

Fall 1942

President's Annual Address

Carl Wilde
Indiana State Bar Association

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj>



Part of the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wilde, Carl (1942) "President's Annual Address," *Indiana Law Journal*: Vol. 18 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ilj/vol18/iss1/1>

This Special Feature is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Indiana Law Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Repository @ Maurer Law. For more information, please contact rvaughan@indiana.edu.



JEROME HALL LAW LIBRARY

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Maurer School of Law
Bloomington

INDIANA LAW JOURNAL

Volume XVIII

OCTOBER, 1942

Number 1

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS

CARL WILDE*



In addressing you today I act in obedience to the mandate of the By-laws of our Association. I should, in order to act in conformity with tradition, deplore the necessity of my being required to speak and of your being obliged to listen, or at least of making a polite pretense of doing so. As a matter of fact, however, I welcome the opportunity, not entirely from an ingrained predilection for speaking in public, but because it affords me the opportunity again to thank the members of the Association for having bestowed upon me the honor of its presi-

dency. It seems a stereotyped sort of thing to say, but in my case it happens to be entirely true, that there is no honor which I could possibly ever attain which I would appreciate as highly. As I said at the commencement of my term of office, I think this is due largely to the respect and

*Delivered at the Annual Meeting of The Indiana State Bar Association at Indianapolis on August 14, 1942.

admiration in which I hold the members of our profession. Such respect and admiration has, during the past year, been greatly enhanced. I think that only one who has acted as the head of a large organization of lawyers can know the willing cheerfulness with which busy lawyers add to their burdens by undertaking any tasks which may be assigned to them as long as they feel that the work involved is such as will serve the interests of our profession and of the community as a whole. The alacrity with which the lawyers of Indiana have responded to every call that has been made upon their time and effort, has been most gratifying. While I may surmise that the members of other professions are equally as willing to serve their fellow-practitioners and the public; in the case of the legal fraternity, I can speak from experience at first hand. I shall, in the future, hold in even lower esteem than I have in the past, those who utter sweeping condemnations of the legal profession as a whole. As I have had occasion to say before, while we should strive constantly to raise the ethical standards of the bar, we should avoid ourselves and resent on the part of others, any imputation that lawyers, as a whole, fail in a greater degree than members of other professions or of the business fraternity to adhere to the highest standards of conduct. We all of us know literally hundreds of lawyers whose casual promise or simple statement carries the same weight as a sealed bond or as testimony given under oath. And yet, the wrong-doing of a single lawyer casts its stigma upon the whole profession. I do not, therefore, mean to encourage an attitude of complacency, or to give the impression that no improvement remains to be made. Until all lawyers subscribe to the ethical standards of the best, our task remains unaccomplished. It should be a matter of pride to every member of The Indiana State Bar Association that that organization more than any other single factor, has been responsible for the gains that have been made in raising the standards of the legal profession in this state. It is that organization to which we must look for further advances in the future.

I regret that it becomes necessary for me to say that during the past year but little progress has been made in the attainment of some of our objectives. All of us who constituted the official family of the Association for 1941-1942, had, at the outset, certain well-defined plans in mind.

We hoped greatly to expand the rolls of our membership realizing that the opportunity for usefulness of an organization like ours, is in direct ratio to its size. We hoped to increase the practice of having, in various parts of the state, the legal institutes which have proved so helpful and which have become so popular among Indiana lawyers. We hoped to increase the effectiveness and influence of our state organization by fostering interest in district organizations and thus enlisting, in every county in the state, the aid of all Indiana lawyers in accomplishing the aims of our Association. Just as we were almost ready to place these plans into action, came the raid on Pearl Harbor. The bombs which fell from the Japanese planes during that infamous attack damaged our plans almost as greatly as they did their direct objectives. We realized at once that the duty of an organization in time of war is identical with the duty of an individual. All other objectives must give way to the great single objective of winning the war.

It would not become us to bewail the frustration of some of our most important plans. At a time when the entire economy of a nation has had to undergo a radical change; when thousands upon thousands of homes are being broken; when men, by the millions, are abandoning the careers for which they have prepared themselves, are leaving their loved ones and are going, at the hazard of their lives, to fight our country's battles: the dislocation of the program of an organization, no matter how important it may seem to its members, is a minor tragedy. Our organized effort has been in no wise diminished; but its direction has been completely altered. We have, for the duration, made aid to our country's war effort the principal aim and object of our Association's existence. I think that there is not a single member of The Indiana State Bar Association who will criticize this course. We are unanimous, I am sure, in our determination, to devote to our country's service all that we have and are, as individuals and as an organization. It is unfortunate that the same thing is true of our Association's work in furtherance of the war, as is true of all other war activities; that a maximum of effort produces only an apparent minimum of result. The principal burden of carrying on this activity of our Association has fallen upon its Committee on War Work. Actively, and almost continuously,

there are engaged in this work the state chairman, ten district chairmen, and one hundred and fifteen local committeemen. Those who are familiar with what this committee is doing—Indiana State Selective Service Headquarters, Government Appeal Agents, the local offices of the State Welfare Association, the Home Service Units of the American Red Cross, the legal officers attached to the units of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps, and a great many of the dependents of men who have been drafted into the armed forces—these have some knowledge of the services which the War Work Committee's organization has performed; but statistically, as you will observe from the Committee's report, it is impossible to give an adequate idea of the results obtained. And yet, if all of the organized efforts of all of our members should produce no result beyond the strengthening of the morale of only one soldier because of the assurance that the rights of his dependents are protected, instead of the really remarkable results along that line that have been achieved, we should still hold to our course. There is no objective that can compare in importance to that of winning this war.

I believe that members of the legal profession can understand the essentiality of our winning the war as well as any other group of citizens. They know that to a people, born in freedom and nurtured upon the concepts of liberty, life under the despotic rule of some foreign dictatorship, would be intolerable. All of us, accustomed to the ways of free men have accepted, as a matter of course, the blessings of a free government as casually as we have partaken of the air we breathe. Now, suddenly, an appreciation of those blessings has come to us because we sense the danger that they may be lost. This feeling is common to all Americans who understand the situation. But the lawyer should have a special realization of what the loss of our free institutions will entail. The historical background of the system of law in the profession of which he is engaged gives him that realization. He knows that if we lose the rights wrung from a despotic king at Runnymede, nurtured and developed through the centuries upon English soil, transplanted to this country and brought to full flower and fruit in our Constitution and Bill of Rights and the monumental decisions of our highest court—as we shall most certainly lose them

if the Nazi attempt at world dominion succeeds and if the Nazi ideology is imposed upon this nation—hundreds of years and the toil and waste of millions of lives must be spent before they can be regained. There can be no question then, that having put our hands to the plow, we must go forward until victory is accomplished.

In this war, as in all previous wars, the lawyers of Indiana are doing their full share. The rolls of our fighting forces are thick-studded with their names; and there are so many lawyers who are not able to be in active military service who are serving on various boards or acting in other capacities related to the draft or otherwise to the prosecution of the war, that it would be easier to count those not so engaged than to enumerate those who are.

Upon the members of no other profession does the impact of war fall with greater force than upon our ranks. When the members of other comparable callings—the clergyman, the engineer, and the physician—are called into military service, they have, for the most part, an opportunity to continue the practice of their professions. They are not drafted into service as private soldiers but are immediately given commissions. Except in a few isolated instances, this is not true of the lawyer. Unless he is commissioned because of some special aptitude, he is drafted or he enlists as a private. He is called to do work entirely alien to that for which he has been specially trained. The practice of his profession is, during the time that he is in military service, entirely suspended. Except to the extent that his associates or the various bar organizations, such as ours, who are interested in protecting the practice of lawyers who are called into service, succeed in conserving his practice, the lawyer-soldier, when the war ends, comes back with no position awaiting him and faced with the loss of the clientele built up by him during the years before the war.

In delineating the sacrifice which the lawyer-soldier is called upon to make, I should not wish to be understood as saying that the members of these other professions are not also making tremendous sacrifices. In the case of each of them, no doubt, as in the case of the lawyer, their entrance into service means the destruction of cherished plans of years' standing and such interruption of their careers that the effects will never be wholly overcome. It is only the pro-

fessional soldier whose career in time of war is not adversely affected, and even to him war means tremendous added hazards and hardships.

I feel impelled at this point to refer particularly to the work that has been done by another profession in Indiana in respect to the war effort. It happens that my offices are immediately adjacent to those of the Indiana Medical Society and I have been privileged, therefore, to observe at first hand the work that has been done by that organization and by the physicians of Indiana in respect to meeting the needs of the armed forces for medical services. I can say advisedly that no organization and the members of no profession have ever done a finer, more efficient, more patriotic piece of work, than have the Indiana Medical Society and the individual physicians of Indiana in coordinating and mobilizing their forces to meet the war-time needs of their country. They are, moreover, doing everything possible to mitigate the hardships which must inevitably fall upon many communities because of a dearth of qualified physicians due to the demands for doctors in the armed forces. I pay this tribute to the Indiana Medical Society and to the doctors of Indiana in sheer admiration of the manner in which they have performed the gigantic task they were called upon to do.

It is perhaps logical that the lawyer should be called upon to make the greatest sacrifice in the prosecution of the war because, after all, no other group of citizens stands to lose more than he. If the United States is not victorious and if democracy is destroyed, our profession will become an almost complete casualty. The lawyer derives his livelihood, to a large extent, in the assertion and defense of civil rights which exist only in democratic governments. In totalitarian states the rights of individuals are unimportant and it is only the welfare of the state, purporting to represent the people as a whole, with which their rulers are concerned. Where the majorities have all the rights and the minorities none, there is no need for lawyers, except to such extent as they are required to enforce the decrees and fiats of the governors of the land. How radically opposed such forms of government are to that of ours is strikingly illustrated by the safeguards which our Bill of Rights throws about individuals and minorities. Except, therefore, for such

comparatively few lawyers as would be necessary to enforce the will of an autocratic state and to prosecute those who fail to obey that will, the legal profession would languish and die were this nation subjugated by the Axis powers or were the form of our government to suffer complete change by reason of its defeat in the titanic conflict in which we are now engaged. The motive of patriotism is, I believe, sufficient to bring forth the utmost effort of every member of our profession to achieve victory; but even if that were not the case, there exist motives of enlightened self-interest sufficient to stimulate every lawyer, who has a clear picture of our situation, to give all that he has to the winning of the war. To gain victory, no sacrifice can be too great.

As was inevitable, the advent of war has seriously affected the financial condition of our Association. For the first time in several years, our course of improvement in this respect has been interrupted. Not only have we lost a great many members by reason of their induction into the armed forces and into other governmental services, but the field in which new members may be acquired has been, for the same reasons, greatly reduced. In this respect, also, the disappointments of the Association are the same as those of the individual citizens. Millions of Americans are finding themselves compelled to reduce their scale of living. Our Association is confronted with the same necessity. We will be compelled to cut our cloth to fit the situation. We will find, as most individuals have found, that it is far more difficult to reduce the scale of our expenditures than it was to increase it. However, the emergency confronts us and it must be met. Fortunately, the existence of a budget committee, brought into being by action of the Association at the preceding Annual Meeting, will permit the reduction in expenditures to be made in an orderly, intelligent way and in such manner that it will least retard the proper functioning of the Association.

While the major interest of the Association has been directed at aiding the war effort, the necessity of maintaining our organization in order that it may be of assistance, as such, in this work, has been recognized. While plans for increasing the number of legal institutes and for promoting district organizations and meetings have been, to some extent, held in abeyance, the work of the committees of the

Association has gone forward as usual. There has been no interruption in the functioning of these committees and I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the many committee members who have so diligently and unselfishly given of their time to carrying on the work of our Association.

Considering such action to be in furtherance of our activities in support of the war, our organization, in March of this year, became a member of the Inter-American Bar Association. This is an organization composed of national bar associations of the countries of the Western Hemisphere and of constituent geographical associations like ours. We took the view that at this time, when hemispheric solidarity is so highly desirable, our Association should do its part by helping to support an organization designed to cement the friendly relations and to promote the union of interests and responsibilities of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

In February, 1942, I had the pleasure of representing The Indiana State Bar Association at a Regional Conference held in conjunction with the Mid-Winter meeting of the Wisconsin State Bar Association for the purpose of coordinating the war work of the state associations in the middle west. In June I attended the Lawyers' War Rally held in connection with the Annual Meeting of the Illinois State Bar Association at Chicago under the sponsorship of the Illinois, Wisconsin and Indiana Bar Associations, and there gave a brief report of our activities in war work. Both of these meetings were extremely well attended and both were to me convincing that we should join more frequently in concerted action with other state associations in this region. It has occurred to me that perhaps we may be subject to the reproach of being somewhat given to isolation in this respect; and I believe earnestly that consideration should be given, as soon as our financial position will justify, to more extended participation in joint activities with the bar associations of neighboring states.

There is pending in the Supreme Court of Indiana an action brought by the Attorney General of Indiana against one William B. Waddell, an attorney. This is a disbarment proceeding filed originally in the Supreme Court. The jurisdiction of the court to entertain such an action has been

brought into question by a motion of the defendant to set aside the return endorsed on the court's order. By and with the advice and consent of the Board of Managers I have appointed a committee of three to act as *amicus curiae* in this proceeding, considering that the question involved is one of major interest to our Association, particularly because the establishment of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction in such matters is in harmony with the program of our Association for establishing an integrated bar in this state.

During the past several months our Committee on Integration of the Bar has been active in disseminating information among the members showing the experience of the states in which an integrated bar is in existence. I believe that the greater the knowledge which the lawyers of Indiana have of what the integrated bar is and how it works, the more certain it is that they will eventually support the establishment of a consolidated bar in this state. I arrive at this conclusion from my own experience. The more I have learned of the operation of the integrated bar in states where that system prevails, the more I have come to perceive the necessity of its establishment in Indiana. I am firmly convinced that the greatest single step that could be taken for improvement in the administration of justice in this state would be the establishment of an integrated bar. Whether, in view of the absence of the many younger members of the bar, sufficient support can presently be obtained to accomplish the desired end through legislation, is a serious question. Whether it would be advisable again to endeavor to integrate the bar by legislative enactment, or whether, in view of the situation occasioned by the absence of large numbers of our members who would most naturally favor the integrated bar, we should revert to an attempt to obtain integration by the exercise of the inherent power of our Supreme Court, is a serious question and one to which the earnest study of the members of the Association should be directed. Certainly, since the By-laws of our Association recognize the accomplishment of integration of the bar as one of our prime objectives, and since the experience of other states (as shown in the information recently distributed by our Committee on the Integration of the Bar) discloses the salutary efforts of integration, our efforts should not falter. With us, it is no longer a question of whether or

not this Association desires integration. This has been officially determined. There only remains the determination of the method by which it can best and most expeditiously be accomplished.

Despite the failure of the two major political parties at their conventions held in Indiana this summer, to include, in their platforms, planks favoring the non-political selection of judges, the case for such method is so plain and clear that, in my opinion, the Association should cause a bill for its establishment to be presented at the impending session of the Indiana General Assembly. No rebuffs should stay our attempts to do away with political considerations in the selection of judicial officers.

The spectacle we have frequently witnessed, of delegates to political conventions denying renomination to incumbent judges for reasons wholly disassociated with their ability and character and nominating lawyers for high judicial office whose only qualifications consist of faithful party service, it is in itself a most powerful argument for the abolition of our present system. Many judges, who themselves have received their office by reason of party service, have expressed to me their dislike of the present method and have advocated the establishment of a system for the non-partisan selection of judicial officers. I have had some experience with, and considerable opportunity to observe, the workings of the non-political election of school commissioners in Indianapolis. By common consent, during recent years, the major party political organizations have refrained from interfering with the election of these officials, who exercise complete control of the School City of Indianapolis, performing the functions in that municipality with the mayor, the common council, and the various boards perform in the conduct of the civil city. Untrammelled by any political debt for their selection, the members of the School Board have acted with complete independence of any outside influence. For more than a decade there has been no criticism of the conduct of the Indianapolis schools except that occasionally voiced by small pressure groups which had failed to obtain from the Indianapolis School Board the special considerations they had demanded. Only those who wish to make the schools subject to political denomination would countenance the return to political party selection. Even more cogent than

any argument that has been advanced for the non-partisan selection of school board members, are those which may be marshalled in favor of the non-partisan selection of judges. Nothing can be more important than the proper administration of justice in a republic whose principal tenet is liberty under law and the constitution and statutes of which are predicated upon their impartial, unbiased application free from all extraneous influence. It is a tremendous tribute to the inherent honesty and integrity of the generality of the lawyers of Indiana, from whom all our judges have been chosen that, despite the political method of their selection, they have, with the rarest exceptions, steadfastly avoided being swayed by political or partisan considerations. That this is now and has been hitherto the case is no argument for the continuance of the present system. No judicial officer should ever have to suffer the suspicion that he is swayed, in the performance of his duties, by gratitude to the political party to which he owes his office, or to the party bosses. If we speak frankly, we must all admit that we are aware that laymen, unacquainted with the personalities of the judges as are lawyers, are prone to suspect that susceptibility to political considerations exists. Granting the existence of such suspicion on the part of many laymen (who are, after all, those whose interests are most involved in matters coming before our courts for determination) it follows that a system which breeds such distrust should not be permitted to continue. Complete confidence in our courts is essential to that devotion to our institutions which must continue to exist if such institutions are to be preserved. The removal of our courts from the realm of political activity will do more than any other one thing to strengthen the faith of the people in the integrity of our judicial system.

The time and energy which we are devoting to war work should not halt our study of the development and growth of administrative law and our attempts to improve its administration. More and more, practice before administrative boards is coming to constitute the major activity of many lawyers. It seems obvious that the growth of this practice will continue. As was said by President Hill in his annual address in 1939: "The profession should recognize that Administrative Jurisprudence is here and it is here to stay." Since the time those remarks were made some of the ad-

ministrative boards (then under the fire of adverse criticism in many respects, at that time, entirely deserved) have become increasingly conscious of their responsibilities and have come to a realization that, while they are not compelled to recognize as controlling the rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity, the reasons upon which such rules are founded are sound and to ignore them results in confusion and injustice. In the early days of some of the boards, now functioning in a manner deserving the commendation rather than the condemnation of the bar, they seemed to resent the intrusion of qualified lawyers into their proceedings and seemed to prefer that the parties litigant appear either in their own persons alone, or by other laymen. The attitude of some of these administrative bodies has changed with the years and they appear now to welcome the appearance of attorneys of standing in the matters that come before them for determination. Unfortunately, the functions of some of these boards, upon which the accumulated experience of several years has had this effect, are being usurped by other and newer boards who have not yet had sufficient experience to realize the value of applying proper rules of evidence and of having lawyers, familiar with such rules, coming before them to represent the parties in interest. However, I entertain the settled conviction that, as time goes on, administrative boards will more and more come to realize that disregard of the rules of evidence results in disadvantage to all parties concerned and that the appearance of qualified lawyers representing the parties litigant will expedite, and not hinder, their functioning. Certainly, the matters which come before many administrative boards for determination are of such moment and involve such important issues, that the services of lawyers, well-grounded in the law in general, and in the statutes and decisions relating to the subject matter with which such boards are concerned in particular, have become to be recognized as essential.

It must be admitted that many of us greeted the advent of the numerous administrative boards and commissions now functioning with ill-concealed hostility. The combining of functions roughly corresponding with those of the grand jury, the prosecutor, and the judge, was repugnant to ideas which had been inculcated in us by our training. The studied

disregard of the rules of evidence, which the statute creating many of these boards had specifically authorized, subjected them to additional criticism on the part of the lawyer. Some boards or their representatives frequently appeared to be determined to arrive at conclusions not justified by the law and the evidence but conforming with their philosophic approach to certain social problems. Too many lawyers, outraged by these circumstances, either refused to engage in practice before the administrative boards whose actions met with their disapproval, or appearing before them, took an attitude of such hostility that the results were invariably disastrous, which served to inflame their resentment further. As the boards have improved with age and responsibility, so has the attitude of the bar towards them. Since, as stated by President Hill, administrative jurisprudence is here to stay, it behooves the lawyer to attempt to correct its defects instead of contending himself with criticism and complaint.

There remains much to be done in respect to bringing about some uniformity in practice before the many administrative agencies now in existence and others that will, undoubtedly, be created in the future. When we consider the difficulty that has been met in attempting to obtain uniformity in procedure in the various state courts, and in the state and federal courts, we realize that the task of achieving uniformity in practice before administrative boards and bureaus is a gigantic task to which the best efforts of an Association such as ours can well be applied. In this connection I quote again from President Hill's annual address delivered in 1939:

"I do not think that we should overlook the suggestions and advice of those who have had experience as to the problems encountered in administrative procedure. If we make uniform as much as possible administrative proceedings upon a sound basis of experience and with due regards to our cherished concepts of impartiality and fair play, we shall have taken a great stride in the improvement of administrative law and maintain our conception that this is a government by law and not by men."

Our attention to the problems of administrative jurisprudence tracks with our resolve to devote our time and energy to matters connected with the war effort. So much of the war activity of the entire nation is involved in the matters administered by these tribunals that anything that

makes for simplification and improvement of the practice before them and for the more certain correct determination of such matters, is in direct aid of our country's war effort.

I am happy to report that during my term as President I have enjoyed the wholehearted cooperation of the editor of the Indiana Law Journal and his staff and have been the recipient of constant courtesy and consideration at their hands. The contents of each issue of the Journal have been outlined to me in advance and my approval has been obtained. It will be recalled that just prior to the time of the Mid-Winter Meeting a referendum respecting the Journal was conducted among our membership by a special committee consisting of the President of the Association, his immediate predecessor, and the Vice-President. The result of that referendum was that twenty-three members cast ballots in favor of a journal devoted exclusively to bar association and professional news, one hundred and forty-eight to a review devoted exclusively to legal subjects, reviews of decisions and the like, and six hundred and twenty-seven in favor of a journal combining both of such types; and that five hundred and ten members expressed themselves in favor of continuing the publication of the Journal under the same editorial supervision as at present, and two hundred and eighty-four in favor of a journal edited and published solely by the Association, without editorial supervision from any law school. One of the criticisms which had been leveled against the editorial conduct of the Journal was that the publication partook, in its nature, too much of a law review, and not enough of a bar journal. It had been pointed out by my predecessor in his Annual Address that during the first year of the present editorship of the Journal, matters pertaining to the Association and its activities had received only thirty per cent of the space in the Journal while over the five year period of a former editor, the Association had been given forty-three per cent of the space. In the six issues which have appeared during my term as President, the Journal has devoted over sixty-three per cent of its space to bar association material and leading articles of general interest to all lawyers, and a little less than thirty-seven per cent to case notes. The percentage given to case notes would have been much less except for the fact that in the April issue of the Journal, which was devoted to the legal

aspects of the Selective Service Act, seventy-two per cent of the space must be considered as consisting of case notes although such notes had to do, practically in their entirety, to matters pertaining to the Selective Service Act. Certainly the subject was one which is of extreme interest to every lawyer in Indiana and of particular interest to the younger lawyers. Of the approximately sixty-three per cent of space taken by leading articles and bar association news, over thirty-four per cent consisted of the report of bar association happenings and a little less than twenty-nine per cent of leading articles.

At the suggestion of Professor Horack, editor of the Indiana Law Journal, the practice of having a "President's Letter" in each issue has been revived. While the preparation of such a letter for each issue has naturally entailed some additional work, I have found the practice very much worth-while because it has enabled me to communicate at regular intervals with our members and to keep them informed of some of the more important things that have transpired.

In concluding, I wish again to refer to the question that is uppermost in all of our minds: Is there something further that the lawyer can do to help win the war?

In addition to the things already specifically mentioned which the lawyer is doing to aid his country's cause, I conceive it to be one of his principal functions in this emergency to help direct the public mind to a correct appraisal of our country's present situation. The lawyer knows the danger of underestimating his adversary's strength on the one hand, and of giving way to fear and consequent panic on the other. In this, the gravest crisis of our national history, when our destiny and that of all other nations subscribing to the democratic principle stand trembling in the balance, the incurable optimism which prevents so many of our citizens from perceiving the possibility of our losing the war is as detrimental to our country's cause as the defeatism which afflicts other Americans: more detrimental perhaps, because we have so many more optimists than we have defeatists. Both unjustified optimism and undue pessimism have the same blighting effect upon our country's war effort. The optimist, viewing the situation through rose-colored spectacles, says that there is no danger and that no effort is necessary. He mag-

nifies each skirmish that we win into a major victory sealing the fate of our adversaries. The defeatist, on the other hand, unable to see a ray of hope, and cringing before the might exhibited by our enemies, says that no effort of ours will be of any avail. In either case—that of the optimist who believes that our fighting forces will take care of everything and that no effort on the part of the rest of us is necessary; and that of the defeatist who believes that our fighting forces will inevitably be overcome and that no effort of ours can possibly be of any avail—the result is stagnation, confusion, paralysis. This is no time for Americans to delude themselves. To say we cannot lose the war, or to say we cannot win it; either statement is alike fallacious; both are equally inimical to the concerted, determined effort which alone can bring success. Only a stern realistic view of the situation can insure such effort. The lawyer should, because of his training and experience, be best able to view the situation with clear-eyed realism. If he does this, and if he can lead public opinion to face the truth that this war can be won only by the unlimited, unified effort of a united people, then he will have played a major part in achieving the victory which must be won if the ideals which we most highly cherish are to be saved to the world.