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New art animates discussion at the Law School

Lichtman on the First Amendment
3 Art Appreciation

“There is something compelling and curious about the new artworks currently on display at the Law School,” writes Meghan Skirving, '05. The collection of contemporary paintings and sculpture is a welcome addition.

6 Captive Audiences and the First Amendment

Some argue that regulation should protect “captive audiences” from potentially objectionable speech. Professor Douglas Lichtman disagrees, suggesting that allowing unfettered speech in situations where the audience cannot look away can serve important civic purposes.

12 Global Human Rights, One Case at a Time

A handful of years ago, Gary Haugen, '91, started the International Justice Mission. Now the IJM is one of the United States' largest international human rights organizations. Working with local governments to enforce existing law, they strive to "close the gap between the aspirations expressed in national laws, and the prevailing reality for the poor.”

18 Behind the Green Bag

The Green Bag is an unconventional legal journal started by a group of Law School alumni. It's thoughtful and philosophical, provocative and engaging, quirky and daring. It's also changing legal scholarship.
Message from the Dean

As you will see, the Law School looks different and is conversing about something new because of the installation of a dozen colorful and provocative pieces of art in our freshly renovated spaces. The paintings and sculpture are on loan to us from Art Enterprises LTD. In some sense the art is an obvious step in our quest to make the entire Law School experience warmer (but no less intense or excellent!). Large, blank, white walls are not conducive to collegial feelings. I am therefore grateful for the Kanter family’s influence and advice in facilitating this loan. Our faculty art committee made some choices and suggestions—and stands ready to approve other art if other friends step forward. (Hint!) Come visit our new collection, making time, of course, to take in a few classes and to talk with current students. The art is provocative, so much so that we are planning a talk here by a curator. But then our students are accustomed to provocation, and it is fitting that the art is like the law and other ideas that compete for attention here.

In unrelated news, we have just completed our entry-level hiring season, and emerged with three fantastic new junior faculty members, whom we will introduce to you soon in publications and at events. Our success in this market is the envy of other schools, and pleases me greatly. We have also survived a reaccreditation site visit, undertaken by the American Bar Association, accompanied by a representative of the Association of American Law Schools, which has its own membership standards. It is conventional to gripe about the massive amount of work that such visits require of the host school every seven years, especially because it seems ludicrous to imagine that a school like ours could be decertified by a (necessarily imperfect) regulatory process of this sort. But I will instead report that we learned some useful things about our great institution through this process. These include administrative techniques that might (yet) better serve our students, feedback on the success of our intensive courses, and other schools’ experiences with library consultants who might provide useful advice as we renovate our Tower.

Finally, I write this note on the heels of our Admitted Students Weekend, during which some 180 admitted students visited and contemplated matriculation here. It was a splendid weekend, with the weather, our upper-class students, our professional staff, and a vibrant Hyde Park all contributing to make the place appear as irresistible as it really is. And, of course, the new and colorful art, like the colorful faculty, new and old, helped the cause as well.

Enjoy the Record and know that things go well at your Law School.

[Signature]

Paul Lehman
MEGHAN SKIRVING, '05

There is something compelling and curious about the new artworks currently on display at the Law School. Perhaps this is because they are colorful, even playful, pieces in the midst of the otherwise subdued haven of academia.

Students disagree about whether or not they like the individual works—"De gustibus non est disputandum," said Hunter Ferguson, '07—but most agree that they improve and somehow broaden the experience of studying and learning. Mark Mulhern's Suicide, Sexual, Preference hangs in the south hallway, demanding our attention as we walk out of seminar. Three Frederick James Brown oil paintings bemuse us as we linger outside the lecture rooms before class—the unsettling, androgynous subjects deflect our attention, at least temporarily, from federal jurisdiction or torts.

Many students praise the imposing Carl Palazzolo piece, Sicilian Lives, Texas Idols, mounted above the reception desk in the clinic. Its pulsating colors and tactile quality welcome students, professors, and clients. "The paintings are a particularly nice addition to the clinic," said Professor Douglas Baird. "The art and the architecture together create an environment with a high level of professionalism, one that says the Law School takes its clinical programs very seriously."

The art is on loan to the Law School by Art Enterprises, Ltd., a corporation principally owned for the benefit of the Kanter family. The collection was inspired by Burton Kanter, '52, who passed away in 2001, and his wife, Naomi. They began collecting in the mid-1950s when Naomi and Burton, a newly-minted Chicago lawyer, scraped together money to purchase their first piece. From these humble beginnings, Art Enterprises was formed, the collection grew, and now contains over 800 works. Thomas McCormick, a gallery owner and the Kanter's son-in-law, says that Art Enterprises didn't approach collecting from an investor's point of view. The Kanter's directed the purchase of work they loved, rather
than seeking out works from the "right" artists, and they had a genuine commitment to supporting local Chicago artists.

Art Enterprises' eclectic collection is far too large—both in terms of the number of pieces and the actual size of many of the individual works—to display in private homes or corporate settings. The Kanters' son, Josh Kanter, '87, happened to mention the collection to Dean Saul Levmore just as the Dean was musing about his ongoing efforts to make the Law School's environment friendlier. The Law School offers an abundance of wall space that is very appropriate for large-scale works, and given that the collection was informed—even if indirectly—by a Chicago sensibility, the fit was a natural one.

McCormick, working with Art Enterprises' curator, Jessica Moss, assembled a list of pieces that they thought would be appropriate for this environment. The final selections were made by a faculty committee, which included Dean Levmore and Professor William Landes.

It would surely bring Burton Kanter great joy to know the art he loved is enriching the Law School experience. As an alumnus, he would understand our tendency to pursue intellectual objectives at the expense of nearly everything else. Just as Burton recognized and sought beauty and mystery in the work he helped Art Enterprises collect, perhaps those same works will inspire the rest of us to view our intellectual pursuits here with a little more depth and a lot more color.
Captive Audiences and the First Amendment

by Douglas Gary Lichtman

The existence of cost-effective self-help remedies often argues against government regulation as a means to accomplish similar ends; and nowhere is that more apparent than in the vast jurisprudence that surrounds the First Amendment. On countless occasions, courts have struck down government restrictions on speech for the simple reason that self-help provides a seemingly adequate alternative. Thus, when the city of Los Angeles arrested a war protestor whose jacket bore the now-infamous "Fuck the Draft" inscription, the Supreme Court held the relevant ordinance unconstitutional. Offended viewers, the court explained, have a sufficient self-help remedy in the form of simply averting their eyes. Similarly, in a long line of cases involving speakers caught advocating crime, sabotage, and other forms of violence as a means of achieving political or economic reform, the Court (albeit after a false start or two) again struck down government restrictions, emphasizing that, where there is "time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence."

This is of course not to imply that every self-help mechanism is favored. Violence, for example, can very effectively discourage speech, but violence is a form of self-help to which the government has no obligation to defer. Similarly, hecklers from time to time chill speech by hurling insults (and sometimes glass bottles) but, again, the government is not required in these instances to sit idly by, and in extreme cases might even have an obligation to intervene.

Douglas Gary Lichtman is a professor of law at the University of Chicago Law School. This article is drawn from "How the Law Responds to Self-Help," a manuscript in which Professor Lichtman considers how legal rules encourage, harness, deter, and sometimes defer to self-help mechanisms. The full version is available online at www.law.uchicago.edu/faculty/lichtman/ppw.html. Comments appreciated at djl@uchicago.edu.
on the speaker's behalf. That said, it is nevertheless striking how often courts invalidate government regulations simply because plausible self-help alternatives are available. The New York Public Service Commission was for this reason rebuked when it attempted to prohibit power companies under its jurisdiction from including with customer bills pamphlets discussing politically sensitive subjects like the use of nuclear energy. The restriction was unconstitutional, said the Court, because offended customers have an adequate self-help response: they can throw any troubling pamphlets away. More recently, the federal government has repeatedly failed in its attempts to regulate indecency online, again because self-help—here in the form of software filters that empower Internet users to block speech at the receiving end rather than interfering with speech at its source—calls into question the government's assertions that the proposed regulations serve a compelling state interest, let alone are sufficiently tailored to pass constitutional muster.

Two intuitions seem to animate these various decisions. First, self-help in these examples makes possible diverse, individuated judgments. It increases the flow of information by allowing willing speakers to reach willing listeners, and it at the same time empowers unwilling listeners to opt out of the communication at low cost. This is attractive because society has a strong interest in allowing each individual to decide for himself what speech to hear. There are of course caveats to this argument: as I will argue below, sometimes individual judgments should be trumped and listeners should be forced to consider information and confront viewpoints that they would rather avoid. However, in most instances, deferring to the individual is attractive, and thus self-help is favored because it offers listeners significant flexibility to choose what they will hear and also what they will ignore.

Second and perhaps more important, self-help in these examples reduces the government's overall role in regulating speech. The First Amendment is suspicious of government regulation not only because regulation inevitably brings with it the possibility that some manipulative government official will use a seemingly innocuous regulation
to in fact advance a particular viewpoint—a classic First Amendment concern—but also because even well-intentioned regulations can, given the enormous influence of the state, inadvertently skew public discourse. The V-Chip offers a sharp example for this latter concern. The V-Chip is a government-facilitated technology that helps parents filter television content. Television manufacturers are required to build the filter into every new model thirteen inches or larger; and the filter works by reading ratings that are encoded onto broadcast television signals. Those

**Courts sometimes insert a third consideration into the mix: the notion that self-help should be preferred only in instances where it will be “equally effective” in terms of achieving the objective that the government regulation itself would target.**

ratings evaluate each program based on a scale that focuses primarily sexual content, language, and violence, and the scale thus makes it easy for parents to filter based on these characteristics. But (and here is the problem) the scale does nothing to help parents filter based on other characteristics, such as religious overtones or political content. The result is that parents who might have previously taken the time to help their children make educated choices based on a combination of all five factors might now opt for the easier approach of just focusing on the government-facilitated three. If that happens—an open question given how few families currently use the V-Chip—the government’s intervention will have skewed content decisions: the importance of the favored characteristics will be amplified at the expense of characteristics not included in the official rating scheme.

The V-Chip example is all the more troubling because the content skew I describe here was not inevitable. Suppose, for example, that the V-Chip were designed not to filter based on specific predetermined characteristics, but instead to filter using collaborative filtering techniques. My family would identify fifteen programs that we deem appropriate. The collaborative filter would use those choices to identify other families with similar tastes. Then the filter would use the choices made by those other families to make recommendations to my family, and it would use future choices made by my family to make recommendations to those other families. Never would any of us need to be explicit about what characteristics drive us to disapprove of one program while favoring another. And, rather than being limited to choose based on the government’s three characteristics, our pattern of choices might naturally result from a complicated balance of hundreds of different characteristics, namely ones on which we and like-minded families implicitly agree. The government-imposed skew inherent in the current system would be removed; and the very same First Amendment interests championed by self-help in my original examples—individuation, and a reduction in the chance that government regulation will intentionally or inadvertently favor one perspective or subject over another—would at the same time be vindicated.

These two touchstones—individuation, and a reduction in government involvement—do more than help to identify cases where self-help might offer an attractive alternative to government regulation; they also help to identify types of self-help that ought to be disfavored. Heckling, for example, drowns out and discourages speech that otherwise might have been warmly received by a willing audience. It is therefore unattractive on grounds of individuation. Violence similarly is an obstacle to individuation in that it allows a subset of the audience to impose its will on the
meanwhile, violence only preferred public intervention. They do so by creating situations where the government must step in to protect public safety.

Courts sometimes insert a third consideration into the mix: the notion that self-help should be preferred only in instances where it will be “equally effective” in terms of achieving the objective that the government regulation itself would target. I do not embrace this third consideration because, in my view, the First Amendment at the very least must represent a commitment to sacrifice some modicum of efficacy in order to reduce government involvement in speech regulation. Besides, assertions along these lines are squarely inconsistent with the facts of the foundational cases. The option of averting one’s eyes to avoid exposure to an offensive message, for example, is not as protective as a government intervention that would forbid the dissemination of such messages in the first place. The unwilling audience member will typically have to confront at least a glimpse of the offensive message before knowing to turn away, and the process of watching for offensive messages itself necessarily reminds unwilling audience members of exactly the communications they were hoping in the first place to avoid. Similarly, fighting speech with speech is certainly not as effective as prohibiting the troubling existence of a plausible self-help remedy poses a challenge to the government’s claim that direct intervention is required. But in First Amendment jurisprudence the opposite argument also plays a prominent role: where a “captive audience” has no effective self-help mechanism by which to avoid exposure to a given communication, that absence of a plausible self-help mechanism is taken to be an argument in favor of direct government regulation. The point was perhaps most famously made in Cohen v. California, the case I mentioned earlier involving the offensive anti-war jacket. The city of Los Angeles defended the arrest in that case on the ground that, because citizens cannot avoid occasionally coming to the local courthouse for official
business, and once in the courthouse they cannot avoid being exposed to communications originating around them, the city ought to be allowed to prohibit malicious speech within courthouse walls. Captive citizens have no self-help options, argued Los Angeles city officials, and that lack of any plausible self-help alternative justifies a speech restriction that might otherwise not be permissible.

The captive audience argument was rejected in Cohen, but the theory has been invoked in many other instances, and with varying degrees of success. For example, when the city of Shaker Heights, Ohio, decided to allow advertisements to be displayed inside its public transit system, four Justices emphasized audience captivity as an important factor in justifying a government restriction on the types of advertisements allowed, and a fifth would have gone farther and on this argument banned advertisements entirely. By contrast, when the city of Jacksonville, Florida, enacted an ordinance designed to stop drive-in movie theaters from displaying potentially offensive visuals in instances where the images would be visible from the public streets, six Justices endorsed the view that the government can selectively “shield the public” in cases where “the degree of captivity makes it impractical for the unwilling viewer or auditor to avoid exposure,” but the six then announced that in this particular situation the necessary degree of captivity was not realized because drivers could simply look away. Personal residences are a setting where concerns about captivity have had particular bite, presumably on the rationale that citizens in their homes should have maximal protection from communications they might find offensive. Thus, in the leading case, the Federal Communications Commission was found to have acted within constitutional boundaries when it prohibited the use of certain vulgar words on the radio, both because “material presented over the airwaves confronts the citizen, not only in public, but also in the privacy of the home,” and because home audiences are captive, with the only plausible self-help solutions being relatively unattractive options like changing the channel at the first sign of offense or refusing to listen to the radio at all.

Important distinctions can be drawn between these several examples, in that they vary with respect to the nature of the speech at stake, the severity of the speech restriction being challenged, and the degree of audience captivity involved. Those details aside, however, the central insight here is that, where relevant at all, the existence of a captive audience is seen to argue exclusively in favor of government restrictions on speech. That is in my view a fundamental mistake. The absence of plausible self-help remedies is not merely a deficiency that the government ought to be allowed to address, but also an opportunity that the government ought not be allowed to without justification squander.

Think of it this way: we as a society have a strong interest in finding ways to ensure that each of us is exposed to a wide variety of conflicting perspectives. Society in fact expends significant social resources in pursuit of this goal, tolerating repulsive speech like that which originates with hate groups like the Ku Klux Klan; accommodating protesters even at abortion clinics where their message will inevitably upset already fragile emotions; requiring broadcasters to air programming devoted to education and news even though viewers would strongly prefer other television fare; limiting plausibly efficient industry consolidation in and across the radio, television, and newspaper industries for fear that consolidation might lead to conformity in thought or perspective; and, among many other examples, spending real tax dollars each election cycle to finance political
campaigns, with much of that money ironically spent to attract the sort of voter attention that the captive audience would naturally provide.

Against this backdrop, audience captivity has genuine and unappreciated appeal. Consider again the courthouse at issue in Cohen. Why not allow unfettered speech in the courthouse? Surely it is implausible to think that citizens will stop showing up for city business, or will wear blinders and earplugs as they walk through the public halls. Just the same, it is implausible to think that the government will in response build fewer courthouses in an attempt to indirectly accomplish its original speech-restricting purpose. Thus, harnessing the captive audience in this instance would not lead to any significant behavioral responses.

Thus, harnessing the captive audience in this instance would not lead to any significant behavioral responses. Society would end up with a new mechanism by which to promote exposure to diverse views, and that mechanism would come at relatively low cost given that neither unhappy citizens nor an unhappy government would do much to resist the effort. In short, captive audiences offer an inexpensive way to accomplish goals that society today accomplishes through the more costly mechanisms I outline above. That is not to suggest that every captive audience should be harnessed in this manner, or that using captive audiences in this way would fully obviate the need for those other approaches. My point is only that the existence of a captive audience should not be understood solely as a reason to regulate speech. Captive audiences can be put to beneficial use; and that fact is ignored today in First Amendment jurisprudence.

Let me be more concrete. I propose here that the existence of a captive audience is properly understood as a reason to allow unfettered speech, and thus the burden on the government to justify a restriction on speech should be higher in instances where a captive audience is in play than it would be were there no captive audience present. With respect to public transportation systems, then, audience captivity should make us skeptical of a rule that bans advertisements. Why, we should ask, is the government wasting such a golden opportunity to promote diverse communication? In the courthouse, I would similarly be suspicious of any speech-restrictive rule. There might be good reasons for some such rules—perhaps a restriction is necessary to protect children from inappropriate images, or to ensure that court business can be conducted without too much distraction—but, whatever the reasons, I would judge them by a higher standard than that normally applied, precisely because a captive audience is too valuable an asset to without justification waste. Again, this is in contrast to current thinking, where the absence of audience self-help mechanisms is considered to be a reason to allow government regulation, not an argument against it.

This might sound crazy to some readers; but note that society in other settings already makes strategic use of captive audiences. For example, every four years the major television networks all simultaneously air the presidential debates. This is wasteful, in that the broadcasts are largely redundant; but there is little public opposition because everyone understands that this is an attempt to create artificial captivity. If NBC were to offer the option of watching baseball instead of the presidential candidates, a good many citizens would accept the invitation. Thus the Federal Communications Commission pressures NBC not to let viewers off the hook so easily, and the networks thereby together create a captive audience and use that audience to pass along hopefully revealing information relevant to the election.

My argument here is made in similar spirit. A captive audience is attractive because it offers an opportunity to pressure individuals to do that which they privately disfavor, and to exert that pressure at low cost in terms of unwanted self-help responses. The strategy should not be used to excess. But, where a captive audience naturally exists, the First Amendment should at least ask questions before allowing the government to squander the resource.
Global Human Rights, One Case at a Time

The role of lawyers in the human rights movement has shifted dramatically since the years following World War II, when they wrote treaties that set international standards for nations to embrace. Then came attorneys in the 1960s through 1980s that were engaged in the political struggle to enact national laws to conform to those treaties. Now a third generation, led by attorneys like Gary Haugen, ’91, is working on individual cases with local authorities, helping to enforce those domestic laws. Haugen, founder and president of the faith-based International Justice Mission, said it’s essential in the developing world, where law enforcement systems in many countries simply aren’t working. “It’s like having medicine on the shelves, but no doctor to deliver it,” said Haugen, whose recent book, Terrify No More, focuses on IJM’s campaign to end sex trafficking in Cambodia. “We have all these laws on the shelf, but the poor lack access to the lawyers to deliver it. So we get involved in the nitty-gritty of enforcing the law, trying to close the gap between the aspirations expressed in national laws, and the prevailing reality for the poor.”

For Haugen, getting down in the trenches provides life-altering help for those unable to fend for themselves. “We are drawn as a professional class to the intellectually complex, but what the poor desperately need isn’t the next level of intellectual sophistication,” said Haugen. “They need us to stand with them and give them a voice.”

A South Asian street in the red light district prepares for business in mid-afternoon. Doors begin opening and women come out to the street to meet customers. Young victims are kept out of sight for fear that they will run away or attract police attention.
The seed for IJM was planted in 1994 while Haugen was on loan from the United States Justice Department to the United Nations, investigating the massacre of an estimated 800,000 Rwandans. After supervising the exhumation of mass graves for the subsequent war crimes tribunal, Haugen set aside his career as a federal prosecutor and started his own organization.

By 1997, the organization's founding group had raised $200,000, enough to open an office in Arlington, Virginia, and hire a handful of lawyers and enforcement professionals. By 1999, IJM had a staff of eight, and a $900,000 budget. Six years later, IJM has become one of the United States' largest human-rights organizations, with a budget of $7.8 million, and 160 employees in offices in Arlington, Cambodia, Thailand, Philippines, Kenya, Uganda, and Zambia.

IJM's emergence as a player on the international human rights scene has dovetailed with the United States government's growing relationships with faith-based organizations. Haugen frequently testifies before Congress and over the past two years, IJM has received $2 million from the State and Labor departments in federal grants to combat sex trafficking in Thailand, Cambodia, and the Philippines. Those grants included funding for training police and prosecutors.

“Gary is one of the anti-slavery heroes of the 21st century,” said Ambassador John R. Miller, director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons at the United States Department of State. “He has decided to go where no nongovernmental organization has gone: to focus on law enforcement, to cajole and work with foreign governments to rescue victims and throw the criminals in jail.”

Haugen's message has resonated with evangelical Christians, a group not historically involved in human rights issues. It has also been well-received among young attorneys like Eric Ha, '03, a lecturer at the University of Miami Law School, who this summer plans to spend twelve weeks working for IJM in South Asia on cases involving sex trafficking and bonded labor.

His classmate, Victor Boutros, '03, traveled to South Asia with IJM in 2002 to investigate bonded labor in the gem
Anabella was kidnapped on her way home from school and brutally raped. IJM and local partners took her case, deployed investigators, and facilitated her attacker's arrest.

industry, drawing up affidavits from workers who had taken loans for as little as $50 from a business owner and then were forced to work for years to pay it back. In 2003, Boutros led a group of University of Chicago Law School students, who researched and wrote an eighty-page legal brief on child rape laws around the world, to support an IJM case still pending in Haiti.

"These cases move human rights from wholesale to retail, to where it really matters for the victims," said Boutros, an associate at Fish & Richardson in Dallas.

Haugen came to the University of Chicago Law School with an eye on international issues. After graduating from Harvard University in 1985, he spent the summer in South Africa, where he served on the executive committee of the National Initiative for Reconciliation, which was devoted to the cause of political reform and racial reconciliation. Former University of Chicago law professor Anne-Marie Slaughter recalls that Haugen's social conscience was apparent in the classroom.

"He radiated a kind of moral authority even as a student—not in any way sanctimonious, just serious," said Slaughter, dean of Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. "No one who knew him had any doubt that he would work to make the world a better place."

After graduating from the Law School, Haugen worked for the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, investigating police misconduct in the Philippines. He joined the Department of Justice in 1991, heading up high-profile cases that included police brutality in New Orleans and the Virginia Military Institute's denial of admission to women.

Haugen, as well as Boutros and Ha, are inspired by the Biblical call to fight injustice. Haugen formed the organization to augment the work of Christian missionaries, who feed and house the poor, but lack the skills to defend those subjected to human rights abuse. Though IJM's attorneys all profess the Christian faith, they do not proselytize, letting their work stand as the expression of their beliefs.
Unlike many human rights groups, which can get results by publicizing abuses and mobilizing public opinion, IJM forms partnerships with local authorities and helps them prosecute the crimes. The cases range from child prostitution in Cambodia, to police corruption in Kenya and the Philippines, and to the illegal bonded labor system in South Asia that enslaves workers who haven’t paid off a debt.

By working individual cases, Haugen said IJM finds where the criminal justice system has broken down. Many times, it is a corrupt police chief who looks the other way. IJM painstakingly gathers evidence, and presents it to higher authorities who can step in.

“With individual cases, you get very concrete information about where the criminal justice system doesn’t work,” said Haugen, the crew-cut father who lives with his family in the DC area. “When you work the cases, you find the choke points, and show the national authorities why their system doesn’t work to provide the outcome they want.”

A look at IJM investigations involving sex crimes in Peru and Cambodia shows how Haugen gets results. In Peru, an estimated 25,000 women are raped each year. Most are under fourteen, and most will never see their rapist punished for the crime. In the city of Huanuco, more than twenty rapes are reported weekly in a city of just 70,000.

Since 2002, IJM has worked with Paz y Esperanza, a Peruvian human rights group, on several cases, including an attack on a girl named Anabella, who was walking home from school when three men forcibly took her to a room and raped her, according an IJM report. She was released the next day, and threatened with death if she told what happened. But she told her mother, who went to Paz y Esperanza. An IJM investigator worked with its partner to investigate the crime, document the assault, and prepare Anabellla for the police interview. The police subsequently arrested one of the attackers, who has been jailed and is awaiting prosecution.

But Haugen also wanted deeper, systemic change. So after meeting Illinois state senator Peter Roskam, of DuPage County, at a speech he gave, Haugen challenged the Illinois attorney to mobilize a task force of concerned citizens and public officials from the suburban Chicago county to do what they could to help. In 2003, DuPage task force members traveled to Huanuco to explore the barriers for

“These cases move human rights from wholesale to retail, to where it really matters for the victims”
Rescued victims from Svay Pak soak up their first few hours of freedom.

justice for sex crimes victims. In 2004, IJM and the task force brought Huanuco officials to DuPage for a week of training in how to combat sexual assault.

"Some law enforcement officials have a tendency to focus on crimes like drugs and murder and view sex crimes as a very low priority," Haugen said. "By bringing the Peruvians to Chicago, we could give them an introduction to international standards in addressing these crimes, which we hope will make these crimes a high-value target for them back home."

While IJM worked with a local group in Peru, it has its own office in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, in a region notorious for its sex trade of underage girls. IJM’s investigation in the village of Svay Pak began in 2002, with IJM investigators documenting how the brothels operated. Evidence was turned over to local authorities, top-ranking IJM attorneys came to Cambodia seeking action, and a week after they left, police raided a brothel and brought fourteen underage girls to a safe house. However, the authorities later arrested all the girls as illegal immigrants. Some were sent to jail, others were deported to Viet Nam.

Undeterred, IJM kept on the case, and determined that it needed assistance at the highest levels of the Cambodian government. Crucial to IJM's success was the United States' Trafficking in Victims Protection Act of 2000, a statute that requires the State Department to annually rank nations on how they meet minimum standards in combating bonded labor and sex trafficking, with sanctions possible for those who don't comply.

In 2002, Cambodia had done little to move on sex trafficking and was ranked Tier 3, which meant sanctions were possible if conditions didn't improve. After IJM investigators went undercover again to document the sex trade, IJM brought its evidence to high-ranking Cambodian authorities. After these discussions, the Cambodians hoped that another successful raid at Svay Pak could boost its standing and help move the country up to Tier 2. The subsequent raid freed thirty-seven girls and led to the arrest of thirteen brothel owners, with four so far sent to

Some of the rescued girls laugh and enjoy soft drinks at a safe house.
prison. Cambodia's ranking has since risen to Tier 2, due in part to Svay Pak raid, said Ambassador Miller.

Haugen, who was in Svay Pak for the raid, said that freeing those girls and sending the brothels owners to jail shows what happens when lawyers committed to justice get involved. It's a message he brings to law students and lawyers looking to contribute their talents.

"The legal profession in America is largely alienated from the heroic, and I think that's because as a professional class, we are alienated from the desperately needy," said Haugen. "I've seen with my own eyes that people are abused and humiliated when the lawyers fail to show up. I've also seen people rescued from death and slavery when the lawyers do show up. I don't think many American lawyers get to experience that, and I wish they did." —D.M.W.

IJM painstakingly gathers evidence in these cases, and presents it to higher authorities who can step in.

Two cousins, Nathiya and Savitha (center and right), met with IJM investigators who were working to free them from bonded slavery. The girls spent their days rolling cigarettes and could not go to school.
Behind the GREEN BAG

What jiggles, is judicial, and can be acquired at auction for about a thousand dollars? Consider yourself very hip if you know the answer: a Supreme Court Justice bobblehead doll from Green Bag, Inc. Consider yourself ultra hip if you actually possess one of the three issued so far: Chief Justice Rehnquist, Justice Stevens, and Justice O'Connor.

The bobbleheads provide some marketing sizzle to the Green Bag, but there's plenty of steak there, too. Founded by three 1997 Law School graduates, with four current Law School faculty members sitting on its advisory board and a vast, multiwing conspiracy of alumni pitching in, Green Bag, Inc. has carved out a niche which seems poised to widen into a publishing empire.

The Green Bag is a law journal founded by Ross Davies, David Gossett, and Montgomery Kosma while they were still law students. They published the first issue soon after graduation, in October 1997. The journal proclaims itself “An Entertaining Journal of Law,” and so it is. Entertaining doesn't mean unserious, but it does mean different. In a short time the Green Bag has become recognized as an important contribution to legal scholarship and to the pleasure that committed lawyers take from their profession. The articles are short, provocative, and engaging. Brian Brooks, '94, a reader and contributor, says, “The editorial style is intended to start an interesting legal discussion rather than trying to have the final word on any subject.” He adds, “the Green Bag is for people who care about novel legal ideas, not just to help them with a current case but also because the ideas are interesting in their own right. You could say it's a journal for people who not only work in the law, but enjoy it as one of their hobbies, too.”

The Green Bag is increasingly cited in judicial opinions and in other scholarly works. Many of its distinctive qualities are finding their way into journals from the country's leading law schools and are being advocated by leading legal thinkers such as Judge (and Law School senior lecturer in law) Richard M. Posner. The Green Bag enjoys a growing subscription list at a time when many law journals are experiencing circulation slumps. Yale's law journal, for example, has fallen from about 7,000 paid subscribers in 1960 to about 4,000 today.

An Old Bag Inspires New Dreams

Green Bag, the business and the journal, came into being in the way many great things spring from the Law School: through a combination of intense intellectual curiosity, faculty support for exciting new ideas, and a whole lot of entrepreneurial drive. Serendipity played a part, too. In 1996, Davies, as a University of Chicago Law Review staffer, was diligently checking an eighty-two page book review. With a perhaps higher-than-normal level of intellectual curiosity, he decided to divert himself on breaks by heading to the library shelves to look through all the law journals there, browsing them in alphabetical order. After making his way from Akron's law review through Gonzaga's, he encountered a series of old journals, published from 1889 until 1914—the original Green Bag. Davies was immediately captivated by the journal's content. “Kind of enchanting,” he says. As he has written about that journal, “Almost every contribution was short, well-written, only lightly footnoted, and thought-provoking. It was, in essence, a journal that appealed to those who valued useful and engaging reading on the legal issues of the day.”

As it happens, right around that same time Davies’s close friend Kosma was also cite checking and one of those cites led him directly to the original Green Bag, of which he says, “I instantly became enamored.”

The next year Davies became University of...
Chicago Law Review editor in chief, Gossett was serving as an editor there as well. Kosma, who had three children at that time, decided the law review was not a top priority (he did, nevertheless, fit some editing for the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy into his schedule). Davies also had a wife and two children and served on the HJLPP editorial board as well, but there came a moment, Gossett recalls, when the possibility of creating a different kind of journal struck them all as very appealing.

Currie’s Favor

Their hopes grew wings as they turned to Law School faculty for ideas about the audacious possibility of publishing a new journal. David Currie, who also remembers encountering the original Green Bag in the same way Davies and Kosma did when cite checking a law review article as a student in

Members of the Green Bag’s editorial board gather monthly for lunch and conversation. These meetings begin with a general discussion of current and future Green Bag projects, and then range widely, anything from the dissenting opinion in Roper v. Simmons to the films of Keanu Reeves. The photographs on these pages were taken at the March 2005 meeting, at which the next bobblehead in the near-legend series was unveiled: Justice Antonin Scalia. It’s worth noting that two versions of the Scalia were made, a “majority” Scalia and a “dissenting” Scalia, each with details illustrating famous cases from those two categories. As to which was ultimately chosen for production, the Record has been sworn to secrecy.
the 1950s, was a principal source of inspiration. Green Bag, in his words, “called to me from just to the left of the Harvard Law Review.”

Currie gladly joined the journal’s advisory board, as did Richard Epstein, Richard Helmholz, and Dennis Hutchinson. Gossett says that these faculty members, along with others, made it possible for the upstart journal to gain a foothold. “They saw value in what we were doing and provided every imaginable kind of assistance, from thinking through logistics to opening doors with distinguished contributors to writing brilliant pieces themselves,” Gossett recalls. “There’s no way we would have succeeded without their help.”

By the time they had graduated, Davies, Gossett, and Kosma had the first issue of the new journal well underway. In addition to Currie’s introduction, they acquired contributions from Epstein, Cass Sunstein, Merton Miller, Mark Tushnet, Theodore Olson, and a host of other luminaries. No article in that first issue was more than fifteen pages long; none labored under a landslide of footnotes; all were invitingly readable and pertinent.

After graduation, Davies and Gossett clerked together for Judge Diane P. Wood at the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, and Kosma clerked for Judge David B. Sentelle at the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Not only did they keep finding time to publish the the Green Bag on schedule; Kosma’s experience led to the 2002 book, Judge Dave and the Rainbow People—now the best-selling title in the Green Bag, Inc. book division. They also publish, among other things, Quidsome Balm, the legal musings of David Currie’s father, Brainerd (“rhymed paraphrases of exotic cases,” as Currie describes them), and In Chambers Opinions, a three-volume set (with a supplement) containing opinions written by individual Supreme Court Justices sitting as Circuit Justices, when they grant or deny an application that has come before them from their assigned Circuit.

The Greening of Law Reviews
With its relatively brief, highly readable articles, the Green Bag at first was bucking a trend in legal scholarship toward massive, and massively footnoted, journal articles. The trend is now reversing itself. Judge Posner, with characteristic pungency, observed in his article “Against the Law Reviews” in the November/December 2004 issue of Legal Affairs, “The result of the system of scholarly publication in law is that too many articles are too long, too dull, and too heavily annotated . . . .” Harvard Law Review recently announced the results of a survey of nearly 800 law professors by saying, “[T]he survey documented one particularly unambiguous view shared by faculty and law review editors alike: the length of articles has become excessive. In fact, nearly 90% of faculty agreed that articles are too long.”

“We might have seen some trends a few years before others caught on to them,” concedes Kosma, and Gossett says his highest satisfaction
from the journal comes from “feeling like I’m part of something that is changing the legal academy.”

**It Takes a Community**

“Being part of something” is an operative phrase for the three founders, who happily acknowledge that they belong to a community of people willing to invest considerable effort toward creating the kind of journal they want to read. *Green Bag* is still a sideline: Davies teaches law at George Mason University, while Kosma practices at Jones Day and Gossett is a partner at Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw. (Last April, Gossett argued his first case before the Supreme Court, winning it unanimously.)

A large contingent of Washington, DC-based alumni serve on the editorial board or otherwise support its activities. Senior editors include James Ho, ’99, Chief Counsel of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights; Gregory Jacob, ’99, Deputy Solicitor at the Department of Labor; and Thomas Nachbar, ’97, Associate Professor of Law at the University of Virginia Law School.

Contributing editors include Susan Davies, ’91, who works on the hill with Senator Patrick Leahy; Thomas Dupree, ’97, an appellate litigator at Gibson Dunn & Crutcher; and David Salmons, ’96, Assistant to the Solicitor General. Also in Washington is Brian Brooks, a partner at O’Melveny & Myers who has contributed two *Green Bag* articles—

including one of the most-cited, “Unpublished Opinions,” which he co-wrote with Danny J. Boggs, ’68, Chief Judge of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The other contributing editors are more geographically dispersed but they remain close to the action. Britton Guerrina, ’99, is in Chicago at Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw, and Keith Sharfman, ’97, teaches at Rutgers. Dan Currell, ’97, trots the globe in his role as a Senior Director with the General Counsel Roundtable, but that doesn’t mean he’s out of touch. In each common-law country he visits he arranges an appointment with a high-level judge and sends back dispatches about his conversations.

The variety of work experience the alumni editors and contributors bring to their engagement with the *Green Bag*—and the range of political views they represent—provoke an ongoing stream of fresh ideas for articles, books, and products. “At any time,” Kosma observes, “we might be evaluating a hundred or more different possibilities.” Right now, for instance, more than seventy-five scouts have been enlisted to collect examples of superior legal writing, for possible compilation into a new annual periodical.

“The best way to understand all this,” Ross Davies says, “is that we all loved law school and many of us were very good friends there, so in many ways the *Green Bag* is an extension for us of what the Green Lounge was. They may say you can’t go home, but we’re keeping things homey for as long as we can.”—G.deJ.

*Last year saw Justice Sandra Day O’Connor added to the series. Annotations may be found on the Green Bag website, www.greenbag.org.*
The Limits of International Law
Abigail Moncrieff, '06
Professor Eric A. Posner's recent book, The Limits of International Law, might be better entitled Yet More Proof That Nothing is Immune From Economic Analysis: A Chicago Theory of International Law. No doubt Professor Posner would have chosen such a proud U of C title but for the fact that his coauthor, Professor Jack L. Goldsmith, is now teaching at Harvard. The book develops and applies a rational choice theory of international law, describing why international rules arise and why states follow them. In their own words, Posner and Goldsmith's theory is that "international law emerges from states acting rationally to maximize their interests, given their perceptions of the interests of other states and the distribution of state power." I recently asked Professor Posner a few questions about the book.

What motivated you to develop this theory of international law? What part or parts of existing theories do you find most inadequate or objectionable?

Several years ago, my scholarship focused on the relationship between law and social norms. One of the puzzles that interested me was why people often cooperate even when the law doesn't compel them to, or isn't adequately enforced. At the same time, Jack Goldsmith was writing about international law, and through conversation we realized that a similar puzzle exists at the international level: why do states comply with international law when there is no sanction for violating it?

The international law literature at that time did not provide a satisfactory answer to this question; indeed, most legal scholars ignored it. The political science literature on international relations did try to answer the more general question of how states cooperate, and how they are able to construct international institutions. But the literature did not address international law as such, so there seemed to be a gap that needed filling.

Your theory assumes that the state is the relevant agent. Why is the focus on the state—instead of the individual head-of-state, for example—a necessary and/or useful assumption?

This assumption is a methodological convenience. It would be more satisfying to have a theory of international law that had, as some people say, "microfoundations" in individual behavior. But to do this, one would need a theory about how individuals' interests determined state behavior, and although there is a lot of work on this topic, none of it is really satisfactory. So it seemed appropriate to try to simplify, and start at the level with the state, with some simple assumptions about what states seek to maximize (security, wealth, and so forth).

Your theory describes foreign relations decision-making as a balancing of interests, by which a state will violate international law as long as the violation is cost-benefit justified from the state's self-interested perspective. The cost of noncompliance, by your account, consists of the possibility of retaliation and, maybe, reputational loss. What factors go into the benefits?

There are all kinds of possible benefits. The U.S. violated international law when it intervened in Kosovo. What were the benefits? Maybe it feared that Serbian aggression was destabilizing Europe, and this posed a threat (however remote) to American security; or maybe the benefit consisted in the reduction of human rights violations.

To make the previous question more concrete: Let's pretend that there's an autocrat whom the United Nations Security Council has ordered to disarm. As the autocrat knows, a powerful enemy believes that he has weapons in violation of the order, but he also knows that the belief is false, that he has no weapons. He further knows that the enemy's polity has recently developed a stronger-than-usual interest in deterring threats to its security, making the enemy more likely than usual to "retaliate" for security-related violations of international law. Assuming that the autocrat has reasonable information about the enemy's desire and capacity to retaliate, are there interests you can imagine that might make it rational for him to obstruct UN weapons inspectors—to prevent the enemy from discovering that he does not, in fact, have weapons?
I'm no expert on Iraq, but from what I read in the newspapers, it sounds as though Saddam Hussein feared that if he revealed that he did not have WMDs, he would appear weak both to internal enemies and external enemies like Iran. It is also possible that he was fooled by his own yes men, who feared that they would end up in Abu Ghraib if Saddam learned that he no longer had WMDs.

One of the key insights of your theory is that states have neither intrinsic desire nor moral obligation to comply with international law. Would it not, however, be consistent with a rational choice model to believe that states discount the benefits of noncompliance based on a sense that noncompliance is intrinsically bad or morally corrupt?

One could imagine that states have such a preference, and it would not be inconsistent with rational choice theory, but theories that assume what they are trying to explain are not very useful. I want to understand why states comply with international law, and assuming that states have a preference for doing so is not to answer the question. In addition, as I can't see any moral reason for complying with international law, it would be surprising if leaders of state thought they had such an obligation.

For the future of the international legal system: Is there any area of international law (e.g. trade, human rights, war... coastal fishing vessels...) that you think would benefit from an executive authority? In other words, is there an area of international law in which it would be good to have an enforcement mechanism realigning states' interests to increase compliance? If so, which area of international law do you think would benefit most and why? If not, why not?

I don't think it's feasible. If it were feasible, the question might be: would we want a world government if it were possible? There is an interesting literature on optimal size of government. Simplifying greatly, a world government would be able to do good things that now require cumbersome and often unsuccessful cooperation among 191 states (for example, reduction of global pollution or of trade barriers); but it would also be less sensitive to local variations in people's valuations and interests. Perhaps, some kind of federal system would work, like the one developed for the United States a little more than 200 years ago.

Eric A. Posner is the Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School.
Expertise Abroad

Nirav Shah, '07, does not set himself to small tasks. Pursuing a joint M.D./J.D. degree at the University, Shah already has applied his medical knowledge to reform Cambodia's health care system. Now the former Henry Luce Scholar and current recipient of a Paul & Daisy Soros Fellowship for New Americans will return to that country to help reform its justice system.

Shah will use the three-year $20,000 Soros stipend to study legal systems in Cambodia, with the intention of recommending reforms that might improve the justice system there. The country has invited outside experts to assist with its path toward modernization, he said. "We don't realize in this country the problems some nations have with institutions such as the courts," Shah said. "In Cambodia, the system of reviewing judicial decisions is haphazard. The judiciary is not separate from the rest of the government, and some judges aren't trained in the law." In addition to studying the system, he will work with government officials in Cambodia to gain political support for changes.

Shah is well experienced in dealing with change in this Southeast Asian country that borders Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam. Using his Henry Luce scholarship, he worked in Cambodia to deter corruption in the health care system. Through the fellowship, he was chief economist for the National Institute of Public Health in Phnom Penh from 2002 to 2003. In that position, he helped decrease the potential for corruption by reducing the number of decisions being made by local and national health care authorities.

"We tend to think of corruption as a moral problem, but I looked at the ways in which it is an institutional problem," Shah said. "In the former system, decisions about health care needed to be approved at thirteen different steps, each providing an opportunity for a bribe to move the decision along." Through his work, the health care system was reformed to require only six steps of approval, and as a result more resources were available to care for Cambodian people seeking health services.

In order to work effectively, Shah pushed himself to learn Cambodia's national language, Khmer. "It was hard, but I was determined to become the best foreign speaker of the language in the country and by the time the year was over, I was dreaming in Khmer and speaking it well enough to be an official translator. I just think it's ineffective and even insulting to go to a country to help with a problem and not speak the language."

The Soros Fellowships for New Americans are awarded to naturalized citizens, resident aliens, or the children of naturalized citizens. Shah's parents immigrated to the United States from India. After he completes his law degree and his medical residency, Shah hopes to work in public health at an international level.—W.H.

LLMs serve as Precinct Advisors

LLM students observed the United States electoral process in action when they were appointed precinct advisors by the Cook County Clerk. In this role they monitored several polling sites in suburban Chicago for the November 2004 election. Pictured are Ruoying Chen, from Beijing, China; Holger Hohmann from Frankfurt, Germany; Siska Ghesquire from Zemst, Belgium; and Rafael Arribas from Piura, Peru.
Excellence in Diversity

Chicago lawyer and alumnus Jesse Ruiz, '95, described the Law School's Latino Law Students Association as a support network that enhances a sense of community among Hispanic students enrolled in the school. That support has garnered recognition from the Hispanic Lawyers Association of Illinois, a group representing 300 attorneys, judges, and law students in Illinois.

Selected earlier in the academic year as that organization's recipient of the Excellence in Diversity Award, the Law School continues its outreach efforts to recruit top Latino/Latina undergraduates.

"We have fifty-six Latino/Latina students, or about nine percent of our enrollment of 607," said Ann Perry, Assistant Dean of Admissions for the Law School. "These students bring new perspectives to the Law School. They enrich the learning experience for all of us."

In order to bring the best Latino/Latina students to the school, admissions representatives visit seventy campuses around the country, and the Latino Law Students Association assists in recruitment efforts by planning events for admitted students and providing information about their group at student organization fairs.

Ruiz was part of those efforts during his time at the Law School. "We would call students and invite them to visit the campus. In the spring of 1994, we sponsored a party with the Latino students from the School of Social Service Administration. We showed the prospective students a true University-wide Latino community that worked together and enjoyed each other's company," Ruiz said.

Besides encouraging students to attend the Law School, association members also provide information on scholarships and potential summer employment, as well as tips about Latino events occurring throughout the city.

Planned activities include quarterly potlucks, an alumni symposium, an annual Super Fiesta, a Cinco de Mayo celebration and presentations on minorities in the judiciary.

"I was the president of the Latino Law Students Association, then called the Hispanic Law Students Association, during my second year in the Law School," said Ruiz. "We brought a number of speakers to the school and sponsored the Cinco de Mayo Wine Mess every year, where we would bring a salsa band to the Green Lounge and share our culture with the greater Law School community."

Also in 1994, the association members held a reception for the first Latino named a federal judge in Illinois, the Honorable Ruben Castillo. Representatives from all the major law firms in Chicago and judges from the Northern District of Illinois attended that event. "We had a mariachi band that really added to the festivities, probably the first mariachi band ever to perform at the Law School," Ruiz said.

"I believe that all those activities helped make the Latino students feel more a part of the Law School community and also showed prospective students that there was an active support system for them at the Law School," he added.

Ruiz said his involvement in the students association, and eventually being involved in the Latino bar association, helped him build a network and support system, which connected him to other Latino lawyers in Chicago.

Ruiz, who has served as president of the Hispanic Lawyers Association of Illinois in 2000 and 2001, also is the chairman of the Chicago Committee on Minorities in Large Law Firms. "My involvement in diverse student and bar associations helped me make new lifelong friends and opened many doors for me that have helped me in my career," he said.—W.H.
She's Your Sister

When not pondering case law in Federal Jurisdiction or Taxation of Corporations, Joel Whitley, '05, is planning his band's CD release party and first world tour. He's part of She's Your Sister, a Chicago rock band that is set to make the leap from local phenom to "we-knew-them-when" status.

"I never expected to come to Law School and start a band," Whitley said. But at the urging of his wife, Guang Ming Whitley, '04, he replied to an ad in one of the local papers. When She's Your Sister formed a little over a year ago, the members knew they were on to something. They plan to release their first CD at the end of May. It's rock and roll with smart song writing, anchored by Whitley's solid tenor, and it's catchy stuff.

Beyond the irresistible fun of writing songs, recording, and touring, Whitley reports that working with She's Your Sister has been an invaluable experience preparing him for a career in corporate law. He's learned the hard way about breaking in, which will help him be a better advocate. After finishing up his studies at the Law School, he and the band will move to Los Angeles, where he will be an associate at Munger, Tolles and Olson.

Through all of this, Whitley has come to understand that there has to be a strict separation between the creative and the legal/managerial roles. "It's too hard to be creative and collaborative one moment—as you must be when writing, playing, and producing songs—and critical and adversarial the next, as you must be when negotiating contracts or disputes. This is why no one should ever be their own lawyer—especially in the creative fields."

Between taking the California bar exam and beginning work at the firm in the fall, Whitley and She's Your Sister will spend the month of August touring the United States and Europe to promote their CD. Further information about tour dates can be found on their website, www.shesyoursister.com. And in case you were wondering, the band's name is a quote from the Wes Anderson film, The Royal Tenenbaums, and refers to a seriously frustrated love. There seems little danger of that for the band itself, however.—K.F.

As Seen on TV

Kevin Allen, '06, participated in the reality tv show, The Apprentice. He made it all the way to the final four candidates before he heard those famous words: "You're fired."
Unusual Ventures

"I like to think of myself as a cattle egret," Frank Wood, '67, laughed. "A cattle egret hangs around fields of cattle and eats little bits of undigested materials and bugs—that's the kind of venture capitalist I am." Wood spent most of his career in radio and had to reinvent himself when ownership laws changed in 1996 to favor large public corporations and the consolidation of radio and television companies. "It was an ideal time to sell the stations and change the Wood family's fortune," he said.

After graduation from the Law School, Wood received an offer from a Wall Street firm, but convinced them to defer for a year so that he could revisit his roots in Cincinnati, Ohio. Around that time, his father started WEBN 102.7, an FM radio station in an era when virtually no FM stations were on the air. The younger Wood decided to work for the radio station, too.

At first, the station played jazz and classical. "A year into it, we were on a first name basis with all of our listeners, which is not a good thing," Wood said. So, in 1972, he was forced to rob the station's pop machine of thirty dollars worth of dimes, which was just enough to meet loan and payroll obligations for that pay period. He realized that change was needed if the station was to survive. His own passion for music became the primary inspiration: the station began playing rock and roll bands such as Jefferson Airplane and the Beatles. By 1975 it was a hit.

Working at the station in its early years was fun, Wood said. The station was "run by a bunch of overqualified, overeducated people who all loved music," he said. The crew amused themselves by writing bogus advertisements for products like Tree Frog Beer "recommended by hookers and bookies" and Brute Force Cybernetics, which advertised fictional products such as Negative Calorie Cookies, the Lost Chord Generation, and 3-D TV. "The station was very, very funny and eventually gained a cult-like status in Cincinnati," Wood said.

After selling the station in 1986, Wood ran Jacor Communications for four years then started Secret Communications, which had about twenty stations. As all of them sold in 1996 and 1997 and as Wood was too young to retire, he drifted into venture capitalism. Initially, he invested other people's money as well as his own, but said "I felt so bad the first time I lost someone else's money that I stuck to investing my own after that." He began making "small, but interesting" investments—thereby earning his cattle egret status.

On Target Media is one of the most successful of Wood's ventures. The company specializes in what is called place-based media, or point-of-purchase marketing. One of On Target's programs, for example, places advertising in doctors' waiting rooms via flat screens that present health-related information. "People end up watching the screens instead of flipping through the two-year-old Field and Stream," Wood said. The program also provides pamphlets about various illnesses and medications in the exam rooms to be perused while waiting for doctors to arrive, at which point the patient can ask immediately for a prescription for the new drug they have just discovered. Wood recently sold On Target Media for six times what he paid for it, even while retaining a ten percent interest.

Some of his investments are more about his passion for music than the bottom line. Wood knew his investment in Tracks, a magazine devoted to "music built to last"—created for baby boomers and Gen-Xers who no longer read Rolling Stone—was a risky one. The 'zine costs more to produce than originally imagined and the subscriber base has been too slow to build. Tracks has many committed readers, Wood said, but "time is money."

These projects go forward under his venture capital firm, Secret Communications—a name which caused his partners some initial dismay. "I just thought about how radio is all about the flow of ideas and information, and thought it would be funny to name the company 'Secret.' It eventually caught on, and now everyone thinks it's funny. We have secret memos, secret meetings, and secret business plans, said Wood with a laugh. "Life is too serious," he observed.—A.B.
"A Gift for Lawyers"

As an undergraduate at Brown University, Esther Lardent, '71, had her career as a movie and theater reviewer completely planned out. She would write reviews for local publications "until someone from The New Yorker died or retired." But then, Lardent said, "the world just exploded." She is referring to the Civil Rights movement and the wars in Vietnam and Cambodia. "I saw a lot of wrongs that needed to be righted, and I wanted to change the world." The strength of this conviction drove her to study law.

Today, Lardent is the president of the Pro Bono Institute at the Georgetown University Law Center. She said, "I did hands-on public interest work and got frustrated because I couldn't reach enough people. This is the perfect job for me because although I'm several steps removed from the front lines, what we do helps lots of people. Additionally, I work with lawyers who have a tremendous passion for justice. We get to work with caring, wonderful, smart, committed people."

The Pro Bono Institute works at the national level, developing the programmatic underpinnings so corporate lawyers can pick whatever type of pro bono work best meshes with their own interests. One current program, Corporate Pro Bono, works with major companies and their attorneys. "Pro bono interests vary from person to person," Lardent said. Lawyers may pick a certain kind of work because it is intellectually challenging, because of personal experiences, or because a particular cause moves them. Corporate attorneys are "doing things from one-hour advice clinics, to representing immigrants trying to stay in the United States, to death row inmates," Lardent said.

The program has been very successful. "In 2000, 'corporate pro bono' was an oxymoron. In 2002, it was an interesting idea. In 2005, there's an aura of inevitability about it." Top attorneys for major companies are leading the effort. Lardent said that practicing law in a corporate environment is so stressful and time consuming that lawyers' lives can start to feel overwhelming. "Pro bono offers the opportunity to break out of that and explore new things and see the effects of their efforts immediately," Lardent said.

Global Pro Bono, another PBI program, also excites Lardent because it provides an "American export for good." Lardent has worked with people in Australia, Brazil, the United Kingdom, and various provinces of Canada; she's also heard interest expressed in Singapore, France, the Czech Republic, and South Africa. Lardent said that pro bono helps lawyers gain a sense of immediacy about the millions of people around the world in dire situations. "Pro bono used to be a uniquely American phenomenon because the United States does a poor job of providing public support for legal services, making supplemental pro bono assistance critically important. The poor and disadvantaged in the United States desperately need legal help, but, particularly in the aftermath of the events of 9/11, lawyers here also want to help fight poverty and promote fairness throughout the world." Lardent said. Pro bono "takes us out of our own self involvement and lets us reconnect to that sense of immediacy," she said. "Pro bono is a gift for lawyers."

Lardent also teaches a course called "Doing Good and Doing Well" one semester a year at Georgetown for students destined to work at large law firms. She teaches that one can be a public interest lawyer no matter where one works. Lardent suggests that, in general, lawyers are very privileged and should understand what other people's lives are like. "Pro bono helps you remember why you went to law school," she suggests, "It's a multi-vitamin for good."—A.B.
Maladies Rendered Plush

Normally, cozying up with the common cold is something to dread. Andrew Oliver, '02, thinks the fuzzy little plush toys from his company Giantmicrobes, Inc. just might change your mind about that prospect.

GIANTmicrobes® are dolls that look like tiny microbes, only millions of times the actual size. The five to seven inch toys are accompanied by an image of the actual microbe they represent, as well as some useful information. According to Oliver, the contents of the labels vary depending on the design: "For designs like the Common Cold, there is information about how to get it and more importantly, how not to get it (basically, wash your hands a lot). For designs like Black Death or Ebola, the focus is more on the historical and cultural impact of the microbe." Aside from the Common Cold, Black Death, and Ebola dolls, the GIANTmicrobes® line includes The Flu, Sore Throat, Stomach Ache, Cough, Ear Ache, Bad Breath, Kissing Disease, Athlete's Foot, Ulcer, Martian Life, Beer & Bread, Flesh Eating, Sleeping Sickness, Dust Mite, Bed Bug, and Bookworm. In what he calls the professional line, consumers can also purchase H.I.V. and Hepatitis.

In addition to the obvious humor of cuddly pathogens, some of the toys have special touches. Kissing Disease bears coquettish eyelashes; the Flesh Eating doll includes a stitched-on fork and knife; and Sleeping Sickness is, well, asleep. Oliver suggests that both the comical and educational aspects of the dolls appeal to their customers. "The educational aspect that appeals to health workers and other educators also appeals to many lay people because they are educators themselves—which is to say, they are parents. There are also the aurodidacts, who tend to be curious children ages eight to eighty-eight. Finally, lots of people respond either to the humor of GIANTmicrobes®, use them as sympathy gifts, or both." The plush dolls can be purchased at www.giantmicrobes.com, and in various bookstores, toy stores, museum stores, drug stores, hospital gift shops, novelty shops, and catalogs.

The sense of humor evident in Oliver’s project is perhaps to be expected from a former writer for the Harvard Lampoon, a stint he calls an “extremely entertaining experience.” He said that “jobs were loosely defined” on the Lampoon and that “everyone contributed material, worked on the layout, visited the printer, distributed the magazine, and drank the beer.”

Before he attended the Law School and started Giantmicrobes, Oliver was the articles editor at National Review magazine and also founded a language school in Russia, among a few other entrepreneurial enterprises. According to Oliver, the language school aimed to “mimic the immersion-based Middlebury Language School—but instead of immersing college-level Russian students in the hills of mid-western Vermont, we immersed them in central Moscow. The students paid according to western tuition rates, and the Russian professors were paid according to local needs. “Karl Marx would have been proud,” Oliver said.

Giantmicrobes, Inc. was incorporated in 2002. There was a demand among agents and retailers for a line of products rather than the initial idea of marketing only one product—the Common Cold. “A local Chicago seamstress made prototype samples that were sent to a dozen or so Chinese factories,” Oliver said. “We wired money to the factory with the best price/quality characteristics—and wondered if we’d ever hear from them again.” Oliver describes this period as the most difficult part of getting started. “In many ways,” he said, “it cut against the lawyer’s impulse to try to manage the risk.” Eventually, however, the products arrived and went to a warehouse. Free press soon followed. “Most significantly, a widely-seen, favorable mention about the product by humorist Dave Barry,” Oliver said, “The company has been growing—rapidly—ever since.”—A.B.
The Highest Standards

Credibility and integrity were traits that made Lori Lightfoot, '89, a leader at the Law School and are traits that have distinguished her career as well. While still a student, Lightfoot was instrumental in getting a law firm banned from on-campus interviewing because the firm had mistreated a fellow student. "What they did wasn't illegal," she said, "but it was immoral." Lightfoot said of the battle with the firm, "Because people knew me in a broader context, they knew I wouldn't be pushing for something unless I had a good reason for it."

Perhaps it is this backbone that City of Chicago mayor Richard Daley recognized in Lightfoot earlier this year when he appointed her to work in the Office of Procurement soon after it came to light that certain companies that had been certified as Minority Business Enterprises or Women Business Enterprises were fronts, created in order to benefit from the city's "set aside" program. The set aside program is designed to foster the economic development of women- and minority-owned businesses in Chicago. Neither the state nor the federal government offers programs of this sort, and the city is committed to this type of economic development. The scandal "really hit the public consciousness," Lightfoot said. "The mayor felt he needed to take a dramatic step." She is taking at least a six-month leave from her regular job to work for the Office of Procurement, but she told the mayor she would stay as long as necessary. "Our charge is to maintain the public trust," she said. "The goal is to make things as understandable and transparent as possible."

Her "regular" job is Chief of Staff and General Counsel for the Office of Emergency Management. In this capacity Lightfoot is tasked with managerial oversight of homeland security efforts in Chicago, the 911 call center, the 311 call center, emergency management, and traffic management. Lightfoot’s reputation for fairness and integrity began to be widely known during her tenure as Chief Administrator of the Office of Professional Standards for the Chicago Police Department. Lightfoot said the biggest challenge in this position was "walking a difficult line between maintaining the integrity of the department and handling complaints against it." One memorable incident occurred in April of 2003, when a van was stopped by police because of an outstanding warrant. The occupants initially refused to get out of the vehicle and the situation rapidly escalated as several squad cars and a large crowd gathered. The police eventually broke the windows of the van and sprayed pepper spray inside. When the driver exited the van the police pushed him to the ground to handcuff him, and even though he was not resisting, excessive force was used. "OPS had to find out who laid hands on this man and who was responsible," she said. The officers wouldn't admit to anything, Lightfoot reflects, "When a community is outraged the only fair thing to do is to follow due process. Unfortunately it's a slow process and it doesn't always satisfy the community." Ultimately, OPS recommended the lead officer be fired, and he ended up facing criminal charges. Lightfoot said that situations like these helped show her staff that this was "not just another job."

She approaches everything with this level of commitment. At the Law School, she was quarterback for the women's intramural football team, Apathy, which in her time had a remarkable record—not only was the team undefeated, it was unscored upon. But memories of her time here are bittersweet. "The Law School has come a long way in terms of diversity, but it has a long way yet to go," she said. "I would like to see greater efforts made to include minority voices in the intellectual life of the Law School, and to reach out to minority alumni for fundraising and volunteer support. Why not have a world-class law school that is a truly inclusive place?" —A.B.
1929
Donald N. Berchem
March 16, 2004
Berkhem was a trial lawyer with the Chicago law firm, Berchem, Schwantes & Thuma for forty-one years. He was elected a Fellow of the International Academy of Trial Lawyers in 1956. When Berkhem retired, he and his wife moved to Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, and operated a Hallmark Card & Gift Shop. In 1981, they moved to La Porte, Indiana, for Berchem to act as Chief Financial Officer of his son’s business, Industrial Maintenance Welding & Machining Company.

1935
Joseph T. Zoline
September 23, 2004
Zoline practiced corporate law before he became vice president of Carte Blanche, one of the first credit card companies. He was also chief executive of MSL Industries and, for a short while, head of Arlington Race Track in Arlington Heights, IL. In 1969, Zoline was a businessman in Chicago and Beverly Hills and a skier who lived part-time on a ranch in Aspen when he heard about the Telluride area from a friend. He went on to establish the Telluride Ski Area, turning the historic mining town into one of the Rockies’ most notable resort communities.

1939
Edmond Mosley
March 17, 2004
After graduation from the Law School, Mosley ran his family’s linen stores for several years. He began to practice law, his passion, in the late 1950s. In 1980, he and his wife retired to La Jolla, California where they enjoyed walks on the beach and were members of the Independent Scholars.

1941
Edward E. Collins
January 25, 2005
Collins, with his late brother James Collins, owned and operated the Hines Legal Directory for fifty years. The company was started by their father, Edward Collins Sr. Collins and his wife, the former Phoebe Loeb, were married in 1941. They enjoyed traveling, and toured all over the United States, Europe, and the Far East. Collins was a train buff and was fond of musicals. He became active with Tri-City Family Service in Geneva, IL and was also a part of a Parkinson’s Disease support group.

William W. Sweet
October 20, 2004
Following his graduation from the Law School, Sweet served as a Lieutenant in the United States Navy from June 1942 to October 1945 as a communications officer in the Pacific theater. Following his military service, he moved to Dallas, Texas, where he practiced law for fifty years. His firm was Bowyer, Thimas, and Sweet. He was also Vice President and General Counsel for the Prudential Mutual Life Insurance Company of Dallas. Sweet was an avid golfer with a life record of three holes-in-one, but his main interest in life was his family and friends.

1949
Norman Karlin
December 4, 2004
Karlin served in the United States Army during World War II in both Europe and Asia where he earned the Bronze Star and Purple Heart before completing his law degree. After graduation, he practiced law in Chicago for more than twenty years, specializing in zoning and land use law as a partner in the firm of Hoffman & Buckley and later with Siegan & Karlin. In 1970, Karlin moved to Los Angeles, where he joined the faculty of the Western University School of Law and remained a professor there for nearly thirty-five years. He helped design, and then taught, in SCALE (Southwestern’s Conceptual Approach to Legal Education) and also taught in the school’s traditional program. He became Professor of Law Emeritus in 1997.

1950
Frederick Morgan
October 16, 2004
Morgan served in the Army Air Forces during World War II and earned the title lieutenant colonel as a Judge Advocate General’s Corps officer in the Air Force reserves. After graduation from law school, Morgan practiced law in Oregon and California for the next fifty-three years as a labor lawyer. He was an attorney at Bronson, Bronson & McKinnon until 1988, then continued to represent many longtime clients and took on more pro bono work. After passage of the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act in the 1970s, Morgan represented many family-owned farms during union elections or when unfair labor practices were alleged. He also assisted the San Francisco Symphony in its labor negotiations with musicians.

1952
F. Raymond Marks
November 8, 2004
Marks practiced and taught law for more than fifty years in Illinois and California. An avid supporter of civil rights, he served as the first Staff Counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union in Illinois.

1955
James Louis Blawie
November 29, 2004
Blawie was a professor of law at Santa Clara University’s School of Law for thirty years, from 1960–1990. His teaching interests were property and probate, trusts and the public law. He was a major in the Judge Advocate General’s Corps, United States Army Reserve, commissioned in 1963 and honorably discharged in 1977. While at the Law School, he was active in the California Law Revisions Commission and served as a complaints examiner for the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in Washington, DC. He is survived by wife Marilyn June B. Blawie, 55, and three children.

1960
Paul Schreiber, Jr.
September 26, 2004
In 1961, Schreiber joined the firm Schreiber, Mack, and Piper, currently Schreiber, Mack, and Postweiler, where he practiced law in estate planning, real estate, and corporate law with his father, brother, and other partners. He liked to sail, collected vintage cars, and was a longtime Rotary member as well as the counsel for the Schreiber Foundation for Cancer Research. He resided in the Chicago area most of his life.

1961
Robert C. Bills
October 25, 2004
Bills practiced law in San Francisco, Redwood City, and San Jose, CA. Survivors include his son and two grandchildren.
1963
Noel Kaplan
October 24, 2004
Before joining McDonald’s in 1973 as associate general counsel in its Oak Brook, IL, headquarters, Kaplan held jobs as a lawyer and accountant at Chicago companies, including Hart, Schaffner & Marx, where he was named general counsel for the retail store division in 1969. At McDonald’s, Kaplan was responsible first for marketing and franchise compliance, then switched to operations management in the late 1970s. In the mid-1990s, he was responsible for introducing the restaurant chain to China, Indonesia, and Korea. Kaplan became an adjunct professor at Northwestern University’s Kellogg School of Management in 2002. He enjoyed playing tennis and riding his motorcycle and was involved in the Jewish Community Centers of Chicago and EZRA Multi-Service Center.

1966
Ronald Larson
December 14, 2004
Larson was an engineer for Texas Instruments for a year before starting law school. After graduation, he joined the Chicago firm of Allegretti, Newitt, Witcoff, and McAndrews. In his thirty-eight year career as a patent lawyer in Chicago, Larson worked on litigation that influenced the development of computers and was involved in cases that dealt with blood analyzers, microprocessors, and electronic pacemakers. Larson sang in the choir for the First Presbyterian Church of Lake Forest and in the barbershop group The Commuters.

1973
Cathlin Donnell
October 5, 2004
Donnell was primarily a litigation lawyer specializing in employment and domestic relations law. She was the founding partner of the Denver law firm of Donnell, Davis & Salomon. Donnell helped found the Colorado Women’s Bar Association in 1978, and served on its board of directors for more than twenty years. She was a co-founder of the Alliance of Professional Women and helped found and organize the Legal Information Center at the YWCA. Donnell served on the Colorado Supreme Court Gender Bias Task Force and was a member of the Colorado Supreme Court’s Jury Reform Standing Committee. In 1996, Donnell received grants to study careers and compensation of male and female attorneys. She also earned a PhD in Communications from the University of Colorado at Boulder, and taught several communications courses there. Donnell claimed Mount Kears and built her own cabin in Colorado.

1975
Barry Wayne Homer
October 15, 2004
Homer was a partner at Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison for twenty years. An expert in employee benefits, he moved to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP in 2003. Early in his career, Homer worked through the difficulties of the 1974 Employee Retirement Income Security Act. He was later selected as an initial member of the American Bar Association Committee on Employee Benefits and then elected into the American College of Employee Benefits Counsel.
Class Notes Section – REDACTED

for issues of privacy
boat to his son, was to resume golf at age eighty-six. At ninety, he set a new course record on what he insists was a "short course." His fourth career is as a solo carakee for the last ten years of his beloved wife Gladys, who has dementia. He claims his "most frequent treatments are hugs and kisses." His good results should earn him a medical award.

Another prompt card return was from Bernard Moritz, who admits that winter in Williamsburg hasn't been good for golf, so he usually keeps his legs "under the bridge table a little more than usual." Brother Jerry, 41, and he are considering visiting St. Marks to see any changes since he was there forty-five years ago. With "tongue in cheek" he concludes "the annual family gathering will be in Lenox, MS, where culture will be the big draw."

We received from Frances Corwin Gray an interesting reprint of an article in the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin of December 27, 2004, reviewing her legal career. It detailed Frances' work at the Legal Aid Bureau of Metropolitan Family Services, which involved to a great extent resolving family litigation and difficult custodial problems. She was excelled by lawyers with whom she had worked, and by Judge Moshe Jacobius, presiding judge of the Domestic Relations Court. Many colleagues praised her ability to compromise, to help clients understand what they can realistically expect, and her fairness.

Many classmates, including your correspondent, were pleasantly surprised that Harold Kahan finally retired, and even did some substantial traveling, particularly in Europe. He plans to include a trip to Australia and New Zealand. That's real age defiance!

Seymour Tabin and his wife Frances, in view of their extensive past traveling and annual trips to Florida over the years, have limited their traveling and enjoy relaxing at home together. Seymour even limits his tennis routine followed for so many years.

Bryson Burnham still praises the scenery and weather of Durango, CO, and is proud that the community created a Symphony Orchestra. "New "Music in the Mountains" is a new treat." He's pleased that his daughter is employed in the field of Internal Corporate Communications, and working on corporate problems of a multitude of prestigious clients.

Dan Smith still resides in Tacoma, WA, and his eight children live relatively nearby in Seattle and Portland, where they are rearing their families. Dan has the joy of frequent family visits. He wasn't exactly sure how many grandchildren are in his expanding family, but he knew that the brood included a grandson and granddaughter who are lawyers, and some great-grandchildren.

Bob Benes, who we hadn't heard from in a long while, lives in Florida and is House Counsel for a Florida corporation. His wife is an appellate lawyer in California, and their daughter writes documentaries for TV. Keep us posted...

No bets intended, but I think that our busiest classmate is Saul Stern, who avoids the frigid winters by dividing his time between Marco Island, FL, and Bethesda, MD. He most recently conducted a "Scholars in Residence" in Marco about a book on two escapees from the Nazis. His next task is having Dr. William Galston, Professor of Civic Engagement at the University of Maryland's School of Public Affairs, come to speak in Marco this March. He has planned other activities for the Washington, DC area this spring and summer. In between times, he participates in Project Intercamb, whereby he arranges for outstanding Americans to go to Israel to meet responsible Israeli leaders. With it all, Saul assures us that he is "fully enjoying life."

1942
Joseph Renihan reports, "My status as a retired lawyer in Michigan is now "Emeritus" under new Michigan State Bar rules. I receive all publications free and a listing as Emeritus—which equals "retired." Protests resulted in the change "resigned" with no perks and no recognition for years of good service."

Harold L. Aronson, Jr. writes that he is "Well retired."

Allyn Franke has focused on representing school districts, community colleges, and the Deerfield Park District continues for more than fifty years. He has more personal, hands on contact with school board representatives on a daily basis than any other member of his firm, Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP. He is also one of a select group of Illinois lawyers recommended by his peers for membership in the Leading Lawyers Network, as one of the top lawyers in School Law.

1944
Judge Samuel Maragos reports: "We have seven grandchildren—six boys and one girl. Three of our sons and their families are in the Chicago area, and one is in the Boston area. Our oldest son Dean is continuing my law practice. He attended the Olympics this summer."

1947
Last November, Judge Margaret (Stevenson) Bries was one of six Iowa women honored at a ceremony in the State Judicial Building in Iowa's pioneer women judges. The ceremony was sponsored by the American Judicature Society, the National Association of Women Judges, and the Iowa Bar Association. Judge Bries was Iowa's first female judge of a court of general jurisdiction, the district court of Iowa's Seventh District Court. She was appointed to that position in June of 1977 and served until her retirement July 1, 1988. She now resides in Fort Myers, FL.

1948
Raymond Norton writes that he is "Still surviving California's natural disasters!"

Mikvas to Receive 2005 Public Humanities Award

For their lifelong commitment to civic education, to public understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and for a partnership that is more than the sum of two distinguished careers in public service, the Honorable Abner Mikva, '51, and Zoe Mikva have been selected by the Illinois Humanities Council to receive the 2005 Public Humanities Award. "We are delighted to honor Judge Abner and Zoe Mikva. All of us who care about civic participation value what the Mikvas have done for the Chicago community and other communities they have called home,"

said Arthur Sussman, Illinois Humanities Council Board Chair and Law School Lecturer in Law.

The awards ceremony was held April 28 in Chicago, at the Council's 30th Anniversary gala event. Preceding the award ceremony, the 2005 Humanities Lecture will be given by another Law School alumnus, Geoffrey R. Stone, '71, the Harry J. Kalven, Jr. Distinguished Service Professor of Law. Stone will provide a historical perspective on the threat to civil liberties, drawn from his recent book, Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime from the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism.

Abner Mikva
Zoe Mikva
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Alter Brings the WNBA to Chicago

In 2004 Michael Alter, '87, attended the NBA All-Star game where he caught an exhibition by WNBA players at halftime. "Wow," he thought. "Who are these people?" Later he would ask himself, "Why not Chicago?"

Alter, president of The Alter Group, a real estate investment firm, is venturing where few dare tread: failed leagues, defunct teams, and the idea that people won't pay to watch women's professional basketball, reports the Chicago Tribune. It's a venture too risky for many investors. But Alter sees possibilities that others miss. "Women's basketball has changed dramatically in the past ten years or so," he said. He believes that families will come to the games, partly because the tickets are considerably less expensive, and partly because WNBA players don't have reputations as thugs on and off the court. He believes that people who simply love basketball will come to WNBA games, which place a much greater emphasis on teamwork.

"If you understand the game of basketball," said Doug Bruno, coach of the DePaul University women's basketball team, "[you will understand that] it's a great ball."

It's risky, but Alter is optimistic. "We looked at this long and hard," he said. "We're putting our reputations on the line." The games begin for the WNBA's newest franchise, which has yet to be named, in the Spring of 2006.

Bruce Melton spotted Carl Mayer (there seems to be a name theme here) in Vanity Fair writing down spaghetti with his Princeton roommate, Elliott Spitzer. It's a long way from maroon burgers in Burton-Judson. By the way, Bruce continues to practice at his firm, Babbitt and Melton, in Chicago.

PERSONAL PART:
Zisl Taub writes that she got married, and has two little boys to go along with her two daughters from her first marriage. Zisl and her husband, Claude Edelson, live with their kids in the West Rogers Park neighborhood of Chicago. Zisl is working part-time as a real estate/finance attorney for a small firm in Skokie, IL.

As of this writing, several of our classmates are awaiting new arrivals.

We'll keep you posted. For those of you who responded to our desperate plea for news, we thank you. For those of you who didn't, there is still time for the next issue. It is never too early or too late! Just e-mail us at akaddj@aol.com.

1987
CLASS CORRESPONDENT
Stephanie Leider
Fisher & Phillips LLP
Suite 200
501 Fourteenth Street
Oakland, CA 94612
sleider@laborlawyers.com

There's always something interesting happening with Mike Alter. In February, he held a press conference with NBA Commissioner David Stern at the UIC Pavilion and announced that a new WNBA franchise would be coming to Chicago—and Mike will be the principal owner! According to a February 17, 2005, article in the Chicago Tribune, Mike saw a WNBA exhibition during the halftime break of the 2004 NBA All-Star game and knew that Chicago needed a franchise. He's now getting the city primed and ready for the team's debut in spring 2006. According to the Tribune, Mike still gets the "Are you crazy?" question from "maybe one out of ten people." But, he adds, "More often I get, 'Hey, this is great for Chicago.'"

Tom Cooke and family abandoned Chicagoland for Connecticut in 2004. Tom's wife, Rosalind, has joined a private medical practice in Hamden and has hospital privileges at Yale-New Haven and other nearby hospitals. Tom hasn't settled into a new position himself just yet, but is adamant that it won't involve firing people this time. (He had to oversee reductions of up to sixty percent of Tellabs workforce while there, and while at Jenner & Block handled the employment aspects of the closure of Fanny May Candies.) Meanwhile, Tom has been indulging his musical side—singing with The Woodland Scholars (a professional choral group), taking voice lessons, and getting reacquainted with his clarinet. Sounds wonderful!

President Bush appointed Scott Wallace, now President and CEO of the National Alliance for Health Information Technology, to chair a federal commission charged with developing a national strategic plan for healthcare information technology that is known as the Commission on...
Benedict S. Cohen, '83, was appointed staff director of the Homeland Security Committee following the retirement of John Gannon. Previously, Cohen served as deputy general counsel for the Department of Defense, executive director of the House Policy Committee, executive secretary of the Congressional Policy Advisory Board, and associate counsel to President Ronald Reagan.

Daniel B. Levin, '81, was appointed senior associate counsel to the President and National Security Council legal adviser. Previously, Levin served as acting assistant attorney general in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice, held a number of positions in the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and was deputy legal adviser for the National Security Council.

D. Kyle Sampson, '96, was appointed deputy chief of staff and counselor to the attorney general at the Department of Justice under Alberto Gonzales, after serving as counselor to the attorney general under John Ashcroft, '67. He is also a special assistant United States attorney in the Eastern District of Virginia. Before joining the Department of Justice, Sampson served at the White House as associate counsel to the President, as special assistant to the President, and as associate director for presidential personnel.

Theodore W. Ullyot, '94, was appointed chief of staff at the Office of the Attorney General. Previously, he served as deputy assistant to the President, deputy staff secretary, and associate counsel to the President at the White House.
The Law School’s softball teams in a photo taken shortly before they left to compete in the national tournament, which is held every spring in Virginia. Unfortunately, the skies opened up the Friday night before the games were scheduled, raining out the double elimination tournament and saving the University of Virginia School of Law the ignominy of losing to the Maroons again this year.
JOIN US FOR AN ALUMNI WINE MESS AT CHICAGO’S NEW MILLENNIUM PARK

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2005
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Millennium Park Roof Terrace – Enter from Randolph Street next to the Harris Theater for Music and Dance at 205 East Randolph Street.

RSVP to events@law.uchicago.edu

For information about other activities occurring over the Law School’s Reunion Weekend, visit www.law.uchicago.edu/alumni.reunion.