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The jurisprudence of United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has received considerable analysis. Numerous legal scholars have scrutinized her perspectives through a feminist lens or ascertained that she speaks with a distinctive feminine voice. Some commentators have asked whether O'Connor’s experiences as a Westerner have affected her decision making in particular substantive fields, namely federalism, religion, and Indian, natural resources, and water law. Other writers have evaluated the ideas which the jurist possesses on abortion, affirmative action, capital punishment as well as additional, critical issues that the modern High Court resolves. O’Connor’s position in the middle of a
Supreme Court that is sharply divided between Justices with liberal and conservative political views means that she often provides the swing vote on appeals involving controversial questions. The jurist is also the only present High Court member who has held elective office and, thus, she contributes a unique outlook to the Justices’ deliberations.

When President Ronald Reagan appointed O'Connor as the first female Justice over two decades ago, she became a celebrity overnight with a public that has long found intriguing the person who spent her youth on a cattle ranch that straddles the Arizona-New Mexico border. Several authors believe the jurist is the nation’s most powerful woman or have speculated that she will become the next Chief Justice. One writer considered her impact sufficiently profound to declare: “[w]e are all living now in Sandra Day O’Connor’s America.”

Many observers of the Supreme Court and related developments in the law, such as women’s role in the legal profession, have eagerly anticipated publication of the lone memoir by a sitting Justice since William O. Douglas released his autobiography, The Court Years, in 1980. The recent publication of Lazy B: Growing Up On A Cattle Ranch In The American

---

6. See, e.g., SANDRA DAY O’CONNOR & H. ALAN DAY, LAZY B: GROWING UP ON A CATTLE RANCH IN THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST 299 (2002) [hereinafter LAZY B] (discussing Justice O’Connor’s appointment to the Supreme Court); Greenhouse supra note 5 (discussing public opinion on Justice O’Connor); sources cited infra note 12.
Southwest (Lazy B)\textsuperscript{10} concludes the wait. However, this new volume leaves certain important questions for legal observers unanswered.

The book may disappoint those who had expected a thorough, specific disquisition on O'Connor's jurisprudence; her insights that relate to legal philosophy, thinking or institutions; the jurist's perspectives on the High Court and its operations and responsibilities; or even the Justice's ideas about the profession or views on her own career before she ascended to the Court. With minor exceptions, Lazy B does not address these matters. O'Connor only briefly alludes to her undergraduate and law school education at Stanford University, legal practice, and experience in the Arizona State Senate and on the Arizona Court of Appeals.\textsuperscript{11} The jurist accords her nomination, confirmation and investiture as the first female Justice a half page, and two decades of Supreme Court service, minimal treatment.\textsuperscript{12}

Much that O'Connor includes in her memoir directly assesses the ranch or leads back to the 160,000-acre tract along the Gila River. Readers who wanted her jurisprudential vision articulated in comprehensive, express terms will have their hopes dashed, and observers who wished to derive felicitously astute insights on the jurist's legal philosophy from Lazy B could be pursuing a quixotic venture.\textsuperscript{13}

Despite the above factors, this memoir will substantially enhance readers' understanding of quite a few significant topics. For example, individuals who seek to comprehend better the desert, the southwestern United States, cattle ranching or the Bureau of Land Management (BLM)—

\textsuperscript{10} Lazy B, supra note 6. O'Connor is the lead author. She writes mainly about herself in the first person and refers to her brother, Alan Day, in the third person. See Mauro, supra note 7; Yardley, supra note 7.


\textsuperscript{12} See Lazy B, supra note 6, at 299. For more detailed information on these matters, see Hearings on the Nomination of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor of Arizona to Serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 97th Cong., 1st Sess. (1981). See generally Savage, supra note 3, at 113–15; Van Sickel, supra note 1, at 1–4, 13–22, 33–41; Yarbrough, supra note 2, at 14–16.

\textsuperscript{13} Serious limitations would restrain any effort by a current Justice to articulate a thorough jurisprudence in book form. For example, that endeavor might seem to prejudge one of myriad issues which the Court must hear. See Hutchinson, supra note 5. This may explain why Chief Justice William Rehnquist writes primarily about history and why Justice O'Connor focuses her book on her childhood. See Rehnquist, supra note 9. Her new book affords somewhat greater insights. See Sandra Day O'Connor, The Majesty of the Law: Reflections of a Supreme Court Justice (Craig Joyce ed., 2003).
the federal agency charged with major responsibility for administering enormous acreages of public lands throughout the West—will glean considerable useful knowledge from the Justice’s instructive volume.

O’Connor explores in clear, but unsentimental, detail the stark beauty and harshness of the “high desert country—dry, windswept, clear and often cloudless.”14 Readers can almost feel themselves gasp when she discusses the blazing sun that interminably sears a parched landscape exacerbated by torrid winds.15 Observers may sigh with relief as O’Connor describes ferocious thunderstorms, which break the protracted weeks of blistering heat and supply the region’s life blood, only to confront fear when she explains the dangers these gullywashers pose in low areas.16 People who are unfamiliar with this natural world, therefore, discern that even its features which seem benign, can quickly turn lethal.

The jurist surveys desert flora and fauna. She emphasizes how the plants, animals, insects and birds are so tough that they defy being killed and eaten or have protective mechanisms—namely horns, poison, teeth and thorns—which permit survival in the treacherous environment.17 The author candidly mentions phenomena, such as the birth and demise of cattle, household pets and wild creatures, that some might find unpleasant. O’Connor considers altogether normal matters, like the need to wash and replace a cow’s inverted uterus, frankly recognizing they “come with the territory” and “death is inevitable and not to be feared or mourned.”18 The writer, thus, eloquently shows how much the high southwestern desert teaches, while the deep feeling for the exquisite, rugged terrain which she

---

15. See, e.g., LAZY B, supra note 6, at 241, 249.
16. See id. at 131–34.
17. Id. at 6; see MICHAEL MARES, A DESERT CALLING: LIFE IN A FORBIDDING LANDSCAPE (2002).
18. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 6, 197. This may reflect her views on death and dying in cases such as Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702, 737 (1997) (O’Connor, J., concurring) (stating that the Court left open “the question of whether suffering patients have a constitutionally cognizable interest in obtaining relief from the suffering that they may experience in the last day of their lives”); see SAVAGE, supra note 3, at 341–42; Brown et al., supra note 1, at 1237–40; see also Beth Johnston, Cowgirl Justice, LEGAL TIMES, July 15, 2002, at 21 (reviewing Justice O’Connor’s book).
acquired as a child "surges through [her mind and] heart often," undiminished by time and space.19

O'Connor as well documents with consummate particularity existence on a cattle ranch. The author evaluates the animals' habits and their life cycle: breeding, calving, dehorning, branding, castration, vaccination and roundup.20 The Justice concomitantly addresses the burdensome, ungainly responsibilities of cowboys.21 She characterizes as "rare as an honest politician," a ranch hand, who possessed singular determination and strength, although her description may reveal less about the cowboy than the jurist's views on the Arizona legislature or Congress and perhaps on campaign finance reform.22 Readers learn of grasses and their cultivation; water and its storage; windmills' operation and maintenance; and other specifics necessary for productive cattle ranching.23

One crucial issue that O'Connor demonstrates ranchers must face is the ubiquitous presence of the federal government, particularly the BLM. Statutes require this entity to manage gigantic expanses of public lands, comprising half the acreage in some western states and even more of the territory on which her family ran cattle.24 She illustrates how pervasive the federal government is by showing that ranchers' livelihood is inextricably intertwined with agency policies and practices. For instance, many across the West pay annual fees for grazing their livestock on public lands overseen by the bureau; thus, it exercises substantial discretion to promote or impair ranching activities.25

The Justice regales readers with vignettes which elucidate the uneasy relationship between the Lazy B and the BLM. The first was ranch installation of a new system to control floods and minimize erosion, at an

19. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 315. There are several recent and valuable accounts of the desert. See VALERIE L. KULETZ, THE TAINTED DESERT: ENVIRONMENTAL RUIN IN THE AMERICAN WEST (1998); SVEN LINOVIST, DESERT DIVERS (2002); MARES, supra note 17.
20. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 165-73.
21. See id. at 185-98. For other accounts of life on the ranch, see MAVETTY, supra note 11, at 7-10; VAN SICKEL, supra note 1, at 22-23; WOODS & WOODS, supra note 11, at 8-16.
23. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 7-10, 139-42, 213-35.
25. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 259-65, 307-09.
agency staffer's behest.\(^{26}\) The project increased the grass available for cattle and, therefore, demonstrated that cooperation might foster improvement.\(^{27}\) Two additional examples of the Lazy B’s interactions with “paper-pushing bureaucrats” and “wet-behind-the-ears” personnel suggested how these efforts could be less salutary.\(^{28}\) One was constructing artificial nests on the ranch ostensibly to facilitate hawks’ lives, a plan adopted at the instigation of a different BLM supervisor.\(^{29}\) This experiment failed, as “no one has ever yet seen a hawk on, in, or near any of the nests.”\(^{30}\) Another involved a novice agency official who ordered mid-summer relocation of the Lazy B cattle to a distant grazing area, even though Alan Day trenchantly admonished that the move would devastate beasts and cowboys alike.\(^{31}\) When the officer persisted, Alan invited him on the trip, which was disastrous as predicted, prompting Day’s comment that experience is the name we assign our mistakes and the official to recant.\(^{32}\) O’Connor also illustrates burgeoning governmental bureaucratization when she reproduces statistical data which show the BLM district for the Arizona ranch employed four staff at the outset, and 115 persons at the conclusion, of her father’s career.\(^{33}\) The jurist predicts time, citizen opposition to grazing on public lands, as well as the federal bureaucracy itself and its solicitude for these perspectives, will jeopardize operations like the Lazy B.\(^{34}\) However, she strongly asserts that responsible use by individuals “who care about both those lands and their own survival” will offer greater protection “from destruction by off-road vehicles and people out for target shooting,” while the “world will not be a better place if

\(^{26}\) Id. at 257–62. See generally U.S. Public Land Commission, One-Third of the Nation’s Land: A Report to the President and to the Congress by the Public Land Law Review Commission (1970).

\(^{27}\) Lazy B, supra note 6, at 260–62.


\(^{29}\) Lazy B, supra note 6, at 308. See generally Limerick, supra note 24.

\(^{30}\) Lazy B, supra note 6, at 308.


\(^{32}\) Lazy B, supra note 6, at 263–64.

\(^{33}\) Id. at 308. In fairness, over that time, BLM’s duties expanded greatly. See, e.g., 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, 4331–4335 (2000); 43 U.S.C. §§ 1702, 1712 (2000) (assigning BLM environmental protection and land use planning duties). For related criticism of bureaucratization and a creative, but controversial, solution, see Daniel Kemmis, This Sovereign Land: A New Vision for Governing the West (2001); see also Limerick, supra note 24.

\(^{34}\) Lazy B, supra note 6, at 265. See generally Pendley, supra note 28; Wilkinson, supra note 14.
ranching ceases on the public lands of this nation.”

The writer thus captures the sentiments regarding federal land management agencies of numerous people who work and live in the West and whose fate is tethered to these entities.

O'Connor also perceptively reviews the benefits and disadvantages of growing up on a cattle ranch in a sparsely populated locale. She observes that modification of the semi-annual cattle roundup “to accommodate a female was probably my first initiation into joining an all-men’s club, something I did more than once in my life.”

The Justice speaks with obvious pride and delight about witnessing her father work each day. Nonetheless, O'Connor acknowledges his high standards that applied with particular rigor to family members. Illustrative was how the fifteen-year-old replaced a flat tire in searing heat, but received only criticism for late delivery of the cowboys’ lunch, because she should have started earlier.

The author’s reflection on valuing labor by the facility with which someone makes a contraption operate, rather than how elegantly the person crafts a sentence or composes an argument, may require lawyers to reflect on their profession. O'Connor describes quotidian interactions among her parents and siblings, adventures that ranged from mending cattle fences to churning ice cream.

The writer examines the Days’ traditions, such as why young children drove vehicles and the ways they celebrated holidays and birthdays. She also explains the many special measures her family instituted which broadened their horizons. For example, the Days traveled extensively, visiting Alaska and Cuba, and subscribed to numerous magazines, such as the New Yorker.

Rural existence was not invariably bucolic, and O'Connor does recount detrimental aspects of this life. For instance, cattle grazing on the Great Depression’s eve became so difficult that her father transported the herd to

35. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 311, 316. Accord KEMMIS, supra note 33. These are among the few strong opinions in LAZY B. See Ken Fuson, O'Connor Memoir Lacks Opinions, PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE, Feb. 17, 2002, at E9. The lands are a public resource that private ranchers use. See supra note 14. But see PENDLEY, supra note 28.

36. See LAZY B, supra note 6, at 96. See generally sources cited supra note 1.

37. See LAZY B, supra note 6, at 23–35. See generally Greenhouse, supra note 9; Wagner, supra note 8.

38. See LAZY B, supra note 6, at 23–35; see also infra note 49 and accompanying text.

39. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 240–44. “You need to expect anything out here” seemed to her a reprimand. Id. at 243.

40. See id. at 315.

41. See id. at 105, 229–34.

42. See id. at 102–05.

43. See id. at 29, 34–35, 44.
Moreover, the jurist voices regret about departing the Lazy B at the tender age of six for El Paso and the education which would facilitate her success in the world: “I felt homesick for the ranch.” She aptly summarizes: the Lazy B was

[a] place where the wind always blows, the sky forms a dome overhead, and the clouds make changing patterns against the blue, and where the stars at night are brilliant and constant, a place to see the sunrise and the sunset, and always to be reminded how small we are in the universe but, even so, how a small voice can make a difference.

In short, O’Connor provides an affectionate, yet pragmatic, rendition of existence on a southwestern cattle ranch between 1930 and 1950 among hardworking individuals who converted insufficient water and overabundant land into a commercially profitable and personally rewarding enterprise. The Justice illuminates a way of life that will rapidly vanish during the twenty-first century.

Observers who seek insights on O’Connor’s jurisprudence may be able to tease some out of this account. For example, insofar as her formative years have affected the jurist’s subsequent public service, especially on the High Court, Lazy B should yield certain ideas on O’Connor’s jurisprudence. Her father’s patience, diligence and perfectionism, which she described and appeared to respect, might influence O’Connor’s labors and views of litigants. When the Justice considers arguments by parties or resolves appeals, she may similarly emulate his “genuine interest in everyone he met,” even while remembering his staunch refusal to countenance excuses, and her mother’s caring ethic. Moreover, the independence, pragmatism and self-sufficiency that O’Connor learned from experiences in the West and on an isolated ranch, could instruct her decision making. The Justice’s early impressions of federal land management agencies might also inform her current perspectives on the governmental entities, on issues, namely conflicts between resource use and preservation, which they treat, and on

44. See id. at 85–87.
45. Id. at 117. After O’Connor had witnessed the initial atomic bomb test in 1945, she lamented the “world we knew was changed forever.” Id. at 244. See generally KULETZ, supra note 19; Wagner, supra note 8.
46. LAZY B, supra note 6, at 302. Ranch life involved their “old-time, long-suffering, good-natured cowboys; living in isolation with just one another and with few luxuries; eating mostly beef and beans, dried fruit, and biscuits; [as well as] riding horseback for long hours in the heat and dust.” Id. at 111; see also Johnston, supra note 18.
47. See LAZY B, supra note 6, at 315–18.
48. See id. at 23–35.
49. See id. at 28, 37–49; see also supra notes 38–39 and accompanying text.
states’ rights, as well as on litigants’ interactions with analogous, substantial bureaucracies. O’Connor’s ideas about the First Amendment may reflect the enduring reverence she feels for the land and her father’s remark, when asked why the family never attended Sunday religious services, that the natural world “is our church.”

Of course, readers can extract many lessons for life, if not law, from Lazy B. The jurist’s memoir relates numerous activities implicating daily ranch existence that probably affected her professional and personal relationships and might teach others. The author writes, in part by telling stories of fundamental values, such as honesty, integrity, good humor, independence, openness, decency, hard work, simplicity, reliability, forgiveness, and respect for people, regardless of their circumstances. She addresses these qualities with clarity and objectivity but never preaches.

In sum, Lazy B thoroughly assesses the childhood of Sandra Day O’Connor. This book will improve most observers’ appreciation for the desert, the Southwest, ranch life and the BLM. The volume may even provide readers a window, through the prism of her youth, on the jurisprudential views possessed by the woman who grew up on a cattle ranch to become the first female Supreme Court Justice.

50. Lazy B, supra note 6, at 142. “There is surely something—a God if you will—who created all of this. And we don’t have to go to church to appreciate it. It is all around us.” Id.; see also supra notes 2, 18 and accompanying text.


52. Id. Individuals who have the good fortune to meet Justice O’Connor will recognize in Lazy B the same attributes of intelligence, warmth, clarity, humor and humility that mark her public and personal interactions. For example, when the jurist recently taught a class at the University of Montana School of Law, she fully and lucidly explained the Supreme Court’s operations while incisively and honestly answering student questions. Her subsequent public address on federalism was as intelligent, clear and direct as it was prescient. She also made time to fly fish, thus exhibiting traits that some attorneys might lack and that may harken back to ranch life.