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Message from the Dean

Dear Friends,

"Public Interest" is an expression that means many things, and of course most of the academic work we do can be described as aiming at the public interest. But to most students and prospective students the phrase refers to careers outside of the private sector. Two years ago we unveiled our splendid post-graduate Hormel Public Interest Program of support for recent graduates who take qualifying “public interest” jobs. You can learn much more about this program on our website. At that time we also introduced our Chicago Policy Initiatives, which should be thought of as another branch of our commitment to public interest law, as should our clinical programs, our community-outreach plans, and much more. These Initiatives represent two-year projects at the Law School, in which students and faculty work together on pressing social problems. One such project has been completed and two are underway. We will soon announce and embark on a new area of interest.

The most recent addition to our public interest programs is a summer program aimed at students who have completed their first year. A description of this program is found on the next page of this Record, and some reports from student-participants follow, but these reports do not quite capture the value of this new program. In the first place, the availability of the first-summer program attracts students to our Law School. We should not underestimate this benefit of all our public interest investments. But public interest programs are, of course, much more than means of attracting excellent and idealistic students. They are educational; they provide important information about career choices; they serve the needs of underrepresented citizens; they teach our students about the impact of law, especially on citizens who are less fortunate than they are; and they enrich the atmosphere of the Law School because a substantial fraction of each class has had mind-broadening experiences. As you will see, we have defined public interest work to include work not only for 501(c)(3) organizations, but also for governmental entities. In this way, some of our students learn about careers in public service—and some return to the Law School with experience in how governments operate. That itself is an important, if often unstated, subject in the study of law.

I hope that as you read about our various public interest programs you will join with me in thanking those graduates and friends who have helped to make these programs possible. Most of what we do costs money of course, but it is no secret that support for public interest work can be especially costly. I think our new investments are already paying dividends, and I know that more of us will find these activities worth supporting.

Thank you so much,

Saul Levmore
In 2005 the Law School created the Summer Public Interest Program, an initiative designed to assist students who wish to engage in public interest work during the summer between their first and second years. Last summer, fifty members of the class of 2008 took advantage of this resource and were able to participate in a variety of different projects. The diversity of legal disciplines, types of practice, and even geographical location represented by their summer employment choices was remarkable.

It is increasingly important for law students to use the summer between their first and second years to gain real-world experience. It is also a great time to explore the nonprofit and government sector. While not every student who participates in this program will ultimately choose to work in these sectors, the experience is invaluable. It enhances legal education, expands career horizons, instills a sense of public spiritedness that encourages future public service work, and students returning with these experiences have much to share with their classmates.

The Summer Public Interest Program guarantees financial support for every student who chooses qualifying public interest work. It is a loan, but if the student completes four or more weeks of service the loan is partially forgiven, and if he or she chooses to work in a qualifying position the following summer, it is completely forgiven.

The program was developed in response to concerns that while many students wanted this type of experience, they were all too often unable to take them for financial reasons. It is no secret that positions in the public sector generally do not pay nearly as well as similar positions in the private sector, and this is particularly true of summer internships. Since many law students must earn as much as possible during the summer, they were understandably reluctant.

"This program makes it possible for students to take these types of positions," said Abbie Willard, Associate Dean for Career Services and Public Initiatives. "We've seen a huge jump in the numbers of students who are choosing to spend at least some time working in the public-interest area."

University of Chicago Law School students interested in this type of work can now rely on several different sources to help them achieve their goals. Chicago Law Foundation grants will now be used primarily to support public interest work for students between their second and third years of law school, and upon graduation they can benefit from the Hormel Public Interest Program, the Law School's loan forgiveness program.

We asked students who participated in the 1L Summers Public Interest Program to write about their summer experiences. The following pages contain excerpts from these statements.
DANIEL R. FINE, ‘08
United States Attorney's Office,
Western District of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Most of my work last summer involved researching discrete legal questions. I had the opportunity to explore, among other topics, questions related to conspiracy, RICO, and the tolling provisions of the Speedy Trial Act. I drafted extradition requests for two defendants whose indictments were still under seal. The project involved legal research, poring over reports of federal agents, and talking with those same agents about details of their investigations. I also spent a fair amount of time in court. One day, I drafted a memo to an Assistant United States Attorney on whether or not the government could establish probable cause for purposes of a preliminary hearing in an ID theft case. The next day, I was in court to see how I did.

LAUREN B. KRAMER, ‘08
Public Defender's Office,
Juvenile Division
San Francisco, California

In California, minors are generally charged with felonies, so every case I worked on was significant. Many of the kids were facing strikes and because of their age, didn’t necessarily understand the significance of their actions or the long term implications of something like a plea. I worked with a lot of youths that were involved in gangs, that weren’t attending school or performing anywhere near grade level, that were drug abusers, and that were raising their own babies already. Being a public defender in an urban community isn’t just about legal counsel—the office works with the families to set up counseling, to clear up criminal charges, and to get these families functioning again. This summer, I was part of that entire process.

GOWOON LEE, ‘08
Law Center for Families
Oakland, California

This summer I had the opportunity to help a diverse group of clients with a variety of family law issues, often handling my own client caseloads from the initial intake to closing. I helped clients file papers for dissolutions, child custody, visitation, and consumer cases, and assisted in drafting supporting declarations and attachments. I learned how to determine which courses of action would be most efficient or beneficial for clients. The most interesting aspect of working at the Law Center for Families was the depth and breadth of client interaction. On Fridays, the Center holds a free clinic—prospective clients come in for interviews designed to pinpoint their legal problems and determine if the Center can assist them. Conducting these interviews helped me learn how to make sense of vast amounts of disjointed information to find the underlying legal issues.

HOLLIN KRETMANN, ‘08
Natural Resources Defenses Council
Santa Monica, California

Within a couple hours of arriving at the Natural Resources Defenses Council, an attorney asked me to see if there was any way we could protect whales from excess seismic air gun activity off the California coast. Throughout the summer, I found myself working on environmental causes that were interesting, challenging, and highly complex. I experienced the thrill of victory—an injunction against mid-frequency sonar activity by the Navy; I also felt the disappointment of losing an argument—a transfer of venue to a less favorable court. The internship gave me the chance to deal with both situations. I always felt I was working for the betterment of society, harnessing a real vehicle for change: improving water quality, reducing harmful emissions, and saving state parks from reckless development and suburban sprawl.
DREW GALVIN, '08  
United States Attorney's Office,  
Southern District of California  
San Diego, California

As a law clerk, I was assigned to two Assistant United States Attorneys who asked me to write memoranda, perform cite checks, and assist in drafting motions for summary judgment. I also attended a sentencing and a settlement conference. Once a week a different Assistant United States Attorney spoke to the clerks during a lunchtime presentation, on topics ranging from human trafficking, cyber crime, personal injury, immigration law, to employment law.

NOSSON KNOBLOCH, '08  
United States Attorney's Office,  
District of Montana  
Great Falls, Montana

The range of cases at the United States Attorney's Office provided me with a wonderful introduction to legal practice— I worked on civil cases ranging from medical malpractice to immigration appeals, and criminal cases ranging from sexual assault to murder. One of my first assignments was drafting interrogatories for discovery in a medical malpractice suit brought against a federally operated hospital. Not only did I get to learn a lot about the adversarial process in civil cases, my draft was sent to the opposing party in its entirety. Subsequently, my level of responsibility increased and for my final assignment I drafted a Ninth Circuit brief for an immigration case.

KATIE MARKOWSKI, '08  
Cook County State's Attorney,  
Child Support Enforcement Division  
Chicago, Illinois

Mornings were spent in a hearing room in the expedited child support division, assisting an Assistant State's Attorney as cases were heard. Normally we would hear about twenty cases in our room, but some days we'd hear closer to fifty. My responsibilities in the hearing room included pre-conferencing litigants to determine how they wished to proceed and drafting orders. Every afternoon I would prepare the next day's cases, assisting with discovery and determining, by the evidence in the file, what course of action the state was going to pursue in each case.

JEFFREY MEINEKE, '08  
Cook County Public Defender  
Chicago, Illinois

I was assigned to work with a team of three attorneys who represent indigent clients charged with drug crimes in one of the busiest court rooms in Cook County. The attorneys I assisted handle anywhere from three to twelve clients per day. I was involved in almost every aspect of the cases, from initial arraignments to bench trials. These attorneys varied widely in their approach to their work. I spent the first few weeks observing before I began handling arraignments and client interviews. Eventually, I learned to spot weaknesses in arrest records and vice reports. One of the most difficult parts of the job was communicating with clients about the elements of their cases. The majority of them knew little or nothing about their rights, and many had only the vaguest notion of what attorney/client privilege means. But it's important work because often the public defender is the first friendly face a defendant sees after spending weeks or even months in jail.
GRANT FOLLAND, '08  
National Immigrant Justice Center  
Chicago, Illinois

The National Immigrant Justice Center provides legal services to immigrants and refugees. The Center advocates for asylum seekers, victims of human trafficking and domestic violence, in addition to engaging in precedent-setting litigation on behalf of immigrant’s rights. My second day on the job I was handed a file with case notes and court records and told to write a Motion to Reopen and Rescind an Order of Removal, which is similar to a memo or brief, complete with Statement of the Case, Argument and Conclusion sections. It felt eerily like a Bigelow assignment. And after twelve weeks, I’m now a crash expert in Congolese proxy marriages, adoption law under Cameroon’s bi-jural system, and how craniosynostosis and/or gastroenteritis relate to 8 USC § 1229a(b)(5)(C)(i).

KELLY LAZAROFF, '08  
United States Attorney’s Office  
Northern District of Illinois  
Chicago, Illinois

Last summer I worked on one civil and five criminal cases, doing everything from research memos—often inserted into motions by attorneys—to motions and an appellate brief. I researched and wrote on the legality of particular law enforcement practices used in narcotics and gang investigations, the use of bloodhound scent-tracking evidence, prosecution of unlicensed money transmitting businesses, and hearsay exceptions. I participated as a full member of a trial team, writing jury instructions, composing voir dire questions, and prepared witnesses and exhibits for a narcotics trial—this was particularly interesting as so much of the research and writing I did will go directly before a judge and opposing attorney.

SHERMON P. WILLIAMS, '08  
Cabrini Green Legal Aid Clinic  
Chicago, Illinois

My work last summer encompassed three primary areas of law: family law, housing law, and criminal law. I conducted intake interviews with low-income clients in crisis, ascertained the relevant facts, then presented the case to staff attorneys. I researched legal issues and wrote memorandum regarding applicable case law and shared in voting whether to accept the case. It was gratifying to share information with clients about their rights and to give them some reassurances—many of them face a difficult uphill climb legally when they have brushes with the law.

STEPHEN SCHWARTZ, '08  
Suffolk County District Attorney  
Boston, Massachusetts

I interned at the Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office in Boston, Massachusetts, where my primary duty was to prepare reply briefs for criminal appeals filed in the Massachusetts Appeals Court. Over the course of the summer I wrote two full briefs. The cases concerned convictions for child abuse and distribution of heroin, and the claims the appellants raised included issues of prosecutorial misconduct, sufficiency and admissibility of evidence, and jury selection. Most significantly, I will argue the cases I briefed in the Massachusetts Appeals Court later this fall.

HELEN GILBERT, '08  
Center for Reproductive Rights  
New York City, New York

I spent the summer working for the Center for Reproductive Rights, one of the few organizations in the United States that addresses reproductive rights issues using legal tools. I assisted with discovery and attended hearings for a lawsuit the Center filed against the FDA for not making a decision about an emergency contraceptive drug’s over-the-counter status. The case was a stellar introduction to administrative law and strengthened my growing interest in litigation. I also wrote research memos to support parts of the Respondent’s brief in the Supreme Court case Gonzales v. Carhart, which the Center will file this fall. It was an extraordinary opportunity to work with seasoned litigators, learn more about litigation strategy, and in a small way, contribute to a case that may very well change the landscape of reproductive rights.
CADENCE MERTZ, ’08
American Civil Liberties Union
Washington, DC

I spent ten weeks as a law clerk for the American Civil Liberties Union’s lead policy counsel on national security issues in the Washington DC office, the organization’s lobbying arm. My work on national security issues came as Congress debated the National Security Agency’s secret surveillance programs and the Hamdan v. Rumsfeld decision’s implications on the limits of executive power. Most of my time was spent researching and analyzing the impact of bills pending in Congress and the constitutionality of executive arguments in support of certain statutory interpretations.

ANGLEE AGARWAL, ’08
Department of Justice
Washington, DC

One of my favorite assignments was researching and drafting Senate testimony for the Assistant Attorney General in charge of our division. The testimony was for use in a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, and it elaborated upon the DOJ’s position regarding a possible split of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Another great assignment was writing an appellate brief for an immigration appeals case. The Office of Immigration Litigation has so many immigration appeals to deal with that they often let other attorneys in different divisions take over some of the cases. I was allowed to read the record and write the brief (subject, of course, to comments from my supervising attorney). It was a fantastic experience, especially because, as a 1L, I had never seen a real case record or dealt with real case documents before.

CARINA CILLUFFO, ’08
Institute for Justice
Washington, DC

The Institute for Justice is a libertarian public interest law firm that represents individuals and small business owners in cases involving private property rights, economic liberty, free speech and eminent domain. Summer clerks are given a wide range of legal research and writing activities: I helped draft appellate briefs, edited a Supreme Court cert petition, wrote memoranda about discrete problems in current cases, and explored the circuit-by-circuit landscape for potential challenges. Most of my summer was spent researching First Amendment and Equal Protection doctrine. In addition to examining the cutting edge of the law for theoretical opportunities, I also learned some practical law. In my first month here, for example, I read more Fifth Circuit venue cases than you could shake a stick at. This is almost certainly the best way to learn; even the notoriously dry intricacies of civil procedure become exciting in the context of a great case.

SHEROD THAXTON, ’08
Georgia Public Defender Standards Council
Atlanta, Georgia

The Georgia Public Defender Standards Council was created as an independent agency within the judicial branch of the state government, charged with ensuring “independently of political considerations or private interests, that each client whose case has been entrusted to a circuit public defender receives zealous, adequate, effective, timely, and ethical legal representation.” In an effort to systematize the handling of indigent cases throughout the state of Georgia, GPDSC implemented the Judicial Case Activity Tracking System software—a requirement for all public defender offices in Georgia. It allows the various public defender offices to store all case information entered into the system on a central database server.

I worked with information technology personnel from the Georgia Department of Corrections and the Georgia Bureau of Investigation to integrate data on prior disposed and pending cases involving indigent defendants charged with murder. I gathered information on over 4,800 murder and manslaughter cases, and conducted various statistical analyses to uncover certain charging-and-sentencing patterns in homicide cases across the state of Georgia.
RECONCILIATION IN TRADITIONAL COURTS:

Making “Never Again” Possible

Allison Benne, '08

In an effort to restore communities lost to genocide more than a decade ago, Rwandans have turned to a traditional approach to the law. This alternative could offer a chance for victims and perpetrators to reintegrate into society and perhaps lay the groundwork for reconciliation between Hutus and Tutsis.

The author spent the summer of 2006 working on the International Criminal Tribunal in Rwanda, as the Judge Diane P. Wood Fellow.

Fifty thousand Tutsis were murdered at Murambi in 1994. Twelve years later I visited the technical school with another intern from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. The Murambi Memorial Centre was closed that cloudy Sunday morning, but a young man with a scarred face walked outside when our taxi pulled into the gravel driveway. Immanuel spoke to us in broken French as he led us around the site.

He said the government had urged Rwandans to flee there, promising safety. Tutsis and moderate Hutus from across the country flocked to the haven for two weeks. One morning civilians armed with machetes and clubs stormed the gate. The refugees, weak from lack of food, could not resist them.

Blood still stained the concrete floors. Immanuel opened the door to a room where petrified corpses lay on white cots. More than a decade later a woman still hugged her children; a man’s arm stuck awkwardly in the air, still pleading for mercy. Immanuel apologized for not having the keys to show us the rest of the bodies kept there, and instead led us to a large room with clothes piled on clotheslines. The killers, he said, stole the desirable clothes from the bodies before going home that day. These were the clothes no one wanted.

I wasn’t brave enough to ask Immanuel how he got the scars on his face or why he cried when he saw the clothes. I never knew what to say when Rwandans brought up the genocide, so I let them ramble or become lost in thought. I heard them refer to the killings in many ways—civil war, the war of ’94, the events of ’94. Only Immanuel called it genocide: “There was a genocide,” he emphasized as we stood in front of the clotheslines. I tried to explain how sorry I was my country had done nothing to stop it, but he didn’t understand. Finally, I touched my heart and reached out to his. He nodded, his eyes lit with comprehesion. He escorted us back to our taxi, hugged goodbye, and whispered, “It is okay. You see, we are a peaceful country now.”

I want to believe him. I don’t think I do. A Sudanese official—a Rwandan ex-pat who left in 1957 before what he said “should have been the first genocide”—once explained to me why South Sudan had to split from the North: “We are Christian. They are Muslim. We have nothing in common.” Fifty years of brewing hatred and power struggles between Hutus and Tutsis left that same stance in Rwanda. The hostility exploded in 1994; it will take more than the elimination of identity cards to prevent it from erupting again.

The most promising effort to placate the country may be a unique court system initiated to try the more than 125,000 prisoners suspected of participating in the genocide. Its goal is to reconcile the perpetrators to the victims, and not to punish.

Gacacas (ga-chas) traditionally occurred under the shade of a tree, where the village elders heard both sides of a dispute before deciding on reparations. The accused was given the opportunity to admit guilt; the two sides then shared a gourd of banana beer as a sign of renewed friendship.

In the modern gacaca the community elects seven volunteers—with no legal training—to sit in place of the village elders. Crimes that once consisted of encroaching on a field or stealing a goat now consist of killing neighbors and

If the accused admits to the acts, he is sentenced to community service, often building houses for the widows whose spouses he killed.
erecting roadblocks. Both victims and fellow accused gather on weekends to stand as witnesses before the community and describe their experiences involving the accused during the genocide. The judges handwrite their findings into a type of story, detailing even the clothes the dead were wearing when last seen. If the accused admits to the acts, he is sentenced to community service, often building houses for the widows whose spouses he killed. If he does not accept, he can be sentenced to up to thirty years in prison.

I attended a gacaca in Kigali for a man accused of being the chief of a roadblock, killing one man and aiding in the death of two more. A woman stood and described how she knew only that her husband, Hussein, was taken to a stadium where the Tutsis were divided from the Hutus. The accused called Hussein's name and ordered him taken away. She turned to the accused, pleading with him: “We want you to tell us what you did to Bwanabweri and Hussein. We are here for reconciliation. Tell us what you did.” The accused refused and was sentenced to thirty years imprisonment. He is currently appealing the sentence. Others in the community, I was told, did apologize for their actions.

The gacacas appear to combine the benefits of tribunals and truth commissions. Like a tribunal, the perpetrators are prosecuted and punished, creating the perception that such behavior will not be accepted or ignored. When courts hand down a light sentence for cooperation, they send the message that the accused can expect to reintegrate into the community. Like a truth commission, the victims gain a sympathetic forum to discuss their experiences, and those experiences form part of the community record of the genocide. As the government has no money for therapy to treat post-traumatic stress disorder, human rights activists worry that survivors cannot heal psychologically because they never speak of their experiences during the genocide. Testifying at the gacacas allows survivors at least one opportunity to voice their memories.

The gacacas have their problems. The courts do not conduct extensive investigations into the truth of accusations. A priest on a bus to Cyangugu stated the gacacas were only as truthful as the politicians in the area. Just weeks before we arrived, he explained, a gacaca convicted a Kigali journalist who had upset politicians with his stories. The politicians turned to gacacas for vengeance, convincing the community to testify against the journalist. The priest noted the extreme reverence uneducated Rwandans have for their leaders, saying it was one cause of the genocide.

The gacacas may never be fair—the measure by which the first lead prosecutor of the International Tribunals said the tribunals would be judged. If Hutus perceive the system as unfair, they may easily perceive the courts as a form of victor’s justice, preventing the very reconciliation the gacacas were intended to achieve.

Despite the risk of initiating this new take on traditional reconciliation, Rwandans are hopeful. As we stood in front of a deep pit at Murambi, Immanuel told how the killers there planned to hide the genocide by throwing the bodies into mass graves. If no one survived to tell the story, he said, no one could prove what had happened. Through gacacas, the survivors defy those killers. The Rwandans face their past as they tell their stories and perhaps make “Never Again” part of their future.
The debates can last until midnight when students from the Law School, Graduate School of Business, and other University departments gather in the Home Room of International House. The spirited exchange of ideas, opinions, and analysis began again on September 30, 2006, at precisely 7:30 p.m., when the 209th debate of the Edmund Burke Society was gaveled to order.

Steeped in tradition, the Edmund Burke Society may seem as time-honored as the legendary debate societies of Yale and Harvard. By comparison, however, the Society is young; it was founded decades later. “Most of the founders, including me, were graduates of Yale College,” explained Joseph Smith, Jr., ’91. “Yale has a rich and storied tradition of student debate, modeled on the student debating societies at Cambridge and Oxford. It didn’t take us long to notice that Chicago lacked anything like that, so we decided to start such a group.”

The first Edmund Burke Society debate, “Resolved: This House Prefers Reagan to Bush,” took place on October 18, 1989, in the Upper Burton-Judson Lounge. Like every resolution for the past seventeen years, it was chosen, in part, because of its ability to generate dissonant viewpoints among conservatives. Resolutions since have ranged from the timeless, “Resolved: The State Exists to Make Men Virtuous,” to the timely, “Resolved: On to Iran.” While the Society bills itself as a conservative parliamentary debating society, the very definition of conservative has even been a subject of debate. “There are so many factions within our conservative membership—from libertarian to social conservative to traditionalist,” noted Laura Kamienski, ’05, a “Sometime” (i.e., former) Chairman. “We try to strike a balance with our resolutions and provide something for everyone—philosophical, cultural, policy-related, et cetera.”

Edmund Burke, above, is held by many to be the father of Anglo-American conservatism. While the political theorist and philosopher published and spoke extensively, he is perhaps best known for his Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790). According to Joseph Smith, Jr., ’91, the founders of the University of Chicago’s Burke Society “actually considered other names, including Alexander Hamilton’s. But no one speaks to modern conservatives like Burke.”
Each debate follows a set program. The Chairman calls the event to order and members make announcements. Up to three short literary presentations follow, which are often relevant to the topic at hand and range from the classic (Plato) to the contemporary (a memoir from Iraq). Finally the resolution is announced and the discussion begins. Arguments alternate between the affirmative and the negative, with “no notes, no teams, no judges, no time limits, just

**Resolved:**
**The State Exists to Make Men Virtuous**

extemporaneous speeches, questions and answers, and of course a healthy dose of heckling and humor,” said Smith.

It is the spontaneous nature of parliamentary-style debate that makes the Society unique, and the perfect complement to the rigorous classroom experience at the Law School. “The Society helped me to develop my thoughts and opinions, and taught me how to structure an argument off the cuff and defend it on the spur of the moment,” said Kamienski. Smith agreed: “It was a wonderful diversion from the hard work of law school, yet also intellectually worthwhile. Many people may not regard debate as relaxing, but when one spends the morning debating, say, Professor Helmholz, and then the afternoon debating, say, Professor Currie, it

**Resolved:**
**This House Prefers Reagan to Bush**

is indeed refreshing to spend the evening debating, say, the editor-in-chief of the Law Review.”

The Society serves refreshments at each debate, and ladies and gentlemen must follow a strict sartorial code. Any participant, not just members, may speak; the only requirements are that gentlemen speakers must wear a tie, and all speakers must debate respectfully, with an open mind and good manners.

Four debates take place each quarter, but the Society also spreads its merriment through social events as well. Occasional teas are convivial gatherings imbued with tradition. From the first-edition copy of Edmund Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France that is prominently displayed at every debate, to the sportive “awards” and “prizes” bestowed for particularly long-winded or equivocating speeches, the traditions of the Society are elaborate and varied. Many of them are known only to members—a fact that further explains the strong sense of community and camaraderie the Society generates among its faithful. Some alumni members of the Society keep up with current resolutions, and many return to participate in a special debate typically held during Reunion Weekend each year. Not surprisingly, the Society has inspired friendships and even marriages. “Some of the finest people I’ve ever met were part of the Burke Society,” said Marsha Fetziger Nagorsky, ’95, “and many are among my closest friends today.”

The history of the Burke Society is now nearly as storied as that of the Yale and Oxford debating societies, and members can find it difficult to pinpoint their most memorable debate. For Kamienski, it was “Resolved: This House Supports a Federal Marriage Amendment.” Many of the non-members who came expected the speeches to be one-sided. They weren’t, and several people commented on how surprised they were by what they heard.” Nagorsky cites “Resolved: Skate, Tonya, Skate,” named for the infamous incident between Olympic skaters Nancy Kerrigan and Tonya Harding, as one of her many favorites. And for Smith? “One of the most memorable events hosted by the Society was actually not a debate but a speech, given by Judge Posner in 1991, on the topic, ‘Why I am not a conservative.’ It was literally standing room only.”

The energetic debates of the Edmund Burke Society, with their timeless and sometimes humorous topics, have quickly become star events that can pack a room. “One thing I would say to anybody curious about the Society is that the only way to know anything about it is to attend a debate caucus or two,” stated Ed Cottrell, ’08, Chief Whip for the fall quarter. “What might appear from its event announcements to be a formal—some might even say “stuffy”—group of like-minded individuals actually offers a great chance to relax while exploring interesting topics in a fun, friendly, and surprisingly intellectually diverse atmosphere.” For students and alumni of the Law School, the Society’s blend of social and intellectual pursuits will continue to be a welcome diversion from academic and professional life.
Students have been grumbling for a while about the inadequate study and meeting space at the D’Angelo Law Library. The vast majority of law students use laptops now, and since they are no longer restricted to computers at home they have moved back into the Library to study and meet with study groups. But efforts to retrofit the D’Angelo Law Library tower to accommodate new technologies have met with limited results.

Architects and designers faced a considerable challenge transforming the Library tower into a comfortable and technologically accessible space. The renovation plan calls for allocating half of the third floor to a new student services suite, and replacing large sections of book stacks with study and conference areas. The problem is what to do with all those books.

The changes underway at the D’Angelo Law Library, however, are less about rehabbing and more about creating the modern law library. Such a transition is both encouraged and complicated by the rise in importance of digital media.

**Who Needs Books?**

The notion that all resources for legal research are available online has become widely accepted. Many law libraries have even concluded that digital media represent the better value compared with the expenses of housing a print collection. Stanford Law School, for example, no longer retains most law journals: they buy current journals, but discard most after five years. Stanford’s law library has also withdrawn its state official reports. Most law firm libraries have shed much of their print collections as well.

With vast amounts of information searchable in hundreds of ways, the rise of digital media has undoubtedly transformed scholarship. Randal Picker, ‘85, the Paul H. and Theo Leffmann Professor of Commercial Law, discovered an interesting repository in the Google Book database: full text versions of Congressional Records. Before the Internet, finding these records involved a lot of reading, but now they are fully searchable online. A few keystrokes in Google Books helped Picker locate specific information in the Congressional Record. “And then,” Picker said with a laugh, “I went and got the printed volumes to work from. It is much easier to search digital information, but you need specific sets of keywords or phrases. Print allows you to browse, which can be very useful because you don’t always know exactly what to look for.”
Picker’s fall 2006 class on antitrust law may shed some light on how student preferences are evolving. He does not assign a casebook for his class. Instead, students can choose whether to download course materials from his website or purchase a photocopied course pack. “It may be that students today don’t need all that paper,” Picker said. “It will be interesting to watch their choices.”

The Downside of Digital

But digital media has its limits. Electronic casebooks have not been successful; students still prefer hard copies when they must read long text. Data aggregators such as LexisNexis are not libraries; they do not serve as repositories of knowledge. They make decisions regarding content based on other criteria. LexisNexis recently stopped providing articles from American Lawyer Media, publishers of American Lawyer, National Law Journal, and Legal Times. A researcher might locate an article online one day, but be unable to find it again because the aggregator removed it. LexisNexis also routinely removes the earlier years of state statutes and session laws because of low usage rates. This policy is not a problem for most practicing lawyers, but it can be a serious obstacle for students and scholars.

“The same thing can happen with print,” said Judith Wright, Associate Dean for Library and Information Services at the D’Angelo Law Library. “Books can and do go missing, but they are relatively easy to either replace or locate in another library. In addition to the dangers of relying on commercial vendors with financial motives, digital archives are fragile in a different way. You may not know a resource isn’t available until you click the link and discover the file is corrupt, or the link is bad or just gone.”

True digital archiving is expensive and a challenge to manage because the data, software, and hardware need frequent migration and upgrades.

Digital resources also face issues of reliability because of how easy they are to “fix.” Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia, is a good illustration of the temporal nature of digital media—everyone can and does correct everyone else. In theory, and very often in practice, this constant revision improves available information. But a Wikipedia entry can also read one thing one day and something entirely different the next. One person’s fix is another’s revanchism. Law depends upon reliable citation, so the transient nature of electronic information is cause for concern.

Last year, the University conducted an extensive survey to investigate how students and faculty used available resources. The survey was part of an effort to plan for the future of campus libraries. Professor Andrew Abbott, AM ’75, PhD ’82, chaired the research group. “The noncorrelation of a student’s electronic everyday life with his or her research practices surprised most of us,” he wrote, “and the powerful positive correlation between electronic- and traditional-research practices was quite unexpected.”

Understanding that students, faculty, and researchers use both print and digital resources led the University to continue expanding its digital holdings, while establishing a formal commitment to print.

The Pledge to Save Print Resources

The University of Chicago Library—which includes the D’Angelo Law Library—is one of a handful of libraries in the country that is formally committed to preserving print resources. To facilitate this commitment, the University will build an addition to the Regenstein Library—a high-density automated storage facility in which books are shelved by size, tracked by barcode, and retrieved by robots. This ambitious project—known in Hyde Park as the Automated Storage Retrieval or ASR—will ultimately house 3.5 million volumes, giving the University libraries a combined capacity of over 10 million volumes, one of the largest print collections in North America.

Internationally renowned architect Helmut Jahn will design the building. Douglas Baird, the Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law and a former Law School dean, served on the committee that selected Jahn for this project. “The challenge,” Baird said, “was to create a building that accommodates the technology while respecting the site and the University’s traditions. Jahn’s plan demonstrated that he understood this combined commitment. The print collections will be safe and accessible, the building will accommodate new and emerging technologies, but its most striking public feature will be a spectacular reading room—one that we felt was perfectly in keeping with the University’s intellectual traditions.”

The University is set to break ground on this facility in autumn of 2007. The site will house 200,000 books from the D’Angelo Law Library—thirty percent of the current collection.
**Books on Hold**

With long-term storage solutions mapped out, law librarians could create a plan of action for renovating the D'Angelo Law Library. The last few years have been spent in preparation: librarians undertook the daunting task of deciding which books, monographs, and journals would stay in the collection; which would stay in the tower or in compact shelving, which would be sent to the ASR; which would be digitized; and which would be deaccessioned. They removed duplicate copies from the collection, donating most to other libraries. These donations included the 2,500 volumes sent to Tulane University to help rebuild their law library after the destruction brought by Hurricane Katrina and 30,000 volumes sent to the University of Hawaii to replace books lost to the recent flooding there as well.

Other parts of the collection will sit in “dark storage”—an interim, off-site space—until they can be settled in the ASR. Most of the information in these books is available digitally, which should alleviate concerns that large portions of the collection will be inaccessible. In addition, the downtown Chicago law libraries—Chicago Kent, DePaul, John Marshall, Loyola, and Northwestern—still retain their print collections. Because of the University of Chicago’s commitment to print, these law libraries are expected to deaccession large portions of their print collections in coming years, relying as needed on the collections housed in the ASR through traditional interlibrary loan programs.

In the short term, students are still coping with a scarcity of study space. But the Law School has solutions to mitigate the crunch. “Students are free to study in the classrooms whenever they are not in use for class or meetings,” Levmore said. “They can use the classrooms for both individual and group study. We went through the previous renovations to make the classrooms cutting edge and comfortable, and we hope they will make full use of those spaces. But if students prefer a library environment, they are also welcome to study in any of the other libraries on campus, where all online materials from our library will be available to them via their laptops.”

The path to the modern law library is marked with obstacles, from the seemingly mundane issue of storage to the challenges of technology. But overcoming these challenges and inconveniences now will pay vast dividends for future generations of students and scholars.

“The print collections will be safe and accessible, the building will accommodate new and emerging technologies.”
Congratulations. I am delighted to welcome you to the profession of the law.

“The first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.” That, of course, is from Shakespeare. It’s generally cited as the first lawyer joke. Now that you’re on the brink of becoming a lawyer, get used to it.

By the way, you and I have something in common. I graduated from law school exactly thirty-five years ago. We’re therefore in the same reunion cycle. When you celebrate your fifth, I’ll be celebrating my fortieth. When you celebrate your fifteenth, I’ll be celebrating my fiftieth. Beyond that, you’re on your own.

From where you sit now, the year 2041, when you’ll celebrate your thirty-fifth reunion, must seem awfully distant. But, let me tell you, from where I sit now, thirty-five years ago was like yesterday. I promise you, it will be 2041 before you know it. Life is like a law school exam. Before you know it, you’re on the last question and there’s not enough time. When I think back to my law school graduation, there’s only one thing I can’t remember—who spoke or what he or she said. Standing here today, I find that rather depressing.

We have something else in common. You and I both had the same teacher—David Currie. When I was a student, David was still relatively new to the job. You’ve had the privilege of studying with him in his final year of service as a full-time member of our faculty. For forty-four years, David has been a brilliant scholar, teacher, colleague, mentor, and friend.

David is one of the truly great legal educators and legal thinkers of the past half century. His presence has graced our Law School and our lives. Please join me, on behalf of thousands of University of Chicago Law School students who have had the privilege of learning from David Currie, in thanking him for all he has done for all of us.

You and I have another thing in common. When I graduated from the law school, the nation was at war.
Of course, it was a different war. But the war in Vietnam did have some things in common with the war in Iraq.

By 1971, there was a lot of chatter about a phased withdrawal of American troops, and about gradually turning the fighting over to the South Vietnamese. As you may know, that didn’t turn out too well.

By 1971, most Americans were wondering why we were fighting there, why the “coalition of the willing” was so small, and whether it was moral for us to inflict such awful suffering on the Vietnamese people in order to serve our own national interests. By 1971, the president was trying to stifle the New York Times and the Washington Post for publishing government secrets, criminal investigations of government leakers were well underway, and the NSA was unlawfully spying on the American people. Some things never change.

On the other hand, the public reactions to Vietnam and Iraq were somewhat different. By 1971, we had seen massive antiwar demonstrations in cities across America, students shot to death by national guardsman at Kent State University, and hundreds of college campuses shut by antiwar protests.

One of you asked me recently, “What’s wrong with my generation? Why don’t we seem to care?” I explained that there’s nothing wrong with your generation—that a good old-fashioned draft wouldn’t cure.

Many, perhaps most, of you came to law school at least in part because you believed the law would enable you to do some good in the world. Now, I know that many, perhaps most, of you have begun to recognize that even as a lawyer this will be harder to do than you thought three years ago. Do not despair and—most important of all—do not ever let yourself lose your voice. Although it may not feel like it at the moment, you have more power to do good in the world today than ever before in your life.

“The first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.” You know, of course, that wasn’t a lawyer joke. Rather, that statement was made in Henry VI by one of the conspirators in Cade’s Rebellion—conspirators who were plotting to overthrow the English government and destroy the rights and liberties of the English people. “The first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.” That speaks volumes about the role and responsibility of lawyers in a self-governing society.

Throughout American history, the most intense pressure for the sacrifice of civil liberties has come in time of war. Of course, this is only natural, for in wartime the national security is most directly threatened. In such circumstances, it is inevitable that grave questions will arise about whether we can afford our freedoms. The challenge is to decide how much sacrifice of freedom is warranted.

One of the lessons of history is that in time of war we not only compromise our liberties, but we do so excessively and to a degree we almost always come to regret. As Justice
Robert Jackson once observed, “it is easy, by giving way to the passion, intolerance, and suspicions of wartime to reduce our liberties to a shadow, often in answer to exaggerated claims of security.” If we are to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, we must understand why this happens. In large part, this is now your job, as lawyers.

To begin, we need a quick review of American history. I will briefly mention five episodes to illustrate the point. In 1798, the United States was on the verge of war with France. Less than a decade after we adopted the First Amendment, which provides that “Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech,” Congress, in the throes of war fever, enacted the Sedition Act of 1798, which effectively made it a crime for any person to criticize the president, the Congress, or the government of the United States. So much for the First Amendment.

Sixty years later, during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus on eight separate occasions. As you know, the writ of habeas corpus is one of the bulwarks of Anglo-American law. If you are seized by executive officials, the writ of habeas corpus enables you to ask a court to decide whether your detention is lawful. When the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, the president or his agents can arrest and detain you for any reason, or for no reason at all, and no court can intervene on your behalf. You are entirely at the mercy of the executive. During the Civil War, as many as 38,000 civilians were imprisoned by military authorities without any judicial review.

During World War I, President Wilson pushed through Congress the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Sedition Act of 1918, which made it a crime for any person to criticize the government, the Congress, the president, the flag, the Constitution, the military, or the uniform of the military of the United States. Some 2,000 individuals were prosecuted under these laws. The punishment for criticizing the war or the draft typically ranged from ten to twenty years in prison. The effect was to stifle virtually all dissent.

In World War II, President Roosevelt ordered the internment of more than 110,000 people of Japanese descent, two-thirds of whom were American citizens. Not a single one of these men, women, or children was ever accused of disloyalty, espionage, sabotage, or any other unlawful act. But in an atmosphere of hysteria, they were shipped off to internment camps and held behind barbed wire for three years. As we now know, this tragedy occurred not because of any military necessity, but because of a desire to appease racism and curry favor with voters on the West Coast.

During the cold war, the United States stumbled into a vicious era of McCarthyism that was fed not only by a legitimate fear of Soviet espionage and sabotage, but also by manipulative politicians who exploited this fear for partisan and personal gain. By turning Americans against Americans, the “Red baiters” generated a frenzy of accusation, investigation, and persecution that ran roughshod over the Constitution.
As these episodes suggest, we have a recurring pattern of overreacting and needlessly abandoning our civil liberties. Indeed, after each of these periods ended, we came to recognize the magnitude of its excesses and promised never to do it again. It is easier to make this promise than to honor it. Once we are in the midst of a wartime atmosphere, it is difficult to strike the proper balance between security and freedom. Just as an individual in the midst of a personal crisis finds it hard to see clearly, a nation experiences the same problem, only worse, because each person's fear reinforces the fear of those around him.

This is where you—as lawyers—enter the picture. Lawyers can and must play a central role in shaping these debates and guiding our nation's policies. You have been trained to be clear eyed, principled, and rational. It is precisely because of that training that “the first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers.” You are the first and last line of defense against intolerance, hysteria, and repression.

Throughout our history, the best lawyers, like the best citizens, have opposed these excesses and helped to moderate them. During World War I, lawyers in the Free Speech League courageously defended those whose rights were attacked.

During World War II, lawyers in the Justice Department resisted the internment of Japanese Americans, and more than forty years later a group of dedicated lawyers fought for and eventually won judicial vindication of the rights of those who had been unconstitutionally interned because of their race.

And during the cold war, lawyers like Thomas Emerson, Joseph Rauh, and Abe Fortas risked everything to stand up to the ravages of the House Un-American Activities Committee and other government agencies that were determined to humiliate and destroy American citizens because of their political beliefs and associations.

You should know that, over the years, individuals connected with the University of Chicago have played pivotal roles in these struggles. During World War I, U of C law professor Ernst Freund was one of the most effective and vocal critics of the Espionage and Sedition Acts. Freund was the first to argue, even before Learned Hand, that free speech finds its limit in the realm of political discourse only in express “incitement to crime.”

During the cold war, University of Chicago president Robert Maynard Hutchins, a lawyer, was the nation's most outspoken academic opponent of the witch hunts of that era. On one occasion, when the Illinois legislature demanded that the University of Chicago fire one of its more left-wing professors, a group of faculty members approached Hutchins and warned, “If the Board of Trustees dismisses Professor Lovett, you'll receive the resignations of at least twenty full professors,” to which Hutchins replied, “Oh no, I won't. My successor will.”

During the Vietnam War, your fellow alumnus Ramsey Clark refused as attorney general to indict the so-called Chicago Eight for conspiracy after the 1968 Democratic Convention. Several months later, when Clark's successor, John Mitchell, reversed this decision, he charged that Clark's “trouble was that he is too concerned with the rights of the individual.”

Another U of C Law School alum and faculty member, Harry Kalven, represented the conspiracy trial defendants
on appeal, winning a reversal of their convictions from the Seventh Circuit.

Still another U of C Law School alum and faculty member, Edward Levi, as attorney general under President Ford, put in place a series of guidelines that sharply restricted the authority of the FBI to investigate groups and individuals solely on the basis of their constitutionally protected expression.

And still another of your fellow alums, Jim Goodale, was general counsel for the New York Times during the Pentagon Papers case and played a central role in crafting the vindication of First Amendment rights in wartime.

As we move forward in the next several years, we are going to see issues of this sort continuing to percolate through the political and legal systems. The issues may range from torture to electronic surveillance, from the secret detention of Americans citizens to the denial of habeas corpus. It will be lawyers who present these issues to the courts, the Congress, and, most important of all, to the American public. It is lawyers who will educate and inform citizens about the nature and importance of our liberties.

The profession you are about to join is fundamentally responsible for helping our nation strike the proper balance between liberty and security. As you move on in your careers, I hope you will remember that the first step of those who would deny our liberties is “to kill all the lawyers.”

**Have confidence in American values. Be fearless in your defense of liberty.**

It is, of course, much easier to look back on past crises and find our predecessors wanting than it is to make wise judgments when we ourselves are in the eye of the storm. But that challenge now falls to you. Have confidence in American values. Be fearless in your defense of liberty. As Justice Louis Brandeis explained some eighty years ago, “those who won our independence... knew that fear breeds reression” and that “courage is the secret of liberty.” Those may be the two most important lessons for you to bear in mind. Let that be the legacy of your generation. Thank you.
Advocating for Displaced Children
A national initiative to safeguard the interests of immigrant children comes to the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic of the University of Chicago Law School. Maria Woltjen will head the Immigration Children's Advocacy Project, which provides child protection advocates to unaccompanied immigrant children in federal custody.

Last year, 7,787 undocumented children, traveling by themselves without parents, were apprehended and taken into custody by immigration authorities as they tried to enter the United States. For some, the trip represented a dream—reuniting with parents or relatives; escaping miserable conditions to start a new life. For others, it was a nightmare—sent from their homes to hard labor in a strange land; or caught up in the worst forms of human trafficking. For all but the luckiest children, life after apprehension means separation from family and the continuing fear of what might happen next.

"Some of these children do have claims for legal relief," said Maria Woltjen, who heads the Law School's newest legal clinic, the Immigrant Children's Advocacy Program, or ICAP. "But often it's necessary to draw their stories from them to figure out whether they are eligible for legal relief."

As a means of relief from potential deportation, some children are eligible for political asylum and special protective visas for victims of trafficking, abuse, abandonment, and torture. Students of the ICAP clinic will act as guardians ad litem for the children, helping to determine what court action is in their best interests, advocating for their well-being, and working to ensure that children who do return home will be cared for and safe.

A significant role for ICAP students will be to write advocacy briefs on behalf of individual children that incorporate international human rights principles and country-specific legal and factual research. Their responsibilities, however, will extend far beyond legal research. For example, students must be moderately fluent in one of four languages spoken by children who are commonly taken into custody as illegal immigrants: Spanish, Mandarin, Hindi, and Gujarati (the language of the Indian state of Gujarat). The ICAP advocates will regularly interact with the children and work on their behalf, meeting with them at least once a week at the Chicago shelter and accompanying them to court and to meetings with government officials. They will conduct factual research regarding the children's presence in the United States and conditions in their countries of origin and develop written recommendations regarding their best interests.

Maria Woltjen has led efforts on behalf of children's rights since 1991. From that year until 1996 she led the Children's Advocacy Project of the Chicago Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. She then turned to the issue of childhood lead poisoning for residents of public housing in Chicago, spearheading the campaign that persuaded the Chicago Housing Authority to implement programs to eliminate lead hazards and prevent children from becoming poisoned. That success led to work as a liaison to the Chicago communities of Austin, North Lawndale, and Rogers Park, facilitating community participation in development of a citywide strategy to eradicate childhood lead poisoning. Woltjen was an adjunct faculty member at the ChildLaw Center of Loyola University Chicago School of Law between 2001 and 2004.
The Immigrant Children's Advocacy Project launched at the Law School in the Fall term of 2006. Woltjen will train student advocates to identify and represent children's best interests during immigration proceedings. Past advocates have done critical work on behalf of detained immigrant children, as illustrated in the following vignette:

When he arrived at the shelter in Chicago, it was clear that Xie Min, a sixteen-year-old boy from China, had a mental disability. When an advocate was assigned, she learned that Xie Min had been required to proceed with his asylum hearing in Seattle pro se and without any adult to accompany him. The advocate obtained a transcript of the immigration proceeding in which the boy had given nonsensical answers to the government attorney and judge's questions; nevertheless, the Immigration Judge proceeded with the hearing and denied relief. The advocate worked with pro bono counsel through the National Immigrant Justice Center to prepare a motion to reopen with the Board of Immigration Appeals; the motion was granted and the case was remanded to the Immigration Court. Xie Min eventually was released from custody and has been shuttled back and forth across the country through the Chinese employment network. ICAP will work with counsel to ensure the boy applies for a protective visa for victims of trafficking.

Introducing the New Dean of Students

On the bookshelf in the office of Michele Baker Richardson, the Law School's new dean of students, there is a prominent plaque that reads: ENJOY THE JOURNEY. A popular T-shirt worn by students at the University of Chicago Law School jokingly refers to the Law School as "the place where fun comes to die" because of the work ethic and intensity of our students and faculty. However, Richardson recalls that the most fun that she's ever had professionally was directly correlated to the challenging nature of the work. "If you look at all my duties, whether they're related to counseling individual students or working with student groups on programming ideas, they really add up to one important thing: helping students to "enjoy the journey" by removing as many nonacademic obstacles as I possibly can to ensure our students' full engagement in their law school experience."

Richardson's own journey through life brings her to the Law School with experiences that qualify her most distinctively for meeting the goal she has set for herself. After earning a degree in economics from Brown University, she attended Yale Law School. Upon graduation from Yale in 1990, she clerked for the late Judge A. Leon Higginbotham Jr. on the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit before completing a teaching fellowship at Stanford Law School. Prior to pursuing a career in legal academia, Richardson spent several years in private practice at Hogan & Hartson in Washington DC. Her time at Hogan & Hartson coincided with the Clinton administration's push for health-care reform, and her experiences with legal analysis and lobbying related to that agenda led to an enduring interest in health law. Among the forms that interest takes today is her position on the board of directors of Advocate Health Care, one of the largest Chicago-area providers of health services.

She joined the faculty at Chicago-Kent College of Law in 1994, and during the twelve years she was there, her interest in teaching evolved into an ever-stronger desire to work more directly with students in an advisory role. While also teaching in the health law area, she set up and ran Chicago-Kent's academic support program, realizing that she'd found her niche in student services. Richardson comes to the University of Chicago from DePaul University College of Law, where she was asked to assist in revitalizing their academic support program. Once again, her hands-on style was employed in outreach efforts to student groups and individual students in need of assistance to help them get the most out of their time in law school.

As fair as it is to say that the new dean of students has greatly enjoyed her own journey so far, it also seems true that it just keeps becoming more enjoyable. "I can't imagine a better place to be than right here," she said. "We have phenomenal students, an astonishing faculty, and a great administration that is completely devoted to fostering the best possible academic and personal environment." Students will benefit not only from the infectiousness of the new dean's enthusiasm, but from the wisdom and expertise she's gained along the way.
New Faculty Profiles

The Historical Perspective

Federalism. Few words have a more prominent place in discussions of constitutional law and national policy. But beyond its broad outlines, what exactly is federalism? Does it have the same meaning today that it had for America's founders? Is it an enduringly constant concept, or have its meanings sometimes shifted with circumstances? How did the idea of a divided system of government develop among the founders, and how did that idea take shape during the creation of the Constitution and in the first decades of the new republic?

Alison LaCroix, who has joined the faculty this year as Assistant Professor of Law, can answer those questions authoritatively. A graduate of Yale and Yale Law School, she practiced for two years at Debevoise & Plimpton in New York before deciding to return to a love of legal history she nurtured since her early years as an undergraduate. She earned a master’s degree in history from Harvard in 2003, taught history to Harvard undergraduates, and is now putting the finishing touches on a doctoral dissertation for Harvard tracing the intellectual history of federalism between 1754 and 1835. As a Samuel I. Golieb fellow in legal history at New York University School of Law last year, LaCroix participated in one of the country’s most distinguished training grounds for legal-historic scholars. She is delighted to join a faculty noted for its interdisciplinary approach to scholarship.

In Cambridge she met William Birdthistle, a Harvard-trained lawyer whom she married in 2003 and who is currently on the faculty of Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Reflecting on her dissertation topic, LaCroix said, “With really astonishing intellectual virtuosity, the founders—Madison in particular, but also many others who often receive insufficient credit—crafted this thing they called federalism from a deep study of the entire history of governmental structures dating back to ancient Greece. But even Madison didn’t get the kind of federalism he wanted.” As LaCroix has demonstrated, Madison believed that it was essential for the federal government to possess the power to veto any state law of which it disapproved. At the Constitutional Convention he insisted strenuously that the central government could not survive without such a veto power. His fellow delegates disagreed, and Madison’s idea survived only in the power of judicial review.

LaCroix’s studies enlighten many other aspects of the formation of America’s legal system. Through a detailed examination of the practice of dueling, for example, she shows how laws interacted with personal and social codes from the earliest days of the colonies until dueling finally died out in the South many years after the Civil War. Her study of the Hartford Convention of 1814–15 reveals deep and competing currents of thought about the role of the United States in international affairs, and her analysis of the voluminous writings of John Adams on the subject of privacy demonstrates that founder’s highly suspicious view of a notion that has now become enshrined in constitutional doctrine.

This year LaCroix will impart her wisdom and insights about the many historical developments she has studied by leading a seminar on federalism and teaching courses on constitutional law and American legal history. “This historical perspective can really deepen students’ understanding of vital constitutional issues,” she said. “I’m looking forward to some lively and enlightening discussions.”

Questioning Conventional Wisdom

In 1989, a national clinical trial of two drugs for arrhythmia was abruptly terminated because more than twice as many patients getting the drugs suffered heart attacks or died as did patients who received placebos. Physicians were told not to prescribe the drugs except in rare circumstances. One of the study’s principal investigators expressed to the New York Times what would become the prevailing wisdom about the trial’s outcome: “Absolutely, unequivocally, this trial was a success because we have identified two drugs of a type that are more dangerous than the disease they are supposed to treat... The question is whether the risks are worth the benefits. In the case of these two drugs, we’ve answered the question.”

The question remained answered in the minds of medical professionals for many years until Anup Malani, ’00, took a second look. In a 2004 paper, applying a more sophisticated form of analysis than the original researchers used, he showed that a significant subset of patients would actually benefit from the proscribed arrhythmia drugs.

Malani, who has now been appointed Professor of Law,
presented his findings before a skeptical audience in Chicago in October 2004. He was used to skepticism from medical professionals. “My mother, father, sister, and several other relatives are physicians,” he explained, “and for a long time they wondered aloud how degrees in law and in economics qualified me to proclaim about medical matters.” (His economics degree is a PhD from the University of Chicago, earned in 2003.)

Some Law School faculty members attended his presentation, and he thinks that may be part of the reason why he's on the faculty today. “I was doing what the Law School does so well,” he said. “Revisiting conventional wisdom with hard analysis and new perspectives, and maybe they saw a spark of potential in me.”

His exceptional qualifications for legal scholarship and teaching surely didn't hurt either. After graduating from the Law School, he clerked for Stephen Williams of the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and then for United States Supreme Court justice Sandra Day O'Connor. He earned his PhD in economics while also serving on the faculties of the University of Virginia Law School and the University of Virginia School of Medicine's Health Evaluation Sciences Department.

Professor Malani's primary academic interests can be summarized into a few very broad categories—law and economics, health economics, and corporate law and finance—but those broad categories don't begin to capture the expansiveness of his inquiries. Among the things he has wondered about and then examined are why habeas corpus cases are settled much less frequently than criminal and civil cases, even though economic analysis suggests there should be no difference; whether patterns of payments to departing executives in mergers and acquisitions might signal the likely performance of the new corporate entity relative to the acquired entity; how placebo effects can be detected in clinical drug trials, and what explains their action; how differing national policies concerning surveillance and antibiotic stockpiles might affect the epidemiology of avian flu; and whether laws can be studied as neighborhood amenities and evaluated by their impact, for example, on housing prices and wages.

In the coming school year, he will teach health law and bankruptcy and reorganization. He is married to his former Law School classmate Rachel Cantor, who is an associate at Kirkland & Ellis. Their son, Eitan, was born in 2005.
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Are Judges Political?
Ken Merber, ’07
Lisa M. Ellman, JD/MPP, ’05, and Andres Sawicki, ’06, recently graduated from the University of Chicago Law School. Ellman now works as an attorney at the Washington DC office of Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP, while Sawicki is currently clerking for the Honorable Robert D. Sack of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. While students at the Law School, Ellman and Sawicki had the unique experience of coauthoring a book with the Law School’s own Professor Cass Sunstein and Professor David Schkade of the University of California, San Diego. The book, entitled Are Judges Political? and published by Brookings Press, is an empirical analysis of the effects of political ideology on decisions of the federal courts of appeals.

Empirical analysis of judicial opinions is still a relatively unusual technique for legal scholars. Unlike ordinary legal research, which focuses attention on a few important cases, an empirical study casts a wide net, incorporating as many relevant cases as possible. As the results described in Are Judges Political? demonstrate, this broadened scope can cast new light on old debates. I spoke to Ellman and Sawicki about the Chicago Judges Project, writing the book, and their experience working with Professor Sunstein.

Seeing Professor Sunstein’s name on the cover of a new book is hardly a surprise. It’s much more unusual to see two University of Chicago Law School students (now alumni) as co-authors. How did you begin working on the project, and what was it like working with Professor Sunstein?

Ellman—My involvement began in the summer of 2002, when I worked for Professor Sunstein as a research assistant. I had always been interested in the intersection of law and policy, and so I was particularly excited to work with Professor Sunstein on an empirical study of judicial voting. We started with environmental cases in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and eventually ended up coauthoring an article, “Ideological Voting on Federal Courts of Appeals: A Preliminary Investigation,” which was published in the University of Virginia Law Review (90 Va. L. Rev 301, 2004). The article generated a great deal of attention, at which point we decided to expand the research into the Chicago Judges Project.

Sawicki—I also began by working for Professor Sunstein as a research assistant in the summer of 2004. I had done a little bit of work on the Judges Project then, but I didn’t get involved full-time until Lisa contacted me during the winter. When she asked if I’d be interested in doing more research, I jumped at the chance.

We really enjoyed working with Professor Sunstein—as everybody knows, he is a brilliant scholar. He is always excited about new ideas and data, and his curiosity carries over to those around him. He is also an amazing teacher. We feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with him and learn from him.

The book draws on the Chicago Judges Project, a database of empirical information on judges and judicial “voting” in certain politically sensitive cases, which has involved a number of University of Chicago Law students. You have both had important roles in the project. What are the goals of the project, and how have you been involved? And what was your role in the final version of the book?

Many legal debates center around the effect of politics on the rule of law. The Chicago Judges Project is part of a growing movement to inform these debates with descriptions of actual judicial behavior. What the project does is take the huge amount of existing data in the form of real case outcomes and translate it into a large but manageable database. The focus is mainly on the courts of appeals, as opposed to most studies, which focus on the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is obviously quite important, but it is not the whole story. Studying appellate judges makes particular sense in light of some of Professor Sunstein’s other work on group interactions, such as the Chicago Judges Project.

Our roles in the project consisted of managing the team of students who were coding the cases, instructing them as to what they were looking for, and then managing the resulting data. We spent a great deal of time cleaning up the coding, verifying results, and trying to determine what the numbers might mean. As for the final version of the book, the writing was a collaborative process; we all sent drafts around to each other, writing and rewriting, until we had decided exactly what we wanted to say.
The book primarily reports the results of a study of the effect of politics on judicial decision making. Judges from the federal courts of appeals (who sit in three judge panels) are assigned political parties, for purposes of the study, based on the presidents who appointed them. Using that measure, the study then examines three main hypotheses: First, does politics matter? Second, does it matter less when Republican judges sit with Democratic judges? Third, does it matter more when you find all Republican or all Democratic panels? In most controversial areas of law, the answer to these questions was yes. However, your data, and your analysis of the data, were more nuanced than that. What did you find to be the most interesting finding?

It was interesting to find what we term panel effects—that a Democratic judge sitting with two Republican judges votes more like a Republican in the controversial areas of law that we studied, and vice versa. The findings echo social science research demonstrating how groups interact. To that extent, a more appropriate title may have been: are judges human? And the answer is yes: judges respond to group influences in much the same ways as other people.

We were also intrigued by areas in which the hypotheses were not confirmed. For example, in abortion cases, judges vote in political ways but resist group influence, while in other areas of political controversy, the law is sufficiently settled so that the politics are not reflected in the jurisprudence. Finally, the widespread agreement in other politically controversial areas, like takings law, was perhaps the most interesting, and perhaps also the most reassuring for those who hold traditional aspirations for the rule of law. It's likely that for the politically uncontroversial areas that make up most of courts' workload, there are few differences between the voting of Republican and Democratic judges.

In other parts of the book, you examine changes in judges over time, differences among judges appointed by different presidents, and judicial responses to landmark cases such as Roe v. Wade. Which of these issues do you think provided the most interesting insights, and what did you find there?

We were struck by the growing conservatism of the judges and courts over time. The data were not conclusive on this point but suggest a slow, systematic shift of judicial decision making, on average, to the right.

We were also intrigued by how judges reacted to landmark cases, with little party distinctions at first, but both ideological and panel (group influence) effects growing over time. Again, it shows how judges are human, and how people respond to new and unfamiliar situations. It is the sort of thing that social scientists have looked at a great deal, but the implications of their findings have not yet been widely acknowledged in legal studies. While academics are used to looking at big decisions in a legal sense, judges react in a very human sense.

---

Books by Alumni


Book Review

_Earl B. Dickerson: A Voice for Freedom and Equality_ by Robert Blakely

Eleanor Arnold, '03

As a child, the first nonfiction I remember binging on was biography. I can still see the neat row of slim volumes in the children's 921 section of the library. While I couldn't recite now the names of famous people whose lives I delved into so avidly, I do know that no one even remotely like Earl B. Dickerson, '20, was in that group. Earl Dickerson was the first African American to be graduated from the University of Chicago Law School, and I became aware of just how interesting his life was at the ceremony held to honor the installation of his portrait earlier this year. So it was with great interest that I picked up Robert Blakely's _Earl B. Dickerson: A Voice for Freedom and Equality_.

On one level my high hopes were met: Dickerson's is certainly a life worthy of examination and, indeed, admiration. But on the level of a good read, I was a bit disappointed.

Earl Burrus Dickerson's life stretched from 1891 to 1983. The grandson of slaves, reared in Jim Crow Mississippi, he was fortunate to grow up in a community that recognized his intelligence and his passion for learning. In 1907, with the encouragement of his mother and assisted by a friendly railway porter, he headed to Chicago to continue his education. After serving in the army in France during World War I, he graduated from the University of Chicago Law School. Dickerson himself recognized the significance of his move to Chicago: "I left the desperate life of a black person in feudal Mississippi...clothed with little else than a burning sense of outrage and a driving resolve, cradled in the Declaration of Independence, not to be bullied, browbeaten, or held hostage, in fact or in spirit—ever again." His life thereafter was true to that resolve.

First and foremost a businessman, Dickerson had access (if often grudgingly bestowed) to political and cultural institutions where he forcefully pressed the end of racial discrimination. His impact as a civil rights leader grew naturally out of his professional experience as an attorney and founder/officer of the Supreme Life Insurance Company. Whether advocating equal treatment for black soldiers (including himself) in the war or breaking virtually every color barrier that stood in his way, Dickerson was an agent of change all his adult life. In one case, he won $100 in a suit against the Palmer House Hotel, which had refused to honor his dinner reservation; to be sure the hotel got the point, Dickerson returned to spend his award in the hotel dining room.

Dickerson was especially influential in removing barriers in two areas of economic importance: housing and employment. At a time when there was a tremendous influx of blacks moving up from the South, many Chicago neighborhoods had in place restrictive covenants prohibiting the sale of real estate to blacks. Dickerson was one of the attorneys who argued against restrictive covenants before the Supreme Court in _Hansberry v. Lee_, the most immediate outcome of which was the opening of an area near Hyde Park to blacks; shortly thereafter, the practice was outlawed altogether.

Dickerson himself moved into Hyde Park (in 1949), and he actively supported community efforts to maintain a viable and vibrant interracial neighborhood.

In the struggle against employment discrimination, Dickerson was influential at the national level. He was a member of FDR's first Fair Employment Practices Committee, which held hearings around the country to point out examples of egregious discrimination in major corporations that were supposedly bound by presidential executive order to "provide...equitable participation of all workers in defense industries." Never an advocate of racial separation, as a number of black leaders were, Dickerson urged Supreme Life and other black-owned businesses to integrate: "If our white competitors no longer recognize color as a barrier in matters of business, why should we?"

As a reader, I had hoped for a more richly textured narrative and more insights into Earl Dickerson, the man. There is too much of "he did this, and then he did that." I want to inquire, "But what was it like? What did he think about that? What kind of person was he really?" In spite of that shortcoming, however, the portrait emerges of a man whose life spanned almost an entire century, from Jim Crow to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and beyond, and who in his daily affairs, both personal and public, helped move the country to a better place.

Eleanor Arnold, '03, is the assistant dean for academic affairs at the Law School.
Doing Something about the Weather

In a part of the world where everybody has talked about the weather for centuries because it's a matter of life and death, Conrad Bahlke, '84, has done something about it, applying some of the most modern financial tools to change what the weather can mean to millions of people.

When Bahlke, a partner in the New York office of Weil Gotshal & Manges, read an article in the Economist magazine about an innovative approach to drought-related humanitarian aid in Ethiopia, he grabbed his phone and called the United Nations official in charge of the pilot project to offer pro bono assistance.

The UN's plan was to use derivative instruments to trigger relief funds in advance of an actual drought, based on a rigorous reading of climatic indicators. Ethiopia is one of the most chronically vulnerable countries in the world to food insecurity and famine. Almost 80 percent of its people depend on rain-fed agriculture for their survival. Over a million Ethiopians died in the 1984-85 famine, and in the recent past, severe droughts with terrible consequences have recurred every five years.

So compelling was the opportunity to help that Bahlke offered to fly to the Rome headquarters of the World Food Programme so he could personally present his and his firm's qualifications for taking on the work. Because of Bahlke's and his team's particular derivatives backgrounds, and because the UN trusted his promise that he would treat this assignment as earnestly as he treats his paying clients, he got the job over several competitors without having to make the trip.

Pulling together a team of Weil Gotshal attorneys, Bahlke made it happen. In return for a $930,000 premium, the World Food Programme now holds an option from a French insurer that will pay $7.1 million if data collected from twenty-six monitoring stations across Ethiopia during this year's rainy season (between March and October) add up to a convincing forecast of a severe drought. The World Bank's Commodity Risk Management Group helped structure the deal, which is based on the losses Ethiopian families would suffer in the event of a drought.

"On the surface, this might look like a pretty straightforward transaction," Bahlke said. "But there were a lot of complicated considerations and no exact precedents." Eventually twelve Weil Gotshal lawyers in three countries contributed over 350 hours to drawing up a model contract, evaluating proposals from the seven firms that submitted bids, and conducting final negotiations with the winning bidder.

The New York Times hailed the transaction as "a pilot project that could someday transform the world's approach to disaster emergencies."

"There are several great advantages to this approach that may transcend the dollar amounts involved," Bahlke said, explaining that it provides a reliable source of relief funding in a world where there are many competing claims on donors' attention, and that such a reliable source of financing permits relief agencies to make concrete plans for applying those funds most effectively. "Most importantly," Bahlke said, "it eliminates the time lag between the occurrence of a crisis and the marshalling of aid to victims. It permits aid to be provided proactively, which changes everything." If aid arrives before farmers are forced to eat the seeds they had intended to plant the next year or in time for them to keep their livestock from dying or before they feel forced to leave their parched lands, the magnitude of a drought crisis can be contained.

Bahlke, who earned a Chicago MBA at the same time as his law degree, says that in some ways this work has brought him back to his roots. "My MBA was in finance and nonprofit administration," he said, "and both of those, along with law, were important aspects of this project. I never thought I'd have the opportunity to contribute to a humanitarian cause in such a direct way, but I'm honored to have been able to do so." He says others with specialized skills at his firm have been talking with him about ways in which they might make pro bono contributions like his, and he is now regularly approached with opportunities to work on similar tasks. The private sector is also interested. "Insurance companies and even hedge funds are looking into this kind of instrument because it can bring noncorrelated risks into their portfolios," he explained. "Weather modeling is highly sophisticated now, so it is known that if some natural disasters occur, others probably won't. Maybe if there's a major hurricane in the United States, for example, there won't be drought in some parts of Africa, so it allows investors to create a more balanced portfolio of weather-related exposures."

"This is a classic University of Chicago Law School project, applying rigorous marketplace standards to advance the social good," Bahlke said. "I'm very grateful for the skills and perspectives I learned at the Law School and for this particular opportunity to put them into practice."
Class Notes Section – REDACTED
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International Arbitrator

While he was a high school student in Chicago Heights, Carl Salans, '57, joined with some other students to form what they called the "47 Club." Their shared interest was international affairs; the name of the club reflected the number of countries that were members of the United Nations at that time. Today the UN has 192 member states, and the international law firm that Salans cofounded employs over 450 attorneys in offices throughout the world.

It's not every day that a high school student's interests become an industry-shaping reality. True to his passions, Salans studied international law and government at Harvard and then earned a degree in public international law at Trinity College, Cambridge. A year at University of Chicago Law School earned him a JD, whereupon he returned to Trinity College to acquire an LLB in public international law. His time at Chicago was anything but fun filled. "I was dropped into the third year, knowing no one, and I had not been exposed to the Socratic method in Cambridge, so life was tough and the classes were even tougher for me," he recalled. "But Chicago was where I really learned what it was like to be a lawyer. At the time, I could hardly wait to get out. In retrospect, it was one of the most valuable experiences of my life."

Joining the United States Department of State in 1959, Salans soon became its top lawyer for legal issues in Asia. He advised the U.S. delegation to the Geneva conference that established the neutrality of Laos in 1962, serving under chief negotiator Averell Harriman. "Laos was a major hot spot at that time," he recalled. "President Kennedy had even held a nationally televised news conference about Laos, saying he was prepared to send troops there. It was my first experience with an international negotiation conference, and quite an experience it was."

It wasn't many years later that he was involved in negotiations that were even more critical and more closely watched. In 1968, Harriman asked Salans to accompany him to the negotiations in Paris aimed at concluding the war in Vietnam. He moved his family to Paris and lived there as the talks continued for several years. But he resigned from the State Department in 1972 to express his dismay that the United States Government, i.e. President Nixon and Henry Kissinger, did not seem to him to be truly pursuing a just and honorable peace settlement.

"So there I was after I quit," Salans said, "in Paris and committed to remaining there because my wife was French and I loved the city and it had become home to my children. I was thirty-nine years old, and I had never practiced law at a firm. Luckily I found one that would hire me, and I worked there for several years."

Then in 1978, he and two others, Eliane Heilbronn and Jeffrey Hertzfeld, realized that they shared an idea for a kind of law firm that didn't then exist—one that was genuinely international. "There were American firms and English firms with offices in other countries, but that wasn't our vision. We didn't want a Paris headquarters with branches elsewhere; we wanted to gather attorneys in many different places who each had a natural understanding of their nation's style of thinking and problem solving, as well as its legal system. No one culture would dominate, allowing us to work without demarcation lines between offices and practices and to focus all our efforts on providing clients with globally integrated service."

Salans Hertzfeld & Heilbronn was formed. Geopolitical events such as the rise of Perestroika and the fall of Communism helped the firm to grow to its current size. Cofounder Hertzfeld spoke Russian, and the firm was soon opening offices in Russia and many other countries of the former Soviet Union. Today it has offices in Almaty, Baku, Berlin, Bratislava, Bucharest, Istanbul, Kyiv, London, Moscow, New York, Paris, Prague, Shanghai, St. Petersburg, and Warsaw.

Salans retired from the firm in 1998, and its name was shortened to Salans in 2002. Retirement, for now, means two things: First, he can enjoy more time with his beloved wife, with whom he celebrated a fiftieth wedding anniversary earlier this year, and with his three sons and seven grandchildren. Second, he can take on more assignments in a discipline he loves and that brings together the skills and knowledge he's developed over his entire career—arbitrating international commercial disputes. As counsel and as an arbitrator, he has participated in many such arbitrations. "I lost count at a hundred," he said wryly.

He is also a vice-chairman of the International Chamber of Commerce International Court of Arbitration and, since 1984, an arbitrator in the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal at The Hague.
"Life's Not a Straight Line"

It's fitting that Bill Noakes, '82, finds himself today as executive vice president of Meijer, Inc., a position he's held for six years. Meijer's 170-plus "superstores" throughout the Midwest contain just about everything a consumer could want, from groceries to lawn furniture, auto parts to pets, and Noakes's career contains just about everything a lawyer could do, from small firms to big ones, commercial law to government service, corporate counsel to the Air Force's Judge Advocate General Department. What's more, just as Meijer operates "grocery stores" that also sell lots of other items, Noakes isn't only Meijer's general counsel—he's the chief information officer, too, and he's involved in quite a few other aspects of corporate leadership.

When Noakes was about seven years old, he read a biography of Thomas Jefferson, and saw there a kindred spirit, someone else whose interests ranged far. Since Jefferson was a lawyer, Noakes announced that he was going to become one, too. His father, a career Air Force sergeant, thought not, telling his son, "There aren't any Negro lawyers." His father recommended a career as a CPA, a prospect that filled the younger Noakes with such dread that he decided, no matter what the odds, it would be lawyering for him.

Were it not for Dean Richard Badger, Noakes might not have become a University of Chicago Law School alumnus. And his personal style might have been different, too. As an undergraduate at Notre Dame, Noakes applied only to Notre Dame's law school and the University of Chicago. Having been accepted at Notre Dame but not yet having heard from Chicago, he wrote to the director of admissions saying, in effect, that Chicago would be missing out on a very dedicated student if it didn't take him. He recalled, "As soon as I mailed it I thought, 'What have I done? They're going to think I'm nuts.'" On the contrary, Badger was impressed with the young man's spunk and expedited his acceptance.

"I learned something important from that," Noakes recalled. "To say what you want politely and directly is a lot better than just hoping people will somehow figure out what you want and respect it. It's an approach I've practiced throughout my career."

Being at the Law School changed his life. "We had the best faculty on the planet. Giants like Ed Levi, Walter Blum, and Bernie Meltzer, and young Turks who would become giants, like Richard Epstein and Geoff Stone. And the students! Brilliant minds everywhere you turned." After his first year, he worked nearly full-time every week at a four-person firm where, he recalled, "I got some great tutelage in how the legal system really works." Restless as his mind was, even all that wasn't enough for him: he acquired a master's degree in public policy before he graduated from the Law School.

After that, it was one rich experience after another. Five years with the Air Force JAG and a stint at the SEC preceded his decision to accept an offer to join the legal staff at General Motors. In 1992 he left GM for a Detroit firm. He served as vice-chairman of Dennis Archer's successful campaign for the Detroit mayoralty in 1993. Jennifer Granholm, now Michigan's governor, asked him to work as her deputy in the Wayne County corporation counsel's office in 1995. In 1997 he became general counsel of a minority-owned automotive supplier, and did some commentary on the "Court TV" television channel. Federal independent prosecutor Donald Smaltz caught one of Noakes's TV appearances, made inquiries, and wound up inviting Noakes to come to Washington DC to handle the trial of former Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy.

Noakes did so, not without misgivings because the investigation had been completed and the strategy was set before he arrived in July for a trial involving 39 counts and over 70 witnesses that was scheduled to begin in September. "I gave it my best shot," Noakes said, "and I think we could have won with a different strategy, but we didn't."

"I was disappointed," Noakes added about that verdict, "but disappointment is just another form of learning. Life's not a straight line, and if it was, I'd be bored to tears." There's plenty in his life right now to save him from boredom: in addition to his many-hatted job at Meijer, he teaches an ethics course at Michigan State's law school, he participates in Grand Rapids civic organizations, he's starting a term on the Law School's Visiting Committee, and his wife gave birth in September to their son, Gian. "I've met a lot of very nice CPAs in my life," he said, "but I couldn't be happier than to be right where I am, and I wouldn't be right where I am if it weren't for the University of Chicago."
Levi's Top Lawyer

Hilary Krane, '89, journeys to the Law School from her home in California to participate in meetings of the Visiting Committee. Passing through the Green Lounge, Krane may have even more reason to be pleased with what she sees than do her fellow committee members. After all, how many of them can look around and see a large percentage of students happily making use of products produced by companies they lead?

Krane is senior vice president and general counsel of Levi Strauss and Company, a position she assumed in January of this year. She is one of the twelve members of the company's managerial governing body, its Worldwide Leadership Team. "It’s gratifying to be allowed to play an important role at an iconic American company with an enormous global footprint, the largest apparel company in the world," she said. "Not to mention that Levi Strauss is a great organization with admirable values—and my kids think my job is cool."

In addition to heading up the vast network of lawyers required by a Fortune 500 company that does business in 130 countries, Krane advises the Levi Strauss board and the company's executives. Among her top priorities is protecting the company's brand, particularly from rampant counterfeiting. "Our brand is really the heart of our business," she said. "Maintaining its integrity requires constant vigilance, often against the shadiest characters in the most far-flung places. It's an even more consuming task than I had expected." So inoculated has brand protection become in her own life, she said, that she finds herself scrutinizing the backsides of passersby to assure herself that the Levi Strauss-labeled jeans they are wearing are the genuine article.

There are reasons beyond corporate pride for Krane to enjoy returning to Chicago. For one thing, it's her home town. She was born and raised on Delaware Street. Her father, Howard Krane, '57, a partner at Kirkland & Ellis, chaired the University of Chicago Board of Trustees from 1992 to 1997. It was also in Chicago that Krane spent her formative years as an attorney. After graduation she clerked for Judge Milton Shadur, '49, of the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. It was an experience she describes as "one of the all-time great learning experiences anyone could have." Then she worked for four years in the Chicago office of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom, where a combination of committed mentoring and challenging assignments further propelled her learning. "I was often boxing above my weight class, but I was always supported and taught, so the experience was tremendously valuable," she recalled.

In 1994, a teaching opportunity for her husband, Kelly Bulkeley, required a family move and led her to transfer to Skadden's San Francisco office. Not long afterward she joined Price Waterhouse (now PricewaterhouseCoopers) as an in-house litigation attorney. When PricewaterhouseCoopers outsourced litigation a couple of years after she arrived there, she was kept on as assistant general counsel, advising the firm and its partners with respect to a broad range of legal issues. Soon she was tapped to head up the legal arm of the company's worldwide advisory practice, a four-billion-dollar enterprise. She was named a PricewaterhouseCoopers partner in 2000.

The exhaustive nationwide search that Levi Strauss conducted for the ideal replacement for its previous general counsel, who had held that position for many years, led to her hiring. "Considering my lack of direct apparel-industry experience Levi's made a gutsy call in hiring me," she said. "I'm determined to rise to the challenge."

Discussing the Law School from her Visiting Committee perspective, Krane sees a thematic consistency with her other endeavors. "Knowing your brand and sticking to your values are essential for building a great franchise," she said. "Just as PriceWaterhouse and Levi's do, the Law School under Dean Levmore's able leadership continues to be true to what it stands for. I'm proud to be a graduate and pleased to contribute to furthering the mission of such a vital institution."
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Erik Jan Ives
Natalie Claire James
Audrey Anne Jeung
James E. Jr.
Katrina Ferriera Johnson
Matthew Ryan Jones
Michael Joseph Kelly, Jr.
Robert Ozza Kenedy II
D. Philip Kenny
Ryan Matthew Kerian
Zubin P. Khambatta
Allana B. Khan
Nabeel Umar Khan
Sermaad Mostafa Khojasteh
Kirstyn Beth Klingick
Joshua Kluewer
Remyk
Brandy Michelle Kuentzel
Christian J. Kuhn
Ambika Kumar
Aiyi Bhargi Kundra
Trampas Alan Kurth

Erica Elizabeth Hewes
Matthew Ryan Hoven
Wayne Haung
Julian Rene Hueng
Erik Jan Ives
Almas B. Khan
Romney Ko
Ariba Kuma
Laura Lallow
Viktoria Lovel
Jaimie Rebecca Lund
Jonathan Lee McFarland
Abigail Ruth Moncrieff
Sarah Hughes Newman

Michael R. Ogibene
Courtney Elizabeth Peters-Manning
Kyle Hilyard Pikkington
Justin Steven Rubin
Andres Saniuick
Jonathan Charles Shapiro
Rebecca Lynne Silver
Aaron Daniel Shubert
Jason D. Specht
Katherine Marquess Swift
Joel Savik Tashjian
Benjamin Walsh Tyler
Benjamin Jay Wimmer
Ana Theresa Zablah
Allison Marie Zissle

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL CLASS OF 2006 LIST OF HONORS

For the Degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence
Alian James Devlin
For the Degree of Doctor of Law
Sharon Renee Albright
Hugo Roberto Angarita
Samuel Abraham Arieta
Jaoujue Arnaoutoue
Lauren Beth Aronson
Amir Azaran
Brooke Ashley Bailes-Irlo
Valdis Correli Barbosa
Kieran Z. Bar
Traci Ann Beeck
Valencia Elizabeth Beatty
Jessica Ann Berford
Derek Stephen Borell
Alyssa Sara Berman
Pryia Moti Bhata
Kevin Charles Blackman
Linda Bochelle Anesha
James Christopher Brand
Lindsey Valaine Briggs
Katherine Renee Caldwel
David Lee Callister
Kristo Marin Camaron
Joseph Francis Cassio
Ashwin Caramontsh
Erin Jason Ceylon
John Wode Challcombe
Basil Matthew Cherian
John Vincent Chibbaro
Michael D. Cohen
Elizabeth Anne Cook
Natalia Marissa Cornello
Stephen Joseph Cowen
Susanne Elenonor Cowen
Mark Cucucao
Tracy Elizabeth Dardick
Amanda K. Davis
Joshua Arthur Decker
Robert C. Deegan
Henry M. Dorn
John Phillip Duchemin
John Christopher Dudley
Lisa Inga Eik
Gyula Ergin
Eva Elsas
Kristin Jane Foner
John Holden Frost
David John Joyal
Rebecca Renee Hanson
Sherron Harris
Emily R. Hausdorff
Louis Daniel Helbebusch
Erica Elizabeth Hewes
Constantinos Hobi
Matthew Ryan Hoven
Wayne Haung
Daphne Pei-I Hsu
Julien Rene Huang
Joanna Ingals
Erik Jan Ives
Natalie Claire James
Audrey Anne Jeung
James E. Jr.
Katrina Ferriera Johnson
Matthew Ryan Jones
Michael Joseph Kelly, Jr.
Robert Ozza Kenedy II
D. Philip Kenny
Ryan Matthew Kerian
Zubin P. Khambatta
Allana B. Khan
Nabeel Umar Khan
Sarried Mostafa Khojasteh
Kirstyn Beth Klingick
Joshua Kluewer
Remyk
Brandy Michelle Kuentzel
Christian J. Kuhn
Ambika Kumar
Aiyi Bhargi Kundra
Trampas Alan Kurth

Jonathan Richard La Chapelle
Alain Chung-Len Lai
Michael Leo Lubochyn
Laura Lallow
James Patrick Langdon
Michael Magneve Lauter
Gina Kyona Loo
Ashley Michelle Liu
Ermelinea S. Liu
Viktoria Lovel
Jaimie Rebecca Lund
Jonathan Lee McFarland
Abigail Ruth Moncrieff
Sarah Hughes Newman

Maria Elizabeth Porrus
Rich Elke Mattson Price
Madecha Rana
Lara Marie Rios
Darlin Odette Rodriguez
Emma L. Rodriguez-Avila
Gina Kyona Loo
Justin Steven Rubin
Jessica S. Ryan
Roger Charles Saad
Andrew Nathan Schach
Moshe B. Saleg
Mary Ellen Sanders
Allison Anne Sapsford
Andres Saniuick
David Paul Scenna
Mariony Charisse Scharf
Alec Huff Schultz
Meredith Lyss Schultz
Jonathan Charles Shapiro
Amit Harsh Sheth
Rebecca Lynne Silver
Aaron Daniel Shubert
Jason D. Specht
Christopher E. Spillman
Keith James Stuart
Ryan Oshiontch
Leslie Nicole Sturgeon
Murtaza Fahkuddin Sultanwalla
Timothy Mychal Swan
Katherine Michelle Swift
Gabriel Taran
Joel Savik Tashjian
Allison Deaah Taylor
Philip Fabian Torone
Benjamin Walsh Tyler
Michael Vernylen
Andres Carlos Vidal
Eric William Widdow
Sarah Elizabeth Walker
Ivy Anahue Walsh
Donald William Ward
Marcell Grant Wimbish
Kathryn Kristine Wycoff
Ryan Rimie Sheila
Ana Theresa Zablah
Allison Marie Zissle
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*Indicates an LLM degree, ** Indicates JD/ MBA. Otherwise, graduates received a JD.

**ARIZONA**
Phoenix
Jessica Benford
Ryley Cerlock and Applewhite

Aaron Welling
Perkins Coie Brown & Bain PA.

**CALIFORNIA**
Irvine
Andrew Hall
Knoebbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP

Los Angeles
Roger Angarita
Latham & Watkins LLP

Joulia Arnaoutova
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP

John Chibbaro
Latham & Watkins LLP

David Han
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Daphne Hsu
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP

Julian Hwang
Irell & Manella LLP

**Daniel Kney**
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

**Jamie Lund**
Irell & Manella LLP

**Sonja Min**
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP

**Walter Pena**
Jones Day

**Bill Ward**
Munger Tolles & Olson LLP

**Palo Alto**
Jonathan McFarland
Morrison & Foerster LLP

Lisa Nguyen
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

Raymond Yee
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

**Pasadena**
Benjamin Turner
Judge Ryner

US Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit

**San Francisco**
Katherine Caldwell
Latham & Watkins LLP

**Brandy Kuentzel**
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

**Ajay Kundaria**
Keiser & Van Neist LLP

**Michael Lauter**
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter and Hampton

**Erica Hewes**
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

**COLORADO**
Broomfield
Lauren Mackey
Cooley Godward

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**
Lauren Aronson
Sidley Austin LLP

**Kevin Blackman**
Latham & Watkins LLP

Stephen Cowen
Chief Judge Douglas Ginsburg
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

Lisa Ellman
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP

Alexander Ginsberg
White & Case LLP

**Kristin Klingsick**
O'Melveny & Myers LLP

**Jeffrey Mandel**
Judge A. Raymond Randolph
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

William Ortmann
Judge David Tatel
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

Justin Rubin
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

**Jason Specht**
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Murtaza Sutarwalla
Latham & Watkins LLP

Gabriel Taran
Judge Richard A. Posner
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

Nicole Welch
Covington & Burling

Ana Zabala
U.S. Dept. of Justice, Civil Dept.: Honor's Program

Yoshikito Ueno*
Student, Georgetown Law Center

**FLORIDA**
Miami

Joanna Ingalls
Miami-Dade Public Defender

**Natalie James**
Miami-Dade Public Defender

Almas Khan
University of Miami

Ashley Litwin
Judge James Lawrence King
United States District Court
Southern District of Florida

William Millsaps
White & Case LLP

**West Palm Beach**

Alec Schultz
Judge Gerald Middlbrooks
United States District Court
Southern District of Florida

**Meredithe Shuford Schultz**
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, PA

**GEORGIA**
Atlanta
Brooke Baires-Irvin
King & Spalding LLP

**Anthony Webb**
Hunton & Williams LLP

HAWAI
Des Moines

Philip Park
Park Steven Collozi
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

**IOWA**

John Duchemin
Judge Richard Clifton
United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

**ILLINOIS**

Aham
Amanda Gilbert
SimmonsCooper LLC

**Chicago**

Sharon Albrecht
DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary LLP

Amir Azaran
Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP

Valdir Barbosa
Latham & Watkins LLP

Alyssa Berman
Foley & Lardner LLP

Traci Beech Bergum
Lord, Bissell, and Brook LLP

Priya Bhatia
Goldberg, Kohn, Bell, Black, Rosenbloom & Moritz, Ltd.

Linda Boachie-Ansah
United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

James Brand
Chief Judge Eugene Wedoff
United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of Illinois

Eric Cayford
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

John Challacombe
Winston & Strawn LLP

**Chicago**

Alicia Cheroian
McKinsey & Company

Elizabeth Cook
United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

Natasha Cornelio
Lord, Bissell, and Brook LLP

Tracy Dardick
Jenner & Block LLP

**Amanda Davis**
Lord, Bissell, and Brook LLP

Robert Deegan
Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon

Henry Dorn
Audiace Research International

Jennifer Esquivel
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC

Sharon Fairley
IL Attorney General's Office

**Iowa**

Lara Flath
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Ryan Foreman
Judge Frank Easterbrook
United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

**Ryan Gray**
Winston & Strawn LLP

**Samuel Gross**
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

**Shanara Harris**
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP

Emily Haus
Foley & Lardner LLP

Shanara Harris
Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP

**Emily Haus**
Foley & Lardner LLP

Louis Hellebusch
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Ye (Cecilia) Hong*
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Matthew Hovanes
Sidley Austin LLP

**Wayne Hsiung**
Northwestern University

Michael Kelly
Jenner & Block LLP

Robert Kenedy
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

**Ryan Kerian**
Latham & Watkins LLP

Zubin Khambatta
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

**Nabeel Khan**
Sidley Austin LLP

Michael Lakovsky
Champion and Cutler LLP

James Langdon
Sidley Austin LLP

Gina Lee
Stein, Ray & Harris LLP

**Viktoria Lovei**
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Annette Moore
Sidley Austin LLP

Sara Murphy
Sidley Austin LLP

Katherine Myers
Sacnoff & Weavar

Nathan Neubarger
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum Perman Nagelberg LLP

Sarah Newman
Sidley Austin LLP

Hartley Niswandre
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Daniel Nydegger
Goldberg, Kohn, Bell, Black, Rosenbloom & Moritz, Ltd.

Gina Oka
Stein, Ray & Harris LLP

Emmeze Okefaro
Illinois Institute of Art

Rebecca Piper
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Madeeha Rana
Latham & Watkins LLP

Emma Rodriguez-Ayala
Sidley Austin LLP

Allison Sapsford
Jenner & Block LLP

Rebecca Silver
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Christopher Spillman
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Keely Stewart
McDermott, Will & Emery LLP

Ryan Stromheiner
IL DCPS

Timothy Swan
Sidley Austin LLP

Katherine Swift
Judge Mark Filip
United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Allison Taylor
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC

Philip Torongo
Stein, Ray & Harris LLP

Andres Vidal
Baker & McKenzie

Sarah Walker
Goldberg, Kohn, Bell, Black, Rosenbloom & Moritz, Ltd.

Ivy Walsh
Niel, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP

Alexandra Weisfeld
Jenner & Block LLP
### WHERE ARE THEY NOW? continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>alma_matter</th>
<th>city</th>
<th>alma_matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver &amp;</td>
<td>Cravath Swain &amp; Moore LLP</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacobson LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathaniel Martin*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friedman, Manges &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saeki &amp; Saeki LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alvaro Sarmiento Lapedra*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Gottlieb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Cascio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Jerry E. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Court of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the Fifth Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Shapiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sullivan &amp; Cromwell LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ami Sheth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minako Shibata*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siedley Austin LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Fernandez Siqueira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Castro*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liang (Alex) Tao*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaye Scholer LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reiko Yoshida*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hengeler Mueller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERISTY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2006 Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the Fifth Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarence Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker Botts LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittman LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Perez-Daple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Roger Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Court of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the Fourth Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambika Kumar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davies Wright Tremaine LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristen Rowell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perkins Coie LLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Sachs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heider Ehrman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michelle Ognibene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge M. Blane Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Court of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the Fourth Circuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WORLDWIDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katrina Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Army JAG Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabio Polverino*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleary Gottlieb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stein &amp; Hamilton Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luciana Gabbai*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Souza, Cescon, Avedissian,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrie &amp; Fliesch Novogogues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Garcia*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instituto Libertad y Desarrollo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macarena Vargas*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carey y Cia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diego Ferrada*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker &amp; McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yun (Samantha) Wang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gottfman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Malley &amp; Myers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CZECH REPUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rudolf &quot;Rudi&quot; Rentsch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilles Lutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Konrad von Hoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Mauerhofer*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student, University of Berne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dueseldorf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Notz*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hengeler Mueller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Köln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Seebach*</td>
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Among time-honored traditions at the Law School, the iL BBQ signals the end of the first year. The photographs on this page represent the celebration following the conclusion of finals.
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