

## **Tribute**

# **JUSTICE STANLEY G. FELDMAN**

## **Introduction**

**Joel Seligman**

Stanley Feldman, class of 1956, is one of the few judges or justices I have met who is regularly referred to by his first name. This does not reflect disrespect for his position on the Arizona Supreme Court so much as it is a measure of the impact Stanley has made on the legal profession and this Law School throughout his illustrious career. Virtually the first day I arrived in Arizona, Stanley offered to help this school in any appropriate way he could. He has frequently spoken to our students. He has been an unstinting supporter of our faculty.

On behalf of the *Arizona Law Review*, we dedicate this issue to Stanley in recognition of his fifteen years as a Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, including the last five years as Chief Justice. The position of Chief Justice in this and other states is occasionally controversial and involves a fair amount of administrative and supervisory work. We wanted, however, to particularly recognize Stanley's contributions to the law of this state. As a Justice, Stanley has made an extraordinary impact on the development of state law both here and beyond the borders of Arizona. Long after Stanley retires from the Court his opinions will endure as monuments to his scholarship and his devotion to the rule of law.

When I think of Stanley I also think of his wife Norma. He so often refers to her and reflects the great love that he feels for this extraordinary woman. The two of them have been blessed with careers that are a wonderful inspiration to all who have come to know and admire Stanley and to law students who have had the opportunity to hear and meet him.

I admire two things about Stanley in particular. If he has been controversial, it has always been because of his deep commitment to principle—his unwillingness to compromise what he believes is the appropriate scope and application of the law. Ours is a profession which not only tolerates but encourages honest differences of opinion. Whatever one feels about Stanley's positions, one cannot help but admire the depth of his integrity and his consistency.

I also deeply respect Stanley's willingness to consider other points of view. He

is a Chief Justice who never became fixed in his ways, who never thought he had all the answers, who never believed the old ways are inevitably the best. Under his administration the Court has adopted a number of innovations which have made it a pathbreaker in judicial developments with respect to procedure, the jury, and televising trials. Whether all of these innovations will ultimately prove to be enduring is not yet certain. But the law advances because of the willingness of men and women like Stanley to ask: *How can I bring us closer to the ideal of justice?*