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We have been given much to think about tonight, as at each of the other three sessions of this Centennial Conference, and I do not want to prolong our session unduly. Let me just throw in a footnote concerning what seems to me a most intriguing phenomenon in continuing professional education, that is, the rise and expansion of programs for the postgraduate education of judges, particularly newly appointed or elected judges. One of the liveliest educational experiments I know of is the National College of State Trial Judges, which went into full operation in 1964 and has already developed excellent materials and effective instructional patterns along graduate seminar lines. Appellate judges, too, are taking increasing advantage of the opportunities offered to them for intensive summer study at special seminars conducted at New York University and, more recently, at the University of Alabama.

I had the very real pleasure of taking part in one of these judicial seminars about a year ago in Seattle. Because of the pressures of judicial business in the states of Washington, Oregon and Colorado, each of the three states had lately created a new tier of intermediate appellate courts and, through the initiative of a very able and energetic judge, Justice Robert C. Finley of the Supreme Court of Washington, a special week-long seminar was organized for the three states' new appellate judges. Two things impressed me particularly about that seminar: first, that the judge-seminarians had done their homework carefully and came to each seminar session loaded for bear; and, second, that the new judges were at least as much interested in jurisprudential and other theoretical questions as in the more practical questions of calendar management, opinion writing, and the like. I came away from the Washington-Oregon-Colorado seminar with two conclusions: (1) that there is nothing like appointment to judicial office to whet a lawyer's appetite for continuing professional education; and (2) that conceivably, just conceivably, there should be a somewhat larger ingredient of legal theory in continuing legal education programs than anyone has yet thought would be endurable to the participants. I concede that my second conclusion is suspect, coming as it does from a card-carrying legal philosopher.

This ends what has been for those of us who have participated in the program a very lively and enjoyable exploration of Professional Education in the Contemporary University. I hope, Dean Kirby, that you will express to President Fawcett the appreciation of all of us who were invited here to take part in this Centennial Program. Speaking for us all, I express our warm thanks, too, to the Centennial Committee of the College of
Law and particularly to the Committee's chairman, the man who did the work in putting the program together, Professor Ervin H. Pollack.

Now I think I may declare this Centennial Conference adjourned, not exactly *sine die* but at least until the event of Ohio State University's second centenary.