

Catherine T. Struve
Penn Law
Memorial Service for Geoff Hazard – January 27, 2018

Distilling my fond memories of Geoff into five minutes is a challenge, but a particularly apt one. As anyone familiar with his correspondence can attest, Geoff was a master of brevity. So I will highlight just two themes.

One is Geoff's generosity of spirit. I first came to know Geoff more than 17 years ago, when I was newly arrived at Penn and had just started to learn how to teach law. There could hardly have been a greater contrast between our respective understandings of civil procedure: I was working hard to master doctrines Geoff had helped to shape. And yet he had a knack for filling gaps in my knowledge without ever letting me feel ignorant. I taught both my students and myself from Geoff's wonderful casebook, and learned still more from him in person.

Geoff invested time in improving not only my teaching but also my writing. He had an amazing capacity to apprehend an argument, take it apart, and re-fashion it in a more incisive, more logical form: My argument would emerge still my own, but vastly better as a result of his reactions. And Geoff gave this attention not only to colleagues' work but also to that of our students.

For a decade I had the delight of co-teaching a seminar on procedure with Geoff and Judge Scirica – or, as I viewed it, of enrolling in Geoff's and Judge Scirica's seminar multiple years in a row. One of my favorite memories of that class dates from a year when we replaced one of the class meetings with joint office hours, during which each of our students, in turn, came in to discuss their research papers. I remember watching Geoff press for exploration of unconsidered points and suggest new directions in which to take the research. I felt, that day, as though I learned as much about teaching as any of the students learned about their paper topics.

My second theme is Geoff's breadth of perspective. He encouraged me, as he encouraged our students, to assess how the litigation system fit within broader social and political contexts. He connected aggregate litigation to mass production. He emphasized that the relative scope of litigation remedies, from country to country, could not be meaningfully compared without also taking into account the extent of other, administrative, mechanisms for enforcing the law. His knowledge of procedure spanned nearly a millennium – from writs in twelfth century England to innovative litigation finance in twenty-first century America. And he melded his analysis of litigation strategy with insights about professional responsibility.

No one knew more about lawyers' professional responsibilities than Geoff. But his compass extended beyond technical requirements, to morality and human nature. Geoff took time to counsel me when I in turn had to counsel, for the first time, a student facing serious discipline. In his absence, I will continue to ask myself, of tough problems, "How would Geoff have viewed this? What would he have advised?"

Having had the joy of co-teaching with Geoff, I feel his absence particularly acutely in the setting of our seminar. But in that setting I find a particular comfort, as well, in knowing that each of those seminar meetings continues to be shaped by his analytical insights and informed, though now at secondhand, by his genius for teaching. Thank you, dear Geoff.