

The Doctor in Court - Expert Medical Testimony: A Symposium

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr>

Recommended Citation

The Doctor in Court - Expert Medical Testimony: A Symposium, 13 Md. L. Rev. 283 (1953)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/mlr/vol13/iss4/1>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maryland Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Maryland Law Review

VOLUME XIII

FALL, 1953

NUMBER 4

THE DOCTOR IN COURT — EXPERT MEDICAL TESTIMONY A SYMPOSIUM

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

Late in 1951, the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland (the State medical society), in conjunction with the Baltimore City Medical Society and the Maryland State and Baltimore City Bar Associations, held a symposium on "The Doctor in Court — Expert Medical Testimony". Dr. Walter D. Wise, the President of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty, acted as Moderator, and the following gentlemen, each eminently qualified in the field of his subject, whose papers are here published in the order in which they were given, served as the Panel: Robert E. Coughlan, Jr., Esq., Dr. T. Conrad Wolff, Dr. George O. Eaton, Dr. Manfred S. Guttmacher, and Chief Judge W. Conwell Smith of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City. After the presentation of the formal papers, here published, there was also a question and answer period.

The REVIEW notes with great regret the death of Dr. Wolff on August 25th, 1953.

The transcript of the five addresses was made available to the REVIEW, and they have been prepared for publication, with the generous assistance of the members of the panel. Since the subject is of such timely interest, the REVIEW felt that the publication of the five addresses would be of great benefit to the many busy doctors and lawyers who were

unable to attend the symposium in person. Many of the suggestions and criticisms made cannot help but be challenging to the members of both professions, and certainly should lead to a better understanding of the problems of each. The REVIEW feels privileged to publish this material.