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Meet the Class of 2015
Message from the Dean

Dear friends,

The buzzword in higher education over the last decade has been globalization. Technological changes in communications, improvements in transportation, and increased integration of capital markets mean that we are all living in a truly interconnected world. Globalization of our economy has not left law behind. Lawyers today increasingly work in law firms whose partners span multiple continents and work on matters involving the laws of more than one nation.

The University of Chicago Law School has long been an innovator when it comes to thinking about the law in global terms. Walking through the portrait-clad hallways of our building one cannot help but be reminded of the pioneering work done by Max Rheinstein in comparative family law, David Currie in German and comparative constitutional law, or Karl Llewellyn and Soia Mentschikoff on international commercial law.

We are now building on that extraordinary foundation, and in true Chicago fashion, our program will be uniquely focused on the mind. As with everything we do, it begins with our faculty. In this issue of the Record we describe some of the elements of our emerging international and comparative law program. We share with you descriptions of the recent work of some of our celebrated senior faculty members, including Ronald Coase, Tom Ginsburg, Martha Nussbaum, Eric Posner, and David Weisbach. We also introduce you to the work of one of our young stars—Daniel Abebe.

One of the most exciting international initiatives of the Law School is our Globalizing Law and Economics Program. Part of the recently launched Law and Economics 2.0 Initiative, the program seeks nothing less than to transform law throughout the world with the insights pioneered at the Law School in law and economics. In this issue of the Record, we describe the recent two-week program that brought more than 70 young Chinese scholars to Chicago to learn law and economics from its leading practitioners and luminaries. We hope that in 50 years, people will remember the summer of 2012 as the moment when groundbreaking Chinese legal ideas and theories were born.

Students are always at the center of the Law School. In addition to the traditional curriculum of courses in international and comparative law, students participate in a wide variety of innovative and ambitious clinics and international experiences. These include our brand new Human Rights Clinic, which will fight injustice throughout the world; the Constitutions Lab, which works with developing countries on their governing charters; international immersion trips, which train our students in the law and cultures of other nations; and our LLM program, which year after year brings extraordinary foreign lawyers to our school to learn and enliven our classes.

Finally, you, our alumni, are a core element of our international strength. Over the past two years I have had the good fortune to visit alumni in Belgium, China, England, France, India, Japan, and Switzerland. While we may not all speak the same language, we do share a core understanding—there is nothing quite as wonderful or exhilarating as the education and insights that flourish in our building on the South Side of Chicago.

Warm regards,

Michael H. Schill
The law and economics scholars stood on the concrete steps behind the Law School, squeezed together, wearing suits and dresses and smiles, even though it wasn’t time for the picture yet. They were waiting for the photograph’s subject of honor, Ronald Coase, who was to arrive any minute. The six dozen scholars, all from China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, didn’t mind the wait. In fact, many were simply in awe that they got to meet one of the fathers of law and economics at all.

This would be a moment to remember among the many moments that made up the 2012 Summer School in Law and Economics.

All of a sudden, there he was, at the back door of the Law School. Seventy-two sets of hands greeted him with enthusiastic applause.

The scholars dutifully stayed in position during the photograph, and then all bets were off. They jockeyed to speak to Coase, take his picture, and even to push his...
Law. It was the pilot program of what the Law School’s Institute for Law and Economics intends as an annual summer event, one that will eventually open to scholars from all countries. China, from where most of the students came this time, was chosen for the inaugural program because of China’s burgeoning economy and a growing interest among scholars in using the tools of law and economics to influence their changing legal system.

The Law School’s Globalizing Law and Economics Initiative seeks to promote the growth of the discipline of law and economics throughout the world. The Summer School followed a conference on European contract law in April and one on climate change in May (see page 30), and other international programs are in the planning stages.

In China, law and economics is in its infancy as a discipline, but scholars recognize that it has many potential insights for the country’s rapidly evolving legal and economic systems. The program received many more high-quality applications than it could accommodate, said Professor Omri Ben-Shahar, the Director of the Institute for Law and Economics.

In China, “there is great hunger and demand for law and economics,” Ben-Shahar said. “Their growth depends on improving their property rights system.”

Throughout the program, Ben-Shahar was impressed with the scholars’ never-ending enthusiasm for the content, presented in an intense two-week schedule of lectures.

“We are known here at the University of Chicago Law School for asking the very hardest questions and for subjecting everything we do to rational inquiry. We’re never afraid to ask hard questions.”

That kind of inspiration was the purpose of the Summer School, which focused on Property Rights and Private Law. The scholars with Dean Michael Schill, Professor Omri Ben-Shahar, Professor Emeritus Ronald Coase, Professor Tom Ginsburg, Professor Saul Levmore, and Professor Jonathan Masur.

wheelchair to the Green Lounge for that evening’s banquet.

“I never guessed I could see him in person,” said Ching-Ping Shao, Associate Professor in the National Taiwan University College of Law. “To see someone so famous in real life makes you think again of all the things you learned from him and makes you relive your life again when you were 22 and first read his paper.”

The scholars with Dean Michael Schill, Professor Omri Ben-Shahar, Professor Emeritus Ronald Coase, Professor Tom Ginsburg, Professor Saul Levmore, and Professor Jonathan Masur.

And there was plenty to soak in. The students studied Property Rights and Public Choice with Professor Saul Levmore, the Law and Economics of Private Remedies with Ben-Shahar, Property and Capital Markets with Professor Douglas Baird, and the Economics of Contract
Law with Professor Eric Posner. They heard lunchtime presentations from several law professors, including Richard Epstein, Martha Nussbaum, Judge Richard A. Posner, William Landes, Randal Picker, Richard Sandor, and Professor Coase himself. Some students presented their research in front of faculty, who responded with questions and suggestions for improvement. They had some fun too, attending a Cubs game and a barbeque at Ben-Shahar’s house, among other activities.

“We’re never afraid to ask hard questions.” Schill encouraged the Chinese scholars to challenge their professors, starting with Professor Saul Levmore, who taught Property Rights and Public Choice. Levmore asked the students to introduce themselves, so he could get to know them as they got to know each other. The scholars rattled through their job titles, majors, and interests. They were assistant professors, senior professors, and younger scholars seeking advanced degrees in law, economics, or political science. They teach topics such as financial law, international law, and law and economics, and they’re interested in “transparency and open government,” antitrust, regulation, and many other topics. Sixty-five came from Mainland China, six from Taiwan, and one from Hong Kong. Many had previously traveled and studied in the United States, but not everybody.

“This is my first time in the US, and I’m very happy,” one student said.

Levmore taught “Property Rights and Public Choice.”

The schedule was packed, but it wasn’t enough for some scholars. Even when they were a little homesick at the end of the two weeks, they had mixed feelings about leaving. “I want more,” said Yun-Chien Chang, Assistant Research Professor and Deputy Director of the Center for Empirical Legal Studies at Institutum Jurisprudentiae, Academia Sinica, in Taiwan. “I want my family with me, and I want more law and economics summer school.”

Their full experience was too big to describe in one article, but selected scenes from the program tell much of the story.

Day one of the summer school started with Dean Michael Schill welcoming the scholars, seated in Room V behind name cards, to Chicago.

“In my view, law and economics is the most powerful tool to help us think about the law,” Schill said, calling his faculty the “strongest group of empirical law and economics scholars in the country.”

Schill told the scholars that they were about to learn tools they could take home to China and teach to their students at top universities. And he filled them in on the Chicago ethos.

“We are known here at the University of Chicago Law School for asking the very hardest questions and for subjecting everything we do to rational inquiry,” he said.

Ben-Shahar chats with students in the Green Lounge.
After class, Jing Chen, a PhD candidate at Renmin University of China studying bankruptcy law, pointed out that the US and China have “very different concepts of law and economics.” Still, she said, American tools could make economic law more rational in China and give its citizens more options. That’s why the topic of Public Choice especially resonates with her.

In China’s future, “we may be willing to welcome other ways to give more choice to people,” she said. “Those changes might be better than what we have now.”

Later, Levmore said his goal was not to spread law and economics in China, but to give the scholars tools they could use in their own work. Obviously, in a country as large as China, studying how large groups make decisions is relevant.

At the end of the first day, the scholars gathered in the Green Lounge to munch on hors d’oeuvres and talk about what they learned (in Mandarin, of course). Some explained difficult concepts to friends who didn’t understand, and others talked about how they might use what they learned at their home universities. They looked up English words online that they hadn’t recognized in class. A few had enough academics for the day and opted to play table tennis.

Jie Cheng, Associate Professor of Law at Tsinghua University School of Law, sat chatting with her fellow faculty members who made the trip with her. She said she is working on a paper about land and property disputes in China.

“I’m trying to apply some law and economics,” she said. “It will be helpful if I can study here and be exposed to the best law and economics professors.”

Increasing scholarship into law and economics was a big topic among the scholars, who even held a separate meeting after class one day to discuss how to improve teaching and research in China. The discussion was led by editors of prominent academic journals.

Weixing Shen spotted a familiar face in the Green Lounge—Professor Richard Epstein, who was about to give a lunchtime talk. Shen is a Professor and Vice Dean of the Tsinghua Law School. He met Epstein at a property

Below: Richard Epstein gave the first of several lunchtime talks on law and economics. Many of the students were already acquainted with his work.
rights conference at Tsinghua in October of last year. He told him that.

“I remember!” Epstein replied, shaking his hand. During his speech, he offered his ideas about the importance of state protection for an efficient private property system.

That’s important, several students said throughout the two-week program. They talked about how law and economics can be a tool to analyze incentives, behavior, and rules and help policymakers understand what real effects the property laws have. For example, because the state owns the land, but people may buy land use rights for several decades, what happens when those rights expire? Despite China’s economic boom, do people underinvest because of the limited nature of property ownership? The answers may not come easily, but the conversation is worth having, the scholars said.

Epstein’s talk was followed, the next day, by a very different talk by Professor Martha Nussbaum, who introduced the group to the human development and capability approach, a way of measuring human welfare that takes into account an individual’s range of opportunity, health, education, control over one’s life, emotional health, and other important factors.

“Capabilities are not just skills people have,” she said. “They’re actually freedoms to choose.”

Nussbaum also explained that theories are necessary to make change in the real world, because they provide a language for talking about problems and reforms.

“It’s the people who matter, but ideas do affect what happens to people,” she said. Afterward, the scholars continued their tradition of taking a photograph with each professor they met.

At the beginning and end of most events of the Summer School, one voice could be heard helping bridge the gap between the Law School and the Chinese scholars. That voice belonged to Ruoying Chen, Assistant Professor at Peking University Law School. Chen is a Chicago graduate, earning an LLM in 2005 and a JSD in 2010. She also has...
served as a visiting assistant lecturer and an Olin Fellow in Law and Economics.

During the Summer School, it was Chen’s job to translate vital information to the Chinese students, and her no-nonsense announcements were delivered in rapid-fire Mandarin. Every once in a while, she would utter a word or phrase an English speaker could decipher, such as “Navy Pier.”

On the last day of the program, Chen—between making sure everyone’s last-minute needs were met—talked about the importance of this program for her native China. Much of the law there is not strictly implemented or enforced, she explained, and policymakers, lawyers, and the public lack knowledge about the effect of state control on the new economic markets. Law and economics can help Chinese scholars understand the relationships between the central government, local government, state-owned enterprises, and private enterprises, she said.

Law and economics can lead to a “better understanding of the impact of government control,” Chen said. “Whether that will lead you to say that we prefer less government control, I’m not sure. Maybe.”

Chen was not the only alumna at the event. Ruoke Liu, who is from Hunan but is working at a law firm in Boston, got her LLM in 2008 and her JD in 2011. “To learn about American law, one year is not nearly enough,” said Liu, who stayed after many classes to ask questions one-on-one to the professor.

A future alumna in attendance was Dichun Duan, who had never been to Chicago before but is part of the LLM class of 2013. She has worked at law firms in China already and wants to go back to that work after she graduates, with a focus on securities and capital markets. Another LLM in the class of 2013 who participated was Zhuang Liu, a PhD candidate at Peking University Law School.

At the welcome banquet, Ben-Shahar stood at the podium and expressed his vision that the meeting would one day be remembered as the first meeting of the Chinese law and economics association. He encouraged the scholars to build on what they learned in Chicago to further develop the field at their universities and to create opportunities to publish and present cutting-edge work in Chinese law and economics.

Below: Some of the students pose with Coase after his lunchtime speech. Several students expressed great personal admiration for the Nobel Prize winning economist.
Schill echoed that sentiment: “What I’m hoping is that in 20 years you will all look back on this day, the next two weeks, as a very important time in your lives. Law and economics can help illuminate legal principles for your nation just as it did for the United States.”

He then introduced the banquet’s keynote speaker, Guoqiang Yang, Consul General of the People’s Republic of China to Chicago.

“In China, we need more of you to support the development of the economy, of the market, especially the market exchange (and) economic partnership with the United States,” Yang said.

Coase was the guest of honor at the banquet. All night, students approached him to ask questions, thank him for his contributions, and take a lot of photographs.

The scholars’ time with Coase didn’t end after the banquet. Days later, they listened to him talk about his hopes for law and economics in their country during the final lunchtime talk of the program.

Coase said economists in the West have made the mistake of focusing on abstractions rather than the way the real world works. He encouraged the Chinese not to do this as they develop their own economy and legal system. He reminded them that the economic system in China is going to be very different than what they have studied in the West.

“What is needed in China is the development of a marketplace of ideas,” he said.

As he spoke, several students filmed his entire speech. Others snapped pictures. When he finished, they gave him a standing ovation and again crowded around him for yet another photograph. These are people who not only have read his work, but regularly assign it to their own students.

“I’ve never met Ronald Coase before, and I’ll probably never get to again,” said Yun-Chien Chang, the Taiwanese scholar who didn’t want the Summer School to end. “As Schill echoed that sentiment: “What I’m hoping is that in 20 years you will all look back on this day, the next two weeks, as a very important time in your lives. Law and economics can help illuminate legal principles for your nation just as it did for the United States.”

He then introduced the banquet’s keynote speaker, Guoqiang Yang, Consul General of the People’s Republic of China to Chicago.

“In China, we need more of you to support the development of the economy, of the market, especially the market exchange (and) economic partnership with the United States,” Yang said.

Coase was the guest of honor at the banquet. All night, students approached him to ask questions, thank him for his contributions, and take a lot of photographs.

The scholars’ time with Coase didn’t end after the banquet. Days later, they listened to him talk about his hopes for law and economics in their country during the final lunchtime talk of the program.

Coase said economists in the West have made the mistake of focusing on abstractions rather than the way the real world works. He encouraged the Chinese not to do this as they develop their own economy and legal system. He reminded them that the economic system in China is going to be very different than what they have studied in the West.

“What is needed in China is the development of a marketplace of ideas,” he said.

As he spoke, several students filmed his entire speech. Others snapped pictures. When he finished, they gave him a standing ovation and again crowded around him for yet another photograph. These are people who not only have read his work, but regularly assign it to their own students.

“I’ve never met Ronald Coase before, and I’ll probably never get to again,” said Yun-Chien Chang, the Taiwanese scholar who didn’t want the Summer School to end. “As
someone who cites him in every article, that was a great moment for me.”

The professors who taught the classes said the Summer School experience was a good one for them too. For example, Eric Posner found the scholars to be “extremely sophisticated.” Posner particularly enjoyed one-on-one conversations with the students about how economic activity takes place in the absence of a strong legal system. “I wasn’t sure what level they would be when they arrived, but they already knew a lot of law and economics. They were familiar with lots of scholarship. I was pretty impressed by them.”

Baird was surprised at how familiar the Chinese students were with the work of American professors. He tried to make sure he offered tools and ideas without indicating that “their path to salvation is imitating us,” he said. But teaching them law and economics early in their development into a market economy “can help them come up with legal institutions that are a little bit better.” He said they were particularly interested in his examples about GM and Chrysler, because they show the impact of government intervention in large enterprises.

In some cases, the professors learned from the Chinese, and in others, they offered advice and commentary on China. Judge Posner, in his lunchtime speech, said this: “In societies in which the position of the judiciary is not well-established because the political authorities do not respect law … the courts have to struggle for legitimacy and authority. And one way they do that is to remove themselves from the practical,” which would include an economic approach to judicial decision making.

Posner’s research into judicial behavior with Professor William Landes is the subject of their upcoming book with Lee Epstein of the University of Southern California, The Behavior of Federal Judges: A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Rational Choice. Landes anchored another lunchtime talk about the research and in the process asked the Chinese how people become judges in China. They
explained: Anyone with a college degree in any subject may take the bar exam. If you pass, you may practice law. Judges have to have a degree in law, but they can enter the judiciary right after college and they are not elected.

Some of Landes’s research delves into when and why judges choose to dissent. He found that sometimes judges decline to dissent with a majority opinion, even if they disagree, because the costs outweigh the benefits.

Richard Sandor, Lecturer in Law and CEO of Environmental Financial Products LLC, gave a lunchtime talk about the difference between good derivatives and bad derivatives. It was a fitting topic for the author of the new book, *Good Derivatives*, which he signed for interested students by name, finishing with, “With all best wishes, Richard Sandor.”

Sandor said China should seize its opportunity to lead the world in fighting climate change. “China has a place to emerge as a world leader in this area,” he said. “As the leading emitter of carbon in the world, its standards can affect US standards.”

One lecture in Room V during the Summer School had nothing to do with law and economics. Richard Badger, Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs, explained the fundamentals of baseball before he and other staff took the scholars to Wrigley Field for a Cubs game. The Chinese, in general, don’t follow baseball and aren’t familiar with its rules. The Taiwanese, on the other hand, are big fans and well versed in the sport.

During his tutorial, Badger explained that baseball has no clock. “There is no time limit to a baseball game. Theoretically, we could be there all night,” he said, eliciting gasps from the students.

He explained strikes, balls, the strike zone, and outs, and then the students were off to Wrigley on a very hot, 99-degree day. The Miami Marlins beat the Cubs 9–5, but the students got to see a grand slam (hit by the Marlins) and sample stadium food. Some took close interest in the rules of the game, while others chose to people watch, so they weren’t any different than your typical American spectators. The Taiwanese students served as baseball experts for the Chinese.

On another afternoon, Levmore and Professor Julie Roin took about 50 students on a bike ride up the lakefront to Navy Pier, and then to Gino’s East for pizza.

Chicago, in general, got high marks, especially for the diversity of its people and attractions.

“I like the life here. People are relaxed here,” said Zhenzhen Bao, a postgraduate student studying international economic law at the Tsinghua Law School, who took time off campus to cruise the Chicago River and enjoy the Taste of Chicago. “The food is delicious, but (the weather is) too hot,” she said.

Xiaojie Liu, Associate Professor in international trade law at Tsinghua, went to a Friday night free concert at Millennium Park. She also went to the Art Institute of Chicago, which she loved.

“I thought the only purpose of the trip was to study law and economics. I thought I might not have the time to go around and enjoy the city life,” she said. “If I would have known the city was so interesting, I would choose another (later) day to leave.”

Ben-Shahar hosted a barbeque for the scholars at his home on their last night in Chicago. All the faculty who taught them came, and they were presented with books about China, signed by the participants with their Chinese names. The scholars stayed late, and later many were up into the early morning hours at their dormitory, talking about the experience.

“It was something they experienced emotionally,” Ben-Shahar said. “The end of summer school was hard, because they had a very good time here.”

The experience was special for Ben-Shahar, too, because it illustrates for him the power of the Law School. “For me, the most remarkable thing is how such a small place like the Law School can create something with as enormous an impact as this,” he said. It shouldn’t be all that surprising; after all, that’s what Chicago’s founders of law and economics did 75 years ago. And to ensure the legacy continues further, the plans for next year’s Law and Economics Summer School are already underway.
Ben-Shahar and the other professors received gifts from the students.

The group went to Wrigley Field for a Cubs game.

Professor Douglas Baird at the barbeque.

Eric Posner at the barbeque.

The barbeque was in Ben-Shahar’s backyard.

Several students said they were sad to see the Summer School end.
Seeking the Past: Early Chinese Scholars at the Law School

By Robin I. Mordfin

Their names are neatly written on grade reports of the University of Chicago Law School, but who they are is partially a mystery. Between 1909 and 1918 the Chinese government sent at least six students to the Law School to study. They each took three years’ worth of courses, from the expected Torts and Contracts, to the more exotic Roman Law. Some of their grades were good, some outstanding, and some not up to snuff, but they all gleaned valuable information about the American legal system that they brought back to China to build a new nation.

For the past year, several people on the staff of the Law School have been fascinated by the possibility of uncovering these students’ stories. These six men—Pan Hui Lo (罗泮辉), ‘11, Tsung-Hua Chow (周宗华), ‘12, Hsi Yun Feng (冯熙运), ‘12, En Tse Wang (王思泽), ‘13, Chun-Chin Kuohwei Chang (张国辉), ‘17, and Chaoyuan Chang (张肇元), ‘19,—came to America to study, to soak up knowledge of the law, and to bring that knowledge back home to help strengthen China. Based on all the evidence available, they succeeded admirably.

These men were strong students who were selected to come here because of their academic abilities. We know they received more preparation—especially in reading and writing English—than previous Chinese students who came to America had received. We know that most, but probably not all, returned to their homeland to work in government or industry. Each of the six received JD degrees from the Law School, and some went on to study at other US institutions as well. Many of the scholars China sent to the United States between 1909 and 1949 studied at several schools and studied a number of different subjects. These men drafted important legislation, served in high levels of government, and taught at prestigious universities. And they came here in larger numbers than one might expect: the University of Chicago Law School granted more JD degrees to Chinese students in the early part of the 20th century than any of its peer schools.

Receiving a Juris Doctor degree from a foreign university in this period was extremely unusual, but a complete Western education was clearly the intent of the Chinese government in sending these students to the United States. The Chinese had a keen interest in introducing new knowledge to their society. Their practice of sending students abroad to learn and return to their native land was seen as essential to bringing China into the modern age.

For the past year, several people on the staff of the Law School have been fascinated by the possibility of uncovering these students’ stories. These six men—Pan Hui Lo (罗泮辉), ‘11, Tsung-Hua Chow (周宗华), ‘12, Hsi Yun Feng (冯熙运), ‘12, En Tse Wang (王思泽), ‘13, Chun-Chin Kuohwei Chang (张国辉), ‘17, and Chaoyuan Chang (张肇元), ‘19,—came to America to study, to soak up knowledge of the law, and to bring that knowledge back home to help strengthen China. Based on all the evidence available, they succeeded admirably.

These men were strong students who were selected to come here because of their academic abilities. We know they received more preparation—especially in reading and writing English—than previous Chinese students who came to America had received. We know that most, but probably not all, returned to their homeland to work in government or industry. Each of the six received JD degrees from the Law School, and some went on to study at other US institutions as well. Many of the scholars China sent to the United States between 1909 and 1949 studied at several schools and studied a number of different subjects. These men drafted important legislation, served in high levels of government, and taught at prestigious universities. And they came here in larger numbers than one might expect: the University of Chicago Law School granted more JD degrees to Chinese students in the early part of the 20th century than any of its peer schools.

Three of these graduates, Yung Wing, born near Macao, was sent to America to study in 1847 and returned to his homeland in 1854. He repeatedly tried to find supporters for his idea that “the rising generation of China should enjoy the same educational advantage that I had enjoyed; that through western education China may be regenerated.” He was largely unsuccessful, but the idea caught on a couple of decades later.

Beginning in the 1870s, the Qing Dynasty, in an effort to modernize their economy and government and drag it out of its agricultural languor, began sending students to the
United States and other countries to learn engineering, sciences, law, and government. Unfortunately, while many of these young people were fine students, they were inadequately prepared for learning in English, and it took them some time to adjust to their new environment.

However, by the time the first of these students returned to China, problems began to arise. The graduates were not well viewed by the Chinese government—they had become too westernized, had given up their traditional upbringings and had not gathered information, according to leadership, that was useful to the Chinese government. By 1881, hostility toward China and the Chinese had risen in the United States, and the students were recalled to Asia much against the protest of their professors.

Then in 1900 the Eight Country Allied Force entered China to suppress the anti-foreign Boxer Rebellion. Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States stayed for a year, helped to defeat the Boxers, and made it clear to the Chinese government that they were owed money for their efforts. Ultimately, the United States was owed $33 million. In the ultimate irony for the xenophobic Boxers, a deal was brokered that allowed the U.S. to use these funds to set up the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship Program, which would enable Chinese students to study in the United States and bring their knowledge back to their country.

The Boxer scholarships funded selection, preparatory training (largely English reading and writing), transportation, and study for the scholarship beneficiaries. Part of the money was used in 1911 to establish a preparatory school, Tsinghua College (also known as American Indemnity College), to help Chinese graduates pursue further studies at American universities.

Before the establishment of the Boxer scholarships, there were a few students who were sent by the Chinese government to study at the Law School. They came from Peiyang University, now known as Tianjin University, the first modern university in China. One of these was Showin Wetzen, who studied at the Law School in 1906 or 1907, but did not end up receiving a degree. In 1914 he sent a letter to his classmate, Paul O’Donnell, ’09, in which he explained that after leaving Chicago he went on to Indiana University where he earned a degree in political science. He then returned to China, took an Imperial Palace Examination and earned a master’s degree, after which he was appointed as Undersecretary of the Board of Education. Wetzen went on to serve as Chief of the Foreign Intercourse Department of the Board of Communications and the Judge-Advocate of the Board of the Navy. After the formation of the Republic, he was appointed a Justice of the Supreme Court of China. While Wetzen was not part of the Boxer program, he took his American education back to China to build a new nation, just as the Boxer scholars were meant to do.

A few of the Chicago JD students also came from Peiyang University. Tsung Hua Chow (周宗华) enrolled at Brown University in 1906, transferred to Yale, and graduated with a PhB in 1908. He entered the Law School in 1909 and received his JD in 1912. Upon graduation, he returned to China and was appointed Chinese Assistant District Inspector at Shiherwei and then became Director of Salt Administration.

Pan Hui Lo (罗泮辉) arrived at Harvard University from Peiyang in 1906 and earned his undergraduate degree in 1909. He matriculated at the Law School in 1908, so it is possible that (as was somewhat common at the time) the first year of his legal studies counted as the final year toward his undergraduate degree. By 1911 he had earned both a JD and an AM in Political Science. After that, Lo joined the Canton Province government on his return to China and was responsible for the portfolio of foreign relations and legislative drafting and later became president of the province. However, his tenure was short-lived because of infighting in the province, and he chose to teach at the Soochow University Law School in Shanghai. At some point, he also served as Deputy Speaker of the Canton Parliament.

Hsi Yun Fen (冯熙运), entered Harvard in 1907 after attending Peiyang and earned an AB in 1909, ultimately
earning a JD from the University of Chicago in 1912. After returning to China in 1913, he was appointed Associate Justice of the Chihli Supreme Court. The following year, he became a Professor of Law at Peiyang and in 1920 became president of the University. In 1924 he established a private school, and from 1927 to 1951 he worked as legal counsel and board member of a number of private corporations.

En Tse Wang (王恩泽) was also a Peiyang University student before being sent to Harvard, where he earned an AB in 1910. He received his JD in 1913 from the Law School, but we have no clues about his career or personal life.

Students came to Chicago Law with a wide variety of educational backgrounds, including higher education at elite Chinese and American universities.

Chaoyuan Chang (张肇元) earned his AB in China at St. John's College and went on to earn a Master's degree in 1916 at Columbia University. In 1919 he graduated with a JD from the Law School. After his return to China, Chang served as the translator of the Chinese Criminal Code, drafted important legislation, and was also a member of Parliament. Ultimately, he rose to the position of Acting Minister of Finance.

Chuncin Kuohwei Chang (张国辉) was sent to the University of Michigan in 1911 and earned a BA, after which he earned an AM in diplomacy and international law at Columbia University in 1916 while working on a JD at the Law School, which he received in 1917. Apparently unsatisfied, Chang returned to Columbia for more diplomacy and law training and earned an LLB in 1919. He won the Einstein Prize for having been “deemed to have done the best and most original work in American Diplomacy.”

Upon returning to China, Chang became an Acting Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a Deputy Judge of the Peking District Court, an assistant Councillor at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and finally a Professor of Political Science and Economics from 1922 to 1926 in Beijing. Later, he served as Commissioner of Foreign Affairs for Fujian Province while simultaneously serving as Superintendent of Maritime Customs for the Xiamen, a subprovincial city of Fujian. In later life, he was appointed an ambassador on overseas mission for the Chinese government.

From 1909 to the end of the Qing dynasty in 1912, 179 students came to America. After the founding of the Republic of China, the students were chosen exclusively from Tsinghua, and 852 students were sent to study in the United States, including 43 women. The finest students in the Republic continued to apply for the Boxer program.

Naturally, there was friction between the goals of the two governments. America wanted the Chinese students to acquire its Christian culture. China wanted the students to learn America’s machinery know-how. Education as a means to understand the cause of poverty in China was the goal, without interfering with the Confucian teachings the Qing government supported. Clashes occurred, but the program continued.

Approximately 1,300 students were able to study through the program from 1909 to 1929. After Tsinghua became a university in 1929, the scholarships were opened to all graduates, and five additional groups of students were educated in the United States before the Japanese invasion of China in 1937. Very few students arrived during the war years, and the Communist Revolution put an end to the program altogether.

Several of the Chinese students who attended the University of Chicago Law School between 1909 and 1918 were likely Boxer Scholarship recipients. Boxer fellows were noted for their academic achievements and are credited with the foundation of China’s modernization in all areas, including the westernization of the legal system of the Republic of China. Soon other nations began designing programs similar to the Boxer Indemnification Scholarship Fund to educate Chinese students abroad.

One additional Chinese student, Ju-ao Mei (梅汝璈), ’28, came to the Law School much later than his other Boxer countrymen. Mei was born in 1904 and was a native of Nanchang, Jiangxi province. He graduated from Tsinghua University in 1924 and came to the United States to study at Stanford, receiving his BA—Phi Beta Kappa, no less—in 1926. He received his JD from the Law School in 1928. He returned to China in 1929 and taught at Shangsi, Nankai, Central Political, and Fudan Universities. He is best known as a judge in the International Military Tribunal for Japanese war crimes in 1946–48. One wonders whether Mei ever crossed paths with
Professor Bernie Meltzer, ’37, who served as a prosecutor in the Nuremberg trials during an overlapping time period.

The Republic adopted the existing German-based legal codes, but they were not immediately put into practice because following the overthrow of the Qing dynasty in 1912, China came under the influence of rival warlords and had no central government strong enough to establish a legal code. In 1927, Chiang Kai-Shek’s Kuomintang government began the development of Western legal and penal systems. Returned Boxer fellows were central to this effort, but the new codes never managed to take hold on a national level.

Boxer fellows were noted for their academic achievements and are credited with the foundation of China’s modernization in all areas, including the westernization of the legal system of the Republic of China.

But law students were actually in the minority of Boxer scholars, as the program supported mathematicians, writers, philosophers, linguists, architects, and many scientists. Engineering and the physical sciences were the most popular areas of studies for Boxer scholars, and those who entered the program before the 1940s largely returned to their homeland to use their education in the new Republic. Beyond the students we know of at the Law School, there are several prominent Boxer scholars who had connections to the University. For example, Peng Chun Chang got his higher education at Columbia University and then returned to China to teach philosophy at Nankai University. He fled the country at the time of the Japanese invasion and worked to promote awareness in Europe and America of the Nanking Massacre. He later taught at the University of Chicago.

Yuzhe Zang, long regarded as the father of modern Chinese astronomy, arrived at the University of Chicago in 1925 as a Boxer scholar and received his PhD in 1929 before returning to China to teach at National Central University. In 1928 while completing his dissertation, Zang discovered an asteroid that is now known as 3789 Zhongguo, which means China in Mandarin. Youxun Wu was a physical scientist who did his graduate work at Chicago, where he studied x-ray and electron scattering and verified the Compton effect, which gave Arthur Compton the Nobel Prize in Physics. He went on to be president of National Central University.

Others Boxer scholars ended up teaching at Chicago, including the mathematician Kai-lai Chung. In 1944, he was chosen as a Boxer Scholar and received a PhD from Princeton University in 1947. In the 1950s he taught at Columbia, Berkeley, Cornell, Syracuse, and the University of Chicago. He is considered one of the most important contributors to the modern theory of probability. Ping-ti Ho, who died just this year, won a Boxer scholarship in 1944 and received a PhD in history from Columbia University in 1952. He began teaching at the University of Chicago in 1965, became James Westfall Thompson Professor of History, and retired from the school in 1987.

Unfortunately, bringing American ideas through education to China fell off significantly after the 1949 revolution. But the success of the Boxer scholarships made them the model for the Fulbright Program, the competitive international educational exchange for students, teachers, professionals, scientists, and artists, which was founded in 1946 by United States Senator J. William Fulbright.

The search continues to flesh out the details of the lives of Tsung-Hua Chow (周圣华), Chaoyuan Chang (张肇元), Chuncin Kuohwei Chang (张国辉), En Tse Wang (王恩泽), Hsi Yun Feng (冯熙运), and Pan Hui Lo (罗泮辉). We will probably never know how they felt their time at the Law School helped them and helped their country, or how their educations helped to shape their beliefs. Simply knowing about the time in which they lived and the program in which they participated, however, tells us something about their intentions and their goals. As we participate in discussions today about the importance of diversity of viewpoint and background in law school classrooms, we can only imagine how fascinating it must have been for the classmates of these men to share insights with each other. Their experience at the University of Chicago Law School must have played an important role in helping to form the legal and political thinking of these pioneers, and, by extension, of the Republic they went back to China to lead. Indeed, in its own small but critical way, the University may have been an important element in the creation of modern China.

Boxer fellows were noted for their academic achievements and are credited with the foundation of China’s modernization in all areas, including the westernization of the legal system of the Republic of China.
Rethinking the Costs of International Delegations

Daniel Abebe
Based upon these two examples, it is unclear which species of delegation, domestic or international, creates greater democratic accountability problems for Congress and the President. It is worth considering whether delegations of authority to international institutions such as the United Nations indeed create what are called greater “agency costs” than domestic delegations of authority to bodies such as the Federal Reserve. The conventional wisdom, which is critical of international delegations, mistakenly suggests that the answer is obvious: international delegations almost always create higher agency costs than domestic delegations. According to critics, for domestic delegations US congressional, executive, and judicial oversight mechanisms are present to monitor the agency to try to ensure accountability and democratic legitimacy. Here, agency costs are low. But for international delegations of binding authority to international institutions, critics contend that the US oversight mechanisms are absent, leaving the US unable to ensure that the international institution will act within the bounds of its delegated authority. Moreover, international institutions are neither representative of US interests nor accountable to the American public. Therefore, agency costs are high for international delegations and binding international delegations should either be disfavored or avoided.

To examine the merits of the agency costs claim, this Article focuses on two important questions: First, are the oversight tools to manage international delegations and domestic delegations systematically different in efficacy? Second, is the balance of costs and benefits for international delegations systematically different from that of domestic delegations? The answer to both questions is no.
I. Delegations: Domestic and International

In the US, domestic delegations were tools born out of the increasingly complex and technical regulatory apparatus of the modern administrative state. Congress, lacking the necessary expertise and resources to address the new regulatory demands, began to delegate broad authority to executive agencies to issue rules, directives, and regulations in their specified issues areas. The benefit is twofold: Congress can take advantage of agency expertise, producing socially desirable outcomes, and Congress can focus its resources on issues for which it is better suited to legislate.

Despite the potential benefits, delegations create a principal-agent problem, namely, that Congress and the President could not perfectly control their agent, the domestic agencies exercising delegated authority. Scholars have proposed various monitoring and oversight mechanisms to constrain agencies and more closely align them with the interests of Congress. One common tool for Congress and the President is the appointment process. Since the President and Congress act together to nominate and confirm potential appointees, they can coordinate and find appointees who share their consensus view and might therefore be less likely to deviate from their interests, presumably reducing agency costs and increasing accountability.

Another tool to constrain agents is through ex ante procedural controls. The President and Congress can force agencies to adopt specific decision-making processes, use certain methodologies, or engage in agenda setting to narrow agency authority. They can also consider the institutional design of agencies to reduce agency costs by creating institutional structures that shape the way the agencies operate and provide greater transparency and limit agency discretion.

Ex post tools are also available to ensure that the agencies continue to function within their delegated authority. Judicial review is one option, but it is unlikely to reduce agency costs. But on an ongoing basis, Congress can use “police patrols,” empower congressional committees to directly monitor agencies, or authorize individuals, corporations, or other parties subject to agency rule making to act as “fire alarms” and report agency misbehavior back to Congress. In theory, once the Congress observes bureaucratic drift or other problems, they could threaten to cut agency funding or conduct oversight hearings to question and embarrass agency heads. The President can issue directives by executive order regarding the breadth or agency authority in a particular area, engage in intraexecutive review of agency actions, and even informally appropriate authority over agency function. The President could threaten to terminate or otherwise pressure agency heads to act within their delegated authority.

Despite the fact that no mechanism can fully eliminate agency costs, domestic delegations are generally uncontroversial because, in theory, politically accountable actors selected through the democratic process can generally review, monitor, or invalidate agency decisions. Congress, acting with the President, delegates decision-making authority to an agency; the President nominates the people to staff the agency; the Senate confirms or rejects the nominee; and the courts are open for judicial review of agency action. In theory, each actor is representative of and responsive to the American public and the process is generally consistent with the Constitution’s formal requirements and structural limitations. For domestic delegations, the benefits of agency expertise come with agency costs, reduced by formal and informal review mechanisms.

With the significant exception of the international component, international delegations are conceptually identical to domestic delegations. Consider the following modified example of a delegation of adjudicative authority drawn from North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The US, Canada, and Mexico want to create a free-trade zone encompassing each country and sign a treaty to that effect. Under the terms of the treaty, the states create an adjudicative body or appeals panel to hear potential claims regarding the treatment of companies operating within the free-trade zone. Nonbinding international delegations are generally not the source of the most serious constitutional concerns because some political branch action is necessary before any decision, judgment,
regulation becomes binding in the US. Presumably, the constitutional problems are minimal and the agency costs are low, or at least similar to domestic delegations.

But what if the NAFTA appeals panel could hear claims and its decisions would be immediately enforceable in the US? After the appeals panel issued its judgment, Congress and the President would not have the option of noncompliance by refusing to act—the judgment would have immediate legal effect. For this reason, critics argue that binding international delegations are constitutionally problematic and exacerbate agency costs.

Binding international delegations of legislative authority may also conflict with Article I procedural requirements for lawmaking and appointments. Typically, binding international delegations are part of Article II treaties or congressional-executive agreements that, by their terms, create an international body. Imagine that the US signs and ratifies a multilateral treaty through the Article II treaty process. The treaty creates an international body that has binding authority to set minimum capital requirements for banks. Subsequently, the body acts and determines that all parties to the treaty must set the capital requirements for their domestic banks at 10 percent. Thus, the US has a binding obligation to comply with the new capital requirements.

For critics, this binding international delegation of legislative authority permits the international body to create new “law” with respect to capital requirements in violation of the Constitution's bicameralism and presentment requirements. The international body’s “legislation” would be automatically enforceable as US law without further political branch action, circumventing the House of Representatives, Senate, and President.

Similarly, a binding international delegation to an international agency would implicate the Constitution’s Appointments Clause and potentially Article II requirements for treaties. For example, let us assume that the US joins a multilateral treaty that creates an international agency with the authority to set binding regulations for the permissible amount of carbon emissions for each state party to the treaty. The international agency's director and staff, who are not appointed by the US President or Congress, would have the authority to regulate the amount of carbon emissions in the US and their determination would have immediate legal effect in the US. This would seemingly violate the Appointments Clause. Moreover, since the international agency can make ongoing binding determinations regarding its area of regulatory authority, such determinations could be interpreted as creating a new international obligation for the US. And if it is a new international obligation for the US, it might require a new treaty in conformance with the Treaty Clause.

Perhaps the area of greatest concern for critics is binding delegations of adjudicative authority to international judicial bodies. The treaties creating the UN, NAFTA, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), among others, each include a quasi-judicial body to hear claims arising under each treaty. Beyond formal constitutional requirements, binding international delegations implicate general federalism and separation of powers concerns. Even if the President can represent US interests at the international institutions, the transfer of decision-making authority away from Congress and the states to the President encourages a consolidation of power in the executive branch.

The failure to conform to formal and structural constitutional limitations produces a second and perhaps larger problem with binding international delegations: a lack of democratic legitimacy and political accountability for those entities exercising delegated authority. In the domestic context, at least Congress, the President, and the courts can proscribe delegations to administrative agencies and monitor their behavior. In the international context, this oversight structure cannot be replicated. Whatever agency costs problems exist in the domestic context, they pale in comparison to the costs created by delegating binding authority to an international institution.

II. Critiquing Proposals to Limit International Delegations

The combination of formal constitutional concerns and high agency costs has motivated proposals to make binding international delegations more difficult and, as a consequence, infrequent. One proposal suggests that courts should adopt a default rule of non self-execution for all international delegations that purport to create a commitment or obligation for the US. Thus, if the US wants to create a binding legal obligation, Congress and the President must specifically indicate an intent to bind the US in the congressional-executive agreement or treaty that purports to make the international delegation. A similar proposal suggests that the US adopt a “super-strong clear statement rule,” requiring Congress and the President to explicitly state their intent to bind the US through an international delegation of adjudicatory authority. In the absence of a “super-strong” clear statement, courts would
treat judgments of international legal tribunals as non-self executing and would not create any binding legal obligation in the US. This proposal is designed to make binding international delegations of adjudicative authority significantly more difficult and limit the binding effect of judgments from international judicial tribunals.

A third option proposes to raise the costs of enacting binding international delegations by requiring that such delegations be made only through the Article II treaty process. The Treaty Clause’s supermajority requirement would have the effect of prohibiting binding international delegations through congressional-executive agreements, which, like domestic legislation, go through both houses of Congress and are signed by the President, and through presidential-executive agreements, negotiated and signed by the President without congressional involvement. These proposals are concerned with a lack of formal adherence to constitutional limitations and structural requirements, combined with the high agency costs from poor accountability and legitimacy.

The key justification for limits on international delegations is the presence of high agency costs. However, the lack of specificity in the claim regarding agency costs and lack of clarity regarding assumptions about the incentives of international institutions create doubt about the need for limits on binding international delegations. First, critics are not always clear about what constitutes high agency costs. Agency costs should vary according to the nature of the international delegation (legislative, judicial, or regulatory); the organizational structure of the body exercising decision-making authority; the issue over which the organization has authority; and the scope of domestic interference. But we would expect the same thing in domestic delegations as well.

Second, it is not clear why agency costs are necessarily higher in international delegations than domestic delegations. Consider this simple example. The US signs a multilateral treaty with three small countries creating limits on the expropriation of foreign property. The treaty creates an eleven-judge “International Expropriation Court” ("IEC") with binding adjudicative authority to hear claims and issue final judgments; it is a binding international delegation by the US to the IEC through a treaty. Agency costs, in theory, might be high since the US cannot control the International Expropriation Court’s judgments, as they would be automatically enforceable in US courts. However, let us assume further that the treaty requires that the IEC operate by majority vote for all decisions but permits the US to appoint six of the eleven judges. Here, agency costs are low because the IEC’s voting structure ensures that it would reflect US interests. Third, critics do not explain why they think that international institutions would be more vulnerable than domestic agencies to higher agency costs stemming from agency drift, coalition drift, or interest group capture than domestic agencies.

A few assumptions about the operation of international institutions seem to motivate the criticism of international delegations. One clear assumption is that international institutions are staffed with cosmopolitan foreign elites who are either dismissive of or openly hostile to American interests. Since these foreign elites exercise binding decision-making authority, the agency costs of international delegations are high. A variant of this assumption is that international institutions (and international law) are tools to constrain American power, making them unlikely to represent American interests. If the US transfers binding authority to international institutions that operate as tools for weaker states to constrain the US, the agency costs are likely to be high.

While it is certainly true that international institutions will not perfectly reflect US interests and that weaker states might try and use them to constrain the US, it also clear that the US has been the leading force in the conception, creation, and use of international institutions across a number of issue areas. The most salient international institutions in world affairs, the UN and the WTO, are both the results of US efforts to shape the world consistent with US interests. Rather than being constrained by international institutions, the US is generally delegating to international institutions that it created and over which it exercises disproportionate influence.

Critics of binding international delegations focus almost exclusively on the agency costs problem but do not weigh those costs against the benefits of international delegations. It is uncontroversial to suggest that there are challenges of global concern requiring international cooperation to address and that international delegations may be one way to exploit the organizational advantages of centralized international institutions. Similar to domestic agencies, international institutions can take advantage of the aggregation of human expertise, broader access to data, greater legitimacy, and the accumulation of institutional knowledge built up over time to address the issues of global concern. International institutions with standing
committees, bodies, or executive structures can act more rapidly to address global issues as they occur, rather than waiting for states to coordinate or act independently in a crisis. Much of this can be done at a lower cost through an international institution with decision-making authority rather than by state coordination on a bilateral or multilateral basis; on an issue-by-issue basis; or in a reactive, ad hoc manner. Limits on the national government’s ability to delegate binding authority might make it harder for the US to enjoy the gains of international cooperation in the situation where the gains outweigh the potential agency costs.

III. Tools from Domestic Delegations Available for International Delegations

Many of the oversight tools for domestic delegations are available and used in the international context, a point frequently ignored by critics of international delegations. Ex ante domestic oversight mechanisms include the appointments process and institutional design. Ex post tools include the appropriations power, judicial review, and executive narrowing of agency discretion through explicit directives, intra-executive supervision, and the assumption of responsibility for agency actions. All of these tools permit the principal to reduce agency slack and limit shirking and self-dealing by the agent.

Many of these ex ante and ex post tools are present, in slightly different forms, in the international context. Of course, international oversight tools do not perfectly mimic those in the domestic context, making agency costs exactly the same. But any claim that agency costs are sufficiently high to warrant constitutional redress fails without a closer examination of the various tools that the US uses to influence international institutions.

International institutions are generally conceived, designed, and operated by powerful states to allow them to coordinate and achieve shared goals. At the same time, rational constitutional design dictates structuring international institutions to meet certain goals, increase flexibility, and potentially shape state interests. If such options exist, the claim that the difference in agency costs between international and domestic delegations, by itself, justifies disparate constitutional treatment is less convincing. In the end, the capacity of the US to influence the international institution will depend on the nature of the delegation; the decision-making procedures of the institution; the substantive area; and the precision of the rule adopted.

The most effective ex ante tools center on institutional design and procedures, namely, agenda setting, attenuated delegation, voting rules, appointments, and funding. The US has been the founder and key member of the most
significant international institutions in the world today including the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the WTO, among others. Given the US’s prominence in world affairs, the US has been able to design the international institution with its interests in mind, making them more accountable to its wishes.

For many international institutions, the US has created “majority rule” decision-making processes on some issues, while reserving the most important issues to smaller entities within the institution. In essence, the US has delegated general authority to the international institution and, within the institution, it has ensured that specific authority has been delegated to a smaller subgroup that exercises true decision-making authority. For example, the United Nations has 192 members and each has one vote at the UN General Assembly (UNGA). But for the most important issues regarding the “maintenance of international peace and security,” the UNGA, in effect, delegates decision-making authority to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The UNSC has only fifteen members at any given time, five of which are permanent and possess a veto: the United States, China, Great Britain, China, and Russia. With the veto power, the US can block any potential UNSC resolution that conflicts with US interests or those of its allies. The agency costs, such as they are, will likely be reduced in this structure.

The US’s outsized influence through attenuated delegations in the UN, the IMF, and WTO is exacerbated by their voting rules. For example, at the IMF, the US has an approximately 16 percent weighted vote at an institution that requires a consensus of 85 percent for major decisions and amendments, and virtually the same structure exists at the World Bank. In fact, the biggest criticism of both the World Bank and the IMF is the effective veto that the US has over any major decisions.

The US also has influence over the appointment and termination of top officials at many international institutions. In agency cost terms, the US has tried to ensure that agency heads are not too far removed from American interests. If a state knows that the US is likely to look unfavorably on a potential nominee, that state will be less willing to nominate the person in the first place. And at the World Bank, the US not only has an effective veto power over major decisions but also unilaterally names the President of the World Bank, inevitably an American who will likely shape the direction of the international institution to pursue US interests.

The US’s predominance in international politics also allows it to use a set of ex post tools that are conceptually similar to those available in the domestic context. They range from funding international institutions, side payments to states, and conditions on foreign aid to provisional participation, withdrawal, and the creation of new international institutions. While they might be more costly for the US—withdrawal from an international institution or the creation of a new one is not easy—these tools are available to the US and it has, on occasion, utilized them. But, if the US’s participation in the international institution is key for its efficacy, the very availability of these tools and the prospect of their use also shapes the operation of international institutions and keeps them generally aligned with US interests.

Perhaps most obvious, just like Congress can threaten or formally limit the agency budget, designate the funding for specific purposes, and condition increases on the achievement of certain goals, the US has done so with some international institutions. This tool is uniquely available to the US because it is often the single biggest financial supporter of international institutions. The US is the largest contributor to the IMF and World Bank, and it contributes almost 22 percent of the UN’s operating budget. Further, when the UNSC authorizes the use of force, it relies on the contribution of the member states for enforcement. The US is by some distance the biggest supplier of troops, funding, and materiel to UN “coalition” forces.

Similarly, the US uses side payments and attaches conditions on foreign aid to influence (or lobby) states to support US initiatives both within and outside of international institutions. When the US expressed concern that the International Criminal Court (ICC) might gain custody over Americans abroad, the US conditioned the receipt of foreign aid to some countries on their willingness to refuse to turn over Americans to the ICC. The US has tools to influence the product of international institutions by shaping the preferences of the member states.

Another tool that the US has used to maintain influence over international institutions is simply creating a new one when, for whatever reason, the old institution has been ineffective or unresponsive to US interests. In the negotiations to form the WTO, the US and other large economic powers withdrew from the GATT and forced the developing countries to either join the new WTO in a single undertaking or remain outside the new international trade system. The US and others forced the developing countries
to join on their terms or lose access to the world’s largest economic markets.

The US can also refuse to join international institutions, withdraw, or only provisionally participate in international institutions that have acted or are likely to act consistently against US interests. For example, the US refused to join the League of Nations in the early twentieth century, likely condemning it to failure at its inception. More recently, the US signed but eventually indicated its intent not to become a party to the Rome Treaty creating the ICC. Since the US was particularly concerned with the ICC’s potential to create liability for both parties and nonparties to the treaty, the US simply passed domestic legislation and signed agreements with state parties to the ICC to ensure that Americans would not fall under its jurisdiction.

The US’s asymmetric power advantage does not mean that the US can influence international institutions in all situations; rather, the US can stop initiatives that it does not like but it cannot always push through institutional objectives that it prefers. For example, the US’s veto on the UNSC means the US can stop the UNSC from acting contrary to US interests, but it does not mean that the US can always force the UN to act consistently with US preferences. Of course, the US has other tools to encourage other states to align themselves with US preferences, but the US cannot guarantee that the international institution will always act in a certain way.

This dynamic suggests that the international institutions have a status quo bias, one that favors the state or states that have designed, funded, and retained operational control of international institutions: in most instances, the US and its allies. Since the international institutions generally cannot act without US consent, they cannot hurt the US; in principal-agent terms, the agent cannot act without the principal’s approval. There is no accountability issue with international institutions since the US can block the initiatives it opposes and generally push through those that it supports. Thus, the acts and omissions of international institutions are unlikely to generate the kind of agency costs that warrant a formal limit on international delegations.

Finally, the argument outlined here focuses on the US’s asymmetric power advantage in creating international institutions and ensuring some operational control through ex ante and ex post mechanisms. But the US will not maintain this power forever, and sooner or later its influence over international institutions will begin to wane. If the US is only one of two or three dominant countries in the world, then the US’s ability to control the international institution diminishes, creating more significant principal-agent concerns.

But even in a world in which the US is no longer dominant, it is unclear why limits on international delegations are necessary when Congress and the President will be able to assess the US’s ability to influence an international institution before delegating decision-making authority. Congress and the President are well placed to analyze the costs and benefits of a specific delegation to an international institution and are already fully incentivized to internalize the costs of international delegations and ensure that the international institutions with delegated authority are accountable to US interests.

IV. Conclusion

Similar accountability issues are present in both domestic and international delegations, and a similar range of oversight tools are available to the US. The mistaken presumption that agency costs are high in the international delegations leads to erroneous arguments in favor of constraints being necessary to ensure accountability. Such constraints are unnecessary. It is unlikely that the political branches would need such constraints to force them to internalize the costs of delegating binding authority to an international institution; the political branches are well aware of the costs and benefits of international delegations. Given the US’s role in the conception, design, and operation of many of the world’s most important international organizations, it is hard to imagine the US delegating binding authority to an international institution that would act consistently against American interests or impose net costs on the US. Given the prominence of international governance in the American political discourse, Congress and the President need no additional incentives to consider carefully the wisdom of both binding and non-binding international delegations; therefore, national constitutional design limits are unnecessary.
For Richard Badger, preparing for the Law School’s Diploma and Hooding Ceremony meant practice, practice, practice. As Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs, Badger called the names of all 68 graduates receiving their Master of Laws (LLM) on June 9 in the Rockefeller Chapel ceremony. With first, middle, and last names from all over the globe, it is the kind of thing one must rehearse beforehand.

Good thing Badger has a system. Every fall at LLM Orientation, he records the students saying their names. He repeats the names, and they correct his effort. Everyone does this together, and it’s a good chance to laugh and get to know one another. But this ice breaker has a long-term purpose too: nine months later, Badger listens to this recording as he reads over phonetic spellings of the names before the hooding ceremony.

“As with anything else, it’s the thought that is important. They know I try to do it right, and they know I’m going to goof up,” Badger said.

Learning nearly six dozen full names from 24 countries was a challenge Badger was happy to face. Badger, ’68, remembers having just a few international graduate students as classmates when he was a student. The group remained small during the 1970s and ’80s in his first two decades at the Law School.

These days, you can’t miss them. The vast majority of Chicago’s foreign students today are LLMs, and they are an integral part of daily life at the Law School. Much has occurred over the last four decades to attract applications in such large numbers. Inside the Law School, faculty and staff committed to the program have driven the change. Foreign students drawn to Chicago Law decades ago by a Max Rheinstein or a Gerhard Casper became ambassadors for the program in their homelands, encouraging new students to apply. The Chicago Law reputation, particularly in law and economics, spread across the seas. This happened alongside the internationalization of law, which dictated that modern business and legal work is done with a global perspective.
Today’s LLMs tend to be interested in corporate law and are sent here by their employers to learn the American legal system. Many of them work for law firms, and some work for government agencies. All must have an undergraduate degree in law, and work experience is preferred. This is all very different from the earliest years of the program, when LLMs tended to be American. The impression is that most of those students planned on academic careers, Badger said. Some had earned a JD from another school but wanted to add a Chicago LLM to their resume.

In recent years, the LLM program has been virtually void of any American students and instead caters to international scholars. This is in part because of the Law School’s relatively small size and the fact that it does not offer LLMs on specialized topics such as taxation or securities regulation. The LLM is a generalized, but advanced, course in American law, which makes it perfect for international students.

What hasn’t changed in the last several decades is what the graduate programs, particularly the LLM program, represent: experience. LLMs have the chance to study American law and live a year abroad. The Chicago LLM experience attracts, as it always has, a relatively small cohort of the best and brightest scholars looking to continue their education in the most rigorous learning environment in the country.

Domestic JD students benefit too: they learn alongside scholars from around the world and hear diverse perspectives that go far beyond an American worldview. Plus the networking opportunities for both sets of students are priceless; if you are a New York lawyer doing business for the first time in Tokyo, whatever your country of origin, it is good to know a familiar face in the city.

Today’s LLMs choose the Law School because they find something special here: a small, intimate community in which they can become fully immersed and integrated. The Chicago LLM program is not nearly as large as at some other elite schools, and with the small size of Chicago’s JD population, these LLMs are much more able to get involved in the Law School community and get to know their American classmates. LLMs join the JDs in all kinds of extracurricular activities—they perform in the Law School Musical and participate in student government, intramural sports, and virtually every other aspect of Law School life—and they bring their own culture to the community as well, hosting country-themed parties for all students over the course of the year.

A few decades ago, “you could take out all the LLMs and no one would notice,” said Professor Douglas Baird, Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law. Baird joined the faculty in 1980, a year in which just two students earned an LLM. “Now, if you removed the LLMs, it would change the dynamic of the Law School, in a very negative way.”

**International Spirit Grows at the Law School**

The first LLM degree at the Law School was awarded in 1942 to Donald L. Hesson, a Londoner, but most of the first LLMs were Americans. The Master of Comparative Laws, or MCL degree, which was first earned in 1954, was the degree for foreign students. Today, the LLM and MCL degrees are identical, and the student may choose which he or she wants to earn. Some students already have one LLM, so they choose the MCL. Some countries may value one type of degree over the other. But largely students choose the LLM.
The fledgling graduate programs thrived in the ’50s and ’60s under Max Rheinstein, a name undoubtedly familiar to many Record readers. Rheinstein first came to the faculty in 1936, the same year as Edward H. Levi, after fleeing his native Germany and the Nazi regime. Rheinstein, a legal sociologist and expert in comparative law, directed the graduate programs as Max Pam Professor of Comparative Law, a title he held from 1942 to 1968.

Rheinstein drew international students to the Law School as he pushed American students to go abroad. He started the Foreign Law Program, which consisted of a year of studying civil law with Rheinstein and a language—either German or French—and then a year abroad studying with a mentor. Grants awarded after World War II brought European students to American universities in increasing numbers.

Rheinstein, who died in 1977, “was greatly admired,” said James Ratcliffe, ’50, who was Assistant Dean under Levi in the ’50s and ’60s. “He was a colorful old gentleman with a Continental background and a rich German accent. He was for some years the major link between the law faculty generally and our Continental counterparts.”

Rheinstein was the critical link to Europe in those days, but other faculty, including Soia Mentschikoff and Nicholas Katzenbach, encouraged international thinking at the Law School, said Kenneth Dam, ’57, now Max Pam Professor Emeritus of American and Foreign Law. (Dam has served as a Deputy Secretary in both the Treasury and State Departments.) In those days, Dam said, “Western Europe was the focus of where young lawyers wanted to practice, or have clients, like China is now. It was a tremendous intellectual focus.”

Consequently, the foreign graduate students coming to Chicago at that time tended to hail from Western Europe. One, Derrick Widmer, X’63, of Switzerland, even wrote a book in 2008 about his time at the Law School titled, America in the Early 1960s: A Love Story. He writes warmly of Rheinstein as someone who encouraged the foreign students to experience everything they could in and out of class.

“He was our admired mentor throughout our stay at the school and gave us also personal advice,” Widmer wrote. “He encouraged us not only to study hard but to see interesting places,” including the Florida Keys, Cuba, and Mexico, Widmer wrote. Widmer also writes about living in International House, where rent was between $90 and $127 a month, and his irritation at “Victorian customs” that limited when he could visit women in their dormitories. He never got that Chicago Law degree, having returned to Switzerland before writing his thesis, a move he describes with great regret in his book. He now practices at a firm that specializes in telecommunications law.

In the 1967–1968 Announcements, the LLM program is described as “a year of advanced study for Anglo-American law graduates” who wanted to develop specialized interests and engage in individual research, while the Comparative Law Program was aimed at students “whose training has been in legal systems other than the common law.” By the early 1980s, it was rare to find American students in the LLM program, which was virtually extinct anyway. Only 11 students graduated with an LLM from 1980 to 1985.

A Program Reborn

The graduate programs, and the LLM in particular, came back to life under Gerhard Casper, whose deanship began in 1979. In 1984, he reinstituted the foreign graduate program, with Roberta Evans, ’61, at the helm.

When Evans started working at the Law School in 1981 as Casper’s assistant, “there was essentially no graduate program,” she said. “There was one Polish student stuck here because there was a revolution and he couldn’t go home.” Casper, a German, was once an international student.
himself, earning an LLM degree at Yale in 1962. Evans said his interest and support were key to the program’s success, as was the changing legal world. Foreign governments revived grants to send their students abroad, and now interest was coming not just from Europe but also from Asia and Latin America. Students were often supported by their home countries or employers and didn’t need tuition assistance, making them even more attractive to American law schools. As the LLM program grew, Evans and alumni organized reunions in Paris, Brussels, Zurich, London, Munich, and Vienna. Foreign alumni encouraged their younger colleagues to come to Chicago for an LLM. In 1986, there were four LLMs and one MCL, and by 1996, there were 47 LLMs in the graduating class.

“I think we just started getting applications,” Evans said, rather modestly. But the faculty and students present during those years are eager to give much of the credit to Evans.

Hildegard Bison, ’89, still counts Evans as a close friend. Bison is a partner at Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer in Dusseldorf, Germany.

Evans “was absolutely vital for me loving this year and making it a success,” Bison said. “She was really a mother of the program at that time. She really cared about every individual, and she was someone you could relate to.”

Bison came to Chicago on the advice of a friend from the University of Bonn, where she received her law degree. He told her that if she ever considered an LLM, Chicago was the place to go. As a student, she was amazed to be in classes with only 25 students, after having taken courses in Germany with 600 or 800 classmates.

“The lectures that were given there, the way they go beyond mere teaching of the law, but broadening people’s minds, that was also exciting at the time for me. I had never had such an opportunity before.”

The work was very challenging, Bison remembered, especially reading assignments for these nonnative speakers. But there was fun too. She remembers Evans inviting the whole group of LLMs—19, in 1989, plus two MCLs—to her house for parties. Because of the exchange rate, money was scarce, and the LLMs really appreciated the invitation.

“We were all so happy and overwhelmed when we were invited to Roberta’s place for dinner,” she said. And sometimes, in true European fashion, they’d stay past midnight.

Evans was truly the students’ mother away from home. She sat in the hospital waiting room during an emergency appendectomy and then called the man’s parents in Argentina to tell them he was OK. She gave advice on long-distance relationships (“if the girlfriend is worth it, she’ll wait”). When she traveled, she left her house, cats, and plants in the care of students.

Those years are long gone, but the ties remain for Evans and her students.

“I have people to visit all over the world,” she said. “That’s the best part.”

Below: LLMs at a soccer game in November 2007.
Today: A Focus on Corporate Law

This year, 885 students applied for the LLM program, and 71 are enrolled this fall. They come from 27 countries. One need only look at the names in the Glass Menagerie—or in the graduation program—to see how much things have changed, said Geoffrey Stone, ’71, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law. Stone has been on the faculty since 1973.

“It’s much more diverse,” he said. “It used to be primarily students from the Commonwealth countries and Europe. Now there are many more Asians and South Americans.”

Of the LLM class of 2012, 20 were from Europe, Australia, and New Zealand. Thirty-one were from Asia (counting 11 from China and nine from Japan), and 14 came from South America. Mexico added another four students. Twenty years ago, European LLMs still had a numerical edge over Asian LLMs, 18 to 10.

The increase in international trade in Asian and South American economies has accounted for much of this trend, Badger said. Lately, he has received close to 200 applications a year from China alone.

“Most of them are here because their employers or potential employers think it’s a good idea to do this,” Badger said. “That’s largely because they’ll be dealing with American law firms or American clients. The idea is that exposure to American law will make it easier.” Plus, he added, American law schools offer classes you can’t find in every country, on topics such as law and economics and gender discrimination, among others.

A minority of LLMs today are interested in academia. They get their LLMs on the way to a JSD, which is usually a five-year process, with one year of residence at the Law School and another four to complete a dissertation. Some complete an LLM so they can take an American bar exam, which is another resume booster.

The most popular classes for today’s LLM students are Corporate Law, Economic Analysis of the Law, Federal Regulation of Securities, Antitrust Law, and Advanced Corporations: Mergers and Acquisitions, according to Badger’s records. The LLMs take classes alongside JDs, and they tend to be about the same age, from their early 20s into their 30s, Badger said. Because all have studied law and most have practiced, they come with the added benefit of some legal sophistication, though the language can pose a challenge.

André Zanatta Fernandes de Castro, LLM ’09, is Litigation Counsel for Google in Brazil. He took a varied mix of
classes during his LLM, from Trial Advocacy and Class Action Litigation to Public International Law, Concluding Complex Business Transactions, and the Law of E-Commerce.

At his former job, the Chicago degree “helped me be promoted to senior associate in my firm earlier than many of my peers,” he said. “It was also decisive when I was offered my current position, as Google is an American company, and naturally they felt comfortable that I had a U.S. law degree. On a day-by-day basis, having been exposed to the Socratic method made me more dynamic professional, which is highly welcomed by my clients.”

Bison said the reputation of Chicago’s LLM is far-reaching. She has recruited employees from Chicago’s LLM class because she knows “they were the best qualified students we could wish to see.”

It’s the same in Chile, said Daniel Weinstein, LLM ’10. He is a senior associate at Morales & Besa Abogados, a large firm in Santiago started by Chicago’s very first Chilean LLM student, Guillermo Morales, LLM ’87. Most of Weinstein’s clients are international, so he uses his skills from his LLM coursework all the time, he said. While at the Law School, he took Economic Analysis of the Law, International Arbitration, and Business Law, plus a Greenberg Seminar with Professors Jonathan Masur and Richard McAdams where they discussed books about crimes in Chicago.

“University of Chicago has a fantastic reputation in Chile, as the architects of our economic system were economists from the University of Chicago. The Law School also has a great reputation, as there are a lot of applicants, and they admit only a few, who usually are the best students from the best law schools,” Weinstein said.

Plus, he said he’ll never forget the focus on ideas at Chicago Law. “Having spent time with such brilliant minds as I met there—and I am referring to both professors and students—both inside and outside the classroom was an experience I will never forget, especially when it is time to discuss ideas,” he said. “At Chicago you are welcome to challenge any idea and don’t have to take anything for granted.”

Back in their home countries, LLM alumni say they think of their year in Chicago frequently. Stephan Wilske, LLM ’95, acknowledges that his LLM year was one he would “not necessarily like to repeat because it was so intense.” Wilske is a partner at Gleiss Lutz in Stuttgart, Germany. Still, “I am somewhat reminded of my year in Chicago every day because I found my wife,” a Taiwanese graduate of the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Siska Ghesquire, LLM ’05, said her “close-knit” class of about 50 stays in touch. She especially remembers volunteering at poll sites on Election Day and going sailing.

Ghesquire, who now practices corporate law at Linklaters in Brussels, considered other elite law schools with many more students, but with those schools she felt somewhat anonymous. At Chicago, she felt like she was noticed, she said. And now, she finds her LLM a useful background with the American clients she works with frequently.

Similarly, Bison said her time at the Law School gave her knowledge, confidence, and the inspiration to start the career she has now. “I would not have joined or even considered joining an international law firm without that experience,” she said. “It really made me more self-confident and broader in many ways.”

Even though she spent more years at her undergraduate university in Germany, Bison considers Chicago her true alma mater, she said.

“This is where I come from,” she said. “The impact it had is much bigger than the German university … it really opened up my whole life.”
In true Chicago fashion, authors of Climate Change Justice invited their best critics to the Law School.

By Sarah Galer
Reaching an international agreement to address global climate change has been notoriously difficult, despite broad international ambition and years of debate.

One major roadblock has emerged from disputes between rich and poor countries about who should bear the cost and responsibility for cutting carbon dioxide emissions. For example, just before the 2009 Copenhagen climate meetings, a protest of 20,000 people in London called for $150 billion a year in payments from industrialized nations to offset the cost of reducing emissions in poorer countries.

“Such demands may have moral appeal, but they are ultimately impractical and unlikely to yield results, argue University of Chicago Law professors Eric Posner and David Weisbach in their book *Climate Change Justice*. If there is to be any hope of meaningful steps on climate change, the authors say, the strategy should appeal to nations’ self-interest rather than moral obligation.

“The problem is that some countries are arguing for a climate treaty that accounts for historical injustices, colonialism, and the unfair global distribution of wealth,” says Posner, Kirkland & Ellis Professor of Law. “But wealthy and rapidly developing countries traditionally do not respond well to these sorts of arguments and are not going to enter into a treaty unless the treaty is in their interest.”

Posner and Weisbach’s fresh perspective on how the international community should address climate change has ignited debate among their peers. Some scholars believe concerns about justice, including the fair treatment of indigenous peoples, are inseparable from the question of how to remedy climate change.

Rather than simply forge ahead with their side of the debate, Posner and Weisbach invited a host of their critics to the Law School earlier this year for a conference on climate change justice. In true Chicago fashion, the conference participants took a deep look at the issue, challenging the authors’ ideas not just from a legal perspective but also from the vantage points of philosophy, political science, international affairs, and the physical sciences.

**Incubating ideas through debate**

“The greatest success for Chicago scholars is to provoke people who disagree to think about the reasons why,” says Omri Ben-Shahar, Frank and Bernice J. Greenberg Professor of Law and Kearney Director of the University of Chicago Institute for Law and Economics. “In the course of people offering contrasting views, we all better understand the topic.”

Ray Pierrehumbert, Louis Block Professor in Geophysical Sciences, and Henry Shue, a professor at Oxford University, reminded the other scholars of the linearity of temperature increase to carbon dioxide emissions. This means that even if the world achieves dramatic reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, the temperature will continue to rise, albeit at a slower rate. However, emissions eventually have to go to zero if we hope to stop the process.

While the aim of Posner and Weisbach’s book was to find the most feasible way to a climate treaty, Pierrehumbert and Shue’s presentations were a reminder that achieving that goal, as difficult as it might be, can only be the beginning. The consequences of carbon dioxide emissions are just too dire to go only partway.

“I had never fully focused on the stark implication that you have got to go to zero,” says Weisbach, Walter J. Blum Professor of Law. “Eventually everyone in the world, rich...
and poor, have to stop emitting carbon dioxide or the temperature will continue to increase indefinitely. It is dramatic when you see it that way, which people have not really focused on yet.”

“The greatest success for Chicago scholars is to provoke people who disagree to think about the reasons why. In the course of people offering contrasting views, we all better understand the topic.”

Several other participants from various disciplines used the conference to voice their disagreement with one of Posner and Weisbach’s central claims. The authors argue that a treaty is only possible if it advances the interests of all the states that sign it, without making any state worse off—something they call “international paretianism.”

Some commentators claimed that Posner and Weisbach’s view of international paretianism is “morally repugnant because it means that wealthy, powerful states do not have to make any sacrifices,” says Posner.

“The feedback we received from our peers at the conference led to us write a response to explain international paretianism more thoroughly, which I think is useful,” Posner says. “Our hope is to influence the academic debate on climate change. The academic debate will then help to inform the political debate.”

Posner and Weisbach’s response, in addition to papers from each of the conference participants, will appear in the winter 2013 issue of Chicago Journal of International Law.

**Global initiative, global implications**

The conference was part of a major new Law and Economics 2.0 Initiative at the Law School, one goal of
which is to globalize the impact of the field of law and economics, transforming legal systems around the world. Since its founding at the Law School nearly 80 years ago, the application of economics to the study and practice of law has been applied to entire bodies of legal study, from antitrust and tort to contract and corporate law. As part of the new initiative, Law School scholars are drawing on this storied history to expand the study of law and economics to new areas, including immigration law and climate change—both focuses of international Law School conferences this spring and summer.

“Law and economics has been so successful in illuminating issues in American law, but it has been largely ignored as a tool by other countries,” says Ben-Shahar. “This conference managed both to engage the international community with the law and economics perspective and to use that perspective to illuminate issues at the core of international law.”

Weisbach is in the process of writing a follow-up book to Climate Change Justice, on how theories of justice should affect climate change policies, drawing in part from the academic debate ignited by their book. He says the world’s biggest concern in negotiating a climate change treaty should not be justice but technology.

“People ask how poor nations can stop being poor if they cannot use energy, because energy is what creates emissions,” he says. “However, if no one can emit, everyone is going to be poor. The principal focus of the international community must be to find a way to harness ‘clean’ energy sources like solar power, nuclear energy, and wind power well enough to fuel our economies. If we cannot do that, then everyone is going to be poor or the Earth is going to become very, very hot.”

Weisbach says, “The way to solve the problems of technology is not through claims about justice but incentives to create renewable energy sources.”

Dean Michael Schill welcomed conference attendees.

Professor Omri Ben-Shahar organized the conference.

Lively discussions continued in between conference sessions.

Professor Dale Jamieson of NYU presented a paper on “Consequentialism, Climate Change, and the Road Ahead.”
When Somali leaders approved a new Constitution this summer for the war-torn, impoverished African nation, a handful of Chicago Law students felt particularly close to the process. Nathaniel Paynter, ’12, Alejandro Herrera, ’12, Emily Heasley, ’14, and Eric Alston, ’14, prepared analyses of the draft constitution through Professor Tom Ginsburg’s Constitutions Lab, a new initiative at the Law School that aims to introduce students to real-world constitutional design.

Under Ginsburg’s guidance, the students compared Somalia’s 1960 Constitution, its 2004 Transitional Charter, and a Consultation Draft created in 2010. Ginsburg included the analysis in a report on the Consultation Draft to IDLO (the International Development Law Organization) which was passed on to Somali leaders. Ginsburg and his students don’t know for sure that the report was used, but the final draft was consistent with some of their recommendations.

Alston, ’14, who worked for the IDLO in Rome this summer, prepared another report that analyzed the final draft and the rights guaranteed therein as it headed into a vote by the National Constituent Assembly, a body formed for the constitutional process. The assembly approved the Constitution, which is provisional until a public referendum can be held. That’s not feasible in the troubled country right now, but the Constitution is at least a symbolic step toward a more stable government.

These benefits, for nations and for students, are what the Lab is all about. It’s a natural outgrowth of Ginsburg’s work with the Comparative Constitutions Project, which is producing a database on formal provisions of national constitutions for all countries since 1789.

“When we started the project, we had several academic goals in mind: to understand how constitutional ideas spread, to determine what makes constitutions endure, and to learn about what ultimately ensures that constitutions
are effective. But we also thought that the project might be useful to real-world constitution makers,” Ginsburg said.

In the past two years, data from the Comparative Constitutions Project has been used to inform reports on constitution-making not only in Somalia, but also in Kenya and South Sudan. Ginsburg’s research has shown that, in any given year, five to 10 countries are engaged in drafting new constitutions. And most of those involved in the process, he noted, have never done it before and will never do it again, at least if the effort is successful. This led to the creation of a website, www.constitutionmaking.org, addressed to the needs of constitution makers and those who advise them.

“Working with the constitutions lab has provided me with unprecedented access to the tools and techniques of comparative constitutional analysis,” Alston said. “From a library of every significant worldwide constitutional event in modern history, to projects offering input into both the process and substance of constitution building, the lab has proven immensely beneficial to my understanding of the foundational documents of societies around the world.”

Alston’s analysis of the Somali Constitution was covered by the Associated Press and other news outlets, and featured by the Huffington Post, Bloomberg, the Washington Post, ABC News, and BBC News. The analysis showed that Somalia’s draft constitution was fairly liberal in granting rights to citizens, compared with other Islamic countries.

While in Rome, Alston’s official position was Constitution Reform Associate, tasked with performing research for the Kenyan constitutional process. Part of his job was evaluating the impact of work that Ginsburg, Law School Professor Aziz Huq, and former Law School Professor Rosalind Dixon did for the Kenyan constitution-making process in 2009 and 2010. The faculty members were part of a team of eight international scholars, led by Ginsburg, who conducted a detailed analysis of the draft text. Alston identified 19 of the professors’ suggestions that were reflected in the final draft.

Sometimes, the Constitutions Lab provides opportunities for students they couldn’t have foreseen when they started Law School. Paynter, for example, enrolled in the Law School in 2009, before South Sudan was even a country. But by his third year of Law School, he was examining its constitutional process with Ginsburg. In July 2011, South Sudan won its independence from Sudan. Paynter and Ginsburg produced an extensive report on drafting processes and constitutional implementation commissions in other countries, to help inform the South Sudan drafters as they designed their own document. The country’s Constitutional Review Commission is currently working on a permanent Constitution, which is expected to be done next year.

Paynter said it was “ridiculously cool” to have real-world impact on a developing country’s framework. He appreciated the chance to do more than just study case law, he said.

“When we started the project, we had several academic goals in mind: to understand how constitutional ideas spread, to determine what makes constitutions endure, and to learn about what ultimately ensures that constitutions are effective.”

“It was the single most meaningful thing to my Law School experience,” he said. “It forced you to really think about things that had real-world implications. It really is a whole different type of work when you know it’s meaningful, it’s going to be used for something.”

Ginsburg’s own interest in constitutions started to develop when he was a young program officer for the Asia Foundation, a nonprofit founded in 1954 in the hopes of developing a “peaceful, prosperous, just, and open Asia-Pacific region.” In that role, Ginsburg was approached by the government of Mongolia to provide assistance for the drafting of a new democratic Constitution for the country in 1992. He identified a number of law professors to help with the effort, and he was so taken with their work that he decided he wanted to go to law school himself.

“Watching a constitution-making process up close was a very formative experience for me, and I wanted to provide our students with similar opportunities for hands-on work,” Ginsburg said. The Lab is the place for those opportunities, and they will only grow, as Ginsburg plans to increase the number of students, countries, and projects in the coming academic year. □
Any self-knowledge worth the name tells you that others are as real as you are, and that your life is not just about you. It is about accepting the fact that you share a world with others, and about taking action directed at the good of others,” Nussbaum explains about the message she hopes to convey in the book.

In *The New Religious Intolerance*, Nussbaum explores religious prejudice through the lens of philosophy, literature, history, and law. She argues that in order to “uncover the roots of ugly fears and suspicions that currently disfigure all Western societies,” Europe and the United States need to reassess the strength of their principles of equal respect, evaluate their narcissistic responses, and develop “inner eyes” to more easily imagine the lives of others.

Fear with no basis in evidence leads to dubious exclusions, she writes. Many examples of this are now occurring across Europe and the United States. The banning of minarets in Switzerland. The forbidding of *burqa* in several European countries. The tragic killings in Norway by an anti-Islamic fanatic. The blocking of a Muslim community center in New York City. Fears of terrorism in Europe and the United States have deteriorated into irrational thoughts and actions towards Muslims, which will continue until Europe and the United States turn their critical eyes inward, argues University of Chicago Law School professor Martha Nussbaum in her new book, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*.

While fear is an important natural emotion, its self-centered nature makes it susceptible to irrational distortions that are harmful to others, writes Nussbaum, the Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics in the Law School and the Philosophy Department.
Europe and North America. European countries have taken aim at everything from what Muslims wear to where they worship. France, Belgium, and Italy have all passed laws banning Muslim burqa, an outer garment worn by very few Muslim women in Europe to cover their whole body, while many communities have even banned the headscarf, which only covers a woman’s hair. Tellingly, the same restrictions have not been equally applied to other religious dress such as nun habits and Christian crosses.

Nussbaum explores the reasoning behind these and other slights against Muslims. Switzerland’s ban on minarets, a tower sometimes built on mosques to help call Muslims to worship, is a result of an irrational campaign of fear, according to Nussbaum. Out of 150 mosques in the country, only four have minarets, and yet 57 percent of the population voted to ban their future construction. The author also discusses the gunman behind the fatal attacks in Norway in 2011 that killed more than 75 people at a government building and a Labour Party youth camp. The killer explained his actions as a fight against Islamization.

This resistance to Muslims is not confined to Europe. In the United States, there are numerous examples of a growing suspicion. In Oklahoma, a law was passed forbidding the use of “Sharia law,” or Islamic law, an unnecessary redundancy of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment that prohibits enforcement of religious legal codes. In New York, a Muslim community center near “Ground Zero” in New York City has caused a major outcry, although neither an existing nearby mosque nor the neighboring strip clubs, liquor store, and off-track betting parlor have caused any backlash.

“It’s not rational to dismiss the fear of Muslim terrorism. That fear is rational in the light of history and current events, and that rational fear ought to guide sensible public policy … but it’s simply not reasonable to believe that all one’s neighbors are fiends in disguise.”

Nussbaum says that for the most part, Europe and particularly the United States understand what good political principles of equal respect should look like, but those principles remain vulnerable.

“They remain fragile, however, in times of fear,” Nussbaum writes. “Like railroad tracks, they guide the train well until some disaster, whether a system failure or an earthquake, causes it to go off the tracks. And today we see all too many cases in which panic is causing derailment.”

Nussbaum has seen attitudes toward Muslims spiraling downward in both Europe and the United States in the last decade after years of relative religious tolerance. Although Europe’s history has been peppered with events such as the Crusades, the Wars of Religion, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, and Nazism and the United States has in the past been less than hospitable toward Native Americans, Roman Catholics, Jews, Mormons, and Jehovah’s Witnesses, Europe and the United States had begun to pride themselves on its openness and acceptance. That tolerance is now being jeopardized.

Nussbaum’s book grew out of a column she penned for the New York Times on the proposed burqa bans in Europe and a later response to the hundreds of passionate comments she received. Her book, in addition to being an intellectual exploration of the subject, challenges people to remain true to the time-honored ideals of the United States Constitution. These changes must be made not just at the political level, but also through individual reflection and imagination about the minority experience.

“That future is in the hands of the people,” writes Nussbaum.

“If we don’t all insist on decency and inclusion, the nation will subtly have become a different nation, one more suspicious of foreigners, more insistent on homogeneity,” she warns. “This would be a tremendous loss.”
The Spring 2012 issue of the *Record* detailed Chicago Law students' increasing passion for public interest law and the Law School's effort to meet that interest with opportunities and funding. Of course, that enthusiasm and support is not confined within the United States. The knowledge and hard work of Chicago Law students are valued all over the world.

For the past three years, an increasing number of Chicago students have received funding from the Law School to spend their summers working for nonprofit and human rights organizations all over the globe. Often with the help of faculty members such as Professors Tom Ginsburg, Aziz Huq, and Martha Nussbaum, the students secure summer jobs that enable them to learn about foreign cultures while at the same time serving the public interest.

This summer, 15 students had international fellowships on four continents: Africa, Asia, Australia, and Europe. They worked for a wide variety of organizations ranging from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to the Hague Conference International Centre for Judicial Studies and Technical Assistance in the Netherlands. Five of those students are Jacobs Fellows, which means their work is funded by the Charles M. Jacobs Fund for Human Rights and Social Engagement. This year, the fund was established by a $2 million gift from the Charles and Cerise Jacobs Charitable Foundation. The fund was split evenly between the College and the Law School.

According to the Law School's Director of Public Interest Law and Policy Susan Curry, the students who take advantage of these international summer programs tend to be rising 2Ls. They commit to eight weeks in a fellowship, which sometimes turns into a postgraduate job.

“Many of our students come to law school with a passion for social justice and a desire to make a difference in international settings.”

“My work experience in India was the most rewarding, exciting, and challenging thing I have ever done. I was assigned to work with The Lawyer's Collective, Women's Rights Initiative (WRI), which is an NGO that I chose primarily because of its focus on women's issues in the developing world. However, that plan quickly changed when I arrived in India.

The WRI was founded and is directed by Ms. Indira Jaising, an internationally known advocate for women's rights who, as of two years ago, has also served as the Additional Solicitor General of India. While I was in India, Ms. Jaising was set to begin her oral arguments on behalf of the Union of India in a matter being heard before the Supreme Court. She approached me with the opportunity to work personally with her to prepare her arguments and written submissions, rather than my planned work with the NGO. I said yes, of course.

I was transferred to Ms. Jaising's offices in Canning Lane, where I worked with two junior lawyers also assigned to the case. Although I was only a legal intern, I was allowed to actively participate in crafting the arguments that were to be presented before the Court when the matter resumed in July. I even was able to contribute some of my knowledge of U.S. and international case law from my 1L classes, and my research was incorporated into the arguments presented by the Attorney General of India.

By far the most challenging part of my job came when it was time for Ms. Jaising to draft her own written submissions. For two weeks leading up to the beginning of her oral
arguments, I had the privilege of brainstorming with my boss, often sitting at her dining room table with my laptop until 10 or 11 p.m., drafting and redrafting her submissions. Although difficult, this was an amazing opportunity. Not only did I get good working knowledge of Indian constitutional law, but there was a sense that the work I was doing was of vital importance—in this case, defending a statute which ensured that all school children ages 6–14 received a free and compulsory elementary school education. Additionally, I finally got over many of the difficulties that I had faced in Legal Research and Writing class during my 1L year—there really is no better way to learn legal writing than to simply sit down and write.

My reward for all this hard work was permission to be present in the courtroom at the advocates’ table each and every day that the matter was argued before the Justices of the Supreme Court. Although legal interns are generally not allowed in the Chief Justice’s courtroom, an exception was made for me as Ms. Jaising’s American “legal assistant.” I got to watch all we had researched and written presented before the highest court in the nation. Thus far I have found no bigger thrill than to hear words that I wrote spoken before the Chief Justice in India and seeing him smile and nod. (And then he quoted our arguments, using my words, later on in the proceedings!)

My experiences in India were not expected, nor could they be considered typical. My incredible luck in meeting Ms. Jaising and getting to work with her and her junior lawyers has left me with an intimate knowledge about how the legal system works in India and an appetite for more international work.
research skills, but also I got a chance to think strategically about where and how to litigate. Moreover, the fact that my cases had an impact on the organization's litigation plans helped make the experience particularly enjoyable.

Catherine Matloub, '13, India
I completed an eight-week International Human Rights Fellowship at the Lawyer's Collective, Women's Rights Initiative in Delhi from June to August 2011. During this time, I edited and updated the first two chapters of a book entitled *Law Relating to Sexual Harassment at the Workplace*, published by Oxfam in 2004. Sexual harassment at the workplace was first identified as wrong in India in 1996 with the landmark Supreme Court case of *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*. The book is written as a guide for Indian lawyers to advocate for their clients and enforce this judgment.

Two projects I worked on stand out. The first was a strategic litigation memorandum on establishing HIV status as a protected constitutional class. I surveyed the law in five countries and made recommendations on where and in what area of law a case would be most likely to succeed. What was most rewarding about this experience was that I was told the organization had chosen a country in which to pursue a suit largely due to recommendations in my memo.

The second project was a judicial removal case. A judge in Swaziland was under removal hearings for alleged misconduct, and SALC was helping with his defense. I worked extensively on the judge's responses to the allegations against him, and much of what I wrote found its way into his official arguments. I got to interact with the judge on several occasions and participated in a consultation between the judge and his senior legal counsel, who was one of South Africa's most accomplished constitutional attorneys. What I appreciated most about the internship was that both of my projects had a real impact on my professional development. Not only did I improve my writing and
at the workplace relates to constitutional law. My work consisted of international comparative legal research, incorporating changes in the law into the original edition, generally updating the material, and rewriting significant portions of the text.

In order to accomplish my tasks, I familiarized myself with the Indian Constitution and the recently proposed bill in India addressing the problem of sexual harassment at the workplace. I compared recent trends in the development of sexual harassment law in the United States and the Commonwealth countries. Notable developments around the world include, but are not limited to, a focus on substantive rather than formal equality, the passage of laws specifically targeting sexual harassment as a distinct wrong as opposed to merely a form of discrimination, and an expansion of the definition of what constitutes sexual harassment.

**Ellie Norton, ’13, Australia**

Working at the North Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency (NAAJA) in Darwin was an amazing summer experience. I was assigned to the office’s Criminal Division, where I served as a legal intern. I spent about half my time on research projects and the other half at the Magistrate’s Court, where I took instructions from clients in custody and attended hearings and trials to assist the attorneys. I was also involved in two Supreme Court matters—most excitingly, I wrote a submission (like a minibrief), which was actually used in a sentencing hearing! I occasionally visited clients at Berrimah Prison, as well, to take further instructions or update them on the status of their cases. I really enjoyed the work that I did—both the research and client interaction.

The lawyers at NAAJA are incredibly talented and hard-working. I learned a great deal just by building relationships with them and observing their unique approaches to practicing law. It can be easy to get comfortable working with one or two attorneys, but I tried to work with everyone I could, because I gained so much from each lawyer’s experience and techniques. There wasn’t much hand-holding, so I soon learned that the experience was mine for the taking—it was going to be what I made of it. I did my best to show that I was determined to contribute and help with substantive work.

A highlight of the summer was attending Bush Court (small court sessions held in Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory). I went to court twice in Oenpelli, a community about 3.5 hours outside of Darwin, in Kakadu National Park. It was a beautiful setting, but also an eye-opening experience, and an important one for understanding the deep and complex problems facing Aboriginals in the Northern Territory. I found I got to know the lawyers better, as it was two to three days in close proximity with them, working hard to get through a lot of matters. My job was mostly to interview clients, help the attorneys prepare, and occasionally track down witnesses in the community. One day, though, I got to play hooky and help some of the ladies who make traditional baskets for the art center collect roots and pandanus leaves. It was a wonderful opportunity to learn more about Aboriginal culture.

Outside of work, I tried to see as much of the area around Darwin as I could. Litchfield National Park, Kakadu, and Katherine are all incredibly beautiful, and it’s easy to get a group of friends together and take a car there for a day or weekend. I was also able to travel to Vietnam and Bali (for really cheap!) on two weekends, which was amazing. There are so many opportunities to take advantage of in Darwin.
When Sital Kalantry joins the Law School faculty in January as Clinical Professor of Law, she will add substantial further momentum to the Law School’s commitment to the study and practice of human rights law. She has been widely lauded for her exceptional teaching and mentoring, her rigorous and wide-ranging research, her incorporation of empirical and interdisciplinary methods into practical human rights advocacy, and her passion for social justice.

Her hiring has been hailed as “a major coup for our Law School” by Martha Nussbaum, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics.

In addition to leading a clinic on international human rights at the Law School, Kalantry will also guide a broad expansion of human rights programming and further strengthen the Law School’s human rights research component. “Chicago’s world-class human rights faculty, its commitment to empiricism and interdisciplinary approaches, its excellent students, and the presence in the Chicago area of so many superb organizations committed to human rights in the US and abroad were all very compelling reasons for me to join the clinical faculty,” Kalantry says.

She has co-taught a legal clinic at Yale Law School and founded and led the International Human Rights Clinic at Cornell Law School, where she also co-founded and is the faculty director of the Avon Global Center for Women and Justice, which works with judges, legal professionals, and governmental and nongovernmental organizations to improve access to justice in an effort to eliminate violence against women and girls. “One in three women will suffer from some form of violence in her lifetime,” she says, “and although gender-based violence can take many forms in different corners of the world, many of the barriers to securing justice are shared experiences. These are among the issues I expect to continue to address with the students and faculty of the Law School.”

In addition to a law degree from the University of Pennsylvania, Kalantry holds a master’s degree in development studies from the London School of Economics. In the spring of this year, as the recipient of a Fulbright-Nehru Senior Research Scholar Award, Kalantry lived in New Delhi, India, where she conducted a study of public interest litigation in India and co-taught a clinical class that was offered jointly at Cornell Law School and an Indian law school.

“I have been so proud of our clinical faculty and the programs they run. Sital’s new human rights clinic will be just the new jewel that this crown needs.”

**The Clinic**

Kalantry is described by Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law, as “the top human rights clinician in the country.” Her clinic’s students will work in close collaboration with local and international human rights organizations, focusing on drawing attention to human rights violations, developing practical solutions to those problems, and promoting accountability on the part of state and nonstate actors.

In preparation for their litigation and advocacy activities, which will likely include substantial work overseas, the clinic students will first learn about the application of empirical and interdisciplinary methods to human rights issues, participate in simulation exercises, and conduct background country and situational research. Then as they work on specific projects they may draft position papers and policy reports, advocate before international bodies, and work on in-country legislative reform and litigation. In the clinic, students will gain experience working with nongovernmental organizations, writing briefs, researching and drafting policy arguments, interacting with clients, and transforming communities.
Dean Michael Schill observes, “I have been so proud of our clinical faculty and the programs they run. Sital’s new human rights clinic will be just the new jewel that this crown needs. It will be a tremendous opportunity for our students to become great human rights advocates. When I read about the work she has done on behalf of abused women around the world, tears fill my eyes.”

Scholarship
Kalantry has studied, written about, brought attention to, and acted on a broad range of issues that include acid-based violence against women in South Asia (she published the first comparative study on acid violence in Bangladesh, India, and Cambodia), barriers to justice for women defendants who have been victims of domestic violence, and various aspects of US immigration and refugee law.

With co-authors Ted Eisenberg and Nick Robinson, she recently completed an empirical study of litigation rates in Indian states, analyzing over 20 years of data from high courts and six years of data from trial courts. That study found that higher litigation rates correlate more with a state’s Human Development Index Score—a composite of economic, health, and education indicators—than with the state’s GDP and literacy rate. “The implication is that simply improving the courts or macroeconomic growth are not the most important factors in ensuring that people are able to access the courts,” she says. “Assuring access to justice may require governments to ensure economic as well as social rights and opportunities.”

In an article published in Human Rights Quarterly, she examined how quantitative indicators might be used to assess a country’s compliance with international human rights treaties, particularly, how they could be applied to ascertain whether a country is providing the right to education in a manner consistent with the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. She has worked with local partners in Colombia to implement international human rights norms relating to the right to education.

“The implication is that simply improving the courts or macroeconomic growth are not the most important factors in ensuring that people are able to access the courts,” she says. “Assuring access to justice may require governments to ensure economic as well as social rights and opportunities.”

In an article published in Human Rights Quarterly, she examined how quantitative indicators might be used to assess a country’s compliance with international human rights treaties, particularly, how they could be applied to ascertain whether a country is providing the right to education in a manner consistent with the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. She has worked with local partners in Colombia to implement international human rights norms relating to the right to education.

“‘There are many synergies between my scholarship and practice,’ she observes. ‘I have drawn ideas from my human rights clinical work for academic papers, and some of the ideas I have developed in academic works have shaped my approaches to human rights projects in the field.”

Programming
Although Kalantry is still formulating the programming she will initiate and lead at the Law School, her contributions will likely include arranging on-campus workshops, presentations, film showings, and conferences, and strengthening ties with the University’s Human Rights Program and with local and international human rights organizations.

Kalantry points to the large number of dynamic human rights organizations in the Chicago area with which she hopes to create strong connections, such as the Midwest Coalition for Human Rights and the Heartland Alliance. Her strong existing connections to international human rights organizations would expand through her continuing activities. Susan Gzesh, who is executive director of the overall Human Rights Program at the University, says she is looking forward to working with Kalantry, whom she describes as “an ideal scholar-practitioner to lead University of Chicago students in understanding and utilizing international human rights norms to deal with complex social justice issues in the U.S. and abroad.” Kalantry will also administer the student summer internship program funded by the Charles M. Jacobs Fund for Human Rights and Social Engagement, through which Jacobs Fellows from the Law School have served human rights internships in countries throughout the world. “This generous gift, honoring a wonderful humanitarian, provides a superb platform for students from the Law School to gain first-hand experience with human rights issues,” Kalantry says. “I look forward to my role in making the most of the opportunities it provides.”

The Missing Piece
“There is a great need for human rights advocacy, around the world and here in the United States, and that need seems to be growing,” Dean Schill says. “The University of Chicago Law School intends to have a preeminent role in meeting that need. We have had most of the necessary pieces in place for achieving that role for some time, and we have searched hard for the missing piece. In Sital Kalantry, I am confident that we have found it. Her combination of deep scholarship with superb teaching and mentoring is consistent with our finest traditions, and the ability she has shown for building strong human rights programs and collaborating across a broad range of parties is unrivaled. The day she said yes to us was a landmark day for the pursuit of human rights at our Law School.”
Students Immersed in Foreign Legal Systems over Spring Break

To best understand your own country and its legal system, it helps to have a firsthand experience with an alternative. That’s the idea behind the Law School’s new International Immersion Program, which sent 17 students to China and Belize over spring break. Last year, the Law School invited students to submit proposals for international trips they would like to take during spring break, which was March 15–25. Selection was based on a set of competitive criteria including substantive academic merit.

Two projects earned Law School funding: one to Belize, with six students, and one to China, with eleven. The Belize trip focused on service, as students worked with one of three local organizations: the Belize Red Cross, the Human Rights Commission of Belize, and the National Garifuna Council, which focuses on preserving Garifuna culture.

The group that went to China was hosted by the University of Chicago Center in Beijing and was organized by Professor Thomas Ginsburg. Students attended seminars, visited law firms, and listened to speakers explain the Chinese legal system.

Belize traveler Michelle Mbekani, ’14, and David Kurczewski, ’13, who went to China, wrote about their experiences for the Record.

Preparing for Hurricane Season with the Belize Red Cross

By Michelle Mbekani, ’14

Belize is a vibrant country, a cultural fusion of its African and Latin ancestry mixed with its English colonial influence. I got to see that firsthand over spring break. I was the only 1L in the group, and I learned a lot in a short amount of time.

I had the pleasure of working for the Belize Red Cross at their headquarters in Belize City. I was assigned to redraft their staff policy and to make proposed amendments to their organizational constitution. Because Belize consists of multiple islands, managing the various branches of their Red Cross is challenging, especially during the hurricane season. My proposed amendments aimed to make the collective organization more centralized, requiring each local branch to have a certain number of initiatives and services proportionate to their budget. Under the proposal I helped develop, each branch would need to complete an annual report showing it fulfilled its requirements in order to receive funding the following year. The student I worked with, Jonathan Wiggins, ’13, and I did not ultimately find out whether our ideas were implemented, but we know they were presented to the Red Cross leadership.

I also had the chance to attend a meeting of all the branch leaders of the Belize Red Cross. There, I heard the local leaders voice their many concerns regarding the upcoming hurricane season. I found that Belize is a culturally diverse country where many local customs differ from place to place. This prevents a “one-size-fits-all” solution for common problems. For example, one branch leader explained that typical evacuation procedures—moving coastal families inland before the storm—would not work in his community. There, the local wives of fishermen will not leave their homes because it is customary for women to wait for their husbands to return from sea, even during a hurricane. I’ll take that lesson with me as a future lawyer—that is, one must take a community’s history, culture, and social norms into account when considering how effective a law is or will be.

The trip wasn’t all work. I enjoyed quick weekend trips to two islands in Belize: Caye Caulker and San Pedro. Having traveled through both Africa and Latin America in the past, I was amazed at how certain aspects of those cultures were very similar to the Belizean culture. In some parts of the islands
people spoke Spanish, while in other parts they spoke Creole. The food was a combination of Spanish rice, seafood, and plantains. The music had an Afro-Caribbean flair, and the people were every shade of the racial spectrum. Belize is a perfect example of how a territory that once consisted of displaced natives, African slaves, and English and Spanish colonizers can evolve into a nation of people who all share a common identity, Belizean. I am grateful to have had both a legal and cultural experience during my spring break.

**DISCOVERING THE CHINESE LEGAL SYSTEM FROM WITHIN**

*By David Kurczewski, ’13*

We were stuck on the tarmac at Beijing Capital International Airport, so I practiced my Chinese introduction with the university student sitting in the airplane seat in front of me. A thick blanket of fog had covered Beijing and made travel impossible, even on the ground after landing. Once we finally got off the plane, we were greeted by our student guide and de facto interpreter, Stephanie, from the University of Chicago Center in Beijing. Our fog-impeded van ride to our dorm rooms at Renmin University through the bustling streets of Beijing at 1 a.m. was an apt introduction to the adventure we were beginning.

The eleven of us had been preparing for this trip for months. Before we left, we attended custom-designed seminars about the history of the Chinese legal system, the nuances of doing business in China, and the Chinese language. But once we were in China, the subject matter became immediately real. Our first day, we woke up early for the first of five seminars on Chinese law. This one explained the evolution of the legal system in recent times.

In addition to learning Chinese law, we had the chance to sightsee and sample great Chinese cuisine. After our first seminar, we took a rainy walk through the beautiful Temple of Heaven, where Ming and Qing emperors would pray for bountiful harvests. Later, our most gracious jiàoshòu (professor), Ruoying Chen, LLM ’05, JSD ’10, arranged for us to dine with several of her Peking University law students for wonderful Sichuan Hot Pot. Though we were all growing exhausted and jet-lagged, we had a wonderful dinner comparing our law school experiences.

The next day, while our friends back in Hyde Park enjoyed unusually warm weather, we were treated to a beautiful snowfall along the Great Wall. That evening, Paul Wang, LLM ’94 and JSD ’99, President of the UChicago Alumni Club of China–Beijing, discussed his experience practicing law in China and shared a wonderful formal dinner consisting of a large spread of fantastic Chinese dishes spread widely across the zhūàn pán (effectively a large lazy Susan).

To better understand how law is practiced in China, we arranged for meetings throughout the week with an array of law firms, public interest organizations, and in-house legal teams. At the Natural Resources Defense Council we discussed the perils and progress of environmental legal advocacy in China. At Sidney Austin’s museum-like Beijing office we learned how a Chicago-based firm utilizes an office in Beijing. Baker & McKenzie hosted our delegation in both their Beijing and Shanghai offices and discussed with us their history as one of the first American law firms in China. We also were privileged to visit King & Wood Mallesons, a premier Chinese law firm. There we practiced our formal Chinese business introductions, and they discussed how they collaborate with non-Chinese law firms. We also visited the China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission (CIETAC), where we learned about the significance of the strong preference for arbitration among Chinese businesses. Our last visit of the trip was to Starbucks’ China headquarters, where we met with General Counsel Jason Yu, LLM ’99, and enjoyed coffee sourced from beans in China.

The academic component of our trip was rounded out with seminars covering topics such as Chinese property law, the legal implications of state-owned enterprises, Chinese tort liability, and government regulation. Once our time in Beijing concluded, we took a high-speed train to Shanghai, reaching speeds in excess of 186 mph. From there, we squeezed in some sightseeing before heading back to Chicago for the start of spring quarter classes.

Overall, we had a truly enlightening experience. As the world economy and the corresponding legal issues become increasingly global in nature, this trip was a valuable chance for aspiring lawyers to immerse ourselves in the modern practice of law.
Remarks of Professor R.H. Helmholz

When he asked me to speak to you briefly this morning, our Dean first cautioned that I must on no account call on any member of the graduating class as part of my remarks. I had no choice but to agree, so I asked him whether I might give you an assignment instead. He said I could, as long as it was not onerous and could be completed before you received your diplomas. So I will. I assign you this task: look first to the person on your right; then look to the person on your left. Both people you know, I trust. Chances are, after today you will never see one of them again.

This prediction—and fact it all too often is—stands as a warning. It need not be so. You can avert it by making an effort. I hope you will make that effort, and that hope is the source of what I want to call to your attention today: the value and importance of friendships in our lives. You will not have heard much said about it during the course of your studies here, but I trust that you have made friends in your three years with us. My own perception is that you have, though I have little more than anecdotal evidence from forays into the Green Lounge to prove it. I do know that friendship is a natural result of shared experiences. And I do know that it is a normal part of such experiences at schools and colleges. M. R. James, the great English medievalist, said that he had only two goals in going up to Cambridge: to discover interesting things and to make friends. My assumption is that you have all done both in your years with us, and I remind you of Dr. Johnson’s famous admonition that we must take care to keep our friendships in constant repair. If not, he said, we will soon find ourselves alone.

The friendship of which Dr. Johnson spoke is not altogether irrelevant to the profession most of you are entering. As any person naturally owes a special care for family and friends, so it is that lawyers owe a special care for their clients. Lawyers may legitimately prefer the interests of those clients to the abstract claims of humanity, just as all of us favor the claims and interests of our friends. Indeed, this is a duty, an entirely natural duty. It is not, of course, an unlimited license. It does not include approving of heedless and wrongful acts. But neither does friendship. And both relationships foster a personal commitment that transcends the standards of the marketplace and the impersonal claims of the public interest.

There are of course some today who prefer the claims of the collectivity to friendship, even some who do not think the traditional ties of friendship can be maintained today. The rapidity of change and the sense of alienation said to be common in our society have rendered those ties impossible to sustain. A character in T. S. Eliot’s The Cocktail Party, put this starkly:

We die to each other daily …
… We must also remember
That at every meeting we are meeting a stranger (Act I, sc. 3)

I trust that this is not an invariable law of modern life, and my own experience has been against it. Time and distance do put a strain on friendship, no doubt, but they do not erase it. I ask you, How often have you found, in meeting with an old friend, that you could slip back into
the easy habits that marked your earlier relationship? How often have you shared, with laughter or with sadness, the memories of what you did and said in earlier times? Often enough, it seems to me; this is not an unusual experience.

I know this is true of our law graduates, your predecessors, because I hear stories—most of them invented I think—about what happened in one or another of their law school classes many years before. Though I doubt their veracity, the stories do elicit laughter and agreement among the graduates who recount them. This is not Eliot’s “meeting a stranger.” It is meeting and sharing with an old friend. As he wrote in another place (Murder in the Cathedral) that “Friendship should be more than biting Time can sever.”

So it should be, and so I hope it will be in your lives.

There is even some evidence to back up this admonition. Professor S. W. Duck, chair of the Rhetoric Department at the University of Iowa, has made something of a specialty of studying what he calls “the psychology of personal relationships,” by which he seems to mean friendships. In his book on the subject (Friends for Life: the Psychology of Close Relationships, 1983), he states as his finding that the likelihood of a suffering a heart attack or even being injured in a traffic accident is inversely proportional to the number of friends one has. I cannot vouch for Professor Duck’s statistics—in fact I could not find any statistics on the subject in his book—but then I am no expert. He is. And this is his emphatic conclusion about the consequences of personal relationships. So, if you do not wish to be run over by a bus or suffer from premature dementia, get as many friends as you can. Good advice!

I even venture to ask you to think of the Law School and those of us who remain here as your friends. The interest
we have had in you and will have in your future lives qualifies us, I think, to be at least potential friends. So have our efforts to help you learn to be good lawyers. We were, it is true, originally thrust together by chance and by the vagaries of the LSAT and the US News and World Report. But how often, as a general matter, friendship grows from a combination of chance and shared experiences! So I wish it may be with us.

In thinking about the future, I confess that a famous dictum of Mark Twain’s does strike a cautionary note. Twain wrote that friendship is “of so enduring a nature that it will last a whole lifetime, if not asked to lend money” (Pudd’nhead Wilson, 1894). There has been, I know, something of a cash nexus in our relationship. Recognizing this, I want you to know that I have secured a promise from our Dean that he will never ask you to lend him any money. Later on, it did occur to me that this was a somewhat ambiguous promise. Whatever it was, I know that he and the rest of the faculty join me in saying that it has been our honor as well as our duty to provide the beginnings of your education in the law. You will learn more—and some of you will learn much more—in the years to come, but we feel confident that we have given you a decent start, and we hope that qualifies us to regard each other as friends in the years to come. We will not be friends in the same way as you are to each other. I know that. I would not wish it otherwise. But I hope we will be friends all the same. Good luck to you. Come back and see us! And do not forget those who are sitting on your right and your left! If you do return, you may escape the dire prediction about the future with which I began these remarks.
failed together, we were intimidated together, we gained confidence together.

The tone was set right from the beginning. No one from the class of 1984 will ever forget what happened on the third day of Contracts, since we all took it together. Our professor was now-Justice Scalia. When he asked a question about the obscure 18th-century case we were studying, a few hands in the first couple of rows shot up. He called on “Mr. Miller,” who in a classroom packed with insufferable overachievers had already distinguished himself as an insufferable overachiever.

Miller paused for a moment, puffed out his chest, and then proceeded to quote from a 17th-century case that had been cited in a footnote to the opinion. The entire class gasped in horror. “He actually read the case cited in the footnote!” we all thought to ourselves. “Why hadn’t I thought of that??”

Leave it to Nino, as Professor Scalia was known. “Miller,” he exclaimed, “what are you doing?!”

Miller stammered. “Well, Professor Scalia, I … I was just … .”

Scalia cut him off. “Ah, Miller. I never read the footnotes!”

We all relaxed—for at least a few minutes—and I never read the footnotes again (perhaps also explaining why I didn’t make Law Review)!

It wasn’t just in class that we learned from each other. We pushed each other and generally supported each other in study groups, and just hanging out in the Green Lounge. Let’s face it, those Wine Messes really work. What a genius concept—give enough alcohol to the students and faculty of a Friday afternoon when there isn’t really anywhere else to go, and everybody drops their guard and gets along famously.

Remarks of Daniel Doctoroff, ’84

Dean Schill, members of the Board of Trustees, faculty, administration, proud families and friends, and of course the University of Chicago Law School Class of 2012. I am genuinely honored to be here with you today.

Twenty-eight years ago, in 1984—when the telephone was the social medium, when Wal-Mart was an emerging market, when Madonna was still a virgin, when the Cubs still hadn’t won the World Series—I sat where you sit today and asked myself the same question you’re likely asking yourself right now…

“Is this the best speaker they could get?”

So, why has that same sad fate happened to you? I can’t imagine that it has anything to do with the fact that the very clever but not-very-subtle Dean Schill has also asked me to co-chair the law school’s yet-to-be-announced capital campaign … nah.

It can’t be that I was a paragon of legal scholarship here at the law school. … I still have nightmares about the rule against perpetuities question on Professor Helmholz’s property final. … No Law Review for me. And it certainly wasn’t due to my exemplary legal career …

I am unlicensed to practice law in all 50 states, as well as the District of Columbia.

I suspect it is because I have had six different careers, five since I left Hyde Park—political pollster, investment banker, private equity investor, leader of New York’s Olympic bid, Deputy Mayor, and now CEO of Bloomberg. Although I seem not to be able to keep a single career, I am convinced that the education that I had here was essential to the many careers that I’ve been fortunate to have.

Certainly the academic program here gave me the essential tools. From the Bigelow writing program, I learned that I really hadn’t learned to write at all as a Harvard undergrad. From the smartest group of people I still have ever seen collected in one place—the faculty—I was terrified into constantly challenging my assumptions, looking deeper into every question, and then articulating thoughtful answers in real time, some of which were right.

And it was here on this campus—braving the Midway winds—that I received the most valuable part of my education—from my classmates. For some of us, Chicago may not have been our first choice of law schools … for others it was the only choice. What is true for all of us is that it turned out to be a wise choice. We succeeded and
But I don’t want to talk about my law school experiences or yours. Today is more about moving on than looking back. Now I know that 98.2% of you have jobs to look forward to, so I’m not talking about what you are going to do after you pass the bar exam this summer (which statistically about 98% of you will do). All of you have made it to this place because you did well in all of your subjects in high school, on your SATs, then in all of your college courses, then on your LSATs. To be offered a spot here in a class of fewer than two hundred people, along the way you had to be really good at everything you did: reading comprehension, analytical reasoning, logical reasoning. From your first day of kindergarten, you never met a curve you couldn’t bust.

So far, you’ve been wonderful generalists. As of today, I hope you have the confidence to stop. I urge you to stop trying to be good at everything. We get it—you’re all very good. In a world that is increasingly specialized, being a generalist just doesn’t cut it anymore. At some point in the future, and I would suggest the sooner the better, you are going to have to figure out what makes you great.

Not someone else’s idea of greatness. Not society’s idea of greatness. Your own greatness.

If being 53 years old has taught me one thing, it is that nearly everyone is endowed with at least one God-given gift that makes them indispensable. In the end, your true greatness may not always be what you want. But by now it is yours. The faster you discover it, the more content you will be. For me, it wasn’t until I was onto my fifth career—as Deputy Mayor—that I recognized my gift. I finally understood that each of my seemingly disconnected careers required weaving a compelling strategy around large volumes of data to solve a particular problem, whether it was for a candidate trying to win office, a company going public, or finding a way to rebuild Ground Zero. But the question remains, how do you find your greatness?

You need to search your experiences for those moments when you felt truly exceptional, whether in a class, at work, or somewhere else in your life. And you need to trust your gut instincts and then have the courage to explore when you think you might have found what you are great at.

For me, each of the times I learned of the opportunity that would mark a career shift, I felt a breathless excitement—the kind I felt the day I met the woman who would become my wife. As was the case with Alisa, in each I was completely out of my league and, yet, I just knew it was right. I am willing
to bet that when you find what makes you truly exceptional, you are going to discover that it is what you are passionate about too. We all love what is special about ourselves. Knowing and doing are two very different things, though. Finding your gifts means you are going to have to take some chances.

As I mentioned, I led New York’s Olympic bid. For ten years. Once America invaded Iraq, I was pretty sure we were going to lose. Total humiliation, I assumed, on a global scale. Finally, the dreaded day in Singapore arrived, when the International Olympic Committee was to make its decision.

Sure enough, we lost. (In the second round, which I might add, was one better than Chicago, which had a popular president and former U of C law professor on board when they bid. But I digress.)


It was at that moment that I learned the most valuable lesson you can ever learn: nobody keeps score on you other than you. And its corollary, show me someone who has never lost, and I will show you someone who hasn’t taken enough chances.

Even when you lose, you win. If I hadn’t started the “failed” Olympic bid, I wouldn’t have met Mike Bloomberg, I wouldn’t have become Deputy Mayor, and I wouldn’t be leading Bloomberg today. If only I had known about this loophole in the rules of careerism—I might have set my sights on failure decades earlier! I mean, just imagine, I might have been the mayor of New York and some guy named Bloomberg would be running Doctoroff, LP.

Right about now many of you must be thinking, gifts and passion are great, but what about those loans? It is easy for me to tell you to take chances now, to not waste the next decade of your life, before kids, before a mortgage, before all of the furniture of your life arrives and before the actuary in you starts making points that you can’t help but agree with—but they are not my loans. Undoubtedly, you have to find a way of harmonizing what you suspect is your true greatness and your passions with the practical realities of your lives.

But I also think you need to know that following your heart gets harder.

I saw this vividly when I was Deputy Mayor. I recruited the smartest, most talented, and committed people I have ever had the good fortune to work with, many from law firms, consulting firms, and investment banks. But never once was I able to recruit people, even to the great cause of rebuilding New York after 9/11, if it meant that they would have to change their lifestyles to come into government. I could recruit the best of the best even for substantially less money than they had been making before, but if they were going to have to change the place they lived, the vacations they took, or where they sent their kids to school, as they say in Brooklyn, fuhgeddaboudit.

The next few years is the best time to lace up your boots and go stomp around a bit. Never seeking what makes you happy—or at least trying to figure it out—is real failure. Failure because you took a chance, put yourself out on a limb, and ended up being wrong—that’s failing right. I hope you all fail like that a few times after you leave here.

For almost all of us, finding our greatness is never easy.
No one is better prepared to take advantage of this world than graduates of the University of Chicago Law School. You’ve learned dexterity by traversing the dreaded minefield of flaming electric outlets in the Green Lounge. Winter Wellness Wednesdays have increased your stamina. You have learned patience waiting for grades … and waiting for grades. Clearly, you can do … I was going to say you can do anything. I know people have been telling you that your whole life, but it isn’t true and it just won’t matter anymore.

But as a result of your time here, you have unique skills. You have an intellectual discipline that pretty much no one else has, you have learned to challenge traditional assumptions about the way things should be, and you communicate your ideas precisely and compellingly.

The truth is, it should be hard earned. Even Buddha got that. He said, “your work is to discover your work … and then with all your heart to give yourself to it.” And when you do, rest assured that there’s always a place for minds like yours to thrive, to lead, to teach, to govern, to manage, to litigate.

You are graduating at a time of stunning change. Rapidly evolving technology, shifts in the balance of power between the developed and developing worlds, greater financial instability, political upheaval abroad and paralysis at home, growing threats to civil liberties, the changing economics of law firms. Every one of these is a cause for concern. And, more important, each provides unlimited opportunity for social innovation, for financial innovation, for legal innovation.
And, as long as you follow your instincts, your passion, and your talent, I can tell you in advance—this will be one of many successes to come.

I hope you have a wonderful day of celebrating. Savor it because tomorrow—I know you—you are going to start thinking about acing the bar!

Congratulations and good luck in everything you do.

Your degree from the University of Chicago Law School is a golden ticket—to be anything you are truly great at.

Today, look around you, look at your friends and family sitting amongst you. When you go outside, let the sun hit your faces. Remember this feeling. It is called success. Moments like these are too few and far between in our lives. This moment wasn’t purchased for you. You’ve earned it. Soak it up.
A Dean in Europe
By Meredith Heagney
When your alumni live all over the world, you must travel the world to see your alumni. And so, in March, Dean Michael Schill spent spring break visiting with alumni in London, Brussels, Zurich, and Paris. In each city, he met dozens of Chicago graduates and filled them in on news from the Law School.

“I was thrilled by the great show of school spirit among our alumni in Europe,” Schill said. “I loved getting to meet our alumni who, even though for many of them it’s been years since they went here, loved the Law School and had their lives forever changed by it.”

The cities were chosen because each has a vibrant alumni base and each requested a visit from the Dean. In addition to JD and LLM alumni, prospective students were invited to attend.

“The idea was to use our alumni, who are really our most eloquent spokespeople, to encourage these students to come to Chicago,” Schill said.

The alumni he met said their strong ties to the Law School were strengthened by the visit.

“We highly appreciate that Dean Schill took the time to come to Switzerland to talk to the alumni and future LLM students here. Ours is a small jurisdiction, but it has a strong community of U of C Law School alumni to whom it is important to keep in touch with their alma mater,” wrote Franz Hoffet, LLM '88, René Bösch, LLM '91, and Daniel Daeniker, LLM '96, partners in private practice at Homburger, a leading Swiss business law firm, in an e-mail.

The firm hosted a group of about 35 at their Zurich office, in the tallest building in Switzerland. Afterward, they adjourned to a nearby restaurant in an arts center housed in a former ship engine building facility.

“In London, Schill mingled with alumni at the city’s Chicago Booth campus. In Brussels, the firm Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer hosted a reception in their offices, in a tower overlooking the city. The Paris reception was at the local Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom office, on a rooftop deck. Along the way, Schill browsed bookstores and indulged his prodigious sweet tooth, sampling delicacies ranging from Belgian waffles in Brussels to gourmet macaroons in Paris. Eric Lundstedt, Associate Dean for External Affairs, accompanied Schill on the trip.

“The LLM at U of C has been the most impressive year of my legal education and staying in touch not only brings back good memories but also the opportunity to keep abreast of the newest developments in legal thinking,” Hoffet said.

In London, Schill and Lundstedt dined with Mimi Gilligan, JD/MBA ’91, and Sean Carney, ’90. Gilligan is Head of Legal and Business Affairs at Atlantic Productions, a company that produces historical and scientific documentaries. Carney is Chief Operating Officer at the Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, the second-largest philanthropic foundation in the United Kingdom.
After meeting with Schill, Carney said the Law School “remains an important, exciting, and vibrant place, with interesting new plans in internationalizing law and economics and great initiatives for strengthening the faculty and student body even further.”

In Paris, recent alumnus Suhaib Al-Ali, LLM ’11, agreed. He was impressed with Schill’s update on the Law School, particularly plans for law and economics “boot camps” to take place around the world. But the visit also brought on a twinge of homesickness for Chicago for Al-Ali, who works at the French firm Bredin Prat, in the international arbitration department.

“To see Dean Schill again and to hear him and all the other alumni talk about the school in such an enamored way made me realize I wasn’t as alone in my nostalgia as I first thought,” Al-Ali said.

“My only question to the Dean,” Al-Ali said, “was whether I could do another LLM.”

Roger Orf, MBA ’77 and JD ’79, said it means a lot to the European alumni to see Dean Schill and hear, in person, his plans for the Law School. Orf works for Apollo Management International in London, where he is responsible for the company’s European real estate investments.

“As the world continues to get smaller, it is vital to travel and receive firsthand reports of what is happening in Europe,” Orf said. “I am very proud of my association and keen for the Law School to continue to prosper.”

Schill plans a trip to visit alumni in South America in the next 18 months. Last year, he traveled to India, China, and Japan.
NEW FACULTY PROFILES

Sital Kalantry

Sital Kalantry, Clinical Professor of Law at Cornell Law School, will join our faculty as Clinical Professor of Law in early 2013.

“I am so thrilled that Sital will be joining us,” said Michael H. Schill, Dean of the Law School. “I have been so proud of our clinical faculty and the programs they run, and Sital’s new human rights clinic will be just the new jewel that this crown needs. Sital and the new program she will create are absolutely essential to my plans for the revitalization of the study of human rights at our Law School. Her new clinic will also be a tremendous opportunity for our students. I cannot wait for her to arrive.”

Professor Kalantry will join the faculty as Clinical Professor of Law and will begin an exciting new human rights clinic at the Law School. She will also help to expand the Law School’s human rights program and curriculum. She is currently an Associate Clinical Professor at Cornell Law School, where she directs the International Human Rights Clinic and is the co-founder and Faculty Director of the Avon Global Center for Women and Justice. Professor Kalantry’s research and clinical work focus on using quantitative and qualitative approaches to understand and promote international human rights law. She has received a Fulbright-Nehru grant to conduct research in India on the use and impact of public interest litigation. Professor Kalantry received her BA from Cornell University, her Masters in Development Studies from the London School of Economics, and her JD from the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

“I am delighted to be a part of the vibrant clinical faculty and excited to interact with such talented students,” said Kalantry. “It is a wonderful opportunity for me to develop a human rights program and an international human rights clinic at the University of Chicago Law School.”

Kalantry’s clinical and scholarly work has been intensely focused on international human rights, particularly involving the right to education and access to justice for women. Her clinic works mainly in advocacy and litigation, with students doing field research internationally, drafting position papers and policy reports, lobbying international organizations, and working on in-country legislative reform and litigation. Her clinic at the Law School will engage students in working for the rights of people all over the world and give them experience working with NGOs, writing briefs, researching and drafting policy arguments, interacting with clients, and transforming communities.

“Sital is already a leader in international human rights, particularly around issues involving women’s rights and the right to education,” said Jeff Leslie, Acting Associate Dean for Clinical and Experiential Learning, Clinical Professor of Law, Paul J. Tierney Director of the Housing Initiative, and Faculty Director of Curriculum. “She is an amazing educator as well. Joining our clinical program, and having the ability to collaborate with the vibrant advocacy and NGO community that exists here and in our city, will allow her work to grow in new and exciting directions.”

Susan Gzesh, Senior Lecturer in the College and Executive Director of the Human Rights Program, is looking forward to Kalantry’s bringing her human rights expertise to the Law School. “Sital Kalantry is an ideal scholar-practitioner to lead University of Chicago students in understanding and utilizing international human rights norms to deal with complex social justice issues in the US and abroad,” Gzesh said. “Sital Kalantry is the top human rights clinician in the country and we are lucky to have her join us,” said Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law. “She brings to her work a unique combination of rigorous lawyering skills, deep compassion, and intellectual range. In addition, she will also deepen our law school and university ties with India.”

Professor Kalantry will join the faculty in January 2013. Martha Nussbaum, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics, thinks that day can’t come too soon. “It is tremendously exciting that we will now have a clinic addressing international human rights issues,” Nussbaum said. “Hiring Kalantry is a major coup for our Law School.”
Edward Morrison

The University of Chicago Law School is thrilled to welcome back alumnus Edward R. Morrison, a leading scholar in law and economics who joins the faculty from Columbia Law School.

Morrison is Columbia’s Harvey R. Miller Professor of Law and Economics and the co-director of the Richman Center for Business, Law, and Public Policy. He is credited with developing ideas that changed how the legal and business communities view bankruptcy, and he is highly regarded by practicing lawyers and judges as well as in the academic world.

Morrison is also a three-time graduate from the University in Chicago, having earned an MA and PhD in economics (in 1997 and 2003) and his JD from the Law School in 2000.

“I am overjoyed that Ed Morrison, his wife Anne, and their three kids are coming home to Chicago,” Dean Michael Schill said. “Ed is the perfect addition to our faculty; his values and commitment to the academic enterprise are our values. With Ed, Douglas Baird, Randy Picker, and Tony Casey on our faculty we easily have the strongest commercial law faculty in the nation.”

Morrison said he’s happy to be back, and he’s armed with ideas.

“I am particularly enthusiastic about helping the school build a new center focused on the intersection of law, business, and regulation,” he said. “I want to support deeper connections with the University’s outstanding business school and with the city’s leading business and legal professionals.

“There are many potential synergies here, and I hope to play a role in finding and leveraging them.”

“Morrison is a first-rate empirical economist whose legal skills are second to none, which strengthens the Law School’s already rich interdisciplinary tradition,” said Douglas G. Baird, Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law.

Oftentimes, the impression of law professors is that they have no real connection with the day-to-day practice of law, but Morrison remains “completely wired with the bankruptcy bench and bar,” Baird added. And his empirical papers are standard readings in business and economics courses.

Randal C. Picker is part of the National Bankruptcy Conference, a small group of practicing lawyers, judges, and academics, along with Morrison and Baird.

“It’s clear that Morrison is “well-regarded as among the elite of the bankruptcy world,” said Picker, the Paul H. and Theo Leffmann Professor of Commercial Law.

Morrison is also described by his new Chicago colleagues as a talented teacher who was beloved by students during his 2008 stint as a visiting professor.

In fact, the Law School tried unsuccessfully to hire him then, but “the second time proved to be a charm,” said Lior Strahilevitz, Deputy Dean.

“His intellectual honesty, his mental quickness, his curiosity about every subject, and his willingness to chase down ideas wherever they might lead him—all these traits describe both Ed and the University of Chicago Law School.”

Immediately following his graduation with High Honors from the Law School, Morrison worked as a law clerk for Judge Richard A. Posner, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. He went on to clerk for Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia.

Morrison’s most well-known work includes a measurement he developed to determine how adept bankruptcy judges were at predicting which firms were likely to survive, Baird said. The common thought at the time was that judges tended to be fairly bad at that, but Morrison proved otherwise, just as he had predicted.

Beyond academics, Morrison said he’s simply happy to rejoin the Hyde Park community, where he met his wife in Gary Becker’s Price Theory course.

“We are thrilled to return,” Morrison said. “Hyde Park offers a great fit for my three children: a calm environment and welcoming community with first-rate educational opportunities and quick access to Sox games.”
Eduardo Peñalver, currently Professor of Law at Cornell Law School, will join the Law School faculty in early 2013. “Eduardo will be a spectacular addition to our faculty,” said Michael H. Schill, Dean of the Law School. “I have long admired his work and have so much enjoyed getting to know him while he was a visitor here last year. Eduardo’s brilliant property scholarship and wonderful teaching were such great assets to our community during his visit, and I am thrilled that we will get to add him to our community so soon. We have an amazing property faculty—surely now the best in the nation. Peñalver, Fennell, Strahilevitz, Helmholz; it really is incredible.”

Professor Peñalver will join the faculty as Professor of Law. He is a nationally renowned expert in the law of property and land use and has an additional research interest in law and religion. He has been on the faculty of Cornell Law School since 2006 and was a Visiting Professor of Law at the Law School in fall quarter 2012. Prior to joining the academy, Professor Peñalver clerked for Judge Guido Calabresi of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and at the Supreme Court for Justice John Paul Stevens. His most recent books include Property Outlaws (Yale 2010) (with Sonia Katyal, ’98), which explores the role of disobedience in the evolution of property law, and An Introduction to Property Theory (Cambridge 2012) (with Greg Alexander), a survey of the theories of property that have been most influential in American legal discussions. Professor Peñalver received his BA from Cornell University and his law degree from Yale Law School.

“I am very excited to be joining such a phenomenal community of scholars and students,” said Peñalver. “I had a terrific time during my visit last fall and was delighted to be invited back.”

The Law School faculty is equally delighted. “Peñalver brings broad and cross-cutting interests to property,” said Randal Picker, Paul H. and Theo Leffmann Professor of Commercial Law. “He will fit nicely with our existing faculty strength in property but will add to that meaningfully in bringing a philosophically grounded framework to bear on property questions. His work is influential, both here and abroad. Indeed, just this morning in one of our sessions in the 2012 Summer School in Law and Economics, Peñalver’s work was cited as being foundational for understanding informal real property arrangements in China. Plus, Eduardo was enthusiastically embraced by his property students who are eager to have him back on a permanent basis.”

Lior Strahilevitz, Sidley Austin Professor of Law and a well-known property expert himself, is equally impressed with Peñalver’s scholarship. “Eduardo would be on anyone’s list of the most important and imaginative Property scholars of our era. He has an amazing knowledge base, a great grasp of both doctrine and theory, and a genuine passion for the material. A few years ago we learned that we were unwittingly working on the same topic—abandoned property—at the same time. After we exchanged drafts I read his punch line and thought, ‘Darn it, I wish I had thought of that!’ The next year we wrote a paper together on judicial takings, and the collaboration was great fun.”

Strahilevitz’s colleagues are equally pleased to have Peñalver join the faculty. “Peñalver brings a humanistic philosophical approach to the understanding of property; he is a pioneer of interdisciplinary scholarship that uses virtue ethics to think about the issues, and his subtle work will enrich our conversations,” said Martha Nussbaum, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics. “Eduardo is one of the very best property scholars of his generation,” said Lee Fennell, Max Pam Professor of Law. “His work is creative, far-ranging, and provocative. His joining our faculty wonderfully complements our existing strengths, and the resulting synergies are sure to generate a lot of exciting new thinking about property.”

Peñalver’s presence on the faculty will enrich the Law School’s teaching as much as its scholarship. “Eduardo and I shared a Property class last year,” said Strahilevitz, “and after sitting in on one of his fall classes and reading his teaching evaluations, I knew I would be filling very large shoes in the winter. Eduardo had been a provocative, eloquent, funny, and innovative instructor, and throughout the winter quarter I was impressed with how much my students had learned—and remembered—from the fall quarter.”

Professor Peñalver will join the faculty in January 2013. He joins two other newcomers to the Law School faculty, Professor Edward Morrison and Assistant Professor Nicholas Stephanopolous, as well as Sital Kalantry, who will join in January 2103 as a Clinical Professor of Law. “This has been an exceptional hiring year for the Law School,” said Schill. “Our Appointments Committee for the upcoming year has a high bar to reach!”
Nicholas Stephanopoulos

Nicholas Stephanopoulos, a rising star in election law, joined the faculty of the Law School as an Assistant Professor of Law in July.

Stephanopoulos was most recently an Associate-in-Law at Columbia Law School, where he taught a legal practice workshop to first-year law students and assisted with the DrawCongress.org redistricting project.

“We’re so glad to bring Nick to Chicago,” Dean Michael Schill said. “Based on the work he’s already done and the intellect and energy he brings to his research, we’re confident he has a very bright future on our faculty.”

Professor Thomas P. Giroux, the Leo Spitz Professor of International Law and Professor of Political Science, is co-chair of the Appointments Committee that brought Stephanopoulos to Chicago.

“Nick is one of the most promising young public law scholars in the country,” Giroux said. “He has the kind of broad engagement with ideas that we value.”

Stephanopoulos earned his JD at Yale Law School in 2006, where he won the Jewell Prize for best student contribution to a law journal. He served as editor-in-chief of the Yale Journal of International Law and as projects editor of the Yale Law Journal. He also holds a Master of Philosophy from the University of Cambridge (Pembroke College), and a bachelor’s degree in government from Harvard University.

After law school, Stephanopoulos clerked for Judge Raymond C. Fisher of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in California. For three years, he worked as an associate at Jenner & Block LLP in Washington, where he drafted sections of Supreme Court briefs on topics including the Voting Rights Act, campaign finance, and criminal procedure.

His work will soon be published in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review and the Harvard Law Review. In “Redistricting and the Territorial Community,” Stephanopoulos argues that courts should resolve political gerrymandering disputes by examining the degree to which challenged districts correspond to organic geographic communities.

“Spatial Diversity,” in the Harvard Law Review, uses a new measure of districts’ geographic heterogeneity to evaluate districts around the country, to assess recent Supreme Court decisions, and to investigate how districts’ internal composition is linked to the quality of participation and representation.

Stephanopoulos has written numerous editorials on election law and voting issues for popular publications as well, including several major newspapers.

“Nick is an outstanding scholar of voting rights and redistricting,” said Lior Strahilevitz, Sidley Austin Professor of Law. “His research will continue to grab the attention of election law lawyers, judges, and scholars.”

Stephanopoulos is a natural when presenting research and answering tough questions, Strahilevitz said.

“I expect him to be a dynamite teacher, and one who fills important curricular needs for the Law School,” he added. “We are thrilled to have him.”

Stephanopoulos said he’s happy to be here too.

“Chicago’s intense intellectual atmosphere, the faculty’s deep engagement with one another’s work, the school’s emphasis on the intersections between law and social science—all of these characteristics make me confident that I’ll thrive in the years ahead. There’s no place in America I’d rather be starting my academic career.”
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Dear University of Chicago Alumni:

My last six months here at the University of Chicago Law School have been both highly informative and productive. There is so much to learn about this institution, which has such a rich and complex history. I continue to be amazed by the diverse and varied careers many of you have pursued and the passion you feel for this unique law school.

We have also accomplished a great deal over the last six months. You welcomed Dean Michael Schill and our staff as we visited our alumni communities in London, Brussels, Zurich, and Paris—in addition to New York, Boston, Washington, DC, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and a number of other regions. You and your classmates returned to campus for Reunion 2012 in record numbers, inaugurated our first Dean's Circle dinner, and helped to welcome the recently graduated Class of 2012 into our alumni body. By any measure, this has been a remarkable six months, and none of this activity and progress would have been possible without your leadership, engagement, and support—so, thank you!

By no means are numbers the only, or even the best, way to measure this progress. Yet, in Chicago tradition, we ought to pause to review, analyze, and adjust our efforts based on what we have achieved this past fiscal year. Our Annual Fund surpassed $4 million in unrestricted cash for only the second time in history—up 6.5 percent from the prior year; and the participation rate of alumni supporting the school hit 35 percent. The following pages provide additional detail on this strong performance in our Annual Fund.

Overall, we achieved over $19 million in new commitments of support for the Law School. This is just a tad lower than our record-setting $20 million in the prior year. Our strong overall fundraising results are partly due to record-setting giving by alumni for Reunion 2012, as well as a number of significant estate gifts. Similarly, we were able to maintain a high participation rate in alumni giving due to strong activity in our Law Firm Challenge Program.

In this section, you will also see a roster of this past fiscal year’s “Gifts of Note.” We list these gifts not only to recognize the transformative philanthropy of some of our closest alumni and friends but also to provide specific examples of how supporters have directed their giving and to illustrate how giving can impact some of our key program areas and priorities.

The numbers above for this past fiscal year reflect a consistent and enduring level of alumni engagement. It is clear that you love this school and that you make significant efforts to commit your time, your talents, and your financial support to keeping our school strong. But as I frequently hear amongst our faculty, “you are only as good as your last article”—and we definitely have room to improve.

To help us realize that improvement, the Office of External Affairs has reorganized and added staff. Many of you have already met some of the new staff, or soon will. To continue the early success of the Law Firm Challenge, we are fortunate to have Carolyn Grunst, who comes to us from the Chicago office of K&L Gates. For our reunions team, we have two new staff members—Abby Scher and Sarah Tobeck—both experienced advancement professionals who will help make Reunion 2013 the best yet. Lastly, many of you already know Melissa Shane from her time on the reunions team. She has moved into a new role as one of our Regional Gift Officers, based in Baltimore/Washington, DC. The new staff members join a core group of veteran law school professionals committed to building on last year’s momentum and making this year a historic one.

As we work to build upon last year’s success and prepare this coming year for a potential comprehensive campaign, we will continue to rely upon you. We need your insight into your region and class, we need your passion for connecting and reconnecting with your fellow alumni, and we need your financial support to ensure we keep Chicago Law the unique experience it has always been—and will always be.

Thank you, as always, for all that you have done and all that you will do to keep us strong and vital.

Warmest regards,

Eric Lundstedt
Associate Dean
Thank you to the many alumni, students, and friends who made a gift to the Law School during the 2011–2012 fiscal year.

Our graduates remain loyal to their alma mater, as evidenced by a 35 percent alumni participation rate, which compares very favorably with our peers. For just the second time in our history, the total cash raised for the Law School Annual Fund exceeded $4 million. We would like to extend our special thanks to Steven Feirson, ’75, the 2011–2012 Annual Fund Chair, and to the Reunion Committee members, Law Firm Challenge representatives, and other alumni volunteers who helped to make this such a successful year.

Through your philanthropic support, you help sustain and improve upon the excellence of the Law School, demonstrating your commitment to the faculty, students, and programs that set Chicago apart.

On behalf of the entire Law School community, thank you!

Please make your 2012-2013 Annual Fund gift by returning the enclosed gift form or by calling (773) 702-9629. You can also make your gift online at http://www.law.uchicago.edu/give/makeyourgift. Remember, your Annual Fund gift also counts toward Reunion and Law Firm Challenge participation rates!
Gifts of Note

The strength of voluntary private support is crucial to sustaining the excellence that has long characterized Chicago Law, and each and every gift matters. A number of alumni and friends stepped forward with signature, major commitments over the previous fiscal year, a sampling of which appears below:

New Endowed Funds

**The Leo and Eileen Herzel Professorship** was established in 2012 by a bequest from Leo Herzel, ’52, and his wife, Eileen, to support a member of the faculty in the fields of corporation law, securities law, law and economics, or the law and economics of agency.

**The Charles M. Jacobs Fund for Human Rights and Social Engagement in the Law School** was created in 2011 by Charles Jacobs (AB 1953, JD 1956) and Cerise Jacobs to support law student summer internships through its JD-International Human Rights (IHR) Summer Program.

**The Michael J. Marks Professorship** was established by a bequest from the estate of Michael Marks, ’63, to support a distinguished individual whose research and teaching is in the area of business law.

**The James and Ann Spiotto Scholarship Fund** was established in 2012 by James and Ann Spiotto, both members of the Class of 1972, to provide scholarship support to students in the Law School.

**The Jim and Patrice Comey Public Interest Fellowship Fund** was created in 2012 by James, ’85, and Patrice Comey to provide postgraduate public interest fellowship support at the Law School.

**The Steve Marenberg and Alison Whalen Public Interest Fellowship Fund** was created in 2012 by Steven Marenberg, ’80, and Alison Whalen, ’82, to provide postgraduate public interest fellowship support at the Law School.

New Expendable Funds

**The Class of 1949 Scholarship Fund** was established by members of the Class of 1949 on the occasion of their 60th Reunion to provide scholarships to students in the Law School.

**The Class of 1991 Scholarship Fund** was established by members of the Class of 1991 on the occasion of their 20th Reunion to provide scholarships to students in the Law School.

**The Class of 2000 Scholarship Fund** was established by members of the Class of 2000 on the occasion of their 10th Reunion to provide scholarships to students in the Law School.

If you believe your commitment should be reflected in a future edition, please contact our office at 773.702.0356.
Thank You Reunion 2012 Classes!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>Total Cash and Pledges Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$325,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$170,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$222,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$395,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$666,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$659,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$215,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$42,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$75,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$13,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Law School welcomed nearly 800 alumni and friends back to campus for Reunion Weekend 2012. More than $2.7 million was raised by the Reunion Classes to support the Law School Annual Fund, student scholarship aid, faculty research, and the clinics. This year, the majority of our classes surpassed their previous Reunion class gift totals, and several classes broke records at the Law School for the largest class gift for their respective Reunion.

Every class did their part and none of our 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, generating excitement and participation among all class members. Thank you so much to everyone who made Reunion 2012 such an incredible success!

2012 Reunion Chairs

David S. Chernoff ’62
Michael J. Freed ’62
David C. Hilliard ’62
Albert C. Bellas ’67
Linda Thoren Neal ’67
Steven J. Sacher ’67
Virginia Harding ’72
David Rieth ’72
Ann Stern Berzin ’77
Emily Nicklin ’77
Richard M. Schwartz ’77
Howard Heitner ’82
Thomas Ogden ’82

Stephanie Leider ’87
Jennifer Nijman ’87
Chuck Smith ’87
Addison Braendel ’92
Jim Squires ’92
Mary Ellen Callahan ’97
Thomas Eggemeier ’97
Suyash Agrawal ’02
Stephen D. Feldman ’02
Martha M. Pacold ’02
Colin Bumby ’07
Brad Robertson ’07
Robin Robertson ’07
1935
Max L. Chill
February 17, 2012
A World War II veteran and recipient of the Bronze Star, Chill was a prominent Chicago attorney and world traveler. He earned his PhD from the College of the University of Chicago in 1933.

1949
Robert L. Farwell
March 18, 2012
Born and raised in the Chicago area, Farwell attended Amherst College, graduating in 1943. After serving in the U.S. Army, he returned to the University of Chicago Law School to receive his JD.

Ray H. Garrison
May 23, 2012
Garrison served as Special Assistant, Special Attorney, and Assistant Regional Counsel for the US Department of the Treasury, and as a trial lawyer for the US government for several years, before becoming the general tax attorney for Navistar International Corporation, formerly International Harvester Company. He was elected to the Illinois Constitutional Convention Committee on revenue and finance (1969–70), and was a commissioner on the Illinois Racing Board for 14 years. Since 1990 he served as the corporate counsel for Balmoral Park Race Track.

1950
Richard E. Alexander
June 26, 2012
After working for several corporations and law firms, Alexander formed his own firm in Chicago and practiced until his retirement in 1994. He served in World War II in the Army and received the Purple Heart. He was on numerous charitable and community boards, including the Great Books Foundation in Chicago, the Hope Foundation, Episcopal Charities, and other charitable organizations.

Byron T. Hawkins
June 30, 2012
Hawkins enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II and attended the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, and Oberlin College on the G.I. bill. As a second lieutenant, he was sent to serve in occupied Japan in August 1945, surviving a plane crash in the Pacific just short of Iwo Jima. After his military service, he attended the University of Chicago School of Law, an experience he described as exhilarating and unforgettable. He first served as labor relations counsel for the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute in New York and later held the position of Director of Labor Relations for Standard Brands, Inc. (now Kraft Foods), during many years of expansion and growth, including its acquisition of both Planters and the Curtis Candy Company in the 1960s.

1952
Robert L. Slater, Jr.
February 26, 2012
Marshall Soren
January 2012

1954
Renato Beghe
July 7, 2012
Senior Judge Renato Beghe served on the US Tax Court since his appointment by President George H. W. Bush on March 26, 1991. Judge Beghe graduated from the University of Chicago with an AB in 1951 and a JD in 1954. At the University of Chicago, Judge Beghe was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and the Order of the Coif, and he was co-managing editor of the Law Review. He practiced law in New York City with Carter, Ledyard & Milburn from 1954 to 1983 and with Morgan, Lewis & Bockius from 1983 to 1989. He was a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and served at various times as a member of its Taxation Committee, Art Law Committee, Special Committee on Lawyer’s Role in Tax Practice, and Committee on Taxation of International Transactions. Judge Beghe also was a member of the New York State Bar Association; he chaired its Tax Section in 1977–78 and co-chaired its Joint Practice Committee of Lawyers and Accountants in 1989–90. Judge Beghe served as a Judge from March 26, 1991, until February 28, 2003, and as a Senior Judge on recall from March 1, 2003, until the date of his death. During his more than 21 years on the bench, Judge Beghe presided over numerous trials and wrote opinions in more than 200 cases, including six opinions in the cases Dixon v. Commissioner, et al. and the Tax Court’s recent Court-reviewed opinion in Tigers Eye Trading, LLC v. Commissioner.

Eva Stanton Goodwin
April 7, 2011
Goodwin graduated, Phi Beta Kappa, with a degree in History and Fine Arts from Oberlin College in 1951 and earned her Juris Doctorate from the University of Chicago Law School in 1954. She served as a staff attorney for the Oregon Legislative Counsel and then moved to Berkeley to take a position as judicial staff attorney for the California Court of Appeal, where she worked until her retirement in 1988. Goodwin wrote the first training manual for Judicial Staff Attorneys and was a mentor to many women who were entering the field of law.
1959
William F. Halley
January 19, 2011
Richard H. Senn
January 25, 2012
1961
Waverly B. Clanton, Jr.
July 1, 2012
Clanton, a Korean War army veteran, practiced corporate law for almost 40 years.
1962
Stephen E. Tallent
February 29, 2012
Tallent attended Stanford University, where he graduated in less than four years, and the University of Chicago Law School, where he served as editor of the Law Review. After being hired by the law firm of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher in 1962, he was given leave to serve in the US Army, where he worked for three years in Army intelligence. His home office was in Los Angeles until 1980, when he was asked by the firm to help expand the presence of Gibson, Dunn in Washington, DC. Tallent was recognized internationally as a leader in labor and employment law.
1964
Taylor McMillan
June 18, 2012
A Phi Beta Kappa graduate with honors from the University of North Carolina in 1960, McMillan earned an MA in Political Science at Yale University in 1961 and earned his JD degree from the University of Chicago in 1964. He was a retired state employee with 30 years of service. He worked with the Institute of Government, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the North Carolina Department of Labor.
1965
Stanley G. Irvine
June 26, 2012
1966
Eulalio A. Torres
January 27, 2011
1969
Melvin S. Adess
March 1, 2012
Adess practiced law for 40 years, primarily as a Senior Partner at Kirkland & Ellis, with an emphasis in international taxation. His practice consisted of foreign tax planning, intercompany transfer pricing, mergers and acquisitions, joint ventures, tax litigation, and executive compensation.
1973
Alice Kryzan Berger
June 2, 2012
After law school, Kryzan Berger worked at a small law firm and then at the Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, before joining Phillips Lytle, where she became the first woman partner at what was then the largest law firm in Buffalo. She went on to manage the Buffalo office of Whiteman, Osterman, & Hanna and, after leaving the firm, continued to practice environmental law before retiring in 2005. In 2008, she was the Democratic congressional candidate from New York’s 26th District, after winning a three-way primary. She also was the Democratic candidate for Amherst Town Supervisor in 2009 and had a distinguished record of community service. A lifelong environmentalist, she served as a Board Member of New York Parks and Trails and served as the chair of both the Erie County Bar Association Environmental Law Committee and the New York State Bar Association Environmental Law Section. Kryzan Berger is survived by her husband, Robert, a Law School graduate.
1975
Charles H. Koch, Jr.
February 20, 2012
Koch’s career as a law professor at the College of William and Mary spanned more than three decades. He was known as a consummate scholar and teacher, developing his passion for Administrative Law during his years at the Federal Trade Commission prior to William and Mary.
1989
Nicholas T. Drees
October 11, 2011
Drees served as an assistant public defender at the Polk County Public Defender’s office in Des Moines, Iowa, before taking a position with the Federal Public Defender’s Office for the Northern and Southern Districts of Iowa. In 1999, he became the federal defender, serving as the head of the agency’s four offices in Iowa and representing clients in federal court. He continued in this position until the time of his death. Throughout his career, Drees was active with the national ACLU, the ACLU of Iowa (serving as a member of the board of directors and holding several offices), the American Constitution Society, and Iowans Against the Death Penalty.

Correction
Maynard I. Wishner, a graduate of the Class of 1947, passed away on December 19, 2011. He is survived by his wife, Elaine, and his three daughters, Ellen, AM ’73, Jane, and Mimi.
Class Notes Section – REDACTED

for issues of privacy
An American Barrister in London

In 2008, Ronald DeKoven, '68, had been living in London for five years, enjoying a thriving international practice built on many years in the top ranks of American lawyers. He could look back with satisfaction on his 40-year career, which also included very substantial contributions to the drafting of national and international legal codes and honors from all of his discipline's leading professional associations.

Instead of looking back, however, DeKoven chose to look forward and aim for a rare distinction that would propel him into a whole new realm of practice—he set his sights on becoming a barrister.

The standards for being “called to the Bar” are so high that only about one in six people who embark on that path accomplish their goal. After DeKoven’s experience and accomplishments were weighed (abetted by enthusiastic endorsements from many of his British colleagues and by a 31-page brief that he wrote on his own behalf), he was permitted to bypass the year of study, the written examination, and the year of “pupillage” that are generally required—an extremely rare full waiver of those requirements.

It’s not hard to see how he merited that waiver. During his years as a litigator, highlighted by 20 years at Shearman & Sterling where he headed the firm’s bankruptcy and leasing practice, he had a lead role in many high-profile international proceedings (involving, among others, Barings Bank, TXU, Olympia & York, Lehman Brothers, and BCCI). He also led the six-year process that resulted in the Uniform Commercial Code’s new article on leasing, and more recently he was the reporter for the model leasing law adopted by the International Institute for the Unification of International Law (UNIDROIT), which has been enacted or is being considered for enactment by at least a dozen national governments.

His many professional honors include selection as an international fellow of the American College of Bankruptcy, life membership in the American Law Institute, and membership on the Permanent Education Board for the UCC.

And so, in 2009 DeKoven was called to the Bar of England and Wales. His new role has been all that he had hoped. “Being a barrister is a dream for me,” he says. “It’s a lot like being a law professor, which is what I originally hoped to become. You work with exceptionally smart people and have very bright opponents; you deal with cases that are fascinating, complex, and important; and you can do the prep work from anywhere in the world.” Within a year of his appointment, DeKoven went from practicing only American law to focusing almost completely on English law. His cases take him around the globe; several current ones involve military contracts in which national governments in Asia, Africa, and Europe are the defendants.

In addition, this year he assumed the board chairmanship of the UK Foundation for International Uniform Law, and he’s about to launch a web-based company, MyBarrister, which links people in need of legal services with suitable barristers (UK law recently changed to permit clients to retain a barrister directly, rather than through a solicitor).

At the Law School, DeKoven met the professor who would become his mentor, Grant Gilmore, when he submitted a lengthy draft of a paper to Gilmore, who rejected it. DeKoven then spent the next nine months revising the draft, which ran to more than 80 pages, and Gilmore enthusiastically approved it for publication. It was then published, at its full length, in the University of Chicago Law Review.

“Professor Gilmore became a great mentor to me,” DeKoven recounts. “I learned many things from him, but two were crucial. The first is that in every case you must understand not just the facts in dispute but also the custom and usage of the parties; the second is that it’s critical to understand how the law applicable to that transaction developed. It’s remarkable how many times I’ve had positive results in a case from presenting the history of the relevant law—it’s not wrong to say that legal history built my career.”

Still focused on legal history, he has begun preliminary work on a lengthy book on international law that he is writing for Oxford University Press.
A Global Career: From Paris to Kazakhstan and Beyond

Just six years after he graduated from the Law School, Christopher Baker, ’83, founded the Paris office of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom. He led that office for more than 20 years and is still there today, specializing in what he describes as “doing legally and culturally complicated deals.”

He was well qualified for the responsibilities of founding that office, having grown up in Paris, being fluent in French, English, German, and Russian, and holding an LLM from NYU in addition to his Chicago JD. As an associate at Coudert Brothers before he joined Skadden, he was closely involved in helping Coudert become the first foreign firm to open an office in Russia. Founding legal enterprises might run in his DNA—his grandfather was the original “Baker” in Baker & McKenzie, and his father founded that firm’s Paris office.

Although he is based in Paris and has handled high-profile assignments in France that include the privatization of Air France, the acquisition of Yves Saint-Laurent by Gucci, and advising the French Ministry of Finance, Baker’s practice has also always brought him to faraway nations. Soon after helping to establish Skadden’s Moscow practice in 1991, he became involved with Kazakhstan, a country he came to love for its vibrant and hospitable people, its majestic landscapes, its centuries-old traditions—and its fascinating need for new laws and legal institutions. Among other things, he negotiated Kazakhstan’s tax treaties after it became an independent nation, a process that involved high-level meetings from Ankara to Washington, DC, via Rome, London, and Paris; and then he facilitated the drafting of Kazakhstan’s tax code, which required him to induce collaboration between seven powerful multilateral agencies, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Under his guidance, Kazakhstan became the first of the former Soviet Union countries to enact a full tax code.

Now his work is reaching into China and Africa: recent assignments have included the sale of a large private Kazakh oil company to a joint venture controlled by the Kazakh state oil company and the Chinese state oil company, the acquisition of French industrial sites for Chinese clients, and the purchase by an international joint venture of Shell’s entire fuel and lubricant distribution business in Africa.

On the bookshelf behind the desk in his office overlooking the Eiffel Tower, Baker has his materials from the Elements of Law course he took with Edward Levi. He has used them to design courses he teaches at the law school of the Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris (the Paris Institute of Political Studies), where France’s political and diplomatic elite have traditionally been prepared for public life. He has taught US law there for six years, and three years ago he also began teaching a course, “Compliance and Social Innovation,” exploring developments in corporate social responsibility and related themes in legal ethics—a field toward which his professional practice has increasingly led him.

“Ed Levi modeled what to me was the best of my Chicago Law School education,” Baker says. “Both facts and ideas are to be handled with respect—but critically. I learned to ask what I have found to be a very valuable question—‘Are we really sure about that?’—as a probe to understand key facts better and as a way to shake a new idea loose from its roots. I learned at Chicago—and it has been integral to my entire practice—that when ideas are permitted to breed, they will, and that results in more ideas, sometimes new and better ideas. Likewise, digging will sometimes produce new and better facts. I’ve built not just a practice but a way of approaching life—and teaching—around making ideas intermingle and making facts speak. I have found the process to be wonderfully nonlinear and key to true disciplined thought and intellectual rigor.”

One place where Baker works on mingling ideas these days is at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (School for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences), a leading French research institute. After providing pro bono assistance to the school in establishing its endowment fund, Baker has worked alongside the faculty to promote, through a series of seminars and breakfast meetings, a continuing exchange of ideas at the interface between social science research and the practical work of French business and political leaders.

He’s not finished with founding things, either. He was one of the instigators of last year’s launch of the first law clinic in France, at the law school of the Paris Institute of Political Studies, and he is one of the key leaders behind the establishment of France’s newest law school, the independent, privately funded École des Hautes Études Appliquées du Droit (School of Advanced Studies of Applied Law), which offered its first classes last month.
Legal Mind, Corporate Leader

In June, Roya Behnia, ’91, was named senior vice president, general counsel, and corporate secretary at Pall Corporation, the nearly $3 billion provider of filtration, separation, and purification solutions.

For Behnia, her new position caps off a steady progression toward the kind of responsibilities she has wanted and prepared herself for.

“I aspire to be part of a ‘new breed’ of corporate general counsels, even though there have surely been many GCs before us with the same qualities,” she says. “We’re working hard to provide legal services in a way that is fully responsive to, and integrated with, the strategic business needs of the companies we serve. We and our teams are integrated within the management and leadership teams, and we work hard to be seen as business partners by everyone within the organization.”

It was in her first job after law school, as an associate and then a partner at Kirkland & Ellis, that Behnia began to perceive the breadth of her interests, finding that her clients’ business challenges and opportunities were often as intriguing to her as their legal issues. Deciding to enter into a more direct connection with the business world, she took a position as director of litigation at a major corporation, and from there she went to multibillion dollar SPX Corporation, where she was group general counsel of the Specialty Engineered Products Group. Her work at SPX was inspiring to her, she says: “The GC empowered the legal team to be involved in the business, and the company’s leaders sincerely valued the legal department. It was so energizing for me to be in that kind of positive, constructive environment.”

Next she joined Rewards Network, Inc., a publicly held marketing and financial services company, as its general counsel, further expanding her business role. As part of the company’s five-person management committee, she was centrally involved in developing and implementing business strategy, including the design and launch of new products and technology, business alliances, and operational improvements.

Her interest in the business side of things has led her to write a number of papers and blog posts addressing such topics as continuous improvement of business and legal processes and the alignment of the legal function with a company’s strategic needs. In a three-part “agile manifesto,” she calls for a shift toward greater collaboration, flexibility, and agility in delivering legal services and for a strong bias toward simplicity.

Like her work itself, her writings display the essence of what she gained from her time at the Law School. “I learned how to think critically,” she says. “Geof Stone, Richard Posner, David Currie, and a host of others helped to shape my ability to analyze and plot a course of action. In my career I’ve worked at a diverse range of companies, where I have regularly encountered problems I’d never seen before. My Law School training helped me meet those kinds of challenges.”

Her ties to the Law School remain strong. She co-taught a seminar on trial strategy for five years, served on the Visiting Committee, and was co-chair of her class’s 20th reunion. “Our class was very close,” she says, “and a lot of us still see many of our classmates on a pretty regular basis. We raised a substantial amount of money for student scholarships as our reunion gift, as a way of giving back and making it possible for others to have the same kind of intellectual and interpersonal experiences that have made such a difference for us.”

She also maintains a connection with the country where she was born, Iran, having returned several times for visits and speaking proudly of her heritage. “Whatever I can do to counter stereotypes about people from the Middle East, whatever I can do to positively affect perceptions of that part of the world—I think that benefits all of us,” she says.

Behnia took her time to consider many opportunities before taking her current position at Pall, which, because of its long history of contributing to sustainability, refers to itself as “the original clean technology company.” She’s very pleased about the choice she made. “I couldn’t be happier,” she says. “I’m part of a great team tending to a strong and fascinating business—and we’re doing something good for the world, too.”

Roya Behnia, ’91

“...and a lot of us still see many of our classmates on a pretty regular basis. We raised a substantial amount of money for student scholarships as our reunion gift, as a way of giving back and making it possible for others to have the same kind of intellectual and interpersonal experiences that have made such a difference for us.”

Greg Garner started a new chapter recently, joining the three-attorney Contracts Control Unit in the Office of the Colorado State Controller. “This unit, among other things, reviews and approves all major contracts entered into by the State, and promises a substantial broadening of my areas of expertise!” Greg’s oldest son, Geoffrey, will be a...
Fighting for Equal Rights, One Case at a Time

Earlier this year, Jennifer Levi, ’92, received the highest honor bestowed by the National LGBT Bar Association, its Dan Bradley Award, for her leadership toward equality under the law. Her civil rights advocacy on behalf of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people includes arguing the Massachusetts same-sex marriage case at the trial-court level, bringing a challenge to Massachusetts’ sodomy law, and establishing important protections for children born to same-sex couples.

Her work today focuses principally on the rights of transgender people—those whose internal sense and external expression of who they are, as male or female, is different from the gender they were assigned at birth. As the director of the Transgender Rights Project at Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders (GLAD), a nonprofit law firm that works throughout New England, she has been instrumental in winning favorable rulings for transgender people in employment, healthcare, lending, public accommodations, and education.

When Levi joined GLAD in 1998, none of the six New England states had statutory antidiscrimination protection in place for transgender people; today all but one of them do. She drafted statutes and testified many times before state legislatures as part of that effort, as well as litigating precedent-setting cases at all state-court levels. There was also no federal case law favorable to transgender people in 1998, and most federal laws and policies explicitly excluded transgender people from their protections. Levi has been a leader in changing that, through litigation and administrative advocacy. She celebrates the ruling earlier this year by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that transgender people are fully covered under Title VII.

Levi came out as lesbian in college, and her experience as a gay rights activist during her postcollege years prompted her to decide to attend law school. “I realized that I wanted the skills to make the most significant difference I could in the fight for civil rights,” she recalls.

The first time she was called on in a class at the Law School, the professor addressed her as “Mister Hertz.” (Hertz was her surname when she was at the Law School.) “That wasn’t upsetting to me, or even surprising, because I had been presenting myself in a way that most people read as male for much of my life,” she says, “though I didn’t come to identify myself as transgender until after law school, when I realized that my experience of difference was related much more to my gender expression than to my sexual orientation.”

Her time at the Law School was foundational for her success as a litigator and advocate, she says: “Some of the professors I respect most and learned the most from were ones with whom I strongly disagreed. They made me think hard about what I believed and helped me learn to express my thoughts clearly and persuasively. It’s interesting that more than a few of the preeminent national advocates for LGBT equality, such as Beth Robinson [’89], Heather Sawyer [’91], and Dale Carpenter [’92], graduated from the Law School around the same time I did. I think Chicago influenced us—at least I know it did me—to work passionately for social justice.”

In addition to her work at GLAD, Levi teaches law at Western New England University School of Law; she co-founded the Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition and the Transgender Law and Policy Institute; and she is co-editor of the first book about transgender family law, which was published earlier this year.

Having been with her partner, to whom she is now married, for nearly 15 years, and having two young children, Levi is particularly attuned to the effects on families of discrimination. She sees her book, Transgender Family Law: A Guide to Effective Advocacy, as a complement to her work—a way to make it more likely that transgender people can exercise the rights that she has helped them obtain, and a path to the full integration of transgender people into communities. “Discrimination hurts families no matter what form it takes, whether it’s a divorced person being denied custody because he or she has come out as transgender, or someone being denied an employment opportunity because of how they express their identity, or a child who is stigmatized or even disciplined in school for dressing in a way that confounds gender stereotypes,” she says. “Everybody has a family. Nobody wants to see their loved ones harmed because of bias and misunderstanding.”
**WHERE ARE THEY NOW?**

**ALABAMA**
- Birmingham
  - Gilbert Dickey
    - Hon. William Pryor, 11th Cir.

**ARIZONA**
- Phoenix
  - Michelle Carr
    - Snell & Wilmer
  - Brian Hembd
    - Community Legal Services

**CALIFORNIA**
- Cotati
  - Jenni James
    - Animal Legal Defense Fund
- Irvine
  - Tamara Hill
    - Knobbe Martens
- Los Angeles
  - Patrick Barry
    - Morrison Foerster
  - Sheldon Evans
    - Gibson Dunn
  - Yuiliya Fradkina
    - Baker Hosteltier
  - Wesley Griffith
    - Stroock & Stroock & Lavan
  - Kristin MacDonald
    - Stroock & Stroock & Lavan
- San Diego
  - Lorraine Saxton
    - Hon. Mark Holmes, U.S. Tax Court
  - Lisa Christensen Gee
    - The Harris School of Public Policy, The University of Chicago
- San Francisco
  - Tara Tavernia
    - Clearly Gottlieb
  - Robert O’Leary
    - Morrison Foerster
  - FLORIDA
    - Miami
      - Pravin Patel
        - Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
      - Andrew Shapiro
        - Akerman Senterfitt
  - GEORGIA
    - Atlanta
      - Melissa Gworek
        - Alston & Bird
      - Rishad Patel
    - IOWA
      - Des Moines
        - Matthew Wallace
          - Bellin McCormick
      - ILLINOIS
        - Chicago
          - Sarah Arendt
            - Werman Law Office
          - Hillary August
            - Jenner & Block
          - Elizabeth Austin
            - Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
          - David Avraham
            - Katten Muchin
          - Joseph Avratin
            - Katten Muchin
          - Alexis Bates
            - Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
          - Ingrid Bergstrom
            - The Roger Baldwin Foundation of ACLU of Illinois
          - Katherine Boyle
            - Winston & Strawn
          - Mark Brisen
            - Lawdalen Christian Legal Center
          - Jeffrey Carroll
            - Sidney Austin
          - Patrick Castle
            - Grippo & Elden
          - Sarah Chandrika
            - Latham & Watkins
          - Brent Chatham
            - Leydig Voit & Mayer
          - Lisa Christensen Gee
            - The Harris School of Public Policy, The University of Chicago
          - Tal Cohen
            - Schiff Hardin & Waite
          - Kyle Dolan
            - Latham & Watkins
          - Ryan Dunigan
            - Winston & Strawn
          - Justin Dykstra
            - Goldberg Kahn
          - Robert Earles
            - Kirkland & Ellis
          - Jessica Ekhoff
            - Patitsahl, McGuiffe, Newbury, Hilliard & Geraldson LLP
          - Megan Fitzpatrick
            - Latham & Watkins
          - Jason Gott
            - Kirkland & Ellis
          - Michael Haebel
            - Johnson Law LLC
          - Alex Hertzel
            - Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg
          - Eileen Ho
            - Sidney Austin
          - James Hoey
            - Cacino Vaughan Law Offices, Ltd.
          - Marnie Holz
            - Kaplan Massamillio & Andrews
          - Jeffrey Huelskamp
            - Winston & Strawn
          - Evan Jones
            - Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
          - Julia Kasper
            - Katten Muchin
          - Aaron Katz
            - Greenberg Traurig
          - Daniel Kim
            - Husch Eppenberger
          - Christine Kim
            - Sidney Austin
          - Meredith Kirshenbaum
            - Goldberg Kahn
          - Caroline Lam
            - Hon. William E. Gomolinski, Cook County Cir. Ct.
          - Matthew Maitz
            - Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
          - Edward Mansell
            - Jenner & Block
          - Douglas Marsh
            - Cook County State’s Attorney
          - Ross McSweeney
            - Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
          - Cory Siggins
            - Mayer Brown
          - Daniel Monaco
            - Kirkland & Ellis
          - Benjamin Mooneyham
            - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
          - Brett Nerad
            - Hon. John Tharp, N.D. Ill.
          - Carl Newman
            - Domestic Violence Legal Clinic
          - David Ogles
            - Kirkland & Ellis
          - Emily Olson
            - Sidley Austin
          - Daniel Ostrovsky
            - Cabrini Green Legal Aid
          - Irene Paik
            - Winston & Strawn
          - Elin Park
            - Jenner & Block
          - Stephanie Patterson
            - Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
          - Amanda Penabad
          - Sean Pillai
            - Latham & Watkins
          - Alyssa Ramirez
            - Winston & Strawn
          - Daniel Render
            - Sidney Austin
          - Eve Rips
            - Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc.
          - Aimee Rodriguez
            - Equip for Equality
          - Matthew Rozen
            - Hon. Richard Posner, 7th Cir.
          - Neal Sarkar
            - Latham & Watkins
          - Benjamin Sauer
            - Jenner & Block
          - Meredith Shull
            - Ropes & Gray
          - Christopher Stackner
            - Katten Muchin
          - Teresa Sullivan Edwards
            - Wildman Palmer

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**
- Washington
  - Lonnie Bean
    - Legal Aid Society of the District of Columbia
  - Erica Guy
    - Sidley Austin
  - Marci Haarburger
    - Sidley Austin
  - Julia Horwitz
    - Electronic Privacy Information Center
  - Traci Irvin
    - Ropes & Gray
  - Minghaj Mirza
    - Covington & Burling
  - Matthew Riemer
    - Sheppard Mullin
  - Christine Roark
    - Federal Drug Administration, Office of Civil Rights
  - Joao Santa Rita
    - Federal Drug Administration, Office of Civil Rights
  - William Kaplan
    - Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice
  - Riley Lochridge
    - Latham & Watkins
  - COLORADO
    - Denver
      - Joshua Parker
        - Hon. Neil Gorsuch, 10th Cir.
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**IOWA**
- Des Moines
  - Matthew Wallace
    - Bellin McCormick

**ILLINOIS**
- Chicago
  - Sarah Arendt
    - Werman Law Office
  - Hillary August
    - Jenner & Block
  - Elizabeth Austin
    - Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
  - David Avraham
    - Katten Muchin
  - Josh Avratin
    - Sidney Austin
  - Alexis Bates
    - Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
  - Ingrid Bergstrom
    - The Roger Baldwin Foundation of ACLU of Illinois
  - Katherine Boyle
    - Winston & Strawn
  - Mark Brisen
    - Lawdalen Christian Legal Center
  - Jeffrey Carroll
    - Sidney Austin
  - Patrick Castle
    - Grippo & Elden
  - Sarah Chandrika
    - Latham & Watkins
  - Brent Chatham
    - Leydig Voit & Mayer
  - Edward Mansell
    - Jenner & Block
  - Douglas Marsh
    - Cook County State’s Attorney
  - Ross McSweeney
    - Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
  - Cory Siggins
    - Mayer Brown
  - Daniel Monaco
    - Kirkland & Ellis
  - Benjamin Mooneyham
    - U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
  - Brett Nerad
    - Hon. John Tharp, N.D. Ill.
  - Carl Newman
    - Domestic Violence Legal Clinic
  - David Ogles
    - Kirkland & Ellis
  - Emily Olson
    - Sidley Austin
  - Daniel Ostrovsky
    - Cabrini Green Legal Aid
  - Irene Paik
    - Winston & Strawn
  - Elin Park
    - Jenner & Block
  - Stephanie Patterson
    - Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
  - Amanda Penabad
  - Sean Pillai
    - Latham & Watkins
  - Alyssa Ramirez
    - Winston & Strawn
  - Daniel Render
    - Sidney Austin
  - Eve Rips
    - Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Inc.
  - Aimee Rodriguez
    - Equip for Equality
  - Matthew Rozen
    - Hon. Richard Posner, 7th Cir.
  - Neal Sarkar
    - Latham & Watkins
  - Benjamin Sauer
    - Jenner & Block
  - Meredith Shull
    - Ropes & Gray
  - Christopher Stackner
    - Katten Muchin
  - Teresa Sullivan Edwards
    - Wildman Palmer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Lawyer Name</th>
<th>Firm/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Benjamin Landry</td>
<td>Cravath Swaine &amp; Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas Patton</td>
<td>Lewis, Rice &amp; Fingersh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Ankang Li</td>
<td>Davis Polk &amp; Wardwell LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Macleod</td>
<td>Hon. Raymond Lohier, 2d Cir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Mason</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Montgomery</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Zachary Rosenberg</td>
<td>Baker Hostetler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Schwartz</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Somozoa</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Suh</td>
<td>Cravath Swaine &amp; Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Wall</td>
<td>Willkie Farr &amp; Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Wang</td>
<td>Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &amp; Garrison LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielle White</td>
<td>Davis Polk &amp; Wardwell LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisa Qian Zhou</td>
<td>Morrison Foerster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie Farnum</td>
<td>Hughes Hubbard &amp; Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bethany Fisher</td>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Foreman</td>
<td>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Geiger</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Graf</td>
<td>Mintz Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Gruber</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winston Gu</td>
<td>Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &amp; Garrison LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Hill</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sigrid Jernudd</td>
<td>Hughes Hubbard &amp; Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Kenny</td>
<td>Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen &amp; Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Kopko</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudia Lai</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>Benjamin Dyer</td>
<td>Mullin Hoard &amp; Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Biggs</td>
<td>Hon. Dale Wainwright, Supreme Court of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casey Potter</td>
<td>Hon. Raynald Lohier, 2d Cir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Mason</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Montgomery</td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Zachary Rosenberg</td>
<td>Baker Hostetler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Schwartz</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Somozoa</td>
<td>Simpson Thacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Suh</td>
<td>Cravath Swaine &amp; Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Wall</td>
<td>Willkie Farr &amp; Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Wang</td>
<td>Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &amp; Garrison LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielle White</td>
<td>Davis Polk &amp; Wardwell LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisa Qian Zhou</td>
<td>Morrison Foerster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audrey Gilliam</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice, Executive Office of Immigration Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shai Bronshttein</td>
<td>Hon. Jerry Smith, 9th Cir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Copeland</td>
<td>Vinson &amp; Elkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Katherine Mann</td>
<td>Baker Botts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Ng</td>
<td>Baker Botts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenton Roberts</td>
<td>Latham &amp; Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathanay Paynter</td>
<td>Parr Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erica Roberts</td>
<td>Hon. Jim Johnson, Washington State Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEET THE CLASS OF 2015

GENERAL STATISTICS:
98 undergraduate institutions
33 states represented
42 undergraduate majors
22 graduate degrees
34 countries lived in/ worked in
15 languages spoken
7 Eagle Scouts
6 Teach for America alumni

FUN FACTS:
Seven varsity athletes
Two Fulbright Scholars

One college marching band member
One curler
One college radio DJ
One Major League Baseball intern
One White House Fellow
One college juggling team member
One PhD in Inorganic Chemistry
One mallet percussionist
One dragon boat team steersman
One personal trainer
One hot yoga instructor
One professional theatre company co-founder
One Special Olympics coach
One published poet
One Korean Air Force Staff Sergeant
One amateur boxer
One competitive tennis player
One river raft guide
One Irish rock band member
One triathlete
One Nickelodeon TV show costume designer
One swing jazz singer
One Lego Robotics Team coach
Looking forward to seeing you at

Reunion 2013, May 3 to May 5!