



6-1-1981

# Role of Attorneys and Accountants in Corporate Governance

Notre Dame Law Review Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Notre Dame Law Review Editors, *Role of Attorneys and Accountants in Corporate Governance*, 56 Notre Dame L. Rev. 947 (1981).  
Available at: <http://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ndlr/vol56/iss5/14>

This Bibliography is brought to you for free and open access by NDLScholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Notre Dame Law Review by an authorized administrator of NDLScholarship. For more information, please contact [lawdr@nd.edu](mailto:lawdr@nd.edu).

## V. Selected Bibliography

### The Role of Attorneys and Accountants in Corporate Governance\*

#### I. Attorneys

##### A. *The Corporate Attorney—Generally*

- Briloff, *The Corporate Society: We are in Pari Dilecto*, 1 J. CORP. L. 457 (1976).
- Cantrall, *Pitfalls in Basic Corporate Practice and How to Avoid Them—Part I*, 11 PRAC. LAW. 7 (Dec. 1965).
- Cohen, Wheat & Henderson, *Professional Responsibility—The Corporate Bar*, 4 INST. SEC. REG. 181 (1973).
- Ferren, *The Corporate Lawyer's Obligation to the Public Interest*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1253 (1978).
- Frank, *Higher Duty: A New Look at the Ethics of the Corporate Lawyer*, 26 CLEV. ST. L. REV. 337 (1977).
- Hall, *Recent Developments in Professional Liability Affecting Corporate Environmental Lawyers*, 36 BUS. LAW. 461 (1981).
- Maupir, *Environmental Law, The Corporate Lawyer and the Model Rules of Professional Conduct*, 36 BUS. LAW. 431 (1981).
- Panel Discussion, *The Corporate Conscience and The Corporate Bar*, 26 BUS. LAW. 959 (1971).
- Panel Discussion, *The Murky Divide: Professionalism and Professional Responsibility, Business Judgment and Legal Advice—What is a Business Lawyer?* 31 BUS. LAW. 457 (1975).
- Phillips, *Pitfalls in Basic Corporate Practice and How to Avoid Them—Part II*, 12 PRAC. LAW. 51 (Jan. 1966).
- Proceedings, The Airlie House Conference, *Ethical Responsibilities of Corporate Lawyers*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1173 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1978).
- Proceedings, ABA National Institute, Advisors to Management, *Responsibilities and Liabilities of Lawyers and Accountants*, 30 BUS. LAW. 1 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1975).
- Sonde, *Professional Responsibility—A New Religion or the Old Time Gospel?*, 24 EMORY L.J. 827 (1975).
- Taylor, *The Role of Corporate Counsel*, 32 RUTGERS L. REV. 237 (1979).
- Williams, *Corporate Accountability and The Lawyer's Role*, 34 BUS. LAW. 7 (1978).
- Williams, *Professionalism and the Corporate Bar*, 36 BUS. LAW. 159 (1980).

##### B. *The Corporate Attorney—Inside Counsel*

- Davis, *Reflections of a Kept Lawyer*, 53 A.B.A. J. 349 (1967).
- Driver, *The Inside General Counsel's Response to Auditors' Inquiries*, 30 BUS. LAW. 217 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1975).

---

\* This bibliography includes materials published between January 1965 and June 1981.

- Ferrara & Steinberg, *The Role of Inside Counsel in the Corporate Accountability Process*, 4 CORP. L. REV. 3 (1980).
- Forrow, *Special Problems of Inside Counsel for Industrial Companies*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1453 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1978).
- Hersman, *Special Problems of Inside Counsel for Financial Institutions*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1435 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1978).
- Maurer, *Ethical and Legal Problems of the Corporate Counsel in the Rendering of Personal Advice to Company Officers and Employees*, 21 BUS. LAW. 817 (1966).
- Rast, *What the Chief Executive Looks for in His Corporate Law Department*, 33 BUS. LAW. 811 (1978).
- Ruder, *A Suggestion for Increased Use of Corporate Law Departments in Modern Corporations*, 23 BUS. LAW. 341 (1968).
- Weber, *Business Decisions: Boundary Line Between the Executive and Corporate Counsel?*, 5 AM. BUS. L.J. 155 (1967).

### C. *The Corporate Attorney—Securities Law*

- Cheek, *Potential Liability of Counsel Named in a Prospectus*, 5 SEC. L. REV. 203 (1973).
- Cheek, *Professional Responsibility and Self-regulation of the Securities Lawyer*, 32 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 597 (1975).
- Cohen, *The Lawyer's Role in Securities Regulation*, 24 BUS. LAW. 305 (1968).
- Daley & Karmel, *Attorneys' Responsibilities: Adversaries at the Bar of the SEC*, 24 EMORY L.J. 747 (1975).
- Doty, *Application of the Anti-fraud Provisions of the Federal Securities Laws to Exempt Offerings: Duties of Underwriters and Counsel*, 16 B.C. IND. & COM. L.R. 393 (1975).
- Floor, *The Scienter Requirement Under 10b-5 and Reliance on Advice of Counsel After Hochfelder*, 12 NEW ENG. L. REV. 191 (1976).
- Freedman, *A Civil Libertarian Looks at Securities Regulation*, 35 OHIO ST. L.J. 280 (1974).
- Gruenbaum, *Corporate/Securities Lawyers: Disclosure, Responsibility, Liability to Investors, and National Student Marketing Corp.*, 54 NOTRE DAME LAW. 795 (1979).
- Jenkins, *Attorney Liability Under the Federal Securities Laws: The Evolving Standard*, 2 J. CORP. L. 505 (1977).
- Johnson, *The Expanding Responsibilities of Attorneys in Practice Before the SEC: Disciplinary Proceedings Under Rule 2(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice*, 25 MER. L. REV. 637 (1974).
- Karmel, *Attorneys' Securities Laws Liabilities*, 27 BUS. LAW. 1153 (1975).
- Kemp, *Disciplinary Proceedings By the SEC Against Attorneys*, 14 CLEV-MAR. L. REV. 23 (1965).
- Koch, *Attorney's Liability: The Securities Bar and the Impact of National Student Marketing*, 14 WM. & MARY L. REV. 883 (1973).
- Lathrop & Rinehart, *Legal Malpractice and Rule 10b-5 Liability: Pitfalls for the Occasional Securities Practitioner*, 5 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 449 (1972).
- Lipman, *The SEC's Reluctant Police Force: A New Role for Lawyers*, 49 N.Y.U. L. REV. 437 (1974).

- Lorne, *The Corporate and Securities Adviser, The Public Interest, and Professional Ethics*, 76 MICH. L. REV. 425 (1978).
- Lowenfels, *Expanding Public Responsibilities of Securities Lawyers: An Analysis of the New Trend in Standard of Care and Priorities of Duties*, 74 COLUM. L. REV. 412 (1974).
- Mathews, *Effective Defense of SEC Investigations: Laying The Foundation for Successful Disposition of Subsequent Civil, Administrative and Criminal Proceedings*, 24 EMORY L.J. 567 (1975).
- Messer, *Roles and Reasonable Expectations of the Underwriter, Lawyer and Independent Securities Auditor in the Efficient Provision of Verified Information: "Truth in Securities" Reinforced*, 52 NEB. L. REV. 429 (1973).
- Parker, *Attorney Liability Under the Securities Laws After Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder*, 10 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 521 (1977).
- Robinson, *Procedures and Responsibilities of Purchasers' Special Counsel in Private Placements of Securities With Institutions*, 31 BUS. LAW. 1489 (1976).
- Ruder, *Multiple Defendants in Securities Law Fraud Cases: Aiding and Abetting, Conspiracy, In Pari Delicto, Indemnification, and Contribution*, 120 U. PA. L. REV. 597 (1972).
- Shipman, *The Need for SEC Rules to Govern The Duties and Civil Liabilities of Attorneys Under the Federal Securities Statutes*, 34 OHIO ST. L.J. 231 (1973).
- Small, *An Attorney's Responsibilities Under Federal and State Securities Laws: Private Counselor or Public Servant?*, 61 CALIF. L. REV. 1189 (1973).
- Smith, *Preventing Errors in Securities Transactions*, 30 S.C. L. REV. 243 (1979).
- Sommer, *Emerging Responsibilities of Securities Lawyers*, FED. SEC. L. REP. (CCH) ¶ 79,631 (1974).
- Sonde, *The Responsibility of Professionals Under The Federal Securities Laws—Some Observations*, 68 NW. U.L. REV. 1 (1973).
- Symposium, *Lawyers' Responsibilities and Liability Under the Securities Laws*, 11 COLUM. J.L. & SOC. PROB. 99 (1974).
- Note, *Attorney Liability Under SEC Rule 2(e): A New Standard*, 11 TEX. TECH. L. REV. 83 (1979).
- Note, *The Duties and Obligations of the Securities Lawyer: The Beginning of a New Standard for the Legal Profession?*, 1975 DUKE L.J. 121.
- Comment, *SEC Disciplinary Rules and The Federal Securities Laws: The Regulation, Role, & Responsibilities of the Attorney*, 1972 DUKE L.J. 969.
- Comment, *Securities Law—Attorney Liability—Aiding & Abetting—SEC v. National Student Marketing Corporation*, 25 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 79 (1979).

#### D. *The Lawyer as Director*

- Hawes, *Should Counsel to a Corporation Be Barred from Serving as a Director?—A Personal View*, 1 CORP. L. REV. 14 (1978).
- Knepper, *Liability of Lawyer-Directors*, 40 OHIO ST. L.J. 341 (1979).
- Panel Discussion, *Lawyers as Directors*, 30 BUS. LAW. 41-64 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1975).
- Riger, *The Lawyer-Director: "A Vexing Problem,"* 33 BUS. LAW. 2381 (1978).
- Note, *Should Lawyers Serve as Directors of Corporations for Which They Serve as Counsel?*, 1978 UTAH L. REV. 711.

Comment, *Corporate Counsel on the Board of Directors: An Overview*, 10 CUM. L. REV. 791 (1980).

For a thorough discussion of the duties and responsibilities of directors in general, see:

ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law, *Corporate Director's Guidebook*, 33 BUS. LAW. 1591 (1978).

Chaplin, *Outside Directors and Their Responsibilities: A Program for the Exercise of Due Care*, 1 J. CORP. L. 57 (1975).

Hershman, *Liabilities and Responsibilities of Corporate Officers and Directors*, 33 BUS. LAW. 263 (1977).

Hinsey & Carey, *The Corporate Director's Guidebook & The Changing Role of the Director*, 9 INST. SEC. REG. 15 (1978).

Joffe, *The Outside Director: Standards of Care Under the Securities Laws*, 24 EMORY L.J. 669 (1975).

Leach & Mundheim, *The Outside Director of the Publicly Held Corporation*, 31 BUS. LAW. 1799 (1976).

Mann, *Directors' Responsibilities—An Overview of Developments*, 9 INST. SEC. REC. 1 (1978).

Miller, *The Fiduciary Duties of a Corporate Director*, 4 U. BALT. L. REV. 259 (1975).

Shaneyfelt, *The Personal Liability Maze of Corporate Directors and Officers*, 58 NEB. L. REV. 692 (1979).

Small, *The Evolving Role of the Director in Corporate Governance*, 30 HAST. L.J. 1353 (1979).

Soderquist, *Toward a More Effective Corporate Board: Reexamining Roles of Outside Directors*, 52 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1341 (1977).

Solomon, *Restructuring the Corporate Board of Directors: Fond Hope—Faint Promise?*, 76 MICH. L. REV. 581 (1978).

#### E. *Attorney-Client Privilege in the Corporate Context*

Block & Barton, *Internal Corporate Investigations: Maintaining the Confidentiality of a Corporate Client's Communications with Investigative Counsel*, 35 BUS. LAW. 5 (1979).

Brown & Hyman, *The Scope of the Attorney-Client Privilege in Corporate Decision Making*, 26 BUS. LAW. 1145 (1971).

Burke, *The Duty of Confidentiality and Disclosing Corporate Misconduct*, 36 BUS. LAW. 239 (1981).

Burnham, *Confidentiality and the Corporate Lawyer: The Attorney-Client Privilege and "Work Product" in Illinois*, 56 ILL. B.J. 542 (1968).

Burnham, *The Attorney-Client Privilege in the Corporate Arena*, 24 BUS. LAW. 901 (1969).

Heininger, *The Attorney-Client Privilege as It Relates to Corporations*, 53 ILL. B.J. 376 (1965).

Herzel & Hagen, *Do Corporations Really Have an Attorney-Client Privilege?*, 59 CHI. B. REC. 296 (1978).

Kobak, *The Uneven Application of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Corporations in the Federal Courts*, 6 GA. L. REV. 339 (1972).

- Levy, *Limitation Under Federal Law on Confidentiality Involving Accountants, Accountant-Attorneys, and Accountants Retained by Attorneys*, 82 COM. L.J. 5 (1977).
- Maurer, *Privileged Communications and the Corporate Counsel*, 28 ALA. LAW. 352 (1967).
- Miller, *The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege and the Work Product Doctrine: Protection from Compelled Disclosure in Criminal Investigation of a Corporation*, 12 U. S.F. L. REV. 569 (1978).
- Miller, *Getting to the Bottom or Digging Your Own Grave: The Applicability of the Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrines to Internal Corporate Investigations*, 9 COLO. LAW. 945 (1980).
- Schaefer, *How Can a Modern Business Corporation Preserve the Attorney-Client Privilege in Communicating with "Outside" and "Inside" Counsel?*, 5 AM. BUS. L.J. 263 (1967).
- Weinschel, *Corporate Employee Interviews and the Attorney-Client Privilege*, 12 B.C. IND. & COM. L. REV. 873 (1971).
- Note, *Applicability of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Corporate Communications*, 48 U. CIN. L. REV. 819 (1979).
- Note, *Application of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Corporations: New Directions and a Proposed Solution*, 20 B.C. L. REV. 953 (1979).
- Note, *Attorney-Client Privilege—Diversified Industries Inc. v. Meredith, New Rules for Applying the Privilege When the Client is a Corporation*, 57 N.C. L. REV. 306 (1979).
- Note, *Attorney-Client Privilege for Corporate Clients: The Control Group Test*, 84 HARV. L. REV. 424 (1970).
- Note, *The Attorney-Client Privilege—Identifying the Corporate Client*, 48 FORDHAM L. REV. 1281 (1980).
- Note, *The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege: Culpable Employees, Attorney Ethics, and the Joint Defense Doctrine*, 58 TEX. L. REV. 809 (1980).
- Note, *The Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege in the Federal Courts*, 22 CATH. LAW. 138 (1976).
- Note, *Evidence—Privileged Communications—The Attorney-Client Privilege in a Corporate Setting: A Suggested Approach*, 69 MICH. L. REV. 360 (1970).
- Note, *Privileged Communications—Inroads on the "Control Group" Test in the Corporate Area*, 22 SYRACUSE L. REV. 759 (1971).
- Comment, *The Application in the Federal Courts of the Attorney-Client Privilege to the Corporation*, 39 FORDHAM L. REV. 281 (1970).
- Comment, *Conflicting Standards for Applying the Corporate Attorney-Client Privilege*, 33 VAND. L. REV. 999 (1980).
- Comment, *The Privileged Few: The Attorney-Client Privilege As Applied to Corporations*, 20 U.C.L.A. L. REV. 288 (1972).
- Comment, *A Securities Lawyer's Dilemma: The SEC's Policy of Disclosure v. The Attorney-Client Privilege*, 15 SAN DIEGO L. REV. 797 (1978).

#### F. Attorney-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation

- Brereton, *Abrogation of the Corporate Privilege in Stockholder Suits*, 15 PRAC. LAW. 24 (Dec. 1969).

- Newman, *Former Corporate Counsel and Client Confidences in a Derivative Action*, 42 TEX. B.J. 923 (1979).
- O'Neal & Thompson, *Vulnerability of Professional-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation*, 31 BUS. LAW. 1775 (1976).
- Patton, *Disqualification of Corporate Counsel in Derivative Actions—Jacuzzi and the Inadequacy of Dual Representation*, 31 HAST. L.J. 347 (1979).
- Note, *The Attorney-Client Privilege and the Corporation in Shareholder Litigation*, 50 S. CAL. L. REV. 303 (1977).
- Note, *The Attorney-Client Privilege in Shareholder Litigation: The Need for a Predictable Standard*, 9 LOY. CHI. L.J. 731 (1978).
- Note, *Evidence—Attorney-Client Privilege—Shareholders May Overcome Corporation's Attorney-Client Privilege By Showing Cause*, 45 TUL. L. REV. 1063 (1971).
- Comment, *The Attorney-Client Privilege in Shareholder Suits*, 69 COLUM. L. REV. 309 (1969).
- Case Comment, *Evidence: "Good Cause" Held to Defeat the Attorney-Client Privilege When a Corporation Is Sued by Its Shareholders*, 1970 DUKE L.J. 1060.

### G. Attorneys' Communications with Auditors

- Deer, *Lawyers' Responses to Auditors' Requests for Information*, 28 BUS. LAW. 947 (1973).
- Matson, *Lawyers' Letters to Auditors: The Uneasy Truce*, 48 J. KAN. B.A. 9 (1979).
- Report, ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law, *Scope of Lawyers' Responses to Auditors: Requests for Information*, 30 BUS. LAW. 513 (1975).
- Report, ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law, *Lawyers' Responses to Auditors' Requests for Information—A Report by the Committee on Auditors' Inquiry Responses*, 31 BUS. LAW. 561 (1975).
- Sissen, *Advertising For Lawsuits: Attorneys, Audit Letters, and The Unasserted Claim—The SEC Now Has the Burden*, 2 J. CORP. L. 33 (1976).

## II. Accountants

### A. Accountants & Auditors—Generally

- Carmichael, *What Does The Independent Auditor's Opinion Really Mean?*, 138 J. ACCOUNTANCY 83 (Nov. 1974).
- Earle, *The Fairness Myth*, 28 VAN. L. REV. 147 (1975).
- Eisenberg, *Legal Models of Management Structure in the Modern Corporation: Officers, Directors, and Accountants*, 63 CALIF. L. REV. 375 (1975).
- Fiflis, *Current Problems of Accountants' Responsibilities to Third Parties*, 28 VAND. L. REV. 31 (1975).
- Hawes, *Stockholder Appointment of Independent Auditors: A Proposal*, 74 COLUM. L. REV. 1 (1974).
- LeBlanc, *Accounting As A Consumer Protector*, 27 BUS. LAW. 75 (1971).
- Moss, *The Crisis of Corporate Accountability: A Legislator's View*, 3 J. CORP. L. 251 (1978).
- Symposium, *Corporate Law and Accounting In The 70's*, 26 BUS. LAW. 199 (1970).
- Wyatt, *Auditors' Responsibilities*, 12 ST. LOUIS. U.L.J. 331 (1968).

B. *Accountant-Client Privilege*

- Jentz, *Accountant Privileged Communications: Is it a Dying Concept Under the New Federal Rules of Evidence?*, 11 AM. BUS. L.J. 149 (1973).
- Tigue, *Accountant-Client Communication*, 12 TAX COUNSELOR Q. 1 (1968).
- Note, *Evidence: The Accountant-Client Privilege Under the New Federal Rules of Evidence—New Stature and New Problems*, 28 OKLA. L. REV. 637 (1975).
- Note, *Government Access to Corporate Documents and Auditors' Workpapers: Shall We Include Auditors Among the Privileged Few?*, 2 J. CORP. L. 349 (1977).
- Note, *Privileged Communications—Accountants and Accounting—A Critical Analysis of Accountant-Client Privilege Statutes*, 66 MICH. L. REV. 1264 (1968).
- Comment, *Couch v. United States: The Supreme Court Takes a Fresh Look at the Attorney-Client Privilege—Or Does It?*, 62 KY. L.J. 263 (1973).

C. *Accountants—Criminal Liability*

- Dunfee & Gleim, *Criminal Liability of Accountants: Sources and Policies*, 9 AM. BUS. L.J. 1 (1971).
- Gruenbaum & Steinberg, *Accountants' Liability and Responsibility: Securities, Criminal and Common Law*, 13 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 247 (1980).
- Isbell, *An Overview of Accountants' Duties and Liabilities Under the Federal Securities Laws and a Closer Look at Whistle-Blowing*, 35 OHIO ST. L.J. 261 (1974).
- Kurland, *Accountants' Legal Liability—Ultramares to BarChris*, 25 BUS. LAW. 155 (1969).
- Mathews & Sullivan, *Criminal Liability For Violations of the Federal Securities Laws: The National Commission's Proposed Federal Criminal Code, S. 1 and S. 1400*, 11 AM. CRIM. L. REV. 883 (1973).
- Note, *The Criminal Liability of Public Accountants: A Study of United States v. Simon*, 46 NOTRE DAME LAW. 564 (1971).
- Comment, *Criminal Liability of Public Accountants: A Lurking Nightmare?*, 67 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 32 (1976).

D. *Accountants and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977*

- Atkesan, *The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977: An International Application of SEC's Corporate Governance Reforms*, 12 INT. LAW. 703 (1978).
- Baker, *Accounting and Accountability: Overview of The Accounting Provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977*, 36 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 809 (1979).
- Goelzer, *The Accounting Provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act—The Federalization Of Corporate Recordkeeping and Internal Control*, 5 J. CORP. L. 1 (1979).
- Program, ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law, *Practical Implications of the Accounting Provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, and Recent Developments*, 35 BUS. LAW. 1713 (1980).
- Note, *Accounting Provisions of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act: An Alternative Perspective on SEC Intervention in Corporate Governance*, 89 YALE L.J. 1573 (1980).
- Comment, *Materiality and Internal Accounting Controls Under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act*, 1980 ARIZ. ST. L.J. 931.



## E. Accountants—Securities Law

- Adams, *Lessening the Legal Liability of Auditors*, 32 BUS. LAW. 1037 (1977).
- Augenbraun, *Private Offerings and Accountants' Liability under Section 12(1): A Problem and a Recommended Solution*, 7 SEC. REG. L.J. 158 (1979).
- Chalmers, *The Independent Auditor—Guarantor or Guide?*, 31 BUS. LAW. 367 (1975).
- Chalmers, *Over-Accountable Accountants? A Proposal for Clarification of the Legal Responsibilities Stemming from the Audit Function*, 16 WM. & MARY L. REV. 71 (1974).
- Gormley, *Accountants' Professional Liability—A Ten Year Review*, 29 BUS. LAW. 1205 (1974).
- Gruenbaum & Steinberg, *Accountants' Liability and Responsibility: Securities, Criminal and Common Law*, 13 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 247 (1980).
- Hull, *Responsibilities and Liabilities of Auditors and Accountants—An Accountant's View*, 30 BUS. LAW. 169 (Spec. Issue, Mar. 1975).
- Isbell, *An Overview of Accountants' Duties and Liabilities under the Federal Securities Laws and a Closer Look at Whistle-Blowing*, 35 OHIO ST. L.J. 261 (1974).
- Kripke, *The SEC, The Accountants, Some Myths and Some Realities*, 45 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1151 (1970).
- Kripke, *Where Are We on Securities Disclosure after the Advisory Committee Report*, 6 SEC. REG. L.J. 99 (1978).
- Margolis, *Sanctions Against Accountants for Violations of the Securities Laws: A Reappraisal*, 4 DEL. J. CORP. L. 399 (1979).
- Metzger & Heintz, *Hochfelder's Progeny: Implications for the Auditor*, 63 MINN. L. REV. 79 (1978).
- Miller & Subak, *Impact of Federal Securities Laws: Liabilities of Officers, Directors, & Accountants*, 30 BUS. LAW. 387 (1975).
- Rosenfeld, *A Sideline View of the Disclosure Advisory Committee Report: A Response to Professor Kripke*, 7 SEC. REG. L.J. 76 (1979).
- Sonde, *The Responsibility of Professionals under the Federal Securities Laws—Some Observations*, 68 NW. U.L. REV. 1 (1973).
- Schnepper, *The Accountant's Liability Under Rule 10b-5 and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934: The Hole in Hochfelder*, 22 ACCT. REV. 653 (1977).
- Symposium, *Accountants and Federal Securities Laws*, 28 VAND. L. REV. 1 (1975).
- Treadway, *SEC Enforcement Techniques: Expanding and Exotic Forms of Ancillary Relief*, 32 WASH. & LEE L. REV. 637 (1975).
- Vernava & Hepp, *Responsibility of the Accountant Under the Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934*, 6 J. CORP. L. 317 (1981).
- Note, *Accountants' Liabilities for False and Misleading Financial Statements*, 67 COLUM. L. REV. 1437 (1967).
- Note, *Redington v. Touche Ross & Co.: An Unwarranted Implication of a Private Right of Action against Accountants under Section 17(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934*, 73 NW. U.L. REV. 1119 (1979).
- Note, *Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder: Narrowing the Scope of Accountants' Professional Liability Under the Securities Laws*, 6 CAP. U.L. REV. 683 (1977).
- Recent Developments, *SEC Disciplinary Hearings—Touche Ross v. SEC—Rule 2(e) Validated in First Public Proceeding: Uncertainty Ahead for Securities Practitioners*, 5 J. CORP. L. 433 (1980).

F. *The Audit Committee and Corporate Governance*

Dent, *The Revolution in Corporate Governance, the Monitoring Board, and the Director's Duty of Care*, 61 B.U. L. REV. 623 (1981).

Farrell, *The Audit Committee—A Lawyer's View*, 28 BUS. LAW. 1089 (1973).

Greene & Falk, *The Audit Committee—A Measured Contribution To Corporate Governance*, 34 BUS. LAW. 1229 (1979).

Kripke, *The SEC, Corporate Governance, and the Real Issues*, 36 BUS. LAW. 173 (1981).

Lovdal, *Making the Auditing Committee Work*, 55 HARV. BUS. REV. 108 (Mar.-Apr. 1977).

Mautz & Neumann, *The Effective Corporate Audit Committee*, 48 HARV. BUS. REV. 57 (Nov.-Dec. 1970).

Solomon, *The Audit Committee: Its Growing Significance in the Corporate Structure*, 42 C.P.A.J. 578 (1972).

Note, *Accounting—The Audit Committee—A Progressive Move Toward More Meaningful Financial Reporting*, 3 J. CORP. L. 400 (19 ).