Why Law School Reviews? A Symposium: Law School Reviews and the Courts

Frederick Evan Crane
William D. Guthrie
Ignatius M. Wilkinson

Recommended Citation
Available at: http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/lr/vol4/iss1/1
### TABLE OF LEADING ARTICLES—AUTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Brendan F.</td>
<td>St. Thomas More, Lawyer</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane, Frederick E.</td>
<td>Why Law School Reviews? A Symposium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delehanty, James A.</td>
<td>John T. Loughran—An Appreciation</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn, John F. X.</td>
<td>New Procedure For Old</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraenkel, Osmond K.</td>
<td>Creditors' Rights in Life Insurance</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraenkel, Osmond K.</td>
<td>The Opinions of United States Supreme Court for the 1934 Term—General Issues</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Walter B.</td>
<td>Principles or Facts?</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, Fritz.</td>
<td>International Legal Practice</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shientag, Bernard L.</td>
<td>Summary Judgment</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, Ignatius M.</td>
<td>John T. Loughran—An Appreciation</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodruff, George P.</td>
<td>Legal and Investment Standards of Trustees</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE OF LEADING ARTICLES—TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creditors' Rights in Life Insurance</td>
<td>Osmond K. Fraenkel</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Legal Practice</td>
<td>Fritz Moses</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Investment Standards of Trustees</td>
<td>George P. Woodruff</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Procedure For Old</td>
<td>John F. X. Finn</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of United States Supreme Court for the 1934 Term—General Issues, The</td>
<td>Osmond K. Fraenkel</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles or Facts?</td>
<td>Walter B. Kennedy</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas More, Lawyer</td>
<td>Brendan F. Brown</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Judgment</td>
<td>Bernard L. Shientag</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Law School Reviews? A Symposium</td>
<td>Frederick E. Crane, William D. Guthrie and Ignatius M. Wilkinson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF BOOK REVIEWS—AUTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Law Institute: Restatement of the Law of Torts. Thomas L. J. Corcoran</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beard: The Open Door at Home. John X. Pyne, S.J.</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicognani: Canon Law. Frederick J. de Sloovere</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen: The Powers of the New York Court of Appeals. Edward Q. Carr</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enson: Courts and Judges in France, Germany and England. Günther Jacobson</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein: The Family in Court. I. Maurice Wormser</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks and Katz: Unauthorized Practice of Law. Rev. Robert J. White</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbie: Principles of the Law of Evidence with Cases for Discussion. Lloyd M. Howell</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennan: A Treatise on Residence and Domicile. William R. Meagher</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBaine: Cases on Common Law Pleading. George W. Bacon</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasongood: Cases on Municipal Corporations. J. Joseph Lilly</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker-Smith: Lord Reading and his Cases: The Study of a Great Career. George W. Bacon</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberger: The Liberty of the Press. I. Maurice Wormser</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX—DIGEST

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

ADMIRALTY
Admiralty cases decided by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 430

APPEAL AND ERROR
Cohen: The Powers of the New York Court of Appeals, a book review 536
The opinions of the United States Supreme Court for the 1934 term: general issues 418-455

ARBITRATION AND AWARD
Arbitration questions settled by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 440

AUTHORITIES
See States
Authorities as “public benefit corporations” 20
Development of the “Authority” as an instrumentality of government 18-23
Obligations issued by an incorporated instrumentality of a state as debts of the state 23

BANKRUPTCY
See Insurance
Bankruptcy questions considered by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 418
Discharge of judgment for wilful and malicious injury: burden of proof 497
Right of the trustee to succeed to any rights which the insured under a life insurance policy reserved to himself 36

BANKS AND BANKING
See Legislation
A national bank as prohibited by law from agreeing to repurchase securities it had sold 439
Bank’s liability for participation in breach of trust: misappropriation by trustee-depositor 328-331
Emergency legislation: attempt to aid the reorganization of closed banks 84
Insolvent banks: claims for future rent 119
Special deposits: transmission of funds 331-333
The bank and the trust receipt at common law 108
The banker under the Uniform Trust Receipts Act: his rights and remedies 110-117

BONDS
See Authorities, States, Trusts
Bonds issued by state institutions do not constitute indebtedness of the state 23
Trustee responsibility and bond values in the depression era 393

BURDEN OF PROOF
See Bankruptcy, Beneficiaries

CANON LAW
Cicognani: Canon Law, a book review 363-367

COMMON LAW
See Conflict of Laws, Insurance
Abrogation of the common law doctrine of unity of spouses 475
Effect of statutory abrogation in some jurisdictions of the common law rule with respect to survival of actions for personal injuries and its retention in others 89
Rights of creditors in the proceeds of life insurance policies in the absence of legislation 30-37
The trust receipt at common law 108
The Rule of Shelley’s Case: operative as at common law due to inadequate legislative efforts at abolition 322-326
The federal “common law” as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in decisions during the 1934 term 446

COMPARATIVE LAW
See Conflict of Laws

CONFLICT OF LAWS
See Public Policy
American Law Institute: Restatement of the Law of Conflict of Laws, a book review 541
Difficulties in comparative law due to differences in cultural background, language and law 240-265
International legal practice: weaknesses in the technique of handling the legal side of private international relations 244-271
Opinions and testimony on foreign law: the foreign lawyer 268-271
Personal tort actions between spouses in the conflict of laws 480
Recognition of confiscatory decrees of a foreign government 333-337
Survival and revival of personal injury actions in the conflict of laws 89-101
Technique of finding the law of foreign countries 267-268
Whether a claim for personal injuries survives the death of either party as governed by the lex loci or the lex fori 91

Fictitious payee: liability of innocent drawer 123
INDEX TO VOLUME IV

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW
See Conflict of Laws, Insurance, Public Works
Constitutional limitations on state indebtedness 23-26
Constitutionality of Mortgage Moratorium legislation: the Blaisdell decision 73-79
Constitutionality of emergency legislation 76-83
Constitutionality of the Railroad Retirement Act 498
Creditor’s rights in life insurance: constitutional problems 48-52
Interstate commerce: the “commerce clause” as the most historic well-spring of federal power 460-465
Local practices as exerting direct or indirect effect on interstate commerce within the meaning of the commerce clause 462
National Recovery Act: delegation of legislative powers to President 341-343
Nature of the power delegated by the N.I.R.A. to the President to approve and promulgate codes 457
Police power in general 274-276
Police power: state regulation of private business 276-284
Power of Congress to punish for completed contempt 338-340
Some constitutional aspects of state recovery acts 273-287
State recovery acts: delegation of legislative power 284-287
State recovery acts and the due process clause 286-287
Suit against a state: immunity 124
The Schechter Case: a restatement of familiar principles 457-466
The satisfaction of gold clause obligations by legal tender paper 287-295
Unemployment insurance: constitutional problems involved 493
Whether the full faith and credit clause is violated by the refusal of one state to entertain suit on a personal injury action arising in another state 100-101
Whether the due process clause is violated by refusal to recognize the existence of a cause of action acquired in another jurisdiction 101

CONTEMPT
See Constitutional Law

CONTRACTS
See Constitutional Law
Infant’s contract: recoupment by defendant vendor 152
Liability of manufacturer or vendor of food sounding in contract: whether an implied warranty is available to one not in privity of contract with the warrantor 299-304
Operation of a contract to give a trust receipt 112
Statute of Frauds: part performance: suit by vendor 523
The nature of the gold clause contract 290-293
Validity: inducement to breach prior contract with third party 126

COURTS
See Patents

COUNTIES
See Public Works

COPYRIGHTS
See Patents

CRIMINAL LAW
See Joint Tenancy
Federal criminal law questions decided by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 416
Right of state to writ of error 130

DAMAGES
Excessive damages: propriety of partial remission solely by act of presiding judge: remittitur 344-346
Inadequacy of damages: increasing jury’s verdict with consent of defendant in lieu of new trial: additur 344-346

DEATH
Statute of Limitations: effect of barring of decedent’s action upon survivor’s suit for wrongful death 501

DOMESTIC RELATIONS
See Exemptions
Goldstein: The Family in Court, a book review 154
Personal tort actions between husband and wife 475-484

DOMICILE
See Taxation
Kennan: A Treatise on Residence and
   Domicile, a book review 161
Residence as distinguished from domicile:
   process: substituted service 140

DOWER
   Eminent domain: wife's inchoate dower
      right as attaching to fund 504

DUE PROCESS
   See Constitutional Law

ECONOMICS
   Beard: The Open Door at Home, a book
      review 542
   Graham: "Tsar of Freedom"—Life and
      Reign of Alexander II, a book re-
      view 542
   Financial difficulties of recent years as
      affecting trustee investment responsi-
      bility 391
   Morgan-Webb: The Rise and Fall of the
      Gold Standard, a book review 362

EMERGENCY
   See Constitutional Law, Mortgages
   Economic emergency: necessity for rea-
      sonable exercise of the police power of
      the state 76

EMINENT DOMAIN
   Inchoate dower: Right of wife as attach-
      ing to fund 504

EQUITY
   See Mistake, Property
   Equitable relief for mistake of law: in-
      fluence of fraud, misrepresentation, ex-
      cessive hardship or over-reaching 473
   Equitable relief: mistake in regard to
      private rights of one party as distin-
      guished from a mistake of general
      law 474
   Need for a new name to describe those
      rights which equity designates as
      property for purposes of protection
      309-310
   St. Thomas More as credited with the
      creation of a new epoch in the history
      of equity 381

ESTATES
   See Taxation

ESTOPPEL
   Invoked to lift bar of Statute of Frauds:
      part performance: suit by vendor 523

EVIDENCE
   See Negligence
   Cross-examination: difficulties of ques-
      tioning a foreign lawyer, as an expert
      witness, so that the foreign law will
      be brought out correctly and clearly
      270-271

Dying declaration: realization of im-
   pending coma and death 507
   Humble: Principles of the Law of Ev-
      idence with Cases for Discussion, a
      book review 162
   Res Gestae: admissibility of self-serving
      declaration as part thereof 346-349

EXEMPTIONS
   See Insurance, Statutes
   Creditors' rights under general exemption
      statutes 43-45
   For the benefit of the wife or children
      of the insured as affecting creditors' rights in life insurance 40-43
   Retroactivity of statutes exempting life
      insurance from creditors' claims 45-47

FOOD
   See Negligence, Sales
   Liability of the manufacturer or vendor
      for injuries resulting from the con-
      sumption of unwholesome foods 295-306

FRAUDS, STATUTE OF
   Part performance: suit by vendor 523

GIFTS
   See Insurance
   A life insurance policy in which a per-
      son is named as beneficiary as in effect
      a gift to the beneficiary 3
   Gifts to charity: burial plot: statutory
      restrictions on wills 144

GOOD WILL
   See Property
   Good will as a property right 306

HUSBAND AND WIFE
   See Domestic Relations

INCOME TAXES
   Federal income tax questions settled by
      the United States Supreme Court dur-
      ing the 1934 term 421

INDEMNITY
   Practice: propriety of indemnitee's serv-
      ing cross-complaint on co-defendant
      indemnitee: New York Civil Practice
      Act, Section 264 137

INDIANS
   Indian questions settled by the United
      States Supreme Court during the 1934
      term 435

INFANTS
   Contracts: recoupment by defendant
      vendor 132

INSOLVENCY
   See Bankruptcy, Creditors

INSURANCE
   See Legislation
### INDEX TO VOLUME IV

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary in common disaster: burden of proof</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors' rights in life insurance</td>
<td>35-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of unemployment insurance in the United States: effect of the Social Security Act</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European systems of unemployment insurance</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for unemployment insurance</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York unemployment insurance legislation</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans: war risk insurance cases decided by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INTERNATIONAL LAW

See Conflict of Laws

Linguistic mistakes in international treaties: difficulties arising out of their bi-lingual nature | 249-250 |

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE

See Constitutional Law

Orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewed by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term | 426     |

#### JOINT TENANCY

Joint deposits: right of murderer to take as survivor | 510     |

#### JUDGES

See Jurisprudence

Enser: Courts and Judges in France, Germany and England, a book review | 163     |

John T. Loughran: an appreciation | 167-185 |

Judicial efforts to improve the legal system as confined by the narrow limits of precedent and analogy | 103     |

Personality of the judge as reflected in his judicial determinations: limitations in deciding motions for summary judgment | 224     |

Renewed zeal of judges and lawyers as evidence of a struggle to survive apparent tendency to settle important problems outside the law | 229-231 |

Sir Thomas More: an outstanding and incomparable legalist and jurist | 381     |

The Judicial Council and the Law Revision Commission as long-needed additions to the judicial branch of government | 103     |

Value of precedents, rules and principles balanced against the weight of facts and unconscious forces as swaying the judicial mind | 53      |

#### JURISPRUDENCE

See Conflict of Laws, Taxation

Cohen: The Powers of the New York Court of Appeals, a book review | 336     |

Jurisdiction of Congress to punish for contempt | 339-340 |

Kennan: A Treatise on Residence and Domicile, a book review | 161     |

Questions of original jurisdiction decided by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term | 437     |

Residence as distinguished from domicile: process: substituted service | 140     |

Whether, in accordance with the principles of interstate comity, the sovereign right of each state to refuse recognition to foreign-created rights ought to be exercised | 96-100 |

#### JURY

See Damages

#### LANDLORD AND TENANT

Nuisance: injury to tenant's servant | 512     |

#### LAW

See Jurisprudence, Practice and Pleading

How to make the law predictable and at the same time adaptable to unforeseen contingencies: the solution of the "civil law" countries | 253-255 |

The myth of the uniformity of foreign law: Roman law, modern "civil law" and the common law | 253-255 |

The New York Judicial Council and the Law Revision Commission | 102-103 |

#### LAW REVIEWS

Benefits to the law school and its students | 10-12   |

Faculty supervision | 7        |

Recognition by the courts | 1-3      |

Value to lawyers | 3-9      |

Why Law School Reviews: a symposium | 1-12     |
FORDHAM LAW REVIEW

[Vol. 4

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

LAW SCHOOLS
See Law Reviews
Influence of scholarship and character requirements of law schools on professional standards 4
John T. Loughran: an appreciation: the student and the teacher 179-185

LAWYERS
See Judges, Jurisprudence, Law Reviews
Critical survey of the professional standards of the American Bar 4
Growing need for the lawyer to be prepared to handle cases with a foreign aspect 244-246
John T. Loughran: an appreciation: the lawyer 170-178
Legal questions which arose between Sir Thomas More and Henry VIII 384
Present-day necessity for "extra-legal" outlook 54
Robinson: Law and the Lawyers, a book review 542
St. Thomas More, Lawyer 375-380
The work of lawyers simplified in the "civil law" countries 266
Walker-Smith: Lord Reading and his Cases: The Study of a Great Career, a book review 160

LEGAL ETHICS
See Law Schools

LEGAL REFORM
See Jurisprudence, Practice and Pleading, Procedure, Trusts
Influence of Lord Chancellor More in reference to substantive and procedural legal reforms 382
Need for a separate, permanent agency for legal reform 103
Need for a single federal agency continuously functioning to simplify the law applicable to the federal courts in all its phases 485
Purpose of the New York Judicial Council and the Law Revision Commission to examine the law and propose reforms and changes to the legislature 102
Report of the Commission on the Administration of Justice in New York State, a book review 156
Unsatisfactory legal standards for trustee investments: whether they have not been demonstrated to be susceptible of improvement 392

LEGAL TENDER
See Constitutional Law

LEGISLATION
See Constitutional Law, Jurisprudence,

Mortgages, Municipal Corporations, States, Statutes
Acts creating the New York Judicial Council and the Law Revision Commission 102
Mortgages emergency legislation: emergency legislation on collateral matters 77-89
Unemployment insurance: New York Unemployment Insurance Law 485-496
Uniform Trust Receipts Act as adopted by New York 108-118

LIBEL AND SLANDER
Liability in testamentary defamation 349-352
Weinberger: The Liberty of the Press, a book review 370-371

LIMITATIONS, STATUTE OF
Death: effect of barring of decedent's action upon survivor's suit for wrongful death 501

LOANS
See Public Works, Public Works Administration

MISTAKE
Exceptions created by the courts as indicating judicial desire to limit the comprehensiveness of the general rule precluding recovery of money paid under a mistake of law 472
Relief for mistake of law 466-475
The discrimination between relief for mistake of law and fact as unsound: abrogation of distinction a legislative duty 475

MORATORIA
See Mortgages

MORTGAGES
See Trusts
Emergency legislation as attempting to aid the liquidation of defaulting mortgage guarantee companies 84
Foreclosure: liability of receiver for failure to repair 136
Minnesota Mortgage Moratorium law: the Blaisdell decision: one year after 84
Standards for mortgage investments and the trustee under the law 407

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS
See Public Works, Revenue Bonds
Further powers conferred by the legislatures of many states where statutory limitations prevented participation in the national program of public works 16
Liability for torts: governmental and proprietary functions 514
INDEX TO VOLUME IV

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

Seasongood: Cases on Municipal Corporations, a book review 155
Use by municipalities of revenue bonds as distinguished from tax obligations: usually predicated upon express statutory enactments 28

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT
See Constitutional Law

NEGLIGENCE
See Torts
Res ipsa loquitur: airplane accidents 517
Violation of pure food law as negligence per se 520

NUISANCE
See Landlord and Tenant

PATENTS
Patent and copyright decisions of the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 433

PAYMENT
See Mistake
Diversity of situations in which money is paid under a mistake of law 469

PENSIONS
See Constitutional Law

PERSONAL PROPERTY
See Constitutional Law, Legislation, Property
Whether the proceeds of insurance were the property of the insured or of the beneficiary where a statute attempts to deprive existing creditors of their rights 48

PHYSICIANS AND SURGEOINS
See Workmen's Compensation

PRACTICE AND PLEADING
See Conflict of Laws, Legal Reform, Process
A difficult question of law does not defeat summary judgment 197-198
Affidavits to be used on motions for summary judgments: the moving affidavit: the answering affidavit 199-211
Appeals from orders denying motions for summary judgment 220-221
Application for summary judgment based on facts exclusively within the moving party's knowledge 213-216
Defects in an adversary's pleading not available to a moving party on an application for summary judgment 211-213
Difference between summary judgment and motion to strike out as sham 191-192
Effect of serving an amended answer after motion for summary judgment is made 195
Emergencies of calendar congestion: necessity for bench and bar to meet the challenge 231
Federal equity practice: the trend in that direction in the states 253-254
General application of Rule 113, Rules of Civil Practice: what is a triable issue? 155-157
History of the summary judgment rule 157-159
Indemnity: propriety of indemnitee's serving cross-complaint on co-defendant indemnitee: New York Civil Practice Act, Section 264 157-159
Interposition of a counterclaim: effect on motion for summary judgment 217-218
McBaine: Cases on Common Law Pleading, a book review 368-370
Motion for reargument and to vacate summary judgment on newly discovered evidence 218-220
Partial summary judgment: Section 476 of the Civil Practice Act and Rule 114, Rules of Civil Practice 225-226
Practice and procedure in federal courts: decisions of the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term as evidence of need for revision 449
Practice on motions for summary judgment 192-194
Reform worked by Rule 113, Rules of Civil Practice 222-223
Report of the Commission on the Administration of Justice in New York State, a book review 156
Rule 113, Rules of Civil Practice, no violation of right to trial by jury 190-191
Simplification and improvement of the rules of practice as an achievement of the New York Judicial Council 165
The English "New Procedure of 1932" 235-239
The menace: the negligence action, the jury trial and the "settleable" case as "The Three Musketeers of the Law's Delay" 228-229
The "New Procedure": a suggested plan to relieve congested tribunals in civil cases 233-234
The Virginia "judgment by motion" 224
Value of oral argument on motions for summary judgment and appeal 221-222

PRACTICE OF LAW
See Law Reviews
Hicks and Katz: Unauthorized Practice of Law, a book review 367-368
PROCEDURE
See Practice and Pleading
New Procedure for Old 228-243
Present federal equity practice, the Virginia "judgment on motion" and the English "New Procedure of 1932" as the basis for a new procedure in crowded cities and states 232-239

PROCESS
Substituted service: residence as distinguished from domicile 140

PROPERTY
See Personal Property, Real Property
Conflicting interpretations of the property concept 307-315

PUBLIC POLICY
See Jurisdiction
Enforcement of a right acquired under the statute of another state as affecting the public policy of the forum 96-100
Invasion of the doctrine of caveat emptor in the sale of food as prompted by public policy 304-306
Public policy background in cases denying the right of action in tort actions between spouses 478

PUBLIC WELFARE
See Constitutional Law, Mortgages
Necessity of rational compromise between individual rights and public welfare 76

PUBLIC WORKS
Some recent developments in the law relating to municipal financing of public works 18-34

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION
See Public Works, Revenue Bonds
Application of constitutional prohibitions against the incurring of debts as a result of attempts by states to secure loans from P.W.A. 24
Revenue bonds accepted for P.W.A. as security for loans to finance sound enterprise 27

QUASI-CONTRACTS
See Mistake
Quasi-contractual relief for mistake of fact and law 467

REAL PROPERTY
See Property
Dignan: A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States, a book review 532
History and content of the Rule in Shelley's Case 316-321

The Rule in Shelley's Case has been abolished: sed quaere 316-327

REALISM
See Jurisprudence
Importance of facts and fact-finding in the evaluation of law: some facts about facts 58-60
Realism as the most interesting and provocative movement in the law at the present time 58-60
Value of "experiments" of fact-finding and the scientific approach 61-04

REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
See Mistake
Reformation on the ground of a pure mistake of law 473

RESTATEMENTS OF LAW
See Property
American Law Institute: Restatement of the Law of Conflict of Laws, a book review 541
American Law Institute: Restatement of the Law of Torts, a book review 533
Property: impossibility and undesirability of a single, comprehensive definition of "property" 315

REVENUE BONDS
See Municipal Corporations
Definition: development in the law relating to financing public improvements through the issuance of revenue obligations 26-34

SALES
See Mortgages, Negligence
Foreclosure sales: statutes granting to the courts the power of extending the redemption period 76
The decline of caveat emptor in the sale of food 295-306

SECURITIES
See Banks and Banking, Trusts
Capital structure: claim of a security on earnings as a factor in determining safe investments 408

STATES
See Constitutional Law, Jurisdiction, Mortgages, Public Works, P.W.A.
 Constitutional limitations on state indebtedness 23-29
Immunity of states from suit 124
Interpretation of the Blaisdell decision by state courts 76-77
New legislation: necessity for revision of statutes to enable states to secure the benefits of the N.R.A. 14-18
Right of state to writ of error in a criminal case 130
Some constitutional aspects of state recovery acts 273-287
INDEX TO VOLUME IV

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

State emergency legislation during periods of economic stress 83
Whether a state can empower an "authority" to incur a debt which will not be held to be that of the state itself 18-20

STATUTES
See Constitutional Law, Contracts, Insurance, Legislation, Mortgages, Municipal Corporations, States

Emergency legislation collateral to mortgage moratoria 83-89
Miscellaneous statutes interpreted by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 442
Mortgage emergency legislation 77-83
Statutory changes as affecting creditors' rights in life insurance policies 37-52
Statutory abrogation of rule that personal injury actions die with the person 89-90
Statutory defects of legislative efforts calculated to abolish the Rule in Shelley's Case 321-326

TAXATION
See Income Taxes
An estate tax ruling by the United States Supreme Court during the 1934 term 425
Situs of intangibles for purposes of taxation 352-355
Trusts: validity of tax on interest of resident beneficiary 526

TORTS
See Conflict of Laws, Domestic Relations, Libel and Slander, Negligence

American Law Institute: Restatement of the Law of Torts, a book review 353
Discharge of judgment for malicious and willful injury in bankruptcy: burden of proof 497
Liability of municipal corporations: governmental and proprietary functions 314
Liability of manufacturer or vendor of food sounding in tort: inroads on caveat emptor in the field of negligence 296-299

TRUSTS
See Bankruptcy, Gifts, Wills

WARRANTY
See Contracts

WILLS
See Joint Tenancy, Libel and Slander

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION
Injuries caused by third parties and physician's malpractice 358-361
Injuries sustained during "horse-play" with fellow employees 529
Injured workers' rights: liberal attitude on the part of the United States Supreme Court in interpreting compensation and similar statutes affecting employees 441
Occupational disease: efforts of the courts to hold all employees' injuries compensable 147
# TABLE OF CASES

Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addiss v. Selig</th>
<th>46, 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aktieselskabet Cuzo v. The Su-carseeo</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Holding Co., Inc. v. Ninson Realty Corp., et. al.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Coast Line R. Co. v. Florida</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker v. Bolton</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Minden v. Clement</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter v. Ford Motor Co.</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibbie v. Lumley</td>
<td>466, 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchall v. Clemons Co., Inc.</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bischoff v. Yorkville Bank</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaisdell Decision</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourcheix v. Willow Brook Dairy, Inc.</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braasch, Matter of</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass v. Stoeser</td>
<td>278, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronson v. Rodes</td>
<td>289, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood of Locomotive E. &amp; E. v. Pinkston</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown v. Garey</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budd v. Morning Telegraph</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler v. Horwitz</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Oregon Power Co. v. Beaver Portland C. Co.</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catani v. Swift &amp; Co.</td>
<td>300, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Vermont Trans. Co. v. Durning</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challis v. Hartloff</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Exchange Bank v. Munoz</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Labor Case</td>
<td>462, 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm v. Georgia</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens &amp; Southern Nat. Bank v. Hendricks</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of New York (Cropsey Ave.), Matter of</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Case</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohn v. Samuels</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Bank v. Canal Bank</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombes v. Getz</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry v. Mackenzie</td>
<td>211, 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis v. Van Camp Packing Co.</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean v. State</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch v. Max</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimick v. Schiedt</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolman v. Levine</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly v. Bauder</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty v. Equitable Life Assurance Society</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers’ Liability Cases</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer v. Chicago &amp; N. W. Ry. Co.</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer, Matter of</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accident, Fire &amp; Life Assur. Corp., Ltd. v. Crowell</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Investment Co. v. Interborough Rapid Transit Co.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George v. Victor Talking Machine Co.</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons v. Ogden</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Clause Cases</td>
<td>288, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Corp. v. Cosman</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory v. Morris</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburger v. Cornell University</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallenbeck v. Leimert</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer v. Dagenhart</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna v. Mitchell</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans v. Louisiana</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne v. Calef</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helvering v. Grinnell</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepburn v. Griswold</td>
<td>288, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herndon v. Gregory</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzog v. Stern</td>
<td>93, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Bldg. &amp; Loan Ass'n v. Blaisdell</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Oil Case</td>
<td>274, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House v. Mayes</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iaffola v. M. Berardini State Bank</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Trust Co. v. Perry</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe Bldg. &amp; Loan Ass'n v. Orr</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson v. Edwards</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby v. Kline Bros., Inc.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis, Matter of</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jame's Claim</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurney v. MacCracken</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpas v. Bandler</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavanaugh v. McIntyre</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kottler v. New York Bargain House</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Tender Cases</td>
<td>288, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liggett, Louis K., Co. v. Broadway John Corp.</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page references in bold type are to Leading Articles; in plain type to Comments, Legislative Notes, Recent Decisions, and Book Reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co. ................................................. 536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Properties v. Irving Trust Co. ........................................................................................................ 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers' Finance Co. v. McKay .................................................................................................................. 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter of, see proper name ..................................................................................................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matterson v. Dent .................................................................................................................................................. 420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazetti v. Armour &amp; Co. ...................................................................................................................................... 403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaskey v. Blauner ............................................................................................................................................ 204, 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrea v. United States ...................................................................................................................................... 431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNally v. Carolina Asbestos Plant ..................................................................................................................... 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills v. Society of New York Hosp. ...................................................................................................................... 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda's Will, Matter of .................................................................................................................................... 144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile v. Yuille ...................................................................................................................................................... 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobley v. New York Life Ins. Co. ........................................................................................................................ 448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco, Principality of v. Mississippi .................................................................................................................. 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Timber Co. v. Washington ................................................................................................................... 495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munn v. Illinois ..................................................................................................................................................... 278, 281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Johnson .......................................................................................................................... 446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagle v. Nagle ......................................................................................................................................................... 349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebbia v. New York ............................................................................................................................................. 280, 281, 283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska v. Wyoming .......................................................................................................................................... 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble State Bank v. Haskell .................................................................................................................................. 496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Amsterdam Cas. Co. v. National Newark &amp; Essex Banking Co. .................................................................. 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Life Ins. Co. v. Hazlitt Realty Corp. .................................................................................................... 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols v. Clark, MacMullen &amp; Riley, Inc. ........................................................................................................... 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nock v. Coca-Cola Bottling Works of Pittsburgh .................................................................................................. 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman v. Baltimore &amp; Ohio R. R. ......................................................................................................................... 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Leary v. Hodapp ............................................................................................................................................... 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Meara Co. v. National Park Bank .................................................................................................................... 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ory v. Aern ............................................................................................................................................................ 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palsgraf v. Long Island R. R. Co. ........................................................................................................................ 536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan ................................................................................................................................. 274, 284, 341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke, Davis &amp; Co. v. Hurd .................................................................................................................................... 358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People ex rel. Rice v. Graves ................................................................................................................................. 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People v. St. Nicholas Bank ................................................................................................................................... 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Nat. Bank &amp; Trust Co. of Pemberton v. Bichler .................................................................................... 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perlman v. Perlman ............................................................................................................................................... 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips v. Bank ..................................................................................................................................................... 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piukkuu v. Pillsbury Astoria Flouring Mills Co. ................................................................................................. 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton R. Co. ............................................................................................................ 499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawstorne v. Maguire ......................................................................................................................................... 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts v. Hardin ............................................................................................................................................... 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schechter Case ...................................................................................................................................................... 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz v. Holzman .......................................................................................................................................... 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior v. Braden ............................................................................................................................................... 526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern v. Rodkin .................................................................................................................................................... 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticosberg v. New York Life Insurance ............................................................................................................... 336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spielberg Motor Sales Co. v. Dodge ..................................................................................................................... 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squibb &amp; Sons v. Mallinckrodt Chemical Works ............................................................................................... 452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State v. Muolo ....................................................................................................................................................... 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stearns v. Association of Bar of City of N. Y. ...................................................................................................... 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternlieb v. Normandie Nat. Securities Corp. .................................................................................................... 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Trust Case ................................................................................................................................................. 462, 463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift and Co. v. United States ........................................................................................................................... 462, 463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindal v. City of Jacksonville ........................................................................................................................... 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas v. Winchester ........................................................................................................................................ 303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson v. Butler ......................................................................................................................................... 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trebilcock v. Wilson ........................................................................................................................................... 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Chicago M. St. P. &amp; P. R. Co. ................................................................................................. 427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Delaware &amp; Hudson Co. ........................................................................................................ 463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Guaranty Trust Co. .................................................................................................................. 448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. Oregon ..................................................................................................................................... 438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States v. West Virginia .......................................................................................................................... 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varick Spring Corp. v. Bank of U. S. ................................................................................................................... 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter v. Hoffman .............................................................................................................................................. 523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Baking Co. v. Trizzino ................................................................................................................................ 302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner v. Colorado .......................................................................................................................................... 444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson v. Jones ................................................................................................................................................... 532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss v. Goldberger ............................................................................................................................................ 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling Steel Corp. Assessment, In re ............................................................................................................... 352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting v. Hudson Trust Co. ................................................................................................................................ 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Nat. Bank v. United States ................................................................................................................... 435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin v. Michigan ...................................................................................................................................... 437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyse v. Powell ................................................................................................................................................... 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe v. Shelley ............................................................................................................................................... 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff Packing Co. v. The Court of Industrial Relations .................................................................................. 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthen Co. v. Thomas .................................................................................................................................. 48, 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honorable John T. Loughran

LL.B., 1911, LL.D., 1925, Fordham University. Lecturer in Law, 1912-1915, Associate Professor of Law, 1915-1916, Professor of Law, 1916-1930, Fordham University, School of Law. Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, 1931-1934; Judge of the Court of Appeals of New York, 1934-.
WHY LAW SCHOOL REVIEWS? A SYMPOSIUM

Law School Reviews and the Courts

FREDERICK EVAN CRANE†

It is timely to say a word in behalf of our law school periodicals and to notice the place which they have made for themselves in legal education. Many of our important institutions and methods have been a gradual growth out of habit and custom without specific planning and forethought or corporate enactment or governmental legislation. Anyone reading the Constitution of the United States to find out how we elected our presidents would hardly believe that we had so far departed from the original scheme of our fundamental government as to make the electoral college a mere formality. He would find nothing in the written Constitution recognizing a national party convention. Unthinkable would it be that the electoral college would vote contrary to the choices of these conventions.

If I mistake not, the English Cabinet has no recognition under their constitutionally developed form of government. It exists as the outgrowth of custom and practice and now functions as the chief source of power. Tradition and custom may be slow in forming, but when once established are more effectual than much written law.

In some such way the law school journal or review or quarterly, call it what you will, has slowly and gradually developed into one of the chief functions of our law schools and has become so important and useful that its weight and authority find influence outside the scholastic atmosphere with the practicing lawyer as well as the judges in our courts.

No doubt the emphasis in the law school curriculum is placed upon the study of law and the teaching of it by the professorial staff. However, both the teaching and the professor himself have developed to cover a much wider field.

In these college papers, law students, or some of them, have found

†Chief Judge, New York Court of Appeals.
the means of expressing their own ideas about decided cases, generally recent ones, and many of their criticisms have been exceedingly good. Independence of thought is a valuable asset to our profession. The main purpose, of course, in the law school, is to teach the law as it is, but this is by no means an easy task. The law does not stay put; it changes with the years; new ideas have to be met and dealt with. Life itself changes; the law must expand to meet the change. The time has long since passed when the certainty of the law is its chief qualification. In the main this is true, but a cursory glance over the procedure or substantive law of the past indicates how rapidly rules are modified either by legislation or decision. Therefore, any means which develops these young college students to think for themselves and apply the tests of their own independent judgment is a very valuable training. Probably the best work which is done by any law school professor is not confined to the mere teaching of the law as it is, but in creating an enthusiasm for justice and for the improvement of the law.

As an aside I may make a confession, which is, that we judges—perhaps I had better speak for myself—look at these reviews of cases with considerable interest and when I find that any opinion of mine has been approved by these young critics I have a feeling of satisfaction which I am sure is justified when we remember that these students come to the law with fresh impressionable minds, sensitive to right and wrong and to any act of injustice. Too frequently the opinion of the older man represents the trend of a time which has passed, whereas youth ever is at the threshold of the future.

Then too, as I have said, the college professor has entered upon a wider field of activity through his teaching in the narrower one. Many of these men no longer are merely professors; they are jurists, like Professor A. V. Dicey of England, whose books and writings are followed by the bench of England. These professors have become specialists at a time when the law is so complicated that specialists are necessary. They give us their views frequently in important articles printed in these law school journals, with the result that the bound volumes of the issues are to be found in the libraries of the appellate courts and in the offices of the leading practitioners.

I may say—again speaking for myself, although I know of others who follow similar practice—that in difficult cases dealing with intricate subjects of law, about which there is much dispute and many conflicting decisions, I eagerly turn to these college reviews, scan the index to see if any of these college professors or teachers have written a paper upon the subject. The responsibility for a negligent statement resulting in damage was involved in *Nichols v. Clark, MacMullen & Riley, Inc.*

---

1. 261 N. Y. 118, 184 N. E. 729 (1933).
and from the opinion you will see the help derived from the law school reviews. As I am not speaking officially, but merely as an individual, I may be permitted to suggest that this help and the advantage afforded the courts by the research of professors and law students are not always acknowledged in the opinions by citations of the reviews, but these writers suffer no further in this respect than many of our leading lawyers who present very able briefs from which the courts may copy copiously without even a suggestion that the lawyer has furnished the idea or possibly even the language.

Courts are busy places. Decisions must be made with expedition. Serious and important questions of law must be disposed of one way or the other by men who have little time for study or for research. Any court which hears seven to eight cases a day involving disputed questions of law and seeks to decide them within the month has very little time for deep and thorough study. We must all more or less depend upon the research of others, whether it be in textbook, previous decisions or in papers printed in our law reviews. The latter has supplemented the textbook and the decision because we have found from experience that the modern law professor or teacher—perhaps jurist would be a better name for some of them—has had time as well as desire to enter thoroughly into the study of a particular subject and has given the result of his efforts for the benefit of the profession. Much of this work is done gladly, without compensation, from a mere desire to be helpful.

Without saying more I shall merely add that we of the bench, as well as the lawyer at the bar, should make this acknowledgment, though somewhat belated, of the help which we get from the younger men and from the college professor in the disposition of the every-day work of the courts.

Law School Reviews and Lawyers
WILLIAM D. GUTHRIE

As I have for nearly twenty years been an honorary alumnus of Fordham University, and have been following with interest the growth and improvement of its Law School, I am much interested in the proposed revival of the FORDHAM LAW REVIEW. I believe that the law school reviews have for many years been rendering a service of great and enduring value to jurisprudence, the administration of justice, and the governance of the State. They have been doing for the literature and the scientific progress of the law to a very great extent what Blackstone and Kent and Story did in their day. They are making the law
more and more a liberal science and an inspiring, ennobling and uplifting calling; and they are helping to supply the Bar, the Bench and our federal and state governments, respectively, scholarly lawyers, able legislators, trained statesmen, and law teachers, as well as competent and trustworthy public executives and administrators.

A broad field will lie before the editors of the *Fordham Law Review* for exploration and service, and to my mind just as important a field as Marshall, Story and Kent faced at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The legal and constitutional foundations that these great American judges and authors helped to lay are being attacked and undermined. We are in a period of experimentation and, to some extent at least, of precipitate, haphazard and ill-considered “trial and error.” Subversive doctrines are being taught and advocated which in Marshall’s day, to quote his own words, “no political dreamer was wild enough to think of.” Ancient principles are at stake. We have among us “false prophets,” against whom humanity has been divinely warned from time immemorial. Many are apprehensive that we are heedlessly drifting from the long tried old order and its constitutional morality and political justice into what is leading us to national socialism, the repudiation of standards and obligations heretofore upheld, the leveling of classes, the destruction of property, and the overthrow of our federal system designed to be composed of sovereign and indestructible States. Novel and innumerable are the problems urgently pressing for study and solution, many of which embody incalculable menace and immeasurable danger to our future. If these problems are to be wisely, justly, and providently solved, it will be predominantly under the guidance of the legal profession and in accord with long tried and honest standards, heretofore observed, and constitutional principles, heretofore revered, and with just and equal laws in accord with these true standards and principles.

A retrospect of half a century at the American Bar vividly recalls to my mind the remarkable and encouraging improvements during that period in the field of legal philosophy, science and literature, and in the administration of justice throughout the United States. These improvements have undoubtedly been due in greatest measure to the influence of the leading and better class of law schools and their law reviews. The term “better class of law schools” should be emphasized, for their standards and requirements of scholarship and character have greatly influenced, if not largely fixed, the intellectual qualifications, the morale, and the professional standards of those who truly represent and lead the American Bar of to-day. Unfortunately, in point of number, the graduates of these law schools have long been outnumbered by graduates

from "the schools which have allowed their standards to be set by the requirements for admission to the Bar and which devote themselves merely to guiding their students by the easiest route to the Bar," as Dean Harlan F. Stone, of the Columbia Law School, pointed out in his University Lectures published twenty years ago, and he then added that "the lamentable result is that thousands of young men in the United States annually find their way to the Bar, who are poorly qualified for its duties and responsibilities, and who, without the aid of the 'cramming' law school, would have possessed neither the patience nor the force of character to have prepared themselves for their bar examinations." But Dean Stone, at the same time, very fittingly and properly tempered his criticism by stating that "examples are not wanting of lawyers conspicuously fitted, by character and attainments, for the practice of their profession, and there is now at the Bar, as there always has been and always will be, a considerable body of men who individually and collectively exhibit qualifications of character, learning, and skill worthy of the best traditions of the American Bar." In my judgment, there continues to be such a considerable body, and they still constitute the true representatives and leaders of the profession in the United States.

Notwithstanding the laxity of the authorities regulating admission to the Bar and of certain law schools, and the consequent flood into the profession of undesirables, innumerable are the representatives of the profession throughout the United States who are governed by the best and highest traditions and ethics of the past. They faithfully "observe the fiduciary principle, the precept as old as holy writ, that a 'man cannot serve two masters,'" which Mr. Justice Stone cited in his address last June at the University of Michigan, published in the Harvard Law Review for November, 1934, in which he rather severely criticizes the profession. There are still many, and I believe a large majority, in the profession who have not become and never have been, as he suggests "obsequious servants of business," and who are not "tainted," as he likewise suggests, "with the morals and manners of the market place in its most anti-social manifestations," or otherwise. Nor have these representatives of the profession been "complaisant to departures from the fiduciary principle," to quote again the characterization of the learned justice. In fact, it may still be confidently affirmed, as Sir Frederick Pollock affirmed many years ago, that "with few exceptions, the law has, in such matters, been constantly ahead not only of the practice but of the ordinary professions of business men."

3. Id. at 178.
The American Bar as a class are not justly to be held responsible for the dishonest corporate methods and breaches of trust which have been recently exposed and exploited, and which Mr. Justice Stone can deplore no more strongly than the profession generally does. Surely, there are lawyers and lawyers. There are undoubtedly many who are not worthy of their profession and its best traditions, and perhaps too many of them, but these are not truly representative, nor are they leaders, and by no means are they examples by which the profession ought in fairness to be judged. An impartial and thorough investigation of the recent reprehensible and deplorable corporate scandals growing out of an era of the wildest speculation in history, and the emergence and domination therein of a class of unscrupulous, untrustworthy, and irresponsible promoters and speculators, would, I venture to assert, indicate very few, if any, really representative or leading members of the Bar as having advised or aided or abetted dishonest or illegal or so-called anti-social schemes, and none so advising who fairly or properly should be classed as representative or typical of the legal profession as a whole throughout the United States. Mr. Justice Stone undoubtedly recalls that the test of leadership and prestige in our profession is not success in mere money-making, or in being, as he sees fit to phrase his criticism, "more often than not the proprietor or general manager of a new type of factory, whose legal product is increasingly the result of mass production methods."

Generalizations on the profession ought not to be indiscriminate and should be based on facts reliably ascertained, for without the facts generalizations are likely to be worthless. As Lord Bryce, when Ambassador here, admonished us in one of his cogent addresses, "To counsel you to stick to facts is not to dissuade you from philosophical generalizations, but only to remind you . . . that the generalizations must spring out of the facts, and without the facts are worthless."

I do not hesitate to affirm that the facts would not warrant the indictment, disparagement, and condemnation of the American Bar as a whole which the address of the learned Justice seems to imply, even if unintended by him.

No one, unfortunately, can read Mr. Justice Stone's address without the impression that he has come to believe that the profession in the United States has of recent years greatly deteriorated, and fallen morally and intellectually to a low and deplorable state. He repeatedly speaks of lawyers as doing "so little" in public service, when the fact, everywhere evident, ought in fairness and justice to have been recognized that they have been doing and are now doing as much as, if not more
than, any other class or group in the country, as shown by their activities, services, and prominence in every branch of public or charitable and welfare service, national or state, whether in the present period of emergency, the New Deal, or otherwise, and frequently, too, at the sacrifice of that kind of professional success that is measured only by dollar incomes. As matter of fact, the large law offices, which he compares to factories, are comparatively few, and they include a small fraction of the profession; they are to be found only in the larger cities; most of them practise according to the best and highest standards of professional ethics and "scrupulous fidelity," and very few of these offices can fairly or properly be stigmatized as a "new type of factory," and their members ought not to be disparaged as proprietors or general managers of factories, or as mass producers.

Mr. Justice Stone mentions "petty misconduct in the disreputable outer fringes" of the profession; but he shows that he appreciates that in judging the profession attention should be focused upon the facts and "not [be] in the form of assumptions or generalizations." He apparently recognizes that it is hardly a reliable or safe method to judge the quality of a fabric by its ragged "outer fringes," any more than it would be rational to judge the ocean in even limited measure by the objectionable rubbish or driftwood thrown upon the beach by a storm. The danger flowing so frequently from the spawn of unwarranted assumptions or generalizations should ever be borne in mind.

The Harvard Law Review is generally regarded as the premier American law review; its prestige and influence are deservedly very high; and its circulation is world-wide. Hence, the harm done to the good name of the profession by the above-mentioned criticism on the part of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States may be quite immeasurable. Such criticism might well tend to bring the American Bar as a body unjustly into disrepute both at home and abroad, and the wrong thus done might well be irreparable.

The faculty of the Fordham Law School should, in my judgment, actively participate in and supervise the direction of the review, the selection of its leading articles, the notes on recent decisions, the reviews of new works dealing with law, government and history, etc.; in a word, should hold themselves in great measure responsible for its direction and contents. Their knowledge, experience, and maturity of judgment must tend to give additional accuracy, weight, and value to the review. Of course, primarily, the interest and cooperation of the students must be considered, stimulated, and cultivated, for in their ranks are the lawyers, judges, legislators and law teachers of the future, and without their constant interest and participation the review would fail of much of its purpose and usefulness. Nothing could be more stimulating or
more beneficial to the students of a law school than the study of current decisions and early practice in legal composition and in the analysis of recent opinions of the courts, under competent guidance. There, in its pages, law students should always find that very real spur, tonic, and encouragement that will spring from reading in print what they have written.

Chief Judge Crane’s generous recognition of the service being rendered to the Court of Appeals by the law reviews ought to be an inspiration and justification for the revival of the Fordham Law Review, and the striking tabulation by Dean Wilkinson of the average of three citations of law reviews in each of four recent volumes of reports of that high court persuasively shows the importance and value of the service that these publications are now rendering.

It may be amusing, and not entirely irrelevant, if I recall a skit or satire interpolated by the late lamented Circuit Judge Hough in a really eloquent tribute which he paid to the law school reviews at the dinner in the City of New York in April, 1926, commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Columbia Law Review. After highly praising the services rendered by the law reviews, he pictured, in most playful banter, the “youngsters” who are presumably allowed therein to set themselves up as critics or reviewers of current decisions and who, he suggested, are at times “self-satisfied and cock-sure on everything.” After citing one delightful, even if imaginary and far-fetched, example of such an instance, he gave what he called a typical and patent inside model for student comment on decisions which he imagined might be available in reviewing a recent decision involving questions of monopoly and tender. His amusing “patent inside model” for a law review criticism on such a current case was as follows:

“This well-written decision re-examines in a modern way a difficult subject. It frankly overrules several earlier decisions of the same court (an excellent procedure), and while flatly opposed to the Supreme Court of the United States in Doe v. Roe, 360 U. S. 1001, is in accord with the more recent decision of the same court in Roe v. Doe, 361 U. S. 1002. There are a few States which still refuse to apply the doctrine, but this decision falls squarely in line with the majority view, which is best expressed in Dives v. Lazarus, 5 New Zealand 25, and more recently set forth in Pharaoh v. Moses, 2 Palestine 1. The English rule is somewhat stricter, drawing unwarranted distinctions between Stellar and Lunar; but the general tendency in this country is toward liberality in all tender matters. There can be no monopoly in tenderness. Doubt should always be resolved in favor of freedom in exchange (citations from Arizona, Alaska and Hawaii reports). The principal case is well reasoned and seems to be correctly decided.”

In conclusion, I want to express confidence that the faculty of the Fordham Law School will ever bear in mind the lofty and inspiring
conceptions of Mr. Justice Holmes, 'venerabile nomen!', who nearly forty years ago eloquently declared that the true function of a law school is "to teach law in the grand manner, and to make great lawyers . . . to do more than simply to teach law," and ever to uphold "the dignity of moral feeling and profundity of knowledge," whose fruits are Justice in its highest and noblest sense. The faculty, I likewise confidently hope, will continue to dedicate their joint efforts to inculcating, so far as practicable, the traditions and maxims of our ancient and honorable profession, which have been its glory in the past, and which are by no means now submerged, and the constant duty of its members, at any personal sacrifice, to devote themselves unselfishly and patriotically to the public service.

Our inspiring motto, coming down to us from the great days of Rome, must ever continue to be Pro clientibus saepe, pro lege, pro republica, semper.

Finally, the Fordham Law Review cannot too often recall and impress upon law students, in one form or another, the lofty admonition of Justice Story in his great work on the Constitution of the United States:

"Let the American youth never forget that they possess a noble inheritance, bought by the toils and sufferings and blood of their ancestors, and capable, if wisely improved and faithfully guarded, of transmitting to their latest posterity all the substantial blessings of life, the peaceful enjoyment of liberty, property, religion, and independence. The structure has been erected by architects of consummate skill and fidelity; its foundations are solid; its compartments are beautiful as well as useful; its arrangements are full of wisdom and order; and its defences are impregnable from without. It has been reared for immortality, if the work of man may justly aspire to such a title. It may, nevertheless, perish in an hour by the folly or corruption or negligence of its only keepers,—THE PEOPLE. Republics are created by the virtue, public spirit, and intelligence of the citizens. They fall when the wise are banished from the public councils, because they dare to be honest; and the profligate are rewarded, because they flatter the people in order to betray them."

---

5. Holmes, Collected Legal Papers (1921) 37.
6. Section 1914.
THE happy event of the revival of the Fordham Law Review after the lapse of a number of years makes a discussion of the policies, advantages and utility of such a publication to the law student and the law school, as well as to the legal profession, appropriate.

The benefits flowing from publication of a law review, both to the school itself and its students, are obvious on slight reflection. Appointment to membership on the editorial board of the review and continuance thereon, are based to a large degree on the ability of the student as disclosed by the grades obtained by him in his law school tests and examinations. The existence of a law review in a school, therefore, necessarily acts as a continued stimulus to a very large part of the student body to display that high degree of scholarship which will result in selection to membership on its editorial board. This means that a powerful motive is furnished to the students for better preparation of material assigned for classroom discussion throughout the year, and more thorough and comprehensive review of the student’s work in preparation for the various tests and final examinations. The tonic effect of this is good not only for the student individually, but likewise for the school, because almost inevitably the level of scholastic effort and attainment of the entire group will be raised.

Appointment to the editorial board, moreover, means that the students in helping select recent cases for discussion in the review, as well as in preparing case notes thereon, will receive invaluable training in the very kind of work which they will be required to do and which will make for their success as future members of the bar. A developed ability to conduct research work in law as well as to handle legal materials and reduce one’s conclusions to clear, concise and readable form is of the essence of the practicing lawyer’s work, both in the preparation of briefs as trial and appellate counsel, and in the formulation of opinions on the legal problems of clients. In addition, the student editor’s work will serve to make him “advance sheet-minded” and develop in him the habit of keeping up with the current decisions of the courts. This habit is of great value to the practicing lawyer and yet is one which all too many practitioners either never have developed at all or have developed so insufficiently as to lose it very soon amid the demands of a busy practice.

The circulation of a good law review among the student body with good leading articles and its exhaustive coverage of leading cases with
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comments thereon, cannot fail to bring to the students generally a knowledge of the progress, change, and perhaps reform occurring daily both in the courts of the domestic forum and elsewhere. At the same time stimulated to read the product of their fellow-students serving as editors, the review will develop in them also the salutary habit of keeping abreast of the trend of recent judicial decisions and of developments in the statutory field effecting modifications in the rules of common law. Moreover, while it may be inevitable that the major part of student activities in preparing material for the pages of a law review must emanate from a permanent board of editors regularly reviewing advance sheets, selecting current cases, and preparing them for the columns of the review, it is possible and I believe it should become the policy of the Fordham Law Review to permit any student in the school to submit worthwhile material for publication. If the student’s work warrants it, there is no good reason why such material should not be accepted. Nor is the suggestion a novel one. The objective of a good law review may well be to make it the publication of most of the students in the law school, and the success of intramural activities in college athletics promises similar success in the law review field if this expansion of activity be not accompanied by a lowering of standards.

Furnishing also a forum in which the alumni of the Law School, as well as others, can publish articles which are the result of their experience and specialization in the field of practice, a law review necessarily tends to develop a proper pride in one’s legal alma mater, an esprit de corps among the graduates of the school and a bond of union between student, alumnus and school of great value to all.

Apart from the immediate benefits to the school, its students and alumni, a well conducted law review is of value to the public, the courts, and the legal profession generally. More and more courts are referring to leading articles in law reviews to give them the history of a doctrine, a review of its rationale and soundness, which busy judges frequently have not the time to develop independently for themselves. An examination of the last four permanent volumes of the Court of Appeals Reports in New York discloses at least a dozen opinions in which reference is made to articles or notes in various law reviews.


What is true of the courts is equally true of the busy practitioner who finds he can turn to the law reviews with the certainty of discovering valuable briefs and case notes on the questions occurring in his practice. The time when a law review was considered as merely a cultural product of the legal profession or of such of its members as had become pedantic professors, long since has passed. Today practicing lawyers have come to regard it as a valuable working tool and an aid to them in their various fields of legal activity.

Because of all of the foregoing it follows that the student appointed to membership on the editorial board of a law review should approach his work not merely with the thought in mind that his designation constitutes a badge of honor for him but also with the consciousness of the high responsibilities of his position. His editorial activities furnish a great opportunity for him to serve his school, his fellow students, the courts, and the great profession in which he aspires to membership. While he may feel a proper pride in his position, his pride should be chastened by the humility which even great scholars feel, because of the consciousness of their own limitations. It has been said, and not without truth, that as the diameter of one's knowledge increases, so in direct proportion does the circumference of one's ignorance. Therefore he must remember always that at best he is a humble co-laborer with students in his own and other law schools, as well as with great teachers and jurists whose painstaking work is making for improvement in our great heritage of the common law.

It is a deep gratification to the Faculty of the school that the FORDHAM LAW REVIEW once more is to take its place among the journals which have been edited and published for years by the students of great law schools in this and other states. May it prove a worthy associate of its distinguished and useful contemporaries.