The art displayed on the front and inside covers of this issue is part of artist John Doyle’s “The Counselors” series. This series consists of 20 original stone lithographs and is part of a larger series of works entitled “The Great Human Race.” Each image in the series represents the concept of justice as it varies from one culture to another. Some of the concepts expressed are given in the prints’ titles: “Equity,” “Wisdom,” “Harmony,” and “Judgment.” The artist averages two years of research before beginning a series, although the actual execution may be completed in three months.

“The Counselors,” which is now a part of the law school’s permanent collection, was donated by the Student Bar Association, Professor Dale B. Furnish, Adjunct Professor Stephen Lee, Todd Stansbury and an anonymous donor. A reception to celebrate our recent gifts of art was held on October 16 and was attended by John Doyle (see article in this issue).

For further information about these and other works by John Doyle, contact the artist at his address: P.O. Box 715, Burnsville, NC 28714.
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Letters

With this issue we begin a "Letters to the Editor" section. Please address your comments to Editor, Law Forum, ASU College of Law, Tempe, AZ 85287. Please include your name and address (although you may request anonymity). We must have time to edit letters for clarity and space.

Sanctuary: Trapped by The Law

To the Editor,

I'm afraid that Professor Michael Allen's article, "Sanctuary: Trapped by The Law," is a grossly inaccurate portrayal of the events of the day. Allen's article is riddled with inaccuracies and misrepresentations. I refer to his article in the Law Forum for Fall '86 in which he blurs Judge Earl H. Carroll's conduct of the trial for the verdicts of the jury. His insistence of disapproving culminates in this statement: "The authority figure was the trial judge who repeatedly used words and voice and bodily language to communicate that the person in charge wanted a guilty verdict."

Such an assault upon the integrity of the judicial process by a trial lawyer is totally unacceptable. If every disgruntled advocate made a public attack on the conduct of the trial judge as the scapegoat for an unfavorable outcome of his case, the administration of justice would soon be in shambles. The maintenance of public confidence in the judicial process is the sacred trust of the legal profession. Professor Allen's petulant outburst is a violation of that trust.

Even more distressing is the fact that the author of this unseemly article is a professor whose behavior is seen by law students as a model of propriety. Professor Allen and the editors of Law Forum should be prepared to accept responsibility for a generation of young lawyers who will see nothing wrong in the public vilification of judicial officers.

Philip E. von Ammon
Fennemore Craig von Ammon
Litlaw & Powers
Phoenix, Arizona

Professor Allen responds:

It is "totally unacceptable" for a law professor or trial lawyer to write critically about how a federal judge conducted himself during a trial. Allen apparently thinks so. To criticize a federal judge, he writes, is "an assault upon the integrity of the judicial process."

With all due respect to Mr. von Ammon, neither the public nor the profession is well-served when lawyers value protecting themselves, including the judges before whom they will appear, more than they value justice.

The said reality is that the sanctuary defendants did not receive a fair trial and thousands of people, including lawyers, from around the United States have less respect for the courts because of Judge Earl Carroll's conduct in the sanctuary trial. A typical non-lawyer reaction was expressed by a class of junior high school students from Mesa who visited the sanctuary trial for an entire day. The Arizona Republic published an anony- mous reaction of these students on the front page: "Judge Carroll was very biased and unfair to the defendants."

Mr. von Ammon's letter also states that I must bear the responsibility for the attitude of a generation of young lawyers. I wish I had that much influence. If I did, I would urge those young lawyers to respond publicly and vociferously whenever and whenever injustice is observed.

Michael L. Allen
Professor of Law
ASU College of Law

CORRECTIONS

We regret the following errors made in the Fall '86 issue of the Law Forum:

The list on page 5 of the Annual Giving report inadvertently omitted the Phoenix law firm of Meyer, Hendricks, Victor, Osborn & Maleden as a donor. The firm has been listed among those contributing more than $1,000.

Parts of two sentences were omitted from the first paragraph of Professor Allman's article, "Sanctuary: Trapped by The Law," (page 15). The two sentences should read:

"Usually refugee assistance was conducted in the open with the media covering the reception. Refugees arrived in numbers by a sanctuary community. The assistance never included violence, exploitation or financial gain."

The "Scholarship News" article (page 29) incorrectly identified the source of four new scholarships for especially promising minority and disadvantaged students. These scholarships have been donated by the Fellows of the Arizona Bar Foundation.

Letter From The Dean

Dear Alumni and Other Friends of the College of Law:

As I write this, construction has just begun on the first stage of the long-awaited renovation of the college of law's physical plant. The start of this project is a very important step in the school's present and future development. The original Armstrong Hall has served us for almost twenty years. During that time, the school's faculty has more than doubled in size and the scope of our educational and student service programs has also increased substantially. As a consequence, we have been, for some time, without adequate office space for many of our faculty and staff, and without proper facilities for our placement, admissions and development offices, for our legal writing and tutorial programs, for the Moot Court Board and the Law Journal, etc.

The construction that has just started will solve a great many of these problems. The project, drawings of which will appear in our next issue, will consist of two two-story wings to be added to the south end of Armstrong Hall. The wings will rise over foundations that are already in place (library stacks are under construction), and will be connected to the present building on both the first and second floors. The project is scheduled to be completed in December, 1987, and ready for occupancy by the time that the building is completed. When the project is finished, we will have a large number of new faculty, staff and administrative offices, new and larger space for expanded Legal Clinic, a new medium-sized classroom, three new seminar rooms, a new ground-level student lounge with kitchen facilities and enclosed outdoor patio, expanded student locker space and shower and changing areas in the basement, expanded new quarters for the law journal, the Moot Court Board and the writing and tutorial programs, and many other improvements too numerous to mention. All of this construction and renovation is being financed through the sale of bonds approved by the State Legislature last year.

When the current addition is completed, our physical plant will be in excellent shape except for the continuing inadequacy of our library facility, which we have long since outgrown. A new library structure, which will probably also house the newly created Center for the Study of Law, Science and Technology, will constitute the second stage of our building program. This structure will be located to the south of the new addition to Armstrong Hall, in an area that is now a parking lot.

That project should begin in about three years and will be financed by state bonding funds and private contributions. Our planning is already underway for what we expect will be a state of the art library that will serve as an outstanding resource for the entire metropolitan Phoenix legal community, as well as for the College.

Although the initiation of construction on our building addition is the biggest single item of news from the school at this time, there have been other wonderful developments as well. For example, our moot court teams have been remarkably successful this year. In the fall, the Jenkins College of Law team comprised of two first year students selected through an intracollegiate competition opened all three classes, defeated the University of Arizona in a jury closing-argument competition; our National Moot Court team took second place in our region's competition and progressed to the round of sixteen in the national finals in New York, which was eliminated by the ultimate second place finisher. Our team also won overall national second place honors for the best brief in the national competition. Our Jessup International Law moot court team recently won its regional competition and will compete in the national and international finals in Boston in April.

Admissions is another upbeat area that also deserves some brief mention here. The number of applications for our 1987 entering class is currently running more than 25% ahead of last year's total, in a period when law school applications nationwide are down by a similar figure. The quality and diversity of applicants continues to improve dramatically.

Construction activity will cause a considerable amount of turmoil here for the next several months. There is also, however, a great deal of excitement, optimism and general good feeling. I'm happy to report that the law school is doing well, indeed.

Paul Bender
Dean and Professor of Law

LAW FORUM
Who Said We Have Too Many Doctors?
Jonathan Rose

The American Medical Association, like other professional associations, suffers from a split personality. While it is devoted to improving the quality of medical care, education and the profession, it also operates as a cartel to protect the economic interests of its members. Although the A.M.A.'s recent report on physician manpower reflects both personalities, the cartel strain is dominant. The report's assertion of a physician surplus and its recommendation that the surplus be eliminated by curtailing medical school enrollment is a blueprint for anti-competitive action.

On the central and difficult question of whether a surplus actually exists, the report is shaky at best. This judgment is particularly complex given the extensive government regulation and subsidies that affect physician supply. Even after conducting "an extensive review of the data and literature," the A.M.A. acknowledges that the studies produce "little consensus about the adequacy of physician supply" and that an acceptable measurement standard does not exist. Thus, the report states that policy makers must base their conclusions on "perceptions and professional judgment," implying that the A.M.A. knows what supply of physicians best serves society.

Another flaw is the recommendation that the medical education system "establish appropriate medical school enrollment." Assuming one could determine that a physician surplus exists, it does not follow that the appropriate remedy is to limit medical school enrollment. Such a solution implies that society is better served by excluding new physicians rather than existing ones. Arguably, given advances in medical education, the opposite may be true.

Moreover, the recommendation that our "future needs for additional physicians will be more than satisfied through the U.S. medical education system" unfairly lumps all foreign medical education into the same dismal category. One does not have to read Doonesbury to know about the low quality of some foreign medical schools. However, other countries have high quality medical education. Imagine if American auto makers announced that our "need" should be fully satisfied by American cars.

In addition, the A.M.A. ignores the economic reality that physician supply is influenced by the demand for medical education. This demand is determined by the students' expected benefits (income and non-monetary) as physicians and the costs (tuition and others) of becoming a physician. For some years, prospective students have anticipated a high income as a result of their educational investment, and medical school tuition has been priced well below the cost of educating students. Both of these factors have produced a shortage of spaces in medical schools relative to the demand by quality students. The response has been a substantial American student demand for foreign medical education.

Rather than confronting the true determinants of physician supply, the A.M.A., like a classic cartel, proposes to restrict supply artificially by controlling medical school enrollment and slowing the flow of foreign-trained physicians. However, excessive demand for medical education will persist as long as its value to prospective physicians exceeds what it costs them. I am not advocating that medical schools auction off spaces to the highest bidder. We should insure that all groups have access to medical school.

The report's conclusion that a surplus of physicians is likely to have negative consequences on the quality and cost of patient care is puzzling. Apparently, the A.M.A. believes that if doctors are too plentiful they will not perform medical procedures often enough to maintain the needed skill level. While possessing some merit, this position is overbroad.

The connection between physician surpluses and a pervasive reduction in quality is unproven. Moreover, it seems more appropriate to encourage physicians who have not performed procedures with sufficient frequency to refer patients to other physicians and to discipline incompetent performance. More generally, the A.M.A. should focus on policing the conduct of existing physicians rather than restricting new entry.

Further, the report makes the dubious assertion that an oversupply will produce a greater tendency for specialists to provide primary care at a higher cost than generalists. But an increase in physicians should lower costs by creating greater competition among both physicians and delivery systems. Specialists could raise prices only if they had monopoly power or if patients or third parties paid whatever price the specialist charged. Given the widespread adoption of cost containment and alternative delivery mechanisms such as health maintenance organizations, these assumptions seem unrealistic.

Just as dubious is the argument (not made by the A.M.A.) that a surplus would cause physicians to perform unnecessary procedures to maintain income. This problem is most likely when services are rendered under a retrospective cost-reimbursement system that lacks any controls to monitor overuse. Once again, the increased use of controls, cost-containment measures and incentive-based systems substantially reduces this problem.

To its credit, the report's recommendations dealing with insuring high quality medical education and improving the distribution of physicians reflect the positive strain of the A.M.A.'s personality. Unfortunately, the report's cartel-like preoccupation with restricting physician supply overwhelms the salutary aspects.


Jonathan Rose is a Professor at the College of Law. He received his LL.B. magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota and is an expert in antitrust law, professional regulation and regulatory reform, writing frequently on regulatory issues. This article has previously been published in the New York Sunday Times Business Forum.
Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission vs. The National Football League:

The Oakland Raiders Franchise Move Case*

The Student Bar Association and the College of Law sponsored a law school forum on the Oakland Raiders franchise move case on November 7, 1986. Professor James Weinstein coordinated the program. Dean Paul Bender was moderator.

Pat Lynch and Max Blecher led counsel for the National Football League and the Los Angeles Coliseum respectively, debated issues from the case after an introduction of the legal issues by Professor Jonathan Rose.

Pat Lynch, a 1966 graduate of Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, practices antitrust law with O'Melveny and Myers in Los Angeles. He is the past chairman of the Antitrust Committee of the American Bar Association. Max Blecher was a trial lawyer with the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice, after graduating in 1955 from the University of Southern California Law School. Since then he has been in private practice with an emphasis on antitrust law and is a member of the National Commission for the Review of Antitrust-Laws and Procedures.

After the debate, a panel of experts was introduced by Professor John Morris. The panel was composed of the following: Dave Megassey, a former linebacker for the St. Louis Cardinals and author of the book "Out of Their League:" Mike Gallagher, a 1970 graduate of the ASU College of Law and former professional baseball player, now with the Phoenix firm of Gallagher & Kennedy and specializing in sports law; and Professor Ralph Spritzer, an expert in antitrust law and oral advocacy. Excerpts from this program are given below.

Jonathan Rose: Let me see if I can quickly put the antitrust issues that are going to be discussed today in context. Everyone agreed that this case is about antitrust law. The rule at that time required three-quarters of all the owners to vote to approve a move of a franchise into the home territory of an existing franchise. In the case, therefore, was whether that rule violated the antitrust law. There was an agreement by both sides that the issue would be tested under the rule of reason, not the per se rule, which meant that there would be an inquiry into the harms and benefits of that rule. In a rule of reason case you look at the harms, competition, the benefits to competition, and whether there are any less restrictive alternatives. This rise of the rule of reason antitrust litigation has caused some real problems, since it had been used infrequently in the past in delineating what kinds of harms and benefits would be relevant to the analysis. In one sense this was not a new issue to antitrust law. As early as Chicago Board of Trade in the first part of the century, Justice Brandeis suggested that shortening working hours was a legitimate benefit. There have been other claims, including a reduction in racial discrimination, improved foreign relations, and a whole host of things. Antitrust has always been somewhat dubious about things that weren't related to competition. The same case arose with regard to harms. Recently Missouri sued the National Organization of Women, claiming that efforts to have states which didn't pass the ERA boycotted violated the antitrust laws. The court decided that those kinds of harms were really politically motivated and not the kind of harms that had the anticompetitive effect the antitrust laws were concerned about.

Thus the debate has existed throughout antitrust as to what kinds of harms are relevant and what kinds of benefits are relevant. In the Professional Engineers case, the Supreme Court talked about the impact on competitive conditions, which made it appear that many kinds of social benefits would not be considered because they weren't benefits to competition. They were just other kinds of social benefits. However, that narrow language in Professional Engineers didn't tell the whole story, and actually further language in that case, as well as the holding in that case and other cases, raised the prospect that the kinds of relevant benefits that could be looked to were broader. And this case involves partly that problem, the question being whether community interest and fan interest are the kinds of benefits that are relevant in antitrust analysis... As I am sure the debaters will tell you, the jury (upheld by the Ninth Circuit) found that rule 4.3 was an unreasonable restraint of trade. But the main issue was that we want to focus on, in making that judgment, is what kinds of benefits ought to be deemed relevant in antitrust analysis and whether they ought to include the things like fan and community interest and not simply benefits to competition in the sense of increased efficiency or reduced costs...

Pat Lynch: What's right in this case? Is it right that the Oakland Raiders should move from Oakland, where they have been supported continuously by sellout crowds for 20 seasons, to Los Angeles because the citizens of Los Angeles find it inconvenient to drive an additional 30 miles to Oakland? Is it right that the people in Oakland, who undertook 30 years of bonded indebtedness to keep the Oakland Raiders in existence at a time when they were roughly equivalent to the late lamented USFL in stature, built them a stadium, supported them at that time, and made them a big and profitable enterprise, now can lose "their" team because of the personal preferences of Al Davis (owner of the Raiders) or because of the opportunity to latch onto what seemed to him to be a highly lucrative pay TV market in the Los Angeles area? Is it advantageous to this one individual to leave behind that stadium, with its bonded indebtedness, and those fans who had paid for season tickets for 20 years and who have waited on waiting lists for even longer, and move to Los Angeles. Is that a good thing? Is the public well served by that decision? That to me, is the question we ought to be asking. Are the antitrust laws, as the primary focus of how we deal with professional sports, as a part of our society, doing a job for the public? . . .

Now the first question posed in this case was: Should the antitrust laws govern this activity? Is it fair to call the league a conspiracy, or is the league more like a corporation, a single team in a single competition by itself, and does this make its business and necessarily required to make joint decisions? When my law firm, over my objection, established an office in Washington, I wouldn’t have lasted long in the federal courthouse. I would have found a conspir- acy between my partners to restrain trade by forcing us to reduce our competitive posture in Los Angeles by sending off the Washington, which I thought was a crazy idea. Why? Because the partnership, although it is clearly a combination of people able to escape in business on their own, is a single economic enterprise under well-coordinated attack. And what we asked the judge to do in this case . . . and ask, “Isn’t this more like a corporation or a partnership or a single enterprise, and shouldn’t the antitrust law standards apply to the decisions of a single enterprise to be applied to it?”

The second question that we raised with the court was: Assuming that the antitrust laws govern here, can we try to bring the antitrust laws somewhat in accordance with common sense? And can’t we call to the jury’s attention that the real issue in this case . . . is simply this: It is required to perceive. What is the employment, a combination, or whatever you want to call it, to recognize a duty of responsibility to the people who have been its good customers for so many years? One of the most bizarre and irrelevant issues that occurred in this case was an overnight decision by Judge Preger- son that he could grant a directed verdict on the grounds that the League had been in business on their own, that they could have pulled out of the National Football League and become the Harlem Globetrotters of football. And from that he concludes that they are not a single enterprise. This was a matter of living to guarantee that the Denver Broncos would be there (as they were last Monday night to a sold out stadium), that the New England Patriots would be there, that those other enterprises would be required by contracts to come.

We said that in that sense it’s reasonable for the people who operate the whole enterprise to consider loyalty to their customers to consider the fact that each and every one of them is playing in a stadium which is to some degree or other funded by public money, on which they are getting a very favorable financial tradeoff. Now Max Becker says that we were entitled to refer to public interest factors only to the extent that we could communicate to the jury a lot of exotic economic analysis . . . I think that the law absolutely let the public down on that issue. Instead, the issue that went to the jury in this case was: Does this restriction cause an in- crease in competition? Is it increased competition between football teams was of any relevance to the public whatsoever.

Max Becker: You can look at the franchise relocation issue the same. And I am going to do it for you both ways. You can look at it as if it was a case of Rose antitrust law under the rule of reason, and that’s of course, what you are required to do in the court- room. Or, you can look at it in the basis of ethical and moral consideration, but they have to show the real- ly the undertakings of the decision and the resolution of this case allowing the Raiders to do what they did. But first let’s take a look at the question of what’s notion of community interest, fan support, fit in . . .

The bottom line is that, in straight legal analysis, in a “rule of reason” approach, those facts play a very minor, relatively insignificant role in the resolution of the legal question. That question starts with, as Pat said, whether or not the National Football League is one person incap- acitating one person by conspiring, or whether it is in truth 32 separate teams which, if they make internal agreements, are capable of conspiring. Now the one thing that I think has been twisted and distorted out of context is a lawyer- commonality of interest. The thing that we have been looking to in order to convince the clients of something that never entered the clients’ heads. It is fantastic and you see it every day; in- ventive and imaginative defense lawyers to get $22 million dollar fees are wonderful at this. Now they have a new thing; they hire a social shrink to go through video- tape performances and help them structure these new businesses. It’s a shoddy business and it’s in business on their own, that they could have pulled out of the National Football League and become the Harlem Globetrotters of football. And from that he concludes that they are not a single enterprise. This was a matter of counting.

The league’s power is profound. The league’s partnership is some kind immune in its internal decisions, immune from the antitrust laws, is something the lawyers thought of the business people who put the NFL together. That’s not in the constitution. The first very ancient of their constitution, Art. I, recites that the purpose of the NFL is to promote and foster the primary business of league business members . . . The purpose of the league was to help the owners make money. Once you accept the notion that there is that kind of competition, and that’s what they did here. They passed the rule, the only rule that the Denver Broncos would be there (as they were last Monday night to a sold out stadium), that the New England Patriots would be there, that these other enterprises would be required by contract to continue.

We said that in that sense it’s reasonable for the people who operate the whole enterprise to consider loyalty to their customers to consider the fact that each and every one of them is playing in a stadium which is to some degree or other funded by public money, on which they are getting a very favorable financial tradeoff. Now Max Becker says that we were entitled to refer to public interest factors only to the extent that we could communicate to the jury a lot of exotic economic analysis . . . I think that the law absolutely let the public down on that issue. Instead, the issue that went to the jury in this case was: Does this restriction cause an increase in competition? Is it increased competition between football teams was of any relevance to the public whatsoever.

Max Becker: You can look at the franchise relocation issue the same. And I am going to do it for you both ways. You can look at it as if it was a case of Rose antitrust law under the rule of reason, and that’s of course, what you are required to do in the courtroom. Or, you can look at it in the basis of ethical and moral consideration, but they have to show the really the undertakings of the decision and the resolution of this case allowing the Raiders to do what they did. But first let’s take a look at the question of what’s notion of community interest, fan support, fit in . . .
people that this rule was better for the public interest and better for competition. . . . Now, finally, the fact of the matter is that there is an immunity if you adopt this single entity notion.

There's a lot of debate about the single entity notion. But the bottom line fact is that if the League were viewed as a single entity, all the internal decisions of these 26 separate owners and corporations would be immune from the antitrust laws. He may not like the word, but that's the reality of it. That's different from General Motors. General Motors is one entity. It doesn't have 26 separate competing interests, people who threaten each other in some way by moving into their locations, for example. And so the process that he argues for, to treat the League as though it was a single company, is nothing more than an argument to say our decisions are above inquiry by you, the United States of America, or anybody who seeks to attack them.

John Morris: We here in Phoenix are deeply grateful to you, Max, for your representation of the Raiders. We've been looking to get a franchise in Phoenix for years. . . . Bruce Babbitt went to New York to confer with Mr. Rozelle (NFL Commissioner) about getting a franchise in Phoenix, and when he met with Rozelle the rumor was that Pete said to him, "Would you like tickets to the Super Bowl?" and Babbitt said, "What's the Super Bowl?"

We're sure it's not going to be solved for some time. Ask Jack LaBota (Adjunct Professor and attorney with Meyer, Hindrick, Victor, Osborn & Maleden, P.A.) sitting there in the back. He is now representing the negotiators for the City of Phoenix to build a stadium with beaucoup de loot to make sure everyone gets a chance to bid on a franchise. Now see Alison Swan there (with the Attorney General's office); she's our antitrust expert for the state. So we're listening to what you have to say today, and we have a panel there to discuss some of the issues which were raised or to make a statement. I think I will start off with Professor Spritzer. Do you wish to make a statement?

Ralph Spritzer: I think this case and the discussion of it really illustrates a couple of difficulties that often involve lawyers and law students, especially law students. One is the difficulty of applying a doctrine which has grown up to deal with one set of problems to a problem that really doesn't fit very well. . . . Now the fact is, with a professional sports league one has a very special problem. There are a number of things which the owners have to get together. The prosperity of each of them depends upon working out schedules, upon each team being viable, upon each team having a certain degree of stability. And so there has to be a compromise in dealing with a professional sports league in the sense that conduct which might not be allowed or clearly would not be allowed in an ordinary business can be permitted to some degree where a professional sports league is concerned. And the problem, of course, as our oral advocates have made clear, in this case was to decide whether some restrictions that might be imposed with respect to mutual arrangements, with respect to stability of the franchise, whether some restrictions which might be permitted were exceeded by the kind of regime that the NFL adopted.

The other difficulty that I think this case illustrates is that the antitrust laws really don't provide a very good mechanism for taking into account the community interest of Oakland or of its fans—the real concern that the Oakland fan may have in keeping hold of his cherished heroes. . . . The antitrust laws are concerned with the openness of sport, as Al Davis to trade, as well as something like the owners of the other pro teams to pursue their individual and joint activity in prospering by exhibiting football. Well, if there is a legitimate interest in community well and isn't the antitrust laws, aren't there other ways by which cities like Phoenix, if they get a franchise, can protect their interests through contract or regulation?

John Morris: Why don't we ask Dave Meggysey, who is with the National Football League Player's Association and is the Western Regional person, to comment.

Dave Meggysey: It seems to me that what was really going on in Los Angeles (at least regarding the National Football League) are questions of monopoly power and questions about the concentration of monopoly power. The antitrust laws have not only applied to franchise re-location issues, they've applied to the draft, the Rozelle Rule, and a number of things that have been central to the players' interests in terms of seeing how the monopoly has worked to the detriment of the players and to the detriment of the public interest. I think there is another element here, and it really is a question of responsibility. It asks the question of how responsible the National Football League has been in its operations over the past 64 years. . . .

I think, in the course of events over the past 20 years, that the public interest has been served by the fact that the League has conformed to antitrust laws. . . . I think the other thing to keep in mind is how the League has operated over the years. It basically has operated to get limited antitrust exemptions from Congress. In 1961, when the Sports Broadcasting Act was passed that allowed the member clubs to share all the television revenues; the second one was to form a functional monopoly . . . which was the merger exemption in 1966. The trade for that was the New Orleans franchise and numerous Super Bowls that are played in New Orleans. So my point is that the League has not been above acting . . . against the public interest. I think the antitrust laws have not only protected the Al Dairies of the world, they've protected the players and they certainly have protected the general public interest.

John Morris: Also, one might say in passing, that in terms of the damage issues involved in the Oakland Raiders' case, there was a settlement with reference to the change of assets—that is, the leaving of the Oakland franchise there and the Raiders moving into Los Angeles, in effect appropriating an asset, as the court viewed it, which belonged to the National Football League, so there was a tradeoff in the damage issue.

Moving on, we have our own representative here. Mike Gallagher has done yeoman's work in representing the City of Phoenix in all of the professional football and other activities, and we asked him to serve on the panel to make a few comments. Thank you, Mike.

Mike Gallagher: I thought what I might do is share a little bit of the historical perspective of what was going on in Phoenix while the Al Davis lawsuit was being decided, because a reasonable argument can be mounted that the Al Davis lawsuit cost Phoenix a National Football League franchise. . . . Governor Bruce Babbitt had a meeting in New York with Commissioner Rozelle after which he returned to Phoenix and formed a committee to study numerous issues related to the obtaining of a professional football franchise for Arizona. I was asked to head that committee. One of its principal functions was to study the Board of Regents' then-existing rule that Sun Devil Stadium could not be used for professional football. After much investigation, the committee recommended that the rule be changed, which recommendation was accepted by the Board of Regents. Thus, Sun Devil Stadium was ready and willing to house a National Football League expansion franchise. However, due in large measure to the Al Davis lawsuit, the NFL put its expansion plans on hold. Around this same time, while the NFL was litigating, the USFL was forming.

Since the change in ASU policy, Sun Devil Stadium has in fact housed USFL football, and three NFL clubs have expressed varying degrees of interest in the Phoenix area. The first was the Baltimore Colts, which ultimately moved to Indianapolis. The second team to stir up excitement in Arizona was the Philadelphia Eagles. That organization went so far as to rent office space, hire press people, and identify a practice facility. The Eagles' approach was rather simple. They asked nothing of the city, merely announcing they had decided to move. The local press broke the story just before the last regular season game. When the news hit Philadelphia, there was an outcry and the city leaders, by complying with a number of demands of Mr. Rose, the owner, were able to convince the team to stay in Philadelphia. The last team to generate a lot of interest in Arizona has been the St. Louis Cardinals. Mr. Bidwell, the owner of that club, has let it be known that he is testing the water in a number of market places, including Phoenix.

The seeking out of a major league baseball franchise has probably been a little less flamboyant than the football efforts. A contingent from Phoenix, including Mayor Goddard and myself, met with Commissioner Ueberroth in December, 1986. At that time, Mr. Ueberroth announced to a number of communities that a major league baseball team should be viewed in many respects as a civic project, which is an interesting proposition when applied to major league sports which generally are viewed as part and parcel of the free enterprise system operated by entrepreneurs for a profit motive. Nevertheless, I believe that the revenue and intangible benefits which flow to a community as the result of major league sports are of such a magnitude as to justify the expenditure of substantial public moneys to help underwrite playing facilities.
Hail Britannia: Impressions of the College of Law’s London Program

Mark A. Hall and Diana S. Greene

Your eyes are stinging, weary from the burdens of reading endless cases about incomprehensible bankruptcy statutes. You decide it’s time for some refreshment. You step outside. Would you like to step out into the brisk air that stirs your breath and wash past the green grocer’s, the fishmonger’s, and the baker’s on your way to the corner pub, where you sit in an overstuffed chair in front of a blazing fire surrounded by Victorian hunting decor sipping a Whitbread’s “Best Bitter.” Or would you rather climb into your scruffy car, drive to the generic fern bar in the nearest shopping center, and guzzle a Miller Lite while sitting on a laminated wood stool surrounded by video booths, strobe lights, and drunks under the bar? The twenty-four students who participated in the fall semester’s London Program found the former more appealing, never mind the fact that the beer was warm and the fire fake.

The students came from Arizona, Iowa, Indiana, and Kansas, six of the seven schools make up the London Law Consortium, which was formed two years ago to give students an international perspective to their law studies. The program is headquartered at the University of London in the Bloomsbury district. Bloomsbury is where folks like Virginia Woolf, E.M. Forster, D.H. Lawrence, and Bertrand Russell lived and met to sip tea and chat about the intellectual issues of the times. It is a considerably more inspiring environment than Temple (or somewhere), but you get the picture; funny that Hanley, Washington, Colorado aren’t Consortium members.

We went along as one of three teacher families charged with the task of seeing that the students actually worked. Each student enrolled in four of the six offerings, which ranged from traditional legal subjects, such as bankruptcy and administrative law, to esoterica such as comparative health care law and art law. The courses were enriched by interesting faculty and enlightening presentations by British guest lecturers on the topic at hand.

The most entertaining offering was art law, where, as part of their studies, students attended an art auction at Sotheby’s, gave class reports on the most expensive art object they could convince some unsuspecting gallery owner to let them see, and studied the controversy over the Elgin marbles, the British Museum’s marble carvings taken from the facade of the Parthenon by Lord Elgin in the 19th century (supposedly only for safekeeping, but now that Greece is a safe place no one is offering to give them back).

Of course, the classes are not what everyone remembers most vividly. The London Program offers an experience that teaches as much out of the classroom as inside. The American Institute of Foreign Studies (AIFS), which provides all the logistical support for the program, arranged a wide variety of legal and cultural extracurricular activities. We took day trips to Oxford, Cambridge, Bath and other nearby towns and we attended first-rate theater. We walked the lanes and byways of legal London, explored ancient legal bookshops, marveled at the regalia displayed during the ceremonies for the opening of the legal year, and toured the Inns of Court and the Royal Courts of Justice.

We learned a great deal about the differences in our supposedly similar legal systems. Our two systems are often conjoined almost as Siamese twins by the term “Anglo-American.” However, try asking an American lawyer to keep a straight face during a dead serious courtroom argument while wearing a George Washington wig. It’s even harder if you are a woman, since the exquisitely wig styles have not evolved to accommodate a two-gender profession. Personally, neither of us could ever be a trial lawyer in England. Even a necktie is too formal for one of us.

The structure of the British legal profession is also rather curious. Far from the ambulance-chasing reputation of contingent-fee-paid American trial lawyers, British barristers strictly adhere to the ethical constraint that they cannot have a direct financial relationship with a member of the public. If you want a trial lawyer in England, you can’t get one without going through your solicitor and paying by the hour.

The most revealing experience with the British legal system came during an oral argument at the Royal Courts of Justice in an appeal of a criminal sentence. This case was remarkable for several reasons. The defendant had not communicated with his counsel during the entire proceeding; he sat like a penalized hockey player between two guards in the booth on the far side of the room, not even attempting to address the sentencing judge. The judge considered illegal factors or exceeded the legal maximum, but instead it was a de novo reconsideration of the length of the sentence, something unheard of in our legal system. The most vivid impression came from something as mundane as the process of transcription. Instead of a bored stenographer mechanically jogging away on her stenograph instrument, there was an elderly, overweight gentleman whose substantial jowls jiggled as he hurriedly handwrote each word.

This is just one of many examples of where the high-tech, computer world has yet to arrive in the U.K. While this characteristic makes the country enormously quaint, it also makes for some hair-raising annoyances. Take the arrangement of my machine, for instance. It seems that very few homes are hooked up with those impersonal screening devices so prevalent here. In our book, that’s definitely plus in the quaint category. However, when the absence of phone-answering devices means letting the phone ring at least 10 minutes for some bloke at British Rail to pick up, quaintness goes right out the window. Over time you learn to prepare for phone calls as you would a plane trip by bringing books, bills, or stationery to while away the time.

Banks in London provide another example of a country that has not quite embraced the computer age. British banks look just like the ones you may remember from the movie “The Sting”: oak filing trays instead of pneumatic tubes, gray tin wastebaskets instead of paper shredders, and countless stacks of handwritten receipts instead of minute, computer-printed cards. And British bank architecture offers a pleasant change from Valley National Bank’s oversized golf ball at Apache and Rural.

When it comes to the written and spoken word, the British are so eloquent and well-versed it’s almost intimidating. Newspapers are not afraid to print words like “mendacious.” Penguin paperbacks are displayed alongside the pulp at train station magazine stores and bookstores. The “tube” (the subway), most commuters seem to be reading poetry, history, or literature. Don’t misunderstand us—there is lots of humor. With more than a dozen daily papers published in London, all tastes are accommodated. If you’re looking for sensational headlines with bare bones writing and some sensual photographs of bare bone females, there are several offerings.

Television news in Britain is yet another barometer of our very different cultures. For starters, there are no Miss Britains smiling at you as they blythly report that thousands were killed in an earthquake in southern Nepal. Women newscasters are delightfully normal looking. Blow-dried news hasn’t hit the U.K. The war stars between stations, with its resulting slick superficiality, is rather low-key.

On the other hand, President Reagan’s Star Wars defense plan is very big news. During the tense autumn of arms race patriotism, seemingly every twitch of Reagan’s eyebrow became front page news. All defense issues are of grave concern to the British since it is their bogey moors where those nuclear arsenals are stockpiled.

We could continue on and on with our impressions of England. We lived with dorm-room-sized refrigerators; we heard cockney-accented strangers call us “lur” and “ganger”; we saw first-run television showings of “Spitting Image” and “Yes, Minister” with minimal commercial interruption (and never a mention of NutraSweet); we smelled the mixture of odors that emanate from a street crowded with sidewalk fish stalls and unkempt punk rockers. But to carry this any further would merely detract from our overall impression that the second annual London Program was a smashing success, despite the falling value of the dollar and the rising fear of terrorism. So next time you hear the pitch “sign with us and see three continents,” listen up. It may be the law school’s recruiter, not the Navy’s.
Law School News

Art and Architecture Reception

A reception was held at the College of Law on October 16, 1986 to celebrate recent gifts of art and also to view the plans for the new building addition.

Over the past several months, the College of Law has received numerous art donations, "The Courtyards," a series of 20 lithographs by artist John L. Doyle, is now part of the law school's permanent collection. Doyle traveled from his home in North Carolina to attend the reception. His presentation focused on his research of the various cultures represented in "The Courtyards" and highlighted the meaning of some of the symbols used in his work. He commented that the concept of justice varies from culture to culture and is based on the moral and ethical foundation of custom and religion. In effect, law and justice often become the mirrors that reflect the social values of a society.

Other works of art donated by individual artists were exhibited in Classroom 112. The artists represented include: Lynn Berryhill, Minnie Dobbin, Gale Dobbin, and Mary Ehling, Jerry Gunning, Ken Harbaugh, Bob Howard, Kay Howard, Howard Holz, Dolores Roberts and Veloy Vigil. Some of these artists were also present at the reception to discuss their works.

Suzanne Brown, of the Suzanne Brown Gallery in Scottsdale, offered comments regarding these donations, which are also a part of the law school's permanent collection. She stated that the College of Law now has one of the most significant collections of contemporary southwestern art in the United States. Her gallery was responsible for coordinating these gifts for the law school.

Jim Hughes, an architect with Dean/Furneaux and Associates, Incorporated, gave an overview of the building addition plans, noting that construction was scheduled to begin in mid-February. Blueprints, artist renderings, and a model of the new building were on display during the reception.

Profile of Four Entering Students

The College of Law has always attracted a wide variety of students, and the 96 entering class is no exception. Composed of 191 students, this year's entering class represents 108 undergraduate institutions and 28 states. Their ages range from 21-73 years; 48 are from 30-39 years and 18 are minors. The median LSAT is now 37 and the GPA 3.33. Statistics alone are not a true measure of diversity, however, as can be seen in the following four profiles.

Dean Paul Bender discusses art with Stephen Lee, Todd Sturmsky, and Suzanne Brown, Prof. Dennis Karjila, Jack Brown, Mike Kennedy and Prof. James Weinstein look on.

Suzanne Brown

Model of Armstrong Hall, showing building addition and idea for future library building

When other retired business owners are out playing golf and enjoying the fruits of their labor, William Shapira, at age 73, studies law. Mr. Shapira, the most senior member of the entering class, is also one of the most popular. "My classmates have been so helpful and are such a caring group of people," he says.

In 1948, Mr. Shapira began a paint manufacturing business near South Bend, Indiana. He was accepted at Notre Dame Law School in the 1960s but stated, "Going to law school then would have interfered too much with my family and business commitments, so I declined the invitation." After selling his business in the 70's, Mr. Shapira and his family moved to Arizona. His concern for the indigent elderly prompted his work as a volunteer with the Senior Citizens Law Project in Phoenix. Listening to and helping sort out the various problems of these citizens in Washington. Previously he served for three years as Deputy Director for the Puyallup National Health Authority in Washington.

Mr. Shapira's wife and two daughters have been very supportive of his new venture. One daughter is a concert violinist and Director of Music at the University of Alaska, and the other is a medical doctor in New York City. While enduring the rigors of the first-year curriculum, this energetic student looks forward to continuing his legal education over the next two years.

When returned military personnel are out playing golf and enjoying the fruits of their labor, John White played football for law books when he entered the College of Law at ASU. Originally from Casa Grande, AZ, he attended the University of West Virginia when offered a football scholarship. Mr. White played all four years and was starting quarterback his senior year, while also receiving his B.S. degree in Political Science. He says he finds football and law school to be similar because of "the competitive atmosphere."

Kevin White traded a football for law books when he entered the College of Law at ASU. Originally from Casa Grande, AZ, he attended the University of West Virginia when offered a football scholarship. Mr. White played all four years and was starting quarterback his senior year, while also receiving his B.S. degree in Political Science. He says he finds football and law school to be similar because of "the competitive atmosphere."

On the other side of the desk feels a little strange to being a Koregaokar after teaching Political Science at Arizona State University for ten years. Dr. Stockey is a first-year law student with a B.A. and M.A. in Political Science from Hamilton University in Huntington, West Virginia, and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Kentucky at Lexington. "Law school is a logical extension of what I've been doing," he stated.

Dr. Stockey was influenced to come to law school by his wife, Kitty Taylor, who is a third-year law student at ASU College of Law. They plan to set up a practice together after graduation. Dr. Stockey sometimes finds it difficult to switch modes from teaching part of the day to being taught the rest of the day. He also says he finds law school different from other graduate programs because it is "very focused."

Lynne Welles-Stevens is the former Director of the Hu- man Resources Department of the Quinault Indian Nation in Washington. Previously she served for three years as Deputy Director for the Puyallup National Health Authority in Washington.

Being on the other side of the desk feels a little strange to being a Koregaokar after teaching Political Science at Arizona State University for ten years. Dr. Stockey is a first-year law student with a B.A. and M.A. in Political Science from Hamilton University in Huntington, West Virginia, and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Kentucky at Lexington. "Law school is a logical extension of what I've been doing," he stated. Dr. Stockey was influenced to come to law school by his wife, Kitty Taylor, who is a third-year law student at ASU College of Law. They plan to set up a practice together after graduation. Dr. Stockey sometimes finds it difficult to switch modes from teaching part of the day to being taught the rest of the day. He also says he finds law school different from other graduate programs because it is "very focused."

Lynne Welles-Stevens is the former Director of the Human Resources Department of the Quinault Indian Nation in Washington. Previously she served for three years as Deputy Director for the Puyallup National Health Authority in Washington.

Clinical Program Receives Grant

For the second year, the College of Law at Arizona State University has received a grant from the Arizona Bar Foundation. The grant, in the amount of $46,630, will be used to continue the College's community service clinical program in Mesa. This grant was among more than $600,000 in grants given statewide this year by the State Bar Foundation to support and expand the delivery of legal services to the poor under Arizona's Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts (IOLTA) Program. Eleven students are participating in the Mesa clinical program this year.

The College of Law's program is designed and supervised by Associate Professor Douglas Blazier. Professor Blazier graduated magna cum laude from Dickinson College with a B.S. and received his J.D. summa cum laude from the Georgetown University Law Center. Prior to coming to the law school, he was an associate with the Fennoerme, Craig, von Ammon, Udall & Powers law firm in Phoenix.

Building Addition

The addition of 17,278 square feet to Arizona State University's College of Law building is under way. This project will add two-story wings for library and study space, offices, and classrooms. 14,200 square feet of the present facility will also be remodeled, providing expansion of classroom space, the law school clinic, the moot court, and the legal writing program.

During the fall semester a program reflecting the school's needs was developed. Architects drew up blueprints based on these findings. The Building Committee then worked to refine the plans and to obtain the needed funds, also to stay within budgetary restrictions. Professor Jonathan Rose, Chair of the Building Committee, commented, "We are very pleased with the design."
Moot Court News
The College of Law's Moot Court Board began its schedule of events for the 1986-87 academic year with the Jenkins, ABA Negotiation, and the National Moot Court Team competitions. In November, the ASU team won the Jenkins Cup from the University of Arizona during the closing argument competition in Tucson. The team was comprised of Joe Rogers (89) and Alice Finn Garrett (89) and Professors Michael Berch and Douglas Blize� announced the Jenkins Cup team.

In addition, two members from the College of Law excellence in the November 20-22 National Moot Court Regional competition in Denver. The team of Cathy O'Grady (87) and Frank Sandner (87) placed fourth in overall in the Regional, with their briefs also ranking second place. The team of Cathy O'Grady (87), Patty Bushkin (87), and John LeHart (87), were third place in their briefs for their regional qualifications.

JESSUP TEAM PREVAILS
The Jessup International Moot Court Team, Kevin Neal (87), Sue Lawler (87), Rita Janes (88), and David Shein (88), finished first in the Regional competition in February. Ten residential regions competed at the University of Denver College of Law. The ASU team traveled to Boston in April for the finals. Patty Bushkin (87) served as coordinator for the team, and Professor Fernando Toston is the team's faculty advisor.

Negotiation Competition
The Law Student Division of the American Bar Association sponsors an annual negotiation competition for law students. This year we entered the competition for the first time, on very short notice. In late October, we conducted a very spirited intraschool negotiation competition. The intraschool competition was organized and administered by the National Moot Court Board. It took place over several evenings, with both a preliminary round and a final round. Each round was judged by practicing lawyers and members of the law school faculty. The winners of the intraschool competition were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88). The students selected were Sally Maharan (88) and Angela Miller (88).

Sally and Angela represented the College of Law at the National regional competition in Provo, Utah at Brigham Young University on February 22, 1986. During the two weeks before the regionals, Sally and Angela engaged in several "practice" rounds, negotiating against recent graduates of the College of Law who volunteered their time to assist in the program. Other lawyers, in addition to being members of the law school faculty, observed and critiqued the team during their practice round negotiations.

In addition, two rounds of negotiation during the regional competition at Provo. The ASU team performed excellently, Sally and Angela outsized all their opponents during the second round, and finished in second place overall in the combined score for the two rounds. The ASU team score was only five one-hundredths of a point behind the overall winner of the regional competition, a team from the University of Miami. Sally and Angela were dissatisfied with the Byu regional, after finishing with such a close second. Had they won, they would have gone to the national finals, to be held in New Orleans in February. Nevertheless, they and I am justifiably proud of their outstanding accomplishment.

Professor Gary T. Lowenthal Faculty Advisor for the Negotiation Competition.

Negotiation Competition Team: Sally Maharan and Angela Miller, with Dean Paul Bender and Prof. Gary Lowenthal.

Special Football Game Recognition for Law Professors Michael Berch and Charles Calleiro
Professor Michael Berch was one of only three ASU faculty members chosen to be specially honored this year in pre-game ceremonies for their outstanding contributions and accomplishments. Mike was recognized in an on-field ceremony prior to the ASU-Washington State game on September 21. This is the second year of the program of recognizing selected outstanding faculty at football games. John Morris was chosen last year.

In addition, six ASU faculty members were recognized in public address announcements during home football games for their accomplishments and contributions.

Baseball Calleiro was honored at the Utah game on October 25. Last year, Professor David Kaye was recognized.

Center for the Study of Law, Science, and Technology
The Center for the Study of Law, Science and Technology sponsored a workshop on scientific evidence in criminal cases and a national conference on "Effective Use of Computer Services in Legal Services and Public Defender Programs." In January, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association cosponsored the computer conference, which attracted approximately 175 participants from across the country. In addition to conducting these two programs, Center staff and volunteers edited and published the proceedings of the Center, April 1986 symposium, "Reconsidering the AIDS Epidemic in the American: Legal, Political, and Social Policy Issues." The Center is affiliated with the Center for Legal Education in the National Judicial College, and Center affiliated faculty published papers on topics in communication law, computer law, forensic science, and health law.

Professor Ira Ellman was named an Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Law, Science, and Technology, which is produced jointly by the Center and the ABA Section on Technology. The first annual Computer Awards for outstanding papers on the Journal were presented to Professors Susan Roberts and Stephen D. Mack of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Center was invited to Forman, a series of public talks dealing with law and science. This spring's program included talks on the protection of the right to an abortion in the United States District Court and the feminist issues raised by the court. In addition to conducting these two programs, Center staff and volunteers edited and published the proceedings of the Center, April 1986 symposium, "Reconsidering the AIDS Epidemic in the American: Legal, Political, and Social Policy Issues." The Center is affiliated with the Center for Legal Education in the National Judicial College, and Center affiliated faculty published papers on topics in communication law, computer law, forensic science, and health law.

Professor James Alan Fox of Harvard University was named an Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Law, Science, and Technology, which is produced jointly by the Center and the ABA Section on Technology. The first annual Computer Awards for outstanding papers on the Journal were presented to Professors Susan Roberts and Stephen D. Mack of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Center was invited to Forman, a series of public talks dealing with law and science. This spring's program included talks on the protection of the right to an abortion in the United States District Court and the feminist issues raised by the court. In addition to conducting these two programs, Center staff and volunteers edited and published the proceedings of the Center, April 1986 symposium, "Reconsidering the AIDS Epidemic in the American: Legal, Political, and Social Policy Issues." The Center is affiliated with the Center for Legal Education in the National Judicial College, and Center affiliated faculty published papers on topics in communication law, computer law, forensic science, and health law.

Fall Orientation
Orientation for the 1986-87 entering class was held on August 22 with approximately 185 students taking part. "Orientation is a way to make first-year students more comfortable and familiar with their school," said Tom Stillwell, President of the Student Bar Association. "New friends and support groups are often established at this time.

The day began with a tour of the campus led by members of the SBA. Following the tour, the class assembled in the Great Hall, where they were greeted by Dean Paul Bender. A welcoming speech was made by former Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court William A. Holohan. Tom Stillwell introduced his wife, Catherine, Coordinator of Administrative Services, and Assistant Dean Nancy A. Murphy, Coordinator of Administration, as well as leaders of several student organizations.

Sample classes were taught by impressed students, Professor Jonathan Rose, Professor Richard Peet, Professor Richard Smith, and Professor Dean Bender taught a sample class to several entering students. Members of the entering class were divided into ten groups and participated in a question and answer session with peers from the second-year class. These peer advisors have had a chance to meet with the entering class throughout the semester to provide them with an ongoing source of information. The orientation concluded with a reception in the rotunda for faculty, staff, and guests.

Students Argue Before U.S. Court of Appeals
On March 15, the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals held oral arguments in two cases. The cases involved an ex parte motion to a Social Security law that prohibits the payment of social security retirement benefits to incarcerated felons and a challenge to regulations implementing that law as ultra vire and creating an irreparable presumption. The students briefed the case last semester and carried it on to oral argument. The panel drawn consisted of D.C. Circuit Judges Pat Wald, Sowtwood Robinson, and Harry Edwards. Congratulations to these students!
Admissions Update
Brian J. Murphy
Conference Co-Chair

Not only was the 1986 en-
tering class the second largest in the history of the College of Law, it was also the most di-
verse. The enrollment efforts made in the previous fall and spring semesters resulted in a substantial increase in both the quantity and diversity of the entering class. To bring the total number of first-year students enrolled to 191. This growth was partially the result of an increase in the number of applicants and the number of students actually admitted. In fact, fewer and fewer students are being admitted to the College of Law, while more and more students are actually attending the college. As of this past spring, the number of applications has increased to 12,573. The number of students actually admitted has increased to 10,087.

Placement Coordinator

There is never enough time or hands to prepare for and administer the fall recruitment program, not to mention the extra counseling, listening and encouraging efforts that are needed for the interviewers. During the Fall 1986, 85% of the students conducted 1,200 interviews with 101 second-year and 63 third-year students. Twenty-eight of the interviewers were conducting for their own

town with approximately 48% of the second-year class had secured summer employment by that time, and 61% of the third-year class had accepted offers for their summer positions.

New Approach for '87 Recruitment Program

Employers participating in the on-campus recruitment program next fall at Armstrong Hall may not need to miss a day at the job or to computation at the law school and attend the orientation program. The new approach to the program will begin in mid-April for May employers seeking new associates and law clerks. The program will be scheduled for May employers who want to reduce the "non-teaching" time during the recruitment season, faculty members who

SBA Briefs

President

During the Fall 1986 Se-

mer, the Armstrong Hall Social Law Association began a special project on the broadest possible spectrum of law students. Realizing that there were no "typical" law students, the SBA made the decision on two points.

First, some activities were especially planned to be of interest to all students and faculty and staff. A debate on Proposition 103, a talk by a candidate and Richard Kirkland, and support of a law school forum on the anti-trust aspects of the National Football League provided some intellectual diversion. The SBA has continued to operate its Book Store, take part, and study and aid on consignment from some students and later selling

them for'er. An additional 10% commission for the SBA. Some "emergency sup-
plies" were also added this year, and the popularity of the legal pads, pens, highlighters and hot coffee has been antibuding.

Also, some social events were designed to bring in law students with their spouses, partners and families. Early in the semester, a semi-formal party and "Armsman Hur- Roar" were well-attended by students, faculty, staff and many guests. Food, dancing were plentiful, and the "anything goes" roast of the law school and its people will be remembered for a long time.

Communication of current information is essential to any successful programming, so the SBA Briefs began publication on a weekly basis. The single-sheet newsletter is printed each Wednesday morning, and gives students a quick way to keep up on the SBA and the College. The SBA makes the Briefs available to all students and faculty and staff for announcements.

Realizing that you can't please all the people all the time, the SBA Briefs accomplishes some activities that appealed to a smaller number of people. The goal with these kinds of activities, however, was to make sure a variety of events were held that so many students would be served by one or more of them.

For the fitness-minded, the SBA Briefs provided an opportunity for students to get together early mornings and for later afternoons..Named for the location (at the law school rotunda), the group eventually moved to the floor of the College Hall to avoid the crowds of onlook-
er. The SBA Briefs was "Be There or Be Rotund!" The SBA supported additional student organizing events for the most notably the Western Regional Conference of Legal Students in Law. This ongoing event was highlighted by a spectacular art exhibit in the Rotunda, following the conference's theme of "Women Making a Difference." The rem\n

Devil's Advocate Election Results

The award-winning student newspaper, The Devil's Advocate, held its 10th annual election in the fall of 1987. The first edition of the newspaper was published in 1987. The first edition of the newspaper was published in 1987. The first edition of the newspaper was published in 1987. The first edition of the newspaper was published in 1987.
New Extremist Program

During the fall semester, Robert Hubbard (36) participated in an extramural with the Tribal Court of the Cila River Indian Community. He was the first ASU law student to be chosen. The extramural provides experience in Indian law and in legal practice at the Reservation level. It is expected to be available to students each year and will be an important part of ASU’s expanding Indian Law Program, which is being developed and supervised by Visiting Professor Leigh Price.

Guests and Visitors

Armstrong Hall was the site of several conferences and many meetings during the fall semester. In addition, LSAT review courses were run by the National Center for Testing and the Chicago Law Students, and a bar review course was held by BARBRI. The Development/Alumni office sponsored several events, including a DWI Seminar on September 6, an art reception on October 16, the Wendell Kay Tribute on November 9, and a Super Seminar Saturday on November 15. The Center for the Study of Law, Science and Technology held two events. The first, on December 6, was “Scientific Evidence 1986: Developments in Arizona and the Nation.” The second was an event sponsored by the Center with The National Legal Aid & Defender Association and Advocate Computer News. It was held January 8-10 and was entitled “Effective Use of Computers in Legal Services and Public Defender Programs.”

ASU Students Accept ’87-88 Judicial Clerkships

Several members of the 1987 graduating class accepted judicial clerkships with judges on the state and federal courts. The United States Courts of Appeals will be marketed to all students.

DEBORAH L. CROSS

Five years, 30 years, and 15 years, respectively, at the University of Arizona Law School.

The University of Arizona School of Law has announced the appointment of John F. Smith as the new dean of the law school.
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the University of Conduct Hearing Board. He is currently working on an article which explores the validity of the Social Security Administration's policy of "non-acquiescence" with decisions of the federal courts.

Charles Calleros published an article in the Spring 1986 issue of the University of San Francisco Law Review entitled "Variations on the Problem Method in First-Year and Upper-Division Classes." He was recognized for his academic accomplishments and contributions to the University in a public address announcement during an AU football game last fall. Professor Calleros was recently re-elected to the Board of Directors of the Society of American Law Teachers (SALT), and he continues to serve as Editor of the SALT newsletter. He and his wife, Debbie Driggis, are the proud parents of a son, Alexander Carlos Col- eros, born on February 28th.

Selwyn L. Dally continued as one of the Directors of the Law School Clinic. He assisted with the selection of the Law School's Trust and Estates participants and with the participants of the negotiation team. He also judged the practice rounds of the team. Professor Dally is presently working on an article exploring the due process limitations on the admission to evidence of the results of the most recent alcohol tests conducted by law enforcement personnel.

Richard Eifeld has returned to the College of Law to teach trusts and estates. He was a Visiting Professor at Pepperdine Law School during the fall semester. He is a member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws Drafting Committees working on a proposed Uniform Statute: Power of Attorney Form Act and attended a meeting of the Committee in Chicago in January.

In a recent article published in the Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law entitled "Foreign Judgments in Mexico and the United States," which includes a draft statute for Arizona and Senora, Mexico, Professor Dally published an article in the Fall 1986 issue of the Michigan Law Review entitled "Federal Taxation in the Taxpayer's World." His article was accepted for publication by the Harvard Law Review in May 1987. In addition, he is currently working on his book, "Book do Business in Mexico." His article "Formacion del Contrato Mercantil" was published in the Revista de Derecho Mercantil, and his article entitled "Patronalidad Laboral," published in the Revista Juridica de Madrid, was accepted for publication by Derecho, the law review of the Universidad Pontificia Catolica del Peru. Professor Dally attended the dedication of the new law school building at the University of Arizona as the official representative of the College of Law. He was serving as the Chair of the College of Law's Advisory Personnel Committee and is a member of the following University committees: Graduate Council; Curriculum Committee, the Board of Advisors for Latin American Studies; the University’s Microcomputer Telematic Fund Advisory Committee; the Personal Computer Support System Project, and a member of the Academic Computing Sub-Committee. Professor Dally has published several articles, one in Vol. 61 of the Washington Law Review, entitled "In Proof of Statistical Significance Relevant?" and another in Vol. 26 of the Jurimetrics Journal, "The Admissibility of Probability Evidence in Criminal Trials," and one with Professor Eifeld on "The Pitfalls of Empirical Research: Testing Faculty Publication Studies," for the Journal of Legal Education. He prepared a discussion of personal injury law for the Law School Admissions Council which was published in the Law School Alumni magazine, 1984-85: The Shame of Selecting Lawyers for the 21st Century. He is presently working on several articles on the evidentiary standards in civil procedures. Professor Eifeld adds a section in his book on this topic of "Economic Analysis in Teaching the Law of Criminal Procedure." He was one of the London Law Consortium's resident faculty members at the University of London during the Summer Semester. He had two articles accepted for publication: "Racially Inclusive and Inclusive An African's New Payment System: Reflections on the Meaning of 'Prosperity,'" by the University of Florida Law Review, and "The Jurisdictional Nature of the Time to Appeal," by the University of Georgia Law Review.

In a recent article entitled "Hospital and Physician Disclosure of Informal Criminal Information to Maine Police," Professor Eifeld was recently featured in the May 1986 issue of the University of Houston Law Review.

In a recent article entitled "Protection of Computer Database Unlawful in California," his article has recently appeared in the September 1986 issue of the Journal of Medical Ethics, "Scientific Journal and Law and Human Behavior."

Professor Lowenthal's interest in public defender funding also focused on legal problems as he served on a County Bar Association Committee studying the inadequate resources of the Maricopa County Public Defender Office. He also served as a volunteer mediator for the Community Mediation Program in Phoenix, mediating over ten disputes, including landlord-tenant, consumer, and minor criminal matters. In addition, Professor Lowenthal's community activities included team teaching a seminar on parenting skills, along with his spouse, Susan Cedar. He assures us, however, that his participation in this seminar was not necessarily a reflection of his own skills as a parent.

Alan H. Matheson was reappointed to a new term on the DNA (National Legal Services Board). He is a member of the Executive Committee, DNAR, a member of the Board of Directors of Faculty Development Program, Chair of the Advice, Consultation, and Guidance Committee of Arizona Bar Association, and Chair of the Curriculum Committee, College of Law. Professor Matheson completed an article for the Arizona State Law Journal, "A Peacekeeper's Tale: Free Speech and the Academic Freedom," and in addition, he was the educational director for a legal professional tour of the Soviet Union last summer.

Robert Minner has recently had two articles accepted for publication: "Limiting In Business Associations I, Professor Richard Morgan serves ice cream to his hungry customer, Professor Douglas Blaze.
Leon: A Mistake of Law Analysis,” to be published this spring in The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Professionalism. He is also the author of the book, the “Awkward Case of Harry Gibson,” to be published in the Journal of State Government. Presently Professor Milner is serving on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee and is a member of the Board of the Franciscan Renewal Center. Professor Milner will be leaving the College of Law in July to be Dean at Williamette University College of Law in Salem, Oregon.

Richard Morgan will be leaving the law school this summer to begin his new duties as Dean of the University of Wyoming College of Law.

John P. Morris has been appointed to the Dean’s Advisory Committee and to the Affirmative Action Committee at the College of Law, and has completed a paper on real estate construction and financing. This is a position for ASU to consider in relation to its posture when NIF funding is being considered. Professor P. Morgan has also started his draft of a Sports Law book.

William H. Pedrick was the Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Kansas Law School during the fall semester. He is currently teaching at the University of California, Irvine. On December 14, he conducted a faculty seminar at the University of Arizona Law School. He will be teaching estate planning at the College of Law this spring.

Alan Phillips, a visiting professor at the law school for eight weeks beginning in March as the Merrimack Professor, Professor Phillips has been a prominent figure in Public Policy, Economics, and Law at the University of Pennsylvania. He has taught in the areas of Regulation and Deregulation at the College of Law.

B. Leigh Price, who will remain a Visiting Professor at the College of Law for the 1986-87 academic year, served as Vice Chairman of the ABA Committee on Native American Natural Resources, organizing the 1987 Annual ABA Conference on Indian Country and the Law. He also spoke at the Southern Conference on Law and Conference and spoke to tribal officials from the Great Lakes on the subject of regulatory authority of tribal governments.

In January, he participated in a conference of officials from California, Nebraska and Arizona tribes interested in border environmental protection, and during the fall semester he served as Vortice Chairman of the House Interior Committee, advising on Indian amendments to the Clean Water Act, the Surface Mining Act and the Juvenile Delinquency Act. He is developing proposals for a summer pre-law program for American and an Indian Legal Studies Program for the College of Law. He will be teaching Environmental Law and Indian Law during the spring semester.

Charles Polski is on leave for the 1986-87 academic year, working at the Phoenix law firm of Smith & Wilmer.

Jonathan Rose is the Chairman of the College of Law Building Committee, and a member of the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee and the President's Congressional Committee. He is also a member of the Governor's Regulatory Review Council; the Arizona Board of Legal Specialization; the Annual Program Committee, National Clearinghouse on Licensing, Enforcement and Regulation; the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Advisory Board, Bureau of National Affairs; and the Executive Council of the Arizona Section of the State Bar of Arizona. Professor Rose was a speaker at the Annual Convention of the National Clearinghouse on Licensing, Enforcement and Regulation, in Denver, Colorado on "Suitem Law and National Legislation" at the 1986 Annual Rule Making Seminar on "The Governor's Regulatory Review Council." At the College of Law's Anti-trust Forum on the Oakland Raiders Case the "Antitrust and The Rule of Reason" Seminar Symposium and at the College of Law's Alumni Association "Law and the Community Seminar Seminar" on "Rule Selection and Characterization in Antitrust." He was also a participant in the 1986 Annual Mountain Bell Annual Seminar held in Denver, Colorado. Professor Rose was a guest on "KATV Television" television show on "Arizona Regulatory Agencies" and on "Interest Banking." He gave his law review lectures on Contracts and Exam Techniques in Phoenix and interviewed, acted as a consultant for various public and private clients regarding contracts, personal injury, estate, economic regulation, and administrative law.

Milton Schroeder is on sabbatical leave during the spring semester of 1987 and will be engaging in research in the general area of commercial banking transactions. During the first part of the semester, Professor Schroeder will remain in residence at the College of Law and conference and spoke to tribal officials from the Great Lakes on the subject of regulatory authority of tribal governments.

The Honorable William C. Canby, Jr., retired in the Spring semester of 1987 as an adjunct professor to teach Constitutional Law.

Stephen W. Craig, of Winston & Strawn, taught Corporate Acquisitions. Amy D. Glitter, Director of the Arizona Law Center for Law in the Public Interest, taught a public interest seminar.

Dennis Hoffman, Associate Professor of Economics at ASU, teamed up with Professor David Kaye to teach the course in Forensic Economics during the spring semester.


Bruce E. Meyersox, ASU General Counsel, taught Intellectual Property.

Jefrie G. Murphy, Professor of Philosophy at ASU, taught Jurisprudence.

The Honorable George B. Niemer, Jr., Bankruptcy Judge for the District of Arizona, taught Corporate Reorganization.

Samuel J. Sutton, of Cahill, Sutton and Thomas, taught Commercial Torts.

Gary W. Weidt, taught Real Estate Law.


Hugo Zettler, a Deputy County Attorney for Maricopa County, returned to teach and supervise the Prosecutor Clinic.

Two Professors Accept Positions as Deans

Two professors at the College of Law will be leaving Arizona State University July 1st to begin their careers as Deans at other institutions. Professor Robert L. Miner will be the new Dean of Williamette University College of Law at Salem, Oregon. Professor Miner, who received his B.A. magna cum laude from the University of San Francisco and his J.D. from the University of Chicago, has been teaching Criminal Law at the College of Law since 1983.

Professor and Associate Dean Richard J. Morgan will be returning to become Dean of the University of Wyoming College of Law at Laramie. Professor Morgan received his B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley, and his J.D. from UCLA School of Law. He has been teaching Business Associations and Corporation Reorganization at the College of Law and Local Government since the Associate Dean since 1983.

Irregardless of Who or Whom

The following letter was written by Associate Professor James Weinstein on January 14, 1987. Professor Weinstein began teaching at the College of Law in the fall semester of 1986. His areas of academic interest include Criminal Law, federal courts and civil procedure.

Dear Chief Justice Rehnquist,

I have an account of your correct a lettering for using "irregardless" as an adverb. You must have been interested in a grammatical error in one of your opinions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
In your defense, I must admit that when I told a friend of mine in the Eng-lish Department at Arizona State Univer-sity about your alleged error, she re-sponded that under liberal, modern usage, "whom" is correct whenever "who" has traditionally been used. (The reverse, she assured me, is not true.) I suppose there is nothing in-consistent with a judicial conservative being a grammatical liberal, although in your case I wish it were the other way around.

I should also confess that there is weighty Supreme Court precedent for misuse of "who" and "whom." In King v. Smith, 392 U.S. 309, 329-30 (1968), Chief Justice Warren wrote: "[T]he distinction is intended to provide economic security for whom children Congress could not reasonably expect would be provided for by simply securing employment for family breadwinners." (emphasis added).

Bartels Appointed to Endowed Professorship

Professor Robert Bartels has been selected as the first holder of the Charles M. Brewer Professorship of Trial Advocacy, Dean Paul Bender of the college announced in December.

Established by a nationally prominent Phoenix trial attorney, it is the first endowed professorship to be established at the college since its founding in 1967.

The income from the professorship endowment will permit the college to expand and enlarge its innovative trial advocacy programs.

Bartels, who has been on the ASU faculty since 1982, is one of the leading academic figures in the United States in the areas of trial advocacy, clinical education, and evidence. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Michigan and his J.D. degree from Stanford University, where he was an editor of the Stanford Law Review.

On being named the first holder of the Brewer Professorship, Bartels said the job was "a very important role for me as a trial advocate, and I feel that the college is well served by this position." He added that he was "very excited" about the opportunity to "work with some of the best students in the country." Bartels said that his primary goal as Brewer Professor is to expose students to the "rigor and complexity" of trial advocacy.

We are happy to report a new addition to the College of Law faculty. Ralph Spritzer joins us from the University of Pennsylvania where he was a professor from 1986-1996. He retired from the Pennsylvania law school last year.

Professor Spritzer received his B.S. and J.D. from Columbia University and has had a distinguished academic career. He served as a trial attorney in the Department of Justice from 1946-1953, as Assistant Solicitor General from 1953-1960, as General Counsel to the Federal Power Commission (1961-1962) and as Deputy Solicitor General (1962-1964). During his career he argued more than sixty cases in the United States Supreme Court.

In addition, Professor Spritzer has had a long career in the public interest and has been a strong advocate for the rights of the disadvantaged. He has represented individuals, organizations, and institutions in a wide range of matters, including environmental and consumer issues, civil rights, and public utilities.

Professor Spritzer teaches Antitrust, Regulation, and Professional Procedure and Litigation at the College of Law, and has published in the areas of criminal procedure and regulated industries. He says the lifestyle in Arizona is pleasant and teaching at the College of Law is a good way to spend one's "advancing years."
A Tribute to Professor Wendell P. Kay (1913-1986)

A tribute and reception to honor Professor Wendell P. Kay was held on November 9 at the College of Law. Professor Kay, who served the law school as an adjunct the year for 12 years in the field of trial advocacy, died on June 29, 1986. A speaker at the tribute included Dean Paul Bender; Emeritus Professor William H. Pedrick and Philip von Ammon of Fenwick, Craig, von Ammon, Udall & Powers, both of whom attended law school with Professor Kay; Dr. Wykoff Kay, his cousin; Professor John Moore; and two former students, William H. Sandberg, III (74) of Robbins and Green, P.A.; and Crystal L. Francis (72), Executive Director of Final and Gila County Legal Aid, Inc. in Coolidge, AZ. The tribute highlighted Professor Kay's life and legal career from law student to practitioner and educator. During the tribute, Professor Pedrick recounted a story from a manuscript Professor Kay was compiling of tales of the Alaska Bar. The story, which exemplifies his life as a trial lawyer, is as follows: Back in law school we had read an English short story about a murder case. The evidence was all circumstantial, and the defendant's lawyer staked everything on final arguments.  

After attacking the weakness of the circumstantial evidence, he went on, "Ladies and Gentlemen, no one really knows when the victim was killed. Certainly the evidence you've heard does not require you to find that it was my client. But we've worked long hours, we've done everything we can to find out what is a real crime." Not only was he discovered, but at this very moment he is standing outside the door of this courtroom. "Sentence and judgment."  

Ladies and Gentlemen, on precisely three seconds those doors will open, and the person who caused the unfortunate death with which you are concerned will enter this courtroom. (Dramatic pause with counsel looking at his watch and all other eyes on him.) No one else entered the door. Counsel put his watch back in his pocket and continued, "Ladies and Gentlemen, forgive me for my deception, which I can assure you was undertaken only in the interest of justice, but let me point out something to you. Anyone who looks at that door must have thought it possible that someone would enter this room."

If that be true, then you had a substantial doubt as to the guilt of my client. Ladies and Gentlemen, every one of you, every person on the jury, looked at that door. The case concluded, and the jury very shortly returned with a verdict of guilty. The attorney was stunned. He encountered the foreman of the jury in the hall. "I don't understand it," lawyer said. "Everyone in the courtroom was looking at that door. What happened?" "Well," said the juror, "there was one person who never looked at the door. Your client. He apparently knew no one was coming in."

So went the story. Finally decided to give it a try. The scenario went very dramatically, I pointed to the door, "Mr. Gilby," "I said, "please bring the person who shot Allan Alhonna into the room." Kept going out the door, Joey Nelson (that's his name) jumped up so violently to see who was coming into that door that he knocked over his chair. The juror eyed the door. Joey Nelson was acquitted. Many drinks were poured at the old club bar. I wonder whatever became of the .38 caliber pistol. That was the reason we apparently were unable to find and had not been owned by Joey Nelson. The newspaper account reported that the prosecutor was absolutely strighted at this trial. And the acquittal stood, notwithstanding.

Another of Professor Kay's tales: Eddie Middleditch, a small, stop-shoulde Indian with bad teeth and short hair, was the village chief. Trooper John O'Brien had been sent out to investigate a report that Allie Aasopac had shot her husband several months earlier. Eddie readily admitted that Allie Aasopac was indeed dead. He insisted that the death might have been the result of a gunshot wound, and that the gun could have been fired by Allie. Trooper O'Brien was curious. Why had there been no report? No charges filed? The chief had gone off into the distance with a serious look on his face. Finally he said, "Mr. Trooper, Adam's going to say it was the men who killed him. Hurt her bad. Adam deserves to die."

"The Moratorium," a painting by Pompa; an untitled mixed media by Bestaro Napora; and "Mixed Media on Masonite" by Hector Navaro.

Additional art was donated individually by several artists, including "Bunny," a painting by James Bernstein of Phoenix; "Santa Cruz Valley," an oil on canvas by Ray Jacobsen of Temecula, Arizona; and "Rhythms," an acrylic on paper by James Mack of Taos, New Mexico. These art collections will be hung throughout Armstrong Hall and in the new building addition.

James Mack of Taos, New Mexico. These art acquisitions will be hung throughout Armstrong Hall and in the new building addition.

Art

Individual gifts of particular importance include numerous gifts of art from Jay and Sarah Brown.

Alumni News

Gift Update to the College of Law

Annual Gifts

By January 1987, midway through the 1986-1987 Annual Fund Drive, the College of Law had received an increase in overall gifts as compared to last year's figure. As illustrated in the chart below, the most significant growth had been in law firm gifts, at an increase of 250 percent from the same period last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Society</td>
<td>$48,561.00</td>
<td>$48,744.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv.</td>
<td>$4,130.00</td>
<td>$5,430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Society</td>
<td>$127,753.15</td>
<td>$127,753.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$167,935.15</td>
<td>$167,935.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes gift of the valued at $15,000

Art

Individual gifts of particular importance include numerous gifts of art from Jay and Sarah Brown.

Equipment

The Flagstaff law firm of Asper, Walters & Diesel donated equipment for the law school's use.

Firm Gifts

The College of Law began a major campaign of Phoenix law firms, asking for an annual gift to support our scholarship program. These awards will bear the name of the contributing law firm. Law Society President Gary Kettner, Dean Paul Bender, and other members of the Law School Society Board of Directors including Ed Hendricks, Ted Warner and Michael Silman (75) have agreed to number the firms for their support. As of this publication, the following law firms and organizations have agreed to sponsor one or more annual scholarships at the law school: Arizona State Bar Foundation Fellows; Brown & Bains; Burch & Cracchiolo; Evans, Kitchell & Jencks; Flanagan, Craig; Gallagher & Kennedy; Jennis, Kepner & Haug; Jennings, Strooss & Salomon; Jones, Skasiak & Hochuli; Lewis and Roca; Mariscal, Weeks, McIntyre & Friedland, P.A.; Meyer, Hendricks, Victor, Osborn & Maleon, P.A.; Mohr, Hackett, Pederson, Blakley, Randall & Haga, P.C. O'Connor, Cavanagh, Anderson, Westover, Kilborn & Beshar; Riley, Carlock & Applewhite, P.A.; Smith & Wilkerson; and Streich, Lang, Weeks & Cardon, P.A.

Alumni Annual Luncheon

Patricia Nolan (83)

The Alumni Association of the Arizona State University College of Law held its annual membership meeting at the downtown Arizona Club on Wednesday, December 10, 1986. In addition to providing an opportunity to visit with the law school faculty and former classmates, the annual meeting featured the presentation of the 1986 Outstanding Faculty Award, a gift speaker and the election of nine alumni to the Association's Board of Directors.

Professor Michael A. Berch was the recipient of the 1986 Outstanding Faculty Award, which is presented annually by the Association to a College of Law faculty member as recognition of his or her contribution to the school, the community, or the legal profession. A long-standing member of the faculty, Professor Berch was cited for his continued devotion, on efforts of behalf of, and involvement with, ASU law students. Although his contribution to the emergence of ASU as a powerful counter in the court activities was highlighted, his years of assistance and support of law students in all activities was recognized as well. The Association was honored to welcome then Vice Chief Justice Frank K. Gordon, Jr. to the meeting as its guest speaker. Having served on the Arizona Supreme Court for over 11 years, Justice Gordon was an honorary member of the college of the elite; Frank, less than one month away from being sworn in as the Court's Chief Justice. He shared the many duties and responsibilities he
would assume in his position as Chief Justice and provided considerable insight into the administrative aspects of the judiciary. He discussed the upcoming 200th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution and expressed his pleasure at being chairman of this State’s committee to coordinate that celebration. Finally, he challenged all members of the Board to continue efforts to educate the public about the courts, law, lawyers and the judicial system.

The Association takes this opportunity to once again congratulate Professor Berch on being named the outstanding faculty member of 1986 and to once again thank Justice Gordon for his attendance and his comments at the meeting.

During the luncheon, the membership voted to elect nine alumni to positions on the Association’s eighty-eighth-year Board of Directors. Andy Abraham (’82), Alan P. Bayham, Jr. (’76), Elizabeth R. Finn (’72), Cathy L. Joseph (’83), Besideidah (’84), David L. Richardson (’73), Michael B. Scott (’71) and Louise Stark (’83) were elected to two-year terms on the Board. David L. Richardson (’71) was elected to a one-year term. At a subsequent meeting of the Board, Scott was elected President for the 1987 term, Abraham was elected Vice President, and Richard J. Caryle (’73) was elected Secretary and Rice was elected Treasurer.

The Board of Directors represents all of the alumni of the law school and welcomes suggestions regarding activities in which the Association might be interested. Several seminars are planned for the upcoming year and a reception is scheduled during the Annual State Bar Convention in Tucson. The Board has also recently funded a loan program which has resulted in several students receiving increased financial aid and which will soon be available to third-year students to offset the costs of bar review courses.

If any member has questions or comments about the Association or its Board of Directors, they may contact any Board member.

Your Alumni Association Working for You
Judith Elizabeth Finn (’72)

The ASU Law School Alumni Association presented two seminars in the fall of 1986. These seminars were offered to any practitioner in the State.

The first seminar was presented on Wednesday, September 6, 1986 on the subject of "DRT." This was one of the best-attended seminars ever presented by the Association, with 228 attendees. The discussion covered many topics including: Discovery Problems, Corpus Delicti, Blood Test Issues, How to Cross-Examine the Criminalist, and What to Do at the Time of Arrest.

The second seminar, entitled "Super Seminar Saturday II," was presented on November 13, 1986. This seminar presented ten different topic areas with five topics presented simultaneously in the morning and the afternoon. Some of the topics were: Criminal Law Update; Tax Consequences of Buying and Selling Real Estate; Domestic Relations; Workers’ Compensation; Legislative Lobbying: Construction Law Update; Garnishment and Provisional Remedies. These topics were presented by well-known attorneys in the various fields.

In total the Association grossed over $3,000 on these two seminars, and the Association Board is currently discussing the most appropriate use for these funds.

Attendees were surveyed as to those areas in which they most desired seminars. As a result of those survey, a Domestic Relations Seminar is being planned for this spring. We are always interested in presenting seminars on those topics you feel are significant. Please feel free to contact me at 261-8610 if you have ideas for future topics.

Thanks for all your support.

John Lancy (’70)
Lancy, Scott & McVevey, P.A.

Cheryl Johnson (’81)

Guy David Keeler, P.C.

Tim Tweeten (’72)

Paul Harter (’73)

Stephen W. Myers (’74)

Myers & Barnes

Jake Bailey (’72)

Gaston Snow Moya Bailey Bowers Jones

Martha Kaplan (’70)

Horne, Kaplan & Bistro

Michael Broydy (’77)

Ryley, Carkle & Applewhite

Barbara McConnell Barrett (’78)

Evans, Ketchell & Jenkens

Rebecca White Birch (’79)

ASU College of Law

Jack Macintyre (’80)

Martin & Macintyre

Susan Thompson (’80)

Corner Messinger Elliot Laughlin & Ragan

Judith Miller (’82)

Harrison & Lerch

Lenni Benson (’83)

Daughton, Hawkins & Bacon

David Damore (’84)

Campana, Vieh & Strohm, P.C.

Vicki Riccardo (’85)

Feller & Cohen

Gloria Cales (’86)

Skarecky, Honstein & Davis, P.C.

The goal for alumni gifts this year is $50,000. Last year’s goal of $46,000 was met and exceeded! All alumni received a letter from the Class Association and a subsequent letter from the Dean of Student Life encouraging their support and participation in this year’s Alumni Annual Fund Drive.

The Alumni Annual Fund Drive was kicked off on October 21, 1986 at the College of Law Annual Banquet. fish the annual meeting, Class Association joined the faculty and staff in the College of Law’s reception in their honor. The primary role of the Class Association is to solicit and encourage gifts from classmates and to serve as an advisory body regarding gifts from alumni. The Class Association also serves as a resource for other alumni regarding questions or ideas for the Law School. They also prepare the Class Notes section for the Law Forum and participate in the phonathon.

If you wish to learn more about becoming a Class Association, please contact Diane Schwan, Development Coordinator, 963-6181.

Phonathon

The College of Law sponsored a phonathon on the evenings of December 9, 10, and 11, 1986 to encourage gifts from alumni. The first phonathon held in the fall was, and was designed to encourage gifts prior to the end of the 1986 tax year.

The goal of our fall phonathon was to raise $10,000. The total amount pledged, however, was $20,145.00. By January 1987, $12,000 was received. The average gift resulting from the phonathon was $73.00.

1987 State Bar Convention

The College of Law Alumni Association sponsored a cocktail reception during the Annual State Bar Convention in Tucson.

Alumni Elect New Board Members

The next meeting of the Law Alumni Association elected new members to the Alumni Board of Directors at their annual luncheon on December 10, 1986. Black is a list of the 1987 Law Alumni Board of Directors:

Clare Abel (’81)
Burch & Cracchio

Andrew Abraham (’82)
Vice President; Burch & Cracchio

Alan P. Bayham, Jr. (’76)
Burch & Cracchio

The Honorable Elizabeth Finn (’72)
Judge, Phoenix City Municipal Court

Stuart Gerrich (’83)
Harrison & Lerch

Ted Jarvis (’72)

Jeffrey Frey & Meyers

Barbara McConnell Barrett (’78)

Rebecca White Birch (’79)

Diane Schwan, Development Coordinator, 963-6181.

Alumni Feature Articles

From Arizona To Dar es Salaam: Reflections on Life in The Foreign Service

Robert D. Caudle (’86) How does a prosecutor get from an Arizona courtroom to Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, serving a tour with the U.S. Department of State Foreign Service, a career path which so many Americans would be willing to undertake? Despite the obvious differences between the two careers, the Foreign Service experience can be a valuable corollary to a legal career, and legal experience is quite helpful in the Foreign Service. Law and the Foreign Service are similar in that each requires the ability to communicate effectively, both in writing and orally, as well as the ability to understand and apply complex rules and regulations to factual problems. Service with the State Department allows one to use and improve legal skills in situations that would probably never be encountered in a domestic capacity. The Foreign Service also offers the practical experience of actually living and working overseas in an unclassified capacity. It also offers the advantage that Americans enjoy but so often take for granted.

Although it sounds like a cliché, people from many backgrounds and all parts of the United States are in the Foreign Service. The foreign service officer is from a long line of diplomats, educated in diplomacy and international relations at an Ivy League college, and fluent in several languages. Although officers with this background certainly exist to keep the Foreign Service alive, it is surprising to discover that my own background was not atypical.

The selection process for the Foreign Service is quite competitive. Upon completing a Foreign Service examination, which is similar to the LSAT, one then applies to participate in oral interviews and practical tests, and if successful is placed on the appointment list for the career specialty selected (political, economic, consular, or administrative). An introductory course designed to acquaint the prospective officer to all aspects of life in the Foreign Service is given in Washington, D.C. Depending on the post to which the officer is assigned, other courses are also taken, including area studies, consular and administrative. These are hundreds of overseas posts at which one can serve, and the selection process is based on individual preferences as well as available positions and State Department needs. Some posts, such as Dar es Salaam, are considered to be the quintessential quality of life that they offer. In an effort to make a tour of such a post more attractive, they are identified by the State Department as hardier

Westover, Killingworth & Beshears

Patricia Nolan (’83)

Randy Nussbaum (’80)

Owens, Rybansky & Nussbaum

Larry Pringle (’76)

Mariscal, Weeks, McIntyre & Friedlander, P.A.

Treasurer; Arizona Department of Revenue

James L. Copeland (’71)

Les Miller & Associates

Barbara McConnell Barrett (’78)

Hiner, Crowe & Scott, P.A.

David L. Richardson (’73)

Michael B. Scott (’71)

President; Hiner, Crowe & Scott, P.A.

Louise Stark (’83)

Les Miller & Associates

Barbara McConnell Barrett (’78)

Hiner, Crowe & Scott, P.A.

Treasurer; Arizona Department of Revenue
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ship posts, with substantial cost of living and post differential salary allowances.

Dar es Salaam is the capital of Tanzania, a country on the east coast of Africa, just south of Kenya, the site of the recent movie "Out of Africa," the socialist government controlled by a single political party. For over two decades after Tanzania gained independence from Great Britain in 1964, the president and party leader was Julius K. Nyere. During his long reign as president, Nyere sought to establish his own style of socialism, termed "Ujamaa," roughly based on mutual aid societies and Eastern European socialism. Despite being the recipient of the greatest per capita inflow of Western aid in sub-Saharan Africa, Nyere's socialist experiment is widely regarded as a failure, despite efforts to establish economic policies, governmental management and corruption. At present, U.S. economic aid to Tanzania is suspended and the country faces a debt crisis due to loan repayments, and even long-time Scandinavian donor countries have cut aid. Nyere's government has poured billions of dollars into the Tanzanian economy with little or no result. In late 1985, Nyere reversed the socialist experiment to a new president, Ali Hasam Mwinyi, but has retained control of the police and military force. Tanzania recently reached an agreement with the International Monetary Fund for a standby loan package, and underwent a major currency devaluation in connection with that agreement. A massive injection of foreign aid has been promised to begin by the end of 1986, but it remains to be seen if governmental policies will change sufficiently to allow for rapid economic growth or to overcome the problem of chronic inflation and growth that has been persistent for many years. 

Diplomatic relations with Tanzania are cordial. However, U.S. policy means that the two countries are on friendly terms but differ on key foreign policy issues. The most notable difference of opinion is over the U.S. policy of constructive engagement towards South Africa, and the related issue of sanctions. Tanzania is vehemently opposed to the apartheid and anti-war policies of the South African liberation movement, and as a member of the Front Line States opposes South Africa's liberation movements. However, this difference does not exist between Tanzania and the U.S. on the issue of common interests. Tanzania is a member of the United Nations, and supports the U.S. policy of recognizing the Full Salea regime. Tanzania does not, however, recognize the Full Salea regime as the only legitimate government of the area. Tanzania is also a member of the Commonwealth, and supports the U.S. policy of recognizing the Full Salea regime as the only legitimate government of the area. Tanzania is also a member of the Commonwealth, and supports the U.S. policy of recognizing the Full Salea regime as the only legitimate government of the area.

The Indian Ocean is just minutes away from Dar es Salaam, and internationally recognized game parks such as Serengeti National Park, Lake Manyara and the Ngorongoro Crater are only hours away. The Full Salea city is located on Mount Kilimanjaro, the highest peak in Africa at over 19,000 feet in elevation. The Full Salea region is frequently visited by the president, and although not a technically demanding climb, it is difficult because of the lack of oxygen on the upper slopes. The Full Salea region is a popular tourist destination, and is combined with Tanganyika in 1964 to form Tanzania, is an island off the coast only fifteen minutes by air from Dar es Salaam. Zanzibar was one of the centers of the East African slave trade which flourished during the 19th century, and offers several historic monuments to those events. Zanzibar is also the site of the house where Robert Owen stayed by petition of an expedition in search of Dr. Livingstone. The waters of the Indian Ocean offer excellent diving and fishing. Olduvai Gorge in northern Tanzania is the site of several major archaeological finds. Unfortunately, although Tanzania has the potential to be a major center of tourism activity in Africa, this potential has been largely ignored by the Tanzanian government. Basic infrastructure such as hotels, roads, and transport are inadequate and services available are vastly overpriced. A career in the Foreign Service can be exciting, different and rewarding. It is also definitely not for every4

### Issue Development During an Attorney General's Campaign

**David J. Ohm ('85)**

During the summer and fall of 1986, I had the opportunity to participate in the campaigns of the new Attorney General, Don Hanaway. As an attorney with a background in government and public policy, this experience afforded me a unique perspective on law and leadership. I was deeply impressed by the way in which Don Hanaway conducted his campaign, and I believe that he has set an example for the future of our profession.

Don Hanaway's campaign was characterized by a strong focus on the issues that were important to the people of the state. He was a strong proponent of education and healthcare, and he was determined to make these issues a priority in his administration. He was also a strong advocate of the rule of law, and he was determined to ensure that the justice system was fair and impartial.

In conclusion, I believe that Don Hanaway's campaign was a great success, and I am confident that he will be a strong and effective Attorney General. He has demonstrated a commitment to the issues that are important to the people of the state, and he has shown a dedication to the rule of law. I am confident that he will be a strong leader, and I am proud to support him in his campaign.
generalized public policy options. In addition, they must be aware of the legal underpinnings to, and ramifications of the policies that they support. Put another way, and as it was in Wisconsin, the options may be a state law versus a local ordinance approach to the issue. However, the implementation of either option would be influenced by the states they affect.

Wisconsin’s obscenity statute had been declared unconstitutional under Miller in 1980. Subsequently, the legislation was amended to enact a new law, and a few municipalities adopted individual obscenity ordinances. During the campaign, both candidates emphasized the view that obscenity should be dealt with as a state-wide matter of concern. So, neither became a factor in the policy-making process.

Another characteristic which fostered issue diversity is the attorney general’s role as the public interpreter of the law. As the state’s "top lawyer," there is a great deal of interest in the area of law that the general might have occasion to be concerned with. One example of this involved a sexual assault proposal which had been introduced during the previous session of the Legislature. In brief, the bill would have established certain criminal transactions from state registration and merit review by the Commission of Securities, provided that a registration was not in conflict with the Securities and Exchange Commission and other criteria limiting eligibility for inclusion to be satisfied. While the attorney general has no authority with respect to regulating the offer or sale of securities, violation of the Wisconsin Securities Law may be referred to the attorney general for legal action. Thus, a campaign issue developed as to whether the provisions of the bill would, if enacted, cause an increase in securities law violations and proceedings.

As an elected official with far-reaching responsibilities and a constituency encompassing the entire voting population of the state, the attorney general is looked to for, and can use those aspects of the office to realize, the enunciation of public policy programs and directions which transcend the authority granted to the office. This characteristic, the attorney general’s ability to be a public interpreter, allowed for a number of instances in which multiple issue situations were presented. For example, one of Han- ken’s proposals involved an agency approach to drug abuse, with equal emphasis upon the development of educational treatment and prosecution options.

In conclusion, the foregoing is representative of a few of the issues I dealt with as strategy and platform initiatives were developed by those of us involved in the campaign. In my view, it was those who worked with those of us who are responsible for being able to make decisions on the basis of questions of course. This important problem of the state of Wisconsin in our role to plan another adventure. A trip to Egypt and Israel was available. Could I have the office? I am a single practitioner, in general practice law. There are two other sole practitioners who share the small house in which I practice, and I often do favors for each other.

Leaving a single practice for a period of three or more weeks can be a problem. Is there a case that only you are acquainted with that will need attention during your vacation calendar? Will that big case come in while you are gone? If one that is present, the schedule and the funds to cover a multi-million dollar judgment.

All of this would be lost if you are off playing tourist. Also, there is always the nagging thought that if I leave it too long, will the business be there when I get back? It is true that the decision on important expense of a vacation to a sole practitioner is loss of income. Clients forget your address but creditors never do. You must carefully weigh your priorities. Is money or fun more important? For the non-pensioned law in a small firm, for the first ten years of his practice, money won out. The financial needs of a grower are often more pressing than fun. Then a strange thing happened. It seemed as if business conferences were being held in the most delightful parts of the country and a lawyer needed his spouse along for the social aspects of these benefits. Typically his wife encour- aged a kind of renewed energy upon his return to the office. We were able to rationalize that the re-NEWED vigor would help make up

for the temporary financial losses incurred during his absence.

We then took a trip to the As- man Dam. The temple was reconstructed so that it still grows out of a mountain. Only by seeing the inside can one realize that the mountain is manmade.

When we arrived at Kom Ombo, we had already seen such magnifi- cent temples that there was no temptation not to get off the boat. However, we did not give in to that temptation, and saw lots of crocodile mummies and elaborate crocodile coffins. Creepy but memorable.

We then went by boat to Aswan, by plane to Abu Simbel, by train to Cairo, by bus across the Suez Canal and on to Tel Aviv. We saw almost every imaginable kind of desert, from shitting white sands to scrub brush. We observed the Be- douins in their free and lonely efforts to eke out an existence in a barren land.

Israel has everything for the tourist. There was the thrill of being in places with biblical names, seeing Masada and Galilea and swimming in the Red Sea. The old city of Jerusalem still has remnants from the many conquerors throughout the ages, from the Persians, Greeks, Macedo- nians, Crusaders, Turks, etc. I loved our free time in Israel. We wandered through the Jaffa market, the place where the ultra orthodox live as they did hundreds of years ago, wearing ancient garments, with the men carrying Torah and the women working.

While traveling in foreign countries you recognize that the people are similar in so many ways as are not yet so different. However, if you want to see some really interesting and exotic conduct, you pay attention to how your fellow Americans on your tour!

Home: Back in the office. My desk is piled high. I clean my desk preparatory to my trip, and now I have to hustle to clean up the backlog. If I did not take a long trip once in a while, would I ever have a clean desk? I wish my hus- band had taken more time off for travel. Fun is more important than money!

Since writing the above article, I visited my homeland in the country of Ireland. While there, I became interested in Ireland’s history; the years of revolutionary struggle with Great Britain, partition along religious lines, civil war and bloodshed. All of which went through my head and, its similar structure, what did the man say about people who don’t learn from history?

Last month I visited India and Nepal and the foothills of the Himalayas. I watched families of Jains teaching their children to practice non-injurious kindness. One village where people wear masks to avoid ingest- ing an insect. I observed Tibetan Buddhists solemnly prostrating themselves in a holy place after a long pilgrimage, while Buddhist apprentice monks with shaved heads carried their lamas. I observed the dead in mass burials in which the corpse was carried to the holy river, galvanized with flowers and then burned. I rode a train called "Palace on Wheels," where the bar bill of one of the American couples was close to the yearly income of an average local family.

Old Delhi is probably the most crowded place in the world - nick- name "lakes, marriage and fu- neral parties, and merchants of live chick- enns all compete for a few inches of space. There is poverty, but also vibrant life - a calm acceptance of conditions that least Americans would find intolerable.

My experience enables me to observe various different mental states that we live in such a way as to lead to understanding how the human mind expands the definition of what it means to be human.

I bought a carving of the ele-phant-headed Hindu god Ganesh. Ganesh is one of thousands of gods. In the Hindu faith, Gan- nesh is the god of wisdom and cut-
ting red-tape; nobody is passed without him. I have put him next to the certificate that says I advise the Bar. I will not be between them both. I might be able to handle my law practice.

Ruth Finn received her J.D. from ASU College of Law in 1970, and has been a general practitioner for nearly 17 years. She has a daughter, Jocelyn, and is currently practicing law, having graduated from ASU College of Law in 1972, and a daughter, Alice Finn Carter, who is currently a first-year student at the College of Law.
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The class alumni listed below are for the 1986-87 fiscal year.
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John S. Lancy
Lancy, Scull & McVey, P.A.
5050 N. Central, Suite 2601
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Michael Hawkins served on the panel of the Maricopa County Bar Association seminar. "Examining the Navigating Process," held in January. Michael is with the Phoenix firm of Hawkins, Pappas & Leo.

Richard A. Jones is practicing in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Gerald E. Knott is practicing in Phoenix.

Duane Schultz is a partner in the firm of Meccia & Schultz in Grant's Pass, Oregon.

Stuart J. Susen is a major immigration case before the U.S. Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit, New York, preventing deportation of an Iranian family who overstayed his visa because his family was politically opposed to Khomeini. He is with the New York City firm of Barst & Kmetic.

William M. Spence has moved his Phoenix office to 122 W. Osborn Road, Phoenix.

C. Peter Whitmore has relocated his office to 625 N. Gilbert Road, Suite 101, in Gilbert.
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Guy Knoller
Guy David Knoller, P.C.
1530 N. Central, Suite 1600
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Van Bethancourt is a partner in the firm of Bethancourt & Fuller.

David Ronfson works in First Interstate Bank's law department.

Brian Hendrickson is practicing in Tempe.

Bruce Demaree and Sandra Massotte are sole practitioners in Phoenix.

Ronald Lee is practicing in Flagstaff. William Perkins now practices with Tellb, Sanders & Perkins in Phoenix.

Nils Olmstead practices in Phoenix.

Leonard Whitfield is practicing in Tombstone.

Jon Snow is in Morrow Bay, California.

Cecil Patterson, Maricopa County Superior Court, is practicing on the Board of Bar Association.

Judy Snow is in in Tempe, Arizona.

Michael B. Scott has been elected President of the ASU Law Alumni Association Board of Directors.

James L. Stevenson was elected to serve on the ASU Law Alumni Association Board of Directors.
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Timothy J. Tuverton
2325 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle, #130
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Jodi R. Andrews is with the Maricopa County Public Defender's Office.

Andy Abraham has been appointed Vice President of the ASU Law Alumni Association for 1987.

John W. Wall is now with the Attorney General's Office, Financial Fraud Division, in Phoenix.
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Paul S. Hargett
Attorney at Law
2325 W. Third Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1471

William K. Culbertson is a Superior Court Judge Prom Tem assigned to the Juvenile Court.

Ted Javili has been re-elected Secretary of the ASU Law Alumni Association.

David L. Richardson is a new member of the Law Alumni Association Board of Directors.

Paul Harte is now in private practice and will continue to work in commercial and civil litigation.

George F. Kink has relocated his office to 323 W. Roosevelt, Suite 102 in Phoenix.

Craig R. O'Connor is the Southeast Regional Counsel for the National Labor Relations Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

Sergianos A. Rodarte has moved his office to 111 W. Monroe, Suite 718, Phoenix.

Crystal A. Russell has relocated to 1817 Century Park East, Suite 1296, Los Angeles, CA.

Donald A. Ryan is in practice at 3080 N. Civic Center Plaza, #202, in Scottsdale.

Donald H. Martin is co-chairing the Arizona State Bar's "Road to Retirement" seminar in May.
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Michael Bregg
Ryley, Carlock & Applegate
1101 N. First Avenue, 26th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85004


Lindsey Ellis Butzen is now with the Phoenix firm of Salsbury & Co., P.C.

Robert N. Bweg is now with the Phoenix firm of Molloy, Jones, Donovan, Tracht, Chidells & Malmalo, P.C.

Raymond M. Deeney is associated with Shersen & Howard, 101 S. Tejon, Suite 300, Colorado Springs, CO 80903.

Roland J. LaVeille has relocated his office to the Western Savings Financial Plaza, 1201 S. Alma School Road, Suite 3050, in Mesa.

Kathleen D. Masters is now associated with Case & Bennett, 16232 West Bell Road, Suite 102, in Sun City.

Richard S. Plattner is President of the Arizona Trial Lawyers Association. A. "Sandy" Plattner is President of the Arizona Professional Association, 1984-85, and President of the Desert Samaritan Hospital Foundation Board.

John D. Schroider is associated with Krieg & Schroider in San Jose, CA.

He was recognized as "The Best in San Jose" by the San Jose Mercury News in August, 1986. His first child, Michael Albert, was born on December 24, 1986.

Robert A. Baumgartner has relocated to 2325 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle, #130, in Phoenix.

Barbara McConnell Barrett Evans, Kitchell & Johnson, P.C.
200 N. Central, 20th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3099

Denise Bloom is currently Legal Counsel/Compliance Supervisor for the Industrial Commission of Arizona. She is a member of the State Bar of Nevada. She returned to practice with her husband, Donald Doerner, in 1985. She says she is glad to be home.

Stephen B. Baumgartner relates that the true meaning of life is finally becoming a parent.

Ted A. Thomson-Taylor has remarried and is with the Arizona State Compensation Fund.

Michael Temple is Operations Manager of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in Phoenix.
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Rebecca White Birch
College of Law
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287

After serving a one-year term as a member of the General Council of the Economics of Law Practice Section of the American Bar Association, Donna M. Kilgour has been re-elected for a second term that began in September, 1986. She will continue her duties as a member of the Product Media Board of the Section for all four years.

The University of Pennsylvania Law Review has appointed her to the Board of Editors, the Section for all its members.

Catherine Bridges is now with the U.S. Army Department of Law at West Point.

Steve Chang is now of counsel to the firm of Winthrop, Lunden & Her. He "semi-retired" from law practice to start an investment banking firm specializing in acquisitions and investments. If you can reach him at his law office, the Bank of Valley Center, you may be able to reach him at his securities office in Scottsdale for his investment banking company at the United Bank of California.

Don't try to find him at his advertising company: he has sold it, and I wouldn't have the experience to "semi-retire" in such a fashion.

Scott Rose is on the faculty of the Maricopa County Bar Association Continuing Legal Education Series Seminar on the Real Estate Law. Scott has specialized in real estate since 1974. Cognitive, Maricopa County, at. She has practiced for several years. It's good to see the class of 1974 chairing the seminar.

On the lighter side: Nina Rivera, District Counsel, U.S. Small Business Administration, is overjoyed to have her partner, Nina Rivera, and her daughter, Nina, as her child. You can see it in the class of 1974 chairing the seminar.
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