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Dear friends—

When I first joined the legal academy more than 25 years ago, figuring out where and how to publish one’s scholarship was largely a choice among three alternatives. Something the length of a book became a book. Most significant pieces became articles. Short pieces that were not especially complex or, alas, completely thought through became book reviews. Sure, you could make the decision to go with a student-run law review or one of the very few peer-reviewed journals, but that was the extent of the variety that was out there.

Today, our faculty shares their ideas in so many venues that it sometimes makes my head spin. On any given day I might read something by faculty members in the traditional venues—a book or a law review article. Just as easily I could see their names and ideas in op-eds, blog posts, weekly online columns, or web-only academic journals. I might listen to my colleagues in podcasts or watch them in videos. Even their traditional journal articles are now published in a significantly wider variety of legal and nonlegal journals than ever before.

All of this allows our faculty to do what they do best—formulate and share ideas—better and faster and farther than they ever have before. In the pages of this issue of the Record, you’ll read about how our faculty decide how best to get their ideas out into the world and how lucky they feel to be working at a time when they can directly connect with and get feedback from readers—nearly in real time. You’ll follow along with one of our professors as he writes his first book (after dozens of articles), and I do hope that you’ll take the time to read the book when it is published in a few months. You’ll also get to see how our faculty deal with getting their works read in other parts of our ever-shrinking world and how they work to get faithful translations of their work into languages they can’t themselves read.

I always enjoy using the Record to help you better get to know our faculty, and so in this issue you’ll also get a taste of the myriad pieces of scholarship that have inspired them along the way in their impressive careers. And because (despite public opinion) we’re not all-work-and-no-play around here, this issue includes some of our faculty and staff talking about what they read for fun. I was particularly interested to see who reads on e-readers these days and who clings to their printed books!

You’ve heard, probably for your entire association with the Law School, about how prolific our faculty is, and that is as true now as it ever was. (Just take a look at the annual publication list on page 46!) But what matters to me more is that the quality of their scholarship exceeds even its quantity. Our faculty continue to innovate in every part of the legal academy and, increasingly, in other parts of the academy as well. I hope you’ll look at that list and pick out a few pieces to read over the next few months—perhaps one by a faculty member who came to the Law School after you left our physical halls. There is no better way to see just how extraordinary this faculty is than by reading what they have to say.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Schill
“My goal is to write something that’s both illuminating to experts and accessible to nonexperts.”

He writes his books with an educated but not necessarily academic audience in mind. Think of the people who are likely to read the New York Times Magazine, he said. “My goal is to write something that’s both illuminating to experts and accessible to nonexperts.”

Stone also coauthors a popular casebook on constitutional law and coedits a peer-reviewed journal produced at the Law School, the Supreme Court Review. He is general editor of the Inalienable Rights series published by Oxford University Press, a series of short books on complex constitutional topics for nonexpert audiences. He submits briefs to the Supreme Court and other courts on issues of constitutional law. And besides the Huffington Post, he also writes regularly for the Daily Beast. His blogging is a fun diversion and a bit of a public service, he said.

“I think what we know in the academy is often extremely useful, and if we can help explain it to people generally, it will help them understand what they’re thinking about better.”

Plus, he added, it’s a good change of pace to be able to have something published so quickly. Journal articles take months and books take years, but popular writing is
immediate. “It’s nice to be walking down the street, have an idea, and have something to do with it.” Over the summer, he blogged about religious tests for public office, the Supreme Court’s decision in the abortion protest case *McCullen v. Coakley*, and NSA surveillance of private citizens. (Stone was one of five people appointed to a presidential advisory committee on National Security Agency surveillance, a result of his extensive writing on civil liberties.)

When Professor Eric Posner has something to say on a timely topic, he turns to his biweekly column at *Slate*, which he’s had since 2012. “It wasn’t something I looked for, but it’s nice,” he said. It did take some adjustment, however, to go from writing for academic audiences to writing for everybody, from experts to laypeople.

“When I first started doing it, it was difficult, because it’s a very different style,” said Posner, Kirkland and Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law. “It’s a lot like teaching. What you’re doing is trying to convey complicated ideas to people who aren’t familiar with them. You’re exercising a different part of your brain, and I find that enjoyable.”

Posner used to write the occasional op-ed for newspapers such as the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal*, but their space is limited and their acceptance rates are low, so he doesn’t bother anymore. His pitches land well at *Slate*, and there’s not too much pressure; if he doesn’t have an idea, he can skip a week. If he has two ideas in one week, he can publish both. Recently, he wrote about why Speaker of the House John Boehner’s lawsuit against President Barack Obama is nonsensical and why the Supreme Court usually decides cases 9-0 or 5-4. He also blogs at ericposner.com.

Posner enjoys his popular writing, but academic work will always come first, he said. He has written 15 books and hundreds of book chapters and articles. He likes to publish in peer-reviewed journals, which he believes are higher quality than law reviews because they are edited by professors rather than students. Student-edited law reviews, however, have larger readership.

No matter the audience, Posner cringes at the concept of being a “public intellectual.”

“I think of myself primarily as an academic who writes for academic audiences. I don’t like the idea of a public intellectual because I think it conveys a certain amount of superficiality and self-aggrandizement. I try to write...
only about things I know. Basically, I only write about the law. I’ll never write about politics. I’ll never write about whether Obamacare is good or bad. I write about the legal angles, like whether Obamacare is lawful or not.”

And it’s all connected, Posner added. “I’d say 90 percent of what I’ve written (for the popular press) is related to my academic work, so when I write I feel like I know what I’m talking about, and I’m not just spouting an opinion.”

Professor Martha Nussbaum, like Posner, is a well-known name who receives a fair amount of press. But the philosopher doesn’t like the label “public intellectual” either. It is sometimes interpreted to mean that the academic has left the academy behind, she said, which is definitely not her.

“I’m not unhappy in academia at all. But I want to connect with the broader public. I think it’s extremely important,” she said. “Political philosophy is about matters of urgent human importance that bear on public policy.”

Nussbaum, who has written more than 20 books and 400 articles, doesn’t have an online column like Stone or Posner, but she does have strategies for writing for different audiences. If she thinks the audience will be largely academic, she is free to reference many works of other scholars, lots of empirical data, and complex examples. If she expects a popular audience, she figures out ways to make the academic more accessible. For example, in her 1986 book, *The Fragility of Goodness*, Nussbaum put all the footnotes at the end of the book, “so you can skip them.”

Sometimes, her aim is to develop theories that will change and shape the field of philosophy. Other times, she wants to effect change on the ground. For example, in her 2013’s *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach* with two audiences in mind: undergraduate students just starting to learn about social justice and, even more practically, development workers around the world trying to make it happen.

The capabilities approach described in that book was developed by Nussbaum with Harvard economist Amartya Sen and has been used all over the world by governments and agencies working on human rights and welfare. Several of these bodies have consulted Nussbaum on implementing the approach. And the chief economist of the World Bank, Kaushik Basu, is the former president of the Human Development and Capability Association, of which Nussbaum is a founding president.

So while Nussbaum is very aware of the importance of writing for broader audiences, she’s quick to point out that she never “dumbs down” her popular writing. Conversely, even in her most complicated academic writing, she works to engage the reader intellectually and emotionally. To put it simply, “Whatever I’m writing, I try to write clearly and compellingly for humans who care about the issues.”


Of course, in Nussbaum, Posner, and Stone’s cases, their accomplished careers and reputations create automatic demand for whatever they write. Faculty who are earlier in their careers publish as a route to academic growth, tenure, and greater exposure.

Professor Laura Weinrib, a legal historian, is writing her first book, *The Taming of Free Speech*, which is about the history of the civil liberties movement in the United States.

Different fields have different norms, Weinrib said; for example, quantitative fields such as economics or the hard sciences tend to be more article driven. Many fields have a premium on getting work out quickly or focusing on changing developments in the courts, but history is not one of those fields.

Books are the norm for historians for a few reasons, Weinrib said. One, history requires a lot of documentation of research and evidence for your argument. In addition, you have to “engage with the historiography,” which means revisiting all the important relevant work and arguments and then adding your own contribution. All those footnotes “require a lot of pages.”

Another reason historians write books? Nonacademics read them sometimes, but they almost never read journal articles. History, and especially American history, is very marketable to a general audience. Weinrib chose Harvard University Press as her publisher, she said, in part because they have a track record of success in a general market. “History has a narrative component,” Weinrib said. “Historical writing is not exclusively analytical, it’s not exclusively normative. There’s a story to tell, and that’s an important part of what makes good history.”
Sometimes, that “good history” is even intensely personal. Weinrib edited the 2009 book *Nitzotz: The Spark of Resistance in Kovno Ghetto and Dachau-Kaufering Concentration Camp*. The book is an English translation of several issues of an underground Jewish journal edited by her grandfather under Nazi occupation, first in the ghetto and then in a concentration camp. Weinrib, who wrote an intensive introduction for the book, first started working on the topic as her senior thesis in literature at Harvard College.

Professor William Hubbard, on the other hand, tries to tell his story through empirical data. He does economic analysis of litigation, courts, and civil procedure. Most of his early publications were invited pieces for conferences and symposia, which the event organizers would later publish. Being a new professor at the Law School helped him get those invitations, he said.

“Chicago helps me a lot,” he said. “People may not know who I am, but they know Chicago.”

Invited pieces came with some peace of mind, because he knew when and where his work would be published, he said. The downsides were that the work had to fit a particular theme and deadlines were tied to an event and therefore strict. Given that empirical work is particularly time-consuming—“it always seems to take twice as long as expected,” he said—writing for a deadline is especially nerve-wracking.

Now with more experience behind him, Hubbard is setting his own pace. This gives him more freedom to develop his own themes but requires that he pitch his work to journals. “I write a paper, send it out, and hope somebody likes it,” he said. He aims for peer-reviewed journals, which are better equipped to edit technical data analysis and mathematical modeling. Hubbard himself is a coeditor of the peer-reviewed *Journal of Legal Studies*, which is produced at the Law School.

Hubbard said he knows that most judges and lawyers don’t read journals. Some judges have criticized academic work as too esoteric, too focused on “sexy” cases, and not in tune with how the law really works or its political
realities, he said. He tries to make sure his work has practical benefit by focusing on issues that have interested him since he was a lawyer practicing high-stakes civil litigation cases. In February, Hubbard presented results of an empirical study on litigation costs to the Advisory Committee on the Civil Rules, the group of judges responsible for the federal rule-making process.

Hubbard also has spoken in depth with federal judges who visit the Law School as part of its Visiting Jurist program, which brings leading judges and members of the faculty together to discuss academic research. In 2013, Hubbard discussed pleading standards with Judge Gary Feinerman of the Northern District of Illinois.

“Judges don’t generally read these papers,” Hubbard said. “But I want to inform an academic debate on how people understand the process by which lawsuits are resolved. As academics, lawyers, and even their clients become aware of new ideas, I think those ideas do trickle up to judges and policy makers.”

Professor Nicholas Stephanopoulos also wants to create work with impact, in his case, on election law.

He does that through both his academic writing, usually published in law reviews, and his popular writing for publications such as Slate, the New Republic, the Los Angeles Times, and the Chicago Tribune.

For example, Stephanopoulos recently completed Partisan Gerrymandering and the Efficiency Gap, a paper in which he proposes a quantitative metric to measure the degree of partisan gerrymandering in district plans. The metric is based on partisan symmetry, which the Supreme Court has shown some openness to despite rejecting other standards. The article will be published in the University of Chicago Law Review next year, but it’s already available online, and people in Wisconsin unhappy about the state’s pro-Republican gerrymander plan to use its proposed metric in a lawsuit. (If the lawsuit succeeds, it would be the first-ever victory on this cause of action.) Stephanopoulos also presented the basic ideas in a July 2 piece for the New Republic, “Here’s How We Can End Gerrymandering Once and for All.”

These “pop” versions of his articles bring his academic ideas to the masses, he said. Both types require some hustle for a young professor; Stephanopoulos pitches each law review article to a few dozen law reviews and then contacts media outlets to find space for a column.

“I’m really interested in not just having a role in the academic debate but also being relevant in the public debate,” he said. “To the extent I can do a bit to further my policy views, I’d like to do that.”

Even better, he said, “doing more popular writing improves my academic writing. Academic writing can tend to be too complex, too dense. When I have to write a piece with no footnotes, I find I work to make it clearer and more accessible.”

Professor William Baude shares Stephanopoulos’s feelings about the importance of making academic work accessible. He started a law blog when he was still an undergraduate at the University of Chicago a decade ago. Back then, law blogs weren’t at all common, but Baude read a few he liked and was inspired to start his own.

“I would see people say things on the Internet I thought were wrong or not quite right, and I wanted a place to respond,” he said. Baude also wrote for the Maroon student newspaper and sometimes for no outlet at all; if he was moved to write an essay about something and had nowhere to publish it, he’d simply circulate it among friends.

While studying at Yale Law School, Baude’s blog evolved into a “place for me to figure out what I thought about things. And that’s still true. I often write about things that puzzle me.” Today, the blog is defunct, but Baude writes for two others: SCOTUSblog, where his beat is jurisdiction and procedure cases, and the Volokh Conspiracy, populated by mostly law professors and now hosted by the Washington Post. Baude’s work has found its way to the Supreme Court and beyond. Justice Antonin Scalia cited two of Baude’s scholarly articles in two separate opinions; first, it was “Beyond DOMA” in his dissent for United States v. Windsor and then “Rethinking the Federal Eminent Domain Power” in his concurring opinion in Bond v. United States. Both articles have been used in recent law school case books. And it’s not just scholarly articles getting attention; one of Baude’s Volokh Conspiracy blog posts was cited in the successful petitions for summary reversal in Williams v. Johnson, decided by the Court July 1.

But even the heavy workload of articles and blogging isn’t enough writing for Baude. He does more, just for fun. His Twitter (@crescat) followers can count on a post or two virtually every day, and he is the author of more than 1,000 business reviews on Yelp, where he has been named to the “Yelp Elite Squad” six years in a row.

“I just love writing,” Baude said.

Luckily for him and our other prolific professors, the opportunities are endless. ✪
THE WORK THAT CHANGED ME

By Robin I. Mordfin
The artful use of words has long inspired great minds. Thomas Alva Edison decided to become an inventor like his idol, Sir Isaac Newton, after reading *Principia*, while novelist Joyce Carol Oates decided to become a novelist after enjoying *Alice in Wonderland*. But what inspires those who choose to study the weighty problems of law, economics, and society and spend their time attempting to find solutions?

Many members of the Law School faculty have been stimulated by well-constructed prose. Naturally, some of the biggest thinkers started with some of the most well-known documents. Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and influential constitutional law scholar, was moved by a journal piece on the First Amendment.

Professor Geoffrey R. Stone

“Harry Kalven’s article in the 1965 *Supreme Court Review*, ‘The Concept of the Public Forum: Cox v. Louisiana,’ played a central role in shaping my lifelong interest in the First Amendment,” said Stone. “I first read Kalven’s article in 1971 when I was a student at the University of Chicago Law School. At the time, it exemplified for me the sort of clear-eyed, insightful, and integrative analysis that marked the very best of legal scholarship. It took judicial decisions seriously, but looked beyond them to seek the broader principles they might support.”

Stone returned to the Law School as a member of the faculty in 1973, at which time Professor Philip Kurland invited him to write a piece for the *Supreme Court Review*. He first considered writing about equal protection, but then Professor Kalven suggested that he write about recent decisions involving the public forum doctrine.

“That led to my first piece as a member of the faculty, ‘Fora Americana: Speech in Public Places,'” said Stone. “That article built upon the idea first put forth by Kalven in his 1965 article and took it in new and—I’d like to think—interesting and original directions. Many of my subsequent articles drew upon and further developed the insights of that first piece. Sadly, Kalven died of a sudden heart attack several months after ‘Fora Americana’ was published, but it was his work and his ideas that inspired it. Much of the First Amendment section of my *Constitutional Law* casebook (coedited with Mike Seidman, Cass Sunstein, Mark Tushnet, and Pamela Karlan) is organized around the ideas I first explored in that 1973 article.”

Jennifer Nou, Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law, also found writing early on that has strongly affected the trajectory of her career. Nou, who has written extensively on regulation, had this to say about Douglas Rae’s *Equalities*:

“Reading it in college sparked questions for me that I think I’m still trying to answer. In *Equalities*, Rae and his coauthors set out to examine the ways in which the abstract concept of equality fissures into the practical ‘equalities’ (plural) of real life. They were concerned, in other words, with the repeated moments of transition...
between the theory and practice of equality; for example, in debates over kidney allocation, baseball salaries, language rights, religious freedom. How do actual societies instantiate the ideal of equality, whether between groups or individuals? How do these practical understandings of equality relate to and conflict with each other?”

“It struck me that these same questions could be asked about the idea of efficiency,” Nou continued. “In our economics classes, we were often told that there was a trade-off between equality and efficiency—with the former the realm of philosophers and politicians, the latter the realm of technocrats. But it seemed that in real life the idea of ‘efficiency’ was actually highly contested, political, and value-laden. The concept of efficiency, that is, became various ‘efficiencies’ in practice, from debates about economic growth to the use and abuse of cost-benefit analysis. In this sense, Equalities highlighted for me the value of understanding how ideas actually lived and breathed.”

Naturally, some even more fundamental sources have brought forth an interest in scholarship. Richard Epstein, James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus, finds Roman law to be a nearly constant source of both new and old ideas.

“The great advantage of the study of Roman law generally is that it gives an alternative system-wide view of legal institutions and doctrines that is still relevant today in modern private and public law,” said Epstein. “The Romans were weak on developing a justificatory apparatus for their rules, whose strength is best measured by their durability. The analytical project is to use the modern tools of philosophy and economics to supply the rationales that explain the great strengths of the Roman system and also give insight to the places in which their rules tend to fail.”

Epstein has found that the one text he has consulted...
more than any other over the past 50 years has been Gaius's Institutes. "I first encountered the book when I began my studies of law at Oxford," he said. "Roman Law of contracts under the guidance of my then Oriel tutor, Alan Watson, was the first book that I read, and did so in close detail. From those early origins, I expanded my set of Roman law texts to cover much of the law of property, tort, procedure, and the law of persons, where again Gaius was the first source I read. His genius in getting the taxonomy right coupled with his deep awareness of the transactional possibilities under Roman law have influenced my own work in common law systems."

"The theories of contract classification influenced my general view that the American system of consideration plus detrimental reliance is not an adequate framework for promissory obligations," Epstein related. "The Roman treatment of causation, which does not involve the use of 'but for' and proximate causation had profound influence on my early treatment of tort law in my 1973 article 'The Theory of Strict Liability.' The Roman approaches to textual interpretation apply in my view not only to the general propositions of Roman law but to many of the broad guarantees of American constitutional law, including my recent work in The Classical Liberal Constitution."

Interestingly, a lack of good writing, in fact a lack of writing at all, has also served as inspiration. Kenneth Dam, Max Pam Professor Emeritus of American and Foreign Law, had already written a book, The GATT: Law and International Economic Organization, when he decided to expand his look at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade by considering monetary issues as well. Unfortunately, he was faced with enormous challenges in putting together his research because of a lack of documentation.

"After having access to the published documents of the GATT, the relative dearth of documents about the International Monetary Fund in the period before Joseph Gold became the Fund’s General Counsel was frustrating. I therefore made many trips to Washington to access unpublished IMF documents," he noted.

Some publications were of interest to faculty members not only for what they say, but also for how they say it. Lior Strahilevitz, Sidley Austin Professor of Law, was a second-year law student when he read "Crystals and Mud in Property Law," by Carol Rose, ’77, which was first published in the Stanford Law Review in 1988. "‘We’re allowed to write that way?’ was the first thing I thought when I put down the article," Strahilevitz mused. "So much of the legal scholarship that I had read as a student was dull, jargon-filled, and lifeless. There was nothing literary about it. Carol’s writing, by contrast, was conversational, unpretentious, clear … even funny. I already had a strong suspicion that I wanted to be a law professor, and I remember promising myself that I would strive to write articles that were a pleasure to read and analytically rich, just like Carol’s."

"As 3Ls on the law review board, my classmate and future Chicago faculty colleague Alison LaCroix and I were assigned the task of editing an essay by Carol," said Strahilevitz. "I am ashamed to admit that I was an overly zealous editor of faculty prose during my time on the Law Journal. That said, as I progressed through the first draft of Carol’s essay, ‘Canons of Property Talk, or, Blackstone’s Anxiety,’ I could not identify a single sentence that needed fixing. How was I to prove that I had read the darn thing? Alison had essentially the same reaction. I think when
all was said and done, we decided to save face by moving a comma and maybe italicizing something.” He added, “Carol Rose needs editors like Frank Easterbrook needs law clerks.”

Fortunately, Rose’s example has served Strahilevitz well as he has kept to his promise and published a number of accessible law articles, including “How’s My Driving? For Everyone (and Everything?)” and “The Right to Destroy.”

Professor Alison LaCroix, who has already published dozens of articles and a book, was also inspired by beautiful prose, but of a very different sort. The essay that keeps her motivated to continue her work is historian Samuel Eliot Morison’s essay “History as a Literary Art: An Appeal to Young Historians,” which was first published in 1946.

“Yes, it’s dated in some ways (for example, references to ‘your wife’ and ‘your baby’ as forces orbiting outside the scholar’s study),” she said, “but the message that has always stuck with me is this—short, straightforward, and so hard to put into practice: ‘First and foremost, get writing!’ And then the nice historical image: ‘Young scholars generally wish to secure the last fact before writing anything, just as General McClellan refused to advance until the last mule was shod.’”

“Historians necessarily spend a great deal of time in the archive, but Morison (a rear admiral in World War II who reportedly also rode a horse to his office in Harvard Yard) urged historians to plunge into the writing, even when the lure of the research continues to beckon,” said LaCroix. “But this is what stays with me: ‘When you once
are writing, go on writing as long as you can; there will be plenty of time later to shove in the footnotes or return to the library for extra information. Writing is how we figure out the story and the argument, so every scholar—young or otherwise—has to find a way to start marching, even with a mule or two unshod.

Unsurprisingly, with a faculty as knowledgeable and prolific as that of the Law School’s, some of our best scholars have used other members as beacons in finding their ways in the world of academia. Much as Geoffrey Stone found Harry Kalven’s work motivating, so law and economics expert Anup Malani, Lee and Brena Freeman Professor of Law, sees the writing of Gary Becker.

“The work that changed me is Gary Becker’s *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior,*” Malani said. “I picked it up at a bookstore as a senior in college. I had taken economics courses and done so-so. None of the classes really gave me a sense of the power of economics. This book did. It made me apply not just to law schools—as most kids at Georgetown did—but also to economics departments. I consider myself fortunate that I got into Chicago. Gary’s Price Theory class was the best class I took in grad school, and he was on my thesis committee. (He even assigned my PhD thesis as a problem set in Price Theory—rare praise he gave his students.) I did not get a chance to tell him how he inspired me to study economics until very recently: you could approach Gary about work anytime, but he didn’t seem so open to social conversations. Fortunately, I had a chance to tell him at a dinner we had after a *festschrift* for him a few years ago. I will miss Gary now that he is gone.”

Similarly, Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law, found a new way of looking at the world by reading *The Clash Within* by Martha Nussbaum. “Reading Martha Nussbaum’s 2007 book on India had a big effect on me,” he said. “The book is an important reminder that the main political struggles of our time are not between civilizations but within them, and even within the individuals that compose them. Every society, and indeed every person, is engaged in a struggle between openness and fear, between tolerance and intolerance. I sometimes come back to the book like a mantra when confronted with the sometimes ugly realities of our world,” Ginsburg explained.

Each year, the researchers and teachers on the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School put out hundreds of articles, chapters, and books that find their way into the hands of eager young thinkers all over the world. Just as each member of the faculty has found inspiration in the work of scholars who came before or worked with them, a work by our faculty members that could change the course of an academic career could be going to print right now.
How I Wrote a Book: Richard McAdams

By Meredith Heagney
McAdams doesn’t remember what he wrote first, or even on what subject he started. He just knows he jumped in and wrote, and chapters formed, broke apart, and flipped around. “The chapters I imagined in the book proposal would bear little relation to the chapters I produced. The ideas are all there, but they’re differently arranged,” he said. “As a writer, I’m somebody who tinkers endlessly and changes my mind about organization.”

But, he added, “the best part was finishing a chapter and feeling that I had discovered significant things in the writing of it that I had not known when I started.”

“The best part was finishing a chapter and feeling that I had discovered significant things in the writing of it that I had not known when I started.”

Many of our faculty are authors of one or more books, generally the form of scholarship that takes the most time and effort to produce. For this story, Professor Richard McAdams, Bernard D. Meltzer Professor of Law and Aaron Director Research Scholar, talked to The Record in detail about the process of writing his first book. McAdams has taught law since 1990—at the Law School since 2007—and has authored dozens of articles and book chapters but had not yet tackled his own book.

Professor Richard McAdams printed out the more than 300-page manuscript for his upcoming book and held it in his hands. He felt the satisfying heft of many years of work all together in one place. He was nearly done.

McAdams still has a few months to go before the book is published, but getting to the final editing stages is a reward in itself.

“It feels liberating,” he said.

*The Expressive Powers of Law: Theories and Limits*, due in January from Harvard University Press, is McAdams’s first authored book. He coedited 2013’s *Fairness in Law and Economics* with Professor Lee Fennell, and he’s written several book chapters and dozens of articles, but writing his own book was a new experience.

The book focuses on two “expressive theories” of law, McAdams’s ideas about how law influences behavior.

He started writing journal articles on these expressive theories back in 2000. Sometimes, he’d discover that other scholars would cite him for one theory or the other, seemingly unaware that he had written extensively about both. He wanted to explore them both in a single vehicle and knew, with much to say, that a book was the best option.

What he didn’t know was whether the publishers he wanted—high-end academic presses—would buy it. So, in 2005, he wrote a 15-page book proposal and sent it out.

“Some people write the book and then try to get a contract, but I didn’t want to write it before knowing if anyone wanted to buy it,” McAdams said.

He didn’t have anything to worry about. Harvard University Press, one of his top choices, told him they would publish it. Then all that was left to do was write.

Despite the fact that McAdams had written several articles on his expressive theories, he didn’t find that they merged obviously into a book. That would’ve been much more efficient, he said, than his process.

“I kind of started from scratch. I had the ideas, but I didn’t take any particular article and say, ‘this is chapter three.’ Instead, I just started over.”

McAdams doesn’t remember what he wrote first, or even on what subject he started. He just knows he jumped in and wrote, and chapters formed, broke apart, and flipped around. “The chapters I imagined in the book proposal would bear little relation to the chapters I produced. The ideas are all there, but they’re differently arranged,” he said. “As a writer, I’m somebody who tinkers endlessly and changes my mind about organization.”

But, he added, “the best part was finishing a chapter and feeling that I had discovered significant things in the writing of it that I had not known when I started.”

The goal of the book is to inform an existing debate about how law influences behavior. Economists have traditionally believed that it’s about deterrence: that is, law changes the cost of behavior by imposing legal sanctions. Sociologists and psychologists subscribe to a theory of legitimacy, which says that people obey the law to the extent that they perceive it as a legitimate authority.

Both likely explain some amount of compliance with the law, McAdams said, but not all of it. His book presents his two theories, the information theory and the focal point theory, and applies them to many interesting real-world situations, including international relations, drug legalization, war, flag desecration, property disputes, and Florida’s Stand Your Ground law.

The information theory says that law is information that may change beliefs that change behavior. For example, if a legislature bans smoking in public places, that conveys information. First, it may cause people to believe that their fellow citizens are more opposed to smoking than they previously thought. Second, it gives people a reason to
think more about the risk of secondhand smoke and its dangers. Smokers may change their beliefs and behavior in response to this information (the law), perhaps not because they’re worried about getting in trouble, but rather because they don’t want to look like a jerk or compromise others’ health.

In McAdams’s second theory, law works as a coordinating focal point to help people avoid conflict. Think of an intersection where the traffic lights are out, and imagine that a bystander jumps in and starts directing traffic. He

“**The beginning of the book is in some ways the most important,”** McAdams said. “If people don’t like the beginning of the book, they’re not going to read the rest of it. And some people will only read the introduction to get the gist of the ideas.”

doesn’t have the legitimacy of the law behind him, and no one can go to jail for not obeying him, but people probably will anyway. In a situation requiring coordination, people seek order, and the law can provide that, McAdams said. “People in conflict often have some common interest in wanting to prevent the conflict from escalating to something that is analogous to a car crash in the middle of the intersection,” he said. “Therefore, in those situations the law gets some power just from being the most salient suggestion for how to resolve their conflict.”

McAdams lays out his theories in his introduction, which he rewrote again and again in the hopes of making it as clear and interesting to readers as possible. “The beginning of the book is in some ways the most important,” McAdams said. “If people don’t like the beginning of the book, they’re not going to read the rest of it. And some people will only read the introduction to get the gist of the ideas. So I spent a lot of time rewriting that

until people who were reading it for me were happy with it.” (McAdams sent drafts to a few friends and colleagues.)

McAdams wrote in his Law School office and in his home office, whenever he had time, which proved difficult to come by. In the years he was writing the book, he started coauthoring more journal articles with colleagues. He didn’t want to let his coauthors down, so he’d prioritize those articles over his solo book project. He also taught, of course, and had a long list of Law School responsibilities: he organized conferences, cochaired the faculty appointments committee, chaired a committee tasked with reorganizing clinical governance, and chaired a university committee reviewing internal investigations of the University of Chicago Police Department, to name a few. That meant that sometimes the book was put aside for months at a time, which then required time to restart the project.

“If I were more efficient, I would have just done all of it, as some of my colleagues do,” he said, but “they may or may not sleep.”

Much of his time was spent working with the D’Angelo Law Library and research assistants to unearth material about the book’s many interesting examples. In the focal point chapters, he talks about the federal statute that states rules for respecting the American flag, the Lieber code promulgated by the Union in the Civil War, and the court in medieval Iceland that issued judgments for several centuries without any executive officials, such as police, to enforce them. All those legal pronouncements created a focal point for people who wanted to, respectively, show respect to the flag, cooperate with an enemy over certain aspects of war, and resolve disputes, he explained.

For the idea of law as information, McAdams writes about the unwanted expressive effects of drug legalization, which signals that drugs are more popular and less dangerous than they actually are. He claims that the real issue in the public controversy over Florida’s Stand Your Ground law (made famous after the killing of Trayvon Martin) were with the law’s informational effects, more than anything else.

McAdams also argues that the law’s expressive influence over behavior (through information on public attitudes) helps to explain why we should interpret the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause to prohibit the government from endorsing religion.
McAdams hopes that the combination of theories and practical examples will appeal to other law professors, political scientists, and lawyers interested in theory. He found it challenging to move beyond the fields of criminal law and procedure. “I wrote a lot about topics outside my primary expertise: the fields of constitutional law, international law, customary law, property, and a host of smaller regulations about traffic and smoking. I discuss game theory, social movements, and histories of dispute-resolution mechanisms,” he said. “Next time, I’ll pick a narrower topic, one that I can complete in less time. Ideally, something where I can fully understand the scope of the topic before I write the book.”

Luckily, Harvard University Press didn’t mind the wait. “Harvard completely left me alone. I guess they’re used to the fact some people take a very long time. They really didn’t bother me, which kind of surprised me.”

His last step was to write a chapter on normative implications of his theories and how they can be used when making policy. Law professors always want a chapter like that, he said.

Finally, on December 22, 2012, McAdams submitted his completed manuscript. After that, the press gave the manuscript to two anonymous reviewers, who came back after about six months with extensive comments. McAdams had to then resubmit the manuscript explaining all the changes he made or why he rejected suggested changes, which ended up being a 35-page document in addition to the manuscript. That version was sent in on September 3, 2013, and editing began in January of this year.

McAdams received Harvard’s first edit in late May and returned his edited manuscript in June. He saw page proofs in July, approved them and made minor changes, and now he waits for the big day: January 12, 2015.

“Maybe it sounds egotistical, but I really like sitting down and reading the whole thing,” McAdams said. “I printed it out, double-sided, and it’s kind of a hefty thing, and it was like, yeah, this is a book, finally.”

He doesn’t know when or on what he’ll write that next book yet. Now he knows firsthand that the process is very rewarding, but rarely easy. “Of course, my favorite part of writing the book was finishing it.”

The end.
Global Reach: Translations Spread Faculty Ideas around the World

By Meredith Heagney
Professor Douglas Baird doesn’t speak Chinese, but if you speak only Chinese, you can still learn game theory from him. Baird’s celebrated 1998 book *Game Theory and the Law*, written with Professor Randy Picker and Booth School of Business Professor Robert Gertner, has been translated into Chinese and is popular among legal academics in that country. Some have even told Baird face-to-face how grateful they are for the translation.

“It’s surreal to know that people halfway around the world are reading it, but satisfying,” said Baird, Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law. He also had a recent article on intellectual property translated into Spanish for a Peruvian journal.

Our faculty’s work is in demand around the world, and translations are an invaluable way to make sure as many people as possible read the scholarship. What is produced here has real impact, and potential for impact, outside of the United States.

Faculty say they’re almost always happy to be translated, even if there’s no way to guarantee that the translation is a good one. Most of the time they can’t read it, after all, to verify for themselves.

“No translation is ever perfect, and there’s a certain acceptable error rate,” said Professor Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law. “You have to be realistic about it. As long as the ideas get out there, that’s what matters.”

Demand varies depending on the part of the world. Right now, Asia and Latin America are hot markets and Europe is less so, said Ines ter Horst, foreign rights manager at the University of Chicago Press.

China in particular is translating at a high rate, ter Horst said. The press issues an average of 140 licenses a year to foreign presses that want the right to translate one of their titles. Forty of those, on average, go to China.

“China has woken up and is thirsty for knowledge. And their population doesn’t necessarily speak English. You need to be translated in order to be known in China,” ter Horst said. “In countries such as Germany or Sweden, where most people speak English, or at least people educated to a certain level who would read our books, then there’s no need to translate.”

The University of Chicago Press issues between ten and fifteen licenses a year for books to be translated into Spanish, most commonly in Argentina, Mexico, and Colombia. Brazil is also increasingly translating titles into Portuguese. The press’s philosophy titles are especially popular in Brazil, ter Horst said.

European academics generally don’t want translations because they read English and have their own competing scholarship. But titles with potential for general readership are popular for European translations.

In Europe, there is much more interest in the humanities among a nonacademic audience than exists in the United States, said Professor Martha Nussbaum, a philosopher. She has standard Italian, Spanish, and Dutch publishers who routinely translate her work, and all three signed contracts for her book coming out in 2015 after seeing just one chapter. The book explores anger and forgiveness and is based on the Locke Lectures she delivered at Oxford University in the spring. She’s even doing a book tour in the Netherlands and Belgium in December to promote the Dutch translation of her 2013 book *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*, which is also being translated into Italian, German, Spanish, Korean, and Chinese.

“If you want to be read beyond a narrow circle of academics, you have to rely on translations,” said Nussbaum, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics.

As for the Arab world, academic publishers would like to sell more translations there, ter Horst said, but the region’s political unrest and haphazard distribution structure make deals difficult. Sometimes, the press agrees to terms in the Middle East it wouldn’t take elsewhere.

“In some instances, you take risks to increase scholarship worldwide,” ter Horst said.

Our faculty scholarship is not just marketable in other countries; it can have real impact on current events. For example, Ginsburg’s work on constitutions is designed to help developing nations determine what features and protections to put in their own nascent documents. “If I write a piece on the Thai Constitutional Court or the Arab Spring, I would prefer it be read by people in that region,” Ginsburg said. “Translations are a great way to do that.”

Professor Omri Ben-Shahar’s new book, *More Than
“You Wanted to Know: The Failure of Mandated Disclosure,” Ginsburg said. “Communicating that is more of an art than a science.”

Making sure the final product is a work of art is hard to do, but faculty have developed various safeguards. In the easiest cases, the professor reads the language well enough to review the work. (Professor Brian Leiter once caught an error in a French translation of one of his books, even though he was “stumbling my way through it.”)

Sometimes, the author asks colleagues or international students, especially LLMs, to take a look. Editors at presses can often read other languages, too; ter Horst, for example, knows Spanish and French. Some foreign presses even have a peer-review process. But, of course, none of it can guarantee a perfect translation.

“Even if a translation is not perfect, it’s beneficial that the translated scholarship reaches its audience,” ter Horst said. “It’s our mission to disseminate the best possible translations of important scholarship throughout the world.”

Of course, the best protection is to choose the best possible translator, and sometimes, that choice is the author’s.

For the Chinese version of *More Than You Wanted to Know*, Ben-Shahar fielded many requests from scholars who wanted the translation job. A translation is a prestigious assignment for a promising Chinese academic, Ben-Shahar said. He decided on Xiaofang Chen, an assistant professor at East China University of Political Science and Law who had attended the Law School’s Summer School in Law and Economics. The annual program, now called the Summer Institute in Law and Economics.
Economics, is part of the Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics, which Ben-Shahar heads. He liked that Chen had a strong reputation both as a scholar and an English speaker and that her own work is on related themes. The Chinese version will come out next year.


Leiter felt comfortable recommending Ratti for *Why Tolerate Religion?* because of his diligence while working on *Naturalizing Jurisprudence*. “The kinds of things he checked on, it was clear he was doing a very conscientious job,” said Leiter, the Karl N. Llewellyn Professor of Jurisprudence and director of the Center for Law, Philosophy, and Human Values.

Ratti teaches at the Genoa Department of Legal Philosophy, founded by the author of the first comprehensive Italian monograph on American legal realism. Both Ratti and Leiter are legal realists, who believe that nonlegal factors such as political ideologies or personal backgrounds influence judges’ decisions and therefore the law. “Because of my academic interest in the research agenda defended in *Naturalizing Jurisprudence*, I was particularly eager to make Brian’s book available to a wider readership,” Ratti said.

The whole process took Ratti about a year and a half and involved a lot of back-and-forth with Leiter, both over email and in a face-to-face meeting in Pavia, in northern Italy. “The biggest challenge was to strike the correct balance between elegant style and technical accuracy in the translation. This is even more difficult when the original text, as in the case of Brian’s book, is written in elegant prose,” Ratti said. “In my first draft, I focused on the accuracy of the translation, paying attention to the best way of translating theoretical terms and the jurisprudential theses. In preparing the final draft, I worked more on the style of the Spanish prose.”

Ratti is now working on the Italian version of *Why Tolerate Religion?* He should finish in February, and the translation will be printed in 2016.

Sometimes translation is a learning experience. Professor Peixin Luo of East China University of Political Science and Law has now translated 10 English books on commercial law into Chinese, but his first was Frank Easterbrook and Daniel Fischel’s 1996 book *The Economic Structure of Corporate Law* for Beijing University Press. Jianwei Zhang, another professor, was his cotranslator.

Luo said he was learning the field of corporate law as he worked on the translation, which came out in 2005. “This book is very familiar” today to legal scholars in China, he said. “It turned out to be the most cited book in the field of corporate law in China. I’m very honored to be the translator.” In fact, Luo thinks the book is so important that he used his payment for translating the second edition, in which he also wrote a preface in memory of Ronald Coase, to buy copies of the book for his students.

Ruoying Chen, LLM ’05 and JSD ’10, teaches at Peking University Law School in Beijing. She likes to read important works in English, but many of her students cannot as effectively, she said, so she assigns translations. Besides the Easterbrook/Fischel book, works by Coase, Baird, Nussbaum, Picker, Richard Epstein, Eric Posner, David Weisbach, and Judge Richard Posner are also very popular, she said. That’s why, during the International Summer Program in Law and Economics run by the Coase-Sandor Institute, professors are often treated like celebrities by the visiting scholars, who ask for autographs and snapshots. “These works are classics in law and economics literature and everyone should read them, including Chinese students and scholars who don’t work with English,” Chen said.

Baird will never get used to signing autographs, but he’s thrilled that his work, and his colleagues’, is read around the world. He put his attitude toward translations in poetic terms: “Let a thousand flowers bloom.”
What
(and Where and How)
We Read for Fun

Compiled by Meredith Heagney
Not even the most serious legal scholar reads scholarship all the time. Is there any greater joy than settling down with a great book, just for fun? The Law School is full of bookworms who would emphatically answer “no.”

You can never have too many book recommendations, so we asked a handful of faculty and administrators to write about their literary favorites and reading habits. If you enjoy this, be sure to check out http://webcast-law.uchicago.edu/facultyreading/ to see the 2013 version of our annual holiday tradition, “What Are We Reading?” Older lists can be found on our Goodreads page (just search UChicago Law), and if you friend us, you’ll get this year’s list before we post it to our website.

Happy reading!

Herschella Conyers, ’83
Clinical Professor of Law, Criminal and Juvenile Justice Project

I just finished The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao by Junot Díaz. It was my plane ride book for several trips. It’s fairly typical of one of my favorite kinds of fiction: sort of hard-hitting surrealism. During the summer, I try to read something old (a book I’ve read before to see what’s changed): The Bluest Eye by Toni Morrison; something new (I’ve been meaning to explore this author): Dear Life by Alice Munro; something borrowed (a book recommended by a friend): Why Zebras Don’t Get Ulcers by Robert Sapolsky; and something blue (back to the surreal): I’m looking.

For me, reading is as much a physical as intellectual and emotional act. I’m trying desperately to convert to an e-reader but I like the weight of a book. I like the marking of a book, accidentally or not. I like seeing, as I go, where I am in the story.

There’s no best for me. What follows are books (not counting the classics and childhood readings, but I have to give a shout-out to Advise and Consent and Gone with the Wind) that I remember and remember reading. These are some of the books that have made me pause, made me grunt or speak out loud, and made me love words and meanings.

In no particular order:
Me Talk Pretty One Day by David Sedaris
A Death in the Family by James Agee
Play It as It Lays by Joan Didion
Go Tell It on the Mountain by James Baldwin

Disgrace by J. M. Coetzee
Life of Pi by Yann Martel
Middlesex by Jeffrey Eugenides
One Hundred Years of Solitude by Gabriel García Márquez
(Nothing beats a poetry anthology for a quick pick-me-up.)

Susan Curry
Director of Public Interest Law and Policy

Given my daily commute from Chicago’s far northwest side, I have upwards of 15 hours spent in my car in a typical week. So I look for books that tell long, sprawling stories. Better still if they feature a cast of hundreds and cover decades or generations. No matter how well told or artfully crafted, a short story leaves me wanting. Unsurprising then, that one major book-choosing factor for me is length: The Goldfinch by Donna Tartt or anything by Bryce Courtenay or Wally Lamb. I recommend The Luminaries by Eleanor Catton. At only 28 years old, she wrote this complex mystery set in the New Zealand goldfields of 1866. I can’t wait for her next book. Once I find an author I like, such as the hilarious Meg Wolitzer (whose The Interestings I am currently reading), I read everything in her oeuvre.

I am most grateful for the new audiobook craze, which has been my car commuter’s deliverance. I find that I have never been as well read. In my four years at the Law School, my audio library has grown to include 162 books. And how decadent it is to be read to! Especially by excellent actors-turned-narrators. Anyone who has listened to the cast-narrated audio version of The Help by Kathryn Stockett will know what I mean.

I used to think that I had a preferred genre of fiction, but since “going audio,” I find that I am willing to experiment with all types of books I would never have considered: in Westerns, I have loved The Son by Philipp Meyer and, of course, Lonesome Dove by Larry McMurtry; in young adult, I recommend Eleanor & Park by Rainbow Rowell and The Fault in Our Stars by John Green; in fantasy/mythology, I’ve found no one better than Neil Gaiman, whose The Graveyard Book and The Ocean at the End of the Lane vie with Neverwhere for all-time favorites.

Reading now: The Interestings by Meg Wolitzer
Best book in recent memory: The Luminaries by Eleanor Catton
Favorite book of all time: One Hundred Years of Solitude by Gabriel García Márquez
One of my great fortunes is that I get paid to read. All day long every day, I read everything I can get my hands on. The bulk of my reading, however, is related to my teaching and research interests in corporate law and financial regulation. Books about economics, current events, and public policy more generally consume most of my time. Accordingly, my ratio of fun-to-work-related reading has fallen dramatically in recent years; when I was working as a lawyer, I read for pleasure as an escape, but unfortunately I read less fiction today. I read mostly on my Kindle, but largely because of the convenience of carrying books with me everywhere and the ability to read in the dark. My drawers are filled with book lights that never quite measured up, and I’m glad to be rid of them.

I like to read many books at once, and I don’t finish books that I don’t like. I usually read things recommended by book hounds that I trust—friends or colleagues with similar tastes or who I admire intellectually. I enjoy science fiction (but not fantasy), classic fiction, and history of all kinds, especially military and geopolitical history. A favorite in each: the *Foundation* series by Isaac Asimov, *Of Human Bondage* by W. Somerset Maugham, and the Liberation Trilogy (about World War II) by Rick Atkinson.

I also enjoy reading to my children, especially now that they are largely out of picture books. My daughter and I have recently read many of the Laura Ingalls Wilder books, and we’re now reading *Anne of Green Gables*. I’m looking forward to reading *The Constitution of Liberty* by F. A. Hayek to them in a few years!

**Reading now:** *Forgotten Ally* by Rana Mitter, about the war between China and Japan during the 1930s and 1940s; *Orkney* by Amy Sackville; and *Sons of Wichita* (about the Koch brothers) by Daniel Schulman; about halfway into each, I can recommend them all very highly.

**Best book in recent memory:** *Nothing to Envy: Ordinary Lives in North Korea* by Barbara Demick, a perspective-inducing account of life in that country.

**Favorite book of all time:** *The Brothers Karamazov* by Fyodor Dostoevsky.
Alison LaCroix
Professor of Law and Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Teaching Scholar

My “fun” books are nearly always works of fiction. I spend a lot of time reading nonfiction historical scholarship and primary sources for my research, which I love, but for leisure-time reading, nothing matches fiction. I nearly always read actual, paper books. The exceptions were when I used to have a longer commute and listened to audio versions of a few novels, some that I was reading for a Greenberg seminar and some others that I just wanted to read. Those were terrific, especially when the readers were especially talented (Frederick Davidson for War and Peace; Timothy West for Trollope’s Barsetshire novels; Kate Reading for Middlemarch). But for real, immersive reading, it has to be a genuine book.

As these titles suggest, I’m very fond of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels. But I also enjoy more modern works, often by British or Irish novelists, many of them female. And I tend to read in thematically or chronologically related groups—so in clumps over the past couple of summers, for instance, I’ve read a number of great books by twentieth-century British, Irish, and Commonwealth writers: Edna O’Brien, Elizabeth Bowen, Rebecca West, Shirley Hazzard, Anne Enright, Kate Atkinson, and Rachel Cusk. I’ve also had some spates of Tudor-era fiction, prompted by Hilary Mantel (who turns out to be basically incomparable), and World War I–era novels, sparked by the recent, excellent BBC/HBO miniseries version of Ford Madox Ford’s Parade’s End.

Reading now: Troubles by J. G. Farrell
Best book in recent memory: Barchester Towers by Anthony Trollope
Favorite book of all time: Tom Jones by Henry Fielding

Jeff Leslie
Director of Clinical and Experiential Learning, Clinical Professor of Law, Paul J. Tierney Director of the Housing Initiative, and Faculty Director of Curriculum

My pattern in reading for fun is to alternate between truly forgettable, trashy stuff—think airport bookstore bestsellers—and something meatier, often biographies or popular histories. The preferred format is almost always a real book and not an electronic format. Nothing beats the convenience of whipping out a battered paperback to squeeze in a few pages waiting for my son’s baseball game to start. The exception is the David McCullough–style histories that weigh you down in book form but fit so very nicely on the iPad. I love audio books but seldom am organized enough to download and listen. One recent favorite in the audio category was Andre Agassi’s excellent bio, Open. It was fun (for me, who knows about the students!) to draw analogies in class between the craft of the professional athlete and the lawyer’s craft.

Reading now: The Border Trilogy by Cormac McCarthy
Best book in recent memory: David McCullough’s biography of the young Teddy Roosevelt, Mornings on Horseback
Favorite book of all time: To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee

Saul Levmore
William B. Graham Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Virtually all my nonlaw reading is by way of audiobooks, listening while I exercise. I am in the midst of the last chapter of Our Mathematical Universe by Max Tegmark. It’s provocative and makes the reader think hard about the importance (or not) of testable hypotheses. I recently finished Evan Osnos’s Age of Ambition, a collection of observations from modern China. The reading (or listening, really) coincided with a trip there this last month. It’s a book for everyone.

I am always asking people for book recommendations but, as with films and television, I find it hard to develop a successful algorithm (of the Netflix kind). Someone recommends a book I love, but then the next suggestion from that source falls flat for me. This is true for fiction as well as nonfiction. I confess that I take my colleagues’ suggestions very seriously. By now I have read almost every book recommended in the Law School’s list. There I found The Boys in the Boat, which I thoroughly enjoyed but also some books that were hard to get through. Reading is experimenting, I guess.

Reading now: Our Mathematical Universe by Max Tegmark
Best book in recent memory: Probably Approximately Correct by Leslie Valiant
Annette Moore, ’06
Associate Director of Admissions

Between work, enjoying all that the city of Chicago has to offer, and hanging out with friends, family, and especially my 19-month-old nephew, I find that I now have less time to read than when I practiced law. However, I do love those lazy weekends when I would rather stay at home than brave public transit on either a blisteringly hot summer day or a painfully cold winter evening. On those days, if I am not trying to catch up on TV shows saved on my DVR or binge watching some ridiculously addictive show on Netflix, I grab some comfort food, a piping hot cup of coffee, and a good book (either on my iPad or the actual print version) and settle on my living room couch.

I don’t discriminate when it comes to my literary tastes. I like historical nonfiction, science fiction (or just any type of fiction), fantasy, suspense thrillers (though not too suspenseful or venturing into horror), and classic American literature (think along the lines of The Great Gatsby). I am currently reading David & Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and The Art of Battling Giants by Malcolm Gladwell. I can’t recall what motivated me to pick up the book from the D’Angelo Law Library other than the fact that I have thoroughly enjoyed every other book of Gladwell’s that I have read (for those ever wondering why they never became an NHL star or a maestro on the violin, be sure to pick up his Outliers: The Story of Success).

Reading now: David & Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and The Art of Battling Giants by Malcolm Gladwell
Best book in recent memory: Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln by Doris Kearns Goodwin
Favorite book of all time: Anthem by Ayn Rand (I love the idea of championing the individual over the collective) for road trips and not much else. There’s just something about dog-earring pages, scribbling notes in pencil.

My favorite genre is probably the memoir, followed closely by the biography. I love hearing people tell their own stories, in their own words: How do they perceive the events, both historic and mundane, that they’ve lived through? What are the details that only they could relate from firsthand experience? One of the best that I’ve read is Katharine Graham’s Personal History. I didn’t know that much about her before reading it, other than that she was the publisher of the Washington Post. But her story, spanning across almost eight decades, is about her complicated family relationships, her husband’s suicide, and her evolution from a housewife to the head of a major newspaper grappling with the Pentagon Papers and many other issues during her tenure. Throughout, she is admirably honest and candid.

More recently, I also really enjoyed Walter Isaacson’s Steve Jobs biography. Published so closely after Jobs’ death, it would have been understandable to whitewash much of his life. Instead, the biography also grapples with Jobs’ weaknesses and warts to present a fuller picture of someone it would be otherwise easy to mythologize. Finally, another one that stands out is David Sedaris’s Me Talk Pretty One Day. Sedaris is not only hilarious, but has such a unique voice and perspective on the most everyday things. Next on my list is probably Piper Kerman’s Orange Is the New Black—the show’s great, so the book must be too, right?

Reading now: Let the Great World Spin by Colum McCann
Best book in recent memory: Complications: A Surgeon’s Notes on an Imperfect Science by Atul Gawande
Favorite book of all time: The Brothers Karamazov by Fyodor Dostoevsky

Jennifer Nou
Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law

Over the years, I’ve owned a Kindle alongside iPhones and iPads with Kindle apps on them. At first, I thought being able to get books immediately and not having to haul thick copies around would convert me. I was wrong; I still buy paper copies. I’m experimenting with audiobooks, but the Audible subscription I got a while ago has been good for road trips and not much else. There’s just something about dog-earring pages, scribbling notes in pencil.

My favorite genre is probably the memoir, followed closely by the biography. I love hearing people tell their own stories, in their own words: How do they perceive the events, both historic and mundane, that they’ve lived through? What are the details that only they could relate from firsthand experience? One of the best that I’ve read is Katharine Graham’s Personal History. I didn’t know that much about her before reading it, other than that she was the publisher of the Washington Post. But her story, spanning across almost eight decades, is about her complicated family relationships, her husband’s suicide, and her evolution from a housewife to the head of a major newspaper grappling with the Pentagon Papers and many other issues during her tenure. Throughout, she is admirably honest and candid.

More recently, I also really enjoyed Walter Isaacson’s Steve Jobs biography. Published so closely after Jobs’ death, it would have been understandable to whitewash much of his life. Instead, the biography also grapples with Jobs’ weaknesses and warts to present a fuller picture of someone it would be otherwise easy to mythologize. Finally, another one that stands out is David Sedaris’s Me Talk Pretty One Day. Sedaris is not only hilarious, but has such a unique voice and perspective on the most everyday things. Next on my list is probably Piper Kerman’s Orange Is the New Black—the show’s great, so the book must be too, right?

Reading now: Let the Great World Spin by Colum McCann
Best book in recent memory: Complications: A Surgeon’s Notes on an Imperfect Science by Atul Gawande
Favorite book of all time: The Brothers Karamazov by Fyodor Dostoevsky
although e-books and audio are slowly easing into the mix. I often read late (sometimes too late) into the night, a habit I probably picked up from my mother.

I just finished Colson Whitehead’s wry and self-deprecating *The Noble Hustle: Poker, Beef Jerky, and Death* about his adventure at the World Series of Poker main event. His style is ironic, satirical, and somewhat negative although humorous at the same time. I’ve also read and enjoyed a couple of his novels, *The Intuitionist* (a metaphorical fantasy about the first black female elevator inspector) and *John Henry Days* (an improvisational riff on the legendary folk hero).

**Just finished:** *The Noble Hustle: Poker, Beef Jerky, and Death* by Colson Whitehead

**Best book in recent memory:** *Malcolm X: A Life of Reinvention* by Manning Marable

**Favorite books of all time:** *Sula* by Toni Morrison, *A Lesson Before Dying* by Ernest Gaines, *Bud, Not Buddy* by Christopher Paul Curtis, and *The Known World* by Edward P. Jones

---

**Paul Woo**
**Director of the Office of Career Services**

I grew up near a library, so I have always had a tender spot for hardcover books. Virtually all of my books are hardcover (though I am picky about which authors I will buy and read); there is just such a connection to hold a page and turn it. I read mostly contemporary fiction but also enjoy a good nonfiction history book when the subject captures me—maritime and naval military history in particular. I do enjoy short-story collections immensely; my most admired author in this form is Raymond Carver. I only use digital formats when I’m faced with a long complex work so I can use the search function to remind myself of characters, places, and events (for example, *Infinite Jest* and *Game of Thrones*), yet I will still buy the hardcover for my library.

**Reading now:** *Cinematography: Theory and Practice* by Blain Brown

**Best book in recent memory:** *On Writing: A Memoir of the Craft* by Stephen King

**Favorite books of all time:** *Foundations of Economic Analysis* by Paul Samuelson and *The Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway

---

**Randolph Stone**
**Clinical Professor of Law, Criminal and Juvenile Justice Project**

I would describe my reading habits, outside of the professional context, as feast and famine. Sometimes, I am reading several books concurrently from a variety of genres including collected essays, history, biography, fiction, and occasional poetry. On the mystery/crime noir level, two of my favorites are Walter Mosley and George Pelecanos. At other times, I’m only reading and savoring criminal and juvenile justice legal and policy materials. For the most part, I’m still reading hardcover books and paper,
Remarks of Nancy A. Lieberman

Graduates, Parents, and Loved Ones, Dean Schill, Members of the Law School Faculty, and Honored Guests:

Before I begin this Commencement Address, I want to reflect on the loss we have all suffered due to the passing of Laura LaPlante and the injuries suffered by your classmate Michael Wasil due to a drunk driver. I would ask each graduate to do an act of public service this coming year, specifically, in Laura’s memory and to be there and help Michael to recover from the injuries he has sustained. It was the overwhelming help and love of my family, friends, and colleagues at work that gave me the strength and the will to surmount my injuries and, therefore, to be here today, and I hope you can do the same for Michael.
Being asked to give this Commencement Address is the greatest honor ever bestowed upon me, and I am absolutely thrilled to be here today to share this joyous occasion with the Class of 2014, their family and friends, and of course the wonderful faculty of the Law School.

First, I would like to speak directly to our graduates. No one just ends up at the University of Chicago Law School by accident. It takes an incredible amount of discipline and hard work to be admitted as students. So, if ever there were a time for you to luxuriate—today is that day. You have persevered, endured, and triumphed through three years of Socratic teaching and come out on the other end wiser, more competent, and ready to take on the world and make it a better place—and you will do just that!

As a first-year law student, I had a very difficult time dealing with the Socratic method of teaching—I could not understand how my terrific professors would speak English words, yet it was Greek to me. As a matter of fact, in my very first torts class with Professor Epstein during the first week of law school, I remember that he asked dozens of students what a tort was and no one seemed to have the right answer. I was mortified when he said to me, “Miss Lieberman … What is a tort?” I had no idea and simply blurted out, “well, it depends … strawberry or apple?” While the rest of the class burst out in laughter, to where I was sitting, handed me the chalk, and said in his wonderful voice “Miss Lieberman, here, you know so much about this subject, why don’t you teach the rest of the class?” It took me a while to figure out that Socratic teaching was perhaps the greatest gift the Law School gave me because it forced me to spot the issues and think on my feet—which are essential elements for success no matter what you do after law school. Often, I explain this phenomenon as analogous to a buzzer going off in the back of my head, and this signal causes me to automatically question and critically think about what I am dealing with at the moment. It is as though I possess a special power which enables me to dissect issues and solve problems. I’ll bet you thought lawyers like me just dropped from the sky, fully formed. Nothing could be further from the truth. Rather, Chicago formed me and you will grow to recognize over the years that it also shaped you!

But for now, as our latest graduates, it is both party time and parting time—which means going into the “real world” and leaving the cocoon of the Law School. At this moment, you must think and feel that this is your day, your celebration, and your chance to savor the moment and remember it for the rest of your lives.

I believe that few of our graduates would be here today receiving their degrees were it not for their family and friends in the audience who encouraged them to reach for the sky academically and intellectually—and by that I mean urging today’s graduates to study hard, stay focused, and remain curious about the world we live in. You have also provided our graduates with a comforting phone call or visit when college or law school seemed just too tough to endure, and so family members and friends here today deserve a special acknowledgment because you provided the “special ingredients” of compassion and love which enabled the Class of 2014 to flourish as they have done.
Now, I would like to talk to you about what I call, “the white elephant standing before you” in this magnificent Rockefeller Chapel. Of course, I am speaking about the wheelchair that I am sitting in because I am a quadriplegic. About 6 1/2 years ago, on Christmas Eve at 2007, I had a freak skiing accident in Colorado and broke my neck. It happened in an instant, but may stay with me the rest of my life. Truly, it is a weird condition to be in because you lose your independence, but you still have your brain power intact. Your mind says one thing, but virtually the rest of your body does something else.

People often tell me that I am courageous, inspirational, brave, heroic, and any other accolade you can imagine. What they are really saying is, “If this happened to me, I could not go on and I am amazed that you are able to do so.”

After hearing this several times, I thought to myself that I could either whine or drink wine and I decided that I would rather celebrate life and “drink wine.” When I was in the first stage of my recovery, I was visited from time to time by others who had had accidents that left them paralyzed. They had retired from their jobs and they rarely traveled away from their homes. Such visitors depressed and scared me to death but ultimately compelled me to do the reverse of what they were doing. There was no choice for me—I was going back to work, I was going to resume travel, and I was going to get back my life, no matter what effort it took.

At first blush, it was not so easy. I was told in the hospital that I would get back whatever feeling that was possible within the first six months of my accident. After that, I would have to live with what I had and should not expect more recovery.

Statistically, the numbers were not on my side. After five years, only about 20 percent of paralyzed adults go back to work. My goal was to go back to my merger and acquisitions practice at Skadden Arps full-time in one year after my accident. On January 19, 2009, I resumed my practice and was warmly welcomed back to Skadden. Several potential clients went elsewhere because I was not around to work on their matters. The economy was in shambles and clients were pulling in their horns and were working to keep above water in the “Great Recession.”

So, what should I do and how should I do it? Re-creating my law practice was the only option. In essence, I had to persevere and go back to basics.

I started calling my old clients every few weeks with any tidbits of information that might be relevant to their businesses. Without saying so, the point was made to them that I was back on top of things and ready to work. Eventually, a new potential client was introduced to me, and I was hired by the general counsel for a significant transaction. That experience buoyed my confidence. I was back on track and have gone on to advise on some of the most complex transactions of my career. There is a message here—no matter where you are in life, you can never rest on your laurels—whether it is a law degree from the University of Chicago Law School or being a senior partner at a major law firm like Skadden Arps—you must always be persistent and persevere and be prepared at any time to reinvent yourself, because you never know what obstacles you may have to confront.

Nothing must ever be taken for granted and you must never have any expectations that anything will be just handed over to you in the “real world.” But, you are eminently prepared because you are a Chicago graduate—with a special skill set—and by now you know what I mean by that.

While re-establishing my law practice, I became aware that New York State was reneging on its statutory obligation to allocate $8.5 million per year toward spinal cord injury research. Remarkable progress had been made toward finding a cure, and the funding cutoff by New York State was like ending a marathon at the 24-mile mark.

But, I realized that I could help make a difference given my Chicago education, perseverance, life experiences, and my belief that I had nothing to lose and much to gain. Combining that attitude along with a belief that the law was unequivocally on my side, I set out to right the wrongs being perpetuated.

Along with some of my colleagues at Skadden, I learned precisely how the law was supposed to work, as opposed to the specious rationale used to justify the cutoff in funding. We had drafted a complaint and were prepared to bring a pro bono lawsuit, if necessary.

As the only lawyer in an advocacy group founded with three others, I was charged with presenting our case
before numerous state legislators and their staff in Albany. Thinking on my feet—metaphorically, that is—I answered hardball questions. Turning the tables, I also asked our government officials a series of questions designed to elicit answers from them to prove the point that dedicated funding was being diverted for improper uses.

Sometimes I raised my voice, sometimes I lowered my booming voice, but never did I stop making my voice heard! This should sound familiar to our graduates and faculty, because all I really did was employ the lessons I learned here nearly four decades ago, beginning with that very first torts class I “experienced” with Professor Epstein.

This past April we succeeded in getting restoration of $7.9 million of funding—something unimaginable just a few months earlier. Without question, this was more satisfying to me than the most complex merger transaction. Remember—as Chicago graduates we get things done! I believe with all my heart that you will, in your own way, “get things done” and leave the world a much better place than you found it. My most sincere congratulations to the Class of 2014!
Remarks of Professor
Eric Posner

It’s an honor to be asked to give this commencement address. I thought I would start with a quotation from the former University of Chicago Law professor Antonin Scalia. This is from a case that the Supreme Court decided last year called Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad:

I join the judgment of the Court, and all of its opinion except Part I-A and some portions of the rest of the opinion going into fine details of molecular biology. I am unable to affirm those details on my own knowledge or even my own belief.

This very brief concurrence—I quoted nearly the whole thing—raised some eyebrows. If Scalia did not understand the facts of the case, how could he come to any conclusion at all?

Justice Scalia’s comment got me thinking about the role of complexity in law. And I’m particularly concerned with a narrower question of interest to you, which is, How should lawyers deal with complexity? This question is an important one because the complexity of technology and social organization seems to be advancing at an ever-greater rate. Yet if a topic is too complex for a judge to understand, then how is a lawyer to make arguments to a court?

To answer this question, I want to make a distinction between two types of legal questions. I will call the first type “hard” questions, and I will call the second type “superhard” questions. (I will ignore the easy questions.)

I asked my colleague Professor Will Baude to give me a hard legal question. Will teaches Federal Jurisdiction, which is a famously hard course. I thought that I could impress you by giving you a hard question from a hard course, and here it is:

“Is a federal court required to abstain from hearing a challenge to a state prosecution if the court has already issued a temporary restraining order, but not yet considered a request for a preliminary injunction, when a state prosecutor subsequently files a criminal case against the federal plaintiff?”

I didn’t ask Will why this is a hard question, but I suspect the answer is that the sources that one would
But that’s also the problem. While you will be able to answer this question, so will all the other lawyers at the law firm, or government office, or wherever else you end up practicing. As a lawyer, you won’t be able to distinguish yourself by being good at legal research and analysis. You must be able to do something more.

Now let me return to the Myriad case. Myriad was a biotech company that had discovered the location and sequence of two human genes, mutation of which increases the risk of breast cancer. One of the major issues in this case was whether something called complementary DNA, or cDNA, was patentable. The Supreme Court held that because Myriad constructed the cDNA, and the cDNA is not identical to DNA or any other naturally occurring substance, it is patentable. The problem with this argument is that cDNA contains exactly the same information as the corresponding segment of DNA, just with some noninformative junk removed.

It’s a bit like the difference between tap water and purified water; you can’t patent purified water. This doesn’t mean that the Court’s holding is wrong, just that the Court did not give adequate reasons. Scientists I have spoken to tell me that the Court just didn’t understand the science. And this was despite the fact that very fine lawyers argued the case, and the Court...
was assisted by amicus briefs submitted by scholars. I suspect that Scalia, in his characteristically mischievous way, was tweaking the majority by suggesting that they, too, did not understand all that impressive-sounding scientific jargon with which they larded the opinion.

So technology advances, and one point I would like to make is that the impact of technological advancement differs across professions. Technology has given doctors new tools for diagnosis and treatment that they lacked in the past, while the human body that they minister to has stayed the same. By contrast, aside from computer-assisted legal research—which has not changed in 30 years—technology has provided no new tools for lawyers. Meanwhile, the body that lawyers minister to consists of the whole range of commercial and personal relations and activities that make up our society. Because of technology, that body, the social and political body, unlike the human body, is constantly changing.

Let me give you one more example. Although many of you will never have a case involving genetics, virtually all of you will have a case involving finance.

One of the causes of the financial crisis was the development of newfangled financial instruments with exotic names like collateralized debt obligations or CDOs, credit default swaps, and so on. CDOs were constructed from mortgages, which had been securitized by investment banks and government agencies, and from other asset-backed securities like car loans. CDOs were so complex that not even the rating agencies could figure out how risky they were. And when asset prices began to fall, neither could the market. When the government launched its rescue, it too was hampered by the complexity of the instruments, which obscured the financial relationships between firms on the brink of insolvency.

The financial crisis spewed forth hundreds of lawsuits where all these issues need to be addressed. Just one of many recent examples is a lawsuit by the SEC against Goldman Sachs and one of its traders, Fabrice Tourre, now improbably a graduate student in our economics department. Tourre had put together a complex transaction known as a synthetic CDO that enabled a
client to bet that housing prices would decline. The jury
ruled against Goldman and Tourre, and I strongly suspect
that the reason was not that they had violated the law but
that the jury did not understand the transaction which,
while complex, was routine and almost certainly lawful.
I can’t explain to you now why I believe this, because the
explanation would be too complicated.

Now here is my question for you. If you go to work
next year, and your boss doesn’t give you the hard federal
jurisdiction question, but instead gives you a superhard
question, will you be able to answer it? If he asks you whether a substance similar to cDNA
but not the same as it is patentable, will you be able to
answer it? If he asks you whether the buyer of a CDO that
defaulted was harmed or not, will you know that in order to
answer this question, you will need to examine the buyer’s
portfolio in order to discover his hedging strategy? Will you
be able to determine whether he was in fact hedged?
I suspect that when you get questions like this, you’re
first impulse will not be to go to the law books, but to go
to Wikipedia. And that’s the right impulse. But Wikipedia
will not suffice. The problem is that you can’t answer the
genetics question unless you have a feel for genetics, and
you can’t answer the finance question unless you have a
feel for finance. To answer the superhard questions, you
need a technical background that most of you don’t have.
You can’t learn these things on the fly. You can’t fake it.
And yet clients expect lawyers to be able to answer
superhard questions and to explain those answers to judges
like Scalia who also don’t have any technical background and aren’t inclined to acquire one.

I wish I could tell you that there was an easy way to solve this problem. The Law School has supplied you with a flashlight and compass, so when you are dropped into a doctrinal thicket, you can find your way out. But some thickets are so dense that what you need to get out is not a flashlight but a chainsaw. Where are you going to get a chainsaw?

Lawyers try to rely on experts, but the problem with experts is that they make mistakes like everyone else and lawyers must be able to catch them. Lawyers also usually must decide whether to accept cases, and what litigation strategy to pursue, before they hire experts.

Nor is it realistic, or consistent with the spirit of this happy occasion, to advise you to go back to school and obtain a PhD in biochemistry, finance, or computer science. And actually I don’t think that would be a good idea even if it were practicable.

There is another way of thinking about this. Most of you excelled in college and chose law school not just because you sought a secure job or professional distinction or money. You came because you relished intellectual challenges and excitement.

My one message is that the end of law school does not spell the end of the intellectual challenges that you will face. Once you find yourself a niche in the profession, and even as you are working 10 or 12 hour days, you will discover that your education did not end in law school. And it will be up to you, on your own, to complete it. Thank you.
The Paperwork Paradigm

By Robin I. Mordfin

These days, shopping comes with a lot of paperwork. For decades we have expected to receive piles of documents when purchasing a house or even a car, but today even small buys such as phones and computers are accompanied by reams of paper filled with tiny print. Verizon iPhone users receive a 5,000-word agreement with their new gadgets, along with another 2,000-word license agreement from Apple. These long-winded disclosures are supposed to give shoppers all the information they need to make an informed decision about whether or not to go through with their purchase and about whether their rights or needs will be impinged on.

But, in reality, how many customers actually take a look at these documents? And of that handful of eager legalese readers, how many actually understand all the language, clauses and additions? According to Omri Ben-Shahar, Leo and Eileen Herzl Professor of Law, the number is very, very low and nearly irrelevant. And such paperwork is not providing any safety or assurances for buyers.

“Most people, even if they were willing to take the time and read all of these pages, wouldn’t understand what they were reading, as it requires much specialized knowledge that no one person can possess,” Ben-Shahar explained. “In banking and healthcare and other crucial areas, people need to make important decisions about extremely complex things, but we now know that the information given to them is doing very little to inform and affect their choices. If the goal was to give people information so that their decisions would be made well, this goal is not being met.”

In his new book, More than You Wanted to Know: The Failure of Mandated Disclosure, Ben-Shahar and coauthor Carl E. Schneider of the University of Michigan Law School argue that mandated disclosure is a panacea the government is using to solve every consumer problem. Each year, more and more regulations are passed that require businesses—including healthcare providers, mortgage brokers, phone companies, and automobile dealerships—to provide consumers with more and more information in the hope that this will allow them to make good decisions on their own. But mandated disclosure does not work, and because it is too often applied by lawmakers as the only potential response, no better protections for consumers are being developed.

“Sometimes a hard solution is the right solution. For example, doctors and other health professionals understand nowadays that there are no simple solutions to cure illnesses. You can’t just use bloodletting to cure everything. Once they understand that, they also understand that they have to go down a bumpy, difficult road to find a solution and that different problems require different solutions,” Ben-Shahar noted. “But in consumer protection right now, mandated disclosure is too often the one-size-fits-all solution. And it’s not working.”

First, he noted, if the government is going to step in, it should only enter the fray when there is truly a threat to consumers, such as when credit card companies were charging fees and interest rates that unfairly affected low- and middle-income cardholders. Consequently, Congress passed the Credit card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure (CARD) Act of 2009, which consisted of two parts. The first portion was business as usual, as it merely mandated new improved disclosure, requiring the credit card companies to put a new information box into each
The new box explains how paying a certain amount each month will pay off the balance in its entirety in three years and also shows how long it will take, and how much it will cost, to pay off the same balance if only the minimum is paid. This portion of the act was intended to nudge borrowers to pay off more of their loans more quickly.

The second portion of the bill enacted a reform with more bite: it established hard-line prohibitions against different kinds of interest-rate increases and against exorbitant finance charges and late fees. The CARD Act capped the fees and controlled costs and prices.

“This is something we don’t do very often in America, because we are not usually interested in regulating prices,” Ben-Shahar said. “But research by economists and by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shows that it worked. It has been four, five years since the act was passed, and published estimates show that there has been an enormous annual decrease, of roughly $20 billion in fees, that are paid by low- and middle-income borrowers. This is a huge redistribution away from creditors that were making profits that are relatively high, toward poor people.”

And what about the disclosure element of the CARD act? Like other disclosures, it has had a miniscule effect. It is now estimated that it prompted borrowers to pay early only in a small number cases, aggregately saving them about $70 million per year, “probably less than the cost of printing all these disclosures and mailing them to people,” said Ben-Shahar.

“This is an example of what the government can do other than disclosure. I don’t think that in all markets the
government should regulate prices, but when they identify a true market failure, regulation with clear boundaries makes a difference. Of course, as with any regulation, there should be cost-benefit analysis, and—as my colleague Jennifer Nou has recently suggested—data should be collected four or five years after the interventions and should be analyzed to make sure the right path has been followed. But it is important to remember that it is okay for the government to enact real prohibitions,” Ben-Shahar advised.

“This is an example of what the government can do other than disclosure. I don’t think that in all markets the government should regulate prices, but when they identify a true market failure, regulation with clear boundaries makes a difference.”

But when there is no overwhelming threat, Ben-Shahar thinks we should remove mandated disclosure because it doesn’t work and not replace it with anything at all because competition can take care of many problems and generate methods of informing consumers that are more effective.

An example he cites for unnecessary consumer protection are the now very popular laws that were recently passed in the European Union and in China that create a mandatory right to withdraw. These acts ensure that any agreements that customers enter into that do not take place in physical stores but instead are made online, by phone or by mail, can be negated by the purchaser within two weeks. The world press has uniformly hailed these acts as key to consumer well-being. But here in the U.S., Ben-Shahar pointed out, we do not have a general right to withdraw.

“Now the question is, do we need a mandatory right to withdraw? My answer is no,” Ben-Shahar said. “People here shop at Target or at Walmart and without any intervention of law, they are offered a right of return, not for two weeks, but for 90 days! Why? Because consumers demand it and it’s good business for retailers to offer it. And unlike the European law, you need less documentation. In some cases, you don’t even need a receipt, you just need a tag, and they take it back. We even have some stores in this country that will take back items indefinitely because they believe that such a policy demonstrates the high quality of their merchandise. This is what competition gives you.”

Consumer ratings are another way in which buyers can protect themselves against bad purchases without government intervention, Ben-Shahar pointed out. Readers on Amazon.com, for example, can look at the five-point rating that previous purchasers have left as evaluations to determine if buying is the right decision.

“Unlike mandated disclosure, ratings give people information that they want and can use. People really want to know how the entire purchase will make them feel. Will they be satisfied, will they regret it, and will they prefer something else? The endless terms in an agreement do not outweigh their interests in owning a new phone. So what better way to predict our satisfaction than to look at the aggregate feedback of past consumers,” he explained.

Clearly, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to consumer protection, and not every situation requires an intervention. But when firms engage in practices that are harmful to consumers or dangerous to customers, then steps must be taken by the government. But like human diseases, every challenge requires its own solution, and such solutions do not come easily.

“Whatever you do, it has to be something other than disclosing to consumers and leaving them to decide on their own,” Ben-Shahar said. “With the information lawmakers are giving them they cannot do it on their own, and it is causing more harm than good.”
NEW FACULTY PROFILES

Bigelow Fellow Adam Chilton Joins Faculty

International law scholar Adam Chilton is the latest Bigelow Fellow to join the Law School faculty. Chilton, who already has published several papers, was described by colleagues as full of potential, and he called being on the faculty of the Law School his “dream job.”

“I feel incredibly lucky. Being a law professor is amazing, because you get to ask the most important questions for a living, and being at Chicago is ideal for me because I’ve long believed that finding an answer to those important questions requires an interdisciplinary approach,” Chilton said. “I don’t know of any other institution that is as committed to critically thinking through important legal and social problems or that is more receptive to the idea that we should use the best methods we can find to do so.”

Professor Jonathan Masur, part of the appointments committee that hired Chilton, said he fills an important role at the Law School. “We have been hoping to hire a scholar and teacher of international trade law for a few years. In Adam, we believe we’ve found the person we’re looking for. We are excited to have him as a colleague, and we’re confident that students interested in international law will benefit tremendously from having him in the classroom.”

Professors Daniel Abebe and Anthony Casey, former Bigelows themselves, oversaw the fellowship program for new academics for the last two years. They said Chilton has “an excellent combination of strong empirical skills and a deep interest in international law, immigration law, and international trade. His teaching and research interests will make him a great asset to our students.”

Chilton has three degrees from Harvard University: a JD (2013), a PhD in Political Science (2013), and an AM in Political Science (2012). In 2007, he earned both a BA and an MA in Political Science from Yale University. From 2007 to 2009, he worked as an associate in the Washington office of the Boston Consulting Group. In that role, he worked for large corporations trying to make strategic business decisions. Much of his time was spent working to financially model the economic consequences of his clients’ options.

Chilton describes his research interests as the intersection of empirical legal studies and international law. He studies issues such as the ways that political considerations affect the United States’ international trade and investment policy, when countries comply with the laws of war, the comparative competency of the executive and judicial branches in foreign relations law, and how experimental methods can be used to study whether domestic politics influence compliance with international law.

Chilton’s work has appeared in the Chicago Journal of International Law, the Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, the University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law, the Columbia Journal of Tax Law, and the Intercultural Human Rights Law Review.


Over the summer, he published an article on Slate with Professor Eric Posner and Kevin Jiang, a research assistant at the Law School’s Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics. The piece was a data analysis of the vocabulary of Supreme Court justices versus rappers and Shakespeare. “Who Uses a Bigger Vocabulary, Jay Z or Scalia?” revealed that Justice Antonin Scalia uses a larger vocabulary than both Shakespeare and Jay Z, although all three of them beat five other current justices.

Chilton is the recipient of several awards, research grants, and fellowships. While at Harvard Law School, he earned the Addison Brown Prize for best paper in private international law, the Certificate for Distinction in Teaching (for his service as a teaching fellow), the Harvard Law School Summer Academic Fellowship three years in a row, and the Laylin Prize for best paper in public international law, among other honors.

While studying at Harvard, he was the Graduate Student Associate in the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs and the Graduate Student Affiliate in the Institute for Quantitative Social Science.

“Adam Chilton is an incredibly impressive young scholar and teacher,” Dean Michael Schill said. “Like many of our former Bigelow Fellows, he impressed us tremendously and already has an enviable record of publications. I am thrilled he has permanently joined our faculty.”
Law School Gains Renowned Tax Scholar

Dhammika Dharmapala, an expert in tax policy and law and economics, joined the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School this fall. Dharmapala was most recently on the faculty at the University of Illinois College of Law, where he has been since 2009. He visited at the Law School in the Winter and Spring of 2014. “Dhammika adds a huge dimension to our faculty,” said Michael Schill, Dean and Harry N. Wyatt Professor of Law. “His scholarship on taxation, corporate law, and public finance is exceptional and is regularly published in the nation’s leading economics and finance journals. He will contribute mightily to our intellectual activities and to our law and economics and Doctoroff Business Leadership programs.”

Professor Dharmapala is a leading authority in tax policy, public economics, and law and economics. His most recent work has sought to use quasi-experimental empirical methods to analyze the consequences of tax law and securities law. “Chicago will be an ideal place to pursue this agenda because of the breadth and depth of faculty expertise in empirical methods as well as in these substantive fields,” said Dharmapala. “During my visit here last year, I found that the Law School provides a rigorous yet supportive environment for developing and refining scholarship.” He joins a group of tax scholars that includes Julie Roin and David Weisbach, which Dean Schill says “constitutes the most formidable tax faculty in the nation.”

“I am delighted to be joining the faculty,” said Dharmapala. “My scholarship is focused on the areas of taxation and the economic analysis of law. In both of these areas, the University of Chicago Law School has been the home of scholars who made fundamental early contributions that continue to shape the way we approach the fields today—for instance, Ronald Coase in the economic analysis of law and Henry Simons in taxation.”

Dharmapala is currently an International Research Fellow of the Oxford University Centre for Business Taxation and a Fellow of the CESifo Research Network (based in Munich). Prior to Illinois, Dharmapala taught at the University of Connecticut in the department of economics. He was a postdoctoral fellow at Harvard University and a John M. Olin Visiting Fellow in Law and Economics at Georgetown University Law Center. Professor Dharmapala earned his master’s degree in economics from the University of Western Australia and his PhD in economics from the University of California, Berkeley. His PhD thesis was awarded the National Tax Association’s Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Award.

“We are very fortunate and very excited to hire such a brilliant tax scholar as Dhammika Dharmapala,” said Professor Richard McAdams, Bernard D. Meltzer Professor of Law, who cochaired the Appointments Committee that hired Dharmapala. “He is an excellent economist specializing in tax and corporate finance, with an extremely impressive record publishing in the best peer-reviewed journals. He was very well received by the students in his classes last year.”

In the upcoming school year, Dharmapala is excited to be teaching courses in Introductory Income Taxation and Corporate Finance. “During my visit, I found the students in my classes to be remarkably motivated and engaged, with a deep interest in the world of ideas,” he said. Dharmapala says that his Corporate Finance course teaches concepts that are essential to understanding modern corporate transactions and to enabling lawyers to structure transactions in ways that achieve particular business objectives. He will also offer a seminar on Corporate Governance in Emerging Markets. This seminar provides an overview of recent developments and scholarship relating to corporate governance in the context of developing and transitional economies, which he said is “an increasingly important area of both scholarship and practice.”

Fellow tax expert David Weisbach, Walter J. Blum Professor of Law, is delighted to gain Dharmapala as a colleague. “Dhammika is a superstar, and we are incredibly lucky to have him join our faculty,” said Weisbach. “He is not only one of the top tax scholars in the country; his work on the intersection of taxation and corporate finance also makes him one of the best corporate law scholars, and his work in law and economics puts him at the top of that field as well. Having a scholar of his caliber at Chicago will make an immediate impact.”
Law School Nabs Rising Star of Constitutional Law

Constitutional law and theory scholar Justin Driver has joined the Law School faculty, a hiring coup that was celebrated across the faculty.

Driver, who also studies and writes on the intersection of race and legal institutions, joined the faculty in July as Professor of Constitutional law and theory scholar Justin Driver has joined the Law School faculty, a hiring coup that was celebrated across the faculty.

I am delighted that we have been able to add a scholar and teacher of his caliber to our great faculty.”

Michael Schill said. “Since the moment he left Chicago to return to Texas, my mission has been to get him to return. I am delighted that we have been able to add a scholar and teacher of his caliber to our great faculty.”

Professor Jonathan Masur agreed. He served with Professors Lee Fennell and Richard McAdams on the appointments committee that helped to recruit Driver.

“He is already highly regarded, and yet his best work is almost surely in front of him,” Masur said. “Justin is also a fabulous and beloved teacher who will be a great mentor to students. Hiring him makes the Law School stronger along every conceivable dimension.”

Fennell added that Driver has a “remarkable eye for interesting topics” and McAdams called him an “exciting young voice in American constitutional law and the legal history of race.” Professor Martha Nussbaum, who invited Driver to present at her annual Law and Literature Conference, said he will be a “lovely presence in our interdisciplinary efforts.”

Driver describes his work as taking “a historically inflected approach to examining constitutional law.” Much of his scholarship scrutinizes the Supreme Court’s ability to issue decisions that clash with majoritarian views. His important scholarship includes “The Consensus Constitution,” which critiqued the notion that the Court almost always interprets the Constitution in a way that reflects the views of the American people (Texas Law Review, 2011). In 2012, he published “Recognizing Race” in the Columbia Law Review, examining the question of when judges should and should not identify the race of individuals in a case while writing opinions. He also is the author of an article recently published in the University of Chicago Law Review, “Constitutional Outliers,” which analyzes the Supreme Court’s invalidation of statutes found in a very small number of jurisdictions, something constitutional scholars frequently call “outliers.”

In two separate works this year in the Yale Law Journal and the Texas Law Review, Driver examined the Civil Rights Revolution of the 1950s and 1960s from the perspective of those typically understood to be the “losers” of that movement.

Historical writing is clearly a strength of Driver’s; he was awarded the Cromwell Article Prize from the American Society for Legal History for “The Constitutional Conservatism of the Warren Court,” which appeared in the California Law Review in 2012.

Driver also writes for the popular press, most commonly the New Republic, where he is a contributing editor. He also has been published on Slate and in the Washington Post.

He earned his JD in 2004 from Harvard Law School, where he held various leadership positions on the Harvard Law Review. Before law school, he earned a Master of Studies in Modern History as a Marshall Scholar at Oxford University’s Magdalen College. He holds a Master of Arts in Teaching from Duke University and a Bachelor of Arts in Public Policy from Brown University.

Driver clerked for Supreme Court Justices Sandra Day O’Connor and Stephen Breyer, as well as Judge Merrick B. Garland of the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. He spent two years as an associate at Sidley Austin in Washington, DC.

In February, Driver visited the Law School to present at the Crime in Law and Literature conference. His paper explored Justice Clarence Thomas’s relationship to Bigger Thomas, the protagonist of Richard Wright’s Native Son.

Driver said he’s “simply thrilled” to be at the Law School full-time. This year, he’s going to teach Constitutional Law I and III and a seminar called “Law and Race.”

“I had extremely high expectations when I visited Chicago in autumn of 2012. Along every relevant dimension, the institution not only met, but somehow managed to surpass, those expectations. The law students are unusually engaged, incisive, and rigorous in their thinking,” he said. “And the faculty’s strong culture of interaction and collaboration, along with its genuine connections to the wider University, enable the law school to occupy an exalted position within legal academia.”
FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP 2013-2014

DANIEL ABEBE
Professor of Law and Walter Mander Teaching Scholar
Three Essays on the Significance of International Relations Theory for Domestic Institutional Design (University of Chicago, Division of the Social Sciences, Department of Political Science, 2013).

CLIFFORD ANDO
David B. and Clara E. Stern Professor; Professor of Classics, History and the Law School and Co-Director of the Center for the Study of Ancient Religions

ALBERT ALSCHULER
Julius Kreer Professor Emeritus of Law and Criminology

DOUGLAS G. BAIRD
Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law

WILLIAM BAUDE
Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law
OMRI BEN-SHAHAR
Leo and Eileen Herzl Professor of Law and Kearney Director of the Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics


“Love Your Frequent-Flier Miles? Let It Go,” Bloomberg View, June 12, 2014 (with Oren Bar-Gill).


LISA BERNSTEIN
Wilson-Dickinson Professor of Law


DIPESH CHAKRABARTY
Lawrence A. Kimpton Distinguished Service Professor, History, South Asian Languages and Civilizations, and the Law School


ANTHONY CASEY
Assistant Professor of Law


MARY ANNE CASE
Arnold I. Shure Professor of Law


ADAM S. CHILTON
Assistant Professor of Law


ZACHARY CLOPTON
Instructor in Law and Public Law Fellow


RICHARD A. EPSTEIN
James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Law and Senior Lecturer


“The Irrelevance of the First Amendment to the Modern Regulation of the Internet,” Icarus 14 (Fall 2013).


“Saving Federalism,” 20 National Affairs 3 (Summer 2014) (with Mario Loyola).


“Afghanistan’s Constitution at Ten,” ForeignPolicy.com, March 2014 (with Aziz Huq).


JAMES J. HECKMAN
Henry Schultz Distinguished Service Professor, Economics and the Law School


“Reconceptualizing Corporate Boards,” Regulation, Fall 2013, at p.28.


DENNIS J. HUTCHINSON

Senior Lecturer in Law and William Rainey Harper Professor in the College, Master of the New Collegiate Division, and Associate Dean of the College


ELIZABETH KREGOR

Lecturer in Law and Director of The Institute for Justice Clinic on Entrepreneurship


ALISON LACROIX

Professor of Law, Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Teaching Scholar, and Associate Member, Department of History


“Why the Supreme Court Should Stop Fetishizing Dictionaries and Start Caring About Words,” Balkinization, June 21, 2014 (with Jason Merchant).

WILLIAM M. LANDES

Clifton R. Musser Professor Emeritus of Law and Economics, and Senior Lecturer


BRIAN LEITER

Karl N. Llewellyn Professor of Jurisprudence and Director, Center for Law, Philosophy, and Human Values


STEVEN LEVITT

William B. Ogden Distinguished Service Professor, Economics and the Law School


LYONETTE LOUIS-JACQUES
Foreign and International Law Librarian and Lecturer in Law

SAUL LEVMORE
William B. Graham Distinguished Service Professor of Law


JOHN LIST
Homer J. Livingston Professor, Economics and the Law School

ANUP MALANI
Lee and Brena Freeman Professor of Law


“BIT by BIT,” *Slaw*, May 9, 2014.


JONATHAN MASUR
John P. Wilson Professor of Law and David and Celia Hilliard Research Scholar


RICHARD H. MCADAMS
Bernard D. Meltzer Professor of Law and Aaron Director Research Scholar
Fairness in Law and Economics (Edward Elgar, 2013) (edited with Lee Anne Fennell).

THOMAS J. MILES
Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics and Walter Mander Research Scholar

JENNIFER NOU
Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law

MARTHA NUSSBAUM
Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics

“‘Si tou pouvais voir ce cœur’: la clémence de Mozart/’Als je dit hart kon zien’: Mozarts clementie,” in La Clemenza di Tito (program book) (Belgian National Opera/De Munt, 2013) (Original English entitled “If You Could See This Heart’: Mozart’s Mercy.”)
ERIC POSNER
Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law


“Inside or Outside the System?,” 80 University of Chicago Law Review 1743 (2013) (with Adrian Vermeule).


RICHARD A. POSNER
Senior Lecturer in Law

El pequeño libro del plagio (El Hombre del Tres), 2013.


NICHOLAS STEPHANOPoulos
Assistant Professor of Law
The Roads to Same-Sex Marriage,” Huffington Post, January 9, 2014.
The South After Shelby County,” 2013 Supreme Court Review 55 (2014).

GEOFFREY R. STONE
Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law
Behavior of Supreme Court Justices When Their Behavior Counts the Most: An Informal Study,” 97 Judicature 82 (2013).
The Death of DOMA,” The Indian Express, July 2, 2013.
The Difference between Conservative and Liberal Justices,” Huffington Post, November 4, 2013.

The United States Has a Deficit Problem that Threatens Its Future,” in Government Spending (Greenhaven Press, 2013).

NORTON, 2014).
Readings in American Politics: Analysis and Perspectives, Ken Kollman, ed. (2nd ed.) (W.W.

JULIE ROIN
Seymour Logan Professor of Law

GERALD ROSENBERG
Associate Professor of Political Science and Lecturer in Law


LIOR STRAHILEVITZ
Sidley Austin Professor of Law
“How Many Years of Famine to Follow Seven Years of Feasting for VAPs?,” PrawfsBlawg, April 23, 2013.
“The iPhone, not the Eye, is the Window into the Soul,” PrawfsBlawg, March 6, 2013.

DAVID A. STRAUSS
Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

MARK N. TEMPLETON
Assistant Clinical Professor of Law and Director, Abrams Environmental Law Clinic

DAVID A. WEISBACH
Walter J. Blum Professor of Law and Senior Fellow, the Computation Institute of the University of Chicago and Argonne National Laboratory

E. GLEN WEYL
Assistant Professor in Economics and the College, Associate Member, Law School

Diane P. Wood
Senior Lecturer in Law
Dear University of Chicago Alumni,

It is my distinct pleasure to serve as your new Associate Dean for External Affairs. I returned last May to the school where I started my career in higher education under the deanships of Geof Stone and Douglas Baird. In the intervening years, as Assistant Dean first at Northwestern Law and most recently for six years at Loyola University Chicago School of Law, I have deepened my knowledge of legal education and the many essential ways in which alumni strengthen their schools by sharing their career expertise, peer networks, volunteer leadership, and financial support.

It has been a thrill to see that our Chicago Law intellectual environment is as stimulating as ever, the academic offerings enriched and expanded, and our students achieving in astounding measure. More than 55 percent of our alumni were involved over the academic year ending June 30, either as event attendees, donors, or volunteers. Record reunion-year giving (see article below), a strong Firm Challenge, and enthusiastic student Class Gift donations fueled our Annual Fund result of $4.4 million, while overall giving totaled an impressive $34 million. In these pages, you will read about several new philanthropic gifts that will have lasting impact for our students in the areas of entrepreneurship, public interest, and business law. Under the dynamic leadership of Dean Michael Schill, we are poised to join the university in launching the public phase of our campaign on October 29. I hope you will be as inspired as I am by these alumni and consider your own way of participating.

My colleagues in External Affairs are constantly on the move to visit with you on campus, in Chicago, around the nation, and even internationally. We appreciate your advice, support, and tremendous good will in partnering with us, and I look forward to meeting many of you in person over the coming year.

Warmest regards,
Annina Fabbioli
Associate Dean

---

Reunion

The Law School welcomed nearly 900 alumni and friends back to campus for Reunion Weekend 2014. More than $4.5 million was raised by the Reunion Classes to support the Law School Annual Fund, student scholarship aid, faculty research, Public Interest Fellowships, and the clinics. None of this success would have been possible without the hard work and efforts of the Reunion Chairs and several hundred Committee Members who worked tirelessly over the course of the year. Thank you so much to everyone who made Reunion 2014 such an incredible success!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reunion Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Kraemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Orschel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Shapiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Delchaney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Michael Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Rooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Schichtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Bronson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank You Reunion 2014 Classes!

Reunion Class Year Participation Rate Total Cash and Pledges Raised
A Gift from Entrepreneurs to Support Entrepreneurs

A gift from Leslie Bluhm, ’89, and her husband David Helfand has further strengthened the Law School’s already-extensive business and entrepreneurship training for its students.

The gift provides funding for a clinical fellow who will supervise law students interested in start-ups and other entrepreneurial activity and will facilitate students’ participation with entrepreneurial groups in programs elsewhere on the university campus, particularly at the Booth School of Business. Mr. Helfand, who is copresident of Equity Group Investments, earned his business degree from the Booth School.

The Bluhm/Helfand fellowship complements other recent additions to the Law School’s business-related programming, including the Doctoroff Business Leadership Program, the Scott and Kathleen Kapnick Leadership and Professionalism Initiative, and the Corporate Lab.

Dean Michael Schill observes, “Our students increasingly want to use their legal, business, and analytical skills to create and collaborate on new ventures. This generous gift, from two donors who are exemplary entrepreneurs in their own fields, enables us to provide our students with the hands-on experience and seasoned guidance that will help them achieve their own entrepreneurial goals.”

Leslie Bluhm’s entrepreneurial venture, Chicago Cares, arose from the intersection between a passion of hers and an unmet need. An avid volunteer as she was growing up, she continued volunteering while she was at the Law School and then when she was an associate at Skadden Arps in New York. When she returned to Chicago in 1991, she was surprised to see that many of her friends and colleagues were not volunteering. “They didn’t know where to turn to find the right opportunities,” she said, “and they were afraid of becoming overcommitted, given their very busy lives.”

Chicago Cares—which is now the largest organization of its kind in the Midwest—creates impactful, hands-on volunteer experiences connecting people, communities, and causes. It is the only nonprofit that addresses needs across the full spectrum—from hunger to education to job readiness—through innovative team volunteer efforts. In the process, the organization empowers people to lead, creates links between neighborhoods, and seeks to transform the city for good. Since its founding in 1991, Chicago Cares has mobilized more than 500,000 volunteers through its programming.

Bluhm also designed an innovative financing method for Chicago Cares: roughly 75 percent of the organization’s income is derived from donations to its Corporate Volunteer Program, which creates customized, hands-on group volunteer projects that are consistent with companies’ team building, leadership development, and philanthropy initiatives.

Although she passed the day-to-day leadership of Chicago Cares to a new executive director a few years ago, Bluhm is still actively involved in the organization’s initiatives, such as the Student Service and Leadership Program. The Chicago Public School students in that program identify critical needs in their communities and then create and implement hands-on service projects that respond to those needs.

Ms. Bluhm and Mr. Helfand have acted to encourage new thinking outside the Law School, too. In 2011 they created the Bluhm/Helfand Social Innovation Fellowship, which provides socially minded innovators, entrepreneurs, and change agents under the age of 35 with exposure to nationally recognized business and community leaders, funding to support their causes, and a platform for growth.

Bluhm sees the new fellowship at the Law School as an apt commemoration of the past as well as an important contribution toward the future. “David and I met when we were in the same business law class at the Law School, so this fellowship, which will further strengthen ties between law students and their counterparts in the business school, seems particularly fitting. It’s a way for us to show our appreciation for the educations we received and the opportunities we were able to pursue as a result, and I know it will also help create future generations of entrepreneurs and advisors who will change our world for the better.”
Public Interest Fellowship Frees Students to Choose Career Path

Barbara J. Fried (née Vogelfanger), ’57, AB’54, has created the Mark and Barbara Fried Fund for Public Interest in the Law School. Her gift endows a one-year public interest fellowship for a Law School graduate and provides support for a second such fellowship. It is part of a larger gift to the University from Mrs. Fried, through which the College also receives funding that will be used to support internships, programming, and staffing to promote public interest careers.

Mrs. Fried’s husband, Mark Fried, ’56, passed away in 2010. They met while he was a student at the Law School and she was an undergraduate in the College, and they married shortly after she graduated. They practiced law together for twenty years before they created the Virginia-based real estate business Fried Companies.

One reason for her gift, Mrs. Fried says, is that career decisions today are not what they once were: “In my day, things were pretty much mapped out and you followed the prescribed plan, but today’s young people are much more flexible in their decisions about life and work, and perhaps more determined to find meaning, direction, and purpose as quickly as possible. Debt can interfere with freely choosing a path, so these fellowships let Law School graduates try out public interest work, to see whether they find a real vocation there. I’m confident that many will, and our society will be better for it.”

Together, Mr. and Mrs. Fried served the public interest in many ways. They cofounded Innisfree Village, a residential community for developmentally disabled adults; created a therapeutic horseback riding program for children and adults with physical and mental disabilities; organized a coalition of Virginia dentists to serve uninsured patients; and helped start a scholarship program for foster children who attend community college. They served under both Democratic and Republican governors to make housing more affordable for all Virginians and held leadership positions in dozens of local charitable organizations throughout the state.

Mrs. Fried currently chairs the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities, serves on the Board of Visitors at the University of Virginia, is emeritus chair of the Sorensen Institute for Political Leadership at the University of Virginia, and is an emeritus trustee of the George Mason University Foundation. Mr. Fried served as a director or trustee or organizations that included the George Mason University Foundation and the Virginia Community College Foundation.

“Barbara and Mark Fried epitomize what is great about the University of Chicago Law School,” says Dean Michael Schill. “They took their educations and became great entrepreneurs and philanthropists. Barbara’s dedication to the world of public affairs is inspiring. I am so pleased that she has taken a leadership role in supporting our efforts to train lawyers who will take on some of the world’s greatest problems and challenges.”

Both Mr. and Mrs. Fried served on the Law School’s Visiting Committee. In 2007, they endowed the Mark and Barbara Fried Professorship at the Law School, which has been held by Emily Buss since its inception. At the time that gift was made, Mr. Fried said, “We wanted to support the work of a faculty member dealing with important social issues, and Professor Buss fits that description.”

“The Law School—and for me, the College, too—opened many opportunities for Mark and me, and enriched the quality of our lives in so many ways,” Mrs. Fried says. “We have been happy to give back; it would be ungrateful not to. Now that our five grandchildren are in various stages of their own educations, I only hope that they will be as fortunate as Mark and I were. And if they are also lucky enough, as we were, to meet the person they want to spend their lives with, that will be a wonderful bonus.”
New Named Visiting Professorship for Doctoroff Program

Gifts from Thomas Cole, ’75, and the Sidley Austin Foundation have created the Thomas A. Cole–Sidley Austin Distinguished Visiting Professorship in Business Law.

The professorship adds another prominent faculty presence within the Law School’s Doctoroff Business Leadership Program. It is held this year by Steven Kaplan, who has served on the faculty of the Booth School of Business since 1988 and has also been the faculty director of the Booth School’s Polsky Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation. Kaplan, who has taught at the Law School twice before, will teach entrepreneurial finance.

Thomas Cole, a Sidley Austin partner, stepped down last year as chair of the firm’s executive committee after 15 years in that position. Cole’s practice has focused on public company mergers and acquisitions and corporate governance. He has been involved in scores of notable transactions, including more than 35 mergers and spin-offs valued at more than a billion dollars each. He says: “I came to the Law School wanting to be a corporate lawyer, without understanding what that really meant. I learned what it meant from a great faculty, and none greater than Walter Blum—any class he taught, I took. I’ll be grateful to him forever.”

Cole joined Sidley right out of law school. Seven years later, having become a partner, he also became (while retaining his partnership role at Sidley) vice president for law at Chicago-based Northwest Industries, then a Fortune 100 conglomerate. He held that position for three years. “At a relatively young age,” Cole recalls, “I got to see first-hand how CEOs, general counsel, and boards looked at legal issues and made decisions. That experience was formative, enabling me to initiate the M&A practice when I returned full-time to Sidley in 1985, and also informing my corporate governance practice, which is transactionally oriented, focusing on how boards make decisions.”

Last year, Cole resumed teaching the corporate governance seminar at the Law School that he led for six years in the 1990s but then had to set aside because of his firm leadership responsibilities. “I’m very happy to be back teaching at this school that I so love and admire,” he says.

Cole has served five terms on the Law School’s Visiting Committee, has been a member of the Law School Business Advisory Council since its formation, and has served as a volunteer at many reunions. He is a trustee of the University of Chicago, and he recently retired from the board of Northwestern Memorial Healthcare after twenty years of service, including a term as board chair.

Carter Phillips, who succeeded Cole as Sidley’s executive committee chair, says, “Tom helped manage our law firm through unprecedented growth and prosperity. In searching for a meaningful way to recognize his contributions to the firm, we could identify no better way to do that than to contribute to a professorship at the University of Chicago Law School, which has been and still is such an important part of Tom’s professional life.”

This is the second professorship to carry the Sidley Austin name. Lior Strahilevitz has been Sidley Austin Professor of Law since that chair was established in 2011.

Dean Schill observes: “Tom Cole has for decades been the gold standard in American corporate law and he has also been one of the Law School’s greatest supporters and advocates. Sidley has for years enjoyed a special relationship with the Law School. More of our graduates are attorneys at Sidley than at any other law firm in the nation. I couldn’t be happier and prouder than to have a professorship named after Tom and the firm that will honor both in perpetuity.”
1934
Roland C. Matthies
April 3, 2014
Matthies, 103, of Springfield, Ohio, served as vice president of Wittenberg University from 1954 to 1975, raising millions of dollars for the school’s endowment funds. A specialist in deferred giving, Matthies began as business manager of the school’s then-new US Army Air Cadet Training Program during World War II and was named treasurer of Wittenberg in 1945; after retirement, he continued to serve on the school’s board of trustees until 1988. Matthies served as head of his ROTC unit at DePaul University and was commissioned second lieutenant in the US Army upon graduation, but asthma kept him from active duty. During his working years, Matthies served as an expert on charitable deferred giving and on taxation as it affects philanthropy. He was a musician, serving as a founding member of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra, where he played violin, and as a bass vocalist in the acclaimed Swift and Company Male Chorus and the East Chicago Male chorus. Matthies also was active regionally and nationally in the Lutheran Church.

1948
Philip Baum
March 27, 2014
Baum, 94, spent more than a half century working at the American Jewish Congress, rising to executive director from the mid-1990s until 2001. Baum was remembered by Jerome Chanes in the New York Jewish Week as having “exemplified the organization. Brilliant, idiosyncratic, passionate about social justice and Israel and captive Jewish communities, he was shaped by, and in his more than 50 years there helped shape, AJCongress in the second half of the 20th century.” Baum wrote the first memo making the legal case that Israel constituted a state under international law and another memorandum arguing in favor of Israel’s jurisdiction in the capture of Adolf Eichmann. Stateside, Baum was closely involved in the crafting of dozens of briefs to the US Supreme Court on church-state, civil liberties, and civil rights. While managing international affairs for AJCongress, Baum “truly made his mark,” Chanes wrote. “His five-decade tenure was one of major change in the Jewish public affairs arena nationally and around the globe. He had perfect pitch for the issues and, equally important, for the complex, indeed arcane, dynamics of the organizational structures of the Jewish community.”

1951
Hubert E. Hermanek Sr.
July 2, 2013
Hermanek, 84, of Riverside, Illinois, served in the US Marines during the Korean War in the Judge Advocate General’s Corps. He then had a long career as a trial lawyer handling personal injury cases, and 20 years ago he joined the firm of his son, Hubert Hermanek Jr., where he worked until two months before his death. Hermanek also served in the Riverside Auxiliary Police Corps for more than 30 years, retiring at the rank of captain. “He just absolutely loved it,” his son, Hubert Hermanek Jr., told the Riverside-Brookfield Landmark. “His two loves were being an auxiliary police officer and being a lawyer. He never took vacations. … My dad had a very good, full life.”
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and US Supreme Courts, and Justice Hugo Black, comparing Anastaplo to Clarence Darrow and other brave lawyers, wrote a dissenting opinion famously asserting, “We must not be afraid to be free.” While the case was under appeal, Anastaplo worked on his doctorate in the Committee on Social Thought, and in 1957, he joined the faculty of the Basic Program of Liberal Education for Adults and continued to teach until December 2013. He also taught at Dominican University (then Rosary College) and later at the Loyola University School of Law. Anastaplo wrote scores of books and hundreds of articles on subjects such as political science, philosophy, religion, and classic literature. In 2005, he was the inaugural recipient of the Graham School’s Excellence in Teaching Award and received the school’s Distinguished Service Award in 2012.

1952
Thomas W. Yoder
April 2, 2014
Yoder, 86, spent several decades with a general practice firm in Fort Wayne, Indiana, then known as Livingston, Dildine, Haynie & Yoder (now Carson Boxberger, LLP). A US Army Air Force World War II veteran, Yoder practiced as a trial lawyer handling both insurance defense litigation and public utility law for such clients as Farm Bureau Insurance, Norfolk Southern Railroad Company, and Indiana & Michigan Electric Company as well as its parent, American Electric Power Company. He was active throughout his career in the Indiana State Bar Association, serving on its board of governors. After retiring at age 80, Yoder immersed himself in his lifelong enthusiasm for sports, cheering on the Chicago White Sox, the Washington State University Cougars, and especially the Purdue Boilermakers, where he held football season tickets for over 40 years. Yoder enjoyed swimming, scuba diving, ballroom dancing, and attending the Indianapolis 500, an annual family outing for nearly 50 years. He avidly read newspapers and magazines, particularly the New York Times and Wall Street Journal, as well as biographies and economics books. Yoder also volunteered for the Rotary Club of Fort Wayne, the Masonic Temple, Mizpah Shrine, and the Visiting Nurse Service.

1956
Allen S. Person
February 24, 2014

1958
William S. Kaufman
January 2013

1959
Joseph L. Sax
March 9, 2014
Sax, 78, taught for decades at the Universities of Colorado, Michigan, and California, Berkeley, law schools. He helped to shape environmental law in the United States—and spark the environmental movement—by reaching back to ancient Roman law to establish the doctrine that natural resources are a public trust that require protections. As a law professor at the University of Colorado in the early 1960s teaching courses on natural resources law, Sax realized his students likely would go on to help companies extract resources, mainly from public lands, and wondered why there was no public component to natural resources law. He later found an answer, writing that natural resources are a public trust that citizens have the right to sue to protect from individuals, businesses, and even the government. This public trust doctrine has been enshrined in at least a dozen state constitutions and has been affirmed as common law in others; Sax himself wrote Michigan’s environmental act while teaching at University of Michigan. Along the way, Sax helped the Sierra Club’s efforts to guard against development along the Colorado River, joined a campaign to stop the use of DDT, and served as counsel to Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt during the Clinton administration. In 2007 he received a Blue Planet Prize from the Asahi Glass Foundation, which has been compared to a Nobel for environmental science.
1960
David K. Anderson
September 19, 2013

1962
Frederick F. Cohn
April 30, 2014
Cohn, 75, was a renowned criminal defense attorney who worked in the Cook County Public Defender’s Office before going into private practice with well-known defense attorney Julius “Lucky” Echeles. On the basis of the belief that every alleged criminal deserved a robust defense, Cohn represented everyone from cop killers, to those beaten by cops, to death row inmates. He took up the case of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton when the latter was accused of robbery, as well as other members of the Black Panther Party in various proceedings. Judge Paul Biebel, presiding judge of the Criminal Division of the Cook County Circuit Court, told the Chicago Sun-Times, “He had a great knowledge of criminal law, and was one of the last of the old breed who would take cases simply because they felt this person needed to be defended.”

Cohn volunteered as a civil rights attorney in the summer of 1964 after the murder of three civil rights workers in Mississippi. Later in life, Cohn taught criminal law and procedure at John Marshall Law School, and he served as chairman of the Edgewater-Uptown Building Task Force in his Chicago neighborhood. During the unrest surrounding the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Cohn tried to calm the waters between shouting police and demonstrators—and somehow escaped unhurt when they did not take up his urgings to talk out their differences peacefully.

1965
Basil G. Condos
August 22, 2013

1974
Paul Alan Strandberg
August 4, 2014
Strandberg, 66, of Roseville, Minnesota, spent more than three decades working in the public sector, in the Office of the Minnesota Attorney General, the state Department of Agriculture, and the Ramsey County Attorney’s Office. Outside the office, Strandberg enjoyed reading, crossword puzzles, listening to music, and writing song parodies.

1979
Michael Joseph Shortley
May 7, 2014
Shortley, 59, spent most of his career in telecommunications law as part of the legal and regulatory teams at Bell Atlantic, Frontier (formerly Rochester Telephone), Global Crossing Telecommunications, and, most recently, Level 3 Communications. In those roles, he participated in two cases before the US Supreme Court and also argued cases in the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Ninth Circuit as well as the New York State Court of Appeals. Shortley began his legal career as an associate at Hughes, Hubbart & Reed, where he specialized in litigation and antitrust law. He was known for his incredible work ethic, sense of humor, love of cats, and enjoyment of running, having participated in the Fleet Feet Rochester Running Team and earned the “26.2” sticker displayed on the back windshield of his car.

1985
Stephen Richard Hertz
May 2014
Hertz, 55, was a partner at Debevoise & Plimpton and a prominent attorney in the field of mergers and acquisitions as well as private equity buyouts. He advised clients such as Landstar System, a transportation services provider, and Cambrex, a life sciences company, as well as private equity firms such as Stone Point Capital and HarbourVest Partners. Hertz joined the firm in 1985 after law school graduation and became a partner in 2000. He wrote forDebevoise’s private equity newsletter about trends in the private equity world; in one such piece, written last year with a number of colleagues, he addressed the examinations of private equity firms being conducted by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The New York Times noted that Hertz also might have helped Debevoise “gain a measure of cultural stardom” as a friend of Aaron Sorkin, the creator of the TV show The West Wing, which occasionally featured the law firm.
Gerald Ratner, ’37, 1913–2014

In 1931, the University of Chicago awarded Gerald Ratner a $300 annual scholarship to cover his undergraduate tuition. A high school valedictorian who commuted on a streetcar every day from the city’s Southwest Side, Ratner graduated with honors from the College in 1935 and from the Law School in 1937.

Ratner embarked on a successful legal career in Chicago and became a devoted and generous supporter of his alma mater. As Professor Saul Levmore put it, he was “one of the best ambassadors the University has sent forth.”

Gerald Ratner, a senior partner at the law firm of Gould & Ratner, died in his sleep on June 20. He was 100.

“We have lost a truly generous, beloved, and devoted friend in Gerald Ratner,” said University of Chicago President Robert J. Zimmer. “We mourn his death while valuing our memories of his long and remarkable life. His various achievements as a philanthropist, attorney, and athlete live on as his legacy.”

A former varsity baseball player and a longtime advocate for University of Chicago athletics, Ratner mentored student-athletes while emphasizing the value of physical activity for all students. In 1998 he made a generous gift toward what would become the Gerald Ratner Athletics Center. Opened in 2003, the center is used by thousands of students, faculty, staff, and alumni each week.

In April 2006, Ratner funded an endowed distinguished service professorship in the Law School, currently held by Professor David A. Strauss, a constitutional scholar.

“I did these as my way of giving back to the University for what it gave to me. It was the springboard for my career,” Ratner said in 2003. “I felt that any gift to this great University would, in turn, be magnified and multiplied a thousand times by what its outstanding graduates and faculty could do for the world.”

Ratner received the Law School’s Distinguished Law Alumni Award in 1999.

Dean Michael Schill said the deans of the Law School had a tradition of taking Ratner out for his birthday each year. “At these lunches he would regale us with stories about his time here in Hyde Park,” recalled Schill. “He loved every part of this university with every fiber of his being. Gerry Ratner was one of a kind. We have lost a wonderful man whose memory will be cherished.”

The son of a neighborhood grocer, Ratner was born on December 17, 1913. He grew up in the city’s Brighton Park neighborhood, where his mother ran a small store that sold candy, ice cream, tobacco, and other items while single-handedly raising him and two other siblings. His mother’s hard-working style had a tremendous influence on him.

“The Law School taught me to think and analyze,” he told the Chicago Maroon in May 2006. “Even if I wasn’t a lawyer, the education was valuable. There are many great universities, but none greater than the U of C.”

Ratner also was an outstanding student-athlete. He played baseball while enrolled in the College and intramural football at the Law School. Although he dreamed of entering the world of professional baseball, he chose the stability of a law career after graduation and practiced for several years before joining the US Army during World War II. He served as a military policeman stationed in Africa, where he processed German and Italian prisoners of war.

He returned to Chicago, where he married his late wife, Eunice, in 1948. In 1949, Ratner cofounded the law firm of Gould & Ratner, which, according to Crain’s Chicago Business, counseled the Crown family on many headline deals over the past decades, including the 1959 merger of Material Service Corporation with defense contractor General Dynamics Corporation, and the 1961 sale of the Empire State Building.

Ratner practiced law for more than 75 years and maintained a noon-to-midnight work schedule into his 90s.

“Gerry was an extraordinarily kind and generous man, with a sweet disposition and a subtle intellect,” said Professor Geoffrey R. Stone, a friend of Ratner’s. “As an alum of both the College and the Law School, he was deeply devoted to the University and, above all else, to the well-being of its students.”

Ratner is survived by his nephew William Ratner of Los Angeles.

Nancy Feldman (née Goodman), ’46, died earlier this year, after a life filled with love, activism, accomplishment, and adventure.

She met her husband, Raymond (Ray) Feldman, ’45, at the Law School. After he graduated and before they were married, Ray moved back to his hometown of Tulsa, Oklahoma, to start his law career. Going by train to visit him, Nancy was outraged by the racial discrimination she saw and told him she would never be happy living under such conditions. Ray responded, “Marry me and change it.” She did, and she did, attacking all forms of discrimination throughout her life. For her accomplishments in advancing opportunities for racial minorities, women, children, and people with disabilities, she received more than 15 national, state, and local awards.

She was also a diligent advocate for the arts, successfully advocating for the inclusion of an expansive arts curriculum throughout Tulsa’s public school system and serving as president of three of the city’s major arts organizations. The Jingle Feldman Award, named in honor of the Feldmans’ late daughter Elizabeth, who was known as Jingle, is presented annually to a Tulsan who has excelled in the arts.

Nancy made her professional career not as an attorney but as a university professor. Unable to find work in Tulsa as a lawyer—she said that in job interviews she was only asked how fast she could type—she found a position at the University of Tulsa teaching sociology. She had never taken a formal sociology class, but she believed, correctly, that her sociologically oriented law school studies with Robert Maynard Hutchins and Mortimer Adler, along with her volunteer service with Legal Aid and the research skills she had developed as a Law Review editor, would help her get by. In the happy and rewarding 36-year scholarly career that followed, she published important papers on urban sociology and taught and lectured throughout the world. She served for nine years on the board of directors of the National Space Institute, for six years she was board president at the Tulsa campus of Oklahoma State University, and for five years she served as one of three “professors of the city” appointed to develop a plan to guide Tulsa’s future growth.

She derived special satisfaction from her lengthy terms on the national board of Planned Parenthood and of the Girl Scouts of the USA and as chair of Oklahoma’s Civil Rights Commission during the presidency of Lyndon Johnson.

One day Nancy and Ray each filled out a lengthy magazine questionnaire about their values. Comparing their results, they noted that “obedience” was last on each of their lists, and “adventure” was first. That kicked their already-extensive adventuring into high gear, and it was as epic as everything else they did, including seven climbing trips in the Himalayas, world-class whitewater rafting, and living for long stretches with indigenous people in China, India, Africa, New Guinea, and elsewhere.

Asked in a 2012 interview to describe a highlight of her life, Nancy answered: “Marrying Raymond, no question. I never had any expectation of such a life. . . . I’ve had 90 years of the best life of anyone I’ve ever known.”

Nancy and Ray Feldman have given generously to the Law School. They provided funding that underwrites 10 public interest fellowships each summer, and a gift they made last year allowed the Law School to appoint a full-time manager of the Pro Bono Service Initiative of the Public Service and Public Interest Law Program. They both served on the Law School’s Visiting Committee, where they were forceful proponents of additional student opportunities related to public interest law and for more women on the faculty.

Professor Geof Stone traces Nancy’s impact on the Law School back nearly 30 years: “I first came to know Nancy when Gerhard Casper was dean and he put me in charge of creating a public service program. Ray and Nancy Feldman were two of the people most interested in making the program possible, and when I succeeded Gerhard as dean, I had many meetings and conversations with Nancy and Ray. Nancy was an insightful, generous, and committed individual who played a pivotal role in helping me, and the Law School, think through these issues.”

“Nancy Feldman was, quite simply, a wonderful person,” Stone added. “We all will miss her.”

Nancy was preceded in death by her daughter, Elizabeth “Jingle” Feldman. She is survived by her husband; two sons, Richard and John; and six grandchildren.
Jerome Katzin, ’41, 1919–2014

Jerome S. Katzin, ’41, died earlier this year, just twelve days after the death of his beloved wife, Miriam. The Katzins had been together for more than seventy-five years, having first met when they were undergraduates at the University of Chicago.

Mr. Katzin’s career was marked by significant accomplishments, and the philanthropic activities that he and his wife undertook benefited the Law School and many other organizations.

After graduating from the Law School, Mr. Katzin joined the Securities and Exchange Commission, eventually becoming the director of the Public Utilities Division. His time at the SEC was interrupted by extended service in the US Army during the Second World War. After the SEC, he worked until his retirement in 1990 as a partner at the investment bank Kuhn Loeb and its successor firms.

He pioneered the practice of arranging private financing for rural electric utilities, helping to transform the American social and economic landscape. He told an interviewer, “People don’t realize it today, but when I graduated from the Law School only about a third of all the farms in the US had electricity. We were able to supplement the government’s program by opening hundreds of rural electrical co-ops to funding from the private capital markets. This method of financing has raised several billion dollars over the years.”

Mr. Katzin served on more than 20 corporate boards, including at technology giant Qualcomm and the former Fortune 500 oil and gas company Coastal Corporation. He was also active in merchant shipping, in aircraft and equipment leasing, and as a financial advisor to federal and state entities.

A longtime friend and supporter of the Law School, Mr. Katzin provided a substantial gift last year to endow the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Jurists Program. Mr. Katzin recalled Levi’s enduring influence on him during an interview last year, saying of the legal theory course that Levi taught, “That class possibly has meant more to me in my lifetime than any other course I took.”

The program made possible by Mr. Katzin’s gift is already achieving important outcomes and creating an enduring legacy. A core element of the program is an invitation each year to several judges who spend time at the Law School, delivering lunchtime lectures to students, engaging with faculty members, meeting with student organizations, and providing commentary on new faculty scholarship by participating in the robust give-and-take of faculty workshops.

Lior Strahilevitz, the Sidley Austin Professor of Law, said that the Levi Program has exposed students and faculty to candid discussions of modern-day litigation and created lasting bonds with many of the visiting jurists. “Often the judges are visiting the Law School for the first time, and at the end of their visits, so many of them express eagerness to return for more sustained engagement with the students and faculty,” Strahilevitz said.

Mr. Katzin’s philanthropic activities extended far beyond the Law School. After he and Mrs. Katzin moved to the San Diego area in the 1980s, he was approached by a fundraiser and asked to donate money for the Judaic Studies program at the University of California, San Diego. “I opened my big mouth,” he later recalled, “and the next thing I knew I was committed to raising money for an endowed professorship.” He succeeded, creating the first endowed chair at the university. He and his wife continued to support the university in many capacities, and they each were awarded the Chancellor’s Medal for exceptional support in service of the university’s mission. They also gave generously to other organizations in San Diego and around the world, and they were honored by the San Diego Association of Fundraising Professionals as Philanthropists of the Year.

“For more than seventy years, Jerry Katzin made this world a better place through his innovative legal work, his civic engagement, and his expansive generosity,” said Dean Michael Schill. “His life exemplified the fundamental values that this Law School has always sought to encourage and develop.”

Mr. and Mrs. Katzin are survived by their children, David, Dan, and Diane, and by two grandchildren, Erica Katzin and Katrina Kurnit.
Harper was also an avid writer who enjoyed reading and discussing literature with her short story club. “She was really creative. That week before she passed … we met for breakfast and read the short story she picked out,” Gonzalez said.

Harper worked at the Centre for Applied Legal Studies in Johannesburg, South Africa, last summer as part of the Law School’s international human rights program. In the essay she was required to write at the end of the program, her “humility and passion” for her work shone through clearly, Gardner said.

“Abbie truly cared about her fellow students. … Her personality came through most clearly in her suggestions for future students, where she provided detailed directions on how to avoid mistakes she had made,” Gardner wrote.

“Abbie truly cared about her fellow students. … Her personality came through most clearly in her suggestions for future students, where she provided detailed directions on how to avoid mistakes she had made,” Gardner wrote. “She went to such lengths to help make it less stressful for future students to move to Johannesburg and help others.”

“What I enjoy and remember her most by is just her honesty and transparency,” Gonzalez said. “She was completely relatable. Even though she’s had all these experiences, she was so down-to-earth.”

Harper is survived by her parents, her three sisters, her brother-in-law, her nephew, and her four grandparents.


By Harini Jaganathan

Jay Brooks, a second-year student in the Law School and alum of the College (AB ’10), passed away on March 22, 2014, after a battle with cancer. He was 25.

Brooks was an integral part of the Law School community and loved by his family and friends, Dean Michael Schill and Dean of Students Amy Gardner wrote in an email to the Law School community. “Jay had a terrific sense of humor, which he maintained even after it was clear that the doctors’ prognosis was correct,” Schill and Gardner wrote.

Brooks, originally from Oak Forest, Illinois, served as a tutor to students in the Chicago Public Schools as a part of the Law School’s Neighbors volunteer program and as a staff member of the University of Chicago Law Review. Neighbors President Brooke Anderson said that when the Law School asked Brooks at the beginning of the school year how they could support him through his treatment, he asked the school to organize a day of service, during which 100 volunteers served at six organizations in Woodlawn and Hyde Park.
“Jay was a genuinely kind, bright, and generous friend who cared deeply about giving back to his community,” Anderson said. “It is telling of the kind of person Jay was that when the Law School sought a way to help support him earlier this year, he chose a way that supported others.”

As a high-achieving student in the Law School, Brooks was named a Kirkland & Ellis Scholar, in recognition of being in the top five percent of his class after his first year. He was also awarded the Joseph Henry Beale Prize for outstanding legal research and writing during his first year.

Gardner said, “One of the things I will remember about Jay is how he decided to spend his last days. He knew that he almost certainly would not live long enough to graduate from law school, but still chose to take challenging classes, study during his chemotherapy appointments, and keep actively engaging in class and with his friends for as long as he possibly could.”

Professor Saul Levmore, who taught Brooks in two classes, said that “Jay was full of ideas and showed enthusiasm for conversations about how the world worked. That he stayed with us and valued his friends and education to the very end has caused my heart to turn inside out many times during these past few months.”

Schill and Gardner said that Brooks “was a keen observer of and participant in politics.” While a student in the College, Brooks was an intern for the Obama presidential campaign as well as for Alexi Giannoulis’s US Senate campaign. After graduating, Brooks worked in Washington, DC, as a paralegal in an antitrust group before enrolling at the Law School in 2012.

He is survived by his mother, father, stepmother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, and girlfriend.

Laura LaPlante will be remembered for her kindness, leadership, and intellect. She died on May 2, 2014, at age 26.

LaPlante died of injuries sustained from a car crash in the early morning hours. A drunk driver headed the wrong way collided head-on into the taxicab she was riding in on Lake Shore Drive.

Dean of the Law School Michael Schill wrote in an e-mail to the Law School community, “I cannot make sense of the passing of such a wonderful, vital young woman who would surely have done so much in her life to make the world a better place. At the same time, during Laura’s short time on earth she made an impact.”

LaPlante originally hailed from Hancock, New Hampshire, and was slated to graduate in June and join the firm WilmerHale in Boston, where she worked as an associate last summer.

“She had been talking about how excited she was to graduate in a few weeks and start her life in Boston,” said LaPlante’s roommate Emily Heasley, ’14. “It is tragic that someone who was acting so selfishly and senselessly caused the world to lose an amazing, selfless person with a bright future ahead of her. I was blessed to have her as my roommate and best friend, and I will miss her dearly, as will all of the people who knew her.”

During her time at the Law School, LaPlante served as president of the Federalist Society, a libertarian and conservative group, and also as treasurer for the Law School Republicans. Her friend, current vice president for activities for the Federalist Society, and third year in the Law School, Michael Lanahan, said that LaPlante had valued her relationships with friends who held different beliefs and ideologies.

“She had wonderful conversations and friendships with people throughout law school from different ideologies, whether that’s our counterpart liberal organization, the American Constitution Society … or Law Students for Reproductive Justice, a pro-choice group, but she cared more about the people than about winning an argument,” he said.

LaPlante was an active member of various other student organizations, including St. Thomas More Society, the Law Women’s Caucus, and the Edmund Burke Society. She also served on the Dean of Students’ Advisory Board.

“She truly was a pleasure to work with in all of her student organization endeavors, a student I consulted to get a sense of student opinion on tough issues, and one who still cared enough about her law school that six months before graduation, she agreed to serve on the Dean of Students’ Advisory Board,” said Dean of Students at the Law School Amy Gardner. “Laura was funny, smart, and the kind of student you hope to be friends with long after graduation.”

She is survived by her mother, father, two brothers, sister, two grandmothers, and grandfather.
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Master Litigator, Public Interest Advocate, and Proud Family Man

This year the Philadelphia law firm cofounded and chaired by Mark Aronchick, ’74—Hangley, Aronchick, Segal, Pudlin & Schiller—further consolidated its reputation for excellence, being named 2014 Pennsylvania Firm of the Year by Benchmark Litigation, recognized as a “Pennsylvania Powerhouse” by Law360, and honored for excellence by Chambers USA.

Mark Aronchick, ’74

Aronchick himself recorded a major victory this year, adding to the lustrous reputation he has earned during his career. He was lead counsel along with the American Civil Liberties Union in the federal lawsuit that overturned Pennsylvania’s ban on same-sex marriage. The case, Whitewood v. Wolf, was so persuasively argued and so conclusively decided that not only has Pennsylvania’s conservative governor declined to pursue an appeal, he has actively helped to discourage other possible interveners.

In a career with many highlights, Aronchick says of Whitewood v. Wolf, “of all the things I’ve done in my professional life, this has been among the most important and the most affirming. Americans are reexamining their prejudices, and those misconceptions concerning our gay and lesbian citizens are evaporating. At no time in our constitutional history has there been such rapid rethinking of who we want to be. It has been so great to be a part of it.”

Only a small sampling of Aronchick’s notable accomplishments can be provided here. Just eight years out of law school, he was appointed as the youngest City Solicitor in Philadelphia’s history. He was one of the only attorneys in Pennsylvania ever to serve as president of the Philadelphia Bar Foundation and Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He is a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers. He maintains a diverse, high-profile national trial and appellate practice, is deeply engaged in politics and governance from the national to the local level, and serves on the boards of many community organizations.

At the Law School, he has served an extended term on the Visiting Committee, and he has been a forceful advocate for programs to advance public interest law. He funded one of the first fellowships for students and alumni practicing public interest law, and he serves on the dean’s advisory committee. “I count myself as remarkably blessed,” he says. “I had wonderful parents and grew up in a small town with a diverse community. I met my wife Judi—who is now a radiology professor at the medical school of the University of Pennsylvania—when we were undergraduates, and we’ve been together more than 43 years. I always have had great mentors. My kids are spectacular. My faith is strong. My firm is successful. And I include the Law School right up there with the greatest blessings of my life. I was taught by an amazing faculty, and my time at the Clinic was transformative, shaping my sense of what could be accomplished through the law. If the Law School has a more outspoken cheerleader than me, I’d like to meet that person.”

He’s also looking out for future generations in many ways: mentoring many young people at any given time, teaching at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, helping to develop a careful succession plan so his firm retains its leadership position, and acting in many arenas to achieve a just society.

He sees his children doing their parts, too. Son Jonathan followed up a degree from Brown with service on the US Senate Committee for Environment and Public Works and is now pursuing a law degree at Georgetown, where he is an articles editor of the law journal. Daughter Sara Aronchick Solow, with a Yale Law degree, just finished clerking for Justice Breyer. She was one of a core group of five people who directly helped Barack Obama prepare for his debates before the 2012 election. He and his wife are, in his words, “over the moon” about their one-and-a-half-year-old grandson Ethan and are awaiting the birth of a second grandchild this fall.

“My kids are so much better, in their values and skills, than I was at their age, and so are so many of the younger people that I encounter,” he says. “I am very hopeful. I think our country’s future is in good hands.”
Leading in International Law and Business from Louisville

Matthew Hamel, ’86, is executive vice president, general counsel, and secretary of Louisville-based Brown-Forman Corporation, one of the world’s largest makers and sellers of beverage alcohol. Offering brands that include Jack Daniel’s Tennessee whiskey, Woodford Reserve bourbon, Finlandia vodka, Herradura tequila, and Chambord liqueur, Brown-Forman does business in more than 135 countries.

Hamel’s career has been marked by global legal responsibilities in a wide range of business enterprises. After joining White & Case after graduating from the Law School, it wasn’t long before he was assigned to the firm’s Stockholm office (he had studied in Sweden as a Fulbright Scholar and spoke the language). From there, he relocated to Warsaw just as commercial activity there and elsewhere in central Europe was heating up after the fall of the Berlin Wall. After four years abroad, he returned to the United States to take responsibility for legal matters in central and eastern Europe, Turkey, central Asia, the Middle East, and Africa as general counsel of Colgate-Palmolive’s International Business Development Group.

He next became general counsel and secretary at Factiva, a joint venture between Dow Jones and Reuters that aggregated business information online and made it available to subscribers worldwide. When Dow Jones bought out Reuters and integrated Factiva into a broader Enterprise Media Group (combining it with DJ Newswires and Indexes), Hamel became Vice President, Legal, of the group and an associate general counsel of Dow Jones. In 2007, he moved into his current role at Brown-Forman.

“Being responsible for legal matters in a wide array of countries at one time or another during my career, in several different industries, I haven’t always had every answer at my fingertips, but thanks to my education at the Law School I have always trusted that I could at least understand the first principles and therefore ask the right question. After that, it’s not hard to find someone who can figure it out,” Hamel says. “I might not know what the law is, but I know what it should be, and that’s proven to be a good starting point for reaching the best outcome.”

He further credits the Law School with helping him succeed with his broader responsibilities as a member of Brown-Forman’s executive team, where he is involved in major business decisions that include establishing corporate strategy and formulating crucial company-wide initiatives. “I often find myself thinking, ‘I didn’t take this class in law school,’ but the skills I learned at the Law School for analyzing problems and finding solutions have served me well,” he says.

He serves on the Visiting Committee and is an enthusiastic supporter of the Law School’s recent initiatives to prepare students for careers in business, such as the Doctoroff Business Leadership Program.

Because Brown-Forman is a publicly listed company that is family controlled—one of only about 130 such companies in the United States—its governance environment presents many distinctive challenges, regarding nepotism and related-party transactions, for example. Hamel has led the formation of a network of general counsel and other senior governance officers from similarly structured companies. The group meets twice a year to exchange information and advice.

He and his family—wife Lena and daughters Emilie (a recent graduate of Northwestern) and Olivia (a sophomore at Yale)—find Louisville a hospitable place to call home. He is on the board of governors of the city’s Speed Art Museum, which is currently undergoing a substantial multiyear expansion and renovation that Hamel believes will make it into a destination art museum, and he is a director of the Louisville-based Kentucky Opera. He notes with satisfaction that Louisville’s bustling arts scene is complemented by its many excellent restaurants.

“We have been happy everywhere we’ve lived,” Hamel says, “but since we arrived in Louisville we really haven’t looked back.”
Relishing Doing on “M&A Work on Steroids”

Earlier this year, Sharon Zezima, ’89, led the legal team for the initial public stock offering (IPO) of GoPro, Inc., the high-flying San Mateo, California–based company that she joined last September as General Counsel and Secretary. GoPro makes what has been called the most successful camera of all time, a small, high-definition, mountable, and wearable capture device that individuals use to document their experiences and share them on social media platforms. GoPro has shipped more than 10 million cameras since its inception, taking in nearly a billion dollars in revenue last year alone, and is embarking on a media and platform strategy to enable its consumers to better manage, share, and enjoy their GoPro content.

GoPro’s stock price leapt by 103 percent in the days right after its IPO. But that wasn’t Zezima’s first red-hot IPO. Last May, as General Counsel of Marketo, she led the legal team for that company’s initial public offering. At year’s end, shares in Marketo had increased in price by more than 185 percent.

“An IPO is like M&A work on steroids,” Zezima says. “Doing two of them in a year and a half made for a hectic, challenging, and exciting time, and it was also very satisfying. At both GoPro and Marketo I worked with great internal people and a superb team of outside counsel, things went smoothly, and there was never a dull moment.”

Because GoPro had no internal legal staff when she was brought in, Zezima has been creating a legal infrastructure in addition to handling the IPO and the other responsibilities of her position. She has built a 10-person legal department, worked to communicate the value of that department throughout the organization, and focused on contributing to the successful execution of the company’s plans. “Things can change so fast in this highly entrepreneurial company that sometimes it feels hard to keep up, but my goal is to stay a step ahead of what the company needs to accomplish its strategies,” she says.

The 12 years she served at the giant video game company Electronic Arts, where she became Vice President and Deputy General Counsel, shaped some important skills and perceptions. “I learned there to manage a department, and I learned a lot about the media and entertainment world that GoPro is entering,” she says, adding that after having worked at law firms for 10 years and becoming a partner, “I also came to realize at EA how much I liked being part of a consumer-facing company and part of an industry, the sense of continuity and of helping to build something.” For the quality and quantity of her contributions, EA recognized her with its annual “Superhuman” award.

At the Law School, she prepared herself to become a litigator, a role she carried out with gusto in her law firm positions, once handling six trials in a 12-month period. “I really loved doing Moot Court at the Law School, and it solidified my skills and reinforced my conviction about my career path,” she says. As her career progressed and she moved into other roles, other aspects of her Law School experience remained with her: “From a whole lot of exceptional teachers, I learned how to see beyond what exists, to what could or should exist. That’s an essential skill for top-level lawyering, and it’s also essential for working in any business, particularly an entrepreneurial one.”

Outside of work, she co-founded The Salonnieres, a social organization that helps accomplished professional women connect with each other, and she’s involved with Women’s Initiative, a nonprofit that helps low-income women develop entrepreneurial skills.

Married and with two children, Isabelle and Lucas, she lives in a home that she saw and couldn’t resist. “It’s my dream house, and we love the location, which is great for bringing up our children. The commute is long—about an hour each way—but it’s worth it.” Sharon Zezima might no longer be eligible for her former employer’s “Superhuman” award, but for all of her accomplishments—at work, at home, in the community, and on the road—that designation still seems to fit her very well.

Amy Kossow

The highlight of my year was a spring trip to Paris and Provence with my mother and brother. We scheduled it for the end of my niece’s semester in Paris so she could join us. Tooling around the French countryside with them was the perfect break.

In June, Maureen Sheehy and I enjoyed Word for Word’s production of 36 Stories by Sam Shepard, which Amy Kossow wrote and directed. Amy seamlessly wove together bits and pieces from 36 different Shepard stories to create an unusual and thought-provoking piece of theatre. Andi Paley Vogel’s eldest, Todd, is now a sophomore at UC Berkeley. I unfortunately wasn’t able to

very proud of him. Her younger son, Harrison, will be starting his sophomore year at Syracuse University, majoring in sports management.

Sharon Zezima, ’89

Maureen Sheehy

I unfortunately wasn’t able to
Building a Career from One Interesting Job to the Next

Not long after she graduated from the College at the University of Chicago in 1987, Julie Fernandes, ‘94, met an influential mentor, the Chicago civil rights leader Al Raby, who gave her some life-shaping advice: “He told me, ‘If a job seems interesting to you, take it. If you like it, keep it. If you don’t like it, find another one.’ For a person just out of college, that advice was so liberating—a message to keep figuring out what wakes you up and always be doing work that makes you feel most fully alive.” Fernandes has held many different positions since leaving the Law School, and each time she took on a new challenge it was to follow a louder wakeup call summoning her to action.

“My jobs since law school have each been a different mixture of law, policy, and politics,” Fernandes says. “Each aspect is important, but they stretch different muscles and present different challenges.” Her first three jobs out of law school fit primarily into the “law” category. The first was a fellowship at the American Civil Liberties Union, where she was involved in litigation from the start, challenging educational discrimination, particularly in the Deep South. Next came a year clerking for Seventh Circuit Judge Diane P. Wood, and after that a few years as a trial lawyer at the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice (DOJ).

Her DOJ position morphed into a policy/politics role when she was assigned as a special assistant to President Clinton at the White House Domestic Policy Council, and when she returned to the DOJ, she took on a policy-focused role as an advisor to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Then came six years of mostly politics at the lobbying arm of the civil rights movement, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. There, she helped lead campaigns to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act and to pass the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Then there were two years back at the DOJ’s Civil Rights Division, as deputy assistant attorney general, primarily focused on voting rights, enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and international human rights issues.

Her year as the director of the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking, full of policy and knee-deep in politics, resulted in many accomplishments, including the signing by President Obama of an executive order strengthening protections against human trafficking.

“I’m a liberal Democrat, and proud of it,” she says, “but I think the things I’ve always fought for are absolutely nonpartisan matters of human rights and dignity. I have worked with people from across the political spectrum in everything I’ve done, engaging everyone I can reach to eradicate discrimination and abuse. I owe a lot of my ability to embrace that approach to the Law School, where discussion, debate, and constructive confrontation were welcomed everywhere—in classrooms, in hallways, in the Green Lounge. Nothing sharpens your perspectives—and your wits—more than the kind of earnest encounters I had every single day with very smart people who approach legal and policy issues from a wide variety of perspectives. It was the most valuable thing that could have happened to me; it’s been a large part of making me the person, lawyer, and advocate I am.”

Her current position, at the Open Society Foundations, is an intense combination of law, policy, and politics. With a portfolio that includes voting rights, campaign reform, and racial justice, she examines policy options, considers changes to obstructive laws, and works the politics of making change happen. She’s also on the board of directors of the American Constitution Society, and you can catch her on television shows with Chris Matthews, Chris Hayes, and others.

“I’m not going to say my work isn’t frustrating sometimes, but you find a place where you can help, you bite into a piece of a problem, you do what you can, and you live to fight another day,” she says. “And I have a great family, my husband and two wonderful children, who matter more to me than anything else. I wake up every day happy to be who I am where I am, and happy to be doing what I’m doing.”

Dan Rabinowitz and Rachel Gibbons looked great at Reunion!!!!!!! Dan is partner and cochair of the Insurance Practice Group at Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP focusing on transactional and regulatory advice in the insurance industry. Recently, he assisted client Stone Point Capital LLC in completing their acquisition of LTGC Holding Corp., the parent company of Long Term Care Group, Inc., the largest provider of comprehensive outsourcing and claims management to long-term care insurers. Dan moderated a panel at the American Conference Institute’s Advanced Forum on Insurance-Linked Securities.

It was also great to see Monte Crawford. Monte is a partner at DLA Piper focusing in general corporate and business litigation. His focuses include internal corporate investigations, insurance disputes, international arbitration and litigation, and general commercial litigation. Monte has lectured at the University of Maryland Law School on the topic of international arbitration and international litigation.

As for me, Sue Moss, I’m still doing family (and antifamily) law in NYC.
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For the Degree of Master of Laws
Syed Jafar Alam
Catalina Estefania Aldunate Heinicke
Stefania Alessi
Waad Nasser S. Alkurini
Meherun Nisa Anand
Shino Asayama
Dirk Anthony George Auer
Stephanie Jean Banham
Natalia Christina Barker
Ioannis Bazinas
Gautam Shrikant Bhat
Yotam Blauhild
Louis-Alexandre Bouchard
Javier Manuel Calmell Del Solar Monasi
Carolina Canales Cama
Camila Carvalho Gomes
Liang Chen
Kristoff Julia Freddy Cox
Juan Pablo Crespo Correa
Kristoff Julia Freddy Cox

For the Degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence
Gilberto Hernandez Osegueda

For the Degree of Doctor of Law
Brian Ahn
Alexander R. Akther
Saf Zamil Aloqili
MaryAnn Tatiana Almeida *
Eric Christopher Alston
Fernando J. Alvez-Perez
Brooke Elizabeth Anderson *
Charles Logan Anderson
Laura Marjatta Balilis
Randi Barcelo
Zara Bari *
Brett Sophie Barnett **†‡
Frederick Calvin Benson ****
Laura Bernesch_u
Rachel Elizabeth Betts
Michael Shaughnessy Biehl *
Jaron Birkan
Christine Ann Bonomo *
Tyler J. Born *
Jerrold Brent Barnett *****
Lauren Elizabeth Berrigan
Benjamin Bellamy Brown
Benjamin Moses Brown
Luke Jeremiah Burton
Charlotte Adelaia Castillo
Yuki Monika Chan *
Grady Chang
Joshua Chow
Justin Adam Cohen
Saul Daniel Cohen *
Sean Joseph Cookey ****
Benjamin Aaron Cousineau
Kristin Lisa Coveney
Courtney Marie Cox ****
Alexander Nathan Cross *
Kristin Sommers Czubkowski *
Samantha Ann Daniels
Matthew S. Davis
Lee Joseph Fitzgerald
Nicholas Albert Deppermann
Nikhil Rama Krishnan *
Vivek Vijay Krishnan
Alison Elizabeth Krueger *
Jay Kumar
James Johannes Kystrø ***
Michael Brendan LaPlanche
Boris Lavent *
Muhuyung Lee *
Esther Lifahitz
Lindsey Kohler Livingston
Katherine Amanda Long
Sarah Elizabeth Losh *
Johnathan Douglas Lott *
Eric L. Mackie
Selina Jessie MacLaren
Eva Yihua Mak
Patricia Anne Therese Mathy
Trevor Jacob Mayer *
Zach Adam Mayo
Michelle Donas Mbekae
Ryan Patrick McCarri *
Christina Marie McIlraine
Jason Evan Meade *
Christian Mejia
Anthony Joseph Moreno
Alexandra Morgan *
Rachael Morgan
Michael Niekresh Mollor *
Ezekiel Hillel Zvi Nadler ***
Julie Marie Napier
Rohit Nath ****
Maria Belén Navarro
Heather Annette Niemetschek
Leah Michelle Nudelman
Shoshana Rachel O’Brien
Benjamin David Witte
Julia Kathryn Schwartz *
Maxwell Louis Schwartz **†‡
Anthony Primo Sensoli
Jill Kassandra Serpa
Emily Marie Sharp-Kellar
Ankur Shingal
Dayron Silverio *
Jaswant Terrance Singh
Ryan Vincent Smith *
Ignacio Sofo *
Naomi S. Solomon
Nicholas Nathan Spear **†‡
John Barrow Sprangers *
Rajesh Ram Srivastavan *
Kenneth Lee Stalkeflet
Mary Megan Stephens *
Donald Robert Stevens
Teodora Stoica *
Matthew F. Streit *
Kelsey Marie Stricker
Matthew Nile Stucky *
Catherine Beth Sullivan
Brett Alan Swearengen
Trenton Don Tanner *
Nicholas David Teichen
Brian Tenenbaum
Mark Adrian Thompson
William Dean Thompson **†‡
Brian William Tobin
John Arden Tracy *
Alexandra Christine Traviss ***
Erim Ergun Tuc
Michael M. Turkel
Channing Jay Turner
Jordan Landrum Von Bokern *
Kevin Michael Wakalski
Robert Bayne Warfield
Michael A. Wasi *
Frederick William Watson **†‡
Jennifer Martin Wheeler *
Bridget Mercedes Widdowson
Benjamin David Witte
Nora Wong
Robert Durham Woods *
Stephanie Irina Yesnik
Vincent Jonathan Ying
Barrett Roland Hotchkiss Young
Randall D. Zack *
William Lawrence Ziegelbauer

*** Highest Honors
** High Honors
* Honors
1 Order of the Coif
1 Kirkland & Ellis Scholar
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WHERE ARE THEY NOW? THE CLASS OF 2014

ARIZONA
Phoenix
Nicholas Spear
Hon. Andrew Hurwitz, 9th Cir.

ARKANSAS
Little Rock
Zach Mayo
Center for Class Action Fairness

CALIFORNIA
Irvine
Stephanie Johnson
Knobbe Martens

Los Angeles
Brian Ahn
Latham & Watkins

Palo Alto
Fenwick & West

Mountain View
Nicholas Plassaras
Fenwick & West

Menlo Park
Jaswant Singh
Sullivan & Cromwell

Pasadena
Barnes & Thornburg
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WHERE ARE THEY NOW? continued

LOUISIANA
New Orleans
Karen Orzechowski
Orleans Public Defender

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston
Brett Bromann
WilmerHale
Courtney Cox
Hon. Sandra Lynch, 1st Cir.
David Emer
Nutter McClennen & Fish
Karen Harrington
Goodwin Procter

MINNESOTA
Minneapolis
Nicholas Teichen
Faegre Baker Daniels
William Thomson
Hon. James Loken, 8th Cir.

MISSOURI
Kansas City
Matthew Stucky
Shook Hardy
St. Louis
Lana Hompluem
Bryan Cave
Michael Lanahan
Bryan Cave

NEBRASKA
Omaha
Charlotte Castillo
Fidelity Insurance

NEW YORK
Albany
Lee Deppermann
New York City
Charles Anderson
Milbank
Zara Bari
Cravath Swaine & Moore
Yukiu Chan
Simpson Thacher
Grady Chang
Simpson Thacher

Joshua Chow
Skadden Arps
Justin Cohen
Allen & Overy
Alexander Cross
Kirkland & Ellis
Sean Gholz
Cravath Swaine & Moore
Adina Goldstein
Sullivan & Cromwell
Alice Ha
Sullivan & Cromwell
Virginia Hildreth
Sullivan & Cromwell
Aarti Iyer
Cravath Swaine & Moore
Raphael Janove
Sullivan & Cromwell
Abigail Johnston
Fried Frank
Adam Josephs
Sullivan & Cromwell
Muhuyung Lee
Davis Polk & Wardwell
Karen Leung
Dechert
Esther Lifshitz
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton
Jason Meade
Sullivan & Cromwell
Rachael Morgan
Kirkland & Ellis
Maria Navarro
Debevoise & Plimpton
Leah Nudelman
Simpson Thacher
Camila Panama
Davis Polk & Wardwell
Julia Park
Davis Polk & Wardwell
Bradley Pearson
Milbank
Samuel Ramos
Skadden Arps
Christine Ricardo
National Center for Law and Economic Justice
James Schulte
McKinsey & Company
Jill Serpa
Freshfields
Naomi Solomon
Skadden Arps
John Tracy
Simpson Thacher
Erim Tuc
Cravath Swaine & Moore
Michael Turkel
Robert Warfield
Skadden Arps
Nora Wong
New York City Law Department
William Ziegelbauer
Sheppard Mullin

PENNSYLVANIA
Philadelphia
MaryAnn Almeida
Hon. Legrome Davis, E.D. Pa.
Eric Mackie
Dechert

TEXAS
Houston
Saul Cohen
Hon. Gregg Costa, 5th Cir.
Sean Cooksey
Hon. Jerry Smith, 5th Cir.
Emily Heasley
Baker Botts
Matthew Olson
Latham & Watkins
Mary Megan Stephens
Vinson & Elkins
Jordan Von Bokern
Hon. Jerry Smith, 5th Cir.
Robert Woods
Yetter Coleman

WASHINGTON
Seattle
Dayne Poshusta
Wilson Sonsini

WASHINGTON, DC
Laura Bails
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Christine Bonomo
Skadden Arps
Aimee Brown
Hon. Thomas Griffith, D.C. Cir.
Samantha Daniels
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
David Frankenfield
Baker Botts
Megan Grant
Sheppard Mullin
Kourtney Hahn
PriceWaterhouse Coopers
Patricia Herold
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Nathan Jack
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Benjamin Kelly
U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Administrative Law Judges
Keith Kiles
Covington & Burling
David King Jr.
Hon. David Tatel, D.C. Cir.
Lindsey Livingston
Pillsbury Madison
Katherine Long
Skadden Arps
Selina MacLaren
Quinn Emanuel
Christian Mejia
U.S. Department of Justice, Tax Division
Andres Saenz
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton

WHERE ARE THEY NOW? continued

John Sprangers
Skadden Arps
Donald Stevens
U.S. Copyright Office, Barbara Ringer Fellowship
Brett Sweearingen
Jones Day
Trenton Tanner
WilmerHale
Barrett Young
King & Spalding

WEST VIRGINIA
Morgantown
Jedda Fanning
West Virginia Innocence Project

INTERNATIONAL
Delegación Miguel Hidalgo, Mexico
Pedro Gerson Ugalde
Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad A.C.
London, England
Saif Alaqqi
Shearman & Sterling
New Delhi, India
Shoshana O’Brien
Jindal Law School, Center for Health Law, Ethics and Technology
MEET THE CLASS OF 2017

GENERAL STATISTICS:
100 undergraduate institutions
41 undergraduate majors
11 graduate degrees
37 states represented
43 countries lived/worked in
22 languages spoken

FUN FACTS:
Twenty-six congressional interns
Nine Teach for America alumni
Nine varsity athletes
Six marathon runners
Four State Department interns
Three international au pairs
Two Iron Man competitors
Two AmeriCorps volunteers
Two Jeopardy! college champions
Two FBI interns
Two Eagle Scouts
One Fulbright scholar
One Rhodes Scholar
One White House fellow
One hiker of Mt. Everest
One professional actor
One classical pianist
One Korean Percussion drum player
One volunteer firefighter in Japan
One NSA analyst
One stand-up comedian
One second-degree black belt
One blues guitar instructor
REUNION WEEKEND MAY 1-3, 2015
For Members of the Classes of