



In Honor of Florian Bartosic

THE THREE FLORIAN BARTOSICS THAT I HAVE KNOWN

*J. Ralph Beard**

I first met Florian (Bart) Bartosic in the late 1950s while I was serving as Associate General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and he was staff counsel for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. During those years our contacts were brief and purely business but I was struck by the fact that Bart did not appear to be the stereotypical labor organization lawyer. His manner was mild and gentle and he relied primarily upon the power of his intellect to convince you of the rightness of his position. Our relations were very cordial, due primarily to his warm engaging manner.

I later became Associate Solicitor of the United States Labor Department in charge of the Division of Labor-Management Laws. This Division was responsible for the administration, interpretation and enforcement of the Landrum-Griffin Act (L-G). Since L-G was the first federal attempt to regulate the internal affairs of labor organizations, Bart and I had many occasions to deal with each other. Once again I was struck by the highly professional approach taken by Bart in representing the Teamsters before the Labor department. On one occasion in particular, Bart's legal acumen and resourcefulness came through. Under L-G union officers could not serve without a bond. The company that provided the bond for Teamster's President Hoffa had

* Dean and University Professor Emeritus, University of Georgia, School of Law.

decided not to renew it. There was some speculation that the decision not to renew was politically motivated. In any event, Bart and Mr. Hoffa came into the office of the Assistant Secretary for Labor Management Relations one morning with \$500,000.00 in bearer bonds stacked in a cardboard box. They told Assistant Secretary Jim Reynolds that they had checked federal regulations and believed that self-bonding was permitted under L-G. This, of course, proved to be true, much to the chagrin of Mr. Hoffa's political enemies. All of us were impressed by the ingenuity of the Teamster counsel. In all our government-Teamster dealings, Bart was a straight arrow, a man of integrity.

I next came to know Bart as a part-time and later full-time professor of law. On occasion he would ask me in as a guest lecturer, an opportunity that I relished, since his discussions of various issues were sharp, penetrating and intellectually stimulating. We both enjoyed discussing the nation's labor and constitutional policy in the classroom environment. Both of us ultimately became full time law professors, Bart at Wayne State and I at Georgia. As an academician I was impressed by the high quality of Bart's teaching and books, particularly, *Labor Relations Law in the Private Sector*, for guidance. By his scholarly writing, Bart demonstrated that he was as much at home in academe as he was as counsel to an international union president.

My next encounters with Bart came while we were both serving as deans of our respective law schools, University of California, Davis and the University of Georgia. We spoke often at dean's workshops on such issues as dean-faculty relations. He once told me that good dean-faculty relations require absolute openness, a practice he followed. I learned from his colleagues at Davis that he was as successful as a dean as he was as a teacher and legal advisor. The one characteristic that marked all of Bart's professional activities was absolute, total integrity. All of the three phases of Bart's career that have touched me were marked by complete dedication to professionalism. Someone once said that a man with his integrity should have been a minister. It was a great day for the legal profession when he chose the law.

BART AS A FRIEND

*Edgar Bodenheimer**

Florian Bartosic, called Bart by his colleagues, assumed the Deanship of the University of California School of Law at Davis in 1980. By that time, I had retired from full-time teaching, although I taught a course once in a while in the Law School or School of Administration. Since I did not attend faculty meetings or serve on committees, I was no longer in touch with the administrative side of law school management, including curricular and faculty recruiting matters. I therefore cannot speak about Bart's performance as head of the faculty or his relations with the students, but I can say a few words about Bart as a personal friend.

Bart and I often exchanged thoughts on domestic and international problems, on the personalities in the news, and sometimes on legal-philosophical issues. We found ourselves in amazingly broad agreement on many subjects. What I cherish most about Bart is his intensely human (as distinguished from chiefly intellectual) approach to the troubling questions of our time. What matters to him is the impact of political and social actions on the life of human beings rather than their bearings on ideology or power relations. This warm-heartedness and deep concern made every conversation with Bart an enjoyable and rewarding experience.

On the lighter side, I wish to mention one little piece of evidence showing Bart's consideration of others which is of minor importance to mankind but much appreciated by authors of books and articles. Bart almost always made substantive and discerning comments on writings sent to him, instead of merely acknowledging their receipt with a firm promise of future perusal, as so often happens in the academic community.

I can testify to one professional endeavor on the part of Bart which, I believe, has been very beneficial not only to members and students of the Law School but also to interested outsiders. This is the whole-hearted support he gave to annual lecture series bringing outstanding scholars and practitioners to the rostrum. One of these is the Brigitte M. Bodenheimer Memorial Lecture Series, established in honor of my late wife, which has been dedicated to the discussion of developments in family law. Another

* Professor of Law Emeritus, University of California, Davis.

one is the Barrett Lectureship in Constitutional Law, which was created to honor the founding dean of the Law School, Edward L. Barrett, Jr..

It would appear that the Law School of the University of California at Davis has significantly grown in breadth, stature, and national reputation in the ten years in which Florian Bartosic served as its dean. I am convinced that every impartial observer would reach the same conclusion.

IT ALL BEGAN WITH AN OBDURATE AUTOMOBILE

*Professor Daniel Wm. Fessler**

Florian Bartosic and I first met in the fall of 1975 when we were both visiting professors at the University of Virginia. The fall term had barely begun when the faculty was summoned for what turned out to be a splendid reception at the home of Emerson Spies. I nearly did not make it. My not too young imported car had taken a firm dislike to something about Charlottesville and, more often than not, would refuse to start. On the day of the reception it was in a "more often" mood. I thus found myself standing in the law school's parking lot uttering words no human should overhear to a malevolent machine. It was then that I heard a quiet voice, "What seems to be the trouble?" That was our beginning.

We now move forward nearly four years. Pete Loiseaux's tenure as our third dean had been cut short by illness. As a member of the search committee I suggested Bartosic. After considerable effort, a man who had not sought the position at any school was persuaded to take on the burdens aptly described by Gary Goodpaster.¹

Shortly after Bart arrived to take up the deanship, the nation elected Ronald Reagan. About a week after the election we found ourselves the dinner guests of John and Freddie Oakley. At some point, the election emerged as a topic of conversation. As the only card carrying member of the Republican party at that table, I held a view of the outcome which differed somewhat from that of my companions. Gradually, three voices rose to a point that neighbors might have monitored the discussion! Bart continued to participate, but never raised his voice. He would, from time to time, inject a fact into a discussion otherwise carried on the wings of opinion. Later, as I drove him to his residence, he asked politely if the Oakleys and I often discussed politics. "Always," said I, "They are two of my best friends." As he got out of the car he looked a bit older. If this had been a convivial exchange among friends, what did the future hold?

We now move forward to 1983. That academic year began on a

* Professor of Law, University of California, Davis.

¹ See Professor Goodpaster's contribution to this tribute, *infra*.

contentious note: a number of second and third year students protested what they styled a "forced curve" imposed upon first year grades. As a participant in the faculty/student committee appointed by Dean Loiseaux in 1977 to deal with the problem of inequities in the grading of first year courses, I took umbrage at what I deemed the explicit misrepresentation of the issue. I was further distressed that such statements were being made to first year students who had not been in the building for a month and who were, from my perspective, being exploited. Dean Bartosic was in the middle. A reader who has reviewed the remarks of Professors Bodenheimer and Goodpaster, Deans St. Antoine and Beard, or Justice Grodin can easily anticipate Bartosic's reaction. It was to seek a de-escalation in the tone of the discussion and tempers of the discussants. And he had to deal with a complaint by two students that I had attended a student forum and spoken of their efforts in a manner which they thought called into question their motives if not their integrity.

The Dean suggested that I reflect on what I had said, and if I agreed that it had given offense, apologize to the two students. Impulsively, I retorted that I had a right to my views and to put them forth in a debate which had not been couched in moderate tones by the very persons now complaining. Again, Bart looked a bit older as he responded: "You surely have that right, but I don't think you will like yourself in the morning." Twenty-four hours later, I dined on a crow sandwich.

We now move to the spring of 1989 and a telephone call which I received in London. Bart announced that after much thought he was determined that the time had come to resign the responsibilities of the deanship, and to turn to matters of his academic interest too long neglected in the service of others. I wish that I could have persuaded him otherwise. Indeed, I might have enlisted Professor St. Antoine to point out that while serving others he had managed to continue a splendid career as teacher and writer.² Bart knew those things and his own mind. I accepted his decision with personal regret and yet joy in the thought of his presence as a colleague freed from governance and all that such a term implies.

Sixteen years is a substantial period of time and yet it is like a moment gone. My friend in need has become a treasured friend, indeed. From the vantage point of King Hall, the University of

² See St. Antoine, *infra*, notes 2-13 and accompanying text.

California, and all of the human constituencies which those institutions embrace, Florian Bartosic has been a friend in deeds. I am privileged to join in an expression of gratitude to a man who should be delighted with himself on this morning of a new chapter in his life as a lawyer, educator, and exemplar.

A TRIBUTE TO BART BARTOSIC

*Professor Gary Goodpaster**

A law school dean's role portfolio is large. To give the short list: it includes leadership, standard-bearing, efficient and effective administration, substantive school development and image-building, the promotion of excellence in education and research, the enhancement and shaping of programs, the care and harmonization of the faculty, the creation of a splendid learning environment, public relations, the serving of multifarious and ever-changing student needs, and interests, fund-raising, and staff supervision and development. The law dean is also the human symbol of the school, its visible embodiment and representative in countless public, social, professional, and ceremonial activities.

Many constituencies, often having conflicting interests and views, claim a dean's attention and service: the University administration, the faculty, the students, the staff, the alumni, donors and special school friends, the state bar, the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the press, and the public at large. Also important, but somewhat more removed are other University departments and the small academic world of law schools and various other legal organizations or interest groups that, in one way or another, lay some claim on a law school's attention or resources. These different actors, who form the political or social universe in which a law school orbits, often disagree with one another and raise conflicting demands for resources, services, ideological allegiance, or policy and program control. More interesting yet, these actors themselves often comprise complex groups divided within themselves, organized or factionalized into smaller groups, each wanting its items placed on the agenda and satisfied, often intransigently unaware or indifferent to a competing, equally valid or even superior, claim from another group.

All seem always to have an appetite for more, yet a dean's resources to give, or accommodate, whether financial or otherwise, seem to lessen year by year. The state and university, usually generous in their support, find themselves financially constrained and must cut budgets. Grant funds, in any case

* Professor of Law, University of California, Davis.

always in short supply for law schools, increasingly dry up. Potential donors, always harried on every side by every sort of charity, interest group, or political organization seeking funds show empty pockets and locked purses.

In a young — in Davis' case when Bart became Dean, one might say adolescent — law school in a state university, a dean has few tools to accomplish the tasks set, to reach high goals and to meet the expectations large. There is almost no discretionary money available to develop or enhance programs or to give or withhold as reward or enticement to encourage school personnel to move in certain directions. Faculty promotion to higher ranks is also not a power of the dean, so promising or withholding decanal favor is also not a major tool to effect purposes. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, faculty, and not decanal governance, is the rule in the University of California, and no dean can move the faculty in directions, or to places, it does not wish to go.

To develop and move an institution so constrained, internally and externally, with constituencies so demanding and potentially conflictual, requires a realistic, pragmatic vision of what is institutionally possible, given the players, the resources, and the environment. To implement the vision requires a clear understanding of an institution's possibilities and defects, of the talents and idiosyncrasies of its personnel. The problem is to orchestrate what is to be achieved and realize what is not yet, and to make the achievement durable, the foundation for further development and achievement to come.

In the Davis law deanship, the dean's powers are almost entirely personal and depend upon relationship-building, human management, and persuasion skills. Such skills, however, even if abundantly held, would not avail if used to manipulate. Intelligent people perceive, resent, and resist manipulation, and even the most skillful "people-handler" would fail in his or her object. No, success in moving a collegial institution, which requires a concurrence of wills, depends on genuineness and honesty in dealing with people, forthrightness, and a certain humility.

All would agree that the law school at Davis has made extraordinary progress on all fronts during the ten years of Bart's deanship. The school has moved from a relative unknown in the law school world to a position of some prominence. The education it offers is highly prized. Law firms seek out its graduates. Most of its faculty have national reputations. It attracts an excellent and diverse student body, and its teaching is generally excel-

lent, as are its many programs. Davis has a friendly and open atmosphere, a characteristic not the norm as most law schools go. Finally, its graduates retain an affection and enthusiasm for the school, a gratitude for the education they received, and a respect for the institution quite unusual for law schools.

No single person is responsible for all that Davis has become, but in my estimation, much of it is due to Bart Bartosic. In many ways, most of them silent and often unnoticed, he shaped and guided the development of the school, building soundly, stably, patiently. He had a vision for the school, quietly held, but a vision nonetheless; the astuteness to perceive just how the particular arrangement of people, possibilities, resources, and problems that was Davis could move to larger and grander achievements, to an excellence previously unattained; and he had the exquisite skills and personal resources essential to create positive change and insure faculty and institutional harmony and support. In my perception, now having been on the faculty almost twenty years, no one else could have done it, and it was most splendidly done.

It is a most difficult job, the dean's job, and often a thankless one. While many may take pride in a school's successes, fewer perceive how they came about. Fewer yet understand the myriad, often complexly interdependent decanal decisions and actions that laid the groundwork for success and achievement — the skillful leadership by indirection, the careful harmonization and management of differing interests and talents, the patient development of relationships, graciousness, fairness, sensitivity and forbearance in dealing with all — sometimes even in the face of hostility, harassment, and personal animus — the deep commitment to institutional interest over personal interest, the sacrifice of self to larger aims, the heavy costs of incessant work, unending tasks, worries legion. Bart brought Davis to maturity as a law school, and led it to its present shining position. Ever committed to the school, he chose to leave the deanship only when the school was healthy, strong, and at its pinnacle.

A most admirable deanship; a most admirable man. On behalf of all I express the gratitude and respect of all and as well my personal wish for joy, well-honored rest, a new life and new challenges away from the cares of office and the stewardship of others' dreams.

A TRIBUTE TO THE OTHER BART

*Joseph R. Grodin**

The Bart we know and honor in these pages, like the rapid transit system whose acronym he bears, is in the business of transporting people, and has been throughout his professional life. He performs that task more reliably, and more sensitively, to be sure. He does not carry us halfway to our stop, hold us captive in an underground tunnel, and inform us (redundantly) that we have been delayed. Our Bart is a warm, caring, very much human being who can be relied upon to get us where we need to go and, what is more, keep us comfortable getting there. For our Bart, the journey is as important as the destination.

I came to know Bart when I was in the practice of labor law, in a firm that represented local unions of the Teamsters at a time when Bart was lawyer to the Teamsters Union nationwide. The Union was undergoing a good deal of strain internally, and externally as well. There were charges of undemocratic practices towards members and corruption in dealings with employers. What is more, some of the charges had merit. Like many organizations, union and otherwise, there were some bad apples in the crate. But locals throughout the country, and for that matter the international union itself, were doing a generally creditable job in representing their members zealously and effectively, and it was Bart's task to steer a safe course through the legal and public relations flak, so that the primary mission of the union could be accomplished. This he was able to do with a combination of consummate lawyerly skill and utmost integrity. He provided the guidance that his clients needed, but never at the sacrifice of public norms or his personal values.

Still, representing the Teamsters in those difficult days was a strain for a person of Bart's liberality and idealism. When I heard, during a period the Teamsters were engaged in a bitter battle with the United Farm Workers Union, that Bart was displaying the UFW flag on his office wall, I knew that his days with the Teamsters must be numbered. And so they were. He left soon after for academia, and dedicated himself to different sorts of transportation. Through his teaching he facilitated the passage

* Professor of Law, U.C. Hastings College of Law; former Associate Justice, California Supreme Court.

of young minds from college graduation to the practice of law, and through his writings the movement of legal principles toward a fairer, more democratic relationship between unions and their members. Bart brought to these tasks, as was predictable, the same skill, integrity and sensitivity that he had displayed as a lawyer, and won comparable admiration and acclaim.

It came as no surprise when the U.C. Davis School of Law invited Bart to be Dean, nor when Bart, having accepted, undertook the task of mass academic transit with his usual enthusiasm and finesse. We in the legal community await the announcement of his forthcoming schedules with anticipation.

BART BARTOSIC: WHAT YOU SEE IS NOT WHAT YOU GET

Theodore J. St. Antoine*

With “Bart” Bartosic, what you see is not necessarily what you get. Anyone even vaguely acquainted with him knows I am not talking about duplicity; on occasion, Bart can be almost painfully forthright. Nonetheless, on first meeting, most persons are likely to view him as the very soul of *politesse* — perhaps actually too deferential and accommodating. Yet behind that beguiling exterior can be found a backbone of cast iron, a mind like a steel trap, and (to extend the metallic figure) a willingness, when the situation demands, to be as hard as nails in dealing with either ideas or people.

I worked for Bart in my first full-time job as a lawyer in the late 1950s. He was the staff director of a novel instrument of equity, a tripartite “board of monitors” that was set up by the federal district court in the District of Columbia to try to ride herd on Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters Union, following Hoffa’s disputed election as president of the international.¹ The Teamsters thought they had the impartial chair of the board in their hip pocket because he was an old-line union attorney who had briefly represented the Teamsters themselves. But Hoffa, displaying a total lack of diplomacy, as well as of the natural cunning with which he was often erroneously credited, managed in a series of face-to-face confrontations to so provoke the chair’s Irish temper that the latter, abandoning nearly all claims to impartiality, set out to bring Hoffa to heel, if not to bring him down.

Bart reacted in character. Like me, he was making his first full-time foray as a lawyer into the “real world” outside academia. That did not deter him, however, from remonstrating with his strong-willed, impulsive chief. “But sir,” he declared in his precise, measured tones, “under the consent decree establishing the board, we have no authority to *order* the Teamsters to do anything; we can only *recommend*.” “All right, then,” came the growling rejoinder, “take this down instead: ‘*Order of Recommendation No. 1*. . . .’” Bart was enough of a realist to bow to the inevitable, and the board soon became famous for sev-

* Degan Professor of Law, The University of Michigan Law School.

¹ See *English v. Cunningham*, 269 F.2d 517 (D.C. Cir), *cert. denied*, 361 U.S. 897 (1959).

eral dozen “orders of recommendation” covering many aspects of the Teamsters’ structure and procedures. Somewhat surprisingly, the union complied voluntarily with a substantial number of these recommendations, much to the benefit, I like to think, of the organization and its members. Eventually, some of our “orders” cut too close to the bone and Hoffa and his cohorts balked. That led to another round of litigation in which the District of Columbia Circuit ultimately vindicated Bart’s judgment: the Board had frequently sought to order when it could only recommend.

Two incidents related to the monitorship, one trivial and one significant, epitomize for me the polar elements of Bart’s personality — his gentleness and his toughness. Once Bart and I were in the office together, assembling a mass of papers. He was operating a heavy-duty stapler. I made some small request or offered some suggestion; I have long since forgotten what. Bart bore down on the stapler and at the same time uttered a loud and forceful, “No!” He immediately turned to me, obviously distressed: “I’m sorry, Ted, I didn’t mean to seem so emphatic. It was only my pressure on the stapler that made me sound that way!”

Much more serious was a career decision Bart made a year or so later. After his stint with the Board of Monitors, he returned briefly to the Washington headquarters of the National Labor Relations Board. And then Jimmy Hoffa, who sometimes (but rarely) knew what was good for him, offered Bart a position as counsel for the Teamsters. Even though Bart would not be going directly from the monitors to the union, I knew his old boss would regard the move akin to high treason, and I told Bart so. In addition, Bart was by now harboring thoughts of an eventual return to law teaching, and we were not so far removed from the McCarthy witch-hunt era but what I feared he might jeopardize his chances with the more timorous schools by an association with the much-maligned Teamsters. I am sure Bart gave my worries all of a moments consideration, and then, as the grand nonrespector of persons he has always been, he did what he thought he should do. Two million Teamster members were the beneficiaries of a dozen years of his impeccable lawyering.

Curiously, I feel I have been less in touch with Bart’s day-to-day activities since he joined me in the academic world in 1971, even though he spent his first decade at Wayne State Law School in Detroit, a mere forty-five miles from Ann-Arbor, and provided

Michigan Law School students with some much-applauded guest teaching. Our relations became more attenuated when he moved to the Coast in 1980, but tales of his prowess as Dean at Davis drifted back from time to time — and confirmed the continuing validity of my thesis concerning his dual hallmarks of gentleness and toughness.

Fortunately, Bart's writings have enabled me to keep abreast of his thinking over the years. The work reflects the man. He does not shrink from tackling the largest, most overarching conceptual themes. Yet he is not above dealing with the practitioner's more mundane concerns. He exhibits the deepest compassion for the disadvantaged. At the same time he can be scathing in his denunciation of shoddy performance, even at the highest levels.

In three substantial articles, Bart, either alone or in collaboration with Professor Gary Minda of Brooklyn Law School, has analyzed the output of the Burger Court from its earliest days to its conclusion. The verdict has often been harsh: "Most of the present Court's significant labor opinions are wanting in logic, style and grace."² There has been a persistent complaint. The decisions are "murky and mediocre because the Supreme Court lacks a consistent and coherent theory of labor law."³ And finally, "if there is one single theme that characterizes the labor law legacy of the Burger Court, it is the failure of imagination and vision in deciding labor law policy."⁴

Perhaps Bart and his co-author are the most focused and eloquent in decrying the "lack of consensus during the Burger Court era on affirmative action doctrine."⁵ They attribute this failure to the conflict between those who believe that affirmative action must be confined to "remediating individual discriminatory acts" and those who believe it should extend to "vindicating group rights and . . . correct[ing] societal patterns of injustice."⁶ They propose a more factually based approach:

Instead of choosing between abstract models, the Court should be focusing more of its attention on the realities of racism

² Bartosic, *The Supreme Court, 1974 Term: The Allocation of Power in Deciding Labor Law Policy*, 62 VA. L. REV. 533, 600 (1976).

³ Bartosic & Minda, *Labor Law Myth in the Supreme Court, 1981 Term: A Plea for Realistic and Coherent Theory*, 30 UCLA L. REV. 271, 326 (1982).

⁴ Bartosic & Minda, *The Labor Law Legacy of the Burger Court's Last Term: A Failure of Imagination and Vision*, 28 ARIZ. L. REV. 533, 591 (1986).

⁵ *Id.* at 553.

⁶ *Id.*

and racial hierarchy. Much of the discussion on affirmative action in the Supreme Court simply ignores the stark realities besetting blacks and Hispanics in American society.⁷

Quite correctly, the authors close by observing that the Burger Court produced no “authoritative pronouncement” in seventeen years on the most “significant and serious questions posed by race-conscious affirmative action.”⁸ The contrast with the Warren Court’s handling of school segregation⁹ and reapportionment¹⁰ is indeed striking. But in fairness I think the moral dilemma of affirmative action cuts far deeper among fair-minded people, and the public is much less ready here to follow the lead of the Supreme Court.

On a less heroic but still vital level, Bart has had a great deal to say about the effective enforcement of substantive rights. He accurately identifies procedural delay and inadequate remedies as the “principal stumbling block[s]” to effectuation of national labor policy, and calls for a new labor court to review NLRB decisions and for increased use of the contempt power as the solutions.¹¹ I heartily endorse the latter proposal, having never understood the reluctance of both the Labor Board and the courts to put some flagrant and persistent management (and union) malefactors behind bars just because they wear white collars. But I am still convinced there is a genuine value in having the decisions of specialists reviewed by generalists — especially if the latter are more likely to be considered the more prestigious appointments — and so I remain skeptical about Bart’s labor court. Lastly, in keeping with his emphasis upon the actualization of theoretically available claims, Bart and a former colleague from active practice have written one of the most comprehensive and persuasive statements in support of the expansion of group legal services for the middle class, particularly for workers through col-

⁷ *Id.* at 555.

⁸ *Id.* at 591.

⁹ See *Brown v. Board of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) (unanimously decided).

¹⁰ See *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964) (with only Harlan, J., dissenting).

¹¹ Bartosic, *Labor Law Reform — The NLRB and a Labor Court*, 4 GA. L. REV. 647 (1970); Bartosic & Lanoff, *Escalating the Struggle against Taft-Hartley Contemnors*, 39 U. CHI. L. REV. 255, 255 (1972); see also Bartosic & Minda, *Union Fiduciaries, Attorneys, and Conflicts of Interest*, 15 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 227 (1981) (advocating an independent regulatory agency to administer the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act).

lective bargaining.¹²

A strong strain of thinking in certain elite circles of the contemporary law school world holds that writing addressed primarily to the practicing bar, including well-crafted and eminently useful treatises, is inherently inferior to the loftier flights of the creative imagination that a scholar addresses to a favored few, often only a handful of his or her fellow scholars. Bart is keenly aware of those hierarchical attitudes. He was also the Dean of a truly fine law school, which has achieved much in short order, and undoubtedly aspires to much more. Taking all that into account, I reserve my highest and warmest esteem for a Dean — responsible as he was for serving as a model for many young, ambitious, anxious faculty members — who would dare to produce a mere treatise on American Labor Law.¹³ That it happens to be the best up-to-date work of its kind is a nice bonus. Its real message, however, to all young, ambitious, anxious faculty members everywhere, from a Dean who has been through many wars, is simply this: “I am my own man. You be yours.”

¹² Bartosic & Bernstein, *Group Legal Services as a Fringe Benefit: Lawyers for Forgotten Clients through Collective Bargaining*, 59 VA. L. REV. 410 (1973).

¹³ F. BARTOSIC & R. HARTLEY, *LABOR RELATIONS LAW IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR* (2d ed. 1986); see also Bartosic & Hartley, *What To Do When Employers Discriminate Against Unions (Part 1)*, PRAC. LAW., Mar. 1987, at 33; *(Part 2)*, PRAC. LAW., Apr. 1987, at 75.

