LEGAL CLINICS FOR LAW STUDENTS — A SYMPOSIUM *

JOHN S. BRADWAY, CLEON H. FOUST, NELLIE MACNAMARA, DAVID E. SNODGRASS, and G. KENNETH REIBLICH, *Chairman*

MANY LAW schools are continually seeking a better solution to the problem of training lawyers more adequately to render the best possible service at the bar. To accomplish this, law schools have been experimenting with (a) active legal clinics, (b) courses entitled "legal clinics," or (c) course credit given for regular participation by students in legal aid work conducted by legal aid bureaus or societies in cities or towns where law schools may have access to such work. As has been true of other experiments in teaching and training, there has not been uniform agreement that any great value can be obtained from such efforts; but they have drawn favorable comments in recent writings,[1] and legal clinic work in the schools seems currently to be expanding.

At the thirty-first annual meeting of the National Legal Aid Association in Washington, October 28–29, 1953, a morning session was devoted to a symposium discussion of "Law Students in Legal Aid Work." This revealed very active participation by students in legal aid work in Nashville, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and New Haven.[2] While there was a variety of opinion concerning the problem of integrating the law student (so as to give him valuable practical training as a

* This article consists of a condensation of talks and a summary of discussion occurring at the Legal Aid Clinics Round Table of the Association of American Law Schools, at the annual meeting of that Association in Chicago, December 28–30, 1953. Mr. Junius L. Allison, Field Director of the National Legal Aid Association, who was present and contributed to the discussion, felt that it would be of value to the bar to have the material presented at the symposium summarized and published, and the committee participating authorized the chairman to comply with this suggestion.

1 For some pros and cons, see: HARNO, LEGAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES 173–176 (1953); BROWNELL, LEGAL AID IN THE UNITED STATES 107–109 (1951); Johnstone, *Law School Legal Aid Clinics*, 3 J.LEGAL EDUC. 533 (1951); Bradway, *The Second Mile for Legal Aid Clinics*, 1952 WASH.U.L.Q. 165.

2 Presiding, Raynor M. Gardiner, Vice President, National Legal Aid Association. Panel: Charles H. Miller, Director, Legal Aid Clinic, College of Law, University of Tennessee; Professor Herbert Peterfreund, New York University Law School, faculty director at New York Legal Aid Society, New York University Law Center Branch; Robert D. Abrahams, Chief Counsel, Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia; H. Fred Gober, General Counsel, Atlanta Legal Aid Society; Henry T. Istas, Director, New Haven Municipal Legal Aid Bureau; Robert J. Lemer and Robert Zampano, student directors for the Yale Law School Legal Aid Association serving the Municipal Legal Aid Bureau and the County Public Defender.

lawyer) into the daily legal services rendered by a legal aid society without detracting from the efficiency of the service to the public owed by such a society, there was no serious dissent from the view that law students need practical experience more adequately to train them as lawyers. Many of the veteran legal aid directors and attorneys felt that they could use students in manageable numbers in legal aid bureaus and handle the conflicting aims of training students and serving the public to the advantage of both.

For what it might contribute to the solution of the problem, the Committee of Legal Aid Clinics of the Association of American Law Schools [3] decided to conduct at its 1953 annual meeting a symposium devoted to the problem of the content of a course in legal clinics. After an introduction by the Chairman, the following papers were presented.

PROGRESS IN LEGAL AID CLINIC WORK [4]

When we are attempting an oversimplification of the aim and object of legal education, one phrase comes readily to mind. We say, we are teaching the student to think like a lawyer. The term, "lawyer," as we use it in this phrase, is elastic. It includes a wide variety of persons—the legal scholar, the judge, the practicing lawyer, and even to some extent the law clerk, the bureaucrat, and the man with legal training who devotes himself primarily to non-professional activities. It is significant that all these people have an area of common thinking. Each has also another area in which his thinking is different from the rest. We should then particularize when we talk about various devices in the field of legal education.

Presently, we do particularize. We are talking about the law student who is going to be at least initially a general practitioner of law. We are concerned with training him so that he can give a good account of himself and vicariously of ourselves.

I want to direct your attention to three items which, I suggest, are characteristic of the better class practicing lawyer and which we should try to teach the student.

(1) *Professional self confidence.* This means that the student shall be able to say to himself, with some assurance: "I have done thus and

[3] Participants in the discussion were James J. Bennett, University of Alabama; John S. Bradway, Duke University; Cleon H. Foust, Indiana University; Alfred L. Gausewitz, University of New Mexico; Nellie MacNamara, Northwestern University; David E. Snodgrass, Dean of the Hastings College of Law, University of California; Clyde W. Summers, University of Buffalo; James A. Washington, Howard University; G. Kenneth Reiblich, University of Maryland, *Chairman.*

[4] By Professor John S. Bradway, Duke University School of Law, Director, Legal Aid Clinic, Durham, North Carolina.

so. I know how to do thus and so. If thus and so ever again confronts me, I shall not be alarmed."

(2) *A sense of professional responsibility.* This means that the attitude of the student toward his work shall have in it a degree of idealism. He shall not say: "I must eat. I need a job. I will practice law." He shall not be content with saying: "I want a career. What is there in it for me? I will practice law." Rather, he will say: "I have a contribution to make. I see a chance of making it in the field of law."

(3) *Professional self control.* This means that the student shall possess skill. The immediately relevant skill is that which enables him, when confronted with a client's problem, to select and use professionally the tools necessary to its solution.

To implement those goals, we are developing an instrument which we call the legal aid clinic. Today this phrase "legal aid clinic" is very elastic. It covers a wide variety of experiments. In fact, one reason for our meeting is to attempt to put a floor under it, to see if we can agree upon certain fundamentals without which the phrase would be a misnomer.

One reason for this variation is the fact that we are experimenting and each one of us goes ahead as far and as fast as he can, considering the various obstacles we have to surmount. Another reason is that we have never seriously attempted to define our objectives. Still another reason is that we have not looked back along the way. It is desirable to trace the direction and extent of our progress.

The legal aid clinic, as an educational device, has passed through several stages in an effort to strike a balance between service-to-client and service-to-student.

At first, we realized that law in books was one thing—law in action might be something else. So we took a student and a client and brought them together. The client had a problem and the student was expected to solve it. The resulting experience was a rugged one for both parties. Its educational value is open to some question. It was like teaching a man to swim in the old fashioned way—by throwing him into deep water and having faith.

Next, we decided the client needed protection from the student. So we brought in someone to serve as a sort of moderator when matters reached delicate conditions. It cost more money, but it was good public relations.

Next, we decided that the student also needed protection. For one thing events at a client-student conference frequently move so rapidly that the student has little understanding of what is going on. Educationally, there is more to be gained by having supervision—before, during,

and afterwards. This, again, was expensive. But it was even better public relations.

Next, circumstances aroused in some of us a curiosity about the best way to employ that supervision. It occurred to us that merely treating each new client problem as something unique might involve a waste of time. If, on the other hand, we could discover, isolate, and describe in suitable language certain fundamental principles involved in the handling and solution of a client's problem, we should have something with intellectual content which could be both taught and learned. The search has been time-consuming but some of us have been interested in what we have found.

Finally, some of us can see a fifth stage, still a bit vague, but inviting further exploration. In it, the client problems are more complex. In fact they are so complex that the resources of the field of law are not alone sufficient for their solution. Therefore, we must cross the frontier of the field of a sister profession and request interprofessional cooperation.

If we are to teach the fundamental principles of the thinking of the practicing lawyer, we need to review the material at our disposal. Our first conclusion is that the law itself is merely one of several factors, and often not the most important one. If this be treason . . . !

Our next conclusion is that what we are looking for is not the tail of the case-method dog but a new animal, a full companion of the first.

Uninformed critics, who have viewed with alarm our pioneering efforts, attempted to identify us with three different tails to the case-method dog.

First, it was thought that our work was merely a continuation of the traditional substantive law courses. If this were so, it would, logically, be necessary to give each student a problem to handle: one involving contracts; another involving torts; another involving crimes; and so on through the list of courses. In a community the size of Durham, there is not a large enough volume of business to allow us to operate that sort of legal aid clinic.

Second, it was thought that our work was limited to the tricks of the trade and it was said these could be learned in six months without a course. For example, one trick of the trade, designed to throw your opponent off balance, is to accuse him in the courtroom of having stolen the papers in the case from the files of the clerk of court. It does not take six months to learn that trick. However, its value to a better than average lawyer is limited. In fact, an admissions committee encountering an applicant with that type of thinking might wonder as to the soundness of his professional character.

Third, it was thought that our work is merely another course in practice and procedure. If it were so, there would be no great need for a legal aid clinic. But upon examination, it appears that practice and procedure courses often are really courses in the substantive law of practice and procedure. The legal aid clinic is not primarily a course in law. Rather, it deals in basic principles of law practice.

Naturally, it is not sufficient for us to use the name "basic principles of law practice." We should tell what we mean by the phrase and illustrate it. As we use the term, it takes us away from the orthodox field of law which we may describe as *topical.* We have built our substantive law curriculum by taking the seamless web of the law and breaking it down into topics convenient for pedagogical purposes: contracts, torts, crimes, practice and procedure—and the like. The legal aid clinic field starts from a different point and involves a different sort of breakdown, which we call *functional.* Our point of departure is: the client's problem—not the seamless web of the law. We are concerned not merely with finding the correct or the best rule of law but with solving the problem. We deal with a different sort of material: a client to be persuaded that he made no mistake in bringing his problem to us; the facts which have to be gathered and evaluated before we can use them; finally, and in some cases, the law. But here we see the law not as an end but as a means.

In dealing with the client, the clinic student learns first hand the significance of the fiduciary relationship of attorney and client. The client can sue us for malpractice or have us up before the court for discipline. The casebook cannot.

In dealing with the facts, the student learns what it means to *get* facts instead of having them *given* to him as in casebook or hypothetical questions. He also sees that if he gathers his facts properly the points of law which he needs to investigate rise up and knock on his door demanding attention—a condition not duplicated in the casebook.

The functional routine in its complete form consists of an over-all framework representing continuity in one dimension and comprehensiveness in the other. It consists also of a series of checklists. The framework is a sort of road map indicating: in terms of continuity, significant stages in the journey; in terms of comprehensiveness, areas of particular interest. Each checklist is a reminder of questions which the methodical lawyer should raise in his own mind at each stage of the journey. Together they provide direction, a basis for measuring progress, and a protection against absentmindedness, confusion of thought, and other situations which plague people.

Let me indicate a part of this framework and one of the checklists, the most obvious one.

For the framework, we begin with the client's problem. The lawyer's thinking about this problem falls naturally into two parts: one, where he is taking hold; the other, where he is closing out. The taking hold part breaks down into two parts to which we attach names with military significance: logistics and strategy. Logistics again breaks down into two parts: gathering facts and marshaling law. Under the head of gathering facts, we find several divisions. The first of these is the process of gathering facts from one's own client.

Here we come to a checklist: (1) Show client customary courtesies; (2) start at once trying to build client confidence in you but do not overdo it; (3) start client talking and keep him on the point; ask specific not general questions; (4) go over the story: (a) to locate the point of beginning, (b) to pick up each crisis and examine it under a microscope, (c) to examine the circumstances surrounding the client's decision to seek a lawyer and yourself, and (d) to "Shepardize" the facts; (5) now repeat the story to the client and have him check it (remember your purpose is to obtain "all" the information your client has at the first interview); this is a checklist not a strait jacket; follow it not slavishly but with a view to covering all the points before you are willing to admit the interview is over.

The practicing lawyer is beset by millions of details. If he has a system, he can ride the waves with some degree of safety. Without a system, the flood will break over him; whether or not he comes up for air, we cannot tell until later.

LEGAL AID CLINIC WORK AT A PART TIME SCHOOL[5]

Any discussion of the minimum content of a legal aid clinic course in law school will necessarily be resolved in terms of objectives. We are agreed, I think, that it is desirable to offer a law student the maximum training in the functional techniques and skills of law practice consistent with sound training in substantive law. Bearing in mind that the content of a legal aid course per se will vary from school to school, perhaps the phrase "legal aid clinic course" had better be broadened to "legal clinic courses."

What functional training should be offered under the general title "legal clinic"? Certainly I do not have the complete answer to that. But as a partial answer, may I give you some of our experience at the

[5] By Professor Cleon H. Foust, Indiana University School of Law, Legal Clinic, Indianapolis, Ind.

Indianapolis Division of the Indiana University Law School. The difficulties incident to establishing a functional course in law may be no more complex in a part time school but at least they are different. Our most recent statistics show that the average student's age is 29. Much more than half of the students are married; 95 per cent of them are employed an average of 33 hours per week. So we start with the handicap that no student will be able to spend more than one afternoon a week in legal clinic pursuits. And as for evenings in an already crowded five-night-a-week schedule, experience has shown that after 8:30 neither students nor instructor operate with any degree of efficiency.

While those limitations interfere very little with substantive law courses, in functional courses we find ourselves constantly fighting the clock—there are not enough days in the week or weeks in a semester. Incidentally, that experience is not peculiar to a legal clinic but also applies to other functional courses such as law review, moot appellate court, and writing courses.

So, our first desire—to assign a student to a case and let him carry that case through to its conclusion—is obviously impossible. At least, we haven't yet found a client who can arrange his legal difficulties so they reach a crisis every Tuesday afternoon. For the same reason, it is impossible to get the student into a courtroom any more than sporadically.

But there is one advantage a part time school in a state capital may exploit: that is the availability of jobs allied to, or in, legal endeavor. For instance, an incomplete survey of the student body shows 53 per cent employed in legal or quasi-legal pursuits. These range from claims and adjusting work through internal revenue service, court attachés, law clerks, and others. While participation in such fields of endeavor by working students offers an opportunity for valuable experience, unsupervised participation should not be allowed to substitute for a legal clinic course because of a probable tendency to develop poor working habits and to learn the tricks of the game rather than the sound fundamentals. To illustrate, some time ago we assigned two experienced claims adjusters to represent the plaintiff in a negligence case. It soon appeared that to them the beginning and the end of the preparation of such cases for trial was the obtaining of signed statements from witnesses. On trial, they were so busy trying to keep the defendant from proving anything that they completely overlooked the fact that theirs was the burden of proof.

Nevertheless, it may be that we are overlooking some valuable training in our failure to tap this extra-curricular experience for the benefit of other students. So far, only one or two small steps have been taken in that direction.

Problems peculiar to a particular school, however, should not be allowed to obscure the basic fact that we can agree on common broad objectives. Divergence should occur only in the methods of achieving them. It is clear that Mr. Bradway's monographs have been a decisive influence in the determination of objectives. Our method of achieving them is not the most desirable but represents a compromise to allow for time shortages and also to allow for the fact that our clinic is run in cooperation with a separately organized legal aid society.

Briefly, our objectives are three:

First, we try to instill habits of careful and painstaking preparation. Sloppy and haphazard work—whether in gathering facts, legal research or preparation of documents—is promptly and thoroughly criticized. Unfortunately, to achieve this objective, the instructor must assume some of the less appealing personality traits of Simon Legree and the rent collector.

The second objective is to afford the student at least a minimum contact with a case in action involving a flesh and blood client and incidentally to introduce the student to extra-legal resources available in actual practice. On his regularly assigned afternoon, the student works in the office of the legal aid society. At the beginning of the course, normally, he will sit in on interviews with clients as a mere auditor. Gradually, he is encouraged to take over the interview of the client until by the end of the semester he is conducting those interviews by himself—always checking his facts and tentative conclusions with the attorney in charge before any advice is given. Out of the interview may come further factual investigation and drafting of legal memoranda or documents of a particular kind, including pleadings. All legal memoranda, non-confidential documents, and pleadings are prepared at least in triplicate so that there is a copy for the law school files. These files are maintained by the students as if they were law office files and are used for reference in subsequent cases.

Once each week the cases are discussed by the instructor and the whole class to determine whether the analyses of problems were correct and the solutions proper ones under the circumstances. This discussion affords a review of the techniques used, a check upon the student's progress, and a refresher for the rest of the class in case the same client should appear at a subsequent time. Since the question has been raised, I might add parenthetically, that try as hard as we may—whatever assistance we are able to give—the legal aid society will scarcely balance the inconvenience and time required in assisting students. Consequently, we do appreciate the opportunity to cooperate and make every effort to avoid

interference with the major function of the legal aid society, *i. e.*, assistance to those who cannot afford a lawyer.

While the objectives and methods so far mentioned have a distinct advantage in giving the student the feel of a live case, they fall short of what a legal clinic course should contain. This brings us to our third objective: to afford a student some knowledge and practice in the techniques and skills of advocacy. This objective is only partially attained in the legal clinic course. There are some very elementary mechanics to the practice of law which are not available in any practice manual or text material. Those include the simple procedures involved in filing a complaint, enforcing a judgment, probating a will, or finding a real property description. Probably no law school is justified in spending much time on these elementary things, but often they are the things that seem most harassing to young lawyers. A legal clinic course can partially fill that training gap without much loss of time or effort. A conducted tour of the courthouse will not do it. A student retains very little of the many records, files, indices, and dockets shown him. Recently, it has been our practice to assign each student an incidental project. One exhausted the files and records in the office of the clerk of court and prepared a mimeographed statement on the records available, how they are indexed, and what they contain. Others did the same with the Recorder's, Auditor's, Treasurer's, Assessor's and various other offices. Once that mimeographed statement was prepared, it is now given to each student at the beginning of the semester and he is told to familiarize himself with the contents. Subsequent projects have been a simple step-by-step explanation of where to take a complaint, how to make sure it is properly filed, and how it gets into a particular court; and similar projects have been undertaken concerning probate of wills, executions, and child support problems. Ultimately it is hoped that the legal clinic students will have developed their own elementary practice manual.

That would seem to fill about two hours of academic work and that is all we are allowed for legal clinic. It was our feeling, however, that we still had left some phases of the third (or advocacy) objective untouched, and consequently a separate course was established for that purpose. That course is probably misnamed "trial practice" because actually it is not the usual trial practice course. Its purpose is expressed in the student manual as follows:

"Most law school courses subordinate factual problems to the discovery and application of rules and principles of law. In trial practice, the emphasis is on facts and evidence: how to gather evidence of facts; how to marshal evidence to prove the ultimate facts supporting a legal theory;

how to present evidence to a court or jury; and how to preserve that presentation in a written record."

This course presents an opportunity to concentrate upon the techniques of developing a factual problem for litigation—an opportunity which we can offer only rarely in the regular legal clinic course. Each student prepares and tries two problem cases a semester. These are not cases of typed, rehearsed testimony, but they are planned and enacted to present factual rather than legal problems. This course overlaps the legal clinic course only incidentally—rather they supplement each other.

Weaknesses? We certainly have. One is that many students do not take either or both courses. Another is that the course in trial practice is not a prerequisite to legal clinic as it should be. A third is that we are not getting the students into court enough.

However, both courses are in the process of development. Neither alone furnishes the minimum basic content for adequate functional training in law school, but together, we feel, they are at least approaching it.

STUDENT APPRENTICES [6]

The legal clinic work at Northwestern University School of Law was described briefly as having returned to a form of student apprenticeship to particular lawyers, who were willing to cooperate with the clinic in accepting supervision of assigned students. Professor MacNamara felt that this had become desirable because of difficulties faced in securing proper integration of the students from the legal clinic into the very heavy schedule of the legal aid society in Chicago. The necessary contacts with lawyers who were willing to supervise apprentice work in their offices resulted largely from the benefits which many of these lawyers had themselves obtained in earlier years through legal clinic experiences and training. Professor MacNamara felt that she was getting very satisfactory results from the apprenticeship program. She also reported briefly on a preliminary appraisal of statistics obtained from a questionnaire sent to former legal clinic students. The results indicated almost unanimous approval of legal clinic work for law students and gratitude for benefits which the attorneys felt they had obtained therefrom.

[6] By Professor Nellie MacNamara, Legal Clinic, Northwestern University School of Law, as summarized by the chairman. Professor MacNamara, because of illness, found it impossible to submit a written summary.

THE MINIMUM BASIC CONTENT OF A LEGAL AID COURSE[7]

The function of a legal aid clinic course appears to be twofold; to develop in a young law student some of the sophistication in dealing with clients supposedly possessed by the apprentice-trained young lawyer of the early nineteen hundreds, and to increase the confidence of the public in the capabilities of the young lawyer to solve the legal problems of the ordinary man.

As to the first point—that is, the forced flowering of sophistication in youth—there is probably no difference of opinion amongst us.

As to the need of developing the confidence of the public in our young lawyers, I refer you to a statement of Hallack W. Hoag, President of the Legal Aid Foundation, which was sent out by the Associated Press from Los Angeles on December 6, 1953. Mr. Hoag was giving the results of a survey as to where people go for legal advice. "People with a legal problem usually ask the advice of bartenders . . . Next in order after bartenders, come notary publics and real estate agents. Lawyers are fourth on the list." No doubt we must learn to give a more convincing demonstration of our ability to do our own job better than our brothers at the other bar.

The teaching job, to be performed in a short time, is one for a senior lawyer, who must condense his own experiences and translate them into words of wisdom for the young. It is no longer possible, under the system of legal education in use today, for our young men to acquire sophistication by close observation and imitation of the day-to-day lawyerlike conduct of a preceptor, to whom the older lawyer, when a student, was apprenticed. The spoken word and the written text, in the spirit of our fast moving world, must take the place of actual experience.

The first step in a course, such as the one which we propose, is to make the student aware of the ethical problems and professional traditions in the relation of attorney and client. Considerable time may be saved in the presentation of this material by assigning for reading the text on *Legal Ethics* by Henry S. Drinker, published by the Columbia University Press in 1953. The material found between pages 69 and 201 of that book gives a clear and comprehensive treatment of this subject.

The second step is to train in law office management, so that the student may appreciate the need for records and see how to direct their preparation, as well as learn what duties may be delegated and what duties must be performed in person so that work will not be duplicated nor—more important—an essential task be left undone. A good Handbook for Legal

[7] By Dean David E. Snodgrass, Hastings College of Law, University of California.

Secretaries may provide text material with which to supplement a lecture on Law Office Management.

The next step is to give a briefing, or preview, as psychologists and psychiatrists sometimes do, of the common idiosyncrasies and foibles of litigants in particular causes of action: *i. e.*, the triumph of selfishness over family reputation in will contests; overemotional and subjective treatment of personal problems in domestic relations cases; the hazy memory and inaccurate observations of witnesses in personal injury cases; how to distinguish between an outright lie and a self-serving declaration in the case of one accused of crime, etc.

Next, there should be given some information in techniques, such as those used by insurance investigators in fact finding, interviewing witnesses, and summarizing such findings for older lawyers or for the personal use of the trainee.

Training in the preparation and writing of a legal memorandum seems to be next in order. This should be covered under three different subjects: (a) for office use; (b) for use in the trial of the cause by a lawyer; (c) as a means of presenting points and authorities to the trial judge.

A field trip, such as that given by the San Francisco Bar Association to summer trainees, appears also to be in order. This includes a trip through the clerk's office of the civil and criminal courts, the district attorney's office, the public defender's office, the juvenile and psychopathic courts, the immigration office, and the county jail, and also a visit to a large private office and a visit to a small private office. A brief interview with members of the staff of each of these offices will help the trainee to anticipate the personal problems that will be presented in future contacts with these offices.

Perhaps some training in conciliation and arbitration techniques to help adjust differences between angry parties without resort to the courts will be more valuable to the trainee than added training in the actual trial of cases. Many courts are unwilling to permit trainees to appear before them. To the extent that a contrary rule exists in other jurisdictions, some added training in trial techniques may be possible. My personal belief is that an ambitious student will learn trial technique through visits to neighborhood courts in whatever spare time he can find. In that area, experience will probably prove a superior teacher to the best vocal effort available.

DISCUSSION

After the above papers were presented, discussion from the floor reemphasized the great variety of local situations under which the national legal aid movement is now operating. Professor Bradway was impressed

with the fact that his remarks were probably more closely related to the needs at Duke University School of Law, operating in the relatively small town of Durham, North Carolina, than to the needs at Northwestern University in Chicago or the University of Maryland in Baltimore.

The Chairman pointed out that at Maryland a relatively small number of senior students (not to exceed 12 each semester) are able to get excellent practical training, as well as course credit, for participation in the work of the Baltimore Legal Aid Bureau. The director of that bureau, and its counsel,[8] has found that the time spent in supervision of the students is more than compensated for by the services they have been able to render to the clients served by the Bureau. Also, for the last two years, the Young Lawyers' Committee of the Maryland State Bar Association has arranged for a series of guided tours in Baltimore for senior law students similar to those described above for San Francisco. Comments from the Maryland students indicate that they found these tours to be helpful.

Dean Boyer of Temple University School of Law, Philadelphia, discussed the active interest displayed by the students at Temple which resulted in having a legal aid clinic established there in 1953 in cooperation with the legal aid society of Philadelphia,[9] and avowed his belief that the clinic work would result in graduates who would be better qualified to practice law upon first leaving law school.

It was emphasized that despite difficulties in attaining uniform programs and objectives caused by differences in local conditions (such as population, available resources, and the particular foot on which a particular program happened to start) the legal aid clinic program is an expanding one in American legal education.[10]

[8] Gerald Monsman, Esq., of the Baltimore bar.

[9] The student demand and activity that led to the establishment of the clinic at Temple is described in a very excellent monograph, *Report of the Legal Aid Committee* (April 27, 1953), submitting to the Dean at Temple the recommendation of the Legal Aid Committee of the Student Bar Association.

[10] For an excellent survey of the work of each of the law school clinics, see Johnstone, *Law School Legal Aid Clinics*, 3 J.LEGAL EDUC. 535 (1951) (a report prepared for the Survey of the Legal Profession).