

LL.B. to J.D. and the Professional Degree in Architecture

JOANNA LOMBARD
University of Miami

Thirty-four years ago, the American Bar Association (ABA) recommended that American law schools offer a single unified professional degree, the *Juris Doctor*. Sixty years of sporadic discussion and debate preceded that recommendation. The Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) had originated as an undergraduate program which evolved over time to graduate studies while retaining the bachelor's degree designation. In recognition of the relatively uniform acceptance of the 3-year graduate program as the first professional degree in law in the 1960's, a number of law faculty and administrators argued for a national consensus confirming the three-year graduate program and changing the first professional degree from an LL.B. to the J.D. (Doctor of Law). The debate among law faculty and the process through which change occurred offers an historical reference which may be useful to architecture faculty and academics seeking to reconcile the current diversity of professional architecture programs with the 1991 Declaration of the Five Presidents. The Declaration states that architecture would "be best served, if by January 1, 2001, there should be only one designation for the professional degree in architecture offered by all the schools in North America." This paper reviews historic discussion regarding the change from the LL.B. to the J.D.; considers the history and context of the professional architectural degrees; and addresses the possibility of architecture schools achieving a single professional degree by 2001.

LL.B. (BACHELOR OF LAWS) TO J.D. (JURIS DOCTOR)

In 1906 the Committee on Legal Education of the ABA recommended the adoption of a resolution favoring the J.D. degree for those "who have previously obtained a degree in arts or sciences (Hervey 1964,537)." The University of Chicago had begun awarding the J.D. to graduates of its post-baccalaureate program in law. Other universities adopted the graduate program but retained the bachelor's degree. This anomaly persisted until the 1906 resolution was finally reiterated in 1964 by the ABA's Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar which stated:

(1) that the lack of uniformity in nomenclature was confusing to the public and (2) that the J.D. terminology more accurately described the relevant academic accomplishment at approved law schools. The Section, therefore, recommended that such schools confer the degree of Juris Doctor (J.D.) . . . on those students who successfully complete the program leading to the first professional degree in law (deCapriles 1967, 54).

By 1967, nearly half the law schools had complied with the 1964 ABA resolution; a number of law faculty and administrators continued the debate (deCapriles 1967, 54). Within the next five years, the J.D. emerged as the single, first professional degree in law and today the J.D. is the first professional degree in all of the 178 ABA approved programs. As the length of time between the 1906 and 1964 resolutions and complete compliance would suggest, years of discussion and debate preceded the final emergence of the J.D. Aspects of that historic discussion among law faculty advocating and opposing the change from LL.B. to J.D. parallel concerns raised today by architecture faculty with regard to the possibility of a single professional degree designation in architecture.

George P. Smith II, then assistant dean at SUNY Buffalo's School of Law, for example, believed that the effort to raise standards was laudable, but admonished schools "seeking to gain 'instant status' by merely changing the wording of the law degree(1967,18)." Smith argued for strengthening law schools

by acquiring good, productive full-time faculties, by placing greater emphasis upon the realization of lawyer-skills through legal education and the development of more effective teaching techniques, by maintaining an up-to-date curricula, by phasing out part-time, evening law schools, by keeping better research libraries, by setting higher admission standards for some of the less prominent schools and requiring complete certification of law schools by the Association of American Law Schools (1967,18).

Similarly, Charles Alan Wright, the McCormick Professor of Law at the University of Texas complained that the J.D. “has had its greatest success among the weakest law schools,” who he believed used the new degree to “achieve a status they have not earned through the strength of their accomplishments (1967,19).”

An even-handed review of discussion of the proposed change from LL.B. to J.D. occupies the opening of Marcus Schoenfeld’s article for the *Cleveland-Marshall Law Review*. An instructor at Cleveland-Marshall Law School and a doctoral candidate at New York University, Schoenfeld examined the issues he felt relevant to decision-making. Schoenfeld first traced the history of baccalaureate degrees to apprenticeships in a specialty, such as law, medicine or theology. After reviewing the history of the LL.B., and a survey of his contemporaries’ arguments for and against the J.D., Schoenfeld contended that discussion should be rooted in one question, “What is the appropriate title for the first professional degree (1963,575)?”

Schoenfeld likened the legal profession to medicine and dentistry which award the M.D. and D.D.S. respectively as their first professional degrees. After distinguishing the first professional degree program in law from research master’s programs in the humanities and sciences which are typically one or two years in duration, Schoenfeld explained that “the first degree in law should be a Doctorate simply because the very high level of achievement over three years is not sufficiently rewarded by a Mastership (1963,579).”

In reviewing the discussion from the 1900’s through the 1930’s to the debate of his own colleagues in the 1960’s, Schoenfeld found that although proponents of the LL.B. often argued in favor of tradition, no current faculty promoted the study of law as an undergraduate curriculum. Given the consensus that had evolved over the previous sixty years on law as a post-baccalaureate program, Schoenfeld characterized the LL.B. vs. J.D. debate as “essentially one of semantics (1963,579).”

While Schoenfeld took a scholarly approach, John Hervey, then dean of Oklahoma City University’s School of Law, discussed the implications for law schools within the university and beyond to the professional world. Hervey maintained that the LL.B. “tends to impair the image of the legal profession. It also lessens the image of the law school in the minds of those who instruct in the other divisions of the parent institution.” Hervey predicted that “conferral of the J.D. as the first professional degree in law would eliminate the existing confusion among the schools” since “there is no uniformity among the law schools as to the name of the first professional degree in law.” Looking at the nomenclature of degrees from other professions and believing the three year post-baccalaureate program in law to be comparable to programs in medicine or dentistry, Hervey asserted that the J.D. “fixes . . . professional rank among colleagues. (1967,56)”

In *The Journal of the Oklahoma Bar Association*, Hervey speculated that “the J.D. degree would induce university presidents and boards of control to think of their law schools

as graduate or professional divisions and equate them with medical schools (1964,535).” Hervey responded to what he listed as his opponents’ concerns, including the idea that “the J.D. will discourage research degrees in law,” with the example of the University of Chicago Law School which, in 1900, was the first to require a baccalaureate degree for admission and to award the J.D. Hervey found Chicago’s J.D.s no less likely to pursue graduate studies than LL.B.s and noted that comparable research degrees in other professional disciplines such as dentistry and medicine were masters’ degree programs (1964,536).

Miguel deCapriles, then dean of the New York University Law School, cautioned proponents of the J.D. that

it would be unwise to underestimate the influence of the leading schools who may decide to stand pat on the LL.B. partly for reasons of tradition, but possibly also because of a bit of reverse snobbery—the sort of attitude that suggests “my bachelor’s degree is better than your doctorate (1967,54).”

Dean deCapriles concluded that the movement to the J.D. would gain momentum and raised the issue that alumni with LL.B.s would likely seek retroactive application of the J.D. (1967,60).

Although by the early 1960’s the structure and organization of legal education had evolved to a relatively consistent three years of graduate level work, protest against the J.D., a change which both proponents and opponents labeled semantic, persisted. Eventually the number of schools offering the J.D. produced a groundswell strong enough to withstand the vocal and in some instances derisive opposition as well as the resistance of what law faculty termed the “leading” institutions. As the benefits of joining the ranks of the professional schools convinced students, faculty and alumni, many of whom sought retroactive degrees, the J.D. prevailed.

The precedent of the shift from the LL.B. to the J.D. illuminates the manner in which academic controversy stalls movement for years, even when the change is nominal. The J.D. may or may not be responsible for the clarity of law’s professional status, its parity with medicine, or its preeminent position in many universities and in the professional world. The *Occupational Outlook Handbook* of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for example, lists starting salaries for law graduates in 1993 averaging \$37,000, with some starting salaries at \$80,000 (Fullerton 1996,9). Despite an elite status, law school has become more inclusive; the participation of women has grown from 4% of the student body in 1967 to 43% in 1995 (ABA,1995,67). There obviously are many factors which account for the ascendancy of the legal profession and no study examines the status of the profession before and after the adoption of the J.D. to determine the effect of the degree. What can be seen, however is that most of the predictions put forward by J.D. proponents have become reality, while the concerns of the opponents seem insignificant in retrospect.

THE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE IN ARCHITECTURE

Architecture has a very different starting point, but the aspirations of practitioners to be on a more equal footing with colleagues in other professions echo Dean Hervey's comments thirty years ago. Academics in architecture who have labored through graduate degrees, three-year internships and professional licensing exams, and are rankled by an academic hierarchy which sees only the designation of "Dr.," echo Hervey's aspiration for an equal footing on campus through a more equal recognition of professional degrees. Unlike the law faculty of thirty years ago, however, architecture has maintained its undergraduate degree programs not only in name but in actuality.

The three-year first professional M.Arch. programs are similar in structure to the three-year J.D. programs, but the B.Arch. is still the dominant degree enrolling almost 80% of the total student body. A review of three reports on architecture education reveals the significant role of the B.Arch. in education, internships, and in perceptions of the professions, both within and beyond the university.

Bosworth & Jones (1932)

In 1930-31, Francke Huntington Bosworth and Roy Childs Jones, at the behest of the ACSA, set out on personal visits to 49 of the 52 "institutions of collegiate rank in the United States offering organized professional courses in architecture leading to an academic degree (1932,3)." They found five consistent areas of curriculum: drawing, graphics, construction, history, and design (1932,5). Bosworth and Jones examined the content of architecture courses and discussed the diversity of instruction. The Society of Beaux-Arts Architects in New York emerged as a potential unifying force in architecture education since many faculty used the programs developed by the society. In the 1928-29 school year, for example, 2,146 or "about 35% of the total school student body," participated in the society's competitions. Bosworth and Jones credited the society's significant influence on architectural education through the competition programs, as well as the influence of French critics such as Paul Cret with elevating design "and with it, the problem system, from the lowly position it occupied in the old catalogue of 1872 to the dominating position that it occupies today (1932,9)."

Any unifying force in design, however, was quickly dissipated in the variety of degrees and even requirements for similarly titled degrees. Bosworth and Jones cited the numerous degrees and requirements, concluding

As representing approximately the same training the degrees have little meaning. Logic or reasonableness has nothing to do with them. Any attempt to "reform" them immediately runs afoul of every variety of snags in the form of long-established academic tradition in this, that, or the other university. The whole question

perhaps is best summed up in a letter by Professor Hudnut of Columbia, who pointed out that after all it didn't make such a tremendous difference what a graduate called himself. The important matter was what he produced. "If the Yale boys wanted to call themselves Bachelors of Fine Arts, and the Harvard boys wanted to call themselves Masters of Architecture," it was a harmless matter which would have little bearing on how proficient they were when they got out of school (1932,95).

The gentlemen to whom Professor Hudnut referred may not have needed the professional certification of their degrees, but as the community of architects grew, the issue of the degree persisted.

Turpin Bannister (1954)

In 1949, Ralph Walker, president of the AIA, commissioned a survey on the education and registration of architects. Turpin Bannister, then the former head of the Department of Architecture at the University of Illinois edited the report, compiled by a committee of academics, practitioners, and registration board members. The introduction to the report describes the need for "professionally educated rather than technically trained candidates (1954,xix)." A study of the 1944-48 candidates for the registration exam in a selected state revealed a first-try pass rate of 42% for 5-year degree holders and 70% for 7.5-year degree holders (Bannister 1954,390). The committee did not address the difference in undergraduate and graduate pass rates but focused instead on the pass rates of graduates vs. non-graduates in an effort to consider requiring graduation from an accredited program as prerequisite to the registration exam.

In spite of the committee's initial distinction of professional education from technical training and its recommendation R-42 which asks the AIA to "recognize officially the paramount contribution to the advancement of architectural research and the increased competence of the profession which a comprehensive program of graduate studies could provide (Bannister 1954,449)," the committee went on to propose admitting students to professional degree programs after their third year of high school. "R-14: Shortened Education and Training for Selected Candidates," recommends

that The AIA urge NAAB, ACSA, and NCARB to join in a study of a proposal to: admit selected students to professional curricula after the completion of the third year of secondary school; screen all professional students at the end of the second year of architectural curricula; provide a year of terminal training for those judged unsuitable to full professional education; intensify the upper three years of professional education; and reduce candidate training for such graduates to two years (Bannister 1954,445).

Perhaps the high proportion of faculty with 5-year degrees

influenced the thinking of the committee. The 1950 survey, for example, found that 86% of the faculty held a first degree in architecture, while 54.7% of the practitioners were first degree in architecture holders (Bannister 1954,240). The abbreviated entry-level education requirements, however, were also part of an effort to move students more effectively into the profession for clinical training. Edwin Sharp Burdell, the committee chair, stated that

the vast new know-how of technology is beyond the compass of any five-year program. Just as the hospital provides internships for the medical graduate, the minor courts for the law graduate, the social agencies reality for the social worker, so the architects collectively through their national and local organization and individually through private office practice must replenish the architectural profession to assure meeting twentieth-century needs (Bannister 1954, xix).

The Bannister report underscored the role of the undergraduate degree and the post-graduate internship in shaping the profession. The relationship of these two aspects of architecture education is significant today, but information needed to study the relationship is difficult to obtain. NCARB, for example, does not collate data which compare B.Arch. and M.Arch. pass rates.

Boyer & Mitgang (1996)

The Boyer and Mitgang Report of 1996 portrays architecture schools as isolated from their own institutions, “strangers in their own settings (145),” disengaged from the civic realm, (130) and with regard to the profession, the report states that “relations between the world of architecture education and practice have sunk to an all-time low (1996,109).” Boyer and Mitgang’s seven goals address the problems they identify by promoting ideals such as greater unity within the curriculum, among the schools, and with the profession, but the report does not distinguish between undergraduate and graduate programs which limits the ability to specify remedial action.

Although the role of the B.Arch. is not itemized in Boyer and Mitgang, a number of the recommendations, such as the liberalization of the curriculum, are only pertinent to undergraduate education. The dominance of corrective suggestions aimed at undergraduate programs may relate to the sheer number of students enrolled. B.Arch. programs constitute about 56% of the professional degree programs, but student enrollment in B.Arch. programs accounts for almost 80% of the total professional student body (NAAB 1995). The architecture schools discussed in numerous recent studies, particularly with regard to the role of women and minorities may be viewed as a largely undergraduate experience.

While the academic and professional legacy of the undergraduate degree has not been studied, the effects of B.Arch. methods of instruction have been examined recently. From an individual perspective, Laura L. Willenbrock’s essay, “An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education” de-

scribes her own experience as a student in a five-year program during which she attempts to seek out greater intellectual opportunities but finds herself reined in by the hierarchy of the program’s structure (1991, 98-118). Linda Groat and Sherry Ahrentzen (1996,166), take a broader look at architectural education through a significant study of six schools and 650 students. Groat and Ahrentzen sought to “investigate the ways in which both the content and form of architectural education might impede or support the progress of female and minority students (1996,166).” The distinction between the undergraduate and graduate experience was not the focus of the study, although Groat and Ahrentzen noted that among the M.Arch. programs a “relatively high degree of commonality in the pedagogical milieu” emerged (1996,169). They found that the B.Arch. programs, on the other hand, appeared to be more focused “toward particular professional constituencies,” such as “one or the other of the social, environmental, technical, or client-based curricular emphases (1996,169-70).” Groat and Ahrentzen noted the need for further research in this area.

Beyond academic experience is professional internship which was flagged in the 1954 Bannister report as a solution to the acquisition of technological knowledge. Today, most B.Arch. alumni enter internship programs at 22 or 23 years old, an age at which their colleagues in medicine or law are just beginning their professional education. B.Arch. graduates, however are expected to perform as fully engaged professionals. The numerical dominance of the B.Arch. graduates once again suggests that it is their experience which becomes the norm, which in the case of internship is not positive.

Boyer and Mitgang note that “by all accounts, internship is perhaps the most troubled phase of the continuing education of architects (1996,115).” Deborah K. Dietsch in the August 1996 issue of *Architecture* on “Architecture Education” noted in her editorial that the internship program is “broken, and no one seems prepared to fix it (15).” Architects and interns alike complain of the ineffectual role of the IDP program. Architects most commonly decry the young graduates’ inability to produce construction documents accurately and swiftly, or the lack of technological expertise, while graduates find themselves unhappily limited to a single repetitive task with little opportunity to experience the full range of professional responsibility. In spite of the nearly unanimous criticism of the internship process, the possibility of a single professional degree which includes technological, professional expertise and eliminates the internship is not discussed as a solution.

Instead, proposals from the profession to solve the internship and licensure preparation challenges discuss the need for an architectural equivalent to the large teaching hospitals which provide well-rounded internships to physicians (Dietsch 1995,15). University hospitals rely on federal, state and local subsidies in order to admit a large enough patient population to make it possible for medical interns to experience a full range of medical practice. Unlike medicine,

however, architecture is not practiced collectively in institutions which are funded by large pools of resources such as the taxes of citizenry or the premiums and reserves of insurance companies. Like the modern legal practice, architecture practice is independent and often specialized. The opportunities for fledgling professionals are defined by project budgets typically financed by individual, private clients.

While architecture professionals, due to the small numbers and the nature of practice, are unlikely to form institutions for the benefit of training young professionals, the closest model architecture schools offer to the teaching hospital is the university-based community design centers whose presence across the country suggests the number of constituencies in need of assistance. The inevitable conflict arises, however, when faculty and students compete with local architects, often their own alumni, in providing professional services. Even if it were possible, however, for universities to overcome the current obstacles and offer a practice-based internship, the undergraduate curricula could not absorb additional professional curricula without further compromising the meager offerings in other disciplines. The call for greater professionalization contradicts the simultaneous call directed at the undergraduate programs for greater liberalization of curricula.

While many voices note problems in the study and practice of architecture, few institutionally endorsed proposals for fundamental change emerge. The Declaration of the Five Presidents could have been such a proposal. The declaration attempted to accomplish what Bosworth and Jones thought impossible in 1932. John Meunier, in 1990, then ACSA president, initiated the action when he appointed a Doctor of Architecture Task Force, "charged with ensuring a well-informed debate about the potential of a Doctorate in Architecture as the professional degree." The Task Force led to the "Declaration of the Five Presidents of ACSA, AIA, AIAS, NAAB and NCARB," signed in June of 1991 which stated that architecture would "be best served, if by January 1, 2001, there should be only one designation for the professional degree in architecture offered by all the schools in North America."

The declaration did not address what that degree would be and included the caveat "that, although this single degree would include the fulfillment of all the basic requirements for accreditation, the needs of the various constituencies served by architectural education will be best met by a diversity of program structures leading to that degree." The five presidents also stated their "intent to establish a single Coordinating Task Force, composed of the presidents and presidents-elect from each organization . . . to continue the examination of the relevant issues pertinent to a single designation of the professional degree in architecture." The presidential task force has met over the last five years and addressed a number of other issues, but the topic of the single professional degree has not re-emerged clearly. The declaration, however, provoked immediate and extensive reaction among the ACSA member schools. The five presidents,

actually ten including the presidents-elect of the five organizations, listed the factors influencing the advocacy for one professional degree designation which included

public confusion and misunderstanding about the proliferation of pre-professional, professional, and post-professional degree titles, public and institutional misunderstanding of the quality and range of education necessary to fulfill degree requirements for a professional degree in architecture, growing demand for reciprocation of professional qualifications

as well as the evolving nature of practice. Opponents of the declaration did not argue the validity of those factors, but instead focused on the threat the declaration posed to existing programs. Since M.Arch. programs would be unlikely to revert to undergraduate status, the declaration posed the demise of the B.Arch. Architecture faculty spoke for the importance of preserving the undergraduate degree option and the potentially anti-democratic result of graduate programs which take an extra year or two, thus costing the student more and possibly compromising student diversity. These were also the arguments raised in the Bannister report against requiring accredited degrees for licensing (1954, 402). In a number of states, both law and architecture, however, still allow candidates with work experience to qualify for professional licensing exams (ABA 1996) (NCARB 1995). Discussion of the declaration was inhibited by the degree to which architecture education is enmeshed in undergraduate curricula

The ACSA Board of Directors in concert with and in response to the furor subsequently issued a "Resolution of the Board" which expressed "support of the core propositions of the Five Presidents' Declaration," with regard to the "long-term move towards a single professional degree designation," and "support of programmatic diversity with the basic requirements for accreditation." The resolution noted that while the "board does not ratify the declaration in its full form and specific content," it recognized "the need for a more focused and structured discussion among the membership of ACSA of the merits and difficulties of a move towards a single professional degree designation," and emphasized "its concern for the different needs and circumstances of all member schools and its commitment to avoid any position that will adversely affect the ongoing educational mission of any school." That statement appears to freeze any possibility of significant, remedial action.

The Five Presidents' Declaration called for one professional degree without specifying a degree or a path in order to allow for diversity. The plethora of diversity, subsequently endorsed by the ACSA, however, causes the confusion which the declaration sought to address. The transformation from LL.B. to J.D. illustrates that even with relatively uniform programs, achieving a single nomenclature is a lengthy and divisive process. The silence and inaction which has followed the declaration suggests the beginning of architecture's sixty-year journey.

If law schools are an example, then without a specific degree mandate from any of the five architecture organizations, individual schools will set the course. Martin Harms, dean of Texas Tech, startled the architectural academic community when he received approval from NAAB to award a master's degree at the end of a five-year program, an action which has incited a number of five-year programs to believe that they must follow suit to maintain marketability. Similar to the law faculty thirty years ago, critics of this action argued against its affront to the tradition of the five-year bachelor's degree, while graduate faculties argued against the legitimacy of the award of a master's degree for a single additional year. Regardless of its legitimacy, the elevation of the fifth year to graduate status does not solve the larger concerns of what constitutes an appropriate first professional degree program and its degree designation, or the parity of the first professional architecture degree with degrees in other professions.

Although it took sixty-four years, the University of Chicago determined the future of legal education when it initiated the requirement of an undergraduate degree for admission to the study of law and awarded its graduates the J.D. The equivalent action in architecture might occur in the Pacific where

The University of Hawaii at Manoa is planning to replace its professional bachelor's and master's programs with a single, six-to-seven-year Doctor of Architecture program. The new program aims to provide more integration of academic and professional content, allow students to take the licensing exam sooner and with better prospects of passing it, and give students more opportunities to interact with other disciplines on campus (Boyer and Mitgang 1996.83).

Beyond the university, the demand for parity with other professions and the evidence of history in other professions argues for a consistent method of education with a single first professional degree, such as the three-year post-graduate degree, the A.D. (*Architecturae Doctor*). If architecture schools maintain admission standards which require specific preliminary course work, as do all medical schools and some law schools, the three-year curriculum can be professionalized to the extent that the registration exam could be administered upon graduation, just as the bar and medical exams. The internship program would be subsumed into the A.D. program. Liberal curricula would be the province of undergraduate education.

The 3-year M.Arch. programs are structured to make the easiest transition to an A.D. The 3-year M.Arch. is already the most selective first professional degree with a national average acceptance rate of 4 applicants for each place, compared to 3 applicants for each 2-year M.Arch. and 2.5 applicants for each B.Arch. place (NAAB 1995). Achieving curricular consensus among the programs and professional organizations and designing a model to institute or eliminate the internship offer the greater challenges. More than half of

the architecture programs today, however, are B.Arch. programs engaging almost 67% of the faculty, and they face radical change in order to meet the quest for one professional degree.

While an honors program, such as those in law and medicine which accept high school graduates into a 3-year baccalaureate program and guarantee admission to the graduate professional program, would allow a student to achieve an A.D. within 6 years, undergraduate faculty must still address the curricula of a newly constituted professional, graduate degree. At the same time, the current 4-year pre-professional degrees would no longer lead to a one- or two-year program, thereby creating an opportunity to design a new undergraduate liberal arts degree with an architecture major. A more liberal program of study would address the Boyer and Mitgang aim of making connections within the university "between architecture and other disciplines (1996.85)." Educating clients may be the new undergraduate frontier.

Although such change may be best for the profession and the university, it is unlikely that the benefits will be easily appreciated. What is ultimately best for students and professionals may not immediately satisfy the pressing survival questions of faculty enmeshed in current programs. Regardless of the radical chic design styles which sweep the academic landscape, the structure and method of architecture education has remained constant for generations. If the LL.B. to J.D. process is instructive, architects can expect decades of argument while a few schools move forward on an individual basis. Eventually the pressures of students seeking parity with other graduates, faculty seeking parity among university colleagues, and alumni seeking to have their B.Arch. 3-year internships, and registration qualify them for retroactive A.D.s will push the movement to consensus and architects will have a single professional graduate degree.

The opportunities of an A.D. to reconfigure professional education in architecture are significant, but the opposition has familiarity on its side. Ten years ago, the Jubilee issue of the *Journal of Architectural Education* presented the thoughts of a diverse group of scholars and professionals on the state of architecture and education. The mystical, cynical, poetic, and prescriptive mingled to create the impression of an academy fragments. If myth is truth told poetically, then perhaps a consideration of Daedalus, the mythical first architect, is prudent. He had wings, but unlike Icarus, Daedalus knew his relationship to the ground. It may be that a single, doctoral designation for professional graduate studies in architecture will establish a solid, level, and powerful ground from which architects can once again spring to perform aerial feats.

REFERENCES

- ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. 1996. *A Review of Legal Education*: Fall 1995. Chicago: ABA

- Bannister, Turpin C., editor. 1954. *The Architect at Mid-Century: Evolution and Achievement*. Vol. 1 of The Report of the Commission for the Survey of Education and Registration of the American Institute of Architects. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation.
- Bell, David H. 1987. *Journal of Architectural Education* 40 (Jubilee 2).
- Bosworth, F.H. Jr. and Roy Childs Jones. 1932. *A Study of Architectural Schools*. Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture by Charles Scribner's Sons: New York.
- Boyer, Ernest L. and Lee D. Mitgang. 1996. *Building Community: A New Future for Architecture Education and Practice*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- deCapriles, Miguel. 1967. "The Escalating Battle of the Degrees: Should it be Bachelor of Laws or Juris Doctor?," *American TRIAL Lawyer*. June/July: 54-60.
- Dietsch, Deborah K. 1996. "Build a Better Internship." *Architecture*, August:15.
- Fullerton, Howard N., Jr. 1996. Lawyers and Judges. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook Home Page. [Http://stats.bls.gov/oco/ocos053.htm](http://stats.bls.gov/oco/ocos053.htm)
- Groat, Linda N. and Sherry Ahrentzen. 1996. "Reconceptualizing Architectural Education for a More Diverse Future: Perceptions and Visions of Architectural Students." *Journal of Architectural Education* 49, no.3 (February): 166-183.
- Hervey, John G. 1964. "Time for a Change- The J.D. vsrsus the LL.B. as the First Professional Degree in Law." *The Journal*. Oklahoma Bar Association. Volume 35, March 28:533-537.
1967. "Evaluate J.D. Degree on Merit," *American TRIAL Lawyer*. June/July: 56.
- NAAB. 1995. Annual Reports. Statistical Information.
- NCARB. 1996 Member Board Requirements.
- Schoenfeld, Marcus. 1963. "J.D. or LL.B as the Basic Law Degree," *Cleveland-Marshall Law Review*. Vol. 4. 573-579.
- Smith, George P., II. 1967. "J.D. Only Instant Status Symbol," *TRIAL Magazine*. August/September: 18-19.
- Willenbrock, Laura L. 1991. "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education." in *Voices in Architectural Education: Cultural Politics and Pedagogy*. edited by Thomas A. Dutton. *Critical Studies in Education and Culture* Series. Vol. 65, edited by Henry A. Giroux and Paulo Freire. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Wright, Charles Alan. 1967. "Let's Keep the LL.B.," *TRIAL Magazine*. August/September: 19.