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Dear Graduates and Friends:

During the past several years, the Law School has undergone many changes in personnel, curriculum and
programs, but the original commitment to quality legal education has never been altered. Advancements and im-
provements have been noted at the School this academic year, and I wish to call your attention to the following
developments of 1980-81.

After an intensive recruitment season, the School hired seven new faculty members, six of whom began
teaching in the fall semester. These positions became available through retirement (Cleary, Strong), resignation
to assume a judicial post (Canby), promotion (Matheson), resignation to accept appointment to another faculty
(Zilman), and the addition of two new faculty lines by the University. The School was fortunate to attract able persons
with extensive public, government and teaching experience, and the newcomers have already enhanced the stat-
ute of an acknowledged strong faculty. These appointments and the naming of Professor David Kader as Assoc-
iate Dean are the major personnel highlights of the academic year. In addition, William Cohen of Stanford
University, a Constitutional Law Scholar, visited as the Meriam Distinguished Professor, and Elza Newby of the
University of Western Australia, George H. Hauck of the University of California, Robert Balters of Iowa and Robert
Greene of Southampton, taught as Visiting Professors during the year.

Significant decisions affecting the curriculum included the adoption by the faculty of a major writing require-
ment as a condition for graduation; a refinement of the credit no credit grading system which essentially extended
numerical grading to all offerings except seminars, internships and independent study; the abolishment of distinction
between what were formally designated as "second-year" and "third-year" courses; and guidelines for internships by law students engaged in law-related activ-
ities outside the Law School. For the first time a course emphasizing skills education, The Lawyering Process, was
offered as an introduction to the internships.

The opportunities for law students in clinical programs were supplemented by a grant of $59,000 to the
School under the Federal Law School Clinical Experience Program. With these funds, the School hired a second staff
attorney for the civil law clinic in an effort to provide more effective supervision for the student interns.

Two special visitors enriched the intellectual atmosphere of the Law School by their presence as "scholars in
residence." Judge Carl McGowan of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and Profes-
sor Harry R. Jones of Columbia University spent several days at the College, teaching classes, meeting with stu-
dents, lecturing and offering faculty seminars. We hope to continue and expand this program of educational en-
rICHMENT.

In March, a Colloquium on Community Property was offered at the School in cooperation with the Arizona State
Bar. Also, a Trial Advocacy Seminar was offered for twenty newly admitted attorneys from the Phoenix area.

The beautiful law building is filled to capacity, and
additional space is urgently needed to continue the educa-
tional programs of the School. Not only is our library stack
space nearly filled, but the number of offices is insufficient
to accommodate the present faculty and staff. Classroom
availability is also a problem. Preliminary planning is under
way for a major addition and remodeling of the law build-
ing.

With the assistance of the University and the Devel-
opment Fund, the College of Law will move to semi-annual
publication of the Law Forum. Our intent is to provide
graduates of the school with information regarding activ-
ties of the College end of the alumni. We invite your
suggestions and, particularly, your assistance in noting the
achievements of fellow graduates.

Warm regards.

Alan A. Matheson
The Role of Alumni in Legal Education—Apart from Fund Raising

WILLARD PEDRICK

The old prescription for success as a university president—keep the alumni happy with a winning football team, the faculty with parking, and the students with sex—well, in our changing world, no longer works. It is assumed that we will not work for law school deans. A law dean is lucky if he can find a place to park his own car. A higher university official, typically a parking administrator, now handles policy questions of that magnitude. As for sex, with a student enrollment now about one-third female, the matter is rather out of the dean’s hands. In any case, one ought not to expect too much from a middle-aged, happily married law dean—and there are a few such still extant. As for football, law alumni are not interested. In having a law school athletic team. Moreover, being happy about legal education, for a majority of alumni, is simply another matter.

For an academic year, 1966-67, as the dean of a not yet operational law school, I had what many regarded as the ideal law school—enjoying the capabilities of full-time law teachers. Of course, offer significant teaching opportunities for practices (therapy of a sort), and this area is one that is and will be further exploited. But these programs, important as they are, do not greatly affect the operation of the basic program of legal education for law students.

There are ways, though, in which law school graduates can assist their schools in meaningful fashion (apart from money, as prescribed in this discussion). The American Bar Association accreditation standards, in Article 208, refer in a permissive way to the use of a “Committee of Visitors” in a “participatory” or “advisory” capacity. In my own view on accreditation visits to other law schools, it has been commonplace to inquire whether a Committee of Visitors or similar mechanism is in operation. Many schools have such committees, and other schools have been encouraged to use this system for an official channel of communication between the school, the profession, and the public.

I was chairperson of a Committee of Visitors to or through an alumni association, the law school can be assisted by interested alumni on several fronts. First, there is the matter of carrying the word—reporting to the profession (and a breathing world) what the law school is doing in its program of legal education. The immediate misconceptions about legal education, unconfirmed by worldly contact, which the practicing bar holds with an iron grip, pass belief. This credibility must be a continued and strengthened version of the law student’s predisposition to accept any rumor, however bizarre, indicating that the school is embodying on some weird and unsurprising departure from the tried and true ways of legal education. “Believe the worst” seems to be the watchword. A few years ago, for example, Dean David Vernon of Iowa was locked in nearly mortal combat with the local bar over a reported law school decision not to list Evidence as a required course. In fact Iowa, as I recall, had not required Evidence for nearly 40 years. (It was not a required course at Northwestern either, my own law school where John Henry Wigmore made his name.) Of course, virtually every student took Evidence, but that is beside the point—compulsion is singularly attractive when it is applied to others, for example, current students.

To have a channel of readily informed alumni and other friends of the law school in a position, after thorough briefing to describe with accuracy and detail the significant features of the law school’s current educational program and to answer proposals from ignorant, can be of enormous value to the school. General awareness of the extent to which trial practice is now and has been taught for the past decade or more could help put the concern over law school training in that field in better perspective. The same can be said of the widely recognized problems of clinical education and developing instruction in counseling skills. It is not enough in this world to build a better mousetrap. The accomplishment has to be known. The alumni, through a Committee of Visitors and alumni association, can assist a school by publicizing, both formally and informally, significant features of the current instruction program of the school, formally through such a committee, be it established separately or as an appendix to the Dean’s Report, deserves consideration.

A second function of such a Board or Committee is to talk back to law teachers. Most full-time law teachers come from practice. They do know from experience as well as from classroom. Moreover, the separation between the practicing world and the world of academia is fortunately not as great in this country as it is in most of the common law world. But still, the world does change, and it is good to have some organized system for gathering information on those changes. The alumni represent such an apparatus. They have not been as apt to be as busy as they are organized, and they can. The alumni can tell their schools about the kind of legal world in which they live and practice. They can also tell their students which features of their legal education seem to relate most fruitfully to their practice and which relate least fruitfully, or not at all. We cannot expect the alumni to be particularly good at forecasting what the world will be like after a few more revolutions, for they spend their time looking at where they have been and are not usually much given to speculation about where they are going. The task of prophecy they leave to the academics, who are not particularly gifted at it either.

The alumni ... can assist a school by publicizing, both formally and informally, significant features of the current instruction program of the school.

What the alumni can tell us about their experience, if properly organized for the purpose, can be of great value on at least two fronts. First, there is the business of what the law-schools should teach. A recent document of the Journal of Legal Education contains an article by Leonard L. Baed, Senior Research Psychologist with the Educational Testing Service, reporting on a study sponsored by the Law School Admissions Council. The article is entitled, "A Survey of the Relevance of Legal Training to Law School Graduates." Dr. Baed’s survey sent questionnaires to a sample of law graduates of Boston College, George Washington, Michigan, New York University, San Francisco, and Texas. Some 4,000 questionnaires in all were sent to graduates who had been out of law school for 5, 10, and 20 years, respectively. The questionnaire must have been somewhat burdensome, but the response rate was about 50 per cent, considered both adequate and good.

The study is high in interest, and some of the results follow. Of the law graduates responding, 62.4 per cent were in the private practice of law, with another 22.3 per cent in the business world. As to the nature of the practicing

DAVID KADER

This year marks the twentieth anniversary of the world's most vigorous and largest nongovernmental human rights organization, Amnesty International (AI). In anticipation of a year of assessment of the work of AI, and of the condition of human rights law and practice, I offer a brief report on this organization, which has been honored with a Nobel Peace Prize. This report will review the nature and role of AI and attempt to place it within the context of the modern international struggle to vindicate human rights. This presentation will indicate both how far the world of nations has come in substantive norm-setting and also how important the formal implementation procedures remain, in their letter and in their substance. The gap between declaration and deed in governmental and intergovernmental behavior creates the necessity for nongovernmental actors, like AI.

Prior to this century, the traditional theory and practice considered the fate of the individual a matter within the exclusive domestic jurisdiction of the State and, therefore, beyond the reach of international law. International law was the very term denotes: law governing the relations between and among States, without recognition of the individual or nongovernmental bodies as equal legal actors.

Where exceptions existed to this jurisprudence (and a number did, as in the customary rules regarding aliens or diplomats and in the various treaties on the slave trade), the individual was the victim of the law, and State motivation was in the main a product of political not humanitarian considerations. Hence, with the dawn of the twentieth century, either a State's treatment of an individual was not a matter of international law at all, or the individual was but its object.

These antecedents to modern international law have been greatly eroded, yet remain vital in State practice and in some important legal provisions. For example, Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter exempts matters "which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of a State from UN intervention. The idea of sovereignty embodied in this provision, combined with frequent State reliance on its letter, blunts the wholesale disappearance of last century's jurisprudence on a State's prerogatives over its own population.

With the Second World War, both international law and theory underwent a revolution, resulting in the emergence of new norms, subjects, and agendas for international law — not the least of which was the place of human rights. During and immediately after the War, efforts to formulate international legal norms on human rights commenced, the individual became a subject of the law, and human rights was very much on the agenda of international discourse. The barbarity of the Nazi domination of peoples in Europe led to an Allied effort infused with
The gap between declaration and deed in governmental and intergovernmental behavior creates the necessity for non- governmental actors, like AI.

English barrier, is a world-wide, non-governmental human rights organization. These characteristics stress personal international responsibility for the protection of human rights. First, AI is international in character, both in volunteers and beneficiaries. More than 2,000 adoption groups exist, with national sections in 39 countries and with individual members and supporters residing in nearly 50 other countries. The vast majority of adoption groups for the year ending in 1979, more than 90 percent of the total income comes from these sources.

In addition to assisting prisoners of conscience, AI also seeks to stop torture and the use of the death penalty in all cases, regardless of the offenses involved. On Human Rights Day in 1972, AI launched its Campaign for the Abolition of Torture. The campaign's goal is not only the rescue of individuals subjected to torture, but also public and governmental awareness-raising efforts, including the establishment of codes of ethics for those who might become involved in the torture process (judges, doctors, police, and military personnel). In 1973, AI issued its country-by-country Report on Torture as a reference source for the Abolition of Torture Conference in Paris. It remains the primary international source of review of the use of torture, and devastating in its findings and conclusions. In essence, AI reports that torture is a world-wide, systematic, administrative practice of political controls not merely a device of extracting information. The suspension of the rule of law by extra-legal emergency declarations of martial law serves to be the "legal foundation" for the growth of torture.

In its opposition to torture, to the death penalty, and to the detention of prisoners of conscience, AI mounts a world-wide voluntary movement to awaken opinion, believing it the force capable of shaming governments to human rights. AI's commitment is to end responsibility for humane conduct world-wide. Central to this campaign is not simply the direct engagement of governments and intergovernmental organizations, but more fundamentally, the concerted effort of individuals organized in small working groups. To these groups, with memberships as small as 10 persons, the International Secretariat in London assigns specific cases for individual denunciations after extensive research to verify the human rights violation. It is this strategy of specific case-works by a world-wide network of adoption groups that so dramatically distinguishes the strategy of AI from other non-governmental human rights groups.

At AI's core is its casework. This commitment is in large part ensured by three basic operational rules. First, adoption groups usually work simultaneously for prisoners from different countries. Second, adoption groups are never assigned a prisoner detained or abused by their home government. Third, the Research Department of the International Secretariat is comprehensive in its research and ensures the information it receives, within the obvious constraint of resources.

These impartiality rules have led to general recognition of AI as the primary source of information about international human rights violations pertaining to political imprisonment. This recognition, however, has placed a particular burden on the organization. Demand now exists for continued and increased servicing of requests for information by scholars, journalists, and even governments, in the midst of an expanding need of the adoption group system as it increases in size world-wide.

The work of AI — the collection, analysis, and publication of such information — leads to action on behalf of individual prisoners of conscience. The conviction of the adoption group effort to achieve release of prisoners of conscience, or at least a betterment of prisoners' circumstances of detention, is to make more visible the individual's plight — more visible to the victimizers by a letter campaign from the adoption group and others who receive it, and more visible to the public. Assistance is forthcoming often from wide segments of the local public and frequently from professional groups interested in the person or status of the prisoner. Words are the weapons of AI action, and its conviction is that justice will only increase with its messages coming from all parts of the world, from all segments of society.

My adoption group work introduced me to three obscure names that are my constant provocation to re-think Victor's Pyykkius, Beneke Rangnorgi, and Anselmo Fernandez. They are the three adoptees of Amnesty Interna- tional's Adoption Group number 58, of Iowa City, Iowa. I wish to discuss them and how AI is trying to make their predicament more visible and thereby more tolera-
ble. My information comes from my past association with Group 6.

In November 1976, Victoras Pyatko, a scholar of Lithuanian literature, and four others formed the Lithuanian branch of the Public Group for the Assistance of the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR. In August of 1977, he was arrested for these monitoring activities and was held incommunicado until his trial at the end of July 1978. As feared, Pyatko received the severest available penalty: ten years in a prison labor camp and five years of Siberian exile for “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.” The fear of severe penalty was based on Pyatko’s early convictions for political crimes. In 1947, as a teenager, he was sentenced to ten years imprisonment for Catholic youth activities and ten more years for an escape; given his youth, Pyatko served only a total of six years. In 1957, he was sentenced to and served eight years for connection with the activities of certain Lithuanian intelligentsia. His trial coincided with and was overshadowed by the more noted Moscow trials of Anatoly Shcharansky and Alexander Ginzburg, also a Helsinki monitor.

Birming Kanegori, a 25-year-old Rhodesian, was arrested April 12, 1979, under the Emergency Powers that were passed in 1965 following Rhodesia’s unilateral declaration of independence and are still in force. Kanegori was held in pretrial detention without charge, trial, or sentence in Wha Wha prison in Gwelo, Rhodesia, until April 12, 1979, when he was released with approximately 700 other prisoners of conscience under the new internal government’s amnesty. Information of his release came to his city from Kanegori himself in a letter of great warmth and continued concern. The Rhodesian coordinator in London later made clear the reason for Al’s instructions to keep Kanegori’s file active: a high possibility of reprisals following the expected early elections existed, and domestic pressure for amnesty would then be less consequential. Kanegori is currently living in Salisbury with his family, but remains unemployed, as do so many of the ex-detainees. Some modest financial support continues from Al to Kanegori.

Anselmo Fernandez, a Uruguayan engineer working for the National Telecommunication Agency, was arrested December 16, 1975, evidently for community sympathies. Little is known of his circumstances except that he was a member of an international communications union and is being held in the First Military Establishment of Reclusion. Fernandez has apparently been tried and sentenced for 6 to 13 years. His family last saw him in August of 1976. The Iowa City adoption group recently received a letter in Spanish from a Colonel Carlos Maynard of the Central Office of Persons in Uruguay stating simply that no address for Fernandez is known. The Central Office of Persons is a new agency established in conjunction with an appeal to international pressure and in deference to Al efforts to learn more of the status of the many prisoners of conscience in Uruguay.

Iowa City’s Al prisoners of conscience are three among thousands who exist amid an even greater population of unknowns. They suffer from the now routine habits of state intimidation and repression common in much of the world.

Rather than evolving into intransigence, Al has become increasingly vital in a world that has become increasingly inhumane. Repression continues to grow as the primary theme of official state behavior throughout the world, with terror as a major technique of government. Human rights are being breached in many countries and in all geographic regions regardless of ideological persuasion. There is no monopoly—increasing evidence points to an internationalism in torture, with tools and techniques becoming a matter of commerce and governmental aid.

All finds more of the barbarity of nations to their own peoples than of crimes between states. This casts doubt on the central idea of progress for most people in this century who have been freed from colonialism: that there is an indissoluble alliance between the principle of nationalism and the principle of freedom. Rather than national freedom with individual liberty, we find torturing ruling elites and martyred populations.

Diverse cultures, economies, and ideologies are the home of human-rights violations; and it is impossible not to wonder about what measure of success can be expected of a world-wide, voluntary human-rights movement such as Amnesty International. Difficult though it is to measure, Al’s 20 years of persistent and consistent efforts have reaped benefits both in the number of prisoner releases and in the improvement of conditions for those still detained. The USA National Section of Al publishes a quarterly newspaper entitled Matchbox. The story that spawned the paper’s name captures the spirit with which most Amnesty workers work.

During the final days of World War II, a captured Resistencia member sat alone in a black prison cell, tired, hungry, tortured and convinced of approaching death. After weeks of torture and torment, the prisoner was sure that there was no hope, that no one knew or cared. But in the middle of the night the door of the cell opened, and the jailer, shouting abuse into the darkness, threw a loaf of bread onto the dirt floor. The prisoner, by this time emaciated, rose and ate the loaf. Inside there was a matchbox. Inside this matchbox, there were matches and a scrap of paper. The prisoner lit a cigarette. On the paper there was a simple word: CORRIGAM Contra. Take Courage. Don’t give up, don’t give in. We are trying to help you. CORRIGAM.

In 1937 President Franklin Roosevelt was dealt a warrant by the Supreme Court for the retirement of Associate Justice Louis D. Brandeis. The name of a widely-practiced candidate, Senator Hugo L. Black of Alabama, was transmitted to the Senate. Opposition was not long in organizing. Among other things, he had supported the Court-Packing Plan, and he was charged with being sympathetic to that artificially stimulated agitation, the Ku Klux Klan. After a hectic war, the candidate was approved and joined the Court. Only then did it surface that the new Justice had in fact, by his own admission, been for a short time a member of the Klan. The fires reignited, but soon burned out, and the Justice began a long and distinguished career on the Court, without suggestion or indication of the slightest that his brief sojourn in the Realm left any imprint upon his views or actions. The Klan incident, however, enabled his son, Hugo, Jr., a Miami lawyer, to introduce his father to the Florida Bar as a man who at an early stage had put on a white robe and scared hell out of the black folks, then put on a black robe and began scaring hell out of the white folks.

This reference to robes may serve to lead our thoughts to the present occasion, a happy one sometimes described by the unhappy term “coping.” Robing suggests its counterpart, disrobing, and here a connecting thread is established. Professor Canby was the ASU law school’s resident expert on disrobing. His was the only class to be visited by a stranger when streaking was de rigueur. Was this a form of expression protected by the First Amendment? And what was being expressed, anyway? Only a constitutional expert could tell us.

Judge Canby’s confirmation hearing was not like Justice Black’s. It was, I understand, a modest affair attended by a single senator, who presided over him. It was further my understanding that essentially but a single question was asked the candidate as a witness: Did he favor the plaintiff, one of the defendants, a white man? Northwestern law school, the one to be considered the better. The defendant, a Negro, was not in attendance. The hearing concluded, the committee polled itself and voted unanimously to recommend confirmation, and the Senate acted accordingly.

Professor Emeritus Edward Cleary delivered these remarks at the swearing in of Judge William Canby to the bench of the US Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.
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Carbery has the qualifications for an outstanding teacher — extremely quick and imaginative mind, capacity to express himself forcefully and effectively, but not in the least domineering or bombastic. He was a joy as a student in...

Despite his intellectual leadership and lean, scarred, mind, he was very well liked by his classmates both on and off the Law Review, because he was modest and simply a genuine good fellow.

All this suggests a resemblance of Stover at Yale. Let me at this point reassert you on two scores: (a) that paragon was not imaginary — a William Carbery did in fact exist; and (b) the writer of the letter was not engaging in a practice known in the law school trade as "practicing away" an unwanted faculty member.

Carbery makes a pleasing personal appearance. He is good looking with a strong chin and penetrating eye.

To interpolate again, this sounds like a man who could be depended upon to bring down a law school, if necessary, in order to rid it of students lacking aptitude or application, though he in fact acquired no fame in student lore as a hatchet man. Translated now into a judicial environment, it suggests Baron Jeferson of Wem, who presided over the "Bloody Assizes" of 1685 following the failure of the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion. As appears from his portrait, he too was of strong chin and penetrating eye. Some 200 executions are reported to have resulted from his judgments. Here only time will tell. Personally changes following elevation to the bench are not unknown.

Stonge as it may be, all the representations made in this letter proved to be true, and more, as we should have known from the beginning, in view of the identity of the author. Doganes would have liked this rant among letters of recommendation. He has a true sense of humor.

Enough of these incursions into privacy. Judges and judges must have been on Judge Carbery's mind during the past day. In fact the press quotes him, "I will have to learn the job, but I am not going to find out about the process." Some thoughts in that direction will not be amiss.

The occupation he is entering is one that has occupied an unexceptionally self image. "Courts are presumed to be no more ignorant than the public generally," said the Supreme Court of Illinois. Chicago v. Murphy, 313 Ill. 98, 122, 144 U.S. 802 (1924). The standards set must be considerably higher for judges, but less so to the public generally. Of course, the court was referring to judicial notice. Still...

Judges on the whole seem to have an affinity for inelasticity; the law, applied to these facts, compels this judgment. The appearance of certainty is comforting to writer and to reader. The opinion writer has, of course, become an advocate for the ordered result. Only a dissent, or perhaps the next case, suggests what really occurred in conference.

Some peculiar techniques may be helpful. If invention is necessary, be discreet. No one, like the miscreant himself, could have felt uneasy when the Supreme Court of Illinois, as a matter of course, recognized the discretion of a lawyer to steal a client's money involves moral turpitude. The court was on solid ground. And one can only nod agreement when the Supreme Court of the United States last year said, "We are aware of the danger to life and property posed by vehicular traffic..."

Despite the Court's further statement that "drivers without licenses are presumably the less safe drivers whose properties may well exhibit themselves." From the latter assumption the Court concluded that searches for drivers' licenses during traffic stops for "bias and the occupant is not required to produce his license..."

We follow the wisdom of the common law, tested and proved by time. "Every dog is entitled to one bite." Everyone except the writers of digests and handbooks would have felt reassured.

Other ancient concepts also lend themselves to stretching consideration implied consent and constructive notice. Precident and stare decisis, like the currency or a clause in the Constitution, may be stretched or shrunk. And "disturb" is one of the most potent words of legal art.

As a judge, you will find that your literary world will meet with the hearty approval of approximately 50 percent of your closest readers. Few writers in other fields do as well. The Supreme Court will be grading your papers; adverse comment from this source is an occasional occupational hazard, to which the bench seems ready to adjust. Critical praise may be dismissed as visionary, as you were once yourself.

To your colleagues whom you are leaving, to the law to which you have contributed so greatly, and to generations of young law students, you owe an occasion of sadness. But great challenges lie ahead. We have every confidence that you can and will do for the First Amendment what Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. did for the dissenting opinion what Senator Sam Ervin did for the Bible. Our best wishes go with you on your new adventure.

Canby makes a pleasing personal appearance. He is good looking with a strong chin and penetrating eye.
Alumni News

CLASS OF 1970
John E. Burke serves on the City Flood Control District in Phoenix.
Robert M. Cook now practices in Norfolk, Nebraska.
Michael D. Hawkins, formerly United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, has re-entered private practice with the Phoenix firm of Dushoff & Sacks.
John S. Lancy and James W. Ryan, '74, have formed a professional association, Lancy & Ryan, in Phoenix.
Robert A. McConnell has been appointed by President Reagan as Assistant Attorney General in charge of legislative affairs.
Major Robert L. Schaefer, USAF, has been promoted to Associate Professor of Law at the U. S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

CLASS OF 1971
Bruce A. Bunker is working with the Office of Inspector General, Office of Investigation, of the Veteran's Administration in Los Angeles.
Jody Grant '71, John E. Herrick '70, and Edmund F. Richardson '73, served on the faculty of the Arizona State Bar Fifth Continuing Legal Education program held at the University of San Diego, San Diego, California, the end of July.
Cheryl Hendrix, formerly with Hill & Slayton in Phoenix, has been appointed a Court Commissioner of the Maricopa County Superior Court.
Rey M. Martin is a Board Member of the Arizona Department of Transportation.
Sandra L. Massetto is serving as Commissioner with the Navajo Hopi Relocation Commission.
Cecil B. Patterson was appointed Judge of Maricopa County Superior Court. He had previously served as a deputy public defender.

CLASS OF 1972
Thomas E. Collins unseated Maricopa County Attorney Charles Hyder in the November 1980 general election.
Elizabeth R. Finn has been elected president of two organizations, the Young Lawyer's Section of the Arizona State Bar and the Arizona Municipal Judge's Association.
James Lane Rhoads writes that he is "taking a break from the profession, to experience an Alaskan adventure: working as a roomabout (laborer) on an oil drilling rig at Prudhoe Bay -- the North Slope of Alaska. I may never be the same!"
Martha T. Russell Thomas was elected president of the Phoenix Executive Club for the 1981-82 year.

CLASS OF 1973
Luis Aranda has been named Assistant Provost for Affirmative Action at Arizona State University.

CLASS OF 1974
Richard J. Trujillo is a shareholder in the Phoenix firm of Richmond and Trujillo, PC.

CLASS OF 1972
Mark E. Aspey has joined the U.S. Department of Justice as an Economic Crime Enforcement Specialist and is assigned to the U.S. Attorney's Office in Phoenix. He previously served 4½ years with the Special Prosecu-
CLASS OF 1975
Judith M. Bailey is a partner in Lewis & Roca, Phoenix.

Vida K. (Brack) Berkowitz works with Central Massachusetts Legal Services and lives in Worcester.

Charles Case II is a partner in Lewis & Roca, Phoenix.


Keith G. Larsen has become a member of Greene, Callister & Nebeker.

Herbert P. Schlanger, formerly associated with Hamell, Pest, Brandon & Doney, has opened his own office in Atlanta, Georgia for the practice of antitrust and trade regulation law.

William L. Topf III, former Director of the Student Defender Project of the College of Law, has accepted a post as Court Commissioner of the Maricopa County Superior Court.

Chris Van Dyke has been elected District Attorney for Marion County, Oregon, which includes Salem, the state capital.

CLASS OF 1977
Carol J. Galbraith is a staff attorney with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, D.C.

Susan D. Goodwin recently resigned as the first assistant city attorney of Apache Junction, Arizona. She has also taken a year's leave of absence from her Phoenix law firm, Martina, Curtis, Goodwin & Kasakew, to travel to North Africa, Asia and India.

Walter Lee Johnson chairs the bar directory committee of the Maricopa County Bar Association.

Carolyn M. Kulis, a partner in Moore, Jennings, Keppner, Schall & Part of Phoenix.

Patricia K. Norris, associated with Lewis & Roca in Phoenix, has been elected Treasurer of the ASU Law Alumni Association.

Donald Wilson, Jr., has formed a partnership, Richter & Wilson, with Joseph C. Richter.

CLASS OF 1978
Steven A. Cohen is now a partner in the Phoenix firm of Leiberman, Cohen & Reed.

Randall S. Dalton has become an associate in the Phoenix firm of Ehrman, Waldman & Brody, P.C.

Louis Demas is Special Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California, in Sacramento.

Patricia A. Metzger has become a member of the Salt Lake City firm of Glazier, Holbrook, Bendinger & Grumman.

Jon E. Pettitbone is an associate with Lewis & Roca of Phoenix.

Susan M. Swick has joined the Law Department of Motorola, Inc. in Phoenix and primarily practices international as well as equal employment laws. She is active on the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee of the Labor Section of the ABA, and the Fair Employment Practices Committee of the Labor Section of the Arizona Bar. She is a member of the Arizona Association of Women Lawyers and serves on its Steering Committee.

Robert L. Wright and David J. Harowitz have opened a temporary partnership, Wright & Harowitz.

CLASS OF 1979
Maryland L. Austin, formerly a deputy prosecutor with the Third Judicial Circuit of Indiana, won the November general election for Harrison-Crawfords County Judge.

Brenda L. Distler is an associate of Lewis & Roca in Phoenix.

CLASS OF 1980
Robert K. Banks is a judicial clerk to Chief Justice Charles Donaldson of the Idaho Supreme Court, in Boise.

Steve Chenen has joined the firm of Wentworth & Lunden.

William W. Clayton is Deputy Navajo County Attorney in Holbrook, Arizona.

Fred Duval has been appointed Special Assistant to Governor Bruce Babbitt.

Stephen Hall is associated with Bryan, O'Dell & Basey in Seattle.

Thomas K. Irvine has joined Duval & Shell in Phoenix.

Ron Johnson is associated with Stephans & Tohomas of Phoenix.

Ronald B. Mellis is associated with Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber & Maddox in Denver, Colorado.

Scott K. Mudgey is associated with Kauffman, Ellis, Burns & Neff in Phoenix.

Macon J. Monson has become an associate in the Phoenix office of Bell, Hime & Myers.

Robert J. Wilson, Jr., formerly with Pettenger & Bloom in Alamosago, Michigan, is now with the Legal Department of the Navajo Nation in Window Rock, Arizona.
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The law school 1981 summer session saw a number of changes, including the addition of new faculty members. The law school, under the leadership of Dean Alan Matheson, continued to develop its reputation as one of the leading law schools in the country. Students and faculty members contributed to the growth of the school, and its reputation continued to grow.

Clinics

- The Arizona State Bar Association Clinic was well attended, with many students and faculty members participating. The clinic provided legal assistance to those in need.

Continuing Legal Education

- The law school sponsored two Continuing Legal Education programs during the past months, with a total of 200 students participating. The programs addressed various topics, including commercial law, employment discrimination, and estate planning.

The law school also had several student appointments. Students were appointed to the Student Bar Association and the Arizona State Bar. In addition, some students were appointed to the journal staff. The student Bar Association is made up of students from all over the state, and it provides a forum for students to discuss legal issues and develop their legal skills.

Library

- There were several changes in the Law Library staff during the past year, with Professor Richard C. Dahl continuing as Director and Richard M. Nash as Assistant Director. Sharon A. Firestone is the Associate Librarian in charge of Government Documents. Naomi H. Reed and Marianne Alcorn are Assistant Librarians in charge of Reference, and Jeannette Au is the Librarian heading Technical Services.

Deans

- Dean Alan Matheson served as a member of the University Presidents' Search Committee, which resulted in the selection of J. Russell Nelson, former president of the University of Colorado, as the new president of Arizona State University. Dean John W. Schwartz was appointed as Associate Dean following the return to full-time teaching by the previous dean, Professor Milton R. Schroeder.

Promotion and Tenure

- On the recommendation of the Dean and faculty, John E. Lunn, David Kader, Dennis S. Karjala, and Richard W. Effland were appointed full professors. In addition, Hannah Arterton, Ira Mark Ellman, and Dennis S. Karjala were granted tenure.

Student Appointments

- The student Bar Association was well attended, with a total of 200 students participating. The association continues to provide a forum for students to discuss legal issues and develop their legal skills.

The student Bar Association is made up of students from all over the state, and it provides a forum for students to discuss legal issues and develop their legal skills.

The law school 1981-82 academic year was a successful one, with a total of 200 students participating in the various educational programs. The law school continues to develop its reputation as one of the leading law schools in the country, and it is expected to continue to grow in the future.