

Washington University Law Review

Volume 19 | Issue 2

1934

Editorial Notes

The Editors

Follow this and additional works at: http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

The Editors, *Editorial Notes*, 19 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 132 (1934).

Available at: http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol19/iss2/4

This Editorial Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

ST. LOUIS LAW REVIEW

Edited by the Undergraduates of Washington University School of Law,
St. Louis. Published in December, February, April, and June at
115 East Fifth Street, Fulton, Missouri.

Subscription Price \$2.00 per Annum. Seventy-five Cents per Copy.

A subscriber desiring to discontinue his subscription should send notice to
that effect. Otherwise it will be continued.

STAFF

HARRY WILLMER JONES, *Editor-in-Chief*

NORMAN PARKER, *Associate Editor*

LON HOCKER, JR., *Business Manager*

JOHN E. CURBY

HERMAN GORALNIK

EVELYN HONIGBERG

ROBERT MAYSACK

SIDNEY MURPHY

CHRISTIAN B. PEPER

PHILIP RASHBAUM

HYMAN A. WALTUCH

RALPH F. FUCHS, *Faculty Adviser*

ISRAEL TREIMAN, *Faculty Adviser*

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

WALTER D. COLES
FRANKLIN FERRISS

CHARLES NAGEL

JAMES A. SEDDON
THEODORE RASSIEUR

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

R. W. CHUBB, *Chairman*

R. L. ARONSON

F. P. ASCHMEYER

G. A. BUDER, JR.

R. S. BULL

J. M. DOUGLAS

S. ELSON

J. J. GRAVELY

A. M. HOENNY

J. M. HOLMES

H. W. KROEGER

R. H. MCROBERTS

D. L. MILLAR

C. H. LUECKING, *Secretary*

M. OPPENHEIMER

R. R. NEUHOFF

R. B. SNOW

K. P. SPENCER

M. R. STAHL

M. L. STEWART

Editorial Notes

CONTRIBUTOR TO THIS ISSUE

ISRAEL TREIMAN, A.B., Washington University, 1921; M.A., 1922; LL.B., 1924; Ph.D. in Jurisprudence, Oxford University, 1927, who contributes *An Analysis of the Statistical Data on Receivership Suits Filed in the St. Louis Circuit Court 1925-1932 Inclusive*, is Assistant Professor of Law at Washington University. He is the author of *Escaping the*

Creditor in the Middle Ages, Law Quarterly Review, April, 1927, and *The Law and the Insolvent Debtor* (1927) 12 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 189.

THE SCHOOL OF LAW AND THE ST. LOUIS RECEIVERSHIP SURVEY

The report of the Receivership Survey Committee of the St. Louis Bar Association, made public February 20, 1934, has been welcomed by lawyers and by business men generally, as an earnest effort on the part of the Bar Association to clear the clouded factual atmosphere surrounding a branch of the law which has long been the subject of controversy in St. Louis—receivership practice in the St. Louis Circuit Courts. Consequently, it was considered appropriate that this issue of the ST. LOUIS LAW REVIEW be devoted, primarily, to consideration of receivership law—theory and practice.

The School of Law of Washington University has been intimately associated with the Receivership Survey since its inception. Assistant Professor Israel Treiman planned and directed the activities of the fact-gatherers whose findings constituted the basis for the general report of the Receivership Survey Committee. Joseph H. Grand, Daniel Bartlett, and John Gilmore, graduates of the School of Law, were members of the Bar Association Committee. The work of collecting the facts was done mainly by C. S. Cullenbine and David Campbell, graduates of the School of Law, assisted by Herbert K. Moss, Lewis Sigler, Sylvia Carafiol, and Elizabeth Kausch, all students or graduates of the School of Law.

The School of Law has welcomed the opportunity of cooperating with the Bar Association in an investigation which should have a considerable practical effect as a basis for reforms in receivership practice in St. Louis and in the State of Missouri.

Notes

FOUNDATIONS FOR RECEIVERSHIP IN MISSOURI

The appointment of a receiver is primarily a mode of action by the Equity court, rather than a benefit to be given to either of the litigants. The nature of a receiver is adequately defined by the United States Supreme Court in *Booth v. Clark*:¹

¹ (1854) 17 How. 322, l. c. 331; see *Crawford v. Ross* (1869) 39 Ga. 44; *Beverly v. Brooks* (1847) 4 Gratt. (Va.) 187.