

Washington Law Review

Volume 24
Number 4 *Annual Meeting of the Washington
State Bar Association*

11-1-1949

Response to Address of Welcome

H. E.T. Herman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>

Recommended Citation

H. E. Herman, *Address, Response to Address of Welcome*, 24 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. 331 (1949).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol24/iss4/4>

This Address is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact lawref@uw.edu.

RESPONSE TO ADDRESS OF WELCOME

BY H. E. T. HERMAN

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rupp, and ladies and gentlemen. It is always nice to be greeted by an editor. When the address of welcome comes from an editor, you just sort of feel that there is something pontifical about it, and you just feel that the man who serves as editor of the paper should know whereof he speaks and that he has the authority to extend the welcome. But in this instance it is doubly nice to be welcomed by the man who delivered the address because he is not only an editor but he is what every lawyer admires and likes—he's a second generation lawyer. He is not only a second generation lawyer but he is a student; he's given to research; he has progressed to such an extent in the representation of his class and in achieving professional eminence that that very erudite gentleman and very efficient lawyer who used to be known as Mrs. Rupp's husband is now known as John Rupp's father.

We lawyers from the provinces are just as loyal to the doctrine of *stare decisis* as are you gentlemen who practice law in the metropolis. But we of the provinces trust that we will not be deemed unreasonable if we suggest that in justice, and our faith in the doctrine of *stare decisis*, I express the hope that none of you Seattle judges will follow the precedent set by the jurist in Georgia in shooting a lawyer, at least not while we are here.

We have come to this city, bringing with us our wives and daughters. And there is a gleam in their eyes and a manner of determination about their conduct which indicates that they have faith in being able to do much better with Seattle merchants than we provincial lawyers have ever been able to do in this metropolis with Seattle lawyers opposing us with Seattle witnesses.

I think that it is not only very fitting but very fine indeed that the Bar Association of the state should hold its sixty-second Annual Meeting on the fiftieth anniversary of the University of Washington's Law School. That school has done a great deal for our state. It has given us our chief executive. It has supplied us with many of the Superior and Supreme Court judges of our state. It has given us leaders in the Legislature, and many of the best laws that have been adopted in this state were adopted due to the influence of alumni of this school. It has given us the senior United States senator

from this state. It gave to us at least one cabinet member. It has given to us two extremely able and affable federal judges. It has supplied schools of the country with law teachers. But above all the University of Washington has achieved, I think, perhaps its crowning glory in giving to this state and to the Northwest a very large number of successful practicing lawyers. And, after all, in my humble opinion, the successful practicing lawyer is the greatest glory of any law school.

Now, of course, there are different types of successful lawyers. There is the successful lawyer who keeps his clients out of trouble. There is the successful lawyer who wins his client's lawsuits. Then there is the type of successful lawyer who makes lots of money for his clients by understanding the possibilities of the tax laws. And then, I think, perhaps, there is the rarest of all types of successful lawyers—that member of the Bar who can impress his wife with his own importance.

And while we are talking about the successful graduates of the University of Washington Law School, I think that we must not forget that gracious and charming lady who graduated with the first law class of the University Law School and who by reason of her wisdom and her tact has contributed much to the very outstanding career of her husband, the senior judge of our state Supreme Court, the Honorable Walter Beals.

I have heard a great deal about lawyers and I have watched them, and it seems to me that, if a lawyer has a weakness, it is a desire to have problems solved for him by somebody else. Whenever you advertise a talk on law, whenever you announce that a new statute will be discussed, you always find plenty of lawyers there.

And I was going to hope, Mr. Chairman, that I might give a word of admonition to the rest of the speakers on the program, but apparently none of them are here at this time. At least, if they be here, they are not on the platform. But I would say to anybody who is going to participate in today's discussion that we came here for some of the purposes intimated by the people who gave the original greetings that Mr. Rupp read from, but we also came here to add to our profound fund of erudition.

I think that anybody addressing this meeting might well bear in mind the suggestion of that great exponent of Harvard legalistic lore, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who in a recent dissent in the case

of Pacific Coast Dairy vs. the Department of Agriculture had this to say: "Legal refinements are not the worse for having eluded the quick understanding of the layman."

And now, my friends of the Seattle Bar, as we from the provinces go about your fair city, guide us, protect us, abide with us while we hustle around doing the best we can for ourselves under the circumstances.

EVERY CHILD MUST BE TAUGHT COMMUNISM
IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BY TRACY E. GRIFFIN

I have long believed that Communism should be taught in our Universities. Further study has convinced me that Communism should not only be taught, but must be a required subject of intensive study by the youth of America. Before entering upon this thesis permit me to clear the atmosphere by a personal statement of principles—you may better then evaluate my argument.

I believe that every man and woman in these United States of America has an inalienable right to believe as he will in any political or economic system, form of government or lack of government, God or gods—to believe in Communism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, subject to Article III, section 3 of the Constitution, which states:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

I do not believe in witch hunting, driving Communism underground, or at this writing outlawing the Communist Party

I want to meet the issue in the arena of public opinion and understanding, not in the tunnels, fox holes, and cellars. The underground should be ferreted out and prosecuted for subversive activities. I do not believe that any Communist should be permitted to hold office, high or low, in this country unless duly elected as a Communist.

I believe in the congressional and legislative right of investigation to the end that no Communist shall hold any governmental position—federal or state.

And I believe that Communism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat must be taught in our public schools, both in theory and