

Herma Hill Kay[†]

David Currie and Roger Cramton brought out their casebook on Conflict of Laws in 1968, and I immediately began using it in my course at Berkeley. I didn't know David, but I had taken Civil Procedure from Roger and Conflicts from David's father, Brainerd Currie, at Chicago. I was convinced that Brainerd's revolutionary approach to choice of law—governmental interest analysis—offered the most constructive way of thinking about that intractable problem. Since the Cramton and Currie book focused on that approach, I was delighted with it.

In 1974, David and Roger asked me to come in with them as a co-author on the second edition. Although I was already hard at work with Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Kenneth Davidson on our casebook about sex-based discrimination, I was happy to accept their invitation. It was during our collaboration on the second edition, which was published in 1975, that I got to know David and appreciate the subtlety of his mind.

The collaboration of law professors on casebooks may be unique to legal education. These books are not scholarly texts, nor are they simply collections of teaching materials. The best of them—Hart and Wechsler's 1953 casebook, *The Federal Courts and the Federal System*, comes to mind—shape the intellectual understanding of a particular field for many years. In such cases, the coauthors are specialists in the subject matter and have published law review articles about it. Typically, they also teach the course and in the process are exposed to and learn from their students' questions and insights about the material. Obviously, the collaboration is facilitated if the coauthors share a common approach to the subject. This was true in our case. Unlike some other editorial teams, we did not meet in person. When the second edition came out, we were spread across the country: Roger at Cornell, David at Chicago, I at Berkeley. Neither the fax machine nor email was commercially available, so we communicated by mail and (rarely) by telephone. There was nothing particularly innovative about our method of preparing the new edition. We divided up the work (I drew the chapters on choice of law theory and family law), produced drafts, sent them to each other for suggestions and comments, revised the drafts, and agreed on a final version.

[†] Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong Professor of Law, UC Berkeley School of Law. BA 1956, Southern Methodist University; JD 1959, The University of Chicago.

It was in this ordinary process of revision that David's clarity of thought and talent for organization stood out. His editorial philosophy, shared by Roger, was stated up front in the Preface:

In general, we have reprinted cases rather fully in a desire to provide class material that retains the texture and diversity of the original. We have not carried this approach so far, however, as to preserve passages that are repetitious or irrelevant. Authorities cited in principal cases have been ruthlessly pruned; only those citations that build an understanding of the course as a whole or that a curious student might want to examine have been preserved.¹

I transgressed this demanding standard more than once, particularly in working on the family law cases in Chapter Six, where my experience in teaching that subject indicated that the facts often influenced the outcome even of interstate child custody cases. David muttered about whether these cases had to include so many factual details. But I persevered, and he was willing to be tolerant. Over the years, Chapter Six has increased in importance (and in length) with the successive Uniform Acts, congressional legislation, and emergence of the knotty conflict of laws problems raised by same-sex relationships.

Through the many revisions of our casebook, and with the addition of two new coauthors, Dean Larry Kramer (on the fifth edition in 1993) and Professor Kermit Roosevelt III (on the seventh edition in 2006), I have tried to keep David's preference for a lean and concise book in mind. He was an excellent coauthor, and I learned much by working with him. His understated manner did not disguise the penetrating quality of his analysis. His many important contributions to legal scholarship in general, and not only to our casebook, will keep his memory bright for generations to come.

¹ Roger C. Cramton and David P. Currie, *Conflict of Laws: Cases—Comments—Questions* xiii (West 1968).