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FOREWORD

Frank Q. Nebeker, Associate Judge, District of Columbia
Court of Appeals

The university law review is one of the many ironies in the legal profession. In what other profession does the young novitiate sit down to explain its intricacies to his elders? Many lawyers, with uncharacteristic wisdom, turn to these student articles for assistance.

There is a lesson in this for the entire legal community, for our vocation is essentially one of teaching in which we are called upon to educate a jury, or a client, or perhaps a judge. Just as the law student is both a recipient of legal education and somewhat of a teacher for the profession, so too must we all be. If the legal profession is not examined by its practitioners and education in the law ceases at graduation, the profession and the law will soon fail to respond as needed.

With the overload of “processed information” today, none of us can continue a pretension that he is fully informed, knowledgeable, and autonomous in the profession. Continuing legal education is now an essential element of professional responsibility. The question whether such continued honing of the professional capability should—by law or by insurance carriers—be made mandatory is a difficult one. Practically speaking, it is mandatory; those lawyers who fail to recognize the responsibility are the ones most in need. It cannot be gainsaid that students, professors, and judges must acknowledge the interdependence that continuing professional education requires. The student law review has always been a silent witness to the cooperation that legal education needs.

At least nine states now mandate continuing legal education for their judges. The barriers of tradition that existed between judges and law faculties, students and practitioners, institutions and the courts, are being breached in a cooperative spirit to foster improved jurisprudence and professional responsibility. I perceive no obstacle to the goal of ongoing legal education, unless it be the failure to commit our will to the task.

This first District of Columbia Law Survey of the Catholic University Law Review reflects the will of its students to join the endeavor. Attorneys and judges alike will be rewarded by its succinct and useful scholarship. Although the legal tomes of other volumes have their place, the concise-
ness of this work recognizes that legal education above all must be practical. With vigilance toward this goal, the Review may look forward to years of respect from the legal community.

We have long needed this tool. With similar efforts from the balance of our profession, we may all be able to return to lives of a less furious pace.