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"The engagement of ideas and the commitment to scholarship here exceeds law schools anywhere. The intellectual and philosophical diversity is greater."

page 54
Closing Argument

My favorite opening line of a closing argument: "Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I will be brief. But first I must speak at length of many things." So it is with me.

When I first became dean in 1987 people repeatedly asked me "What's your agenda." I consistently (and honestly) replied: "I don't have an agenda. I just don't want to screw it up." Although I've never really developed an "agenda," in the sense of a firm set of concrete goals, I now understand (with the benefit of hindsight) that my decisions as dean often have been shaped by a very specific set of values, each of which was instilled in me as a direct consequence of my own experience as a member of our Law School community over the past quarter-century as student, alumnus, professor, and dean.

First, I believe the Law School has an overriding responsibility to provide our students with a first-rate legal education. To meet this responsibility, we must strive first and foremost for excellence in the classroom. As Robert Maynard Hutchins once observed, we must aspire "not to teach students facts, theories or laws, not to reform or amuse them or make them expert technicians, [but] to unsettle their minds, widen their horizons, inflame their intellect, teach them to think clearly, if possible, but to teach them to think nevertheless."

In pursuit of this aspiration, we have paid careful attention to teaching as a central element of the faculty appointments process, encouraged constructively critical student course evaluations, videotaped classes to enable teachers to learn to teach better, and supported the students' creation of a new award for teaching excellence (bestowed upon David Currie in 1992 and Elena Kagan in 1993). Perhaps most important, however, we have repeatedly made clear to our students that they have a right to expect excellence from us in the classroom and that, if we meet that expectation, we have a correlative right to expect excellence from them as students. It is a sound bargain for all concerned.

Second, I have long believed that legal education can be demanding, rigorous and professional without creating an unpleasant or unwelcome atmosphere for students. Students who feel good about themselves and are positive about their education will learn better (and be more engaging to be around) than those who are alienated from the institution. It is not easy to achieve this balance, for the inherent nature of traditional legal education carries the potential for student frustration and even occasional humiliation.

Unlike many law schools, we have not tried to solve this dilemma by abandoning the traditional rigor of legal education. We are charged with the task of preparing our students for a demanding profession in which they will be responsible for the property, the liberty and even the lives of others. It will not do to make our own lot easy by failing to prepare our students for the demands and pressures of the law. The better approach, the approach we have pursued, is to encourage a sense in students that they are valued members of our Law School community and that the effort they put into their own education is respected and honored by their teachers.

To this end, we have attempted to make as clear as possible to our students our own deep commitment to their education, established a liaison program that enables students to have direct input to faculty committees, sponsored quarterly town meetings to give students an opportunity to understand better the direction and mission of the Law School, and supported and encouraged the creation of a broad range of new student activities and organizations to enrich both the social and the intellectual components of the students' experience.

Third, from its very inception, our Law School has committed itself to the value of scholarly research as essential to the progress of the law and to our broader understanding of our legal culture. The faculty of the University of Chicago Law School has long been recognized as the most productive in the nation in terms of scholarly research. That tradition continues. We have reinforced this tradition in recent years by establishing a faculty work-in-progress workshop, increasing faculty research support, and creating the...
Law School's Program in Law and Government and Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe.

Scholarly research, I should note, is not limited to the faculty. Students, too, should share in this adventure. To encourage this, we have established a third student-edited scholarly journal — *The University of Chicago Law School Roundtable*; created research fellowships for students in law and economics, legal history, criminal justice, taxation, and law and government; encouraged student-initiated study trips abroad; involved students in numerous faculty-run scholarly workshops (e.g., legal theory, law and economics, and feminist theory); and required all students to complete two substantial research and writing projects in their second and third years.

Fourth, as reflected in the University of Chicago Law School lawyer’s pledge, drafted almost forty years ago by Karl Llewellyn, the Law School has long emphasized that a central part of a lawyer’s professional responsibility is to serve the public. As Llewellyn wrote: “In accepting the honor and responsibility of life in the profession of the law, I engage to be at all times a champion of fairness and due process for all, whether the powerful or envied . . . or the helpless or the hated or the oppressed.”

To help our students and alumni fulfill this pledge, we have established an ambitious Public Service Program that provides grants to students who work for public service agencies over the summer, offers loan deferment and forgiveness to graduates who pursue careers in public service, and actively facilitates job placement by students and graduates interested in public service positions. In addition, the continuing excellence of our Mandel Legal Aid Clinic, enhanced by our new pilot program with the MacArthur Justice Foundation (see page 51), provide further opportunities for students to experience first-hand the special challenges and satisfactions of legal work in the service of others.

Fifth, I believe that a breadth of intellectual, ideological, gender, racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and student body is important both to deepen the educational experience and to further the needs of our profession and our society. We have made significant progress along these lines. A decade ago, the voting faculty included two women and no African-Americans; today there are four women and one African-American. A decade ago, the entire faculty (including lecturers and visitors) included 8 women and no African-Americans; this year there are 23 women and 6 African-Americans. A decade ago, the entering class included 31% women and 5% minority students; this year’s entering class includes 45% women and 21% minority students.

Finally, a unique feature of our Law School is our long-standing commitment to faculty collegiality and accessibility, respect for competing ideas, and robust (but always civil) discourse. This may be the most precious value of all, for it is so rare in legal academia and so easily lost. We have worked hard to preserve this value by seeking faculty consensus rather than conflict on even the most divisive of issues and by leaving our doors always open to students.

This commitment to collegiality extends, not only to faculty and students, but to our alumni and other friends as well. By creating this “Dean’s Page,” writing frequent reports on developments in the Law School, increasing significantly the number and variety of alumni events, distributing a year-in-review issue of the student-edited *Phoenix*, and in a host of other ways, we have tried to keep our friends and alumni informed, interested and involved. It is my view that when students enter our Law School, they join our community not for three years, but for life. That, certainly, has been my experience.

Looking back, then, it seems to me that these six values — teaching, respect for students, scholarly research, public service, diversity, and collegiality — have played a central role in shaping my term as dean. I hope these values are consistent both with the traditions of our Law School and with our aspirations for the future. I hope, too, that I haven’t “screwed it up.”

Thanks . . . for everything.

— Geoffrey R. Stone

Harry Kalven Jr. Professor of Law
Dean of the Law School

*The Dean’s Page*
Although the Japanese Constitution guarantees judicial independence, the Liberal Democratic Party sees to it that it does not happen too often.

Judicial (In)dependence in Japan

By J. Mark Ramseyer

The Supreme Court sure defers to bureaucrats these days,” suggested Ebato to Taniguchi. Tetsuo Ebato was a freelance journalist. Masataka Taniguchi had retired from the Supreme Court a year earlier.


“Maybe it’s because the Prime Minister has the last word in appointing chief and associate justices,” said Ebato.

Taniguchi was less sure. “Professor [and former Supreme Court justice] Dando says so too, but I wonder. I thought judges just had to obey their conscience, follow the law, and write opinions. But when I said so to [Tohoku University professor] Odanaka, he wouldn’t have it. ‘You’re wrong,’ he said. ‘The judges I know who’re conscientious and write good opinions spend all their time circulating through provincial district courts.’”

For measuring the independence of the Japanese judiciary, Ebato and Taniguchi identify the right issue: which judges climb the ranks the fastest, and which circulate through provincial district courts. In a recent book, *Japan’s Political Marketplace* (Harvard University Press, 1993), political scientist Frances Rosenbluth and I explored the way Japanese politicians of the then-ruling Liberal Democratic Party (the “LDP” — it lost power this summer for the first time since 1955) controlled Japanese judges. In the following excerpt from that study, I summarize some of the simple empirics; turning first to the institutions that LDP leaders could manipulate to constrain judges, and then to the ways that judicial career records may illustrate how LDP leaders did manipulate them. I conclude by asking when and why rational politicians may choose to keep their judges independent.

**Institutions**

If there is a difference in the independence of Japanese and American courts, it does not derive from the constitutional text. The texts are instead quite close. The Japanese Constitution guarantees judges their independence: “All judges shall be independent in the exercise of their conscience and shall be bound only by this Constitution and the laws.” And it promises them “adequate compensation which shall not be decreased during their term of office.”

Notwithstanding their nominal independence, however, Japanese judges have not been as free as their American federal peers. Like senior
American politicians, LDP leaders could decide who would become a judge. Unlike American politicians, during their nearly four decades in power they also manipulated the system to reward and punish those they made judges. Their ability to do so stemmed primarily from the way they recruited and posted judges. Judges in Japan join the bench in their 20s. During their career, they then rotate through a variety of judicial posts. By controlling access to the favored posts, the men and women in the Supreme Court Secretariat (the courts' administrative offices, staffed by judges) can reward and punish judges. By controlling the Secretariat, the LDP could control the judges.

Whether Japanese judges lived well or lived poorly thus depended on their status with the LDP leaders. Most basically, Japanese judges serve 10-year terms which the cabinet can freely decide whether to renew. If regularly renewed, they can work until age 65. Yet when they receive pay increases, where they work, and what they do are all matters that the judges at the Secretariat decide. In theory, these assignments are something the (LDP appointees to the) Supreme Court determine. In practice, the justices delegate the task to the judges in the Secretariat.

Crucial to the LDP, therefore, was the composition of the Secretariat. The LDP controlled it by appointing politically reliable justices to the Supreme Court (including at least one who knew first-hand how the Secretariat worked). Those justices then staffed the Secretariat with younger politically reliable judges. The result was indirect — but substantial — LDP control over the courts.

Most Japanese judges share basic preferences about the type of appointment they want. Granted, a few judges prefer small-town life and some dislike appellate work. In general, though, most Japanese judges prefer an urban post to a rural post. They prefer a family court to a branch court, a district court to a family court, and a high court to a district court. They prefer a chief-judgeship to associate judge status. And they hope for an occasional administrative position in the Secretariat or at one of the ministries. According to Table 1, most judges can realistically hope for at least one stint as a chief judge in a district or family court. Generally, they obtain it near the end of their career. As 58 of the judges in this class of 1951 also served at least once on a high court, they can also realistically hope for an appellate position.

**Table One:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Judicial Positions Attained by Class of 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President (High Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief judge (D. Ct. or Fam. Ct.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Court judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Court branch office head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Table shows the highest judicial (non-administrative) position held by judges who began their career in 1951 and remained in their job for at least 20 years.

Although the lengths of assignment vary, judges generally work for three years in each post. Before reassignment, they can request preferred appointments. Nominally, they can even refuse transfers they do not want. In fact, they refuse them at their peril. By 1969, Judge Shigeharu Hasegawa had worked in Hiroshima for 17 years and his wife was sick. When he declined an out-of-town transfer that year (it was a promotion to a neighboring high court), he was out of a job: the cabinet refused to reappoint him to his next 10-year term.

**Political Control**

The Fukushima incident. According to many observers, the LDP began to manipulate judicial careers toward political ends in the late 1960s. Before then, they argue, few judges asserted any political independence. As judges did not indulge their politics, the Secretariat could assign them to judicial posts without considering their politics.

The "crisis," these observers claim, came when right-wing ideologues began attacking judges for their liberal bias. Eager to pla-
cate their conservative constituents, the LDP launched a witchhunt. It criticized recent court decisions, and urged the cabinet to make independent judges pay for their independence. By March 1969, the Minister of Justice could declare that the time had come “to jam the cogs of the courts.”

The man who took center stage in the ensuing controversy was Shigeo Fukushima, a district judge born in 1930. He had joined the judiciary in 1959, and had just begun his second 10-year term in 1969 when he found on his docket a controversy. Nearly 200 local citizens had sued the Japanese government over a planned missile base. Because Article 9 of the Constitution banned military force, they claimed, that base was unconstitutional.1

Fukushima was a leader in a leftist organization of lawyers, law professors, and judges called the Young Jurists’ League. Although the LDP had been fighting to repeal Article 9, the League was explicitly dedicated to preserving the 1947 Japanese Constitution, and implicitly dedicated to fighting those repeal attempts. This potential for conflict worried local chief judge Kenta Hiraga. Lest Fukushima ban the proposed base, Hiraga wrote him a letter explaining why, were he deciding the case, he would refuse the injunction. But to no avail. Fukushima ignored the letter and enjoined the base.

Fukushima did not keep his dispute with Hiraga quiet. Instead, he circulated copies of Hiraga’s letter to his friends in the League, and some of them circulated copies to the press. Within a few days, the letter was in the newspapers. The press and professoriate accused Hiraga of subverting judicial independence, and the Diet launched impeachment proceedings. Nonetheless, Hiraga emerged relatively unscathed. On October 19, 1970, the impeachment committee reprimanded him but then dismissed the charges. After additional reprimands from his District Court and the Supreme Court, he joined the Tokyo High Court.

Fukushima fared worse. He too faced impeachment proceedings, in his case for leaking the letter to the press. But where the committee dismissed Hiraga’s charges, it ruled against Fukushima. It did let Fukushima stay where he was for a while, however, and Fukushima himself remained adamantly “independent.” He rallied against the judicial bureaucracy in print. And notwithstanding Supreme Court decisions to the contrary, in 1973 he held the entire Japanese military unconstitutional (quickly overturned, of course). Although the Secretariat eventually brought him to the Tokyo District Court for a time, it soon dispatched him to rural family courts. By 1989, he was 59 years old and had served without relief in provincial family courts for over 12 years. Rather than continue, he quit.

Public critics. Although the Supreme Court and Secretariat apparently did not punish judges merely for joining the Young Jurists’ League, they did penalize those who directly and publicly criticized their administrative policies. Take Masamichi Hanada. Appointed in 1957, Hanada had started his career right. He had graduated from the University of Tokyo (the most selective university in the country) and begun his career at the Tokyo District Court (the prized starting assignment). He then did a judicial stint in Japan’s northern-most island, and returned to Tokyo by 1963. Nonetheless, in 1971 his career began to come apart. That year, the cabinet and Supreme Court refused to reappoint (for a second 10-year term) a League judge named Yasuaki Miyamoto. To Americans, the resulting fracas sounds more like a university tenure fight than anything judicial: they fired Miyamoto because of his politics, claimed his friends; they fired him because he was slow and mediocre, claimed the others. In any case, Hanada appointed himself the public spokesman on Miyamoto’s behalf. He lost his fight, and Miyamoto lost his job.

For his prominence in the Miyamoto dispute, Hanada paid dearly. In 1972 the Secretariat transferred him to a branch office, in 1976 to a family court, and in 1979 back to a branch office. By 1987, he was 56 years old and had spent the last 15

1 Article 9 provides: “the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation .... In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained.”
years in branch offices or family courts. Like Fukushima, he quit. His co-principal signatory on a petition to the Court over the Miyamoto affair was Minoru Takeda. In 1972, the Secretariat transferred Takeda from the Tokyo District Court to a branch office. He stayed in branch offices for the next 11 years.

To capture the severity with which the Secretariat treated these men, consider

| Table Two: |
| Positions Held by Class of 1957 Judges in 1981 |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| High Court judge    | 16                   |
| District Court judge| 21                   |
| Family Court judge  | 4                    |
| District Court branch office head judge | 3 |
| District Court branch office judge | 3 |
| Administrative post  | 6                    |
| Dead or retired      | 21                   |

Note: Positions are those held in December 1981.

Table 2. The table details what the members of Hanada’s class were doing at the time he was working in family courts and branch offices. Of class members still working in 1981, 16 were high court judges, 21 were district court judges, and six held administrative posts. Only two others were ordinary judges in branch offices. By April 1987 when Hanada resigned, of the remaining 43 judges, six were chief judges, 12 were high court judges, 13 were district court judges, three were family court judges, and six held administrative posts. Only two were branch office heads and only one was an ordinary branch office judge. The person who eventually replaced Hanada in one of his branch office posts was a judge 16 years his junior.

Others who protested the Supreme Court’s treatment of Miyamoto similarly suffered. Take the four judges who contributed to a 1972 book on the Miyamoto affair called Security of Status for Judges. One was Hanada. A second was Katsuhiko Moriya. The year after the book appeared, the Secretariat transferred him to the northern provincial Family Court, and as of 1990 he had spent the last 11 years on family matters, four in a branch office. A third was Tsuneo Suzuki.

By 1969, Judge Shigeharu Hasegawa had worked in Hiroshima for 17 years and his wife was sick...

The year after the book appeared, the Secretariat demoted him from the Tokyo District Court to a branch office. Moriya and Suzuki were both national university graduates (on average, Japanese national universities are more selective than private universities), and both have since spent at least some time on a high court. But the fourth, Masahiro Tanaka, went to a private university and suffered worse. The year after the book appeared, the Secretariat moved him to a branch office. As of 1990, he had stayed in branch offices for the 17 years since.

The Campaign Cases. Although it does not do so consistently, the Secretariat can also penalize judges for writing politically incorrect opinions. It has done so most readily when the decisions threaten vital LDP positions. The various judges who held the Japanese campaign rules unconstitutional provide a good example. The Public Offices Elections Act drastically restricts the tactics candidates can use. Because incumbents obtain media coverage through their official functions while challengers do not, these restrictions benefit incumbents. Because the LDP has had the most incumbents, they have benefited the LDP.

Section 138(a) of the Elections Act bans door-to-door canvassing. In 1950 the Supreme Court had held a similar ban constitutional, but by the late 1960s people had again started challenging it as a violation of their free-speech rights. In the first of these cases, a 1967 Tokyo District Court decision, the court suggested — gingerly — that § 138(a) might be unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court responded almost immediately: §138(a) was indeed constitutional. That did not stop judge Haruhiko Abe. A University of Tokyo graduate who started his career at the Tokyo District Court, Abe was one of the most able members of the League. He was also one of the most outspoken. In 1968, sitting temporarily in a summary court as an assistant judge with less than 5 years’ experience, Abe held the canvassing ban flatly unconstitutional. Lest there be any doubt, this was the very ban the Supreme Court had upheld against the same challenge a few months earlier. When his initial 10-year term expired in 1972, observers rumored that
the Court would not reappoint him, but not so. It did reappoint him — into oblivion. The Secretariat gave him family law responsibilities for several years, and then moved him to a branch office. By 1990, 35 members of Abe’s class had already served one or more terms on a High Court. Abe had been in branch offices since 1979.

Since its 1967 decision, the Supreme Court has held the canvassing ban constitutional at least another seven times. The ban’s political importance is obvious and, perhaps for that very reason, some lower court judges persist in fighting it. When they do, they suffer badly. Wholly aside from politics, one would not expect the Secretariat to promote quickly judges who ignore Supreme Court precedent. But politics are not aside — for by all odds the Secretariat punishes more harshly those judges who ignore precedent in these politically controversial cases than it does those who ignore it in more mundane disputes.

One-time League member Tetsuro So, for example, held the ban unconstitutional in 1978. As of late 1990, he was still in a branch office. He had spent three of the 13 years since the decision in family court and five in branch offices. Judge Kunio Ogawa held the ban unconstitutional in early 1979, and as of 1990 still had not left branch offices. Only former League member Shigemi Anazawa escaped branch offices for voiding the canvassing ban. He held it unconstitutional in 1980, and spent the years since handling family law cases in various northern provincial courts.

The potential punishment may be clearest with judges like Abe who show the most promise. Take Judge Masato Hirayu, who held the same ban unconstitutional in September 1979. A star University of Tokyo recruit like Abe, he too began his career in the prestigious Tokyo District Court. Although not a formal League member, he had overlapped with Miyamoto at the Tokyo District Court and participated in a study group with him. After holding the ban unconstitutional, Hirayu stayed in a branch office until 1987. He then returned to a district court, but still with family law responsibilities. By the end of 1990, he had spent 11 of his 23 years on the bench in a branch office. As Table 3 shows, that placed him in the last eight percent of his class. Among his University of Tokyo peers, it placed him at the very bottom.

The Tokyo Five. Or consider how the Secretariat eventually handled a bizarre panel of five Tokyo judges who, in the late 1960s, took judicial independence to a new extreme. Together,
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of Tokyo for damages. When the TPSC forced him to avoid the Diet, claimed he, that violation of his constitutional rights traumatized him. On December 2, 1969, the panel, now with Sugimoto, Nakahira, and Shun Iwai, awarded him ¥100,000 ($278 at the time) for his emotional distress. The city of Tokyo had violated his freedom of expression and caused him anguish. It now owed him money.

For several more months, this "judicial independence" continued unabated. The panel continued, for example, to harass the TPSC. In 1968, it (now Sugimoto, Iwai and Akira Watanabe) held that the Ministry of Education violated the rights of authors when it certified textbooks for high schools. And in 1969, it barred the government from implementing the "COCOM agreement," an American-led embargo of communist countries. Under the Japanese Constitution, the judges explained, "the freedom to export is a fundamental human right." If the government refuses its citizens the right to sell militarily sensitive equipment to the Peoples' Republic of China, it violates that fundamental right.

The judges most involved in these opinions paid for their independence. Watanabe and Senda were on relatively few of the panels and were never on a panel together. Indeed, because lower-court opinions never disclose how the judges voted, they may have been dissenters. In any case, they received relatively ordinary assignments and eventually became chief judges.

The judges who served most often on these panels were Nakahira, Sugimoto, and Iwai. Nakahira, the senior-most of the three, quickly retired. The Secretariat moved Sugimoto from the civil division of the Tokyo District Court to the bankruptcy division. When it eventually promoted him to the Tokyo High Court, it put him in the patent division and kept him away from all administrative responsibilities. From 1970 to 1986, Sugimoto spent three years in family court and 10 in district court branch offices.

Although Iwai too eventually received a high court appointment, he was on a much slower track than the one on which he had started. Iwai was born May 1942 and began his judicial career in 1967 at the Tokyo District Court. Apparently, he passed the entrance exam to the University of Tokyo on the first try, and the entrance exam to the national law school while still in college (the exam had a pass-rate of about 2 percent, and most successful applicants flunk a half-dozen times before passing it). Of the 77 judges in Iwai's class, only four others could claim to have passed the law school exam so young and only one was a University of Tokyo graduate. Because the only University of Tokyo graduate as young as Iwai quit the bench within five years, by all odds Iwai was the class star. By 1990, however, he had spent 10 years in branch offices. According to Table 4, that placed him in the bottom 1/3 of his class. Of the University of Tokyo graduates, it put him at the very bottom.

**Table Four:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dead or Retired</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Toward an Electoral Theory of Judicial Independence**

In the United States, political leaders consider ideology in appointing judges, but leave judges once in office alone. That style of judicial independence may be a good thing — but apparently it is essential neither to economic prosperity nor to electoral democracy. Japan is rich, Japan is free, and Japan has had judges that (by many American jurisprudential standards) are not independent. Hence the predictive theore-
political puzzle: why do politicians in some electoral democracies (e.g., in the U.S.) leave judges (once appointed) pretty much alone, while others (e.g., in Japan) do not?

The constitutional text does not answer the puzzle. Both the U.S. and the Japanese constitutions promise judges much the same independence — yet notwithstanding the similar texts, the two judicial systems generate radically different results. If the text were the determining factor, American politicians could do pretty much what LDP politicians did in Japan — yet notwithstanding that opportunity, they do not.

Instead, electoral politics may suggest (tentatively, to be sure) the answer: for reasons Rosenbluth and I detail in our book, LDP politicians had much higher odds of staying in power than either Democratic or Republican politicians have had. Rationally expecting to stay in office long, they manipulated the courts; rationally expecting to alternate with each other in office, Republicans and Democrats implicitly agreed to leave their judges (once appointed) alone.

To see why political leaders might make these calculations, take first the LDP. By 1990, it had been in power continuously for 35 years, and could see no viable opposition party in the wings. It had stayed in power by giving Japanese voters largely what they wanted, and could rationally expect very high odds of staying in power in the future (though odds of less than 1.0, as the summer 1993 elections showed ex post). If so, the LDP had strong incentives to try to control the courts. After all, it wanted not just to enact its programs but to implement them. For that, it did not need judges who did as they pleased. It needed judges who did as they were told.

By contrast, take two political parties that alternate in power, and suppose that both are risk-averse. Although D is in power now, it expects to lose power periodically in the future. Although R is out of power, it expects to gain power periodically. In this situation, D and R may rationally adopt what amount to cooperative strategies in an indefinitely repeated game: both parties may agree not to manipulate the courts to their partisan advantage (i.e., will agree to keep courts independent) while in power.

In this world, despite the potential gains in programmatic implementation that accrue from monitoring courts, both D and R (and the voters they represent) may find it advantageous to keep courts independent. The reason derives from the way each may rationally expect the other to reciprocate. If both expect that (a) their returns while out of office from an implicit hands-off-the-courts rule (the cuts in the losses they would otherwise suffer by being out of office) will have a present value greater than (b) their returns to manipulating courts while in office, then both will have an incentive to keep the courts independent. Both will sacrifice some effectiveness in how they implement their programs while in office, but both may earn larger offsetting gains by lessening their losses while out of office.

If all this is true, then judicial independence may largely be an artifact of the electoral market: judicial independence may be relatively less likely where one political party dominates elections, and relatively more likely (though not inevitable) where two parties alternate in power. And if so, then maybe the consultants drafting the constitutional texts to maintain independent courts in the new democracies in Europe and elsewhere are approaching the issue entirely wrong. Maybe the issues do not involve constitutional texts at all. Maybe they just involve elections.

J. Mark Ramseyer studied as a Fulbright scholar at the University of Tokyo. For his 1990 book in Japanese he received the Suntory Foundation book prize in political economy. He is currently a professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School. This article is adapted with permission from chapters 8 and 9 of Japan's Political Marketplac by J. Mark Ramseyer & Frances McCall Rosenbluth, © 1993, Harvard University Press.
The benefits of mandatoriness are almost entirely achievable.
ONE OF THE MOST important developments in crime control policy during the past decade has been the proliferation of mandatory minimum sentencing statutes. Despite persistent criticism of mandatory, repealing them has seemed unthinkable, because of strong public support for long sentences and the assumption that flaws in the

both smaller than expected and plausible by other means.
concept of mandatories are too complex to be explained to voters. But there are new signs of doubt, most prominently expressed this past summer by Senator Orrin Hatch, the ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee. At long last, it may be possible to reexamine the subject without whistling in the dark.

Long prison sentences are very expensive (in human and budgetary terms), and their deterrence benefits are speculative. For those reasons, many criminal justice experts consider mandatories fundamentally misguided, the more so when they really “work” by boosting prison terms substantially.

I will not emphasize that perspective here. Mandatories retain strong bipartisan support in Congress, and during the last Presidential campaign they were endorsed by the Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates of both major parties. I take these endorsements seriously and assess mandatories primarily from the perspective of those who subscribe to their basic goals.

Although some element of symbolic politics no doubt plays a role in Congressional support for long mandatory sentences, this policy tool also reflects real and important objectives. Frustrated with the persistence of violent crime and a spreading drug problem during the 1970's and 1980's, Congress saw inadequate penalties as partly to blame. It concluded that long mandatory sentences could insure a more just penalty and a more effective deterrent. But severe sentences cannot be effective when their application is too unpredictable, and they cannot be viewed as just punishment when they are disparately applied. If mandatories are failing to achieve their intended purposes, then continued reliance upon them is a poor crime control strategy and, ultimately, poor politics as well.

Unfortunately (for opponents of mandatory minimums), the available evidence does not entirely bear out their objections. Some of the benefits claimed for mandatories (especially increased severity and greater willingness by defendants to provide information on others) are almost certainly being realized. Nonetheless, the benefits of mandatories are both smaller than expected and almost entirely achievable by other means. There is now good reason to believe that mandatories are not only unfair but counterproductive. Committed crime control advocates should now favor their repeal.

There is a lesson here too about Congress's broader role in establishing policy for the criminal justice sys- tem. Congress can identify basic values and provide a sense of direction. Congress and only Congress can respond to the system's perennial top-priority request: “Send money.” But Congress cannot micromanage. The attempt to do so is undesirable in principle, unattainable and destructive in practice.

**Federal Mandatories and Their Goals**

Mandatory minimum penalties have been a feature of federal criminal law since 1790. Mandatories remained rare, however, until the passage of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956, which imposed stiff mandatory sentences for drug importation and distribution. In 1970, Congress concluded that this effort had been a failure, and it repealed virtually all the drug mandatories. Among those who supported the 1970 repeal was Congressman George Bush, who urged that the drug mandatories were ineffective and unjust.

Fourteen years later the pendulum swung again. In 1984 Congress enacted mandatory penalties for several drug offenses and imposed a mandatory five-year sentence enhancement for any offender who carried a gun during a crime of violence. Every two years thereafter, from 1986 through 1990, Congress enacted additional mandatories and stiffened some of those already on the books. Its objective was to insure effective deterrence, guarantee severe punishment for those perceived as egregious offenders and eliminate disparate sentencing of defendants convicted of like offenses.

The federal code now contains over 100 mandatory minimum sentence provisions, but most of them are seldom or never used. Just four of these statutes (covering drug offenses and the enhancement for carrying a gun during another offense) account for 94% of all mandatory cases.

**How the Federal Mandatories are Structured**

The best way to understand mandatory minimum sentencing is to distinguish two forms that these statutes can take. I call these two models discretionary mandatories and mandatory mandatories. The nomenclature seems oxymoronic in the first case and redundant in the second, but the clumsy terminology is necessary to underscore the central fact of life under “mandatories”: Most of these statutes are essentially discretionary.

A. Discretionary mandatories.

Mandatories require the judge to impose a minimum sentence upon conviction under a specified
Frustrated with the persistence of violent crime and a spreading drug problem during the 1970's and 1980's, Congress saw inadequate penalties as partly to blame.

charge, but they do not usually obligate prosecutors to bring such a charge every time the facts would support it. Legislatures in effect delegate to prosecutors the power to decide whether the statute really mandates a minimum sentence or instead is only another charging option. And prosecutors typically assume that a "mandatory" statute imposes no mandate on them. Mandatories then become little more than a bargaining chip, a "hammer" which the prosecutor can invoke, as needed, to obtain more guilty pleas under more favorable terms.

Bargaining-chip mandatories provide an escape from the additional trials that real mandatories can generate, and they may even reduce process costs, because their severe penalties can induce pleas that would not otherwise be forthcoming. Bargaining-chip mandatories also have important crime-control benefits. Though they do not constrain prosecutors, they do constrain judges, who are sometimes perceived as "soft" on crime. And even when bargained away, mandatories have crime-control value because they tend to increase the severity of sentences that guilty plea defendants will accept. But these deterrence benefits are undercut by uncertainty about whether the mandatory will be applied and by the perception among offenders that the mandatory can be manipulated. Also, bargaining-chip mandatories tend to increase rather than reduce disparity, because low-visibility prosecutorial choices control their application. And their most severe effects fall not on flagrantly guilty repeat offenders (who avoid the mandatory by their plea), but rather on first offenders in borderline situations (who are more likely to insist upon trial).

B. Efforts to constrain discretion in mandatories.

Fairness concerns and the desire for stronger crime-control benefits prompt efforts to make mandatories more than mere bargaining chips. Two approaches are possible. In the mandatory-prosecution approach, prosecutors are required to charge and are prohibited from bargaining. In mandatories that are fact-based rather than charge-based, judges ignore the formal charge and base the sentence on actual conduct.

The federal gun enhancement, 18 U.S.C. §924(c), illustrates the possibilities. The statute provides that whoever uses a firearm in committing a federal crime of violence or drug offense shall, in addition to the penalty for the underlying crime, serve a further term of five years without parole. Courts have assumed that the extra five-year term can be imposed only if the defendant is indicted under §924(c) and found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. As a result, §924(c) creates a charge-based mandatory which becomes inapplicable at the prosecutor's discretion.

The penalty effect of this bargaining chip is enormous. Under the federal Sentencing Guidelines, a first offender convicted of selling 50 grams of cocaine faces a sentence of 21-27 months, and if the offender carries a firearm, the Guidelines provide for an additional six-month penalty. But if the drug dealer is charged and convicted under §924(c), the 60-month add-on for carrying the weapon is ten times the enhancement otherwise applicable.

Because §924(c) depends on the prosecutor's charg-
ing decision, there is obviously no “mandatory” five-year enhancement for carrying a weapon. The Department of Justice has sought to fill this gap by adopting something close to a regime of mandatory prosecution for “readily provable” violations. But the Department’s policy has wavered and its effectiveness is incomplete.

The drug mandatories have a similar verbal structure but a different history. The principal statute, 21 U.S.C. §841(a), declares it to be unlawful for any person to manufacture or distribute a controlled substance. The penalty provisions, set forth in §841(b), provide that “in the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving [various drug quantities], such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment which may not be less than [various terms of years].” Unlike §924(c), §841(b) has not been treated as a charge-based mandatory; to date the courts have uniformly held that the drug quantities specified in §841(b) are not elements of the offense but solely sentencing factors to be considered by the judge.

So interpreted, the drug statute becomes a fact-based rather than a charge-based mandatory. If, at sentencing, the judge finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation was one “involving” more than the specified drug quantity, the mandatory applies and the minimum sentence must be imposed. In this regime, the quantity that a prosecutor chooses to charge is irrelevant. The quantity applicable for sentencing purposes may be either higher or lower than the amount stated in the count of conviction.

This approach seems to eliminate the bargaining-chip quality of drug amounts. But the appearance is deceptive. The prosecutor who wants a deal can simply “hide” some of the drug quantities. She can also avoid §841 altogether; if she charges under a different statute, the quantity-based regime of §841(b) becomes unavailable to the judge.

After 1984, the alternative of choice for prosecutors seeking to avoid §841 was the charge of conspiracy to distribute drugs, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §846. Congress responded by plugging this loophole in 1988, when it made sentencing under §846 subject to the §841 penalties. But Congress’s effort did not, and obviously could not, stop a prosecutor determined to use §841 as a bargaining chip. The fact-based mandatories of §841 and §846 can still be avoided as long as there is any other charging option. When Congress eliminated conspiracy as a negotiating alternative to §841, two other options emerged — the “phone count” (use of a communications facility to further a drug offense), a violation that carries a four-year maximum, and simple possession of a controlled substance, a violation that carries a one-year maximum. To judge solely by the statistics, the country has suffered an epidemic of telephone use and simple possession since 1988; in some districts, these charges have become the most serious count in up to 30% of all drug convictions.

Congress could plug these loopholes by extending maximum sentences for these alternate charges and by making their penalties fact- rather than charge-based. Plea negotiators then would have to be more imaginative, but they would no doubt be equal to the task. Guilty pleas to misprision of a felony, filing false tax returns, and similar violations could be expected to proliferate. Unless Congress converts all misdemeanors into felonies carrying sentences of life in prison, the fact-based approach can never prevent mandatories from becoming bargaining chips.

The other way to constrain bargaining is to make prosecution mandatory. Though Congress has yet to take this approach, a few states have done so. Their experience is not encouraging. After enactment of New York’s Rockefeller drug laws in 1973, the volume of arrests declined sharply, and the overall probability of imprisonment actually dropped as a result. Yet trial rates rose and case processing times roughly doubled, despite the addition of 31 new criminal courts in New York City. “Mandatory” sentencing had not eliminated discretion but had simply displaced it to less visible stages of the criminal process. After less than three years, the experiment was abandoned and plea bargaining restrictions were repealed.

At the federal level, there are no statutory restrictions on charging or bargaining, but in 1987, the Department of Justice began to address the loophole by internal guidelines. The Department sought to enhance the bite of §841 by making prosecution mandatory for all “readily provable” violations. Though not uniformly followed, the policy has had impact; in some districts a degree of real mandatoriness has been attained. But success in this endeavor brings problems of its own.

C. Mandatory mandatories.

When mandatories are actually applied to all fact situations falling within their scope, predictable and severe sentences are achieved. The result is longer prison terms, increased correctional costs, and (perhaps) enhanced deterrence. Because judges cannot award a discount for a guilty plea, the percentage of defendants going to trial rises. Finally, mandatory-pros-
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crime of violence or a drug offense is subject to a minimum consecutive sentence of five years, and for a "second or subsequent conviction," the minimum consecutive sentence is 20 years. The Supreme Court decided, this past Term, that because of the "second or subsequent" wording, the 20 year minimum is applicable to a first offender, if he is convicted of committing two offenses with weapons during the same month or even the same day.

One might think that obvious bloopers of these sorts are not relevant to assessing the mandatory idea in principle. But Congress can never foresee the full range of circumstances to which a mandatory might apply. Mistakes are inevitable. Anomalies and injustices will arise in any system that attempts to base severe sentences on just one or two circumstances of a case.

3. Misplaced equality will occur even if all outright mistakes can be eliminated. Equal treatment of like offenders prevents one form of disparity, but equal treatment of unlike offenders creates another form of disparity – excessive uniformity. And excessive uniformity is inevitable under mandatorype because they single out just one or two factors to determine the sentence. Offenders who differ in a host of crucial respects receive inappropriately equal treatment.

One example is equal treatment of offenders who play different roles in the offense. The ringleader faces the same sentence as a young messenger with no real control over the events. Parties who were pressured to participate face the same sentence as the most violent and abusive leaders. Mandatories could allow room for
such factors by permitting them to aggravate the sentence. But that approach would require setting the minimum penalty at the level appropriate for the least culpable offender, and such a statute would hardly "send a message." Instead mandatoriness are invariably pegged at a level that the legislature considers appropriate for a highly culpable participant; in some of the federal mandatoriness, the "minimum" sentence is life imprisonment without parole. Just punishment for lesser roles is inevitably precluded.

Because mandatoriness are excessively uniform, pressure to evade them constantly occurs. Mandatory-prosecution mandatoriness can be grossly unfair if faithfully applied, but (perhaps fortunately) they become difficult to sustain in practice because misplaced equality produces powerful resistance to their enforcement.

4. The cooperation paradox provides a final example of the distortions that result from inattention to context. One universally recognized exception to a mandatory minimum is the situation in which a defendant testifies against confederates or provides leads in other investigations. Sentence concessions are essential to guarantee that mandatoriness do not choke off the flow of such cooperation. Indeed mandatoriness coupled with an exception for cooperation provide powerful inducements for assistance that might not otherwise be forthcoming.

But the escape hatch for cooperation creates a paradox. Defendants who are most in the know, and thus have the most to offer, are almost always the more important members of the conspiratorial group. The highly culpable offender is the best placed to negotiate a big sentencing break. Minor players, with little knowledge or responsibility, have little to offer and can wind up with far more severe sentences than the boss.

Of course, sentence concessions for helping the government have always been part of American sentencing and always will be. The vice of an escape hatch for cooperation stems from its interaction with the rigidity that mandatoriness otherwise impose. Low-level dealers, middlemen and more important distributors are normally held accountable for the same quantity of drugs flowing through the conspiratorial network. All participants therefore face the same high mandatory sentence, regardless of their limited role on the offense or mitigating personal circumstances. The "big fish" and the "minnows" wind up in the same sentencing boat. Enter the escape hatch, with sentence concessions that tend to increase with the knowledge and responsibility of the offender. The big fish get the big breaks, while the minnows are left to face severe and sometimes draconian penalties.

This result makes nonsense of the intuitively plausible scale of penalties that Congress and the ordinary person envisage when they think of sentences linked to drug quantity. Instead of a pyramid of liability, with long sentences for leaders at the top of the organizational ladder, the mandatory system can become an inverted pyramid, with stiff sentences for minor players and modest punishments for insiders who can cut favorable deals. Judge Frank Easterbrook calls this the phenomenon of "inverted sentencing. The more serious the defendant's crimes the lower the sentence..."

**The Effect of Mandatoriness: The Empirical Evidence**

Sentencing Commission data show evidence of dramatic increases in sentence length in the period since mandatoriness were adopted. From 1984 to 1990, median sentences for one typical kind of drug case increased from 36 months with parole eligibility to 66 months without parole, an increase in likely time served of 367%.

Although such increases cannot be attributed solely to mandatoriness, those statutes no doubt contribute to the trend, both directly and through their impact on the Sentencing Commission's choice of guideline ranges.

The mandatoriness did not, however, have much effect on the rate of cases going to trial. Guilty plea rates in drug cases (79%) remain roughly what they were before the mandatoriness took effect. Even in large quantity cases that appear eligible for the ten-year minimum, the plea rate (73%) is only slightly lower than the 79% rate observed in drug cases generally.

One explanation for the persistence of high guilty plea rates emerges from the Sentencing Commission's analysis of prosecutorial charging practices. In a sample of defendants apparently eligible for a mandatory drug or weapons sentence, the Commission found that only 74% of the defendants were charged with the highest mandatory indicated by their conduct. Among drug defendants who appeared eligible for the §924(c) weapons enhancement, only 55% were so charged. Further attrition occurred after indictment. Only 59% of the defendants were eventually convicted at the mandatory level for which they appeared eligible, and

---

Among defendants who entered into plea agreements, more than half were sentenced below the mandatory level for which they appeared eligible.

Many in this group still managed to avoid the mandatory level through a reward for cooperation. Among defendants who entered into plea agreements, more than half were sentenced below the mandatory level for which they appeared eligible.

Even more troubling, the attrition of cases did not appear to be random. Whites were less likely to be charged at the highest possible level, and once charged were less likely to be convicted than similarly situated blacks and Hispanics. Moreover, of defendants who faced a mandatory minimum at sentencing, 25% of the whites benefited from a prosecutor’s “substantial assistance” motion, but only 18% of the blacks did. The Commission’s data thus suggest not only a large element of discretion in the federal “mandatory,” but also uncertainty, disparity, and possibly even invidious discrimination.

Methodology may be part of the problem here. Evidentiary gaps might explain some of what looks like unjustifiable manipulation. Because the Commission relied primarily on case files and written presentence reports, its evaluation may miss the significance of certain intangibles.

My own research, conducted with Sentencing Commissioner Ilene H. Nagel, attempted to provide a contrast to the Commission’s statistical approach by using case files as background for extensive interviews with case prosecutors and probation officers. This “softer” but more comprehensive information base can help separate unjustified manipulation from legitimate evidentiary problems. We found that prosecutors evaded the applicable legal sentence (including both the requirements of mandatories and Sentencing Guidelines) in 20-35% of all cases resolved by guilty plea. Evasion seemed especially common in drug cases; on the other hand, §924(c) cases were treated scrupulously in many districts.

Some confirmation of our qualitative impressions can be gleaned from data concerning the tool most likely to be used to evade mandates – the lesser drug offenses that can serve as vehicles for count bargaining. In fiscal 1990, only 2% of all guilty pleas in drug cases resulted from pleas to a telephone count (21 U.S.C. §843) and only 7% resulted from pleas to a charge of simple possession (21 U.S.C. §844). But §843 convictions represent a major share of all drug convictions in New Hampshire (18%), Northern Texas (14%), Southern Indiana (13%) and Colorado (25%). Convictions under §844 were frequent in Maryland (25%), Eastern Virginia (24%), and Middle Alabama (34%), among others. In many districts §843 and §844 counts combined represented over 30% of all drug convictions. It is possible, of course, that simple possession and telephone use happened to be especially pervasive in these districts, or that weak evidence was a more common problem there than elsewhere. But one is entitled to be skeptical of such explanations for the data. The inference of commonplace evasion of drug mandatories in these districts seems compelling.

Motions for reduction of sentence on grounds of substantial assistance provide another window into the phenomenon. In fiscal 1991, such motions were made...
in 12% of all cases nationally, but substantial assistance motions were almost routine in Eastern Pennsylvania (41%), Western North Carolina (37%), Colorado (24%), and Northern Florida (36%). Some of the districts that rarely use §843 and §844 seem to rely on the substantial assistance motion as a substitute. Others (e.g. Colorado) seem to use both devices, with a cumulative effect that may touch more than half of all drug cases. The raw data cannot by themselves preclude legitimate explanations; cases of genuine cooperation may happen to be distributed very unevenly by districts. But again, one is entitled to be skeptical. The inference of pervasive discretion, with sharp disparities in its application, is strong.

**Conclusion**

The federal mandatoriness have almost certainly raised the severity of punishment in drug and weapons cases and made defendants more willing to assist in other investigations. Yet because the federal mandatoriness preserve discretionary features, trial rates have not soared. The process costs of true mandatoriness have been largely avoided.

These gains aside, the federal mandatoriness, precisely because they retain large measures of both discretion and mandatoriness, produce many of the worst effects of both models. Severity gains are undercut by uncertainty, since mandatoriness appear to be evaded in 30-50% of the cases to which they apply. At the same time, mandatoriness remains real, especially when defendants choose to go to trial. In such cases severity becomes a mixed virtue; sentences that seem fair when judged in the abstract from Washington often appear draconian as applied in context. Uniformity backfires because true mandatoriness produces inequity: cliffs, mistakes, misplaced equality and the cooperation paradox. Meanwhile discretion remains, and this discretion, largely unguided, is exercised at the lowest levels of visibility. Indeed the very illegitimacy of discretion in an ostensibly mandatoriness system drives discretionary judgments further underground, obscures accountability and invites disparity and abuse.

Is there another way? Mandatoriness, even if they bring some benefits, simply may not be worth their high budgetary and moral costs. But there is no need for Congress to face up to this hard choice, because virtually all the benefits of mandatoriness can be achieved without their unwanted side effects.

The alternative that can achieve Congressional goals is one that is already in place – the guidelines system enacted in 1984. Guidelines create greater uniformity than the previous regime of discretionary judicial sentencing and can guard against what some perceive as undue judicial leniency. At the same time, guidelines can avoid excessive uniformity by basing the sentence range on structured adjustments for an offender's role in the offense, lesser culpability, and mitigating personal circumstances. And when a sentence range is provided by guidelines rather than mandatories, the judge can depart if circumstances are unusual.

Guidelines can achieve a substantial degree of uniformity and even severity. At the same time, guidelines can preserve discretion, channel it into a structured framework, and allow sufficient flexibility to avoid the inequities of mandatory sentencing. By taking advantage of the guidelines system, Congress can achieve all the goals it seeks through mandatory minimums, without the adverse effects.

But guidelines can provide an effective alternative to mandatoriness only on one condition, only if they are flexible in ways that mandatoriness are not. Guidelines that permit artificial factors to drive the computation of offense levels, that prevent adjustments for variations in culpability, and that deny scope for judicial departure in exceptional circumstances are "guidelines" in name only. Just as mandatoriness can be discretionary, guidelines can become mandatory, with all the costs that excess rigidity brings. The existing federal Sentencing Guidelines too often seem to slide in this direction. To develop a just and effective sentencing system, Congress and the Commission must work together to remove excessive rigidity not only from the mandatory minimums, but also from the Guidelines themselves.
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MESSAGE FROM THE FUND FOR THE LAW SCHOOL CHAIR

This year has been both challenging and rewarding for me as chair for the Law School Fund. I am delighted to report that, once again, this year’s Fund for the Law School reached another record total of $1,787,838—no small achievement in such a difficult year for the economy and the legal profession in particular! As part of that total, the Mandel Legal Aid Clinic surpassed its goal by raising $115,336, which represents a 7% increase over last year.

This accomplishment is due in large part to the tremendous efforts of the 415 volunteers who participated in the Fund. I would first like to thank the 71 students who threw their energy and time into making the annual Student Phonathon such a success. The outstanding leadership of Fund and Reunion Phonathon Co-Chairs Ruth Bro ’94 and Kent Bressie ’94 and Clinic Phonathon Co-Chairs Gavin Dowell ’93 and K.J. Dell’Antonia ’94 brought in terrific results as the students increased the total raised by 15% to a record $137,039.

I would also like to recognize and thank Larry Rubin ’70 for his energetic work heading the Decades committee, and the Leadership Committee of Joel Bernstein ’69, Susan Davies ’91, Chuck Edwards ’65, Pat Ellingsworth ’74, George Felleman ’67, Marian Jacobson ’70, Karen Johnston ’91, Bob Lofts ’59, Mark Mamolen ’77, Denny Mayer ’59, Alison Miller ’76, Gail Runnfeldt ’79, Bob Schloerb ’51, Ed Warren ’69, Dick Watt ’42 and Scott Williamson ’85 for their strong recruitment efforts and support. The Law School also owes its gratitude to the additional 330 volunteers who worked through regional, class and firm assignments to contact alumni personally and encourage their continued commitment to the school.

As I have served this year, I have been struck many times by the strength of feeling for the Law School and the commitment of the 2,795 alumni and friends who gave so generously. As I pass the baton to Chuck Edwards, our 1993-94 Fund Chair, I know that he will build on our strong base of volunteer and alumni support to involve as many of you as possible, and to reach new records for the Law School.

Terry D. Diamond ’63

1992-93 VOLUNTEERS

Terry D. Diamond ’63
Fund for the Law School Chair

Charles L. Edwards ’65 Chicago Hinton-Hall Societies Co-Chair
Patrick J. Ellingsworth ’74 Los Angeles Chair
Marian S. Jacobson ’70 Chicago Katz Society Chair
Robert L. Lofts ’59 San Francisco Chair
Mark C. Mamolen ’71 Chicago Hinton-Hall Societies Co-Chair
Frank D. Mayer, Jr. ’59 Chicago Bigelow Society Chair
Alison W. Miller ’76 Regional Chair
Edward W. Warren ’69 District of Columbia Chair

Lawrence R. Rubin ’70
Fund for the Law School Decades Chair
Joel M. Bernstein ’69 Decade of the 60s Chair
Susan M. Davies ’91 Decade of the 90s Chair
George P. Felleman ’67 Firm Chair
Karen M. Johnston ’91 Mandel Legal Aid Clinic Chair
Gail P. Runnfeldt ’79 Decade of the 70s Chair
Robert G. Schloerb ’51 Decade of the 50s Chair
Richard F. Watt ’42 Decade of the 40s Chair
Scott R. Williamson ’85 Decade of the 80s Chair
## Fund for the Law School Volunteers

Terence M. Abid '91  
Samuel W. Ach '87  
William L. Achenbach '67  
Melvin S. Ades '69  
Ronald J. Aronberg '57  
Steve M. Barnett '66  
Bonnie A. Baramian '89  
Gregory B. Beggs '54  
Roya Behnia '91  
Maureen K. Berg '87  
Amy B. Bernstein '90  
Dorn G. Bishop '89  
George P. Blake '61  
Joseph D. Bolton '74  
Elizabeth M. Brown '66  
F. Ronald Buocio '51  
Debra A. Caffaro '82  
David J. Chiswery '91  
Philip S. Clark '89  
Alexandra R. Cole '79  
Sherman P. Corwin '41  
Ellen M. Cosgrove '91  
Jennifer A. Coyne '90  
Matthew C. Crowl '89  
Theresa E. Cudahy '92  

### All Law School Contributions 1992-93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund for the Law School</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Mandel Legal Aid Clinic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,672,502</td>
<td>$115,336</td>
<td>$1,787,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Restricted Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Law School Contributions</th>
<th>$2,144,553</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Contribution Breakdown 1992-93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Number of Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgs</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund for the Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Number of Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgs</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mandel Legal Aid Clinic Fund Volunteers

- June E. Daniel '90  
- Jeffrey S. Davis '91  
- T. Stephen Dyer '79  
- David R. Melton '77  
- Elliott L. Molk '89  
- Mark W. Powers '89  
- David J. Saul '91  
- Robert H. Smith '72  
- William R. Brandt  
- Sherman F. Corwin  
- Robert J. Janda  
- Daniel C. Smith  
- Saul I. Stern  
- William M. Brandt  
- Richard F. Watt  
- Stanley L. Cummings  
- Dale M. Stucky  
- Nancy G. Feldman  
- Stuart Bernstein  
- Ruth G. Goldman  
- Abe Krahe  
- Mildred G. Peters  
- William R. Brandt  
- Milton A. Levenfeld  
- Gerald B. Greenwald  
- Robert G. Schloerb
### Class Giving

The following classes contributed $50,000 or more to the Law School in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1965</td>
<td>$170,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1977</td>
<td>$136,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1935</td>
<td>$129,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1978</td>
<td>$127,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1967</td>
<td>$101,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1963</td>
<td>$93,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1953</td>
<td>$93,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1964</td>
<td>$71,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1957</td>
<td>$62,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1958</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1983</td>
<td>$56,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1952</td>
<td>$54,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1973</td>
<td>$53,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1955</td>
<td>$53,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1968</td>
<td>$52,841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following classes' participation rate was 50% or more in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1941</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1940</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1946</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1949</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1974</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1983</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1979</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following classes' mean gift per donor was $2,000 or more in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mean Gift per Donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1935</td>
<td>$6,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1953</td>
<td>$4,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1936</td>
<td>$3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1965</td>
<td>$2,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1946</td>
<td>$2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1977</td>
<td>$2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1978</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1937</td>
<td>$2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 1943</td>
<td>$2,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pledges not included.

---

**1952**
- Jack Joseph
- Edwin P. Wiley
- Harold R. Junke
- Joel H. Kaplan
- Philip L. Vermeer

**1954**
- Gregory B. Beegs
- Alan R. Brodie
- Leo Feldman
- John M. Friedman
- Walter Hellerstein
- Lawrence E. Rubin

**1955**
- Joseph N. DaCanto
- Harris A. Gilbert
- Bernard J. Nussbaum
- Barry S. Alberts
- Karen J. Kaplowitz
- Thomas L. Kimer

**1956**
- B. Mark Fried
- Michael L. Igoe Jr.
- George J. Casson Jr.
- Deborah C. Franczek
- Neal S. Millard

**1957**
- Jack Alex
- Ronald J. Aronberg
- Barbara J. Fried
- Warren J. Archer
- Louis B. Goldman
- Michael R. Hassan

**1959**
- Norman J. Hanfling
- Robert L. Lotfs
- George L. Saunders Jr.
- Walter C. Greenough
- Robert F. Weber

**1960**
- Stuart A. Applebaum
- Peter F. Langrock
- Gerald F. Mintz
- Thomas M. Fitzpatrick
- Joel M. Hurwitz
- Alison W. Miller

**1961**
- Thomas N. Jersild
- Donald A. Mackay
- Richard N. Oglet
- Donald M. Wessling
- Neil S. Braun
- Andrew Kull
- Dana H. Kull
- James D. Parsons

**1962**
- James A. Donohoe
- Roger R. Foss
- David C. Hilliard
- Gerald J. Sherman
- Michael A. Donnella
- Gail P. Runnfeldt
- Harry H. Schneider Jr.

**1964**
- Malcolm S. Kamin
- Laurel J. McKeil
- Mitchell S. Shapiro
- F. Ellen Duff
- Thomas V. Dulich
- Fredrick C. Lowinger

**1965**
- Charles L. Edwards
- Joseph H. Golant
- Chester T. Kamin
- Bryant B. Edwards
- Kevin M. Murphy
- Steven I. Peretz

**1966**
- Steve M. Barnett
- Robert M. Berger
- William A. Pomerantz
- Debra A. Cafaro
- Thomas J. Scorza
- Claire E. Toth

**1967**
- William L. Achenbach
- George M. Covington
- Peter T. Ostroff
- Daniel L. Doctoroff
- Denise J. Harvey
- Elizabeth M. Streit

**1969**
- Melvin S. Adess
- Scott R. Williamson
- William M. McCabe
- Jay Stark
- Judy Zecchin

---

**1970**
- James C. Geoly
- Mary Ellen Kamer
- Joel H. Kaplan
- Philip L. Vermeer

**1971**
- Joel H. Kaplan
- Philip L. Vermeer

**1972**
- Barry S. Alberts
- Karen J. Kaplowitz
- Thomas L. Kimer

**1973**
- George J. Casson Jr.
- Deborah C. Franczek
- Neal S. Millard

**1974**
- Warren J. Archer
- Louis B. Goldman
- Michael R. Hassan

**1975**
- Walter C. Greenough
- Robert F. Weber

**1976**
- Thomas M. Fitzpatrick
- Joel M. Hurwitz
- Alison W. Miller

**1977**
- Neil S. Braun
- Andrew Kull
- Dana H. Kull
- James D. Parsons

**1978**
- Michael A. Donnella
- Gail P. Runnfeldt
- Harry H. Schneider Jr.

**1979**
- F. Ellen Duff
- Thomas V. Dulich
- Fredrick C. Lowinger

**1980**
- Bryant B. Edwards
- Kevin M. Murphy
- Steven I. Peretz

**1981**
- Debra A. Cafaro
- Thomas J. Scorza
- Claire E. Toth

**1982**
- Daniel L. Doctoroff
- Denise J. Harvey
- Elizabeth M. Streit

**1983**
- James C. Geoly
- Mary Ellen Kamer

---

**1984**
- JS. M. Brown
- Maureen K. Berg
- Oscar A. David

**1985**
- Scott R. Williamson
- William M. McCabe
- Jay Stark
- Judy Zecchin

**1986**
- James C. Geoly
- Mary Ellen Kamer

**1987**
- Joel H. Kaplan
- Philip L. Vermeer

**1988**
- John R. Dent
- Nancy R. Rotting

**1989**
- Roya Behnia
- Ellen M. Cosgrove

**1990**
- Theresa E. Cudahy
- Susan M. Cullin
- Elizabeth E. Gordon
- Eric H. Jaso

---

**1991**
- Minn. Cullin
- Elizabeth E. Gordon
- Eric H. Jaso
**FIRM REPRESENTATIVES**

Terence M. Abad ’91
Pillsbury Madison & Sutro

Samuel W. Ach ’87
Butler, Rubin, Saltzstein & Boyd

Jack D. Beem ’74
Baker & McKenzie

H. Nicholas Berberian ’78
Neal Gerber & Eisenberg

Wilber H. Boies ’68
McDermott, Will & Emery

Stephen S. Bowen ’72
Latham & Watkins

Roland E. Brandel ’66
Morrison & Foerster

David A. Bronner ’73
Katten, Muchin & Zavis

David N. Brown ’66
Covington & Burling

Geraldine S. Brown ’75
Miller Shakman

Wayne Dale Collins ’78
Shearman & Sterling

Peter H. Darrow ’67
Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton

Oscar A. David ’87
Winston & Strawn

William R. Dougherty ’66
Simpson, Thacher & Barnet

F. Ellen Duff ’80
Watson & Strawn

Steven B. Feinson ’75
Dechert Price & Rhoads

Geoff Felleman ’67
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison

John M. Friedman Jr. ’70
Dewey Ballantine

Roger R. Fross ’62
Lord, Bissell & Brook

Robert H. Gerstein ’59
Holde & Cuff

Wayne S. Gilchrist ’75
Goldberg, Kahn, Bell, Black, Rosenblum & Moritz

David R. Goldberg ’91
Dewey Ballantine

Louis B. Goldman ’74
Altheimer & Gray

James C. Goodale ’58
Debovoise & Plimpton

Walter C. Goodnow ’75
Schiff Hardin & Waite

Cynthia J. Griffith ’91
Heller Ehrman, White & McAuliffe

**D’Ancona Pflaum**

**Howard M. Heitner ’82**

**Laura Banfield Hogue ’67**

**White & Case**

**Charles C. Ivie ’70**

**Gibson Dunn & Crutcher**

**Marian S. Jacobson ’72**

**Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal**

**Thomas N. Jerstid ’61**

**Mayer, Brown & Platt**

**Chester T. Kamin ’65**

**Jenner & Block**

**Mary Ellen Kimer ’85**

**Pillsbury Madison & Sutro**

**Anne G. Kimball ’76**

**Wildman Harford Allen & Dixon**

**Thomas L. Kimber ’71**

**Fosgate & Benson**

**Abe Krash ’49**

**Arnold & Porter**

**Nancy A. Lieberman ’79**

**Sheddian Arps Slate Meagher & Flom**

**William F. Lloyd ’75**

**Sidley & Austin**

**Frank D. Mayer Jr. ’59**

**Mayer, Brown & Platt**

**Terry A. McIlroy ’70**

**Chapman and Cutler**

**Neal S. Millard ’72**

**Jones Day Reavis & Pogue**

**Charles H. Mingo ’88**

**Fried Frank Harris Shriver & Jacobson**

**Janet D. Olsen ’81**

**Bell Boyd & Lloyd**

**Greg W. René ’75**

**Foley & Lardner**

**Louis E. Rosen ’62**

**Hopkins & Sutter**

---

**LAW FIRM GIVING**

(Includes firms with 10 or more University of Chicago Law School graduates)

The following law firms contributed $15,000 or more to the Law School in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Total Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis</td>
<td>$58,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenschein Nath &amp; Rosenthal</td>
<td>$41,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer, Brown &amp; Platt</td>
<td>$38,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidley &amp; Austin</td>
<td>$32,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; McKenzie</td>
<td>$32,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman and Cutler</td>
<td>$17,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten, Muchin &amp; Zavis</td>
<td>$17,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Dunn &amp; Crutcher</td>
<td>$16,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altheimer &amp; Gray</td>
<td>$15,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following law firms' alumni participation rate was 65% or more in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller Shakman Hamilton &amp; Kurtzon</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Carton &amp; Douglas</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedder Price Kaufman &amp; Kammholz</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman and Cutler</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Ancona Pflaum</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debovoise &amp; Plimpton</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Dunn &amp; Crutcher</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudnick &amp; Wolfe</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington &amp; Burling</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillsbury Madison &amp; Sutro</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDermott Will &amp; Emery</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following law firms' mean gift per graduate was $700 or more in 1992-93:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Mean Gift Per Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; McKenzie</td>
<td>$1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson Dunn &amp; Crutcher</td>
<td>$985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner Carton &amp; Douglas</td>
<td>$975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnenschein Nath &amp; Rosenthal</td>
<td>$894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis</td>
<td>$858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Gerber &amp; Eisenberg</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katten, Muchin &amp; Zavis</td>
<td>$766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman and Cutler</td>
<td>$744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Case</td>
<td>$740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington &amp; Burling</td>
<td>$705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT PHONATHON VOLUNTEERS
FUND FOR THE LAW SCHOOL

Bruce A. Albert '95
Jeanette E. Alvarado '94
Evelyn L. Becker '93
Kent D. Bessie '94
Ruth H. Bro '94
Derek M. Bush '94
Marina Bush
Michael G. Cartier '94
Michael G. Connors '95
Andy G. Deis '95
Marcelo C. Duhamel '93
Evelyn Beth Evans '94
Aline J. Fairweather '94
Marsha J. Fetterer '93
Daniel E. Frank '93
Michael E. Frankel '95
Rachel K. Gibbons '94
Adam B. Goodman '95
Gabriel E. Gore '94
Griffith L. Green '93
Sarah B. Haby '95
Donald F. Harmon '93
Gregory Harrington '94
Maurita Elaine Horn '94
James W. Joseph '94
Paul J. Karafiol '95
Joseph H. Kaufman '94
Harry S. Lind '94
Margaret C. Liu '93
David S. Malmon '94
John B. McDonald '95
Susan M. Moss '94
Lawrence A. Neubauer '94
Stephen J. Newman '95
Lisa M. Noller '95
Phillip G. Oldham '95

Wesley M. Oliver '95
Ann L. Parsons '94
Daniel A. Rabinowitz '94
Richard J. Reisman '94
Larry R. Rivkin '94
Paul L. Rodriguez '94
Abigail L. Rudoff '94
Jesse H. Ruiz '95
Jonathan S. Saver '95
Matthew R. Schantz '95
Elizabeth W. Scott '94
Linda J. Simon '95
John E. Sorkin '94
Susan J. Steinhalt '94
Mythili Thamarathan '94
Andrew N. Thomas '94
David A. Vincent '94
Derex Walker '95
John-Paul F. Whelan '94
Teresa F. Wilton '94

STUDENT PHONATHON VOLUNTEERS
EDWIN F. MANDEL LEGAL AID CLINIC

Salvador J. Antonetti '94
Andrew L. Berke '94
Marc J. Boxerman '93
Ruth H. Bro '94
Michael G. Cartier '94
Karin J. Dell'Antonia '94
Gavin C. Dowell '93
Cynthia A. Faur '93
Mary Christine Graff '94

Beet J. Hart '94
Ira M. Kalina '94
Marc D. Kirshbaum '93
Seth L. Levine '93
David S. Malmon '94
Thomas R. Morton '93
Elise C. Masse '93
Gregory C. Mayer '93
Susan M. Moss '94
Ann L. Parsons '94
Ann T. Reading '93
Robert L. Seelig '94
Tanya H. Stede '94
Donald E. Walther '94

Michael Nusbaum '61
District of Columbia
Diane Erickson '73
Honolulu
Michael M. Wilson '78
Houston
Karen J. Kaplowitz '71
Los Angeles
Alison W. Miller '76
Miami
Peter W. Bruce '70
Milwaukee
Byron E. Starrs, Jr. '69
Minneapolis/St. Paul

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION REGIONAL PRESIDENTS
Peter Kontio '73
Atlanta
John M. Kimpel '74
Boston
Alan R. Oreschel '64
Chicago
Robert L. Seaver '64
Cincinnati
Richard N. Ogle '61
Cleveland
James A. Donohoe '62
Dallas
Edward J. Roche, Jr. '76
Denver
Miles Jaffe '50
Detroit

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT STAFF
Dennis M. Barden
Assistant Dean and Director of Development

Annina Fabbioli
Assistant Director of Development

Victoria J. Ferrera
Development Assistant

For inquiries regarding the Honor Roll, please call
(312) 702-9496

ALUMNI RELATIONS AND REUNION DEVELOPMENT STAFF
Holly C. Davis '76
Assistant Dean for Alumni Relations
Elise Takaki
Assistant to the Assistant Dean

REUNION CONTRIBUTIONS
2 Year Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>1992/93 Funds Contributed and Pledged</th>
<th>1991/92 Funds Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>$288,075</td>
<td>$93,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$114,440</td>
<td>$93,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>$145,841</td>
<td>$52,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$89,945</td>
<td>$53,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$137,705</td>
<td>$127,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$56,985</td>
<td>$56,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$927,197</td>
<td>$571,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>1992/93 Funds Contributed</th>
<th>1991/92 Funds Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
<td>$18,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>$17,430</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
<td>$58,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$93,075</td>
<td>$40,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>$52,841</td>
<td>$129,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$53,945</td>
<td>$38,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$127,605</td>
<td>$380,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>1992/93 Funds Contributed</th>
<th>1991/92 Funds Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>$93,075</td>
<td>$93,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
<td>$58,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$93,162</td>
<td>$93,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>$52,841</td>
<td>$52,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>$53,945</td>
<td>$53,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$127,605</td>
<td>$127,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$56,985</td>
<td>$56,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$571,819</td>
<td>$380,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DEAN’S FUNDS

JAMES PARKER HALL SOCIETY
($15,000 AND ABOVE)

Nathan and Emily S. Blum Foundation
Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc.
Central European University Foundation
Chicago Community Foundation
Chicago Sun-Times
Joseph N. DuCanto ’55
Gene E. Dye ’67
Daniel R. ‘77 and Phyllis R. Fischel Foundation
Francis J. Gerlits ’58
Adrienne G. and Burton E. Glazov ’63
Harris Foundation
Irving B. Harris
James C. Hormel ’58
Lawrence T. Hoyle Jr. ’65
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
Marilyn and Thomas Kantor Foundation
Marilyn H. Karsten
Claudia J. and Jeffrey J. Keenan ’83
Kirkland & Ellis Foundation
Claude R. Lambe
Charitable Foundation
Elisabeth M. and William M. Landes
Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois
Peter D. Lederer ’57
Long Mountain Road Foundation
J. Roderick MacArthur Foundation
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Estate of Joseph L. Mack ’54
Mark C. Mamelen ’77
Mayer, Brown & Platt
Erhel McQuiston
Bernard D. ’37 and Jean S. Meister
Margaret and Richard Merrill Foundation
JoAnn and Stuart C. Nathan ’65
Bernard J. ’55 and Jean Nusebaum

John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.
Barrington D. Parker ’46
Friends of Tony Patullo Fellowship
George J. Phocas ’53
Herbert Pordes ’36
Andrew M. ’78 and Betsy R. Rosenfield
Estate of Ruth Wyatt Rossen
Salans Hirtzel & Heilbronn
Sarah Scaife Foundation
Laurence N. Strenger ’68
Fritz Thyssen Stiftung
Tower Foundation
Helen R. Weigle
Marc O. Wolinsky ’80
and Barry C. Skovgaard ’80
S. K. Yue Foundation, Inc.
James and Bobette Zacharias Fund
Bobette and James L. Zacharias ’35

EDWARD W. HINTON SOCIETY
($5,000-$14,999)

Anonymous (2)
AAUW Educational Foundation
Jack Alex ’57
Alzheimer & Gray
AT&T Foundation
Erhel and Irving J. Axelrod ’39
Douglas G. Baird
Baker & McKenzie
Steve M. Barnett ’66
Doris and Stuart Bernstein ’47
Walter J. Blum ’41
Stephen S. Bowen ’72
and Ellen C. Newcomer ’73
Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
Patrick & Aimee Butler Family Foundation
California Community Foundation
Canadian Women’s Foundation
Chicago Area Foundation for Legal Services
Frank Cicero Jr. ’65
Lillian Cohen
Jack Cornblith ’49
Cotsirilos Family Fund
George J. Cotsirilos ’42
Kenneth W. Dann ’57
Frank H. ’31 and
Katherine Derweiler
Terry D. Diamond ’63
Isaiah S. Dorfman ’31
Charles L. Edwards ’65
Patrick J. Ellingsworth ’74
Adam O. Emmerich ’85
George P. Felleman ’67
Fieldstead & Company
First National Bank of Chicago Foundation
Herbert B. ’32 and
Marilyn Fried
Ethan J. Friedman ’83
John M. Friedman Jr. ’70
Anthony C. Gilbert ’63
Global Fund For Women
Robert C. Gobelman ’58
Harold L. ’47 and Ruth G. Goldman ’47
Ruth & Harold L.
Goldman
Philanthropic Fund
Mayer Greenberg Foundation
Daniel B. Greenberg ’65
and Susan Steinhauser
Elmer M. ’37 and Harriet Heffter
Eileen and Leo Herzel ’52
David C. Hillard ’62
Laurn B. Hoguet ’67
Lawrence Howe ’48
Hoyle, Morris & Kerr
International Business Machines Corporation
Chester T. Kamin ’65
and Nancy S. Scharfer ’74
Burton W. ’52 and
Naomi R. Kanter
Noel Kaplan ’63
Spencer L. Kimball
Lillian E. Kraemer ’64
Krane Foundation
Howard G. Krane ’57
Douglas M. Kraus ’73
David S. Kreisman ’63
Paul H. ’30 and Theo H.
Leffmann
Paul H. & Theo H.
Leffmann
Philanthropic Fund
Edward H. ’35 and Kate S. Levi
Dorothy R. Levin
Richard L. Marcus ’62
James J. McClure Jr. ’49
and Lynn P. McClure
Laurel J. McKee ’64
Mary McClure Miller Foundation

HARRY A. BIGELOW SOCIETY
($2,500-$4,999)

Anonymous
Aetna Foundation, Inc.
Barry S. Alberts ’11
Thomas W. Albrecht ’79

Norman H. Bachman ’32
Larry T. ’67 and Phil C. Neal
Stephen C. Neal
New York Community Trust
Russell J. Parsons ’42
Patinkin Family
Charitable Trust
Hugh M. Patinkin ’75
Gerald M. Penner ’64
Kenneth C. ’34 and Pearl L. Prince
Roberta C. Ramo ’67
George A. Ranney Jr. ’66
and Victoria P. Ranney
Gerald Rattner ’37
Richard C. Reed ’48
Mary W. and Robert G.
Schloerb ’51
Judy M. and Thomas J.
Scora ’82
Serfarth Shaw Fairweather & Geraldson
Mitchell S. Shapiro ’64
Sidley & Austin
Alice and Richard D.
Sinsheimer
Robert L. Sinsheimer
Stephen M. Slavin ’64
Daniel C. ’40 and Louise H.
Smith
Estate of Leo Spitz ’10
Charles Stern and Judith Haberman Stern
John N. Stern
Norman H. Stone Family Foundation
Geoffrey R. ’71 and
Nancy S. Stone
Stephen E. Tallent ’62
Allen M. Turner ’61
Wachstett Lipton Rosen & Katz Foundation
Charlotte P. and Roger A. Weiler ’52
Whistler Foundation
Nancy Freund White
Barry S. Wine ’67
Michael G. ’64 and Rita P.
Wolfson
Marc Wolinsky and Barry C.
Skovgaard Foundation

Jean Allard ’53
Amoco Foundation, Inc.
ARCO Foundation
Geraldine B. and Ronald J.
Aronberg ’57
Elizabeth C. and Irwin J.
Askow ’38
Michael F. Baccash ’73
Morton J. ’27 and
Eleanor S. Barnard
Donald S. Bernstein ’78
William H. Boies ’68
Joseph D. Bolton ’74
and Alison W. Miller ’76
Kristin J. Brandner ’87
Neil S. Braun ’77
Roger T. Price ’73
Gerhard and Regina Casper
Chicago Bar Foundation
John Michael Clear ’74
John M. Coleman ’78
Covington & Burling
Charles F. Custer ’58
Shari S. ’85 and Stewart
H. Diamond ’63
Dow Chemical Company
Donald E. Egan ’61
James H. ’48 and Mary J.
Evans
Roberta G. Evans ’61
David Falk Memorial Fund
John P. Falk ’68
Cathy H. and Joe Feldman
Richard J. Fine and
Associates
Richard J. ’64 and
Maryellen Fine
Funding Exchange
National Grantmaking Programs
Rosemary Hale
William M. Hardin ’82
I. Frank ’43 and Virginia
Harlow
Laura G. ’77 and Michael R.
Haasen ’74
Jean R. ’81 and Thomas B.
Haynes ’81
Walter Hellerstein ’70
Irene S. ’73 and Oliver L.
Helmis Jr. ’73
Leland E. Hutchinson ’73
Gordon E. Isley ’57
Maurice H. Jacobs ’52
Marian S. Jacobson ’70
George B. Jawors ’64
Carlynn E. and Daniel E.
Johnson ’57
David V. ’52 and Ruth I.
Kahn
Ruth I. and David V.
Kahn Philanthropic Fund
Arthur O. Kane ’39
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WILBER G. KATZ SOCIETY
($1,000-$2,499)

Anonymous (3)
William H. Abbott '28
Morris B. Abram '40
Carolyn S. and William L. Achenbach '67
Cyrus Max Adler Fund
Alexander & Baldwin, Inc.
Albert H. '30 and Marian
B. Allen
Eleanor B. Alter
American National Bank & Trust Company Foundation
Arthur H. Anderson Jr. '70
Walter J. Andrews '82
Stuart A. Applebaum '60
Gregory K. Atkinson '75
Leo H. Armstrong '28
Simon H. '73 and Virginia L. Aronson '75
Frederic J. Artwick '70
Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
Ball Corporation
Russell A. Bathen '66
Andrew L. Barber '79
and Mary E. Kazmer '85
Bonnie A. Barber '75
Steven L. Bashwirtner '66
Baxter Foundation
Ingrid L. Peall '86
Gordon A. Becker II '65
Bina H. and Renato Beghe '54
Lee F. Benton '69
Richard B. Berryman '57
George P. Blake '61
Leslie N. Bluhm '89
Daniel J. Booker '71
John W. Bowden '53
Roland E. Brandel '66
William R. Brandt '50
Kathleen W. Bratton '74
Mervyn L. Brenner Foundation, Inc.

Rose J. '34
Nathaniel '35
David H. '36
Gerald '37
Ms.

John W. Broad '42
James A. Broderick '67
Alan R. Brodie '54
Richard J. Bronstein '74
David N. Brown '66
Evlin S. Brown '67
James E. Brown '83 and Gretchen A. Winter '83
Ralph E. Brown '53
Peter W. Bruce '70
Brunswick Foundation
John J. Buckley Jr. '72
James E. Burns Jr. '72
Laurence A. Carton '47
Champion International Corporation
David S. Chernoff '62
Chicago Title Insurance Company
Max L. Chull '35
Michael J. Cicero '89
Samuel D. Clapper '71
Peter J. Cohen '82
Lewis M. Collens '66
John E. Collins '73 and Susan K. Jackson '75
Wayne Dale Collins '78
Ronald S. Cope '63
David L. '63 and Dorothy M. Crabb
Crossroads Fund
Robert W. Crowe '49
CSX Corporation
Stephen C. Curley '69
Delegation Comm. of the European Communities
Loren E. Desonville '78
Timothy W. Diggs '83
Daniel L. Doctoroff '54
Robert E. Don '62
John W. Dore '85
Michael A. Donnelly '79
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company
George T. Donohue Jr. '38
James D. '62 and Joyce U. Donohoe
Thomas A. Doyle '80
Joseph DaCoeur '57
F. Ellen Duff '80
Dan & Bradstreet Corporation Foundation
Bryant B. Edwards '81
Donald E. '63 and Nancy Eisngburg
Alex Elsm '28
Jamie L. and Maurice S. Emmer '78
Endowment Fund of the Jewish Community of Houston
Bruce L. Engel '64
Sheri J. Engelken '83

Cheryl A. Engelmann '82
C. Curtis Everett '57
Ward Farnsworth '58
Judith F. and Terry Y. Feierag '66
Laurie N. Feldman '84
and Stephen G. Gilles '54
Nancy G. '46 and
Raymond G. Feldman '45
Gail P. Fels '65
Steven L. Fisher '73
Jacob L. Fox '47
Richard T. Franck '67
Deborah C. '72 and
James C. Francel '71
David N. Frederic '73
B. Mark '56 and Barbara J. Fried '57
Robert S. Friend '31
Roger R. Fros '65
Maurice and Muriel Fulton Foundation, Inc.
Maurice H. '42 and
Muriel F. Fulton General Electric Foundation
Scott D. '79 and Sherry W. Gillette '78
Gillette Company
Laura A. Ginger '79
Douglas H. Ginsburg '73
Joseph H. Golant '65
Jane W. Goldberg
Jerald H. Goldberg '73
Perry B. Goldberg '60
Robert J. Goldberg '65
Goldman Sachs Fund
Louis B. Goldman '74
Matthew B. Curson '73
William B. Grinnel '36
Ronald B. Grass '68
Donald M. Green '58
Robert M. Green '57
David R. Greenbaum '76
Ben '33 and Sally Grodsky
Susan C. Haddad
William N. Haddad
Avonell C. Hamilton
Ronald W. Hanson '75
E. Houston Harsha '40
Richard M. Harter '61
Mitchell A. Harwood '85
Howard G. Hawkins Jr. '41
Michael B. Hays '79
C. J. '52 and Elizabeth B. Head '52
Richard A. Heise '61
Howard M. Heitner '82
Richard H. Helmholz
David J. Herb '64
Sidney J. Hess Jr. '32
David A. Heywood '81
John T. Hickey Jr. '77
Thomas C. Hill '73
George A. Hisert Jr. '70
Lieff, Nancy A.
Wesley Louis W.
Lance E.
Golda and
Bernys Daniel E.
Jeffrey Jahans '71
Elliott A. Johnson '30
Elmer W. Johnson '57
John A. Johnson '69
John J. Johnson '69
Harold R. Juhnke '69
Joel H. Kaplan '69
Kathleen G. '84 and
Scott B. Kapnick '84
Peter P. Karas '65
Harold A. '48 and Ethel M. Katz
Harold A. & Ethel Mae Katz Philanthropic Fund
Peter M. Kennel '57
Donald R. Kerr '36
Thomas L. Kimer '71
John M. Kimpel '74
Debra S. Koenig '78
Lorenz F. Koerber Jr. '42
Peter R. Koller '66
Elizabeth and Peter Konot '73
Robert J. Kopecky '79
Alan M. Koral '75
Howard R. Koven '47
Krasberg-Meyer Foundation
Robert G. Krupka '74
Carol L. & Jerome F. Krul '78
Antonio M. Laliberte '68
Frederic S. Lane '59
Richard Langerman '61
H. Douglas Laycock '73
Alain G. LeCoque '85
Philip C. Lederer '35
Milton A. Levenson '50
Milton & Iona Levenson Philanthropic Fund
Daniel E. Levin '53
Daniel B. Levin '81
Bennys S. and Richard H. Levin '57
Louis W. Levin '46
Wesley J. Liebeler '57
Nancy A. Lieberman '79
Lief, Cabraser & Heimann
Lance E. '78 and Marjorie P. Lindblom '78
Golda and Ivan Lippitz
Robert L. Lofit '59
Ralph B. Long '58
Alexander I. Lowinger '41
Frederick C. '80 and
Lynn T. Lowinger
Jo Desha Lucas
James T. Lyon '48
Donald A. Mackay '61
Neal D. Madden '71
Thomas M. Mansager '63
Robert D. Martin '69
David E. Mason '64
Barbara W. '68 and T. Michael Mather '68
Frank D. Mayer Jr. '59
David A. '86 and Joyce L. McAnille '86
Michael W. McConnell '79
McDonald's Corporation
Stephen E. Mochary '73
Timothy V. McGree '73
James B. McHugh '74
Kenneth G. McKenna '84
Thomas A. McSweeney '65
Stanley H. Meadows '70
Michigan Bell Telephone Company
Mary K. '84 and Maurice E. Miller '83
G. Paul Motters '73
Mobil Foundation, Inc.
Stephen E. Mochary '66
Peter J. Moss '65
Donuts A. Mordin '65
Louis P. Morris '89
Norval R. Morris
The Morrison & Foerster Foundation
Paul E. Moses '52
George L. Mullin '91
Donna M. Murasky '72
Paul M. Murphy '77
Carleton F. Nadelhoffer '55
Donald R. Newkirk '46
William O. Newman '52
Hope G. Nightingale '81
Robert E. Nord '72
Kenneth J. Northcott and
Zarina O. O'Leary '84
Northern Trust Company
Elizabeth J. and Karl F. Nygren '51
Robert H. O'Brien '33
Edward T. O'Dell Jr. '60
O'Melveny & Myers
Oak Brook Bank
Dallin H. Oaks '57
Paul T. Ogden '82
Richard N. Ogle '61
Roger Of '79
Irving H. Paley
Shari L. Patrick '82
Roger J. Patterson '81
Russell M. Pelton Jr. '63
Mildred G. Peters '48
Gloria C. Pharres '75
Henry W. Phillips '49
John R. Polk '65
Lee T. Polk '70
Herbert Portes Family Foundation
George L. Priest '73
Thomas J. Pritzker '76
R.G.F. Family Fund
James W. '68 and Jo
Anne K. Rankin
George A. Ranney Sr.
Penny Brown and Jeffrey C. Rappin '66
James M. Ratcliffe '50
Laurence Reich '53
Robert N. Reid '30
Greg W. Renn '75
James G. Reynolds '68
Richard M. Rieser Jr. '68
J. Timothy Ritchie '63
Miriam R. '89 and
Stephen L. Ritchie '88
RJR Nabisco, Inc.
Lindsay E. Roberts '85
and Richard Shepro
Judith L. Rose '82
Jill L. Rosenberg '86
Luaine B. and Merwin S.
Rosenberg '34
Eric Rosenthal '59
Maurice Rosenthal '38
Lee H. '77 and Gary L. Rosenthal
Gary and Lee Rosenthal
Philanthropic Fund
Walter Roth '52
George W. Rothschild '42
Lawrence E. Rubin '70
Daniel W. Luther and
Cathryn Ruggeri '86
Charles F. Rule '81
Paul T. Rutten '72
James W. Sack '48
Bernard Sang '33
Miriam S. and Frederick Sass, Jr. '32
Charles Satusinov Foundation
Charles D. Satusinov '30
Michael E. Chubrich '72
and Donna P. Saunders '71
Anne H. Schiave '73
Schiff Hardin & Waite
Foundation
Irene T. Schoenberg
Donald L. '74 and Susan J.
Schwartz '74
Richard M. Schwartz '77
Warren Scott III '78
Donald Segal '63
Marc P. Seidler '73
Milton L. Shadur '49
John N. Shepard '41
Gerald J. Sherman '62
Nancy M. Sherman '48
Deborah G. and Robert A. Sherwin '78
Donald L. Shulman '68
Allen M. Singer '48
Skadden Arps Slate
Meagher & Flom
Robert A. Skinrick '66
Matthew D. Slater '83
Charles F. Smith Jr. '87
Mark W. Smith '81
Payton Smith '57
Teft W. Smith '71
Branka J. and Harry B.
Saulhove '57
Harold E. Spencer '37
Frederick J. '79 and
Priscilla C. Sperling '79
Lawrence D. Spungen '63
Rolf O. Stadheim '66
Debra J. Stanek '86
Robert & Susan Star
Foundation
Robert M. Star '73
Charles D. Stein '47
Mason W. Stephenson '71
Herbert J. Stern '61
Saul L. Stern '40
David M. Stigler '68
Ieda F. Stone
Dale M. '45 and Vena F.
Stucky
Steven E. Suckow '89
Michael J. Sweitzer '76
Joseph C. Swidler '30
Kenneth R. Talle '69
James E. Tancula '82
Kenneth M. Taylor Jr. '79
Janine P. Tepperman
Alfred B. Teton '37
Thomas M. Thomas '35
Robert A. Thoren '34
Tigert Law Offices
John J. Tigert '61 '73
Time Warner
Incorporated
C. Stephen Treat '80
Roger D. '76 and Sally D.
Turner '76
Thomas Unterman '69
Dana L. and Edward E.
Vail '65
David J. Vandermeulen '85
Paul W. Vosseli '71
Robert J. Vollen '64
Maurice Wall '21
Jacob B. Ward '48
John A. Ward '65
William B. Weickmaer '62
Claire A. Weisler '83
Peter L. Wellington '77
Matthew E. Welsh '37
Donald M. Wessling '61
James S. Whitehead '74
Peter Widmer '68
Lawrence E. Wieman '84
Hubert L. Will '57
Howard L. Willett
Charitable Foundation
Michael M. Wilson '78
L. Mark Wine '70
George E. Wise '48
Erich P. '74 and Susan A.
Wise '74
Hal Witt '58
Helen E. Witt '82
Mark C. Zaander '76
Morton H. Zahtersky '60
John E. Zimmerman '49
William A. Zolla '65
Barry L. and Jan R.
Zubrow Foundation
Barry L. Zubrow '79
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1921
Bernard Nath
Maurice Walk
Sidney J. Wolf

Participation Rate 43%
Total Contributed
$5,550

1925
Thomas Carlin
Willis A. Overholser

Participation Rate 44%
Total Contributed
$11,403

1926
Samuel B. Perlman

Participation Rate 35%
Total Contributed
$3,395

1927
Morton J. Barnard
Robert L. Hunter
Austina W. Kivett
Lester Reinsward
Irving Stern
Peter J. Troy

Participation Rate 35%
Total Contributed
$4,375

1928
William H. Abbott
Leo H. Armitage
Alex Elson
Gould Fox
Milton Kepes
Jerome F. Kutak
Harry J. May
Henry P. Weihofen

Participation Rate 35%
Total Contributed
$4,375

1929
William H. Alexander
Bernard L. Edelman
Clyde L. Korman
Robert McDougall Jr.

Participation Rate 14%
Total Contributed $675

1930
Albert H. Allen
Frank C. Bernard
R. Guy Carter
Donald B. Dodd
Milton L. Durschlag
Elmer Getz
John W. Golson
Elliott A. Johnson
John T. Jones
Paul H. Lefman
Robert N. Reid
Charles D. Satinover
Joseph C. Suddler
Allan M. Wolf

Participation Rate 44%
Total Contributed
$11,403

1931
Abby Blattberg
Frank H. Dotweiler
Alex H. Dolnick
Isahak S. Dorfman
Robert S. Friend
Rudolph J. Fricka
Frederic W. Heineman
Gertrude S. Jerold
Julian H. Levi
Evelyn E. Overtos
Harold N. Solomon

Participation Rate 34%
Total Contributed
$18,350

1932
Leonard P. Aries
Paul S. Davis
Robert A. Frank
Herbert B. Fried
Sidney J. Hess Jr.
Martin K. Irwin
Samuel L. Jacobson
Frederick M. Kaufman
Norman H. Nachman
William G. Navid
Paul Niederman
James S. Pennington Jr.
Frederick S. Jr.
Leonard Schram

Participation Rate 45%
Total Contributed
$129,602

1933
Milton S. Applebaum
Lawren G. Davidson
Elmer C. Gage
A. Russell Griffith
Ben Grosky
George L. Flecker
Alfred W. Israelstam
Harold Kruezer
Robert H. O'Brien
Robert L. Shapiro

Participation Rate 30%
Total Contributed
$3,903

1934
Frederick T. Barrett
Cecelia L. Corbett
Harold Durschlag
Benjamin Ordorver
Harold Orlinsky
Kenneth C. Prince
Merwin S. Rosenberg
Harry B. Solomon Jr.
Robert A. Thorson
Raymond Wallenstein
Charles D. Woodnuff

Participation Rate 29%
Total Contributed
$14,875

1935
Sam Alschuler
Max L. Chill
Ambrose Cram
Samuel J. Eisenberg
William B. Elseo
William R. Forrester
Lewis G. Groebe
Telford F. Holland
John C. Howard
Edwin M. Katz
Philip C. Lederer
Edward H. Levi
Allan A. Marver
Stanley Moss
Bernard Sarn
Ruth Shpere
Thomas M. Thomas
Paul E. Treesh
James L. Zacharias
Joseph T. Zoline

Participation Rate 41%
Total Contributed
$45,072

1936
Herman J. DeKoven
William B. Graham
Carroll Johnson
Donald R. Kerr
Lawrence E. Lewy
Soloman G. Lipman
Herbert Portes
Erwin Shafter
Blanche B. Simmons
Martin L. Simon
Jerome S. Wald

Participation Rate 31%
Total Contributed
$33,525

1937
Kurt Borchardt
William R. Emler
Eduard D. Friedman
Frank L. Gibson
Roger S. Gorman Jr.
Arthur L. Grossman
Elmer M. Heifetz
Earl K. Gunz
Richard H. Levin
Harry W. Malm
Dagald S. McDougall
Bernard D. Melzer
Byron S. Miller
Jeanette R. Miller
Louis R. Miller
Robert D. Morgan
Gerald Rutner
Samuel Schlesinger
Harold E. Spencer
Alfred B. Teton
Matthew E. Walsh
Hubert L. Will

Participation Rate 35%
Total Contributed
$33,525

1938
Irwin J. Askow
Roger A. Baird
John P. Barden
Walter F. Berta
Ernest A. Braun
Marcus Cohan
Robert A. Crane
George T. Donehous Jr.
Zahn S. Goldsmith
Henry L. Hill
Phineas Indritz
Quinton Johnston
Warren R. Kahn
Thomas J. Megan
Maurice Rosenberg
Ralph J. Wehling

Participation Rate 36%
Total Contributed
$8,393

1939
Ami F. Allen
Irvig L. Azrhal
Paul M. Barnes
Morton J. Harris
John N. Hazard
Arthur O. Kane
Harriet J. Levin

Participation Rate 40%
Total Contributed
$33,525

1940
Morris B. Abram
Fred C. Ash
Beyon P. Larnham
Thad B. Carter
Robert B. Cook
William T. Dean
Francis B. Gray
A. Eugene Grossmann Jr.
E. Hoxon Harsha
Robert J. Janda
Karl R. Janetsky
John A. Johnson
Harold L. Kahen
Donald C. McKinley
Bernard Moritz
Thebna B. Simon
Daniel C. Smith
Saull I. Stern

Participation Rate 40%
Total Contributed
$11,635

1941
Walter J. Blum
William M. Brandt
Mabel W. Brown
Sherman P. Corwin
Howard G. Hawkins Jr.
J. Gordon Henry
Delco B. Hollins
Byron E. Kabot
Jerome S. Katz
David S. Logan
Alexander L. Lowinger
Fred A. Messeschmidt
Robert H. Milleman
Harry Rosen
J. Leonard Schermer
John N. Shephard
John R. Van de Water

Participation Rate 68%
Total Contributed
$22,871

1942
Hermon H. Bergman
John W. Bronf
Norton J. Come
George J. Costizilos
Maurice F. Fulk
Robert H. Halton
John B. Howard
Lorenz F. Koehrer Jr.
1947
Stuart Bernstein
Laurence A. Carton
John A. Cook
Jacob L. Fox
Theodore G. Gilinsky
Harold L. Goldman
Russ G. Goldman
Ernest Greenberger
Frank J. Harrison
Donald M. Hawkins
John Korf
Howard R. Koen
John D. Lawyer
Richard A. Magalan
Paul Noelke
David Parson
Seymour Schriar
S. Dell Scott
Charles D. Stein
Maynard L. Wishner

Participation Rate 58%
Total Contributed
$17,650

1948
James R. Ahrens
Thomas R. Alexander
Michael Bong
Robert M. Boyer
Donald B. Cronson
James H. Evans
Lawrence Howe
Harold A. Katz
Julius M. Lehrer

Leonard Louis
James T. Lyon
Arthur C. Mayer
Robert A. McCord
Donald R. Newbark
Raymond M. Norton
John E. Pederson
Lawrence W. Rabb
Richard C. Reed
John W. Rogers
James W. Sack
Nancy M. Sherman
Arthur H. Simmons
Allen M. Singer
Forrest L. Tozer
Jacob B. Ward
Robert L. Weiss
George E. Wise
Donald J. Yellen

Participation Rate 37%
Total Contributed
$35,581
Total Pledged and Contributed to 45th Reunion
$35,581

1949
Arthur E. Berlin
McKnight Brunn
Kuo-Ho Chang
Ralph J. Colerta
Sheldon O. Cullen
Jack Cornhill
Robert W. Crowe
Theodore W. de Loos
Richard G. Dinning
Urchie B. Ellis
Perry L. Fuller
Ray H. Garrison
Samuel D. Golden
Harry E. Groves
Frank B. Hubachek Jr.
Jerald E. Jackson
Eugene M. Johnson

Norman Karlin
Frank D. Kenney
Charles V. Krasovec
Abe Krash
Sidney I. Lezak
Bernard N. Marcantel
William T. Martin
James J. McClure Jr.
Mordecai M. More
John A. Morris
John J. Naughton
Richard M. Orlikoff
Mildred G. Peters
Victor S. Peters Jr.
Henry W. Phillips
John T. Posey
Margaret K. Rosenberg
Antonio R. Sarabia
Milton I. Shadar
James H. Shimberg
Bert E. Sommers
Morris Specter
Masao Takehuchi
Donald H. Weeks
Vytold C. Yasas
Arthur W. Zarlingo
John E. Zimmerman

Participation Rate 54%
Total Contributed
$35,203

1950
Allan A. Aaron
L. Howard Bennett
William R. Brands
Donald J. Dreyfus
Esther M. Edelman
S. Richard Fine
Arnold M. Flamn
Jack E. Frankel
Raymond Goetz
Edwin H. Goldberger
Lionel G. Gross
Leis G. Gross

Byron T. Hawkins
James T. Holton
Miles Jaffe
Raymond A. Jensen
Bernard S. Kaplan
Virginia A. Leary
Milton A. Levensfeld
Richard K. Pelz
Richard H. Prins
James M. Ratcliffe
Milton L. Ray
Jerome W. Sandweiss
F. Max Schuette
John D. Schwartz
Richard N. Siegel
Henry L. Stern
Sherwin J. Stone

Participation Rate 43%
Total Contributed
$8,700

1951
Paul J. Allison
Arthur J. Baer
John Borst Jr.
Harold H. Bowman
Robert Bronstein
F. Ronald Brioscio
Edward R. De Gracia
Fred J. Dopheide
Howard W. Edmunds
H. Charles Ephraim
Herbert I. Friedman
Alvin Frass
Gerald B. Greenwald
Maynard J. Jaffe
Laurence R. Lee
Manning K. Leiter
Charles A. Lippitz
Marshall E. Lobin
Marshall L. Lowenstein
John C. McLean
Ahner J. Mikau
Patsy T. Mink
M. Thomas Murray
Edward H. Nakamura
Karl F. Nguyen
Eustace T. Pliakas
Dan R. Roin
Paul A. Rosenberg
Charles F. Russ Jr.
Robert G. Schildcr
Minoru Shibata
Jack M. Siegel
Gerald S. Specter
Sheldon R. Stein
Thomas R. Sternau
Frederick G. White
John B. Wolff

Participation Rate 48%
Total Contributed
$12,060

1952
Joseph S. Balsamo
Robert S. Blatt
Allan M. Caditz
Arland F. Christ-Janer
Robert G. Clarke Jr.
James D. Du Frain
Ward P. Fisher
James T. Gibson
Harry Golter
Ralph M. Goren
Julian R. Hansen
C. J. Head
Elisabeth B. Head
Leo Herzog
Maurice H. Jacobs
Jack Joseph
David V. Kahn
Burton W. Kanter
William C. Leiper
Charles E. Lindell
Edgar E. Lungren Jr.
Stephen I. Martin
Paul E. Moses
William O. Newman
Cauvin Ninomiya
Alexander H. Pope
Walter Roth
A. Bruce Schimberg
Richard F. Scott
Lowell A. Siff
Marshall Soren
Roger A. Weiler
Bernard Weissberg
Edwin P. Willey

**Participation Rate 48%**
Total Contributed
$54,885

**1953**
Jean Allard
Jose J. Baum
George B. Beall
William E. Bertholf Jr.
John W. Bousden
Ralph E. Brown
Marvin Chrystal
Robert V. Dalenberg
Harry N. Fisher
Merrill A. Freed
David H. Fromkin
Daniel E. Levin
Marion C. Malone
Ralph A. Marianband
William M. Marutani
Robert S. Manisuel
George J. Phucas
Alexander Polkoff
Laurence Reich
Richard Stillerman

**Participation Rate 42%**
Total Contributed
$93,075
Total Pledged and Contributed to 40th Reunion
$288,075

**1954**
Boris Aserbach
Donald Baker
Gregory B. Beggs
Renato Beighe
David M. Brenner
Alan R. Brodie
William H. Brown
James E. Cheeks
Louis J. Cohn
Leo Feldman
Vernon H. Houchen
John W. Klooster
George S. Landon
Robert E. Nagle Jr.
Thomas L. Nicholson
Daniel G. Reese
Alan Rosenblat
Ellis I. Shafter
Edwin H. Shanberg
Jay L. Smith
William A. Soules
Marvin E. Stender
Hubert Thurnwald
Wesley A. Wildman

**Participation Rate 42%**
Total Contributed
$6,248

**1955**
Norman Abrams
Richard M. Adams
Charles T. Beechion Jr.
Jack D. Beem
Richard L. Boyle
Hugh A. Burns
M. Eugene Butler
Roger C. Cranton
John N. Durell
Joseph N. DuCanto
Donald M. Ephraim
A. Daniel Feldman
Daniel N. Fox
Keith E. Fry
Harris A. Gilbert
Michael S. Gordon
John R. Grimes
Solomon I. Hirsh
Adrian Kuiper
Robert M. Lichtman
Carleton F. Nadelhoffer
Rita K. Nadler
Bernard J. Russbaum
William J. Reinke
Harold A. Ward III
Charles J. Wong
Michael A. Wyatt

**Participation Rate 29%**
Total Contributed
$11,175

**1957**
Anonymous on behalf of
Stanley B. Block
Jack Alex
Ronald J. Aronberg
Stuart B. Belanoff
Richard B. Berryman
Stanley B. Block
Robert C. Claus
George L. Cowell
Kenneth W. Dom
John D. Donlevy
Joseph Doncic
C. Curtis Everett
Carl B. Frankel
Barbara J. Fried
Gilbert J. Ginsburg
Ernest B. Goodman
Robert M. Green
Alden Guild
Gordon E. Inlay
Newell N. Jenkins
Elmer E. Johnson
David A. Kirsch
P. Richard Klein
Howard G. Krane
Peter D. Lederer
Wesley J. Liebeler
Terry F. Luntsford
Louis V. Mangrum
Carol E. Miller Jr.
Robert N. Niematt
Dallin H. Oaks
Peter K. Sivaslian
Payton Smith
Harry B. Sondheim
Alan C. Swan

**Participation Rate 47%**
Total Contributed
$62,673

**1958**
C. John Amatus
Edward A. Berman
Charles R. Brannard
Richard W. Burke
Ernest G. Crain
Charles F. Custer
Allen C. Engeerman
Terry S. Fagen
Ward Farnsworth
William W. Fulmer
Francis J. Gerlitz
Robert C. Gobelman
James C. Goodale
Richard M. Goodman
Donald M. Green
Philip H. Hedges
Ralph J. Henkle
James C. Hornbl
Charles E. Hussey II
Francis A. Karem
Kent E. Karolh
William S. Kaufman
Ralph B. Long
Fred R. Mardell
Oral O. Miller
A. Connel Olson
Robert L. Reinke
John A. Ritsher
Frederick P. Roehrl
John G. Satter
Peter O. Steege
Joe A. Sutherland
Ronald L. Tomidandel
William L. Twining
Robert E. Ulbricht
Hal Witt

**Participation Rate 46%**
Total Contributed
$58,625
Total Pledged and Contributed to 35th Reunion
$58,625

**1959**
Matthew E. Brislaw
Kenneth V. Butler
Pauline Corbell
Robert L. Doan
Alfred J. Gemma
Robert H. Gerstein
John V. Gilhooley
Gerald Goodman
John W. Gosselin
Thomas W. Huber
John Judinsky
Herman H. Kay
L. Hugh Kemp
Sinclair Kossoff
Frederic S. Lane
Robert L. Loftis
Robert J. Martinneau
Frank D. Mayer Jr.
Joseph A. Murphy
C. David Peebles
William P. Richmond
Eric Rosenhaid
George L. Saunders Jr.
Richard J. Schreiber
Neale A. Secor
Miadrag N. Sukijasovic
George W. Unverzagt
John Voortman
Stanley M. Wanger
Robert H. Wier

Participation Rate 33%
Total Contributed $13,016

1960
Neil H. Adelman
Stuart A. Applebaum
David M. Boche
Irma S. Bell
John W. Castle
H. Collyer Church
Elliott Cohen
Lawrence M. Cohen
Edward J. Cunningham
Diana S. Eagon
Edward K. Eberhart
David K. Floyd
Robert D. Glick
Perry B. Goldberg
R. Dickey Hamilton
Luther A. Harthun
Terry J. Hatter Jr.
David L. James
A. John Klaassen
Raymond J. Kuby
Norman G. Karlund
Peter F. Langrock
Gerald F. Munitz
J. Michael Newburger
Edward T. O'Dell Jr.
Nathan P. Owen
Bruce D. Pattner
Robert D. Rachlin
Jan M. Schlesinger
Paul Schreiber
McNeil V. Seymour
Arthur H. Smith
John A. Spangale Jr.
Donald M. Spanton
Harvey B. Stephens
James S. Teborek
Ralph E. Wiggen
Keith A. Williams
Arthur Winoker
Edward E. Yalowitz
Morton H. Zaluzsky

Participation Rate 42%
Total Contributed $14,280

1961
David R. Ball
George P. Blake
Gene B. Brandebel
Philip L. Bransky
Richard F. Broode
Craig E. Castle
Waverly B. Clanton Jr.
Donald C. Dolding Sr.
Anthony S. Earl
William S. Easton
Donald E. Egann
Richard R. Elledge
David M. Evans
Robert G. Evans
James R. Fairstich
Richard C. Fox
Mary Ann Glenden
Haldon K. Grant
Richard M. Harper
Paul H. Hauge
Richard A. Heise
M. Leslie Kite
Norman I. Klein
Charles E. Kopman
Richard Langerman
Donald A. Mackay
Donald Martin
Christopher M. Moulad
Lawrence F. Nathan
Richard N. Ogle
Albert L. Parks
S. Richard Pincus
Jerry Z. Pragin
Roger E. Reynolds
Stephen A. Schiller
Larry P. Scroggins
Butler D. Shaffer
Gordon M. Shaw
Herbert J. Stern
Gerhard Stoll
Richard E. Thompson
Allen M. Turner
Donald M. Wessling
Harry G. Wilkinson
David M. Wittenberg
Michael W. Zavis

Participation Rate 44%
Total Contributed $38,139

1962
Allan E. Bildin
Richard W. Bogosian
Martin N. Burke
Bruce D. Campbell
David S. Chernoff
Frederick F. Cohn
Robert E. Don
James A. Donohoo
David P. Earle III
Lowell N. Ellen
William B. Fisch
Michael J. Freed
David B. Goshien
Jean F. Greene
Edward B. Greensfelder Jr.
Charles H. Gustafson
Willy G. Hailemeech
William M. Hagan
David C. Hilliard
Martin Jacobson
John M. Janker
Michael J. Kindred
Charles L. Kittes
William C. Lee
William A. Leet
Richard L. Marcus
Sheldon M. Meizlish
Morris Much
Frank F. Ober
Robert W. Ogren
David M. Rothman
Harold S. Russell
Dale L. Schlifer
Frederick Schneider
Fred K. Schomer
Gerald J. Sherman
Howard J. Silverstone
Robert A. Smith
Stephen E. Tallent
Charles F. Vihon
William B. Weidenaar
Laurin A. Wollan Jr.
Robert A. Woodford
Ralph G. Wrobley
Joel Yohalem

Participation Rate 39%
Total Contributed $36,950

1963
Alexander C. Allison
Charles P. Carlson
Philip T. Carter
Ronald S. Cope
David L. Crabb
Gary E. Davis
Stewart H. Diamond
Terry D. Diamond
Donald E. Elsiburg
Dorsey D. Ellis Jr.
Barry F. Fink
Edwin B. Firmage
Paul J. Galun
Anthony C. Gilbert
Sheldon M. Gissler
Marvin Gitter
Burton E. Glazov
Gene E. Godley
Philip J. Grib
Thomas M. Haney
Noel Kaplan
Charles Kleinbaum
Dennis H. Kops
David S. Kreisman
Hans-Werner Laubinger
Robert M. Leone
Thomas M. Mansager
Michael J. Marks
James C. Marlas
Allan B. McKittrick
Marc J. McSweeney
Lee B. McClum
d
Frederick A. Muller
John E. Nelson
William P. O'Keefe Jr.
Russell M. Pelton Jr.
Charles P. Persell III
J. Timothy Ritchie
Philip R. Resi
Donald Segal
H. Warren Siegel
Lawrence D. Spangkan
Charles R. Stealey
Robert E. Stevens
Dennis J. Tuchler
Robert G. Weber
John R. Wing Jr.
Paul J. Winton
Stephen Winton

Participation Rate 42%
Total Contributed $93,162
Total Pledged and Contributed to 30th Reunion $114,440

1964
Terence J. Anderson
Gilbert F. Asher
Alfred E. Aspengren
Lawrence G. Becker
Jon L. Beermann
Fredrick E. Brenn
Edward M. Burgh
Gerald B. Cohn
John D. Daniels
Joseph N. Darwoess
Michael Davidson
Samayla D. Deutch
Robert J. Donnellan
Bruce L. Engel
John S. Eskilson
J. Roderick Falby Jr.
Richard L. Fine
Linn C. Goldsmith
Floyd C. Hale
William S. Hanley
David I. Herbst
J. David Hertzer
Al Hofstad
George B. Javars
Robert V. Johnson
Malcolm S. Kamin
Sidney Kaplan

Participation Rate 45%
Total Contributed $71,235

1965
Dennis R. Baldwin
Marvin A. Bauer
Gordon A. Becker II
Andy L. Bond
Michael E. Braude
Yung Chiang
Frank Cicero Jr.
Donald T. Dickson
Seymour H. Dounan
Charles L. Edwards
Tim J. Emmit
William J. Esig
Bruce S. Feldacker
Gail P. Fels
Sherman D. Fogel
Frank E. Forsythe
Roger R. Fross
Joseph H. Golant
Robert J. Goldberg
Daniel B. Greenberg
Janice C. Griffith
William A. Halma
Joel L. Handelman
Patrick H. Hardin
Wills E. Higgens
Lawrence T. Hoyle Jr.
James T. Moskowitz
Robert M. Turner
Robert E. Van Meter
Heathcote W. Wales
William R. Wallin
Peter Widmer
James T. Williams

Participation Rate 42%
Total Contributed $52,841
Total Pledged and Contributed to 25th
Reunion $145,841

1969
Mark N. Aaronson
Melvin S. Adess
Richard P. Alexander
Frederick W. Axley
Lee F. Benton
Joel M. Bernstein
Thomas A. Blade
Harvey E. Blitz
David M. Blodgett
Judith S. Boggs
Martin R. Cohen
Stephen C. Curley
John M. Delehanty
Qan A. Deniw
Robert N. Dokson
Alan R. Dominick
Charles L. Dostal Jr.
J. Eric Engstrom
John H. Ferguson
Gilbert E. Gildie Jr.
Harold S. Goldsmith
Philip Gordon
Frederick L. Harrmann Jr.
Susan A. Henderson
Case Hoggendoom
Allan Horwich
Randall M. Jacobs
Denis L. Jarvela
John A. Johnson
John A. Johnson
Robert T. Johnson Jr.
Harold R. Juhnke
Allen R. Kamp
Joel H. Kaplan
Daniel M. Katz
Thomas D. Kitch
Stephen E. Kitchen
David A. Lander
Charles R. Levon
Gary T. Lowenthal
Warren E. Mack
James T. Madsen
Robert D. Martin
Frank S. Moseley
Jules Moskowitz
David B. Peyster
Thomas L. Ray
Howard J. Reed
James R. Richardson
Brent D. Riggs

Louis F. Rosenberg
Irwin F. Roth
Peter W. Schroth
Daniel J. Seifer
William L. Severns
Arthur B. Smith Jr.
Milton D. Smith Jr.
Byron E. Stams Jr.
Stephen A. Tagge
Kenneth R. Talley
Burton M. Tenny
Ursula Tenny
Henry J. Underwood Jr.
Thomas Unterman
Philip L. Verveer
Gordon G. Waldron
Alvin C. Warren Jr.
Roger K. Warren
Clifford L. Weaver
James H. White
Howard M. Wilchins
John P. Wilkins
Michele O. Williams
James D. Wing

Participation Rate 47%
Total Contributed $31,230

1970
Kenneth L. Adams
Alfred C. Anam Jr.
Arthur H. Anderson Jr.
Frederic J. Artwick
Urs W. Berz
Paul S. Berch
Gerdano M. Boniello
Peter W. Bruce
C. John Bunesh
Jack P. Caiole
Walter S. Carr
Jo Ann L. Chandler
Mary J. Checchi
James W. Daniels
Erica L. Dolgin
Richard S. Frase
Martin J. Freed
John M. Friedman Jr.
Aviva Futorian
Marjorie E. Gelb
Jeffrey S. Goldman
Gunter Griss
Joseph H. Groberg
James H. Heldan
Walter Hellerstein
George A. Hilsen Jr.
William G. Hoerger
Edwin E. Huddleston III
Charles C. Irie
Marian S. Jacobson
Paul F. Jock II
Randolph N. Jonakait
Jean P. Kemp
Delen N. Lutson
Terry A. Mcllroy
Stanley H. Meadous
James W. Paul
Lowell C. Paul
Lee T. Polk
David A. Rotman
Lawrence E. Rubin
Herbert R. Schulte
Mark B. Simons
Richard A. Skinner
Margaret M. Stapleton
Ronald W. Staudt
Robert J. Stucker
Robert J. Tonos
John B. Truskowski
Mark B. Weinberg
L. Mark Wine
Bernard Zimmerman

Participation Rate 42%
Total Contributed $32,486

1971
Barry S. Alberts
Rosemary B. Avery
Robert B. Barnett
Jerry H. Biederman
Daniel I. Booker
Samuel D. Clapper
Robert N. Clinton
Lawrence J. Cornecke
William H. Cowan
John T. Duax
Michael M. Eaton
James C. Franczyk
Michael R. Friedberg
Michael P. Gardner
David W. Gast
Jeffrey S. Goddess
Roger N. Gold
Steven A. Grossman
Steven P. Handler
David M. Higbee
Carl E. Howe Jr.
Marc R. Isaacson
Jeffrey Jahn
Alan N. Kaplan
Steven Z. Kaplan
Robert A. Kelman
Thomas L. Kimer
Jonathan C. Kinney
Kenneth N. Klass
M. David Kroot
Ester F. Lardent
Peter M. Lauriat
Carl B. Lee
Nicholas W. LeGrand
Gerald D. Letwin
David D. MacKnight
Neal D. Madden
Philip R. Mcloughlin
Judith M. Mears
Alexander M.
Mieklejohn
James W. Mercer
Robert L. Minner
Leonard P. Nalencz
Ralph G. Neus Jr.
Theodore H. Nebel
Jose S. Neuman
Mark R. Pettit Jr.
Larry E. Ribstein
Michael D. Riedberg
Franklin J. Rieseber
James E. Rotsolk
Kenneth J. Russell
Donna P. Saunders
Mark L. Silbersack
Tefft W. Smith
Gabriel N. Steinberg
Mason W. Stephenson
Lyman R. Sterling
Robert I. Stier
Paul M. Stecker
Garyfrey R. Stone
Richard A. Sugar
Alan D. Sugerman
William R. Sullivan Jr.
John L. Swartz
Peter M. van Zante
Paul W. Vogeli
H. Steven Wilson
Bruce H. Wyatt

Participation Rate 46%
Total Contributed $37,692

1972
Kenneth E. Armstrong
Samuel M. Baker
Wendy C. Binder
Fern C. Bonchill
Stephen S. Bowen
Joanne A. Briggs
Joseph J. Bronesky
Robert L. Brubaker
John J. Buckley Jr.
James E. Burns Jr.
George J. Cushon Jr.
Michael E. Cusbrich
Robert D. Dassen
H. Theodore Cohen
James M. Davis
Harlan M. Delly
John A. Encir
Howard G. Erwin III
Deborah C. Franczyk
Don E. Glickman
Christopher A. Hansen
Virginia M. Harding
Aaron E. Hoffman
Betty C. Jacobs
John G. Jacobs
Cary I. Klapfer
Jeffrey T. Kuta
Jay E. Leipham
Jen D. Levin
J. Kenneth Muegan
John W. Mauck
Michael L. McCluggage
William P. Macluse
Neal S. Millard
Michael M. Morgan
Carol Moseley-Braun
Donna M. Murasky
Robert E. Nord
Vincent F. O'Rourke Jr.
Barbara F. Petersen
Buail N. Petrou
Thomas Pillari
Susan P. Read
Robert I. Richter
David M. Rieth
Robert E. Riley
James B. Rosenbloom
Paul T. Ruttum
Robert P. Schwerk
Ray W. Sherman
Eileen L. Silverstein
Robert H. Smith
James S. Sorrels
Ann E. Spoto
James E. Spoto
Stephen F. Stroh
Dodge Wells

Participation Rate 37%
Total Contributed $23,050

1973
Larry A. Abbott
Joseph Alexander
Simon H. Aronson
Fritz E. Atsaway
Mary L. Azenbag
Michael F. Buxcash
Victor Bass
Robert S. Berger
Steve A. Brand
Roger T. Brice
David A. Broner
Jean W. Burns
Ronald G. Carr
Ronald A. Cass
Robert W. Clark III
Rick R. Cogswell
Stephen A. Cohen
John F. Collins
Rand L. Cook
Donald M. Crook
John R. Crossan
Jerry R. Everhardt
Richard F. Fielding
Steven L. Fisher
David N. Frederick
George F. Galland Jr.
Douglas H. Ginsburg
Jerold H. Goldberg
Matthew B. Gorson
Dennis C. Gott
Howard O. Hagen
Geoffrey R. Handler
Thomas N. Harding
Steven L. Harris
Carolyln J. Hayes
Raymond P. Hermann
Thomas C. Hill
Irene S. Holmes
Oliver L. Holmes Jr.
Richard P. Horn
Leland E. Hutchison
Honor Roll

Participation Rate 47%
Total Contributed $53,945
Total Heded and Contributed to 20th Reunion $89,945

1974
Warren J. Archer
Mark A. Aronchick
Margaret D. Avery
Robert M. Axelrod
Thomas A. Baker
James M. Ball
Sheldon I. Banoff
Philip H. Bartels
Barry R. Bartlett
Frederick W. Bessette
Roger A. Bixby
Joseph D. Bolton
Kathleen W. Bratton
Richard J. Bronstein
Stephen R. Buchenroth
John E. Banks
Anthony J. Castellabuno
John Michael Clear
Michael G. Cleveland
Rudolph F. Dallmeyer
Ellen Higgins
James M. Hirschhorn
James E. Honkis
Glen S. Howard
John A. Hubbard
Ted R. Jadin
Arthur G. Kidman
John M. Kimbel
Keith A. Klopferstein
Robert G. Krutka
Roy F. Lawrence
Scott A. Levine
Thomas M. Levine
Peter A. Levy
Glen S. Levey
Judith A. Lindquist
Robert W. Linn
Kenneth W. Liptman
Jeffrey S. Lubbers
Alan H. Maclin
Joan C. Maclin
Jeffrey L. Madoff
Paul C. Marengo
James B. McHugh
John A. McLees
Michael A. Rosenhouse
Steven I. Saltzman
Nancy S. Schaefer
Glenn E. Schreiber
Donald L. Schwartz
Sussan J. Schwartz
Keith E. Secular
Mark L. Shapiro
Duane E. Shinnick
John A. Straus
Robert J. Strauss
Carl W. Struby
Barry Sullivan
Frederick B. Thomas
Maureen T. Thornton
James S. Whitehead
Marc R. Wilkow
Lucy A. Williams
Eric P. Wise
Susan A. Wise
Richard A. Wueste

Participation Rate 51%
Total Contributed $40,200

1975
Gregory K. Areson
Virginia L. Arong
Sharon Baldwin
Bonnie A. Barber
Jayne W. Barnard
Patrick B. Bauer
Marc O. Beem Jr.
Julian R. Birnbaum
David J. Bradford
Geraldine S. Brown
Sidney B. Cheesin
Thomas A. Cole

Participation Rate 41%
Total Contributed $32,220

1976
Joseph L. Andrus
Karen S. Austin

Bruce R. Maughan
Catherine M. McCauliff
Kay McDermott
Judy J. Miller
Robert B. Millner
G. Paul Mouts
Henry M. Ondorow
Hugh M. Patskin
Susan J. Feavy
Glória C. Phares
Nicholas J. Pittske
Greg W. Rent
Thorn Rosenhal
Robert S. Carrick
Robert C. Gislasson
Philip G. Hampton II
Lafayette G. Harter III
Jeffrey A. Heller
Susan M. Jacobs
Charles M. Kennedy IV
Steven A. Kersten
Ramsay L. Klaflf
Marilyn G. Klawitter
Barbara H. Kras
Daniel E. Latkin
Cynthia R. Leider
John J. Lee
Clyde M. Jeff
John C. Lorenzo
Randi D. Loser
Frederick C. Lowinger
James Malefakis
Elliot S. Orol
Alfredo R. Perez
Timothy L. Porter
Reynold T. Pratt
Elizabeth Samuels
Michael W. Schley
Arthur E. Schmidt
Steven G. Schulman
Charles V. Senator
Robert K. Sholl
Michael J. Silver
Barry C. Skoogaard
Mitchell H. Stobbe
C. Stephen Treat
Milton S. Walschlag
Karen J. Ward
Kenneth E. Wille
Garth D. Wilson
Marc O. Wolinsky

Participation Rate 36%
Total Contributed
$28,603

1981
Joseph H. Andersen
Anna B. Ashcraft
Gordon C. Atkinson
Jeremy A. Berman
Baron A. Bisenshtein
Michael W. Blair
Joel N. Bodiansky
Bruce E. Brusnahan
Robert M. Brill
Steven F. Brocklage
Alan C. Brown
Michael T. Buckley
Thomas P. Carroll
Robert B. Craig
John A. Crittenden
Bryant B. Edwards
Susanne Ehrenberg
Stephen Fedo
Gregory J. Flemming
Edward P. Gilbert
David H. Glaser
James A. Goodman
Karen E. Oros

Sean M. Hanifi
Jean R. Haynes
Thomas B. Haynes
Janet S. Herbstman
Gail L. Herriot
David A. Heywood
John A. Houlihan
David B. Jaffe
Sara L. Johnson
Ivan P. Kane
Kristin H. Kerth
Peter D. Kerth
Kathleen M. Kopp
Bryan Krakoauer
Bernard S. Kramer
Daniel B. Levin
Andrea M. Likwornik
Hilary G. Lord
Brenda L. Lyons-Talent
Linda K. Mandel Gates
Marcy J. Mandel
Douglas E. Markham
John A. Menke
Daniel J. Micciche
Neil A. Miller
Richard B. Muller
Kevin M. Murphy
Hope G. Nightingale
John M. O'Malley
Janet D. Olsen
Roger J. Patterson
Jeffrey C. Paulson
Steven L. Peretz
Stephen C. Phillips
Vincent F. Prada
Patricia M. Relovsky
Laura D. Richman
Joseph W. Rugg
Charles F. Rule
William F. Ryan
Charles F. Sawyer
Mark W. Smith
Barbara J. Stob
James M. Talent
Anne T. Taylor
Eduardo R. Vital
George N. Variel Jr.
Joel S. Weiss
Diana C. White
Daniel G. Wilckze
Thomas J. Yocis

Participation Rate 45%
Total Contributed
$30,120

1982
Amy L. Abrams
Marion B. Adler
Walter J. Andrews
Jeffrey P. Bialos
Kim J. Bisenshtein
Locke E. Bowman III
Ann E. Bushmiller
Albert P. Cacozza Jr.
Debra A. Cafaro
Peter J. Cohen

Charles W. Cape
Richard Cunningham
Robert P. Dahlquist
Leslie R. Desmond
David G. Dietze
Patrick P. Dinardo
Jeff H. Eckland
John C. Eichman
Cheryl A. Engelmann
Geoffrey Etherington
Brian G. Flanagan
Richard B. Friedman
Mark H. Fukunaga
Mark F. Gergen
Michael J. Gerhardt
Keith E. Godman
James M. Hainman
William M. Hardin
Claire T. Hartfield
Howard M. Heitner
Jonathan Honig
Jathan W. Janove
Harold E. Kahn
Michael F. Kerr
Kenneth Krug
David S. Landman
Jeffrey Lieberman
Alexander Louie
Patrick J. Maloney
Ronald A. Martinietti
Laura J. Miller
Alejandro D. Moglia
Lois C. Moonitz
Maureen Mosh
Ronald M. Neifeld
Thomas P. Oglen
Harriet L. Orel
Shari L. Patrick
Richard G. Placey
Carda V. Porter
Teresa E. Raizen
Joel L. Riff
Thomas W. Rissman
Deborah E. Robbins
Judith L. Rose
Philip R. Rosenblatt
Jeffrey S. Roheinstein
Gail Rubin
Paul L. Sandberg
Cindy A. Schiapani
Henry C. Schmetzter
Thomas J. Scorga
Corey R. Shamus
Lynda G. Simpson
Wendi Sloane-Weitman
James H. Snowdon
Brad M. Sonnenberg
Stephanie L. Striffer
Carol E. Suanson
James E. Tancula
Henry N. Thomas
Helen M. Toor
Claire E. Toth
David S. Turetsky
Vicki A. Turetsky
Charles D. Weissberg
Kenneth R. Whiting Jr.

Susan R. Whitman
Helen E. Witt
Sandra G. Wolf
Elaine D. Ziff-Leibman

Participation Rate 47%
Total Contributed
$33,375

1983
Susan P. Alman
Bradley J. Andreozzi
Terry S. Arbit
Joseph M. Atkinson
Wesley N. Becker
Jack M. Beermann
Robert J. Binger
Michael T. Brody
James E. Brown
Daniel H. Burt
Denise B. Caplan
Steven D. Chantelois
David J. Cholat
Benedicte S. Cohen
John G. Connor
Martha F. Davis
George R. Diaz-Arrasti
Timothy W. Diggins
Susan J. Donnelly
Deborah B. Dormentz
Sheri J. Engleken
Daniel R. Ernst
Jeanne E. Etelson
John E. Etelson
James M. Findler
Ethan J. Friedman
Gary M. Friedman
Michael M. Frey
William T. Garcia
Robert C. Goodman
J. David Griswold
Elisabeth R. Gunther
Philip L. Harris
Lisa M. Hanot
Anne M. Hutchins
James A. Kamin
Jeffrey J. Keenan
Thomas O. Kelly III
Christian E. Kimball
Thomas J. Kosco
Jeffrey Kraus
Ruth Krugly
David J. Landes
Shake Lapping
Michael R. Lazerwitz
Karen W. Leeber
Michael A. Mendon
David S. Mintz
Peter Lubin
John R. MacDowell
Susan M. McCowin
Patricia R. McMillen
Maureen M. McShane
Rebecca C. Meriwether
Pamela M. Meyerson
Barbara S. Miller
Bunny Miller
Maurice E. Miller
Robert A. Monk
Patrick J. Nelligan Jr.
Philip A. O'Connell Jr.
Gregory G. Palma
Mark F. Rising
Maris M. Roden
Phillip H. Rudolph
John E. Ryan
James L. Santelle
Robert M. Saunders
Laura S. Schnell
William I. Schwartz
Ronald A. Schy
Alison J. Shuller
Jonathan A. Siegel
Matthew D. Slater
David G. Small
David M. Stone
Sherree Taylor
John D. Torres
Claire A. Weiler
Richard M. Weinraub
Mark D. Whitten
Gretchen A. Winter
Philip D. Witte
Todd M. Young
Stephen F. Yunker

Participation Rate 51%
Total Contributed
$56,985
Total Pledged and Contributed to 10th Reunion $56,985

1984
Barbara J. Anderson
Lance B. Balk
James H. Barnett
Marc L. Baum
Lori I. Baum
Todd A. Bauman
Jose L. Berra
Bruce W. Boyd
Willis R. Buck Jr.
Karen J. Canon
Ethan M. Cohen
Jeanne T. Cohn
Marcia E. Connolly
Philip C. Currie
Diane S. Danoff
Daniel L. Dociomy
Lorraine W. Egan
David T. Eri
Laurie N. Feldman
Jonathan J. Fieldman
Jonathan H. Gardner
Stephen G. Gilles
Richard B. Goetz
Arnold E. Grant
Ross B. Green
Susanne S. Greene
Denise J. Harvey
Doris A. Hightower
Vincent E. Hillyer
Kevin J. Hochberg
James C. Scoville  
Robert L. Shapiro  
David T. Slattery  
Charles F. Smith Jr.  
Stephen D. Spears  
Takeshi Takahashi  
Margaret A. Telscher  
Susan L. Theiss  
Jennie M. Vogelzang  
Mary L. Walker  
Gregory A. Weingart  
Dorian R. Williams  
Elisabeth L. Wittenberg

Participation Rate 32%  
Total Contributed  
$12,583

1988
Michael D. Annes  
Paul L. Applebaum  
John R. Baranick Jr.  
David S. Barash  
Anthony Bergamino Jr.  
Martin J. Black  
Beth Z. Boland  
Lavea Bruchman  
Linda K. Breggin  
Joseph H. Brennan  
Jonathan C. Bunge  
Laurie W. Calder  
Paul Davis  
Lisa A. Farrington  
Geoffrey A. Fields  
Laurel L. Fleming  
Amy B. Folbe  
Todd F. Gaziano  
Patrice M. Gliniecki  
John W. Greene  
James E. Gregory  
Clifford R. Gross  
Hugh L. Hallman  
Alan J. Harris  
Kyle L. Harvey  
Franz N. Hoppet  
John E. Hrubec  
Alison C. Humphrey  
David J. Hurwitz  
Christopher J. Joyce  
Julie E. Justicz  
Karen L. Kammer  
Michael J. Keane  
Peter D. Kennedy  
Mark J. Khimian  
John A. Knight  
William A. Levy  
David G. Litt  
Mary Jane Mace  
Robert L. Margolis  
William J. McCabe  
Donna L. McDowell  
Katherine T. Mellett  
Stuart L. Mills  
John D. Nelson  
Basil P. Nichols  
David W. Norton  
Frank J. Notaro  
Gregory L. Poe  
Stephen L. Ritchie  
James P. Rosenzweig  
Jennifer E. Shea  
Adam Silver  
Leslie E. Slater  
Andrew O. Smith  
Seán R. Smith  
Nina L. Stillman-Mandel  
Michael D. Vhay  
Nina E. Vinik  
Laura B. Warshauksy  
Richard C. Wirthlin  
Richard J. Zook  
Ari S. Zymlerman  
Jennifer S. Goldstein  
Leon B. Greenfield  
Brigitte R. Guilla  
Ruth J. Helitzer  
Rachel C. Heyman  
Chris A. Hollinger  
Johannes G. Jonas  
Mark A. Jones  
Rogers J. Kaplan  
Joshua Kant  
Jonathan J. Kaufman  
Erna B. Kostuch  
Emmanuel Lulin  
Alan J. Meese  
Gneime G. Mitchell  
Elick I. Molk  
Richard M. Weil  
Marian E. Whiteman  
Judy Zechman  
Participation Rate 36%  
Total Contributed  
$16,150

1990
Bruce Adelstein  
Amy B. Bernstein  
Ashutosh A. Bhagwat  
Michael A. Borait  
Sean R. Carney  
Elisabeth N. Cheng  
Frederick H. Cohen  
Participation Rate 34%  
Total Contributed  
$8,945

1989
Stephen W. Anderson  
Margaret M. Antinori  
Douglas A. Applegate  
James T. Barry III  
Bonnie A. Barsamian  
Michael E. Bieniek  
Dorn G. Bishop  
Hildegard Bison  
Leslie N. Bluhm  
Cynthia L. Brown  
Michael J. Ciocero  
Douglas J. Clark  
Robert C. Clothier III  
Timothy M. Collins  
Michael P. Conway  
Matthew C. Crow  
Daniel J. Delaney  
Elizabeth P. Donnem  
Nicholas T. Drees  
John F. Duffy  
Sean N. Egan  
Margery B. Feintzig  
Nina B. Finton  
Shunichi Morita  
Louis P. Moritz  
Tarig Mundhia  
David M. Murphy  
Richard S. Murphy  
Tecla A. Murphy  
Paul S. Nelson  
Adam H. Offerharrtz  
Gary W. Osborne  
Andrew M. Ostrogai  
Marc D. Ostrow  
Brent C. Perry  
Lori J. Polacheck  
Mark W. Powers  
James B. Pratt  
Lauren M. Pytel  
Duccio Regoli  
Lindsay P. Reichmann  
Miriam P. Ritchie  
Bett Robinson  
Patrick J. Schultheis  
Gunnar Schuster  
Barry G. Sheer  
Mark S. Snyderman  
Steven E. Suckow  
Jill A. Thompson  
Ester E. Tryban  
Monica J. Wahl  
Jennifer A. Coyne  
Marianne W. Culver  
June E. Daniel  
Joel G. deJesu  
John R. Dent  
Mary M. Diggins  
Karen J. Dilbert  
Thomas W. Dimond  
Alvin B. Dodek  
Bruce W. Doughty  
Mark J. Duggan  
Laurie A. Gallancy  
Thomas P. Gallanis Jr.  
Jacqueline Gerson  
Alison F. Glanov  
Susan S. Gomory  
Tara R. Gordon  
Kenneth M. Gorenb erg  
Ann L. Heilman  
Timothy B. Higginson  
Steven J. Hooke  
Michael C. James  
Heather J. Kahn  
Gary A. Kochman  
Andrew T. Krieg  
Victoria V. Lazar  
Donald C. Lockhart  
James S. Lucci  
Participation Rate 31%  
Total Contributed  
$6,719

1991
Anonymous  
Terence M. Abad  
Bronwyn D. Andrews  
Josef S. Arthans  
Charles E. Baumann  
Fabrice Baumgartner  
Roya Behnia  
Participation Rate 36%  
Total Contributed  
$16,150

1988 Honor Roll

Participation Rate 32%

Total Contributed

$12,583

1989 Honor Roll

Participation Rate 34%

Total Contributed

$8,945

1990 Honor Roll

Participation Rate 36%

Total Contributed

$16,150

1991 Honor Roll

Participation Rate 31%

Total Contributed

$6,719

'T50s


Valerie E. Ross
George J. Sampas
David J. Saul
John A. Shope
Marc J. Shrike
Amanda P. Siegel
Melanie I. Sloan
Andrew J. Sloniewsky
Michael J. Small
Barbara L. Smith
Joseph C. Smith Jr.
Mary L. Smith
Jeffrey T. Soukup
William C. Stern
Jeffrey D. Tekanic
Erik M. Valgoeren
Thomas D. Waldman
Katherine T. Ward
Thomas O. Weeks
Earnest W. Worthing
James P. Young

Darlene A. Lynch
Amy B. Manning
Robert L. Martin
Scott R. Martin
Paul B. McKeeney
Downey Meyer
James E. Murray
Paul W. Okel
Martin T. Oltmanns
Jason L. Pelz
Sandra E. Raitt
Brian K. Richter
P. Jacqueline Romano
Leah Schlesinger
John J. Sciortino
Gerald J. Seach
Nancy R. Selfst
Katharine B. Silbaugh
Christopher S. Sonitch
Robin M. Straes
Patricia E. Steinmeyer
Staci A. Stobart
Thomas D. Stoddard
Elizabeth A. Stotland
Lisa Von Der Meiden
Gerald R. Whitcomb
Robert B. White
Mary G. Wilson

Patricia A. Flaming
Todd H. Flaming
Daniel E. Frank
Shahid D. Glick
Adam M. Gold
Craig T. Goldblatt
Griffith L. Green
Douglas N. Greenburg
Jennifer L. Hampton
Donald F. Hamron
Richard B. Harper
Marc D. Jafe
Thomas E. Keim Jr.
Robert C. Kern Jr.
Wan J. Kim
Marc D. Kinshum
Stephen M. Kramarsky
Cecelia Kye
Kristin M. Laub
Christopher A. Lidstad
Nancy L. Lomazzo
Peter J. Love
Judy A. Manier
Elise C. Mayee
Gerald F. Masoudi
Gregory C. Mayer
Joseph P. McGahg
John Kevin Mills
Alexandra V. Mochary
Robert H. Nathan
John C. Nishi
Jill K. Oberlander
Jack W. Pirozolo
Ashish S. Prasad
Ann T. Reading
James W. Robertson
Michael P. Ruiz
Heidi L. Rummel
Lisa B. Schultz
James E. Schwartz
John Gordon Seymour
Christopher P. Sonderby
Christopher J. Sprigman
James G. Toptezes

Participants Rate 45%
Total Contributed
$12,870

1992
Abigail Abraham
Richard E. Adelman
Douglas W. Anderson
Tracy V. Bare
Addison D. Braendel
Mark A. Challinor
Robert D. Cheifetz
Theresa E. Cadahy
Sheila M. D'Cruz
Sean H. Donahue
Steven P. Finizio
Nathan A. Forrester
Steven A. Friedman
Alfonso Garcia-Mingo
Paul R. Garcia
Keith M. Garcia
Robert R. Gasaway
Kathryn J. Gerber
Lawrence A. Gold
Janine F. Goodeman
Elizabeth E. Gordon
H. Kent Greenfield
Melissa A. Hall
Bong H. Han
Geoffrey L. Harrison
Paul W. Harttel
Wendy J. Heiman
Lothar K. Hofmann
Marshall P. Horowitz
Bonnie J. Host
Masaya Hotta
Sarah K. Johnson
Patrick J. Kaeding
Robert A. Katz
Sarah D. Keller
Kathleen E. Kinney
Steven G. Krone
Kenneth E. Lee
Daniel W. Levin
Sharon G. Levin

Students Who Made
Commitments to the
Chicago Law Foundation
in 1992-93

1992
Pamela J. Auerbach
Evelyn L. Becker
Michael L. Blend
Steven P. Blonder
Kevin J. Cameron
Lee C. Carter
Nicole Caucci
Kathryn S. Chanin
David A. Charnumette
Geneva L. Clark
William H. Clune
Michael D. Conway
Kenneth D. Crews
Ana E. Cruz
Stefan Deckmyn
Anne G. Depew
Gavin C. Dowell
Larry C. Dowes
Marcel C. Dufaline
Nancy S. Eisenhauer
Lauren J. Elliot
Marc C. Falcone
Cynthia A. Faur

Patricia A. Flaming
Todd H. Flaming
Daniel E. Frank
Shahid D. Glick
Adam M. Gold
Craig T. Goldblatt
Griffith L. Green
Douglas N. Greenburg
Jennifer L. Hampton
Donald F. Hamron
Richard B. Harper
Marc D. Jafe
Thomas E. Keim Jr.
Robert C. Kern Jr.
Wan J. Kim
Marc D. Kinshum
Stephen M. Kramarsky
Cecelia Kye
Kristin M. Laub
Christopher A. Lidstad
Nancy L. Lomazzo
Peter J. Love
Judy A. Manier
Elise C. Mayee
Gerald F. Masoudi
Gregory C. Mayer
Joseph P. McGahg
John Kevin Mills
Alexandra V. Mochary
Robert H. Nathan
John C. Nishi
Jill K. Oberlander
Jack W. Pirozolo
Ashish S. Prasad
Ann T. Reading
James W. Robertson
Michael P. Ruiz
Heidi L. Rummel
Lisa B. Schultz
James E. Schwartz
John Gordon Seymour
Christopher P. Sonderby
Christopher J. Sprigman
James G. Toptezes

1993
Janet Agoglia
Benjamin D. Aller
Jeanette E. Alvarado
Salvador J. Antonetti
Mark G. Artlpp
Joanne Bal
Steven A. Bank
Janet E. Bauman
Camille E. Bennett
Robert L. Beranek
Lisa B. Berens
Andrew L. Berke
Heidi M. Berol
April V. Boise
Elizabeth M. Bradshaw
Julia A. Bronson
Brian P. Brooks
Elizabeth F. Brown
Ingrid J. Brunk
Aaron Christopher Bryant
Derek M. Bush
Michael G. Cartier
John A. Cashman
Karen L. Chisholm
Jessica R. Cilluffo
Jonathan A. Clark
Richard C. Cohan, Jr.
David M. Cohn
Scott B. Cooper
Jonathan L. Cope
Carin Coman
Mary M. Cowhey
Quincy M. Crawford
David W. T. Daniels
Karln J. sDante'allo
Laura J. DeMoor
Timothy A. Duffy
Laurie Beth Evans
Kevin M. Fain
Lila A. Faulkner
Kevin R. Feldis
Julie A. Fernandes
Jeffrey R. Fink
Jonathan H. Forstman
Theodore H. Fink
Kevin L. Freeman
Michael S. Freeman
David C. Giardina
Rachel K. Gibbons
Veronica Gomez
Frank D. Gordon
Gabriel E. Gore
Stephanie A. Gore
Mary E. Grant-Grabbe
Sunil S. Hariani
Gregory Harrington
Brett J. Hart
Charles R. Haywood
Emmy Y. Heissler
Arthur F. Hickox
Maurita Elaine Horn
Victoria E. Houck
Joanne S. Hovis
Robert T. Ichi
James W. Joseph
Ira M. Kalina
Joseph H. Kaufman
John C. Kern Jr.
Paula M. Ketcham
Janet D. Lewis
Harry S. Lind
Bruce E. Lithgow
Neil Lloyd
Alan F. Loewis
Christian M. Lucky
David S. Malmon
S. Ross Mansbach
Viasta M. Marc
Richard S. Marks
John C. Martin
Christian B. McGrath
Carol C. Metcalf
Robert D. Miller
John A. Mitchell
Susan M. Moss
Adam E. Muchinick
Lawrence A. Neubauer
Bridge O'Connor
FRIENDS

The Law School gratefully acknowledges gifts received from the following friends in 1992-93:

Anonymous

Albert W. Aicheller
Eleanor B. Alter
Michael and Anita
Auster Family

Douglas G. Baird
Rosie Baldacci

Dennis M. and Marlon
Borden

Benjamin and Edith A.
Bass

Alice H. Bator
Judith K. and Harvey
Bernerger

Mark R. Bires

Demis Bookstein

Roger Bosch

James J. and Loretto B.
Breuss

Neil Brewer

Rebecca T. Brock

Maurine J. Neiberg

Stephen J. Newman

Lisa M. Noller

Christopher Y. Okumura

Phillip G. Oldham

Wesley M. Oliver

Marie-Rose Papandrea

Bruce A. Parsons

Mary A. Pellegrino

Stanley Pierre-Louis

Dheepa Ramanathan

Edward B. Rowe

Kimberly K. Rubel

Jesse H. Ruiz

Jennifer J. Rutledge

Martinez

Thomas I. Savage

Jonathan S. Savar

Teresa B. Scheller

Douglas P. Seby

Carolyn E. Shapiro

Jeffrey N. Shapiro

Linda J. Simon

Susan J. Steinthal

Jennifer W. Stinson

Aparna P. Sule

BJane P. Tellмен

Stephen R. Tetro

Scott B. Toban

Tyson F. Toles

Charles E. Torres

Valerie A. Villanueva

Sarah M. Well

Joel K. Wighton

David B. Zanger

Neal R. Burger

Jeffrey Burman

Gerhard and Regina
Casper

Gerald J. Christian

Allen Clement

Jerry Cohen

Lillian Cohen

Pan Cook

William J. Cooley

Judith S. and William R.
Cottle

Joe J. Danary

Jane S. and Muller Davis

Joleen de Witt

John T. Duff III

T. Bentley Duncan

Anne C. Dumon

Thomas J. Egan

Connie S. Eidenmüller

Helen S. Eisenhardt

Jillie Ellison

Frank L. Ellsworth

Carly H. and Joe Feldman

Ronald S. Feldman

Elianne Fifer

George T. Fredrick

Helen A. Freudenthal

David D. Friedman

Gustav Gants

Jane W. Goldberg

Eugene J. Grady

William A. Greenberg

Audrey E. Haberman

Joel S. Haberman

Susan C. Haddad

William N. Haddad

Harlan L. and Mary C.
Hagman

Rosemary Hale

Avonel C. Hamilton

Eileen Hammond

Irving B. Harris

David L. Heath

Richard H. Helmbold

Frederic W. Hickman

Howard B. Hodges

Edwin E. Huddleson Jr.

Peter Ishkanian

Betty Kalven

Marilin H. Karsten

Stanley N. Katz

John L. Kaufman Jr.

Isao Kawanishi

Irene M. Kennedy

William S. Kenney

Spencer L. Kimball

Frederic L. Knudtson

Elizabeth M. and William
M. Landes

The Lettas

Jill F. and John G. Levi

Charles L. Levin

Jeffrey L. Levin

Dorothy R. Levinian

Leon M. Liddell

Gilda and Ivan Lippitz

Van Voorhees and

Virginia Z. Lloyd

Lori

Joseph K. Luby

Jo Desha Lucas

Tony Martellini

The Mclellans

Ethel McDermott

Daniel J. Meltzer and

Ellen M. Setonoff

Bert H. Michelsen

Paul Miller

Catherine C. and Francis
J. Milligan Jr.

Sheldon M. Mittleman

Norval R. Morris

Edwin N. Nalle

Mary C. Neal

Stephen C. Neal

Barb Nicholson

Irving H. Paley

Joseph A. Parker

Max S. and Helen H.
Perlman

Gail T. Pfix

Dorothy M. Press

George A. Ranney Sr.

James T. and Laura C.
Rhind

Janice D. Robson

Dante F. Rochetti

John L. Ropiquet

Rose D. Rosenthal

Warner A. Rosenthal

Beverly and Irving
Rosenzweig

Richard J. Ross

Jane E. Rothschild

Jean F. Rowland

Tony F. Sanchez

Joseph H. and Lillian R.
Schiff

Irene T. Schoenberg

Renée M. Schoenberg

J. W. Schrader

Kim Schroeder

Stephen J. Schuhofer

Arnold Shaze

Richard D. Sullivan

Alice and Richard D.
Sinsheimer

Robert L. Sinsheimer

Mary D. Smith

Siobhan L. Sontchi

Linda Speetzen

Abe L. Stein

John N. Stern

Charles Stern and

Judit Haberman Stern

Ida F. Stone

David A. and Benna
Strauss

Richard J. Stumpf

Harry P. Tatelman

Jane P. Tepperman

Linda Tomsak
Robert I. and Roberta S. Ury
Robert B. Warwick III
Helen R. Weigle
Gordon L. Weil
Nancy Freund White
Ann and Arnold R. Wolff
Arthur M. Wood
Susan W. Zagorin
Donald E. Zepfel
Kenneth F. Zimmerman

LAW FIRM GIFTS

The Law School gratefully acknowledges gifts received from law firms in 1992-93.

A growing number of law firms have established matching gift programs. The terms of the programs vary from one law firm to another, but usually a law firm will match the gift of an associate, and increasingly, a partner, to a law school. Frequently, law firms establish minimum and maximum amounts they will match.

Matching gifts have become increasingly important to the Fund for the Law School. Alumni who are in a position to designate matching gifts to the Law School are urged to do so by securing the proper forms and sending them, along with their gifts, to the Law School.

Matching gifts are counted as gifts from alumni when the Deans' Funds are prepared for the Honor Roll. The following list includes both outright and matching law firm gifts:

- Altherme & Gray
- Baker & McKenzie
- Buoscio & Buoscio
- Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton
- Covington & Burling
- Cravath Swaine & Moore
- Davis Polk & Wardwell
- Dorsey & Whitney
- Faegre & Benson
- Foley Hoag & Eliot
- Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
- Law Offices of Michael S. Gordon
- Albert F. Hofeld Ltd., Inc.
- Hoyle, Morris & Kerr
- Keck Mahin & Cate
- Kirkland & Ellis
- Kirkland & Ellis Foundation
- Langrock Sperry & Wool
- Lief, Callaner & Heimann
- Mayer, Brown & Platt
- Montgomery McCracken Walker & Rhoads
- Morrison & Foerster
- O'Melveny & Myers
- Patishall McAuliffe
- Newbury Hilliard & Geraldson
- Pillsbury Madison & Sutro
- Pope, Ballard, Shepard & Fowle, Ltd.
- Reese Law Office
- Salans Hertfeld & Heilbronn
- Sands, Anderson, Marks and Miller
- Schiff Hardin & Waite Foundation
- Seyfarth Shaw Fairweather & Geraldson
- Sidley & Austin
- Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett
- Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom
- Sommenschneid Nath & Rosenthal
- Sullivan & Cromwell
- Tigert Law Offices
- Van Cott, Bagley, Cornwall & McC ready
- Vedder Price Kaufman & Kammholz
- Venable, Baetjer and Howard Foundation, Inc.
- Wachtell Lipton Rosen & Katz Foundation
- White & Case
- Wilczynski, Wilczynski, Chambrone, and Branson, Ltd.
- Wiley, Rein & Fielding
- Wilmer Cutler & Pickering

CORPORATION, FOUNDATION AND OTHER ORGANIZATION GIFTS

The Law School gratefully acknowledges outright and matching gifts from the following organizations in 1992-93:

- AUAW Educational Foundation
- Cyrus Max Adler Fund
- Aetna Foundation, Inc.
- Asian Corporation of America
- Alexander & Baldwin, Inc.
- American Fuji Fire and Marine Insurance Company
- American International Group, Inc.
- American National Bank & Trust Company Foundation
- Amernitech Foundation
- Amoco Foundation, Inc.
- ARCO Foundation
- Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
- Aspengren and Associates
- AT&T Foundation
- Au Marche, Inc.
- Ball Corporation
- BankAmerica Foundation
- Baxter Foundation
- Berlman & Associates, Ltd.
- Berraert NV
- Bell Atlantic Corporation
- Nathan and Emily S. Blum Foundation
- Boeing Company
- Bond Case Briefs, Inc.
- BP America
- Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc.
- Mervyn L. Brenner Foundation, Inc.
- Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, Inc.
- Brunswick Foundation
- Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
- Leo Burnett Company, Inc.
- Patrick Aline Butler Family Foundation
- BYJE Foundation
- California Community Foundation
- Canadian Women's Foundation
- Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.
- Castle Industries Foundation, Inc.
- Centel Corporation
- Central European University Foundation
- Champion International Corporation
- Chase Manhattan Bank
- Chicago Area Foundation for Legal Services
- Chicago Bar Foundation
- Chicago Community Foundation
- Chicago Sun-Times
- Chicago Sun-Times Charitable Trust
- Chicago Title and Trust Company
- Chicago Title and Trust Company Foundation
- Chicago Title Insurance Company
- Cutbank
- Coca-Cola Company
- Elliott & Judith N.
- Cohen Charitable Foundation, Inc.
- Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston
- Consolidated Natural Gas Company Foundation
- Continental Bank Foundation
- Corning Glass Works Foundation
- Cotsirilos Family Fund
- Crossroads Fund
- CSX Corporation
- CUNA Mutual Insurance Group
- Dar-Ichi Kango Bank, Ltd., Chicago Branch
- Day & Zimmerman, Inc.
- Delegation Comm. of the European Communities
- R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company
- Dow Chemical Company
- Don & Bredstrom Foundation
- Corporation Foundation
- Endowment Fund of the Jewish Community of Houston
- Donald & Rebecca Ephraim Family Foundation
- Ernst & Young
- David Falk Memorial Fund
- Farmers State Bank
- Federated Department Stores Inc.
- Fidelity Foundation
- Fieldstead & Company
- First Boston Foundation
- First National Bank of Chicago
- First Toledo Corporation
- FMC Foundation
- Ford Foundation
- Ford Motor Company Fund
- Frensham Foundation
- Maurice and Muriel Fulton Foundation, Inc.
- Funding Exchange
- National Grantmaking Programs
HONOR ROLL

IN MEMORY

During the 1992-93 fiscal year, the Law School received gifts in memory of the following individuals:

Leo H. Arnstein '28
Herman Chil '37
Allison Dunham
George S. Freudenthal, Jr. '32
Mary Cump '76
Bryce L. Hamilton '28
Richard Hanson '57
Harry Kalven '38
Mary Jane Kurland
Soia Mechtikoff
John Fred Smith '51
Sheldon Theft
Philip Tocquin '26

IN HONOR

During the 1992-93 fiscal year, the Law School received gifts in honor of the following individuals and occasions:

Ingrid L. Beall
Walter J. Blum

SPECIAL GIFTS

Gifts of books to the D'Angelo Law Library
Christian Altendorfer '93
Douglas G. Baird
Mary E. Becker '90
Walter J. Blum '41
Anne-Marie Slaughter Burley
John C. Brooks '62
Max L. Chll '33
David Currie
Richard A. Epstein
Emerson H. Fly
Annette Gelderetzer '90
George B. High
E. Adamson Hoebel
Spencer L. Kimball
Andrew Kull '77
Philip B. Kurland
William M. Landes
Robert D. Martin '69
Michael McConnell '79
Bernard D. Meltzer '37
Geoffrey Miller
Norval Morris
Phil C. Neal
Deborah S. Panella
Randall C. Picker
A. Bruce Schimmel '49
Geoffrey R. Stone '71
Cass R. Sunstein
Alan O. Sykes
Diane P. Wood

Gifts of Computer Equipment
Richard J. Ross
CAMPAIGN FOR THE NEXT CENTURY

On October 5, 1992, at the beginning of the University’s Centennial celebration, then-Board Chairman Barry Sullivan announced the University’s resolve to raise $500 million over the next five years to ensure the University’s fiscal soundness for the century to come.

The Law School, as an integral part of this overall effort, seeks to raise $25 million to support faculty, students, library, academic and clinical programs, and other needs. As of June 30, 1993, the alumni and friends of the Law School had made commitments and gifts to the Campaign totalling $23,917,878, or almost 96% of the goal. The Campaign will continue until June 30, 1996. Below, we acknowledge those individuals and organizations whose gifts or commitments of $10,000 or more have helped to make this progress possible.

Anonymous
Jack M. Alex ’57
Alzheimer & Cray
Douglas G. Baird
Baker & McKenzie
Donald S. Bernstein ’78
Nathan and Emily S. Blum Foundation
Walter J. Blum ’41
Charles W. Broid ’33
Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc.
Neil Braun ’77
Estate of Herbert C. Brook ’36
Patrick & Aimee Butler Family Foundation
Central European University Foundation
Chicago Area Foundation for Legal Services
Chicago Community Foundation
Chicago Sun-Times
Frank Cicero Jr. ’65
Jack Corbitli’49
Estate of June B. Davis
Marcus Cohn ’38
Kenneth W. Davis ’57
Katharine P. and Peter H. Darow ’67
Fieldstead & Company
Daniel 77 and Phyllis Fischel
Ford Foundation
B. Mark ’36 and Barbara V. Fried ’57
Herbert B. ’32 and Marjorie Fried
Maurice F. and Muriel Fulton ’42
Francis J. Gerlit ’38
Anthony C. Gilbert ’63
Glass Container Litigation Settlement
Adrienne and Burton E. Glazer ’63
Gideon A. Gottlieb
Thomas A. Gottschalk ’67
Mrs. Harold J. Green
Harold J. Green Foundation
David R. Greenbaum ’76
Mayer Greenberg Foundation
Daniel B. Greenberg ’65 and Susan Steinhausser
Rosemary Hale
Harris Foundation
Irving B. Harris
Jean R. ’81 and Thomas B.
Hayes ’81
Elmer M. ’37 and Harriet Heifetz
Richard A. Heise ’61
Perry S. Heut Jr.
Eileen and Leo Hersel ’52
Sidney J. Hess Jr. ’32
Madeline E. Hinshaw Trust
Laura Buntfeld Hogan ’67
Hopkins & Sutter
James C. Hornel ’58
Lawrence T. Hoyle Jr. ’65
James G. Hunter Jr. ’67
Leland E. Hutchinson ’73
International Business Machines Corporation
Robert J. Janda ’40
Jenner & Block
Mrs. Elliott A. Johnson
Kanter Family Foundation
Burton W. ’52 and Naomi R.
Kanter
Marlyn and Thomas Kanten Foundation
Marlyn H. Kanten
Miriam H. Keere ’33
Cludia and Jeffrey Keenan ’83
Spencer L. Kimball
Kirkland & Ellis Foundation
Lillian E. Kraemer ’64
Howard G. Krane ’57
David S. Kreisman ’63
Alice W. Kraus
Douglas M. Kraus ’73
The Robert J. Kurak Foundation
Claude R. Lambe Charitable Trust
Elisabeth and William Landes
Lawyers Trust Fund of Illinois
Peter D. Lederer ’57
Paul H. ’30 and Theo H.
Leffmann
Robert M. Levin ’67
Dorothy R. Levitan
Leon M. Liddell
Ivan & Golda Lippitz Marital Trust
Long Mountain Road Foundation
Lord Bissell & Brook
Georges Lucey Charitable and Educational Trust
J. Roderick MacArthur Foundation
John D. and Catherine T.
MacArthur Foundation
Estate of Joseph L. Mack ’34
Mark C. Mamolen ’77
Richard L. Marcus ’62
Mayer, Brown & Platt
James J. McClure Jr. ’49
Ethel McQuistion
Bernard D. ’37 and Jean S. Melzer
Margaret and Richard Merrell Foundation
Michael E. Meyer ’67
Stanford Miller ’38
Mary K. Mochary ’67
Robert H. Mohlman ’41
Estate of Alice Smith Mulac
Thomas R. Mulroy ’28
Bernard Naeh ’21
Jo Ann and Stuart C. Nathan ’65
Linda T. ’67 and Philip C. Neal
Bernard J. ’55 and Jean Nussbaum
Michael Nussbaum ’61
Robert H. O’Brien ’33
John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.
Barrington D. Parker ’46
Russell J. Parsons ’42
George J. Phocas ’53
Abra and Herbert Forte ’36
Kenneth C. ’34 and Pearl L.
Prince
Roberta Cooper Ramos’67
George A. ’66 and Victoria P.
Ranney Jr.
Richard C. Reed ’48
Laurence Reich ’53
Robert N. Reid ’30
Andrew M. ’78 and Betsy B.
Rosenfield
Estate of Ruth Wyatt Rosenson
Estate of Althea Robb
Steven J. Sacher ’67
Salans Hurefied & Heilbronn
Sarah Scaife Foundation
Irene T. Schoenberg
Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson
Mitchell S. Shapiro ’64
Eunice H. Shields
John N. Sheppard ’41
Thelma Brook Simon ’40
Richard D. Sinsheimer
Robert L. Sinsheimer
Barry C. Skovgaard ’80
Daniel C. ’40 and Louise H. Smith
Myrdell W. Spector
John N. Stern
Geoffrey R. ’71 and Nancy S.
Stone
Norman H. Stone Family Foundation
Laurence N. Strenger ’68
Stephen E. Tallent ’62
Harry Paul Tatelman
Jane P. Tepperman
Ronald E. Stackler ’62
Fritz Thyssen Stiftung
Tower Foundation
Allen M. Turner ’61
Helen R. Weilge
Weiler & Co.
Charlotte P. and Roger A.
Weiler ’52
Nancy Freund White
Edwin Wiley ’52
Barry S. Wine ’67
Michael G. Wolfsen ’64
Marc Wolinsky ’60
S.K. Yee Foundation, Inc.
Bobette and James L. Zacharias ’35
Hans Zeisel
Geoffrey R. Stone '71 has been named Provost of The University of Chicago by University President Hugo F. Sonnenschein. Stone, who is dean of the Law School and an authority on civil rights and the First Amendment, will become the University's second-ranking officer effective January 1, 1994.

"As dean of the Law School, Geof Stone has maintained and strengthened the quality of the school's faculty and academic programs," Sonnenschein said. "He is committed to the importance of teaching and nurturing faculty collegiality and scholarship."

Stone's new position of provost will make him the university's chief academic officer after the president, responsible for academic appointments, programs, and budgetary priorities.

Gerhard Casper, president of Stanford University, said, "Geof Stone has all the right values to serve successfully as provost. He is deeply committed to academic quality and the seriousness of the academic enterprise. His capacity to be analytically discriminating, to ask questions, and to get to the bottom of something, is immensely important, particularly when making academic appointments."

A native of New York, Stone is a 1968 graduate of the University of Pennsylvania. He received his law degree in 1971 from the Law School, where he was editor-in-chief of the Law Review. Mr. Stone served as law clerk to Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, then as law clerk to Justice William J. Brennan Jr. of the Supreme Court of the U.S. Mr. Stone joined the faculty in 1973 and was appointed dean in 1987. Stone is co-author of the nation's leading constitutional law case book, and he is the editor of the Supreme Court Review. He and his spouse, Nancy, and their two daughters, Julie and Molly, live in Hyde Park.

Diane P. Wood, the Harold J. and Marion F. Green Professor of International Legal Studies, has accepted appointment as deputy assistant attorney general in the U.S. Department of Justice. In this position, Ms. Wood will have primary responsibility for international antitrust policy.

Ms. Wood received both her B.A. and J.D. degrees from the University of Texas at Austin. In 1981, she joined the faculty of the Law School. Her research interests include antitrust (both international and general), federal civil procedure, and international trade and business. She teaches in all three fields.

She will be on leave of absence from the faculty through the 1994-95 academic year.

Dan Kahan has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of law, effective July 1. Mr. Kahan received his B.A. summa cum laude from Middlebury College in 1986, where he majored in political science. He received his J.D. magna cum laude in 1989 from the Harvard Law School, where he served as president of the Harvard Law Review. After law school, he served as law clerk to Judge Harry Edwards of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and then as law clerk to Justice Thurgood Marshall of the U.S. Supreme Court. Since 1991, Mr. Kahan has been in private practice specializing in appellate advocacy at the Washington, D.C., office of Mayer, Brown & Platt. Mr. Kahan will teach criminal law and constitutional law.
LECTURERS IN LAW

Dean Stone didn’t have to sell me on the Law School. This was the place I wanted to go. I’ve wanted to be the type of teacher that engages, creates, and communicates. This is a great place to engage that philosophy.

—Dan Kahan

Kathleen Banar, Locke E. Bowman III '82, and David Bradford '75 have been appointed lecturers in law for the 1993-94 academic year. Ms. Banar, Mr. Bowman, and Mr. Bradford are, respectively, counsel, legal director, and counsel-director of the MacArthur Justice Center, a Chicago-based public interest organization focused on constitutional
impact litigation primarily in the field of criminal justice. The Center is currently litigating several important death penalty cases as well as challenges to the constitutionality of state public defender resources, the constitutionality of certain police interrogation practices, and the constitutionality of parole board discretion. During the 1993-94 academic year, Ms. Banar, Mr. Bowman, and Mr. Bradford will maintain offices at the Law School and supervise students who will have the opportunity to work with them on these cases. The students will help draft pleadings, conduct substantive and procedural issues, and participate in litigation strategy. In addition, Ms. Banar, Mr. Bowman, and Mr. Bradford will teach a seminar on Death Penalty/Habeas Corpus Litigation in the autumn and winter quarters.

Kathleen Banar received her J.D. with honors from DePaul University College of Law in 1989, where she served on the DePaul Law Review.

After graduating from law school, she served as a litigation associate with the Chicago law firm of Jenner & Block, specializing in criminal and civil litigation and appeals.

David Bradford received his J.D. cum laude from the University of Chicago Law School in 1976. After a clerkship with Judge Alvin B. Rubin of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, he became a partner in the Chicago law firm of Jenner & Block. Since 1984, he has served as counsel-director of the MacArthur Justice Center, as well as director of the Death Penalty Information Center in Washington, D.C., and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Illinois Capital Resources Center.

Locke E. Bowman III earned his J.D. cum laude from the University of Chicago Law School in 1982. After serving as a law clerk to Judge Hubert L. Will of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, he practiced law in Chicago, first with Mayer, Brown & Platt, and then with Martin, Brown, Sullivan & Bowman.

Thomas A. Cole '75 has been appointed a lecturer in law for the winter quarter of the 1993-94 academic year. Mr. Cole received his J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School in 1975. He is a partner at Sidley & Austin and serves as a member of both the executive committee and the management committee. He was vice-president of Northwest Industries from 1982 to 1985 and now serves on the executive committee of Northwestern University's Garrett Corporate and Securities Law Institute and as a member of the advisory board of Northwestern University's Corporate Council Center. Mr. Cole will teach a seminar on Corporate Governance.

Herschella G. Conyers '83 has accepted appointment as a clinical lecturer in law in the Mandel Legal Aid Clinic. Ms. Conyers received her J.D. in 1983 from the University of Chicago Law School. Since, 1986, she served as an assistant public defender, a supervisor and a deputy chief in the office of the Cook County public defender. She has served as a member of the faculty of the Illinois State Appellate Defender Trial Advocacy Program, as a member of the faculty of the Basic Trial Skills Program of the New York State Defender's Association, and as an instructor in the Harvard Law School's Trial Advocacy Workshop. Ms. Conyers will work with Clinical Professor Randolph Stone in the Clinic's Criminal Justice Project.

Shari Diamond '85 has been appointed a lecturer in law for the spring quarter of the 1993-94 academic year. Ms. Diamond received her B.A. from the University of Michigan in 1968, her M.A. in psychology from Northwestern in 1970, and her J.D. cum laude from the University of Chicago Law School in 1985. Ms. Diamond is a
professor of psychology and criminal justice at the University of Illinois and a senior research Fellow of the American Bar Association. She is the author of more than thirty scholarly articles, including “Blinding the Jury to Verdict Consequences,” “The Assessment of Sentencing Choices through Triangulation,” “Scientific Jury Selection,” and “The Content, Method, and Epistemology of Gender in Sociological Studies.” Ms. Diamond will teach a course on social science research and the law.

Christine Lutgens has been appointed a lecturer in law for the 1993-94 academic year. A partner with the Chicago law firm of Mayer, Brown & Platt, Ms. Lutgens received her B.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Toronto and her J.D. from Harvard. After earning her law degree, she joined the Cleveland law firm of Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue. Since 1987, she has been with Mayer, Brown & Platt, where she specializes in ERISA, employee benefits, and executive compensation. Ms. Lutgens is the author of “Employee Benefit Plans in Chapter 11 Reorganizations,” Tax Management Compensation Planning Journal (1991). She previously served as a lecturer in law during the 1991-92 academic year. Ms. Lutgens will teach a seminar in the area of employee benefits law.

Thomas Scorza ’82 has accepted an appointment as a lecturer in law for the 1993-94 academic year. Mr. Scorza received his A.B. summa cum laude from Notre Dame in 1969 and his Ph.D. in government from Claremont in 1972. After serving several years as a professor of political science at Kenyon College, he earned his J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School, where he served as articles editor of the Law Review. After graduation, Mr. Scorza served as a law clerk to Judge Milton I. Shadur of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Since 1983, Mr. Scorza has served as an assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Illinois. In this capacity, he has served as senior litigation counsel and as chief of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force. Mr. Scorza will teach a section of the course on the legal profession.


Andrea Zopp has been appointed a lecturer in law for the winter quarter of the 1993-94 academic year. Ms. Zopp received her B.A. in history from Harvard in 1978 and her J.D. from Harvard in 1981. She then served as a law clerk to Judge George N. Leighton of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. She has spent most of the years since her clerkship with the office of the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, where she served as deputy chief of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force and deputy chief of the Criminal Litigation Section. She is currently the first assistant state’s attorney for Cook County. Ms. Zopp has served as an instructor for the National Institute of Trial Advocacy and as an adjunct professor of law at Northwestern University. Ms. Zopp will teach a seminar in federal criminal law.
VISITING FACULTY

Douglas Ginsburg '73 has accepted an appointment as Charles J. Merriam Visiting Scholar and lecturer in law for the 1993-94 academic year. He is a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and is Foundation Professor of Law at George Mason University in Virginia. He graduated from the Law School, where he was articles editor of the Law Review, in 1973. He clerked for Judge Carl McGowan on the D.C. Circuit and for Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall on the Supreme Court. Judge Ginsburg taught at Harvard Law School from 1975 to 1983. From 1983 until his judicial appointment in 1986, he served as administrator for information and regulatory affairs at the Office of Management and Budget, where he was responsible for the regulatory program of the executive branch, and as deputy assistant attorney general and then as assistant attorney general in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

Tracey Meares '91 has accepted an appointment as a visiting assistant professor of law for the 1993-94 academic year. Ms. Meares received her B.S. in engineering in 1988 from the University of Illinois and her J.D. cum laude from the University of Chicago Law School in 1991, where she won the Thomas Mulroy Prize for Excellence in Appellate Advocacy, was an active member of the Black Law Students Association, and worked on the Homeless and Mentally Ill Project of the Mandel Legal Aid Clinic. After receiving her J.D., Ms. Meares served as a law clerk to Judge Harlington Wood, Jr., of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Since completing her clerkship, Ms. Meares has been in the Honors Program as a trial attorney with the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. Ms. Meares will teach a course in remedies in the winter quarter.

Reinhard Zimmermann has accepted the appointment as the Law School's Max Rheinstein Visiting Professor of Law for the autumn quarter of the 1993-94 academic year. Mr. Zimmermann holds the chair of Private Law, Roman Law, and Comparative Legal History at the University of Regensburg. He has taught at the University of Edinburgh, Tulane Law School, the University of Cape Town, and the University of Cologne. He is the editor of a number of monographs and scholarly articles, including "The Law of Obligations: Roman Foundations of the Civilian Tradition," "Suicide and Criminal responsibility in South African and German Law," and "The Interpretation of Statutes." Mr. Zimmermann will teach a comparative introduction to German private law.
HOLMES AWARDED BUSTIN PRIZE

The D. Francis Bustin Prize, awarded each year in recognition of extraordinary scholarly contributions to our understanding of the process of government, has been awarded this year to Stephen Holmes for his work in the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe and his contributions to the East European Constitutional Review. Mr. Holmes is professor of political science and law, co-director of the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe, and Russell Baker Scholar.

The prizes are made possible by the D. Francis Bustin Educational Fund for the Law School.

GLASS CONTAINER ANTITRUST RESERVE FUND

The Law School has received a grant of $200,000 from the settlement of Superior Beverage Company, Inc. et al. v. Owens-Illinois, Inc. et al., an antitrust class action suit involving the pricing of glass containers. The funds are designated to support the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic's new Criminal Justice Program under the supervision of Clinic Director Randolph N. Stone.

The grant was awarded by Judge Hubert L. Will (A.B. '35, J.D. '37) of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Perry Goldberg (A.B. '55, A.B. '56, MBA '57, J.D. '60) of Specks & Goldberg represented the plaintiffs; John H. Morrison and William Jentes of Kirkland & Ellis represented the defendants. In addition to this grant, support was awarded to thirteen other not-for-profit organizations, mostly legal service providers and law schools.

The Law School's grant will provide seed money for the Criminal Justice Program in the Clinic. The program will focus on children between the ages of 13 and 17 charged with a crime and subject to transfer from juvenile to adult court. The goals of the program are to provide poor children with quality legal services, to improve the system of justice in the Juvenile and Adult Criminal Courts, and to provide Law School students with a supervised opportunity to develop advocacy and other lawyering skills in the special context of representing indigent individuals in need of legal assistance.

"If our Criminal Justice Project can have a positive impact on juvenile offenders, it may help to reduce the cycle of recidivism that is so devastating to our families, our communities and our courts," said Professor Stone. "If, additionally, the students involved in the program become forceful advocates for the rights of juveniles and of the indigent, this money will have been well invested by Judge Will and the District Court." The Clinic's Criminal Justice Program will also benefit from a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

The grant, totaling $120,000 for the first year, will supplement the support from the Glass Container Litigation settlement. The amount available in the second and third years of the grant is contingent on the program’s progress.

THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, based in Chicago, has awarded a grant to the Law School in support of the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe. The $300,000 grant will be used for the next three years to underwrite a portion of the Center's activities in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The MacArthur Foundation has placed a special emphasis on the emerging democracies in these nations. The grant will support video recordings of parliamentary debates and court hearings; audio recordings of interviews with political figures involved in constitution-
making; travel to the region by the Center's Directors; publication of the Center's quarterly journal, *The East European Constitutional Review*; and other expenses incurred by the Center in servicing the specific countries covered by the grant.

The Law School's Center, which monitors the development of constitutions and free market economies in the nations of the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact, has recently opened an office in Moscow in order to streamline its dealings in the region. When informed of the grant, Center Director Steven Holmes remarked, "The support of the MacArthur Foundation, combined with the establishment of the Moscow office, significantly increases the Center's resources in the former Soviet Union. In particular, the grant helps us to bridge the distance between Eastern Europe and Chicago, making the Center's materials and scholarship even more accessible and timely." ♠

**THE FORD FOUNDATION**

The Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe will also benefit from the continued and expanded support of the Ford Foundation. One of the world's largest philanthropic foundations, the Ford Foundation has been an active supporter of the democratic and economic reforms taking place in the former Eastern Bloc, and was one of the first supporters of the Center.

The Foundation has announced its intention to renew its grant support of the Center for the 1993-94 academic year, and has increased the level of that support to $117,000. The grant will allow the Center to increase its level of activity in Ukraine, will support operations of the Moscow office and will partially sponsor the Russian-language version of *The East European Constitutional Review*, the Center's quarterly newsletter. In addition, the grant will underwrite a series of seminars in Russia, involving members of the Law School faculty — but concentrated outside of Moscow.

— on a variety of pertinent political and legal subjects, utilizing Law School faculty. ♠

**A GIFT FROM ROBERT H. O'BRIEN**

Robert H. O'Brien, whose career spanned service as the commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission and as CEO of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie empire, has established a bequest to the Law School in the amount of $100,000. Mr. O'Brien, a member of the Class of 1933, intends for his gift to be used to support the central intellectual mission of the Law School, as determined by the dean.

This is the second time Mr. O'Brien has provided for the Law School through estate planning. In 1985, he created a charitable remainder annuity trust, from which he and his wife, Minna, will receive an annual income for life, with the remainder reverting to the Law School. The two gifts will be combined in The Robert H. O'Brien Fund, which will support such enterprises as the Law School's program in law and government, an area of particular interest to Mr. O'Brien.

Dean Stone said of Mr. O'Brien's gift, "Bob O'Brien has once again taken a leading role in support of the Law School. His generosity not only provides the Law School with an important measure of financial security, but is also an excellent example of the inventive ways in which our emeritus alumni can help ensure the continued excellence of the Law School well into the future. We are deeply grateful to Bob and Minna for this important leadership." ♠
A PLEDGE FROM LAURENCE N. STRENGER

In honor of his 25th Reunion, Laurence N. Strenger has made a five-year commitment totaling $100,000 in support of the Law School. The pledge will be applied to the Law School's goals within The Campaign for the Next Century, a University-wide effort to raise $500,000,000 over the five years ending June 30, 1996.

Mr. Strenger, who served as co-chair of the Class of 1968’s reunion, is also a member of the Law School’s Visiting Committee. He is managing director of Ampton Investments, a New York City-based investment concern. In addition to his long-standing support of the Law School, Mr. Strenger has been a beneficiary of The Los Angeles Music Center, an umbrella organization supporting the Los Angeles Philharmonic, the LA Opera, and several resident theatre companies.

Noting that Mr. Strenger chose his 25th Reunion as the appropriate time to make his commitment to the Law School and the Campaign, Dean Stone remarked, "Larry Strenger established a marvelous precedent with this important gift. It will have a real impact on the central mission of the Law School, and is a terrific model for others to follow in their own philanthropy. Leadership by example is rare, indeed, and we are all grateful to Larry for this marvelous gift.”  

The 1993 Fulton Lecture was presented by William Twining '58 of the University College of London (second from right). His lecture on May 14, “Karl Llewellyn’s Unfinished Agenda,” was the beginning of a two-day symposium in honor of Llewellyn. Pictured with Mr. Twining are his fellow panelists (left to right), Peter Winschip of Southern Methodist University, Michael Ansaldi of Boston University, and Robert Summers of Cornell.

CASS R. SUNSTEIN

The Partial Constitution (Harvard University Press, 1993)

American constitutional law is at a crossroads. As it is currently interpreted, the Constitution is partial. It is, first of all, biased. Contemporary constitutional law meets the status quo as neutral and just, and any departure as necessarily partisan. But when the status quo is neither neutral nor just reasoning of this sort produces injustice. The Constitution is also partial in another sense: its meaning has come to be identified solely with the decisions of the Supreme Court. This was not only the case, as Sunstein demonstrates; nor was it the intention of the country’s founders. Instead, the Constitution often serves as a catalyst for public deliberation about its general terms and aspirations—and Sunstein makes a strong case for reviving this broader understanding of the Constitution’s role.

In light of this analysis, Sunstein proposes solutions to some of the most hotly disputed issues of our time, including affirmative action, sex discrimination, pornography, “hate speech,” and government funding of religious schools and the arts. Sunstein connects these and other debates to the Constitution’s historic commitment to public deliberation among political equals—and in doing so, he reconceives many of our most basic constitutional rights, such as free speech and equality under law. He urges that public deliberation about the meaning of the Constitution in turn be freed from a principle of neutrality based on the status quo. His work points to a historically sound but fundamentally new understanding of the American constitutional process as an exercise in deliberative democracy.

The New Republic writes: “Cass Sunstein’s important book appears after the inauguration of a Democratic administration headed by a ‘new liberal’ who, by training and apparent inclination, is much taken by laws and lawyers from elite law schools. The Partial Constitution is now, among other things, a memorandum to the White House about the way that ‘new liberals’ (in whose camp Sunstein would count himself) should respond to the unexpected opportunity to reshape American constitutional doctrine.”
PROFILE:
MICHAEL W. McCONNELL

"I think that one of the things a law school should do is give students a basis of the practice of law, not merely a duplication of the experience of law," states Michael McConnell, William B. Graham Professor of Law.

"Students don't need to be told how to file a paper. They need an education that enables them to be the leaders of the field in the future. The mark of a great law school is not in the first 10 weeks on the job but in 10 or 20 years out when they are striving to be the top of their profession."

And of all the law schools McConnell has come to know over the years, he reserves his highest praise for the school with which he first became involved in seventeen years ago.

In 1976, after earning his B.A. at Michigan State University, this Kentucky native looked elsewhere when it came to pursuing his J.D. He applied to two schools, Yale and the University of Chicago, because he heard their pursuit of the legal perspective was on a more intellectual basis. In the end, he chose the Law School. "The engagement of ideas and the commitment to scholarship here exceeds law schools anywhere. The intellectual and philosophical diversity is greater. It is the only major law school that genuinely spans the spectrum of opinion. This is a much more intellectually interesting place..."

While at the Law School, Mr. McConnell was a comment editor on the Law Review and a member of the Order of the Coif. Following his graduation in 1979, McConnell served as law clerk to J. Skelly Wright, then Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Circuit, and to Justice William J. Brennan Jr. of the U.S. Supreme Court. He then assumed the position of assistant general counsel at the Office of Management and Budget, where he was principally involved in regulatory review. In 1983, he began two years of service in the solicitor general's office at the Department of Justice, where he argued six cases before the Supreme Court in the 1983 and 1984 terms.

In 1985, McConnell returned to the Law School, this time, in the capacity as assistant professor of law. He left little doubt as to why he agreed to return. "This is the best governed of all the major law schools. This institution has a reputation of treating its junior faculty very well. In other schools, the junior faculty usually picks up the slack, teaching the courses that no one else wants to teach. When I arrived here, the dean asked me what I wanted to teach. I told him and he said fine. And that's what I taught. That's the difference. Here you have first year faculty teaching courses that elsewhere are the prizes of seniority."

One such course is McConnell's own in constitutional law, one of his major interests. He also holds courses on regulated industries, state and local governments, and religion and the First Amendment. All taught in the surroundings he has come to admire more as the years pass.

"It is a much better law school now than when I was here. I've heard this so often that I have to consider it more than flattery, that our students do better than those from competitive law schools." -Michael W. McConnell

Having obtained full professorship in 1989, McConnell's workload has anything but slackened. But when not in the classrooms, he still finds time for a variety of other activities. His pro bono work mainly concerns the First Amendment but not entirely. He has represented the entire telephone industry in cases that concern their exclusion from the cable television, as well as several cases in the court of appeals on behalf of students and religious organizations whose constitutional rights have been infringed. He served as a member of the President's Intelligence Oversight Board from 1988-90 and is currently on the board of directors of the Austin Christian Law Center, a low-income legal clinic in the Austin neighborhood of Chicago. He also is chairman of the finance committee of university's Laboratory School, where two of his three children attend. ♦
HONORS AND AWARDS

Craig Darren Singer, of the graduating Class of 1993, graduated with Highest Honor and was inducted into the Order of the Coif. The following graduates of the Class of 1993 received their degrees with High Honors and were inducted into the Order of the Coif: Douglas Russell Cole, Kenneth D. Crews, Larry C. Downes, Griffith Lowell Green, David Noah Greenwald, Jody A. Manier, Gerald Fahrad Masoudi, and John Gordon Seymour.

The following students graduated with Honors and were also inducted into the Order of the Coif: Abraham M. Bell, Jeffrey Alan Brown, Patricia Anne Flaming, Craig Todd Goldblatt, Douglas Neil Greenburg, Stephen M. Kramarsky, Jack Woodruff Pirozolo, John Edward Putnam, Lisa Beth Schultz, and Amanda Katherine Williams.


RUIZ EARS SEVERAL PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

It proved to be a very busy final year at the Law School for Michael P. Ruiz '93.

Active in the Law Students' Association, he served as the public service liaison to the faculty public service committee. In this capacity, Michael was instrumental in the establishment and organization of Public Service Week. He coordinated the efforts of various student groups for the Week, organized a concurrent information fair, arranged for the printing of many publicity items, even manned the helium tank for inflating the balloons he had emblazoned with the Public Service Week logo. After the success of the Week, Michael turned his attention to other areas of public service, as in helping to rewrite the Law School's Loan Forgiveness Program and lending a hand with the Law School Charity Auction.

These tireless efforts not only earned him the admiration of both classmates and faculty alike, but also proved to be outstanding enough to garnish several awards. At the Law School, Michael was named the winner of the 1993 Hyman M. Spector Public Service Award, an honor awarded from time to time to those students who have made truly unique contributions to the Law School's Public Service Program. Michael also was one of three 1993 winners of the Ann Watson Barber Outstanding Service Award, given each year to those students who have made exceptional contributions to the quality of life at the Law School. Then, in June, at the Illinois State Bar Association Annual Meeting in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, Michael was awarded the ISBA Law Student Division Public Service Award, the first University of Chicago Law School student to be so honored. Finalists from each affiliated law school had been selected and from this group Michael was chosen as the winner.

In her letter to the ISBA nominating Michael for the award, Kathryn Stell, assistant dean of students at the Law School, wrote: "In an environment where most students are scrambling to find the most lucrative positions with the most prestigious private law firms, Mike has consistently kept to his vision of public interest. As a law student, Mike has devoted more time helping the less fortunate than most full-fledged lawyers do during their entire careers. I am sure that I speak for Dean Stone and Professor Greene as well as myself when I say that Mike Ruiz's dedication to public service sets a standard we should all strive to attain."

Since graduation, Michael has not lost any stride. Having spent the last few summers working at the Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance office downstate, Michael returned to southern Illinois to be the sole lawyer in a legal-aid office serving a several-county area.
Lee Carter and Ann Reading, both of the graduating class of 1993, were the recipients of the 1993 Edwin F. Mandel Award. This prestigious award is presented each year to those members of the graduating class who, during their Law School careers, have made exceptional contributions to the Law School's legal aid program, in both the quality of work done and the conscientious exercise of legal aid responsibilities. Ms. Carter is a native of Washington, D.C., and received her B.A. from Denison University. Ms. Reading is from Chautauqua, New York, and received her B.A. from Wellesley College.

The D. Francis Bustin Award was established to recognize the achievements of those students whose published scholarly research has made a particularly outstanding contribution to our understanding of the law and its impact on society. The winners of the 1993 Bustin Award are: David Greenwald '93, for his comment in the University of Chicago Law Review on “The Forgetful Witness”; Jacqueline Smith '93 for her comment in The University of Chicago Legal Forum on “The European Community’s Directive on Environmental Impact Assessment”; and Craig Singer ’93, for his comment in The University of Chicago Law Review on “The First Amendment Rights of Public Employees.” Mr. Greenwald hails from Brooklyn, New York, and earned his B.A. from Harvard. Ms. Smith is from Northbrook, Illinois, and received her B.A. from the University of Michigan. Mr. Singer received his B.A. from Wesleyan University and is from Philadelphia.

The 1993 winners of the Ann Watson Barber Outstanding Service Award are Donald Harmon ’94, Jody Plotkin ’93, and Michael Ruiz ’93. This award, established in the memory of the former registrar of the Law School from 1962 to 1976, is given each year to those students who have made exceptional contributions to the quality of life at the Law School. Don Harmon was cited for his work as president of Law Student Association and for coordinating orientation. Judy Plotkin was commended for her activities in the Musical Scales of Justice (singing group), and the Trivia Contest. Michael Ruiz was cited for his efforts in the establishing of Public Service Week, and for his work on the Law School Loan Forgiveness Program, the Charity Auction, and the Phoenix.

The annual spring banquet of the Black Law Students Association of the University of Chicago was held at Capt.’s Hard Time Dining in Chicago on April 3, 1993. The evening began with a private alumnus reception and book-signing, featuring the evenings keynote speaker, Derrick A. Bell, Jr., professor of law at New York University and author of Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism and And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice. Professor Bell later addressed the nearly three hundred assembled on “Meeting the Challenge: The Role of the Black Attorney in America.”

NEW EDITORS NAMED

The members of the Managing Board for Volume 61 of the University of Chicago Law Review are: Timothy Duffy, editor-in-chief; Barton Clark, executive editor; Mark Artlip, managing and book review editor; Theodore Ulyot, topics and comments editor; Timothy Simeone and Erik Vanden Berg, articles editors; Derek Bush, Neil Lloyd, Dan Parish, John Sellers, Jonathan Youngwood, comment editors; Chris Bryant, Monty Crawford, M. Elaine Horn, topic access editors; and Janet Bauman, associate business editor.

The members of the Editorial Board
for the 1993 Volume of the University of Chicago Legal Forum are: Mythili Tharmaratnum, editor-in-chief; Joseph H. Kaufman, managing editor; Kathe A. Pate and Hille S. von Rosenvinge, articles editors; W. Benjamin Lackey, symposium and developments editor; Eric M. Schweiker, senior comments editor; David M. Cohn, John C. Martin, Christian B. McGrath, and Megan M. Moshayedi, comments editors; and Kent D. Bressie and Jay O. Wright, associate editors.

• • •

In response to student interest in a third journal last year, the Law School announced the creation of a new journal, the University of Chicago Roundtable, to be published annually. It will focus on interdisciplinary approaches to legal analysis. The Roundtable board plans to host a conference for late winter or early spring on the rights of ethnic minorities and women in Eastern Europe in new constitutions, and will publish the resulting papers in its first issue next fall. Each issue of the Roundtable will contain a section devoted to a specific topic, as well as an open section comprised of articles and student comments on a variety of interdisciplinary legal subjects. The Board has invited experts, as well as second and third year students, to submit papers for both sections of the journal.

• • •

The 1993-94 University of Chicago Roundtable Board will be: Stephen Bank and Stephanie Gore, editors-in-chief; Jennifer Spruill and Kathy Vaclavik, articles editors; Rachel Gibbons, Christi Graff, and Michael Strong, comments editors; Elizabeth Brown and Kevin Feldis, symposium editors; Sue Moss, managing editor; and Johnathan Clark and Nicole Reid, senior staff members.

Those interested in obtaining the Roundtable may contact the editors at 312/702-0223 for a subscription form. •
MOOT COURT

Three distinguished federal judges, Gerald B. Tjoflat of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, Judge John Noonan of the Ninth Circuit and Chief Judge Patricia Wald of the D.C. Circuit, heard the final arguments of the Hinton Moot Court competition on May 12 in the Weymouth Kirkland Courtroom. In Richard Lyle Austin v United States, the Respondents Pamela Auerbach ’93 and Dov Pinchot ’94 argued that government seizure of the petitioner’s home and place of work for possession and sale of drugs was not disproportionate punishment under the Eighth Amendment. Arguing for the petitioner was the team of Abraham Bell ’93 and Seth Levine ’93.

After two hours, in a competition described by Judge Tjoflat as a “barrel of fun,” the judges awarded to Auerbach and Pinchot the Hinton Moot Court Competition Award for excellence in appellate advocacy with highest distinction. Bell and Levine received the Karl Llewellyn Memorial Cup for excellence in brief writing and oral argument.

Afterwards, the judges had nothing but high praise for the participants. Judge Tjoflat commented that the performances were nothing short of “extraordinary” and Judge Noonan commented that both the briefs and arguments would rate among the top ten percent of those he actually hears from the bench.

RETURN TO JAPAN

For the second year in a row, Law School students were able to investigate the Japanese legal system first hand. For nine days, eleven second- and third-year students spent their spring break in an active trip to Japan. The visit offered several opportunities to study the country’s legal, commercial, and social systems. Their full schedule included visits to leading Japanese law firms and corporations, where they able to participate in several discussions on the country’s legal system, investment and capital organization, and import laws. A walking tour of Tokyo with a leading sociologist proved a great study guide on crime and other social ills of Japan. The Law School students took time to visit the University of Tokyo and the Legal Research and Training Institute to study the similarities and differences between American and Japanese legal education.
CLERKS

Fifty-four Law School graduates have accepted judicial clerkships for the 1993-94, including eight for the U.S. Supreme Court, a new Law School record.

United States Supreme Court

Kate Adams ’90 (Justice O’Connor), Sean Donahue ’92 (Justice Stevens), Allison Eid ’91 (Justice Thomas), Nathan Forrester ’92 (Justice Kennedy), Jim Gauch ’89 (retired Chief Justice Burger), Dan Klerman ’91 (Justice Stevens), Steve Krone ’92 (Justice Brennan), Mark Perry ’91 (Justice O’Connor).

D.C. Circuit

Kevin Cameron ’93 (Judge Buckley), Wan Kim ’93 (Judge Buckley), Jody Manier ’93 (Judge Williams), Susan Pacholski ’92 (Judge D. Ginsburg), Craig Singer ’93 (Judge Mikva).

1st Circuit

Ana Cruz ’93 (Judge Torruella), Kent Greenfield ’92 (Judge Campbell).

2nd Circuit

David Karp ’93 (Judge Mahoney), Gordon Seymour ’93 (Judge Winter).

3rd Circuit

Scott Bovino ’93 (Judge Alito), Jack Pirozzolo ’93 (Judge Becker), Monica Powell ’93 (Judge Alito).

4th Circuit

Griffith Green ’93 (Judge Luttig).

5th Circuit

Sara Crovitz ’93 (Judge Davis), Richard Morrison ’92 (Judge Smith).

6th Circuit

Dan Frank ’93 (Judge Boggs), Margaret Liu ’93 (Judge Siler), Elizabeth Wellinghoff ’93 (Judge Nelson).

7th Circuit

Doug Cole ’93 (Judge Easterbrook), Larry Downes ’93 (Judge Posner), Craig Goldblatt ’93 (Judge Cudahy), David Greenwald ’93 (Judge Posner), Gerald Masoudi ’93 (Judge Easterbrook), Amanda Williams ’93 (Judge Eschbach).

9th Circuit

Chris Sprigman ’93 (Judge Reinhardt).

10th Circuit

John Putnam ’93 (Judge Ebel).

11th Circuit

Jeryl Bowers ’93 (Judge Hatchett).

District Courts

Pamela Auerbach ’93 (Judge Zobel, D. Ma.), Wendy Berkowitz ’93 (Judge Nordberg, N.D. Ill.), Kate Chanin ’93 (Judge Billings, D. Vt.), David Chaumette ’93 (Judge Hughes, S.D. Tex.), Anne Depew ’93 (Judge Brody, D. Me.), Gavin Dowell ’93 (Judge Sanders, N.D. Tex.), Marcel Duhamel ’93 (Judge Aldrich, N.D. Ohio), Marc Falcone ’93 (Judge Zagel, N.D. Ill.), Michael Gold ’93 (Judge Rosenthal, S.D. Tex.), Richard Harper ’93 (Judge Marcus, S.D. Fla.), Seth Levine ’93 (Judge Crabb, D. Wis.), Peter Lurie ’93 (Judge Owen, S.D.N.Y.), Kimberly Macri ’93 (Judge Tashima, C.D. Cal.), Tom Marton ’93 (Judge Woodlock, D. Ma.), Annalis Pizzarello ’93 (Judge Fong, D. Hi.), Heidi Rummel ’93 (Judge Jackson, D.D.C.), Lisa Schultz ’93 (Judge Cabranes, D. Ct.), Dan Tanenbaum ’92 (Judge Conlon, N.D. Ill.), Mark Weiss ’93 (Judge Wolf, D. Ma.).

State Courts

Ashish Prasad ’93 (Judge Levin, Mich.).

Meeting outside the Supreme Court Building are the record-breaking eight Law School graduates currently clerking for Court justices: (front row) Kate Adams ’90, Allison Eid ’91, Nathan Forrester ’92, Jim Gauch ’89; (back row) Mark Perry ’91, Steve Krone ’92, Dan Klerman ’91, and Sean Donahue ’92.
ALBERT ALSCHULER
Wilson-Dickinson Professor of Law and Arnold and Frieda Shure Scholar
Legal Activities: Opinion Letter on Constitutionality of Proposed Grand Jury Reform, District Court, Hennepin County, Minnesota; Advisor on Appellate Litigation, County Attorney's Office, Hennepin County, Minnesota; Advisor, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

MARY BECKER '80
Professor of Law
Member of: Core Committee, Illinois Clemency Project for Battered Women
Legal Activities: Involved in organizing state-wide clemency project to submit a number of clemency petitions to Illinois Governor Edgar next year.

RICHARD EPSTEIN
James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law
University Positions held: Spokesman, Committee of the Council.
Member, Presidential Search Committee. Editor, Journal of Law & Economics.

**R.H. HELMHOlz**
Ruth Wyatt Rosenson Professor of Law. Director of the Legal History Program, and Arnold and Frieda Shure Scholar
Elected to: The Executive Committee of the Association Internationale d'Histoire du Droit.

**MARK J. HEYRMAN '77**
Clinical Professor of Law
Addressed: Seventh Annual Forensic Conference co-sponsored by the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities and Mount Sinai Hospital. Keynote address: "Forward into the Past: Mentally Ill Offenders in the 1990's and Beyond." Chicago Bar Association Committee on Legal Services for the Disabled, "A New Model for Civil Commitment Defense." The spring meeting of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, "New Developments in the Law of NGRI Detainees."
Appointed: Chairperson of the committee to create a community economic development corporation for the Rogers Park neighborhood of Chicago.

Legal Activities: In Brown v. Murphy, 91 Co 85 (Cir. Ct. of Cook Cty.), the court permanently enjoined the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities from acting as payee for the social security disability funds of patients and then paying those funds to itself without first ensuring that the patients had the capacity to give informed consent and had been provided with the information necessary to make a reasoned choice. Michael Small '91, Lynn Engel '92, Brian Bossert '93, and Jack Friedman '93 represented the plaintiff class as part of their super-
vised work in the Law School's Mandel Clinic.

**STEPHENV HOLMES**
Professor of Political Science and Law, Law School, Department of Political Science and the College, Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe, and Russell Baker Scholar
Awarded: The 1993 D. Francis Bustin Prize.

**Elena KAGAN**
Assistant Professor of Law
Awarded: Graduating Class of 1993 Award for Teaching Excellence

**Lyonette LouisJacques '86**
Foreign and International Law Librarian and Lecturer in Law
Addressed: CALI/LEAP Conference for Law School Computing Professionals, Chicago-Kent College of Law, June 12, 1993, moderator, plenary panel on "The Virtual Law Library", presented paper, "Perspectives on the Virtual Law Library (or Visions of a Law Library with No Walls and (Virtually ) No People)"; 1993 Summer Institute for Teachers: Questions of Justice:

Collegiate and Humanities Divisions (University of Chicago May 1993).

Participated in: Workshop on First Amendment neutrality at St. Louis University School of Law.
Appointed: Special Counsel to the Senate Judiciary Committee for nomination of Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the U.S. Supreme Court.

**Spencer KimBAll**
Seymour Logan Professor Emeritus of Law
Addressed: The Federation of Regulatory Counsel, Inc., in Chicago on "Risk Based Capital Requirements in Insurance."
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**PARTICIPATED IN:** American Society of International Law, Annual Meeting; American Association of Law Libraries, Annual Meeting.

**ELECTED:** Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Foreign, Comparative and International Law Special Interest Section (FCIL SIS) of the American Association of Law Libraries.

**APPOINTED:** Co-Chair, Education/Program Committee of the FCIL SIS, 1993-94.

**MICHAEL W. MCCONNELL ’79**

William B. Graham Professor of Law, Director of the Law and Government Program, and Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe.


**LEGAL ACTIVITIES:** Delivered oral argument in Western Electric Co. v. United States (Funding/Royalty Appeal), No. 92-5079, in the US. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (April 14, 1993). Delivered written testimony to the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources on the Constitutionality of S. 636, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1993, with Prof. Michael Paulsen of University of Minnesota Law School.

**GEOFFREY P. MILLER**

Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law


**MARK RAMSEYER**
Professor of Law


**GERALD N. ROSENBERG**
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and the College, and Lecturer in Law

Awarded: The 1993 Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, University of Chicago.

**RICHARD ROSS**
Visiting Assistant Professor of Law

Participated in: Conference on Jewish law and philosophy, Shalom Hartman Institute, Jerusalem, Israel (June 1993)

**RANDALL SCHMIDT ’79**
Clinical Professor of Law


**STEPHAN J. SCHULHOFER**
Frank and Bernice J. Greenberg, Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice


Addressed: the Criminal Justice Section of the Association of American Law Schools, and presented the principal paper at their January meeting, on the subject of protecting sexual autonomy through the criminal law; addressed the Law & Economics Workshop at the University of Chicago, on the delivery of criminal defense services to the indigent; addressed the National Association of Former United States Attorneys, at their annual meeting in Lake Tahoe, Nevada, on the subject of future prospects for the federal sentencing system.

Participated in: a two-day workshop on empirical research sponsored by the U.S. Sentencing Commission in March in Washington, D.C., and spoke to the group on field research into prosecutorial charging behavior; also participated in the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Law Schools in January in San Francisco, and the Annual Meeting of the Law & Society Association in May in Chicago.

**DAN SHAVIDO**
Professor of Law and Associate Dean


Published: "Passive Loss Rules," *Tax Management Portfolio* 454-2nd
**GEORGE R. STONE '71**
Harry Kalven Jr. Professor of Law and Dean


Appointed to: Nomination Committee, Section on Law, American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Ad Hoc Committee of Law School Deans to appoint members of the special committee that will advise Senators Paul Simon and Carol Moseley-Braun '72 in the appointment of Federal District Judges and United States Attorneys for the Northern District of Illinois.

Miscellaneous: Participated in Illinois Legal Times Roundtable on "The Future of Legal Education" (May, 1993); appeared on "Larry King Live" on the subject of Supreme Court nominations (June 10, 1993); appeared on National Public Radio ("The Nation Speaks") and on "Chicago Tonight" with John Callaway (WTTW) on June 14, 1993 to discuss the nomination of Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the Supreme Court.

**DAVID STRAUSS**
Harry N. Wyatt Professor of Law and Russell Baker Scholar

Addressed: American Association of Law Schools Annual Convention, Section on Jurisprudence, on "Toleration vs. pluralism: Group Identity and Constitutional Law"; American Association of Law Schools Annual Convention, Section on Constitutional Law, on "Private Power and the Constitution."

**CASS SUNSTEIN**
Karl N. Llewellyn Professor of Jurisprudence, Law School, Department of Political Science and the College, and Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe

CHICAGO

Loop Luncheons

Loop Luncheons are held monthly throughout the year at the Board of Trustees Room at One First National Plaza. The Organizing Committee, whose chair is Milton Levenfeld ’50, invites you to attend future luncheons. New graduates may attend their first luncheon as guests of the Alumni Association. For more information on the luncheon, please call Assistant Dean Holly Davis ’76 at 312/702-9628.

The Honorable Abner Mikva, ’51, chief judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. District, and senior lecturer in law and Charles J. Merriam Fellow at the Law School, spoke to the gathered alumni for the May 24th luncheon in Chicago. Judge Mikva spoke on “Whatever Happened to States’ Rights and Who is Still for Them?”

On June 24th, the luncheon topic was “Perspectives on the Death Penalty.” On hand to address the assembled were Randolph Stone, clinical professor of law and director of the Mandel Legal Aid Clinic at the Law School, and Lawrence Lessig, assistant professor of law at the Law School.

ATLANTA

Douglas Baird, Harry A. Bigelow Professor of Law and director of the Law and Economics Program, spoke before graduates and friends on June 10, 1993. Professor Baird’s topic was “Chapter 11 and Other Perils: Bankruptcy and the Business Lawyer.” The meeting took place at the offices of Alston & Bird, thanks to Peter Kontio ’73, president of the Atlanta Chapter.

DALLAS

Judge Lee H. Rosenthal ’77 of the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas, was the guest speaker at a gathering of alumni and friends on June 28. Maura Neligan ’84 of Hopkins and Sutter provided a conference room in the firm’s office. Judge Rosenthal practiced in the area of general civil litigation at Baker & Botts prior to her appointment to the bench.

NEW YORK

On August 9, 1993, Dean Geoffrey Stone ’71 spoke at a breakfast held for graduates and friends attending the Annual ABA convention in New York. Eighty-three alumni and guests registered for the event held at the University Club.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Washington, D.C., Chapter held its annual alumni luncheon on May 13 in conjunction with the American Law Institute meeting. Ralph Neas, Jr. ’71, executive director of the Leadership Conference of Civil Rights, spoke on “Civil Rights: Where We Are and Where We Are Going.” Neas discussed his views on the future of civil rights in light of the new president, new Congress, and the changes on the Supreme Court.

LONDON

A two-day reunion was held in London for alumni residing in Europe from August 27-28, 1993. Friday evening marked the beginning of the events with dinner at
the Open Terrace in Covent Garden. Saturday's schedule was full. The day began with alumni touring Sir John Sloane's Museum, built in the early nineteenth century by the eccentric architect to house his enormous collection of antiquities & art. The graduates then met at the Old Hall of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn for lunch. The inn, the only one of four to survive World War II without significant damage, was formed in the middle ages and added onto over the centuries. The Old Hall, built in 1491, was then the site for the panel discussion immediately following lunch. With moderator Andrew De La Rosa '78, a partner with Morris, Raphan & De La Rosa, London, and panelists Richard Helmholz, Ruth Wyatt Rosenson Professor of Law and Arnold and Frieda Shure Scholar at the Law School, Monique Nion MLL '65, a partner with Baker & McKenzie, Paris, and Andras Sajo, Law School visiting professor, the panel and gathered alums discussed "The New Europe and the Clinton Administration." The dinner Saturday night was held at the Old Hall, with guest speaker Dean Geoffrey Stone '71.

EMERITUS LUNCHEON

The Law School's third annual luncheon honoring Law School alumni who graduated from the Law School over fifty years ago was held in June at the Chicago Bar Association. Over seventy graduates and friends enjoyed remarks made by Phil Neal, Harry A. Bigelow Emeritus of Law and former dean of the Law School. Members of the Class of 1933, who were celebrating their sixtieth reunion, and members of the Class of 12938, who were celebrating their fifty-fifth reunion, were specially recognized.

RELIVING OLD EXPERIENCES

Reliving old experiences and catching up with the new ones, graduates returned for the Law School's Reunion Weekend May 13-15.

Above: Enjoying the view from the terrace at the Hotel Nikko.
For the Classes of 1943, 1948, 1953, 1958, 1963, 1968, 1973, 1978, and 1983, the Law School's annual Reunion Weekend began on Thursday as many of the graduates attended the Alumni Association Annual Dinner at the Hotel Nikko. The evening provided an opportunity to meet Hugo Sonnenschein, the University's president-elect and the guest speaker at the dinner.

Friday afternoon the graduates had a chance to relive one experience they could never forget: attending law school classes. They then were invited to listen to William L. Twining '58, Quain
Professor of Jurisprudence at the University College in London, as he lectured on “Karl Llewellyn’s Unfinished Agenda.” The afternoon wound down with the students and faculty joining the alumni for the traditional Friday afternoon Wine Mess.

On Saturday, after a continental breakfast, graduates attended a Town Hall Meeting with Dean Stone, who answered questions about the Law School, legal education, and its relationship to the practice of law. This was followed by a roundtable discussion on “Hate Speech and the First Amendment” with panel members Judge Danny Julian...
Boggs '68, U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, Judge Frank H. Easterbrook '73, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, Martha A. Field '68, professor of law at Harvard University, and David A. Strauss, Harry N. Wyatt Professor of Law at the Law School.

The graduates and their families proceeded to the Harold J. Green Lounge for the Dean's Lunch, then rounded out the afternoon with a tour of the campus. Saturday evening graduates met one last time for their class dinners before returning home.
REUNION VOLUNTEERS

The Law School would like to thank all those who gave so generously of their time to organize Reunion Weekend 1993.

1948
Ira T. Wender, Chair
Donald J. Yellen
George E. Wise
Lawrence Howe
Harold A. Katz
James Van Santen

1953
Jean Allard, Co-Chair
George J. Phocas, Co-Chair
John W. Bowden
Merrill A. Freed
Robert C. Morton
Ralph A. Mantynband
Laurence Reich
Mr. Robert S. Milnikel
Mr. Wallace M. Rudolph

1958
Charles F. Custer, Chair
Richard W. Burke
Ward Farnsworth
Francis J. Gerlits
Robert C. Gobelman
James C. Goodale
Ralph J. Henkle
Mr. James C. Hormel
Robert E. Ulbricht

1963
Burton E. Glazov, Chair
Miriam Balanoff
George F. Bruder
Ronald S. Cope
David L. Crabb
Terry D. Diamond
Barry E. Fink
Anthony C. Gilbert
Marvin Gittler
Noel Kaplan

1968
Laurence N. Strenger, Co-Chair
Wilber H. Boles, Co-Chair
Richard I. Badger Jr.
Karl M. Becker
Mr. Dale Edward Bethoffer
Joseph I. Bentley
James P. Carey III
Ronald DeKoven
Martha A. Field
Jeffrey L. Grausam
Celeste M. Hammond
Louis A. Huskins
Ann Marie Lousin
James E. Mann
Barbara W. Mather
Gregg L. Skalinder
Mr. James Winton Rankin
Richard M. Rieser Jr.
Deming Eliot Sherman
David Mack Stigler
Thomas Paul Stillman

1973
Douglas M. Kraus, Co-Chair
Leland Ellis Hutchinson, Co-Chair
Mary L. Azcuenuaga
Victor Bass
Steve Aaron Brand
Roger Thomas Brice
Rand L. Cook
Douglas H. Ginsburg
Jerold H. Goldberg
Kenneth V. Handal
Irene Saal Holmes
O. Lock Holmes
Peter Kontio
H. Douglas Laycock
Bruce R. MacLeod
Stephen Michael Olson
Gerald G. Saltarelli

1978
Andrea Waintroob, Co-Chair
Richard Lee Fenton, Co-Chair
Leslie Ann Stulberg, Co-Chair
H. Nicholas Berberian
David M. Bernick
Nancy G. Chaffetz
Peter R. Chaffetz
James P. Clark
Barbara Downey
Nancy Ebe
Jerry A. Esrig
Douglas C. Herbert, Jr.
Debra Sadow Koenig
Marjorie P. Lindblom
James Looman
Claire E. Pensyl
Howard Roin
Gregory G. Wrobel

1983
Todd Marcus Young, Chair
Michael T. Brody
Denise B. Caplan
Ruben Diaz, Jr.
Dorothea W. Dickerman
Gregory P. Farnham
Douglas Hilleboe
Debra Fagan
Jeffrey J. Keenan
Pamela McLean Meyerson
Barbara S. Miller
Mark Alan Moore
Patricia A. Nazek
Patrick J. Neligan, Jr.
Laura Schnell
Claire A. Wetler
Gretchen Anne Winter

Anne Hamblin Schiave
Stewart Robert Shepherd
Linda Van Winkle-Deacon
Class Notes Section – REDACTED

for issues of privacy
Gertz, '30, helps free long-time prisoner Paul O. Crump

Elmer Gertz is known as a persistent, resourceful, and tireless attorney. It took him over fourteen years to win his famous libel case against Robert Welch, Inc., the publishing arm of the John Birch Society. It took only thirteen years to win another important libel case, Zeinfeld v. Hayes Freight Line. But it took thirty-one years to get Paul O. Crump out of jail.

Paul Crump, as a young man, was convicted of a payroll robbery and sentenced to death forty years ago. He was kept alive during the next ten years through involved litigation. During that period, Crump became rehabilitated in the opinion of the then-Governor Otto Kerner. In August 1962, Gertz and a group of lawyers persuaded the governor to commute the death sentence of Crump and order him confined to life. After that, Gertz alone remained as Crump's lawyer and tried every means to get him paroled, without success.

Then, a young lawyer, Donald S. Rothschild, became associated with Gertz in his efforts to get Crump released. In his memoirs, To Life, Gertz said that he would not retire from the practice of law until he got Crump out of prison.

Finally, on February 19, 1993, Elmer Gertz, now in his eighty-sixth year of life and sixty-third year as a lawyer, succeeded in his efforts to release Paul O. Crump from prison. Gertz and Rothschild intend to write a book on their experiences in this case as they believe it holds several legal lessons.

by Donald Yellon from San Francisco, George Wise from Long Beach, California, and Larry Howe, Harold Katz, and Jim Van Santen from Chicago.

Seventeen members of the class and twelve spouses, with a child and grandchild thrown in here and there, attended our reunion. After spending a great day at the Law School attending meetings and seminars, we gathered at Spiaggia on the Near North Side for a happy get-together. After dinner, Wally Blum '41 and Kate and Edward Levi '35 joined us for a brief time. Happily, before the evening got-together, we had great fun at a luncheon with Edward and Walter when Geof Stone hosted us all at the Law School. Those attending were Tom Alexander, Don Cronson, Jim Evans, Harold Green, Larry Howe, Harold Katz, Julius Lehrer, John Pederson, Lawrence Rabb, John Rogers, John Schindler, Joseph Sheeks, Arthur Simms, Jim Van Santen, Jacob Ward, Ira Wender, George Wise, and Don Yellon.

The prize for traveling the farthest goes to Don Cronson who resides permanently in Geneva, Switzerland, and who was full of great European stories.

Most of our class members attending the reunion were also able to attend the Law School Alumni Association dinner the evening of May 13, when we met and listened to sparkling comments from Hugo Sonnenschein, president-elect of the University. We all agreed that Mr. Sonnenschein will brilliantly carry on the traditions of our University, even though he has the misfortune of not being a member of the bar.

Our 40th Reunion was a three-day, grand and glorious event. The 45th Reunion Committee is under the superbly capable hands of Jerry Specter, a classic Bears fan who really knows a matzo ball from a football. So think about 1996. I still have some programs from the Reunion. Write if you want one.

Our Class Scholarship now stands at over $41,000 and currently pays $1,700. Dick Badger, Dean of Students, wrote me that the award for the 1992-1993 academic year went to Charles Haywood. He has a B.A. in History from Indiana University and studied at Budapest University of Economics. He's on the Law Review, is a Phi Beta Kappa, active in Streetlaw (teaching inner-city high school students about law), the Fedralist Society (all you WWK loyalists should note that), and he was a delegate to the 1988 Indiana Republican Convention, a Republican precinct captain and more. Sorry Ab. He has done many more things and he represents the unusually high standards and achievements of those who receive our help. Congratulations to him and to all supporters of this wonderful expression of interest in our past and the Law School's future.

Bob Kharasch has really moved contacted by a member of the committee who will fill you in on the details. Keep your eye out for the official brochure with registration materials which will be mailed in March.
John Emerson ‘78 leaves his career to help a president get elected

Lawyer John B. Emerson has been fascinated by presidential elections since he was a ninth grader in suburban New York, canvassing precincts for Eugene McCarthy.

Four years later, he was a student organizer for another failed Democratic presidential hopeful, George S. McGovern. He then took an 18-year hiatus from the campaign trail to go to law school and begin his career.

Then, a brief stint as national campaign manager for Gary Hart’s ill-fated presidential attempt to win the Democratic presidential nomination in 1987 left him disillusioned.

“I was destroyed more at what American politics was becoming,” Emerson said recently of Hart’s retreat from the primary after extensive media reports that he was having an extramarital affair.

Emerson’s outlook brightened last year, however, when he overcame an early reluctance to get involved in another presidential campaign. He couldn’t resist helping Bill Clinton—then just an acquaintance—win the White House.

“I love the courtroom,” said Emerson, a former litigator who has been chief deputy Los Angeles city attorney since 1987. “But politics is a good substitute. There is so much public speaking and debate and so much strategic thinking and tactical adjustments. It is very analogous to trying a very large case. The only difference is the jury is 12 million people as opposed to 12.”

After two decades as a volunteer, Emerson accepted his first paid political job as Clinton’s California campaign director last June, when it became clear the Arkansas governor had a good shot at defeating President Bush. He took an unpaid leave from the city government post he has held since 1987.

“As much as I was discouraged about [politics] in 1988, I was encouraged by what happened in 1992, largely by engaging the American people with a substantive message,” Emerson said, referring to Clinton’s ability to overcome personal attacks, including charges of marital infidelity and draft-dodging. He noted that Clinton overcome negative attacks by taking “the time to learn about and understand the problems people had.”

In California, their similar styles served Emerson well as Clinton’s top messenger. Emerson described the role as requiring more creativity than traditional campaigning to sustain the momentum without candidate appearances.

Neither Clinton nor Vice President-elect Al Gore visited California in the months before the election because they were confident of winning the state. Instead, they focused on states they could win only with frequent stopovers.

That strategy won Clinton both California and the election.

“It’s awfully exciting to blow someone out,” Emerson said. . .

Emerson describes himself as “a quick study” who has developed political expertise from old-fashioned sources, such as reading and talking to friends.

Among his inner circle are powerful Democratic leaders, including Charles T. Manatt, a senior partner in the Manatt firm and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and [Emerson’s former law partner, Mickey] Kantor, who was Clinton’s campaign manager and has been appointed as the new administration’s trade representative.

These friendships began at the Manatt firm shortly after Emerson graduated in 1978 from the University of Chicago Law School, although he insisted he didn’t join the firm with plans of entering the national political arena.

“I came to California with virtually no connections,” Emerson said. “I saw it as a land of opportunity.”

This excerpt from an article entitled “Disillusioned Practitioner Revives Love of Politics” and written by Jean Guccione, is reprinted by permission. © Copyright, 1993, Daily Journal Corp.

Class of ’79 (the guy who, among other things, sang and multiplied so well), gave birth to their fourth son, Ross, on July 30.

Congratulations, Barbara, Al, Kevin, Dylan, and Eric!

Mark Reinhardt lives in the mountains of Colorado and spends his free time writing regularly for Vegetarian Living and Vegetarian Voice, publications he describes as having “limited circulation and limited interest (to others).”

Peter Wilbur and his brother Tom recently visited Finland and Estonia. In Tallinn, Estonia, they attended a conference on privatization and met members of the Estonian Parliament. Peter even learned some Estonian. The people were friendly, and Estonia has no neon or McDonald’s (at least, not yet—don’t these necessarily follow privatization?) Peter and Tom
A move from politics to law changed the life of Monica McFadden '93 — but not her dreams

In a moment, everything changed for Monica McFadden. On a summer morning in 1987, she was standing on a Washington street corner near Capitol Hill during her regular breath-of-fresh-air stroll, waiting for the light to change. Two cars collided in front of her. One bounced, jumped the curb and, before she could move, clipped her left knee.

She had been a Washington lobbyist for the National Federation of Business and Professional Women, among other groups, working on health-care issues and women’s causes. But lobbying is pretty much a stand-up field, walking the halls of Congress, button-holing contacts at cocktail parties, running from appointment to appointment. Not work for a person whose knee was so badly damaged that she had to use crutches for a year and still suffers from chronic pain.

When her case against the driver who hit her came to trial, she won a judgment for $350,000, about one-third of what she figured she would need to pay medical and other expenses arising from the injury, which will eventually require further surgery. But she also got a tip.

“We didn’t get you as much as you wanted,” her attorney, George Shaaban, told her, “but I watched you during the trial. You enjoyed the process and you’re intuitively good at this. Why don’t you take the money and go to law school? This is something you can do sitting down.”

So off she went.

In 1990, at an age (39) when many people are settling into repetitive mid-life patterns, McFadden enrolled in the University of Chicago Law School. The next summer she got a job clerking for the Loop law firm of Hofeld and Schaffner. Last month she graduated. This month she takes the Illinois Bar examinations. In September, if all goes well, she’ll join Hofeld and Schaffner as their newest lawyer, specializing in personal-injury and product-liability cases.

“She has tremendous skills. She is superb at recognizing the issues, at doing research and in relating to clients,” said senior partner Albert Hofeld, referring to her work as a law clerk. “She has a lot of energy,” adds senior partner Howard Schaffner. “You can hear her laugh clear through the office.”

“Not a lot of people can keep their energy up and switch from one career to another,” said Sue Silk, a former WBBM-Ch. 2 news producer, now a media consultant. “She still feels, like we used to in the ’60’s, that we can make a difference.”

Recovery hasn’t been easy for McFadden. She walks with a bit of a limp. Because her knee tires easily, she has to be careful about how much time she spends standing up. She has been through most of the known procedures for dealing with chronic pain, including massage therapists, chiropractors, meditation, medication, and stress-relief programs.

Her own accident, she feels, “helps me to understand what a client might be going through. Often, what is involved is more than just the immediate injury.”

As an example she cited the notorious Dalkon Shield, a birth-control device pulled from the U.S. market in 1974 after its design was blamed for thousands of infections, spontaneous abortions, hysterectomies, and eighteen deaths among its three million users.

In one case, in which McFadden assisted while clerking at Hofeld and Schaffner, a married woman had postponed having children while she and her husband built a financial nest egg. The poisons that backed up inside her because she used a Dalkon Shield left her infertile and suffering from “an unbelievable sense of injustice. This happened to her— and it shouldn’t have happened,” McFadden said. During long interviews, McFadden helped the woman go beyond the bare medical facts of what had happened and draw out her deeper feelings of loss.

McFadden said she decided that “you’ve got to get on with your life”— and she did. On June 2, she graduated from the U. of C. Law School “with honors, which I didn’t expect.”

“Also,” she said, “the University of Chicago does these things very nicely. [President] Hanna Gray welcomes you to the community that you will be entering, in my case, the community of lawyers. Then she told us to ‘go out and seek justice on behalf of the people.’ And that’s what I intend to do.”

This is a condensed version of an article originally entitled “A Career Switch Kissed by Kismet” by Jon Andersen. It is reprinted here by permission. © Copyright 1993, Chicago Tribune.
lice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Andy notes that Justice Scalia is fond of walking across the Mall clad only in a toga. Andy is taking a well deserved vacation: a biking tour of Europe. When I asked Andy if he did a lot of biking, he said, "No, but if I get tired there's a van that follows behind us that will pick me up." Andy will probably be working for a New York firm when he gets back from Europe.

I also ran into Terry Abad who appears fit and trim. Terry evidently gets a lot of exercise from training his champion team of llamas. When asked what he was training them to do, Terry declined to comment, citing national security reasons.

It was also a delightful pleasure to see class heartthrob Donna Mattis. Unfortunately, for all you single guys, Donna is off the market as of Labor Day, marrying Tom Bell '93. Professor Isenbergh will perform the ceremony. Donna also left Morrison Forester in San Francisco and, after a heated bidding war, is now with Berg, Ziegler, Anderson and Parker where she practices commercial litigation. Attending the wedding were the Woffords, the Fagels, Roya Behnia, C.J. Griffith, Donna Petrine, Emily Nozik with her husband Rob, and Sharon Hendricks.

We also have our first classmate running for office. Linda Dilts Rawles is running for Congress in Arizona, and we wish her the best of luck.

Jillisa Brittan and Tom Weeks had a little girl, whom we hope looks more like Jillisa than Tom. Also, Pat Cipollone and his wife Becky recently had a little girl, whom we hope looks like Becky. That makes two in twelve months for Pat and Becky.

Val Ross went to New Zealand where she bungee jumped and also traveled to Australia and Fiji where she saw Billy Stern. Val lives with Susan Maxson, whom Val relates is also dating JFK, Jr. Val also wants to warn any would-be bettors that the Michigan State Spartans will take the Super Bowl and the National Championship.

Joel Wakefield called from Seattle to report the birth of a male child, Andrew. Joel had a rendezvous with the eternal several months ago. He was recovering from what he believed was a cold. The next thing he knew he was awakened by a nurse in the hospital who asked if he saw "light on the other side." When asked what she meant, the nurse informed him that at one point he had gone code blue. Much to Joel's surprise, he discovered he had actually died for a short period of time from pneumonia before he was resuscitated (Whew!). This is true! Joel decided to take the rest of the week off.

Irwin Kramer writes us to say that he has kept in touch with many of the students he had while a Bigelow Fellow at the Law School and would like to continue doing so. Thus, he would like everyone to be aware of his new address: Suite 400, 10451 Mill Run Circle, Owings Mills, Maryland 21117. For those of us with phones, it's 401/356-8867.

'92

Last year, the Chicago firm of Jenner & Block was enriched by the talents of Paul W. Hartzel, David T. Odom, Jodi K. Rosen, and Dan A. Tanenbaum.

'93

Ken Berman announces the arrival of his second daughter, Lily Marguerite, on June 18, 1993. She joins her sister Gayron, who will be two in September. Ken is still working with the Securities Exchange Commission.

The White House Fellowship Program

The White House Fellowship program begins its twenty-eighth year this fall. The program provides young men and women with firsthand experience in the process of leadership of the country. During their year-long assignments in Washington, D.C., Fellows serve as special assistants to Cabinet secretaries or senior members of the White House staff. Additionally, Fellows participate in an extensive education program including seminars with top government officials, scholars, journalists, and leaders from the private sector.

Three Law School graduates have participated in the White House Fellowship program. Wayne Collins '78 was a member of the 1981-82 class of Fellows and describes his year as "one of the best experiences I ever had." Assigned to then-Vice President George Bush, Wayne was involved in many aspects of regulatory relief. His experiences enabled him to move directly to the front office of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department upon completion of his Fellowship. "My year as a Fellow was great. The education program is uniformly superb. It benefited me in understanding how the government works, and how the White House functions. It was an eye-opening experience."

All U.S. citizens are eligible to apply during the early and formative years of their careers. There are no educational requirements and no special career or professional categories. Employees of the federal government are not eligible, with the exception of the Armed Services. The commission seeks candidates who have demonstrated excellence in their professional roles as well as significant breadth of interests and community involvement.

If this program sounds interesting, application forms and additional information can be obtained from: President's Commission on White House Fellowships, 712 Jackson Place N.W., Washington, D.C. 20503. Or call: 202/395-4522. The application deadline is December 1.
DEATHS

The Law School Record notes with regret the deaths of:

Robert McDougal, Jr. '29, a lawyer and retired partner in the firm of Winston & Stawn, died on May 23, 1993. He was a graduate of the Laboratory Schools, Princeton University, and the Law School. From 1948 to 1962, he served as president of the Chicago Child Care Society, the city's oldest charitable organization, having been founded in 1849 as the Chicago Orphan Asylum. The society is a multipurpose child care agency involved in placement, counseling, and adoption services. He also served on the national board of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund and helped organize its Chicago committee. He was active in interracial concerns long before the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Mr. McDougal was also on the board of the Child Welfare League of America.

General Shiu-Kee Yee, chairman and managing director of the United Chinese Bank Limited and a generous benefactor of the Law School, died in Hong Kong on April 25, 1993 at the age of 90. General Yee had served in the army of the Chinese Republic under General Chiang Kai-Shek, and was decorated for his service in the defense of Hong Kong against invading Japanese forces in 1942. After the war, he became managing director of the United Chinese Bank in Hong Kong, eventually rising to the post of Chairman. In his youth, General Yee had attended American universities with the help of financial aid. Believing deeply in the moral obligation of such aid recipients to reciprocate on behalf of others, the General established the S.K. Yee Foundation, which supports moral obligation scholarship funds at four American law schools, including the University of Chicago. Since 1983, the Yee Foundation has contributed $100,000 annually to the Law School, providing grants of $5000 to each of 20 students, who in turn acknowledge their moral obligation to repay their awards so that future students may similarly benefit. General Yee is survived by his wife, Hannah Hu Yee.
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Roy C. Compton

1923
Benjamin R. Williams
March 14, 1990.

1926
Phillip R. Toomin
May 23, 1993

1927
Irving N. Stenn
July 22, 1993

1928
Leo Arnstein
April 15, 1993

1929
Robert McDougal, Jr.
May 23, 1993

1935
Leslie W. Damon
January 2, 1993

1937
Robert S. Leavitt
May 5, 1993

1939
Hasseltine Byrd Taylor
March 8, 1993

1946
Richard F. Babcock Sr.
September 13, 1993

Barrington D. Parker
May 2, 1993

1949
Herbert M. Beitel
May 9, 1993

James B. Parsons
June 19, 1993

1951
Joe Minsky
April 24, 1992

1960
Richard H. Seigel
August 31, 1993

1961
Donald Wessling
July 23, 1993

1965
Thomas E. Nelson
March 31, 1993

1966
Robert A. Shuker
June 28, 1993

1986
David Crowley
April, 1993.