

Afterword

*Lauretta Tomasco
William S. Laufer*

In the Memory of Thomas W. Dunfee: Recollections of Colleagues

Thomas W. Dunfee left an indelible mark on his colleagues, peer, students, and friends. He pushed the boundaries of an emerging field at Wharton and elsewhere with a strong but gentle elegance. More important, Tom lived what he studied and professed. His life was supported and structured by principles of faith and the love of all who knew him.

There are few gesturers in life that can capture what leads all to mourn the passing of a dear friend and colleague. This volume, however, is the first step in some long overdue recognition. The thoughts and sentiments found in the afterword below reflect the powerful influence that Tom continues to have on our field and in our lives.

Edwin M. Epstein

I write this with great sadness. What was supposed to be an encomium for a distinguished colleague has become a eulogy for an esteemed friend who has left us so prematurely, leaving a deep void in all who knew him.

Virtual colleague

Tom and I had a unique relationship – we were “virtual colleagues.” Let me explain. Of course, all of the authors whose articles appear in this Festschrift to Tom are “colleagues” as are those of you who are reading these words. We are all laborers in a common vineyard of scholarship and provide sustenance and support for each other. We are part of an intellectual community. My relationship with Tom, however, went far beyond these more general connections and became the “virtual collegiality” referenced above.

A bit of history – mine and Tom’s – is necessary to understand my point.

My academic career began in 1962 in the Business Law department at Penn’s Wharton School. A 1958 graduate of Penn, albeit not Wharton, I had gone to Yale Law School, from which I graduated in 1961. Following a year of judicial clerkship and admission to the Pennsylvania Bar in 1962, I was about to commence practice as a Philadelphia lawyer when I received a call from an undergraduate mentor, Professor Bernard Cataldo, chair of Wharton’s Business Law department, inquiring whether I might be interested in teaching an 8 a.m. section of the Introductory Business Law class. With great trepidation – I had not thought previously of teaching – and equal enthusiasm, I said yes and became a part-time lecturer during 1962–1964. I found teaching exciting and stimulating and when an offer came from the University of California–Berkeley, to join the Legal, Social, and Political Environment group at what is now the Haas School of Business, I, after consultation with my wife, answered the call – once again with great trepidation and enthusiasm. I had never been to California and, in truth, was a naïf concerning the rigors and expectations of a tenure-track junior faculty member at a preeminent research institution. Fortunately, I thrived at Berkeley where my research and teaching came to focus more on the political and social environment of business than on the legal.

Meanwhile, Tom, who was 5 years younger than I, was establishing his reputation as a “wunderkind,” first at Illinois State University (1968–1970) and then at Ohio State University (1970–1975). Our paths, however, did not cross until he came to Wharton in July, 1975, as an Associate Professor. I frankly do not recall when or how Tom and I first met. Perhaps, we

intersected at a meeting of the American Business Law Association (ABLA) to which I infrequently went (since I ceased teaching law oriented courses by the late 1960s), or during one of my occasional visits to Penn. From the time we first met, it was obvious to me that Tom was someone special both as an intellect and as a person. I felt that I had come upon a soul mate.

Although I would occasionally see Tom at ABLA meetings, our real point of contact was at annual gatherings of the Society for Business Ethics (SBE) in which we both participated actively. In due course, Tom became president of both ABLA and SBE. We had an opportunity for more intimate contact when we traveled together to Moscow shortly after the collapse of the Soviet Union to participate in one of the first conferences bringing together Russian and American scholars interested in business ethics. Tom and I often traveled on parallel professional tracks. We both journeyed frequently to Japan to work with Japanese scholars initiating the study of business ethics in that country, an experience from which we learned as much as we taught. We also both visited (although not together) the Law department at Newcastle University in Australia. In a rather uncanny career commonality we both served as Vice/Associate Dean of undergraduate studies at our respective business schools, Tom in the late 1990s and I a number of years earlier.

My non-professional interactions with Tom were particularly meaningful and enjoyable. We spent times together chatting about family, religion, our current stage of life and aspirations for the future, the “state of the world” and the like. Particularly enjoyable were occasions when we broke bread together, including a time when Tom and his son John had dinner at our Berkeley home when they were in the San Francisco Bay Area to see the San Francisco Giants play in their new stadium. It is Tom, my friend, who I miss even more than Tom, my professional colleague. And when I think of Tom, it invariably brings to mind two young daughters, now grown women, Shannon and Jennifer, and their mother, Dottie who charmed us all when we were together.

Intellectual change agent

Let me turn specifically to Tom Dunfee – “intellectual change agent” and trace the metamorphosis

of a scholar and his impact on two fields – legal studies and business ethics. As his resume makes clear, Tom began his academic career as a traditional business law scholar. After completing his LL.M degree at New York University Law School, he spent 2 years on the Illinois State University faculty before migrating to Ohio State University where he taught from 1970–1975. At OSU, he began his collaboration with Frank F. Gibson, senior member of the OSU Business Law department, a publishing relationship that continued for two decades and resulted in six textbooks, covering such subjects as Business Law/Legal Environment of Business, Contracts, Anti-Trust, and Trade Regulation. Tom’s journal articles focused on anti-trust issues and criminal liability of business professionals. Frequently, he collaborated with colleagues in other fields, especially marketing. From the outset of his career, Tom demonstrated a strong interest in the status and role of business law (later, legal environment) in the business school curriculum and wrote a number of articles on the subject. During this initial period, the first explicit indication of Tom’s interest in ethics was a chapter entitled “Business Ethics” in an edited volume, *Business Law: Key Issues and Concepts*, published in 1978.

Although Tom was quite productive during the 1970s, to my taste, he did not hit full stride as a scholar and intellectual change agent until he settled into his long-time home at Wharton. He continued, indeed, deepened, his works in the anti-trust area and was a leading figure in the evolution of business school legal studies from Business Law to the broader-gauged Legal Environment field.

From the mid-1980s onward, there was a definite shift in the focus of Tom’s scholarship. While continuing to publish revised editions of his various business law/legal environment of business and government regulation texts as well as articles and book chapters in the anti-trust and marketing areas, his publications throughout the decade were increasingly in the area of business ethics. There were two dimensions to his writing during this period. One stressed the importance of integrating business ethics into the Business Law/Legal Environment curriculum, and more generically, into management education. The second strand was the evolution of his thinking and writing about what was to become his and Tom Donaldson’s signature contribution to the business ethics field – integrative

social contracts theory (ISCT). Tom's initial foray into this conceptual area was his 1991 article on "Business Ethics and Extant Social Contracts." It was during the early 1990s that Tom and Tom Donaldson, who joined the Wharton faculty in 2006, began their dynamic collaboration, which resulted in numerous articles in ethics, philosophy, and management journals and culminated in the 1999 publication of the widely acclaimed, award-winning *Ties That Bind: A Social Contracts Approach to Business Ethics*. The book imaginatively interwove legally based contractual theory with ethical theory regarding interpersonal and inter-organizational relationships as well as with agency theory and transaction cost analysis emanating from economics. Its publication constituted a veritable bombshell in the business ethics world.

If the truth be told, most academics generate one (if they are exceptionally fortunate and creative, perhaps two) truly original ideas. The rest of their work is generally variations on that theme. In Tom's case, his and Tom Donaldson's seminal contribution has spawned a subfield within business ethics thought and has provided rich food upon which seasoned scholars and doctoral students have been feasting for the past decade, catalyzing an outflow of literature critiquing, and extending the Dunfee–Donaldson thesis. Fortunately, this focus on ISCT does not diminish the importance of the rest of Tom's three and a half decades of scholarly contributions, which are important indeed. However, it is for ISCT that Tom (and Tom) will long be remembered by current and future generations of scholars for expanding the intellectual frontiers of the business ethics field.

During the decade following publication of *Ties That Bind*, Tom's scholarly contribution continued unabated, with a steady flow of articles, book chapters, and conference papers. Indeed, his final publication appeared in 2008, shortly before his death. What is particularly impressive is that this scholarly output occurred during a period when he had undertaken major administrative responsibilities at Wharton (e.g., Vice Dean 2000–2003 and subsequently (for the third time, 2005–2008), department chair.

In the 1990s, another dimension of Tom's intellectual interests surfaced – international collaboration with scholars in diverse institutions, such as Reitaku University in Japan and Erasmus University/Rot-

terdam School of Economics in the Netherlands. He also taught twice at the University of Newcastle in Australia and participated in one of the first business ethics conferences in Russia following the breakup of the Soviet Union. It is fair to say that in all of these international collaborations, Tom served as a catalyst in either introducing or enhancing serious work in the business ethics and legal studies areas in these foreign settings.

A particular aspect of Tom's scholarship warrants mention. Tom was the consummate collaborator. Although he was, of course, the sole author of many important works, throughout his career he published books and articles with a wide range of colleagues. Collaboration is not easy and requires both intellectual and organizational synergy between and among scholars, not to mention patience, empathy, and a sense of humor. Fortunately, Tom possessed all these traits in abundance and the result was impressive work with both eminent, well-established colleagues and with younger scholars for whom publishing with Tom provided professional visibility. Included in the latter cohort were students in Wharton's doctoral program in business ethics.

Institutional change agent

From the outset of his Red and Blue days, Tom served as a change agent at Penn, gradually transforming a traditional Business Law department into the preeminent Department of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, which it is today. In 1975, when Tom joined the Wharton Business Law department, little had changed from a decade earlier. With the exception of Arnold (Skip) Rosoff who came in 1970, the latter faculty was virtually unchanged from the time I left for Berkeley in 1964. Save for Frederick Kempin, who had an interest in legal history, the five long-time core faculty were traditional business law academics. Most were graduates of Penn Law School and had spent their entire teaching careers at Wharton. Although highly competent – and in the case of Bernard Cataldo, brilliant, and well regarded by its business law peers nationally – the department was characterized by stasis, not merely in personnel but in curriculum. Little had changed in course offerings in the intervening decade since my departure. The department

offered courses, which concentrated on various aspects of commercial law and were directed primarily to undergraduates. Unlike the situation at other leading business schools, there was little evidence within the department and at Wharton generally of interest in the emerging field of Business and Society, which explored the social and political role of business organizations and their leaders. Nor was ethics on the radar screen.

Contrast that with the situation today. Wharton's Legal Studies and Business Ethics department (its name since 2005) has 17 tenure-track faculties. Although lawyers still predominate, some colleagues have doctoral degrees in philosophy or in diverse social science fields. Unlike in the past, when Penn degrees predominated, current faculty members come from other leading law schools and graduate programs in the United States and abroad, bringing with them rich and diverse intellectual backgrounds and professional experiences.

The department's curriculum has similarly broadened. There are 24 undergraduate and 17 graduate course offerings, covering both traditional business/commercial law subjects and such non-traditional undergraduate topics as Comparative and International Legal Institutions, Environmental Management, Law and Policy, Human Rights and International Business, and Morality and the Future of Capitalism, and a comparably rich set of offerings at the graduate level. For both undergraduates and graduates, there are a variety of courses dealing with ethics and corporate responsibility. The department is a model for business schools domestically and internationally.

I am not suggesting that Tom Dunfee engineered this departmental transformation single-handedly. He obviously had to have support from colleagues both within the department, the Wharton School and the greater campus to enlarge the faculty, particularly with non-lawyers, and enrich the curriculum and degree options, most significantly the creation of a doctoral program in 2003, unimaginable during my Wharton days. Tom served three terms as department chair spanning three decades, from 1979 to the moment of his untimely death in 2008. From the time of his arrival at Wharton, he was intimately involved in the recruitment of virtually every faculty member in the department now. As his colleague, Eric Orts, noted in an e-mail message shortly after Tom's death,

“[M]ost of us remaining in his department here at Wharton owe our careers to Tom Dunfee.” In addition to his multiple services as department chair, Tom was the founding director of both the Wharton Ethics Program (1992) and the Lawrence and Carol Zicklin Center for Business Ethics (1997). Professor Orts captured the essence of Tom's legacy terming him “the heart of the Legal Studies and Business Ethics department.”

Tom's contributions to Wharton and Penn were not restricted to the department. He served as Vice Dean and Director of Wharton's Undergraduate Programs from 2000–2003, and as a member and chair of multiple school and university committees during his 33-year tenure at Penn.

Organizational change agent

Just as he was a change agent intellectually and within his institution, Tom Dunfee played transformational roles within the professional organizations he led. In the Academy of Legal Studies in Business (formerly the American Business Law Association), Tom was instrumental in the transformation of a once sleepy body into a much more vibrant entity with subsections in such areas as ethics, the environment, international, feminist studies, and technology. He was the organization's president in 1989–1990. Tom was a role model for both contemporaries and particularly for younger faculty appreciative of his wide-ranging scholarly interests, excellence as a teacher and warmth as a mentor.

Similarly, Tom became a driving force in the Society for Business Ethics, serving as SBE president 1995–1996. He is the only person to have headed both organizations. Tom also served on a variety of domestic and international professional bodies devoted to the integration of ethics into business education and business practice, including the International Society of Business, Economics and Ethics, and the UN Taskforce to Develop Principles for Responsible Business Education.

Coda

It is exceedingly difficult, perhaps even unseemly to attempt to capture the essence of a life, which ended

so prematurely while still fully engaged in creativity and contribution. Tom was about to retire from Wharton after more than three decades of service and move to the Washington, DC, area to be closer to his children and grandchildren. He had no intention, however, of “hanging it up” professionally. There were doctoral students to mentor through the completion of their studies, writing projects to undertake and ongoing organizational obligations to fulfill. An affiliation with George Washington University awaited him. He was about to morph into the role of “elder statesman” to his professional colleagues, which comes with emeritus status. Tom is missed by these colleagues from both near and afar, and remembered for his myriad professional accomplishments and, more importantly, for his humanity. Personally, I sorely miss my friend and “virtual colleague,” who I have long regarded as my Penn alter-ego and academic soul mate. He was truly an extraordinary gentleman and scholar.

Arnold J. Rosoff

I was a close colleague of Tom Dunfee for some 35 years at Wharton – the only person in our department who was there before Tom arrived from Ohio State University in 1974. I knew him as lunch-buddy, co-author, chair of the department, my mentor, devoted family man ... Vice Dean of Wharton Undergrad, etc. Through all those years, I never ceased being amazed by Tom’s capability and capacity in all of those roles. He could do, and did do, so much more than most others around us did; and just when you thought you understood what Tom’s parameters were, he would morph into something else, take on and master a new challenge, march off in a different direction, and surprise you anew with fresh accomplishments. Tom was an exceptional man.

Tom was also a very disciplined man. He had a plan for every day – usually a carefully folded piece of paper filled with notes – and unlike many who write a “to do” list, Tom held to it. It was not just a wish list of things he hoped he would get done; it was a personal commitment. I could go on about the remarkable way Tom worked himself, set goals for himself and cut deals with himself to assure they were achieved. (“No glass of wine at the end of the

day until I finish the next two chapters of my book” might be the result of such tough internal negotiations.) Notwithstanding the time pressure and scheduling constraints this put on Tom, he had an “open door” policy and was almost always available to colleagues, students, and staff. Moreover, when you would go into Tom’s office, even to ask him a simple, short question or pass on a limited tidbit of information, there was an obligatory introductory exchange about your family or his family, or both. Tom wanted to know what was going on in your life and always had something exciting – to him, anyway – going on in his life that he wanted you to know about.

However, most of all – in my view, anyway – Tom Dunfee was about people. As Richard Shell points out in his reflections on Tom, Tom was a master of relationships. He had a larger retinue of comrades than most people I have known in my life, and he kept adding to it. At Tom’s funeral and memorial service, when a large number of people came forward to offer their insights and reflections on who Tom was and what he meant to them, it was striking how many said of Tom “He was my best friend.” Even allowing for eulogistic hyperbole and the fact that some of these people were referring to different stages in Tom’s life, it was remarkable that so many felt so close to him. He had a private side, and he was complex; but there was an openness about him that made all who dealt with him feel they knew him well and that he was a close, personal friend.

Tom made a point of knowing everyone he could. That is a description that could apply to all sorts of salespeople, promoters, social climbers, and others who cultivate relationships so they can use them as stepping stones to something else. However, Tom was not like that. Although he was adept at the effective strategic use of relationships to get things done, Tom planted, tended, and grew relationships because he cared about people. He wanted to share their lives and to have them share his. He was a man for whom social interactions were the essence of life.

I think this is a key to why Tom was so drawn to the study of ethics and migrated so readily and naturally into Business Ethics when the field moved to center-stage of his attention in the mid-1980s. Business Ethics is about people and how they relate to one another. One gets the sense that the notorious

business-world scoundrels of our time – the Bernie Madoffs, Ken Lays – naturally were, or could easily make themselves be, blissfully unaware of the people on the other end of their questionable dealings and the outright scams they perpetrated that caused so much loss and pain. Tom Dunfee always had a sense that all business dealings – even those that took place through nameless, faceless exchanges, for example – had real flesh-and-blood people at both ends. These were people with feelings and families at stake, not just dollars. If you sold a defective product, carried out an exploitative business scheme, or otherwise acted irresponsibly or deliberately wrongly, you were not just committing an abstract violation; you were hurting actual people. This notion that society is made up of sentient humans who have real and reasonable expectations about how others will interact with them in business dealings is the basis of Dunfee and Donaldson's book, *Ties that Bind*, that sets out their concept of ISCT.

My ultimate point is that Tom Dunfee, the man, and Tom Dunfee, the business ethicist, were one and the same. They both believed that people matter; and when people matter how they treat each other necessarily matters too...very much. In so many ways, this was the core concept that Tom Dunfee undertook to study and to teach and, of course, to live. As I said, he was an *exceptional* man.

G. Richard Shell

So who, exactly, was the man that this volume of the *Journal of Business Ethics* honors? I met Tom Dunfee the day I showed up on Penn's campus in 1986 to interview for a job in Wharton's Legal Studies Department. Though my visit took place during a year when Tom was not chairing the department (he served a total of almost 14 years as chair between 1979 and 2008, and he died while holding that office), it was obvious to me right from the start that he was "the man" to impress. I was a young law firm associate in Boston at the time, and my due diligence had revealed that Tom had the best publication record of anyone in the group and was the only person holding an endowed Chair. The clinchers during my visit, however, were two "tells" that my law firm experience had taught me to recognize: Tom had the best office and, alone among his

colleagues, he had his own assistant (Lauretta Tomasco, who is still working with us). I eventually got the job, and as I settled into the Legal Studies Department and the Wharton School, I quickly discovered that my initial impression of Tom was 100% correct. He was the man.

However, he turned out to be a completely different man than I had expected from all those outward and visible signs. Far from being the pre-occupied and self-important "senior partner" I had been used to dealing with, Tom was a man in full – someone who always brought his whole life with him to every interaction he had. Over the years, I learned from him, in equal measure, both how to write a good law review article and how to be a good father. If I ran into Tom at the office on a weekend and I had one of my young sons in tow, it was not long before Tom was out in the hallway playing pitch-the-ball with him. And as my two boys grew older, I discovered an important fact: Tom's three children were just enough older than my kids to make him an invaluable source of wisdom and experience on everything from planning a successful family vacation to what a dad is supposed to do (or rather not do) on prom night.

Moreover, as I grew in my job from assistant to associate professor, from associate to chaired full professor, and eventually to chair of the department, Tom was always there with advice, strategic perspectives, insight into academic human foibles, and a chuckle. He knew Penn's and Wharton's political landscapes the way a fur trapper knows his favorite forests. He could catch funding for things he wanted to do in even the most unlikely places.

And that chuckle was especially important. Tom used to talk about how hard he had laughed at something that one of his children or grandchildren had said, or that had happened to him and wife Dottie. However, at work it was that chuckle that I listened for – accompanied by an understated, wry smile that would rapidly spread across his whole face. They were Puck-like moments when Tom seemed to be saying "Lord, what fools these mortals be!" I once saw Tom on a Monday morning in the hallway outside his office. He told me that he had just used – with his Bible study group at church, of all people – a negotiation role-play simulation I had written about selling a used car with a bad radiator to an unsuspecting buyer. "It was amazing," he said,

“how many people forgot to tell the buyer about that radiator.” Needless to say, he was chuckling.

Generally, the chuckles came when we were talking about something to do with university politics – who needed to be spoken with about what and in what order to get something done. I always felt especially astute when I elicited that chuckle from Tom. It meant I had said something he thought was true, and that I was on the right track in that trapper’s forest he knew so well. The success that usually followed proved him right.

As Ed Epstein has so ably described in his essay in this volume, Tom’s skills in getting things done extended far beyond Wharton – as his track records at the Academy of Legal Studies in Business and the Society for Business Ethics showed. However, I was most impressed with his accomplishments closer to home and within our own domain – his successful advocacy on behalf of ethics as a key part of both the MBA and undergraduate curriculums, his founding and leadership of the Zicklin Center for Business Ethics Research, his ability to secure additional faculty lines to staff those new ethics courses, his role in helping launch our PhD program in ethics and law, and his skill running Wharton’s undergraduate program as its Dean.

How did he do all that? Tom taught me that to have influence within an organization as complex as a university, you start with credibility. You stand on the platform you build with your scholarship. Tom’s credibility in this regard was impeccable. Top law review articles on antitrust law as a young legal academic; top management and marketing articles as he broke into the business ethics area; and, in the end, a paradigm-setting book co-authored with Tom Donaldson that extended the basic vocabulary of his field.

Next, you must have relationships – real relationships built over years and with no ulterior motives, not just temporary relationships of convenience. Tom had them everywhere, from our sister departments at Wharton to research centers at the Penn Medical School. If he did not know someone, he knew someone who knew that person. With Tom, there was seldom more than one degree of separation to access the social network needed to accomplish any task. And he obviously enjoyed this aspect of his work. At a departmental dinner one night in the late 1990s, Tom spent 20 min showing me something he

was as excited about as I had ever seen him: it was his first Palm Pilot. All those relationships were suddenly in his pocket, a mere touch pad away.

Finally, you must be scrupulously reliable with your word – when you say it will happen, it gets done. When you say that a certain thing is so, it is exactly so – and if you are not sure, you say exactly that. It was no coincidence that Tom became a leader in ethics. Tom lived his life ethically, and everyone knew it. You might disagree with him, debate with him, and argue with him. In fact, he could be pretty stubborn when he had fixed his mind on an idea or a point of view about something. However, you never questioned his motives or his word.

I will miss Tom – we all will – because he was a top scholar and an academic leader. However, I will especially miss him because he was a man in full – he brought his full attention and his best self to each person he encountered. His legacy? His ideas, the institutions he helped to build, and a wonderful, loving family. However, for me, most of all, Tom’s legacy is the wisdom, perspective, and humor that he bestowed on all who had the privilege to work with him.

Ken Shropshire

Thomas W. Dunfee was an exceptional man. A significant part of my relationship with Tom mirrored that of Richard Shell’s. Richard and I arrived at Wharton within days of each other, had numerous interactions with Tom in our role as newly minted assistant professors and were mentored by him even more when, at our appointed times, we took the reins as department chair.

To use a sports metaphor that Tom would probably cherish, he was the “go to guy.” Whether with regard to scholarship, teaching, administration, or personal matters, Tom was there to provide sage guidance. In my sports-flooded-mind, he was also the equivalent of the head coach who offered figurative rope. He recognized that you had trained hard and that in the end, properly pulling off the play was up to you. Tom gave you enough rope to hang yourself if you did not follow the guidance he provided, but he also tied a knot on the end for you to grab onto at that very last second, in the event you

needed a bit more help. However, Tom was not the one to force it on you.

I have too many examples to make the point. The most prominent was when I was relatively brash and determined to succeed when I was first appointed to the faculty at Wharton in 1986. Early on in my anxiousness to be the professor with the vast consulting portfolio (after only a few weeks on campus) I went to Dunfee for advice. “Tom,” I said, one early morning when we were the only ones in the department, “How do I get some of this consulting business?” Without much hesitation, after giving me a look that was strikingly longer than a glance, (and this is a verbatim quote), “Do your job.” It was not harsh, but calm, with a slight chuckle. I had wanted to hear him tell me to call law firms or, contact sports franchises, or some magic technique to begin to bring in the consulting dollars. However, instead, he simply advised me, “Do your job.” He looked at me, smiled, and was ready for the next question. It was a very clear, “you know what I’m telling you...no one is going to give you anything until you’ve done something.” Tom was, of course, right. That conversation, 20 years later, is fresh in my mind today. When presented with the opportunity to counsel other individuals – anxious to get in the sports business or be a professor or whatever – the same advice.

Six months or so before his death I gave Tom a copy of former National Football League coach Tony Dungy’s book, *Quiet Strength: The Principles, Practices and priorities of a Winning Life*. Among other themes, from one of the best people in sports, is the admonition to “just do your job” and everything else will follow. When I read Dungy’s book and message, the first person I thought about was Tom. It was a simple message, but he was absolutely right. We only had that single conversation on “work habits.” By contrast, I cannot begin to tell you how many sports related conversations we had. It was the sports side of Tom that cemented our relationship.

What I learned early on was that Tom was a diehard Cleveland sports fan. He was befuddled by my indifference and lack of full fledged insanity in support of any sports team. He was sure, I believe, that with all of the sports legal and business research I did, I had to be dedicated to a particular sports team. I am not. Tom would stop by, especially during football season on Mondays and ask me what I

thought about a specific play, or a given call. More often than not, I hated to disappoint him that I had not seen it. However, Tom was not trying to impress me; he thought he finally had someone who would joust with him on the football facts of the day. His enthusiasm was refreshingly genuine. And would he laugh about the bad call or the misery of the Browns our adopted home team, the Philadelphia Eagles. I have not had a colleague before or since with the same level of sports passion. Then, as he would walk away, he would ask me my thoughts about that evening’s Monday Night Football game.

Other times he would show me with great pride the sports musings of his son John. Another time he showed me a combined father–son piece written for a Cleveland Browns fan publication. The authors were John and Tom Dunfee. He would then reflect on the time they spent at one sporting event or another. I remember when one spring came around he explained to me the ongoing family goal to visit every major league baseball park. I probably looked at him for a second too long letting him know that I was thinking *a la* John McEnroe, “you cannot be serious!” But he was. I came to understand that little of the motivation behind this activity was his personal sightseeing desire. No, this was yet another Dunfee ploy for family time. Years later, when I sat in the freezing rain during the 2008 World Series I constantly thought about Tom and how he would have sat through a blizzard to have that time with his family. I did not suggest to my son that we should leave because of a little rain.

The last time I saw Tom was a bit before noon, a few days before we lost him. I was circling around the Wharton Legal Studies suite hallway about to approach his office and thinking about what bit of sports knowledge I might throw his way. As I approached his office, he and Dottie were coming out, together, smiling. This was not unusual. A Dunfee family member in our offices, especially Dottie, was a frequent and pleasant occurrence. When I caught sight of Dottie, I forgot whatever sports blather I was about to throw his way. I commented on how Tom was making us all look bad by taking his bride to lunch. I joked that they would be doing a lot more of that with his impending retirement. They both smiled that glowing Dunfee family smile, and told me to have a great day. They went off together. I wish I could tell

you that I watched them walk out with admiration. But I did not. There was nothing unusual; seeing them like that was what I saw for over 20 years. I continued to walk around the hallway to my office. I was smiling at the life that a person can lead if they do their job.

Lawrence Zicklin

I can remember the first time I was introduced to Tom Dunfee. He was already a bit of a role model for me based on the things he was teaching as well as his research into business ethics or, as we used to discuss, “the lack thereof.”

After a pleasant lunch, Tom asked if I would be willing to be a guest in one of his classes. I thought it a great honor and after considering the offer for three or four seconds, I accepted. We agreed on a subject and I began to prepare what for me was a new adventure. I had been in the investment business all of my adult life, but talking about finance and ethics to a class of Wharton Graduate students was a wholly different challenge.

I do not remember much about the preparation, but I do remember finding myself in Tom’s office on the appointed day and a few minutes before class. I was very apprehensive about what was about to take place, but Tom was his usual calm and relaxed self and only wanted to chat about baseball. As we headed toward the class, I confessed my sense of trepidation and asked for any advice he might offer before the lions devoured me. He thought for a moment and then leaned over and suggested I stop at the rest room. That was quintessentially Tom. Life was not to be regarded as overly complicated but was to be met with enthusiasm and optimism. He had the true scholar’s knack for simplifying the complex without detracting from its essence.

Over the years, I met with Tom as often as possible. We would have lunch or dinner together when our paths crossed in Philadelphia or New York. We shared our children’s accomplishments and were tolerant of their failures. And we then did the same as our grandchildren began to emerge on the scene. It never ceased to amaze me that this icon of business ethics, who was internationally known for his accomplishments as a teacher, author, and creator of cutting edge research, was so plain spoken and humble. For Tom, it was family first and everything else was a distant second. He both understood and lived his priorities.

To the extent that we went beyond family and ethics, baseball was certainly our highest priority. His knowledge of ballparks, and his pride in having visited all of them, was impressive. However, it was his insights into the game that was truly astonishing. He could remember a centerfielder’s catch of a ball and which way he turned to throw out a runner trying to score from second on a long single. He knew batting averages and slugging percentages as well as earned run averages and hall of fame credentials. Family, ethics, and baseball; this was truly a renaissance man.

I never met with Tom when I did not come away having enjoyed our time together and being more educated as a result of the meeting. He was all the good things that he wrote about. He talked the talk, but unlike so many others, he also walked the walk. The world is a far poorer place in his absence. I will never step into a Wharton classroom without seeing his smiling face in front of my eyes.

*Legal Studies and Business Ethics Department,
The Wharton School,
University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A.
E-mail: tomascol@wharton.upenn.edu*