DAN MORGAN—THE MOST INTERESTING MAN 
IN THE WORLD

Alvin C. Harrell*

The Oklahoma City University School of Law (OCU) recently became a less interesting place. Not, as you might immediately assume, because the 2014–2015 academic year began, and I resumed teaching commercial law courses, but because Daniel J. Morgan (Dan) retired from teaching. By any measure, Dan is one of the most interesting teachers, scholars, and colleagues ever at OCU. His retirement after 33 years at OCU is a loss to our faculty, the students, and the school.

But there is more. Unusually, if not uniquely in academia, Dan’s friendship is cherished by all who know him. Indeed, many of us not only like Dan, but we want to be him or, at least, more like him. Because, from our experience, he may be the most interesting man in the world.

Clearly, Dan has an interesting career history, including stints practicing law, serving as a public official (as a county and prosecuting attorney), running an election campaign, teaching diverse law subjects at two universities, working as Associate Dean of the School of Law, organizing and coaching various appellate advocacy and trial competition teams and other practical skills projects, coauthoring and updating three books, writing numerous law review articles, and serving as the Norman & Edem Professor of Trial Advocacy at OCU. It is a résumé that any of us could aspire to.

Again, there is more. Much more. Because that résumé just scratches the surface of Dan’s interesting life. Of course, there are his successes in so many diverse activities and endeavors, his cabin at the lake, his travel experiences, his style and his wardrobe (the latter being a particular source of envy for your Author). Then there are his unique and engaging personality and sense of good humor. We could all use more of this.
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Dan’s scholarship deserves special note. In this respect, his retirement is a particular loss because Dan has produced valuable and unique scholarship that cannot be easily replaced. Along with his noted scholarship in areas such as trial and appellate practice, Dan has been a reliable source of essential research and publications relating to consumer law, including the federal Truth in Lending Act and Oklahoma’s Uniform Consumer Credit Code. His law review articles on these subjects include in-depth pieces in the *Oklahoma City University Law Review* and the *Consumer Finance Law Quarterly Report* on the right of rescission, a challenging subject that is rarely covered elsewhere in such depth and with such perception. Dan contributed roughly a third of the comprehensive consumer law coverage in coauthoring his casebook with Fred Miller and your Author and essentially half of the new edition (which remains a work in progress due to your Author’s struggle to incorporate the massive impact of the Dodd-Frank Act). For many years, Dan has written and annually updated Chapter 8 (on the Right of Rescission) in the American Bar Association’s *Truth in Lending* treatise (including a complete rewrite in the recently published 2014 edition), a leading standard text in this area of law.

Dan’s in-depth expertise and scholarly contributions in these areas of law will be impossible to replicate. Dan is a leading specialist and prolific author in an important area of law not adequately served by the larger academic community. His work involves legal issues that can be terribly challenging, are difficult to master on an isolated basis without the assistance of scholars like Dan, and therefore (despite their obvious importance) are in danger of becoming a lost art among lawyers, judges, and even academics. Dan’s insightful scholarship and practical guidance on these issues will be sorely missed.

4. Your Author recently attended an academic conference where several consumer law professors from other schools reported that they had dropped coverage of the Truth in Lending Act from their law school courses, essentially because the subject is too difficult to teach and for the students to master in the time available. Instead, they indicated that they have refocused their attention on social justice issues.
Dan came to OCU in 1981. His 33-year career at OCU spans probably the best years in the history of the law school to date. Now, I don’t mean to suggest that Dan is solely responsible for that success or that the path of progress has always been smooth. But clearly his involvement in the law school has measurably contributed to that success. More than once his wise counsel has played a role in resolving contentious issues. His steady nerve and good judgment, with the esteem of his colleagues, have been major factors in maintaining the civility of faculty debates and deliberations. As a result, his participation in faculty governance has been a significantly positive, unifying influence. Always, and without fail. It is a hard thing to lose a colleague like this. Even more than his scholarship and interesting wit, this is the thing I will miss the most.

5. For example, there was Associate Dean Morgan’s promise to your Author of an office with a private balcony and an auxiliary storage building in return for moving from a favorite faculty office, allegedly to create space for a moot court jury room. Further suspicions were aroused when, after a seemingly short interval as a jury room, the office was occupied by Professor Von Creel (who retained it until his recent retirement). But, in truth, this is the worst story I can tell about Dan, so perhaps the path of progress has been pretty smooth after all.