



Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons

Oral History of Case Western Reserve University
School of Law

Special Collections and Archives

5-2-1989

Interview with David I. Sindell, Class of 1936 (transcript)

Oliver Schroeder

Case Western Reserve University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/oral_history

Recommended Citation

Schroeder, Oliver, "Interview with David I. Sindell, Class of 1936 (transcript)" (1989). *Oral History of Case Western Reserve University School of Law*. 13.

https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/oral_history/13

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections and Archives at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Oral History of Case Western Reserve University School of Law by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

David I. Sindell, 1936 graduate
Sindell & Rubenstein
Interview with Oliver Schroeder, May 2, 1989
transcription by Kerstin Ekfelt Trawick

We are located in the offices of Oliver Schroeder in Gund Hall, and we have with us Mr. David Sindell, who will reminisce about his experiences here at the law school a few years ago, and also about his activities at the bar during his highly successful professional career.

Dave, why did you come to Western Reserve Law School? How did you get here?

I'm a strange student. I'm a transient student, to begin with. And also a derelict of the Depression. In the first place, I got into Adelbert College and lived out in an area where very few high school students came to Adelbert--out in Collinwood High School. I was very privileged in coming to Adelbert College. My brother Ted had gone before me through Adelbert, and Reserve, and I had a tremendous respect for the school on account of him and what it did for him. And of course Reserve's reputation was already established in 1928, when I graduated high school. As I say, I thought it was a great honor to be admitted to the school.

How did you decide on the practice of law? -- that you wanted to practice law?

Well, I didn't really decide to be a lawyer until after I was a teacher for a few years. I taught high school first. I thought I was going to be in the teaching field. And my brother--my brother Ted--kept saying, "You ought to be a lawyer, we'll do well together." I said, "I'm not so sure." Then he said, "Well, how long are you going to teach for five dollars a day?" (In the high school system at that time.) And I said, "Well, you've got a point there. I probably can do better in the law financially, but I do love teaching." "Oh," he said, "combine teaching with law. You can teach wherever you want to, at night or wherever you can get to teach, and be a lawyer too." He said: "Being a trial lawyer is like being a teacher anyway. You're teaching a jury, you're reducing complex situations into simple understanding language for them." So he really talked me into getting into law. He felt that I had some of those--

What subjects did you teach in high school?

I taught public speaking; strangely enough, commercial law (I had been to a summer of law by that time); and social problems, which we call sociology today; and vocational guidance; and I was very big on setting up school assemblies for political moot campaigns and all kinds of things. I taught about everything but cooking, actually, because in those days you taught five classes of sixty in a class a day for five dollars. It was a thousand dollars for my first year, and twelve hundred for my second year.

But during those times that I was teaching, I figured I might as well see what the law was like. So being affluent, since I did teach night school and Sunday school as well as high school, and having a few hundred dollars and a little Ford that cost me \$200, I decided to go to summer law school, and I registered at University of Michigan, which was one of the few law schools that taught in the summertime. So I got my start at the University of Michigan law school, and I thought I was on a vacation, because instead of teaching in the daytime and nighttime and Sunday school, I really had all day to myself. All I had to do was go to two classes three times a week, and I enjoyed that very much.

I had very good professors. I had Paul Lytie, who taught me torts; and Edson Sunderland, who wrote the first code pleading from Missouri, I believe, taught common law pleading. And I loved that. Then the next summer I went back to Michigan. I took evidence from a fellow named Atkinson, from Kansas, and also a course--let's see, equity. Durphy, who wrote the book on equity, was the teacher. We called him Death's Head Durphy. He was old, his skin was taut-- But he was a great teacher. I learned to study, because I had all day to study. I'd go swimming in the afternoon, study all day in their wonderful library. I loved the complex there. In the summer the students didn't eat with the professors, as they do now in the law quad during the winter, but-- I missed that. But you know, for three dollars a day I had a room and breakfast, with a little old lady and two other law students. And we had a good time.

But then when I wanted to go to law school the third summer, to make up my first year of law, I was told that Michigan would not teach contracts--it was too long a course for the summertime. So I found a course at Wisconsin Law School, and who should appear to teach contracts but Mr. Page, who wrote the Ohio code, from Ohio. He was there, quite elderly at the time. And I took a course from Professor Rundell in real property. So I had three summers, which were equal to one year.

By that time, I was two years behind my Adelbert class. And I decided to try night law school. So I went to law school for one night downtown, called Cleveland Law School at that time, I think. And it was at night in the Engineers Building. It was dark. It was dirty. It-- everybody was asleep. And I was tired--I'd been teaching all day--and I said, "If this is going to law school, I don't want to be a lawyer." So I turned around, quit the high school teaching, went to Reserve Law School, and got my last two years here. So I was a transient student really--came in with a year of law. All the students were new to me. I didn't know the men; they had come from Adelbert. My class graduated in '34; I didn't graduate till '36. So, as I say, it was the Depression. And in those days at Reserve you didn't meet many people, many of your fellow students even, because at twelve o'clock the law school seemed to close down. Everybody had to go out and work in order to get money to go back to law school, pay tuition.

I remember the building very well. I remember the classes and the professors. And as I say, I was always highly honored to be at Reserve Law School, because it had a reputation. I had no money to go anyplace else anyway. I didn't even apply anywhere else. In those days I don't think you did. You just ended up wherever you found yourself. I was a streetcar student. I lived in Collinwood. I had taken the streetcar to Collinwood High School as a kid, and just took the streetcar the other way on Euclid Avenue to come to Reserve--to Adelbert and the law school. I was a cum laude student at Adelbert. I took four years of arts instead of taking that fourth year in law, and became an English teacher basically. That was my major, English literature. I missed the political science, and the economics, and the courses that lawyers usually take, because I was going to be a teacher. And I studied education too, to get my license.

So when I came to the law school, I was kind of lonesome. I didn't know anybody. And the first day of classes, with Throckmorton, I'll never forget. Because something happened to me that embarrassed me, and I almost walked out. Throckmorton was way up in this new classroom, and it was a big class, of 65 students. And he proposed a constitutional question. And being a real smart guy, having come from two good law schools, I raised my hand and volunteered, and I said, "Well, I'd file that action first in a Common Pleas Court." He thought I said "police court." And he said, "Police Court!" And he laughed--a guffaw--and the whole class began to laugh, I thought the dog was laughing. (He had a dog there, of course, a seeing-eye dog.) And I couldn't correct him. He didn't hear very well, being blind also. And I paid no further attention, and never volunteered after that. That was the end of my volunteering experience. But I was very embarrassed the first day. I was a stranger, and it was a strange class. And I had come from out of town. And I was fairly young. You know, I graduated Adelbert at the age of twenty and was the youngest high school teacher back in 1932 in the Cleveland school system.

But despite that I went on, and-- The thing I remember about the law school was that it was a dreadful building. The downstairs where the lavatory was was absolutely horrendous. And I got my first feeling for scholarship in a very funny way. Wayne Townsend was teaching sales at that time. I'll never forget, he walked down to the men's lavatory with a book in one hand, used the other hand for what he had to do with the urinal, and he walked out reading that book and never looked at anybody. I said: This guy is a devoted legal scholar. I think I got my love of learning law from that man, who was one of the most brilliant teachers I ever met. He taught sales, and of course sales was like studying Greek and mathematics at the same time. There was no sense to it. There were a lot of rules, like tax law. But somehow we got through the toughest course in law school, which was sales.

Later on, we got the laugh on Townsend, because we were walking

down the steps from the Memorial Hall in Columbus, where we all took the bar exam, and he was walking down with us. And somebody said, "Did you notice that question about making a will?" The kid that made the will was 19 years old; at that time 21 was majority. One of our law students who had taken the bar-- Townsend was right next to us--said, "Oh my god, I forgot you can't make a will unless you're 21." And Townsend spoke up and said, "I didn't see that either!" We got a good laugh out of that.

You've mentioned several teachers here now, and you have an interesting experience to compare--with teachers, for example, at Michigan and Wisconsin, albeit in the summertime, with those here at Reserve.

I thought they compared very well. I thought that Dunmore and Andrews and men of that type were excellent teachers. I had a tremendous respect for Dunmore and Andrews. I remember them quite clearly. Dunmore was brilliant. He had a scholarly mind. He also was a man of great integrity, and I liked that. The year that we were there, two students cheated on an honor examination. And Dunmore suspended them immediately. They just had no recourse. He was a man who believed that you had to be totally honest, and you had to have integrity, if you were going to be a lawyer. And if you want to do that in law school, look out! And those men never came back. I admired the man for his scholarliness and brilliance. He was almost so modest that he was withdrawn. I mean, he would speak in a very low tone of voice, because he was a terribly modest man. But he knew his law. Personal property and wills, I believe that was what I got from him.

Andrews was the kind of teacher who was crystal clear. He never-- If a point was raised, he would with his pencil keep on going around that desk until everybody understood what we were talking about. He was very clear. He was one of those kinds of lawyers who can take a complex problem and make it simple and easy to understand. Criminal law made a great impression on me because of his way of teaching it. I remember trusts and other subjects, but those areas of personal property and wills and criminal law had a great effect on me. Because I saw they were fine men--

Michigan had wonderful professors. One of them, of course, came from Kansas that summer, as I told you. Paul Lytie was a wonderful teacher of torts. He taught the socratic method. He gave you a fact statement in torts, you gave him the answer, he changed the facts a little bit, made it much harder for you to give the same answer. Then he changed the facts again--What do you do now?--and pretty soon he had you over the fence, and he showed you that your answer was no good, and the proposition wasn't so hot as you thought it was when he started. He was a socratic teacher, one of the first I'd ever met, and he made a great impression on me. He was like Andrews in many ways, in that Andrews also taught in the socratic method, and was clear--crystal clear--in his manner of teaching. Lytie was threatening. The usual threat--look at the man next to you, at the right and the

left, and two of you are not going to be here next year. That kind of thing. But we got used to his threats and found out he was a soft-hearted guy.

Sullivan (?) used to have us over at his house for weekends, and we'd talk to him there. I never shaved, so he called me Sinbad the Sailor. I'll never forget that.

But I compare our teachers at Reserve at that time--I don't know about today-- Just as good as they were at Michigan. You know, I taught at Harvard one year at the invitation of Dick Markus, and I found out the students were not much different from our students. I mean, Harvard's a great law school, but I think Reserve is right up with the best law schools in the country. And its teachers were, at least at the time I went to law school there. And I think they're good today, from what I hear.

You had fellow students, and you remarked that at that time, everybody left at noon to go downtown and make money so they could go to law school, it was that simple.

Some of them drove oil trucks, some of them sold shoes, they--you know--every afternoon had to go out and scrounge. The law school was kinda empty, by the way, the library I mean. The library was a small library, overcrowded, and you didn't see many students in the library, except before an examination. They were all there then. But I studied at night at home. I didn't study much in the library, unless I had to refer to some volumes. In fact, for many years, I couldn't study anything except at night, when it was dark outside, because all through high school I had the same experience. We came from a poor family. We had a little store out in Collinwood, my mother was a widow; and I learned to study at night.

Did you pick up any friendship with fellow students who later on, as you practiced at the bar, found it to be a pleasant experience? a camaraderie that you had developed?

When I met lawyers who were in the same class, it was pleasant and it was good. There was a camaraderie. I would meet a lawyer on the defense side for instance like [Louis] Otto--you remember Otto?--he was on the defense side. One day I had a case with Jaeger, John Jaeger. We had a good experience together, and we all knew that we'd had a good legal education. And I think that by and large they were men of character, and that showed up in the practice of law. They went on, many of them, my class did, to do well in society, as well as to help the law school. The class of '36, I think, was an outstanding class. Myron Ulrich impressed me as a very fine man. John Jaeger-- Norman Miller was in that class. [James] Hoffman, who went with Mansfield Tire and Rubber Company. Men that I admired and respected. Some of that kind of rubbed off on me, I think. We were all in a very bad time, economically. And we overcame. And we worked like the devil. For the dollar to go to school. And we were so happy being in school that we studied hard and appreciated it very much.

Did you find that the classroom preparation and study at the law school outfitted you well for the practice of law?

Oh yes, no question about it. I think hitting the books was the thing. Extracurricular activity is great, moot court and all of that, and it should be continued. We didn't have those things. We hit the books. We read the cases. We learned how to reason in the law. We were casebook graduates really, let's face it. And I learned that at Michigan. At Michigan you typed up your own notes, when you read the case at night, and you had them on tissue paper. You came in with your notebook, took notes during class, and when the notes were over, pasted the tissue paper--your review of the case--over it. I ended up with solid books of case law.

Strange that one of the first cases we had in our office was a case I remembered from Michigan. I went to my book and found the case. It was a workmen's compensation case, where a fellow had made a statement to one tobacco merchant--he was a salesman--that he was going to go across the street to see another tobacco store, and on the way over he was killed by a car. Question: Was he in the course of employment? And do you know, the question was, could his statement that he made prior to going across the street be admitted into evidence to prove that he was in the course of employment? You know, there was a case just like that, and we had it in Michigan, and I said to Ted, "My god, I got the exact case." I went to my notebook, found my notes and the case (I think it was 1 or 10 Ohio, the old Ohio reports, I forget the page number), and we won the case here in Cleveland because I remembered that case.

In other words, the case method did teach you, did discipline you, to think like a lawyer, to look for answers, to look for solutions to difficult questions. And that's what the law's all about. Somebody comes in with a trouble, with a problem, and you've got to solve that problem. So--problem solving is very important. I did have the advantage of having a brother who was a lawyer, but I never worked in his office during the summertimes. I went to summer law school and taught school in the winter. Fortunately, he gave me my start in the law. I had a desk in the hallway of his office to start with--there was no space in the office at that time--and started out at \$25 a week again, practicing law. But I think the case method was a tremendous way to teach law. I loved it.

You have over a good many years been a great litigator. The courtroom is your second home. What changes have you observed from the time you began to the time you have begun to rest a bit from litigation? What changes in the courtroom procedures, in the litigation process, have you observed?

Well, lawyers in the old days, when I started, were more evenly matched. You were in a firm of five or ten, as we were, and you had a lawyer on the defense side who came from the same-sized

firm, and you were about evenly matched, in terms of tools, to win the case. Today, if you have a case against a large firm, then you're in a firm of five or ten, they throw ten or fifteen lawyers at you, and enough paperwork to bury you, and therefore unless you've got a judge who knows how to get to the point you can be defeated by just the weight that's thrown at you--in numbers of lawyers, paperwork, and things of that kind.

There is a change. There was more of a-- Law had more surprises in it, discovery wasn't as well developed, you could win a case sometimes in the rebuttal by bringing in a witness that nobody knew about except the plaintiff's side. Now it could work the other way too. I'll never forget a case where Joe and I and Ted were trying the one lawsuit, and Joe was out trying to find a certain witness that was mentioned in the beginning of the trial, found him, got a statement, had him subpoenaed, brought him in on rebuttal, and he destroyed the defendant's case. While Ted and I were in court, Joe was out working on the case. We surprised the defendant. That no longer can happen, because you can't-- No surprises any more, which is better for the judicial system. But I think we had more fun in the old days.

I remember a federal judge once saying to me, we were in front of the Standard Hotel, not long ago, in a 6th Circuit judicial meeting, and I said, "What do you think of the new discovery procedures?" The old judge said, "I don't like 'em, I hate 'em, because I hate going through those papers. We had more fun in the old days." So I said, "Isn't there more justice under the present discovery system?" He said, "Yes, but it's a lot more paperwork." That's the way he answered it.

So today the growth of the large law firm, I think, has made it more difficult for at least my side of the table, the plaintiff's side--where you have a product liability case, and you find you got to put \$25,000 into the case for expert opinion and so forth. What you have is, unless you have a damned good heavyweight lawsuit, you can't afford to put the money into the expert. So the little guy, who lost only one finger, he's not going to get the \$25,000 expert. Money is so prevalent in our practice of law today; you have to be loaded to carry on a proper practice of law. Otherwise you're driven to handle routine traffic cases and things of that kind. So it's awfully hard, it seems to me, for the average lawyer who doesn't have a lot of money to practice law.

Advertising has made a great difference. Lawyers today advertising they handle everything in the world. I mean, lawyers you know are not prepared advertising they handle wills, personal injury, workmen's compensation, you name it. They advertise ten areas of law-- they're not prepared to do that. What they're doing is soliciting the business. Sometimes they send the case to an expert, because they know it's out of their field. Advertising has cut down the law work for the individual lawyer, so that today I think the income of the individual lawyer has dropped considerably, the lawyer out there by himself. It's

tough, for the average lawyer to make a living today. Unless he's in a firm well established, he may have difficulty practicing law. He has to rely on his ideals, because he may not make a lot of money.

I must say that we relied a lot on our ideals too. Our object was not to make a lot of money, it was to be good lawyers and give good service. If we made money, it was nice. We'd like that. But we had a well organized office. We had investigators. We had at least one investigator full time. We had trial lawyers, and we tried to give them the tools with which to work. We worked hard, until the end of our time came. I mean-- Ted died. Joe's ill. And I'm now a senior, about to retire. But in the old days we were well prepared. But if we had not worked together, I don't think we would have accomplished as much, if we worked as individual--

You have seen the introduction and the impact of the computer. You talked about the casebook. We don't give books any more. The impact of those sheets that come out of the computer--

Wonderful tool. I think that's the best thing about computers. You can get your research done more quickly. You still have to read the cases. It's good-- because the information is so tremendous. You've got to have computers. We have them in our office now. Another expense, by the way, for the law firm that has to carry on the burden-- Today overhead has gone, for instance-- It used to be 25 percent in the 30s, it went to a third in the 50s and 60s, and in the 70s and 80s it began to go to more than a third, and now I'm afraid it's over 50 percent, the overhead of the medium-sized law office. It's 50 percent. A lawyer brings a case in to you and says he wants to halve the fee, it's mindless. You don't take the case, because he has no overhead. And you do. So you end up with nothing. It's even difficult to share the fee on a third basis, if he does a third of the work. Because you've got the overhead and he doesn't. But we still do that.

As far as the computer is concerned, there are many other uses of course--in keeping track of your caseload, and keeping track of dates, things of that kind. By the way, I keep a series of notebooks, just in case the computer goes bad.

That's right, that is the danger. You always have that problem, you get into a bank and they can't record your deposit because the computers are down.

Correct. We have fallback systems. We have notebooks of cases. One secretary's full job is to watch the statute of limitations, even though the computer is supposed to spit out the dates. It fails very often, breaks down. And the original cost of programming was tremendous. You never could get the thing programmed just right. But it's a tool, and again it demonstrates that you can't practice law today without expensive tools. That's what's happened to it. Paperwork,

interrogatories-- I love those judges who say, "Look, all you can ask is twenty questions." That's a wonderful way to go. Because you used to get 165 questions. It's going to take hours to answer those questions. And typists to type them. Terrible. So yes, I'm for computers, it's the only way to go.

You've also been active in the community, as a civic leader. How have your experiences as a lawyer dovetailed with that part of your life?

It's been terrific. I mean, I don't think a lawyer can stay out of the community. He's got to be there. I'll never forget the great lawyer, Francis Harrier, down in Alabama--Birmingham, Alabama, he's a wonderful lawyer--speaking at a national convention. He said, "When you stand up before the jury, the jury very often asks, 'Who is this man? What kind of a person is he? Can we trust him?' And if a lawyer is active in the community, and has done good things for the community, and his name becomes known, then the jury feels they can trust this man." And the truth of it is that if you're active in the community you're generally a trustworthy person, because you've given your time and your energy and substance to other causes. So I think that being a good lawyer-- If you're going to be a good lawyer, you have to be a good community person. You have to be helpful to your fellow man in ways other than through the law. And you have to be broader than that. You have to read avidly, have broad interests, and make the world your oyster. If you don't do that, you get narrow, and pretty soon your whole life is devoted to making money. That's an ugly way to live anyway. So that if you're a lawyer of the community, you're a better lawyer in all respects, in my opinion. There's no other way to go.

I'll never forget when Toepfer, Dean Toepfer, came to me and he said, "You're going to be-- it was either the first or the second fund raiser for the law school." It was a privilege to do that. And then when he became president, he said, "You're going to be chairman of the national Telethon." And I did that one year, and we raised a million dollars. To me that's fun. And in the Jewish community, of which I am a member, I'm active there. I helped to build a temple, raised money for Israel--Israel bonds. I was on the Jewish Federation's board of trustees. I count that kind of a background, the traditional background of helping your people, helping all those around you. I try to be a good American and a good Jew. That's the way I am. It's in my blood I think, somewhere along the line.

I come from a very distinguished family in many ways--physicians, lawyers, rabbis, and so forth. You knew Dr. Alexander Miller? He was a cousin of mine. And Rabbi Miller, his brother. David Miller went to law school. David took the University of Chicago arts course by correspondence. He was Phi Beta Kappa, would you believe it! And then when he went to law school here, and met Zelda Garber, by the way, who was in my class, they got married-- he then worked for the VA and memorized the code, so that if anybody wanted to know what any section said, they would ask

David what certain sections meant and said. Brilliant man. Had other problems, but he was a brilliant lawyer. It's traditional in our family--we have writers in the family, my brother Joe wrote a book in the field of settlement. Today he works in computers, out in San Diego. As ill as he is, he's written several computer programs that are sold by computer companies. He's got a system now, where if you feed in the settlement and the fee and expenses and everything else, and if you've got co-counsel what his fee is, you put it into the computer and press a button and the damned thing comes out as a settlement agreement. It's the most amazing thing you ever saw! And of course Joe developed the tort file of papers, where if you fill out all the papers that he prepared, your case is really ready for investigation and even for settlement, and you can send for your medical-- It's used all over the country. It's a file of forms that he developed. And really it took him a long time to do it. Nobody has done a better set of forms than Joe Sindell. A very fine mind, a very creative man.

So, you asked me about community service? To me it's been a joy. I think lawyers get very narrow unless they're in community service, they become a bore, they become very boring. I was president of the City Club last year. The privilege of introducing some wonderful people, and learning about the world around me. It's all a part of life. And by the way, I just raised \$25,000 for a foundation--a lecture foundation, with the City Club--of Paul Walter (you know Paul), and I, and Myron Krotinger, and Samuel Glassman's widow (Sam was in my class at the law school), and Bob Fay, who's a patent lawyer, contributed enough money to set up a \$25,000 foundation on law and society. There'll be a speaker once a year on the subject. We're looking for a Supreme Court justice to start the thing off. We just announced it. So you know, law and society and community and family are all one to me. They're all related, one to the other. Somewhere it's written in the Talmud that if you save one life you save the world. It's part of my makeup, and that's the way I've been all my life. I haven't been an angel all my life, but I've tried.

You told a little anecdote about yourself, for example, coming into Throckmorton's class and getting the Court of Common Pleas confused-- Can you think of other anecdotes, either by yourself or other students, that you thought were humorous? You told the one about Townsend, going to the men's room and that--

You know, I've been thinking and thinking about incidents, and I can't think of any more than what I've given you. Because the law school, and being in the Depression, and not being there all the time, we missed a lot of that, a lot of that fun. I did, anyway. Maybe some of the other men had more time to have those experiences. But as a kid in high school I went to work at twelve o'clock every day. My senior year I said to my mother, "You know, I don't want to work in the store this last year. I want to do something in high school." I published the high school annual, did all sorts of things the last year, and I loved

it. Going to law school in the summer time was a great thing for me. Golly! I had the whole day free, outside of classes! Never had that privilege before. It's been a lot of work. I think the work ethic is important, by the way. The lawyer who's used to working doesn't work just at his job, but he also works as a lawyer. He begins to learn to work. The work ethic is very important. You know sometimes we elect people to high office who are from very rich families and never have worked. You wonder whether they're going to be able to work hard as the job requires. We didn't think work was a privilege then. We had to work. We rather would have not worked so hard. But that was the way it was. And I think the Depression stamped our lives. We never forgot what could happen, if you didn't make a living. I think young people today are not as tough as we were. I don't know whether they're going to carry on with the strong work ethic that we developed. I have no idea. I have three children, they all work hard. They grew up in a pretty good environment, a pretty easy environment. But they work hard, so it doesn't always work out that you have to go through a Depression to learn to work. If you're interested in your work, you're going to work. I have a son who's working on a space station, as an engineer. Another son who was in the movie business and now he's a publisher, of medical books by the way. My daughter's an artist, and married to an artist. And they all work very hard. They struggle to make a living, but they make it. I think they learned the work ethic from me, I'm not sure. They learned how to work by watching me.

So I've been lucky in all respects indeed. I'm a very fortunate man. Life's been good to me, and the school's been good to me, and the word Western Reserve to me means something very important. I have great love for the school, as you know.

Sure. Well, that's great. We've had a good session here, and I appreciate your taking time.

Did I talk too long for you?

No, no! What you said is-- It's not how long, it's the quality.

By the way, excuse me, there's one-- I remember that when the students gathered outside on the front steps between classes there was so much smoke in front of the law school that you would have thought there was a fire, every day. Everybody smoked in those days. Very odd. We didn't know that tobacco was that harmful, or didn't guess about it at the time. My god, classes would break, everybody would rush out, light up cigarettes, and there was everybody smoking, including Zelda Garber, who smoked one after the other.

I remember the women in the class very well. There was Ann Landy, and Bea Handy, who married Myron Ulrich, and Zelda Garber, and Colchester I believe was her name. Those four women is all I remember. Today you have fifty percent. We had a few girls, but they were good. They were good.

But smoke! It was amazing. The change in our attitude toward smoking could be demonstrated by what happened between classes. We have a picture of our class. John Jaeger has a copy of it. We all look like really bedraggled human beings, with our overcoats and hats on, in front of the law school.

The building was awful. Was it Whitey Falsgraf that woke up the administration, with others, and changed this thing around. Best thing that ever happened to the law school. I think it's wonderful what's happened here.

It's remarkable, and I've seen it from the inside. You know, it's really nice to have been a part of that. You were a part too, and the leadership, the guidance you gave as an attorney. We can be rather proud, in a humble sort of way, everybody got their shoulder to the wheel, and we built something here, let me tell you. It's recognized nationwide now. I can't go any place, where this law school is not-- Provincial when I came here, when you studied here. Good law school, but they didn't think beyond northeastern Ohio.

That's correct. I go to California and all over the country and people say, Oh, Western Reserve, my daughter applied there"--or something.

And the number of alumni we're getting, in other parts of the country. Great.

Turn the machine off, I want to tell you something.