

Scholarly Commons @ UNLV Boyd Law

Committees & Bylaws

Society of American Law Teachers Archive

4-28-1975

Lesnick Report on Committees

Howard Lesnick

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/saltarchive_committees



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lesnick, Howard, "Lesnick Report on Committees" (1975). *Committees & Bylaws*. 1.
https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/saltarchive_committees/1

This Letter is brought to you by the Scholarly Commons @ UNLV Boyd Law, an institutional repository administered by the Wiener-Rogers Law Library at the William S. Boyd School of Law. For more information, please contact youngwoo.ban@unlv.edu.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

PHILADELPHIA 19174

The Law School
3400 Chestnut Street

April 28, 1975

Professor Norman Dorsen
University of California School of Law
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Norman:

My recent letter to you on SALT committees went out about the same time as Dave Chambers was sending his letter of April 16, and I would simply like to comment on it. I did not, as he did, send copies of my letter to the relevant people. I am sending Dave and Steve copies of this letter and including the other with it.

As you know, and Dave can see from my earlier letter, he and I had pretty much the same set of notes on the committee structure. The major contribution I made, which he did not, was to identify him as the emerging chairman of the committee which he entitles, "Regulation of the Private Bar, and I," "Quality of Legal Representation." If he does not stand in the way of the groundswell in his direction as chairman, he will be in an excellent position to pick a title. Beyond that, he has gone somewhat further in identifying several sub-committees in a couple of the areas involved, and I agree with what he has set forth.

Since "law reform" and "legal aspects of current public issues" are somewhat overlapping, since they both involve the hiring of a part-time staff person in Washington, and since one or both are in a rather amorphous state at present, perhaps it would be best for now to sound Bob Pitofsky out on his own interest in these areas, and leave it with him whether he thinks they should be crystallized further as two separate but related fields and a chairman found for the one which he does not take, or, alternatively, that he become chairman of a committee which for the present would embrace both areas and perhaps spin one off as its work crystallizes. Perhaps you have a preference as between these two, in which case I am quite happy to see you follow it.

Best regards.

Cordially,



Howard Lesnick

*Feller's statement is
very fine - I didn't
think it was doable*

H

HL:rp

cc: Prof. David Chambers, Stephen Gillers

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

PHILADELPHIA 19174

The Law School
3400 Chestnut Street

April 22, 1975

Professor Norman Dorsen
University of California School of Law
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Norman:

Let me throw away my notes arising out of the recent SALT Board Meeting by passing along some thoughts to you.

(a) I think the most important thing that needs to be done is to get the committees under way. Dave Chambers' proposal and the little discussion of it left me with the thought that we would have five standing committees (and perhaps a sixth, see below). In some cases, one or two existing areas for the constitution of subcommittees were identified, but in every case I think the first order of business is to complete the list. What I have is as follows:

1. Law reform

work C.
This would include legislation-lobbying work, if we ever do it; and would involve ongoing technical work and perhaps liason developed with key people on congressional staffs. Presumably a proposal like Bob Whitman's would fall within the law reform umbrella.

2. Legal aspects of current public issues

This too would include some legislation-lobbying work, but would aim more at things like the Nixon tapes, the CIA, etc. than substantive fields.

3. Legal education

Not G.
Minority admissions and curriculum are two sub-committees which I suppose have been talked about in this regard. Are there others?

4. Distribution of legal services

What?
We have a subcommittee on the National Legal Services Corporation and legal services for the poor; another on group legal services, pre-paid plans and the problems of the middle class generally; perhaps there should be others.

5. Quality of Legal Representation

One subcommittee here would be concerned with Bar admissions; another perhaps with certification, specialization, continuing education, the Second Circuit, etc.

Beyond this, I suppose that there either should be a standing committee to deal with judicial appointments (applying the standard which we adopted last winter) or that this area could be regarded as a sub-committee under 2, above.

So far as people goes, it sounded to me from discussion as if Bob Pitofsky was gravitating toward No. 2, Nat Gozansky toward 3, Sylvia Law toward 4, and perhaps Dave Chambers toward 5 -- perhaps any or all of those are inaccurate or unadvisable. What I would suggest is that you settle on a chairman for each committee, and in discussion with them identify the relevant subcommittees which should be activated from the outset; co-opt a chairman for each subcommittee; have the chairpeople try to add some membership, from within or without the Board; and hope that the committees can begin having some existence by or immediately after this summer.

(b) I think that the newsletter proposal is likewise an extremely important one. The sad fact of life may well be that regular receipt of a newsletter makes people aware of activity which exists, and its absence reinforces the notion that there is no activity. I think that a newsletter and a committee structure will tend to reinforce each other, and I hope that that too can be launched just before or just after the summer break.

(c) When people were talking about the book, three names occurred to me which I now cannot tie up with specific chapter headings that were ticked off, but I do want to pass them along before I forget them entirely. Lou Schwartz of my faculty and Murray Schwartz (who will be here next Fall as a visitor following his retirement from the Deanship at UCLA) are two well-known senior people; Carrie Meadow, who is a recent graduate of this school, has been our Legal Writing Supervisor at Penn during the past year and has thought a lot about the passage into law school. These are three people whom I think might be usefully approached.

Finally, perhaps you know this already, but Linda Champlin has decided to leave Ohio State and is very anxious to settle in New York this summer or fall. She would like to stay in teaching, but

3.

realizes that she probably will not be able to, and is looking for a legal job of some sort in the city. She was a student here ten years ago, and I have always thought extremely well of her ability. I do not know whether ACLU or any of your other satellite organizations in New York are in a position to add her to their staff, but she would be a real asset. Failing that, perhaps you can come up with some other appropriate suggestion. She is under the mistaken notion that I know something about the New York market, whereas the fact of course is that all I know is your address.

I assume that by the time you get this we will have talked on the phone about the fate of the law school, etc. Best regards.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Howard".

Howard Lesnick

HL:rp