

# OHIO STATE LAW JOURNAL

---

Volume 11

Winter, 1950

Number 1

---

## Foreword

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM\*

The papers which make up this symposium on legal education speak so effectively for themselves that a foreword is all but a useless formalism. Perhaps a small contribution can be made by way of providing context for the reader.

The busy practitioner is, doubtless, not so familiar as are his brethren in academic halls with the greatly sharpened interest that law teachers have been taking in recent years in the objectives of legal education as well as curricula and pedagogy. He may know that there have been subject-matter changes; that Administrative Law, Federal Taxation and Labor Law, among other subjects, have come to the fore in law school offerings. I doubt, however, that he is aware that law teachers, the country over, are deeply concerned with the clarification and restatement of objectives in legal education and with the improvement of programs of instruction and teaching methods. There is, in fact, a very real preoccupation with these matters.

Well may there be greater interest in the "how" of law teaching. One of the striking things about instruction in professional schools is that the teachers, by and large, have no formal training whatever in pedagogy. This is in marked contrast with the preparation of people who are engaged in secondary education. A law teacher gets his notions of teaching methods from observation of his own instructors, from such independent study as he may have made of teaching techniques and from experience in the classroom. For a long time there was but scant interchange of ideas about method and the visiting of a colleague's classes is still a most unconventional procedure.

The current period of quickened interest in the function, in-

---

\*Dean and Professor of Law, College of Law, The Ohio State University.

structional program and methodology of legal education began about ten years ago. Recommendations made at the 1941 meeting of the Association of American Law Schools led to the establishment of a Committee on Aims and Objectives of Legal Education and a Committee on Teaching and Examination Methods. I consider it not inappropriate to say that Ohio State men were very active in these developments. Nor did Pearl Harbor arrest or seriously retard this trend. It is well known that the call to military and government service practically decimated law faculties as well as law school student bodies. Yet the few faculty members who remained somehow found time to devote a great deal of thought to the matters upon which the present symposium is focused.

Since the War, despite the temporary complications brought on by the huge influx of law students, the development of which I have been writing has both spread and intensified. In faculty discussions, in Association and other meetings and in the writings of the schoolmen and a few practitioners it has been playing a very prominent part. Out of it has come the establishment by the Association of American Law Schools of the *Journal of Legal Education*, a publication designed to provide the profession, as Dean Gavit has put it, "a ready channel for the communication of ideas and the reporting of experiments in legal education."

Curricular developments in the College of Law of The Ohio State University provide an interesting parallel to the more general movement we have just been reviewing. The significant revision in the program of instruction which was achieved in 1939 is given appropriate notice in the symposium paper by Professor Frank R. Strong, who had served on the 1939 committee. As of that time it was an exceptionally advanced effort in the realm of curricular planning keyed to identified objectives in legal education. Experience with and reflection upon that program combined with the general ferment in the law-school world to activate further organized faculty study of such matters soon after the faculty reassembled following the cessation of hostilities. In 1946 Acting Dean Harry W. Vanneman appointed a curriculum committee, headed by Mr. Strong, to examine afresh the educational program of the College. In the autumn of 1947 the Committee was reconstituted with Professor Robert E. Mathews as chairman and Harry W. Vanneman, John E. Hallen, Frank R. Strong and Robert L. Wills as the other members. During 1947-48 substantial progress was made in clarifying objectives. At the end of that period the chairmanship was shifted back to Mr. Strong and Roland J. Stanger replaced Mr. Mathews as a member of the committee. It was under the leadership of Mr. Strong

that the work of the 1949 curricular revision was carried through to completion. I should add that changes in the committee chairmanship were caused by the uneven demands of other responsibilities.

It seemed highly propitious to the Dean and Faculty that the celebration, by the College, of the University's Seventy-fifth Anniversary should come at a time when accomplishment of a major curricular revision was imminent. It was accordingly determined that the outstanding event in the celebration, scheduled for May 6 and 7, 1949, should be a conference on legal education. The present symposium is made up of the papers delivered at that conference and of a discussion by Mr. Strong of the revised curriculum of the College.

It is, I think, a fortunate circumstance that we are able to present a discussion of the revised curriculum in these pages as a companion piece to the very important and exceedingly stimulating discussion of objectives, programs and methods which took place at the conference on legal education. This combination of materials should afford the reader an opportunity to test the new program of the College of Law against some of the best thought of our contemporaries, who have been particularly concerned with the subject, as well as against his own individual ideas. He will find some interesting differences of view as well as significant points of agreement. A notable instance of the latter is the way the revised curriculum responds to the insistence in the paper by Professor Jones that the study of legislation be stressed. The new curriculum definitely rejects the traditional law school preoccupation with the work of judicial tribunals. It is not sought to give the student the impression that the judiciary performs a minor rôle but the idea, instead, is to give the student from the outset, a better-balanced perspective of legal institutions and legal processes. It is conceived that the legal system has two great processes, legislative and adjudicative, in the conduct of which legislative, judicial and administrative institutions share. The revised program allots seven quarter hours in the first year of law study to a consideration of the legislative process and of statutory interpretation.

One final word. The Survey of the Legal Profession now being conducted by the American Bar Association embraces legal education within its sweep. It may well be that the data and ideas which we gain from the Survey will call for more or less extensive re-examination of the new law college program at Ohio State. It has not been the view, however, that this possibility should cause us to postpone curricular revision. The task of improving legal education is a continuing one; we should give it sustained attention and lose no opportunity to move forward.