Congratulations to the Class of 2012

The Harvard Law School graduating Class of 2012 was encouraged to remember the importance of service in their future careers, during Class Day and Commencement exercises this year. The law school conferred 757 degrees—580 J.D.s, 169 LL.M.s, and 8 S.J.D.s—at Commencement on May 24.

Celebrating 35 years on the Court

Harvard Law School celebrated Justice John Paul Stevens’ 35 years of service on the Supreme Court with an April 25 event honoring his work and his contributions to the fields of environmental, energy and natural resources law.

In her introduction, Dean Martha Minow said that Justice Stevens’ crucial leading role in environmental law follows from his attention to facts and his ability to cut through the fog to bring reason to bear in the midst of high emotion, high drama and sometimes boring detail. That focus on facts, she said, is “among the dimensions for which Justice John Paul Stevens has set the standard defining what a great judge is.”

“This is the kind of thing that affects billions of dollars for industry, pharma, hospitals, researchers and universities across the world,” said Assistant Professor I. Glenn Cohen ’03 (right), co-director of the Petrie-Flom Center for Health Law Policy, Biotechnology, and Bioethics.

The future of human subjects research regulation

Leading experts in the fields of law, science and medicine gathered at HLS May 18 and 19 to discuss the future of human subjects research regulation.

The topic for the conference, sponsored by the Petrie-Flom Center for Health Law Policy, Biotechnology, and Bioethics at Harvard Law School, was prompted by a July 2011 advance notice of proposed rulemaking from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services proposing to amend the rule that has governed this research for more than 20 years.

“We felt this might be an opportunity to revisit and actually change things regarding human subjects research,” said HLS Assistant Professor I. Glenn Cohen ’03, co-director of the center. “This is the kind of thing that affects billions of dollars for industry, pharma, hospitals, researchers and universities across the world.”

In announcing a contemplation of the rule change, officials at HHS noted that the research landscape involving...
**BRIEFS**

### Glendon appointed to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom

An article by **Andrew Tuch S.J.D. ’12** has been voted by the nation’s corporate and securities law professors as one of the top 10 corporate and securities law papers of 2011. The article, “Multiple Gatekeepers,” was originally published in the Virginia Law Review. The Corporate Practice Commentator, a quarterly journal, polls corporate and securities law faculty to select the 10 best articles published during the prior year. Professors chose Tuch’s article out of 580 articles on this year’s list.

### Cohen named a fellow for medical tourism

The Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University has selected **Glenn Cohen ’03** as a Radcliffe Institute Fellow for the 2012-2013 academic year. The co-director of HLS’s Petrie-Flom Center for Health Law Policy, Biotechnology, and Bioethics, Cohen will focus his fellowship on medical tourism and the legal and ethical issues related to travel by patients who are residents of one country to another country for medical treatment.

### Academy fellows: Wilkins and Vermeule

Harvard Law Professors **David Wilkins ’80** and **Adrian Vermeule ’93** have been elected to membership in the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Wilkins, the Lester Kissel Professor of Law, is director of the Program on the Legal Profession and vice dean for Global Initiatives on the Legal Profession. Vermeule is a leading scholar of administrative law and constitutional law and theory. Several HLS alumni were also named 2012 fellows: **Rita Hauser ’58**, president of the Hauser Foundation; **Kenneth Frazier ’78**, president and CEO of Merck & Co.; and **David Weisbach ’89**, the Walter J. Blum Professor of Law and former ambassador to the Holy See, was appointed to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom on May 23 by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell. Comprising nine members, the commission is an independent, bipartisan federal body that is responsible for reviewing the facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom internationally and making policy recommendations to the president, secretary of state and Congress.

### Students recognized for community work

**Crystal Redd ’13** and **Angela Chuang ’13** were among 10 students chosen as 2012 Harvard University Presidential Fellows for their commitment to public service initiatives. The university-wide fellowship program, designed to promote public service across Harvard’s schools, provides grants to undergraduates and graduate students to fund summer projects. Redd will work at the Advancement Project and with the Southern Center for Human Rights, working with defendants facing the death penalty. Chuang will intern at New York County Defender Services’ newly created Immigration Unit, helping to represent indigent clients.

### Glendon joins commission on religious freedom

**Mary Ann Glendon**, Learned Hand Professor of Law and former ambassador to the Holy See, was appointed to the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom on May 23 by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell. Comprising nine members, the commission is an independent, bipartisan federal body that is responsible for reviewing the facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom internationally and making policy recommendations to the president, secretary of state and Congress.

### Radcliffe honors Marshall as a ‘true pioneer in her field’

Margaret H. Marshall, senior research fellow and lecturer on law at Harvard Law School, was recently awarded the Radcliffe Institute Medal. Marshall, who is former chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and senior counsel at Choate Hall & Stewart, gave the keynote address during the Radcliffe Day luncheon on May 25.

---
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AWARD WINNERS

Rethinking music

TWO HLS STUDENTS, ADAM GOTTESFELD ’12 and JOEY SEILER ’12, recently won Rethink Music’s Genesis Project, a startup competition that aims to encourage and monetize creativity in the music industry. The duo will receive $10,000 in legal services from the firm Duane Morris, additional in-kind consulting, and at least three meetings with venture capitalists. Their project, Have You Heard?, utilizes data available on music-streaming platforms such as Spotify and GrooveShark to make music listening and sharing more rewarding for fans and more lucrative for artists and brands. The project combines the classic street team promotional model with online games to bridge relationships between artists and fans. They received the award in April during the Rethink Music conference, sponsored by Berklee College of Music, in association with the Berkman Center for Internet & Society.

A Progressive Vision of National Security


The only member of the Senate to vote against the PATRIOT Act in 2001 and one of 23 to vote against the Iraq War in 2002, Feingold recently wrote “While America Sleeps,” a book which details his criticisms of American foreign policy since 9/11 and proposes a plan to correct the nation’s course.

Feingold said he chose to write the book—which is his first—about national security, rather than issues with which he is better associated, such as campaign finance reform, because despite an initial spike in engagement in the years immediately following 9/11, the American government and people are not sufficiently connected with the rest of the world, and have failed to stay connected to the issues. He said that, although it is understandable that public discourse and government resources shifted to address the financial crisis, a crucial lesson from 9/11 is that when we’re not alert to what’s occurring in the rest of the world, regardless of what’s occurring domestically, we can be taken completely by surprise.

Feingold said, “We can’t say ‘Domestic issues now, global issues later.’ We need to address both at once.”

THE PROMISE OF efforts to redesign humans and the needed limits on those efforts were the focus of a talk by Professor EINER ELHAUGE ’86.

According to Elhauge, the law currently draws a distinction between biological interventions that treat human diseases and disabilities, and those that enhance human abilities. “It’s an important distinction because it’s a central organizing principle of our modern health care system,” said Elhauge, “but it is unsustainable in the face of growing technological development.”

Professor RICHARD LAZARUS ’79 discussed how private-sector law firms have captured the Supreme Court’s docket, overwhelming the Court with petitions. According to Lazarus, the Court needs to create its own office of career lawyers to provide an initial layer of review, with experts capable of second-guessing and scrutinizing expert advocates. Clinical Professor and Director of the Harvard Criminal Justice Institute RONALD SULLIVAN ’84 discussed the ethical dimensions of criminal defense, questioning whether a good lawyer can be a good person.

“How can a lawyer use her great education, skills and talent to secure the acquittal of a person who she knows is guilty?” he asked. Since most junior criminal defense lawyers have to resolve these sorts of conflicts on a nearly daily basis, said Sullivan, criminal law provides “a rather dramatic prism” to answer this question.

ANNETTE GORDON-REED ’84, professor of law and history at Harvard, said it’s important for students, particularly at an institution that sees itself as training people to be leaders, to have a full grounding in history—to go through the process of thinking about how the American legal system developed—so that they can make the arguments and can think about policy when they are drafting laws.

Our institutions should be separate from money influence, said Professor LAWRENCE LESSIG, director of Harvard’s Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics. Congress has moved from dependence on the people to dependence on the funders, which jeopardizes the future of American democracy. Americans’ belief that money buys results in Congress erodes trust in the institution, which erodes participation, he said.

BIG THINKERS

Five ideas in 50 minutes

“HLS Thinks Big,” inspired by the global TED (Technology, Entertainment and Design) talks and modeled after the college’s “Harvard Thinks Big” event, was held at Harvard Law School on May 23 in Austin North. During the event, five professors presented some of their favorite topics.

Einer Elhauge

Richard Lazarus

Ronald Sullivan

Lawrence Lessig

Annette Gordon-Reed

WATCH VIDEO hvrd.me/feingold2012

HONORS AT VIS MOOT COURT

Two HLS teams competed at the 2012 Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot competitions, in Vienna and Hong Kong, which aim to train future leaders in methods of alternative dispute resolution. In Vienna, 282 universities from 68 countries competed. HLS placed third in oral arguments, making it to the semi-final round and winning Best Memorandum for Claimant, and received honorable mention for the Respondent’s Memorandum. JESSICA MOYER ’12 and JESSICA BEESS UND CHROSTIN ’13 received honorable mention for Best Individual Oralist. The Hong Kong team placed eighth out of 90 teams, making it to the quarter-final round and winning honorable mention for the Claimant’s Memorandum. TARIK ELHUSEIN ’13 won honorable mention for Best Individual Oralist.

Vienna Team

Hong Kong Team

PHOTOS BY MARTHA STEWART

PHIL RENFRO/THI
The 82nd attorney general of the United States, Eric H. Holder Jr. addressed the Class of 2012, urging the newly minted lawyers to continue the tradition of service encouraged at Harvard Law School and to use their skills to define the country’s future. The nation’s top attorney joked that he wasn’t offended that he was the school’s fourth choice for Class Day speaker, behind comedians Stephen Colbert, Tina Fey and Jon Stewart, because the school wasn’t his first choice either. After his undergraduate studies, Holder was accepted to Harvard Law, but he chose to attend Columbia. [WATCH VIDEO hvrd.me/Holder2012]

Frank talk at Harvard College Class Day

U.S. REP. BARNEY FRANK (A.B. ’62) ’77 shared the stage at Harvard College with actor, writer and comedian Andy Samberg to deliver the keynote address during the college’s Class Day celebration. Frank, who has represented the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts since 1981, served as chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services from 2007 to 2011. He remains the committee’s ranking Democrat.

As part of his talk, Frank urged his listeners to join him in calling for the United States to end its billion dollars in regular assistance to Europe. He referenced Secretary of State George Marshall’s Harvard Commencement speech of 1947, during which he announced the Marshall Plan, the allied roadmap on how to rebuild Europe after the Second World War. At that time, Frank said, Europe was “poor and hungry and defenseless, and facing a brutal Soviet Union.” The current situation is vastly different, and “65 years later, too little has changed in our policy,” he added.

“America continues to commit tens of billions of dollars that we could otherwise use for very important purposes,” including education, environmental solutions and health research. [WATCH VIDEO hvrd.me/BarneyFrank2012]

A number of good deeds

352,120
total number of pro bono hours completed by Class of 2012

2,500
pro bono hours completed by Rajan Sonik ’12

597
average hours per student

97
number of students who contributed more than 1,000 hours

7
number of students who performed more than 2,000 hours

Rajan Sonik ’12 is the winner of this year’s Andrew L. Kaufman Pro Bono Service Award. He was recognized for performing the highest number of pro bono service hours in the Class of 2012. He was also recently presented with the 2012 Law Student Ethics Award from the Association of Corporate Counsel, Northeast Chapter.

“Put your skills to use in helping to define our future”

“Put your skills to use in helping to define our future”

Attorney General Eric Holder keynotes Class Day

“I ask you to use your influence to serve others and better the world.”
– Dean Martha Minow
Commencement 2012
"As you leave here, I hope you remember the powerful potential attorneys possess to bring justice into the world." That was the message delivered by Professor WILLIAM RUBENSTEIN ’86, this year’s winner of the prestigious Albert M. Sacks-Paul A. Freund Award for Teaching Excellence, bestowed each spring by the graduating class.

Rubenstein, who specializes in civil procedure, complex litigation and legal remedies, recalled his time at HLS in the early-1980s, when many of his close friends were dying from a disease that would be known as AIDS. As a gay man, he said, he operated under the assumption that he would likely be infected and didn’t have much time to live.

“In the midst of a plague, I turned to the law … because the law’s promise was that it too could ameliorate human suffering,” he said.

After law school, he said, he took a job at “the margins of the legal profession,” choosing to dedicate his abilities to protecting the rights of people with AIDS. He worked for nearly a decade at the national office of the American Civil Liberties Union, litigating sexual orientation and AIDS discrimination cases in federal and state courts throughout the U.S.

In the 1990s, he began teaching civil procedure at Stanford. “It turns out, I loved it,” he said. Teaching civil procedure has been his “single most enjoyable professional pursuit.” He told the class, “I primarily enjoy the experience of working with such enthusiastic and brilliant students at this formative moment in their careers. It is a gift that you all give to me.”

WATCH VIDEO hvard.me/Rubenstein2012

"WHO WOULD HAVE THOUGHT that a girl from Sierra Leone, a country with one of the highest percentages of illiterate women, and a daughter of an illiterate mother, would have made it to Harvard," said commencement speaker Nyella Maya Rogers LL.M. ’12. "This is a personal story, not only because of my circumstances, but a story about all the other women in the developing world with untapped potential."

WATCH VIDEO hvard.me/HLS2012gradvid

Congratulations to 757 HLS graduates!

DURING COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES on May 24, Dean Martha Minow congratulated the 757 graduates in the Harvard Law School Class of 2012 on all that they accomplished while at HLS. Minow urged graduates to not only take problems apart and work to persuade others, but also to celebrate and extend their role as designers.

Minow cited a range of examples of the positive impact of design—including Chief Justice Warren Burger’s redesign of the Court’s judicial bench, from a straight row to a curved bench allowing justices to see each other and communicate better. Thinking about things differently allows for alternative ways to solve problems, said Minow. “As you design options, rules, for clients, for the public, you design your career, your priorities. I have hope for our world because you will design solutions to local, national, international challenges; you design our future worlds.”

"As you leave here, I hope you remember the powerful potential attorneys possess to bring justice into the world."
A COMPLEX CASE

Randy Barnett, on challenging the individual mandate

A decision by the U.S. Supreme Court on whether Congress has the power to mandate individuals to carry private insurance coverage isn’t expected until the end of June. But Libertarian legal theorist and Georgetown University Law Center Professor RANDY BARNETT ’77 is already claiming victory of sorts for his argument that the mandate is unconstitutional.

Barnett, who represented the National Federation of Independent Business in its challenge to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and attended the oral arguments in March as an observer for that organization, joined HLS Dean Martha Minow April 12 to discuss the case in a program sponsored by the HLS Federalist Society.

Minow introduced Barnett as “the person who’s most responsible for bringing public attention to this issue and identifying the structure of a constitutional challenge.”

Barnett characterized his ongoing constitutional challenge to the individual mandate as a rather lonely one when he took it up two and a half years ago after lawyer David Rivkin raised the issue in a Wall Street Journal op-ed piece and launched an online legal-blog debate.

“There was another law professor on that blog who posted a very snarky ‘Nobody can be serious about a constitutional challenge here,’” Barnett said. “And I just sort of decided, Well, maybe I should say something.”

Since then, Barnett said, his argument has gained constant momentum, culminating in a historic examination of the issue by the Supreme Court in March. The justices gave attorneys more than six hours for oral arguments over three days—the most time they’ve allowed for oral arguments since their consideration of Miranda v. Arizona in 1966.

This time, the justices are reviewing U.S. Department of Health and Human Services v. Florida, and NFIB v. Sebelius, in which the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit ruled in January 2011 that the mandate falls outside the federal authority contemplated by the commerce clause in the Constitution.

One of the central issues examined during the Supreme Court hearings was whether the Anti-Injunction Act, which prohibits taxpayers from challenging a tax until it goes into effect, applies to the health-mandate requirement in the Affordable Care Act.

The argument that the Anti-Injunction Act does apply—and therefore renders the constitutional challenge moot—is widely held in legal academia, Barnett contended.

“It’s an argument that’s so beloved by professors, but there was not a single justice who was even interested in the tax-power argument in six hours of oral presentation,” he said. “If any justice liked the tax-power theory, you would have expected to hear from her or him during the discussion of the Anti-Injunction Act.”

“The justices were debating among themselves about why it didn’t apply. There was nobody saying it did apply.”

Barnett said he is cautiously optimistic about how the justices will rule. He said he had the sense from the justices at oral arguments that they may believe the Affordable Care Act goes too far.

“If it were actually accepted by the Court, they would basically be saying that Congress has unlimited power to do whatever they want as long as they limit these sanctions to a monetary fine collected by the IRS,” he said. “That would be a startling claim of power.”

“This is a claim of power by Congress that is literally unprecedented. Never before in history has Congress required individual citizens to do business with private companies as a means of exercising its commerce powers.”

He pointed out that just because something is unprecedented, that doesn’t mean it’s necessarily unconstitutional.

What it does do is render it a case of first impression, “which means that it’s highly unlikely that prior precedents have directly addressed the issue of whether this is OK or not. That’s exactly the reason why this has always been a close case on the merits, and not an easy case.”

Proposed rulemaking discussed

human subjects has changed significantly since 1991, when the regulations were last substantially modified. Before then, research involving human subjects was conducted mostly at single sites within academic and medical centers. But, according to the HHS, the subsequent expansion of research into new scientific disciplines and multi-site studies has “highlighted ambiguities in the current rules” and led to questions about whether the current regulatory framework is meeting the needs of both researchers and research subjects.

Greg Koski, former director of HHS’s federal Office for Human Research Protections, the office responsible for regulatory oversight of research funded by the agency, said that he supported a dramatic shift in the regulation of human subjects research and acknowledged that it is highly unusual for a regulatory office to look critically at the system it is charged with overseeing.

HHS is considering a variety of changes to the rules governing human subjects research, but Koski characterized the proposals as “simply tinkering around the edges of a system that the bioethics community, the investigator community, and virtually every other community see as being somewhat dysfunctional and not achieving the goals for which it was originally intended.”

The current regulatory framework, he said, is largely based on reactions to such tragedies as the Tuskegee syphilis study of 1932 to 1972, in which the U.S. Public Health Service and the Tuskegee Institute conducted a clinical study involving hundreds of poor black men who, despite the advent of penicillin, remained untreated for purposes of studying the disease. Public outrage over Tuskegee and other reported abuses led to the creation of a government commission that drew up a document called the Belmont Report in 1979, which set forth the ethical principles to govern human subjects research and led to the current regulatory structure.

However, Koski said, regulation has been dominated by human-subject protectionism and an ethical-review system that has “de–volved to regulatory compliance oversight.” The result, he said, is a system that is “inefficient and burdensome.” His recommendation, he said, was to replace the current system with one modeled after medical training and certification.

He said: “If we were able to develop a paradigm of professionalism in human research, it would likely be every bit as effective, less costly, less burdensome and more efficient than the protectionist, compliance-focused system that we are now seeking to reform. I would argue that reform of our current system is perhaps not the most appropriate or even adequate approach to try to achieve the goals that we seek.”

While some panelists took broad views of the issue, others focused more on specifics. Laura Stark, an assistant professor in the Science in Society Program and the Department of Sociology at Wesleyan University, addressed the functions of Institutional Review Boards, which are mandated by federal regulations to approve, monitor, and review most biomedical and behavioral research involving human subjects, and concluded that reform is necessary.

“It’s commonly assumed that IRBs take regulation and apply it to specific research contexts and to a local population,” she said. “But instead of applying these general regulations to a local context, IRBs apply their own previous decisions to the next protocols that come in. So they’re actually working case to case, rather than from regulations.”

Rosamond Rhodes, a professor of medical education at Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City, proposed the creation of a new category of risk, “de minimis risk,” which would apply to research that poses no physical danger to humans and may therefore proceed without obtaining informed consent.

Holly Fernandez Lynch, Petrie-Flom’s executive director, addressed the degree to which labor and employment protections might be applied to research subjects, concluding that subjects generally should not be offered weaker regulatory protections than...
Regulation has been dominated by human-subject protectionism and an ethical-review system that has devolved to regulatory oversight compliance.

GREG KOSKI

their counterparts engaged in more traditional work. Were subjects to pursue unionization and collective bargaining, she argued, the Screen Actors Guild might offer the closest model for imitation.

In addition to structural critiques, the conference also addressed the actual impacts that human subjects research may have on specific vulnerable populations.

Osagie K. Obasogie, an associate professor at the University of California’s Hastings College of the Law, spoke about another population that’s been historically vulnerable to use as research subjects: military personnel.

Efthimios Parasidis, an assistant professor at Saint Louis University School of Law, spoke about another population that’s been historically vulnerable to use as research subjects: military personnel.

Parasidis pointed out that soldiers have long been used to test the effects of various threats and drugs, ranging from exposure to mustard gas in the 1940s and atomic-weapons explosions in the 1950s to the more recent use of memory-altering drugs to reduce inhibitions to killing, and he said a strong legal framework supports and perpetuates that activity.

For instance, he said, military law mandates that soldiers must follow their commanders’ orders or face the risk of court-martial.

And, he said, the Feres doctrine prohibits military personnel from collecting damages from the U.S. government for injuries.

He proposed that the regulations be amended to clearly require informed consent from soldiers before they are used as research subjects, and that the military provide medical monitoring and post-research treatment for soldiers used as research subjects. He also proposed that an exception to the Feres doctrine be provided for violations of research protocols.

As for Cohen’s hope that the conference might help effect change, he’s already taken steps in that direction, sharing conference papers with federal regulators and planning further collaboration between the conference participants. ♦
Professor Richard Lazarus ’79, who led the program, said that Justice Stevens earned his reputation as the environmental law steward on the nation’s highest court by repeatedly safeguarding the laws from attempts to weaken them.

“Environmental laws challenged the nation to do no less than redefine the relationship of humankind to the natural environment, in order to protect our air, water and lands,” he said. “Those laws inevitably challenged very powerful political and economic interests and institutions. The strength of Justice Stevens’ jurisprudence lay in his willingness to embrace the clear policy import of the nation’s new laws.”

Professor David Barron ’94, a former clerk to the justice, held a conversation with Stevens about his service on the Court and about his recent book, “Five Chiefs,” which discusses the five different chief justices with whom he worked. Justice Stevens also discussed some controversial cases that the Court has decided in the past, including Bush v. Gore, which he said greatly damaged the independence of the judiciary.

“I do think it was a most unfortunate decision, largely because of its impact not only on the Supreme Court itself but on other judges in other courts. I think it did create the impression that judges weren’t acting as judges should act in many respects,” Justice Stevens said. He noted that he does not find the Affordable Care Act challenge similarly troubling because there is legitimate conflict over the law, regardless that the issue has become politically charged.

He also spoke more generally about the inner workings of the Supreme Court, touching upon pre-conference discussion between the justices, the shifting dynamics of the Court when a new justice joins, and the impact of oral arguments on the justices’ deliberations.

“I’ve often been surprised at the difference between what happens at oral arguments and what happens at conference and in considerations down the road. I can’t tell you how often my mind has been changed during conference and the minds of my colleagues have been changed,” he said. “My colleagues are people who recognize their own responsibility to get to the right answer, and I think they act in good faith.”

The HLS Environmental Law Society presented Justice Stevens with HLS’s first Horizon Award, for outstanding contributions to the fields of environmental, energy and natural resources law. The award, crafted out of renewable bamboo, is itself sustainable. The justice also received a bowtie that depicts climate change.

Green is the new Crimson

HLS wins Cambridge GoGreen Award for sustainability efforts

In May, the city of Cambridge awarded Harvard Law School a 2012 GoGreen Award for Waste Reduction and Recycling for a Large Organization. The award recognizes sustainability initiatives of Cambridge businesses and organizations in the areas of transportation, waste reduction/recycling, energy, storm water management, climate protection and initiatives by community organizations.

The law school’s new Wasserstein Hall, Caspersen Student Center, and Clinical Wing Building recently received LEED-NC (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design – New Construction) Gold certification for the energy efficiency, waste reduction and resource conservation features that were incorporated into its design.

Reusing furniture

When HLS departments moved into new offices in the Wasserstein Hall, Caspersen Student Center, and Clinical Wing Building this winter, 12 tons of furniture remained behind. The law school hosted a Furniture FreeCycle, for students, faculty and staff. Leftover furniture was donated to local charities.

Earth Day at HLS

On April 22, HLS celebrated Earth Day with live music and free food donated by local, sustainable vendors.

HLS recovers most compost ever

In March, HLS recovered almost 10 tons of clean organic refuse, thanks to expansion and improvement of a campuswide composting program. When the law school began composting in April 2008, 38 percent of refuse was recovered for recycling, with 493 tons of trash generation. In 2011, HLS recovered 64 percent of refuse for recycling, and trash generation fell to 145 tons. Today, nearly all dorms and most offices have access to organics recovery stations, an elaborate set-up which includes recovering food scraps from cafeterias, as well as paper towels from dormitory rest rooms. The refuse is picked up daily and is composted at Brick Ends Farm in South Hamilton, Mass.

‘Stevens has set the standard for what a great judge is’