisory board of the executive women's division of the National Savings and Loan League. She is one of the founders of Los Angeles Beautiful and remains active in this organization.

**Milton Feinerman '56** is president and chief executive officer of Westdale Savings and Loan Association (Los Angeles). He received his bachelor's degree from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Feinerman is a director and member of the executive committee of the California Savings and Loan League, and a member of the legislative committee of the U.S. Savings and Loan League.

**Thomas V. Girardi '64** is a partner in the law firm of Girardi, Keese & Crane (Los Angeles). He earned his bachelor's degree from Loyola University (Los Angeles) and a master's degree from New York University Law School.

Girardi is a member of the part-time faculty at Loyola Law School and a lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar in the area of trial procedure and evidence.
William T. Huston is a graduate of the University of Notre Dame Law School. Following a brief period with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Huston began the practice of law in 1954. Since 1963, he has been president and chief executive of Watson Land Company and Watson Industrial Properties [Los Angeles].

Huston’s civic activities include membership in the Los Angeles Area and Long Beach chambers of commerce.

James H. Kindel, Jr. ’40 is a partner in the Los Angeles and Santa Ana law firm of Kindel & Anderson. He received his bachelor’s degree from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Kindel is a former partner [retired] with the accounting firm of Coopers & Lybrand [New York] and he is currently general counsel for The UCLA Foundation.

Mariana R. Pfaelzer is a senior partner in the Century City law firm of Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel. She earned her bachelor’s degree from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and her law degree from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Mariana’s professional, business, and civic activities include serving as chairman of the State Bar of California’s Committee on Professional Ethics and Special Committee on Juvenile Justice. She is a director and a member of the executive committee of TICOR, and is president of the Board of Police Commissioners for Los Angeles.

Robert W. Prescott ’39, a member of the Board since October 1977, succumbed to cancer on March 3. He was president and chief executive officer of Flying Tiger Line, and chairman of Tiger International (Los Angeles). Prescott pioneered the air cargo industry in the United States when he founded Flying Tigers in 1945 as the first airfreight carrier.

During World War II, he participated in five major campaigns while serving as a flight leader for General Claire Lee Chennault’s American Volunteer Group in China, popularly known as “The Flying Tigers.”

Prescott was a member of the Transportation Association of America board and the Board of Directors of the Air Transport Association. He was also active in civic affairs, and served as a trustee of the City of Hope.

Margaret Ann Shaw is an associate of the Wallace Jamie Resource Group (Los Angeles), a public relations firm. In
1969, Mrs. Shaw was named a Los Angeles Times Woman of the Year, and in 1971 received an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Redlands where she currently serves as a member of the Board of Trustees.

Mrs. Shaw's husband, Leslie, is the former postmaster of Los Angeles (1963-69), and he is currently vice president and director of community affairs for Great Western Financial Corporation (Beverly Hills).

Sheila Prell Sonenshine '70 is a partner in the Newport Beach law firm of Sonenshine & Armstrong. She received her bachelor's degree from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Mrs. Sonenshine's professional and civic activities include being the founder and chairperson of the Women and Individual Rights Section of the Orange County Bar Association, and a member of the Judiciary and Ethics committees of the Orange County Bar Association. In 1976, she was appointed by Governor Brown to the Board of Directors for the 32nd District Agricultural Association.

Martin Stone '51 is chairman of Monogram Industries (Santa Monica). He earned his bachelor's degree from the University of California, Los Angeles, and a master's degree from the University of Southern California Law School. In 1969, Loyola awarded Stone an honorary Doctor of Laws degree.

Stone's community activities include serving as president of the Los Angeles Urban Coalition and as a member of the National Urban Coalition. He is a former member of the Board of Trustees of Loyola Marymount University.
The California Uniform Determinate Sentencing Act: The Problem of Vagueness

by Gerald F. Uelmen

Responding to a chorus of criticism that the unbridled discretion placed in the hands of parole boards resulted in unacceptable disparities in the punishment meted out to similar offenders for similar crimes, the California legislature enacted the Uniform Determinate Sentencing Act of 1976. By presenting a narrow range of choices to the sentencing judge, and creating explicit factual guidelines to control these choices, subject to appellate review, the Act promises greater consistency in sentencing results.

The California Act confronts a judge who is sentencing a defendant to prison with three choices: a middle term, a lesser term when circumstances of mitigation are shown, and a greater term when circumstances of aggravation are shown. Aggravating and mitigating circumstances are described in Rules adopted by the California Judicial Council. The judge must support his choice of the term with a statement of reasons, and that choice may be challenged on appeal by the defendant. To illustrate the effect of these changes, we can compare a defendant convicted of armed robbery before and after the new law. Before the new law took effect, robbery was punishable by an indeterminate sentence of one year to life in prison; but if the jury found the defendant was armed with a dangerous or deadly weapon, the possible sentence was five years to life in prison. The defendant convicted of ordinary robbery would be eligible for parole after serving one year, but a defendant convicted of armed robbery would have to serve one-third of the five year minimum before being eligible for release on parole. The actual parole release date and length of the parole term would be determined by the Adult Authority based on a subjective judgement of the defendant’s progress toward rehabilitation. Under the new law, armed robbery is no longer defined as a separate crime. Robbery is punishable by two, three or four years. Ordinarily the three year term would be imposed, unless aggravating circumstances are shown, to justify the four year term, or mitigating circumstances are shown, to justify the two year term. Among the aggravating circumstances which would justify the four year term would be proof that the defendant was armed. Alternatively, the fact that the defendant was armed could be pleaded and proven as enhancement, which would also add one year to the sentence to be served. The defendant would not be released on parole until he served two-thirds of the sentence, and the parole term is ordinarily limited to one year.

While these reforms may correct the most serious disparities in sentences, they inject procedural changes into the sentencing process which raise substantial issues of constitutional magnitude. If the sentencing judge is required to make new factual findings to justify the sentence, a whole panoply of procedural rights within the rubric of due process may apply, including the right to standards which are not vague, adequate notice, confrontation and cross examination of witnesses, the right to exclude unlawfully obtained evidence, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, a jury trial, explicit findings and appellate review. The magnitude of the impact such changes could have upon the criminal justice system is rather stark; while only 10-15 percent of California defendants now avail themselves of all of the procedural rights of a trial, all convicted defendants are ultimately subject to the sentencing process, including the 85-90% who plead guilty. Even if the full panoply of due process rights is limited to the 28% of felony defendants who receive prison or jail sentences, we face the possibility of a
vast multiplication of the commitment of judicial resources to what is now a rather routine and expeditious process.

As the law has evolved thus far, two basic models of the sentencing process have emerged. The traditional model, which we can label the discretion model, gives the judge relatively free access to information for sentencing. In *Williams v. New York*, 337 U.S. 241, (1948), upholding the imposition of a death penalty on the basis of information contained in a presentence report to the judge, the Court reasoned that "modern concepts individualizing punishment have made it all the more necessary that a sentencing judge not be denied an opportunity to obtain pertinent information by a requirement of rigid adherence to restrictive rules of evidence properly applicable to the trial." The Court did not hold that the sentencing process is immune from due process scrutiny, however, noting that the defendant was represented by counsel, and was not deprived of an opportunity to present evidence. Only the rights to reasonable notice of the charges and an opportunity to examine adverse witnesses were explicitly rejected.

The second model, which we will call the enhancement model, finds its paradigm in *Specht v. Patterson*, 386 U.S. 605, (1967). There the Court confronted a proceeding whereby a defendant convicted of indecent liberties, carrying a maximum sentence of ten years, could be found to be a "threat of bodily harm to the public" or a "habitual offender" and given an indeterminate sentence of one day to life. The finding was made on the basis of a psychiatric report submitted to the Court. Noting that the finding defendant was a public threat or habitual offender was a new finding of fact that was not an ingredient of the offense charged, the Court found the situation "radically different" from *Williams v. New York*. This difference entitled the defendant to the "full panoply of the relevant protections which due process guarantees in state criminal proceedings," including "that he be present with counsel, have an opportunity to be heard, be confronted with witnesses against him, have the right to cross-examine, and to offer evidence of his own. And there must be findings adequate to make meaningful any appeal that is allowed." The absence of a right to proof beyond a reasonable doubt and a jury trial from this catalogue of rights may simply be explained by noting that the cases holding these rights to be incorporated within "due process" had not yet been decided.

The essential difference between the discretion model and the enhancement model is the existence of an explicit factual predicate for punishment which was not an essential element of the underlying crime. But these two models are not mutually exclusive; it would be more accurate to characterize them as representing opposite ends of a spectrum. Due process is no longer the "all or none" proposition suggested in *Specht v. Patterson*. As stated by the Court more recently in *Morrissy v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1971):

"Once it is determined that due process applies, the question remains what process is due. It has been said so often by this Court and others as not to require citation of authority that due process is flexible and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands."

The purpose of this paper will be to review the major procedural protections encompassed within due process, and consider their applicability to the sentencing aggravation procedures envisioned in the California statute. We will find that these procedures do not always fit comfortably into *either* the discretion or the enhancement models. But in seeking the answer to "what process is due," the ambiguous terrain we tread is not untrod. At least two other legislative devices raise a similar galaxy of issues.

First, we have the death penalty statutes enacted in response to the holding in *Furman v. Georgia* that a discretionary death penalty violates the Eighth Amendment proscription of "cruel and unusual punishment." These statutes require the finding of specified "aggravating circumstances" to justify the imposition of a penalty of death. This separate factual finding may take these provisions outside the realm of
defendant convicted with a maximum of twenty-five years, upon a finding he is a "dangerous special offender." The statute specifically provides that a notice of the prosecutor's intent to rely upon the Dangerous Special Offender provisions must be filed prior to trial, and that the defendant has a right to counsel, compulsory process, cross-examination, specific factual findings and appellate review of the determination a defendant is a Dangerous Special Offender. The statute does, however, permit reliance upon hearsay in presentence reports, limited non-disclosure of such reports, and provides that the burden of proof is merely a preponderance of the evidence, to be determined by a judge sitting without a jury. This middle position was justified by the draftsmen as follows:

"The requirements of Specht v. Patterson * * * are inapplicable, since no separate charge triggered by an independent offense is at issue. Only circumstances of aggravation of the offense for which the conviction was obtained are before the court." As we review each of the procedural rights in the due process panoply, it will be enlightening to compare the judicial treatment of these two legislative parallels.

The task of defining circumstances of aggravation and mitigation under the California law was delegated by the legislature to the California Judicial Council, a body comprised of representatives of all California courts. The task of drafting reasonably detailed and explicit standards is a formidable one, perhaps best done by an administrative body. Whether that administrative body should be a judicial one, however, raises an intriguing question of separation of powers, since the constitutionality of the standards adopted will ultimately be resolved by the Courts.

The constitutional issues raised by the formulation of these standards are serious ones. The right to explicit definitions which are not vague is an essential of due process of law. Two rationales support this doctrine of vagueness: the lack of fair notice of potential defendants, and the danger of discriminatory applications where the law is vague. While both rationales apply with greatest force to the definition of the crime itself, one cannot simply dismiss the vagueness doctrine as inapplicable to sentencing enhancement provisions. This much is now abundantly clear from the Supreme Court opinions considering the constitutionality of statutes defining the aggravating circumstances under which the death penalty may be imposed. The precision with which those circumstances were defined was of a central concern to the Court. In Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153, [1976], for example, the Court carefully examined each of ten categories of aggravating circumstances in the Georgia statute in terms of vagueness or overbreadth. The Court noted with approval that the Georgia Supreme Court, in Arnold v. State, 224 S.E.2d 386 (1976), had already declared one statutory ground for capital punishment was unconstitutionally vague, and had narrowly construed other grounds.

The Arnold opinion is instructive for our purposes. The Georgia Supreme Court was confronted with a defendant sentenced to death upon the jury's finding of one aggravated circumstance: "The offense * * * was committed by a person * * * who has a substantial history of serious assaultive criminal convictions." Citing Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104 (1972), the court noted that "whenever a statute leaves too much room for personal whim and subjective decision-making without a readily ascertainable standard of minimal objective guidelines for its application it cannot withstand constitutional scrutiny." Applying this standard, the court found the term "substantial history" unconstitutionally vague.

Similarly, a higher standard of strictness is recognized where the statute defines the availability of capital punishment. At the other end of the spectrum are cases suggesting greater leeway with respecting to "regulatory statutes governing business activities." This variable standard is consistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the standards of procedural due process.

Thus, the first step in applying the constitutional test of vagueness to definitions of aggravating circumstances is to ascertain the extent of aggravation permitted. The extent of aggravation should not, however, be measured in purely quantitative terms: the real issue is one of proportion. For example, the aggravation of a two-year sentence to a three-year sentence under the California law permits a 50% increase in the punishment being meted out; at the other end of the spectrum, adding one year to a six-year sentence is an increase of less than 17%. The subtlety of this distinction was not lost on the draftsmen of the Dangerous Special Offender provision in the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. The increased sentence permitted upon a finding that the defendant is a dangerous special offender is limited to a term "not disproportionate in severity to the maximum term otherwise authorized by law." Apparently, this limitation was intended as an end-run around Specht v. Patterson, which held that the full panoply of the relevant protection which due process guarantees in state criminal procedures applied at the sentencing of a habitual offender under the Colorado Sex Offenders Act. The proportionality limitation was designed to insure that the increased sentence did not represent a penalty for a different crime. At least one court was persuaded by this
argument, although it contradicts rather specific language in Specht:

"The Sex Offenders Act does not make the commission of a specified crime the basis for sentencing. It makes one conviction the basis for commencing another proceeding under another act to determine whether a person constitutes a threat of bodily harm to the public, or is an habitual offender and mentally ill. This is a new finding of fact that was not an ingredient of the offense charged." id at 608.

A persuasive argument can be made that, even if Specht is limited to a separate offense, whether the aggravating circumstance states a separate offense should be determined by a comparison of the nature of the aggravating circumstance and the nature of the offense, rather than looking to the extent of aggravation permitted. Using this standard, it is clear that many of the aggravating circumstances specified in Rule 421 adopted by the California Judicial Council do state a separate offense, at least to the same extent the Colorado Sex Offender Act did. A sentence can be aggravated if the defendant "has engaged in a pattern of violent conduct," if he has "numerous" prior convictions, or if he threatened witnesses or suborned perjury.

The test of proportionality remains a more significant part of the equation, however. Whether the aggravating circumstance is characterized as a separate offense or not can quickly engage us in a label game. The real focus of our inquiry should be what's at stake for the defendant. Applying this test, we can see that the California approach of broadly defining aggravating circumstances across the board, to be applied to all crimes and all sentencing ranges, may create difficulties. Although the definitions may be precise enough in one context, they may not in another.

The second step in our vagueness analysis should be to ascertain the extent of free play in the definition of aggravating circumstances, to insure that prosecutors and judges are held to ascertainable standards in utilizing them. When we confront an aggravating circumstance which is so broad and amorphous it could be plausibly utilized against any defendant, we face the very danger that the vagueness doctrine is designed to prevent: the prosecutor can pick and choose the defendants against whom the provision will be utilized virtually at whim.

Applying this standard to the aggravating circumstances contained in Rule 421 promulgated by the California Judicial Council, we see some rather startling examples of vagueness:

Under Rule 421 [a] [3], circumstances in aggravation include that "the victim was particularly vulnerable." Every victim, of course, is "vulnerable." What makes a victim "particularly" vulnerable is left to our imagination: age? sex? physical incapacity? stupidity? time of day or night? A prosecutor would need little imagination to utilize this circumstance in virtually every crime that has a victim.

Rule 421 [a] [8] includes that the "planning, sophistication or professionalism with which the crime was carried out, or other facts, indicated premeditation." This would seem applicable to all but the most spontaneous of crimes.

Rule 421 [a] [11] allows aggravation if "the crime involved a large quantity of contraband." Frequent use of this provision can be anticipated in drug prosecutions. In defining the crime of possession with intent to distribute, at least one court has held a provision authorizing conviction based solely on evidence of quantity without specifying the amount required was void for vagueness. Whether a quantity is large should not be left to the varying subjective judgements of the prosecutors to whom the use of this provision is entrusted.

While the California Uniform Determinate Sentencing Act may achieve greater consistency in sentencing, this result cannot be attained at the expense of the procedural guarantees of due process. It appears that attempting to define aggravating circumstances for all crimes, without particularization, will inevitably lead to broad and amorphous definitions subject to a constitutional challenge as void for vagueness.

Gerald F. Uelman received his B.A. from Loyola University in 1962, named a J.D. at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. in 1965, and an LL.M. the following year at Georgetown where he was named an E. Barrett Prettyman Fellow; he served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in Los Angeles (Chief of Special Prosecutions Unit) from 1966-70. He is a Certified Specialist-Criminal Law, by the California Board of Legal Specializations. He joined the faculty at Loyola Law School in 1970, teaching classes in Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure, and Drug Abuse Law. He served as the Associate Dean at Loyola in 1973-75, and was instrumental in writing a successful grant proposal to the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare which secured the first drug abuse law program at any U.S. law school. Uelman was involved in the founding of the Loyola Continuing Legal Education Program in 1975, and has served as chairman of the CLE committee for three years. He has written and lectured extensively in the area of Criminal Law related to drug abuse, served as a consultant to the Rand Corporation, and was a Special Examiner with the California State Bar Disciplinary Committee from 1975-77.

1This Article is excerpted from 10 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. (1977)
Faculty Forum

Frederick J. Lower, Jr. '64 has been selected as a Fellow of the American Bar Foundation. Membership is limited to only one-third of one percent of the lawyer population in each jurisdiction. The By-laws of the Fellows provides that selection for membership is in recognition of outstanding achievement and professional distinction. Dean Lower also attended the mid-Winter meeting of the American Bar Association held in New Orleans, February 8-11, and met with the Deans of the American Association of Law Schools. Lower was also the keynote speaker at the annual meeting of the Superior Court Clerks Association in Los Angeles, and was appointed to the recently formed executive committee of the Committee on Legal Education of the California State Bar.

J. Timothy Philippi has been appointed chairman of the ABA's Section of Taxation Task Force on the Model State Tax Court Act. He has also recently published an article on "Deductibility of Legal Expenses in Corporate Readjustments" appearing in The Monthly Digest of Tax Articles.

Owen G. Fiore '61 was a faculty member of the American Law Institute-American Bar Association Tax Planning for Agriculture course, a three-day seminar emphasizing tax and estate planning problems of farmers and ranchers held in New Orleans. Fiore has spoken widely on estate planning for agribusiness, and he appeared as a speaker for the Montana Tax Institute sponsored by the University of Montana Montana Law School in December.

Robert W. Benson submitted a paper at the request of the World Intellectual Property Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, commenting on the WIPO draft treaty for the protection of geographical indications on wine bottles and other consumer goods. Professor Benson also testified in San Francisco before a panel of the U.S. Treasury Department on the need for reform in the matter of deceptive labeling of wines.

Gerald F. Uelman testified in December 1977 during hearings conducted by Los Angeles County Supervisor Ed Edelman on procedures to deal with police shooting incidents. He is currently on a six-month sabbatical to participate in an ABA-sponsored Legal Exchange Program with Scotland Yard to study British drug abuse criminal procedures. He also appeared on the Criminal Justice panel of the first West Coast Conference of Constitutional Law. Professor Uelman presented a paper on "Constitutional Issues in the Federal Sentencing Reform Proposal" now under deliberation before the U.S. Senate.

David C. Tunick spoke on the topic of "Civil Procedure" at the annual meeting of the Superior Court Clerk's Association held in Los Angeles. Professor Tunick also addressed the recently formed Committee on Law and Technology of the Los Angeles County Bar Association on the topic of "Computers and the Law."

Jane Wolf Eldridge and Gerald F. Uelman appeared before the California Court of Appeals in San Bernardino last November to argue on behalf of the California Conference on Methadone Programs in the case of Reyes v. Superior Court, challenging the use of child abuse laws to prosecute a pregnant mother who is an addict.

Louise Bereswill, director of Admissions, traveled to Hawaii to participate in a panel presentation with a consortium of private west coast law schools in a joint recruitment effort.

Donald T. Wilson is serving as faculty advisor to the upcoming Loyola Law School publication International and Comparative Law Annual. This is the first such publication in Southern California and only the 19th in the United States. It is scheduled for completion in June 1978.


Gideon Kanner was a guest speaker at the California Trial Lawyers seminar at the recent Bar Convention.

Lola McAlpin-Grant '66 addressed a consumer conference at the Student Trial Lawyer's Association in October 1977, spoke to a group of Atlantic-Richfield employees in November and delivered a speech to a career conference sponsored by the Girls State Program. Mrs. McAlpin-Grant also gave the keynote address to a Goodwill Industries meeting last December in Los Angeles on the topic of securing civil rights and justice for handicapped Americans.
The Alumni Office records indicate that there is no current address for the alumni listed below. If you know the whereabouts of anyone on this list of "lost alumni," please call the Alumni Office: telephone (213) 642-3549 or drop us a note:

**Alumni Office**
**Loyola Law School**
**1440 West Ninth Street**
**Los Angeles, California 90015**

The list will be continued in forthcoming issues of the *Loyola Lawyer*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Rasmus</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>John K. Light</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rothman</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Richard S. Pierce</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis E. Carter</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Arnold Borenstein</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen M. Cassidy</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Rudolf Maslach</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome C. Dolan</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Robert A. Millikan</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel McCarthy</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>A. Donald McAlpine</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen C. Mittelman</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>John W. McElheney</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. O'Neil</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Douglas L. Barnes</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Sabate</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>John F. Burns</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph B. del Valle</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Franklin G. Campbell</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Doherty</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>John R. Morris</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer P. Hardenbergh</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>George R. Steene</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saied N. Karam</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Frank J. Barry</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Miller</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Ben M. Grimes</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred E. Subith</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Leslie M. Hershman</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald F. Walker</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Robert A. Smith</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman B. Gilbert</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Edwin Greenberg</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Hart</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Thomas D. Griffith</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Miller</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Kenneth A. Murphy</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward A. O'Connor</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Arnold Colt</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Sourtlock</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>George C. Goldman</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred E. Subith</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>William F. James</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald F. Walker</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>William D. McGarry</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman B. Gilbert</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Robert T. Whitman</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Hart</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Verne L. Cline, Jr.</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Miller</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Walter I. Colby</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward A. O'Connor</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>I. F. Fiori</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Sourtlock</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Stanley H. Shaw</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred E. Subith</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Robert G. Helm</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald F. Walker</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>James D. Littlejohn</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman B. Gilbert</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>John M. Marshall</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Hart</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Frank X. Ball</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Miller</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Richard E. Stewart</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward A. O'Connor</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Maripaul Salmon Baier</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Sourtlock</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Bruce Buchanan</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred E. Subith</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Joseph J. Armoush</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>