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Dear Alumni and Friends,

I first arrived at the University of Chicago Law School almost (but not quite) half a century ago as a first-year law student. At that time, I had no idea what I was getting myself into. In fact, I came here by accident. My girlfriend at the time had transferred to Northwestern, and I chose Chicago over the other law schools to which I’d been admitted so I could be near her. The night before I left New York to drive to Chicago for the beginning of classes, she broke up with me. It was not an auspicious beginning.

But here I am, almost half a century later, sitting once again in the Dean’s office, counting my blessings. For me, the privilege of being at this Law School for lo these many years has been just that . . . a privilege, and a joy! As I discovered soon after arriving as a very unhappy camper, this is a remarkable institution.

I found in my fellow students and my extraordinary teachers a community in which ideas and arguments and the unyielding search for the truth were at the center of everything. It was eye-opening, and it was exhilarating.

And, happily, it is still that way today. Let me offer just four examples.

First, there is faculty scholarship. Our faculty today is the most energetic, most creative, and most productive in the nation. Although we have by far the youngest faculty of any of the nation’s leading law schools, our professors are consistently among the nation’s most influential legal scholars. Moreover, thirty percent of the most-cited professors at Harvard and Yale got their start at Chicago. That is a powerful reflection of our extraordinary culture.

Second, there is teaching. Here, I daresay, we have improved over the years. Although there were always great teachers at Chicago, over the past half-century we have paid ever-more attention to the importance of excellence in the classroom. Here is a simple example: We have a student-teacher evaluation process in which students rate their teachers in each course on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Last year, the median evaluation for all first-year courses was an extraordinary 4.72. That speaks volumes.

Third, there is the curriculum. When I arrived at Chicago, we offered a total of 83 courses. Today, we offer more than 250. Of course, we remain committed to teaching our students such foundational subjects as contracts, torts, corporate law, administrative law, and evidence. But we now also offer our students a broad array of more specialized courses in such areas as corporate governance, juvenile justice, entrepreneurship and the law, global inequality, feminist philosophy, and litigating financial disputes.

Fourth, there are, of course, our students themselves. They are spectacular. The median student today has an LSAT of 170 and an undergraduate GPA of 3.9. But that is only part of the picture, because they also bring a wide diversity of experiences and backgrounds to the Law School. The members of our new entering class, for example, have lived or worked in 37 different nations, had 46 different undergraduate majors, and attended 102 different undergraduate institutions. They are an absolute joy to teach, because they are smart, they are curious, and they are determined to make their mark in the world. What a privilege it is to teach them!

At graduation these days, the comment I hear most often from our departing students is “thank you.” We demand a lot of our students. We ask hard questions. We put them on the spot. We make them understand that they need to know how to deal confidently with uncertainty, confusion, and chaos. It is hard. But when all the dust has settled, they say “thank you.”

And with that, I say thank you, for helping to make this very special place possible. We couldn’t do it without you.

With warm best wishes and much appreciation,

Geoffrey R. Stone, ’71
Interim Dean
Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law
The motto of the University of Chicago is “Crescat Scientia; Vita Excolatur,” which is usually translated as “Let knowledge grow from more to more; and so be human life enriched.” When Michael Schill arrived in 2010 to become the fourteenth dean of the University of Chicago Law School, the first “more” was already well-settled—more than a century in the making. The question was what Schill would do with the rest of the sentence. Schill’s announced plan for the Law School was to go from strength to strength: to make everything good about the Law School even better, and to improve upon its enrichment of human life as well.

Drawn to the Law School by its unique culture and storied history, Schill—whose tenure as dean ended earlier this year when he departed to become president of the University of Oregon—declared his intent to improve upon excellence in his first interview as dean: “While the school is truly extraordinary today, I would not have taken the job to be a caretaker,” he said. “We can be even better.” He stated his intention to increase the school’s interdisciplinary character and more fully engage with the rest of the University, to grow training in leadership and business law, to increase the size of the faculty while maintaining or even improving its quality, to substantially expand existing programs in law and economics and in public service, and to dramatically improve financial aid and scholarships. “I want to spend every waking moment working to make our school better,” he said.

Underlying all of Schill’s goals was an indefatigable commitment to getting to know the Law School’s graduates and asking for their support. It became a hallmark that he would do anything to build relationships with alumni. He once attended a concert of the jam band Widespread Panic at a donor’s request—and went out and purchased jeans for the occasion after his staff told him that his version of casual attire (“suit with no tie”) wouldn’t work.

Jonathan Masur, the John P. Wilson Professor of Law and David and Celia Hilliard Research Scholar who also served as one of Schill’s deputy deans, reports from first-
from one of our most successful graduates—a gift for which [former dean] Saul Levmore deserves a great deal of credit—has allowed us to attract the brightest students in the nation to Chicago. They’re amazing students, just amazing; and they’re going to be great leaders in all segments of society.”

Several additional full-tuition scholarships were funded by generous donors, and overall, financial aid for students was tripled during Schill’s term, with an increase of more than 50 percent in the number of students receiving aid.

Support for students pursuing public service was a high priority for Schill, and his tenure saw significant advances on that front. A full-tuition scholarship is now awarded each year to a student who has demonstrated a commitment to public-interest law. Another donor-funded program enables students to undertake public-interest summer projects around the world, and there are now one-year fellowships for Law School graduates considering long-term public-interest careers. Other improvements in the past five years include the strengthening of the Loan Repayment Assistance Program, the addition of the first full-time staff position focused solely on public-interest and public-service programs, and the introduction of the Pro Bono Service Initiative, through which students pledge to volunteer a minimum of 50 hours of law-related service during their time at the Law School.

Schill’s support for students, unfortunately, sometimes had to extend to the most difficult of circumstances. Several times during Schill’s deanship, tragedy struck the Law School when students were seriously injured or passed away. Schill’s warmth was evident. “Among the many things Mike Schill did so well was his ability to be himself and yet represent us and all that we aspire to be.

Support for Students in Many Ways

Of all the gifts received during his deanship, Schill says that the twenty full-tuition scholarships per year that were first funded in 2010 by David Rubenstein, ’73, have had a particularly far-reaching impact: “That wonderful gift amount raised in any comparable previous period.

Those funds, in turn, enabled dramatic improvements throughout the Law School. Deputy Dean Tom Ginsburg, the Leo Spitz Professor of International Law and Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Research Scholar, asserts, “Mike Schill was the best law school dean in America, an absolutely transformative leader who improved the Law School in every dimension, building on the Law School’s best attributes while positioning it beautifully for continued greatness.”

Schill is the first to credit others for what was achieved during his tenure: “Nothing that we’ve accomplished here would have happened without faculty, administrators, students, and alumni all pulling together. And, of course, it was done because donors gave us the money we needed in order to make it happen.”

Support for Students in Many Ways

Of all the gifts received during his deanship, Schill says that the twenty full-tuition scholarships per year that were first funded in 2010 by David Rubenstein, ’73, have had a particularly far-reaching impact: “That wonderful gift
Attracting faculty was also made possible by Schill’s individual attention to each professor, building on the Law School’s long-standing reputation as a community where faculty can truly thrive. Martha Nussbaum, the Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics, says, “I particularly admire him for his ability to listen to each faculty member and to offer warm and personal support for our work.”

In the classroom, the Law School has always struck a curricular balance between a core of classical legal education and a response to changing times in the legal profession. Schill’s deanship saw developments on both fronts. He focused early in his deanship on elevating one of the Law School’s historical strengths: “This is the school that created Law and Economics, the most important interdisciplinary theory of law of the past seventy-five years, so one very important initiative while I was dean was to add even more energy to the study and application of Law and Economics,” Schill says. A $10 million gift endowed the Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics, and an additional gift allowed for an interdisciplinary housing-focused program related to the...
Institute. The Institute also established a new joint JD/PhD program in Law and Economics and created the Globalizing Law and Economics Initiative, which seeks to transform the legal systems of other nations with the insights of Law and Economics.

Recent years have also seen the introduction of many other interdisciplinary initiatives and strengthened relationships with many of the University’s academic departments. The Law School created a one-year Masters in Law degree to permit doctoral students from any discipline, from inside or outside the University, to include the law within their studies.

A comprehensive business-related curriculum took shape with the 2013 launch of the Doctoroff Business Leadership Program. The program provides an expansive array of intense business courses—taught by Booth School of Business faculty members—for all students, and for some students who are committed to careers in business there are also opportunities for mentorship, internships, and other enrichment opportunities not normally found in law schools. Donors also financed a full professorship and two visiting professorships focused on business law.

Business-related programming will be further reinforced by the presence of a clinical fellow who supervises law students interested in start-ups and other entrepreneurial activity, and by the Kirkland & Ellis Corporate Lab, a clinical program in which students work directly with legal and business leaders at household-name companies.

At the annual Kirkland & Ellis Scholars Reception after graduation, Schill always delighted in toasting the new graduates.
**More Clinics, Even More Practical Skills Training**

Schill saw one of his responsibilities as “eliminating any disconnect between the teaching of analytical skills and the teaching of lawyering skills, so that Chicago students, who are the most brilliant and energized students of any law school anywhere, are also the most effective, no matter what they choose to do.”

Clinics are one way to accomplish that, and in addition to the Corporate Lab, four other new clinics—the Abrams Environmental Law Clinic, the International Human Rights Clinic, the Gendered Violence and the Law Clinic, and the Prosecution and Defense Clinic—were begun during Schill’s tenure. With those new clinics and the expansion of others, for the first time in the Law School’s history enough space is available for any student who wants to participate in a clinical experience.

Practical skills are conveyed through other new programming as well. Schill acknowledges that he was apprehensive when an early practical-skills initiative, the Keystone Professionalism and Leadership Program, was presented to the Visiting Committee in 2012: “I half-expected that our alumni would roll their eyes and say that focusing on what some call ‘soft skills’ was not appropriate for a school like the University of Chicago. To my surprise, however, the idea of a leadership initiative resonated deeply with our alumni.” That endorsement of Keystone led to its continuing evolution, and today it offers more than 70 opportunities each year for students to learn pragmatic skills in written and oral communication, professional judgment, interpersonal skills, and career building, among other areas.

In 2013, the Law School took a much bolder step, joining with the Booth School of Business to adapt Booth’s highly regarded leadership training program to law students, as the Kapnick Leadership Development Initiative. Further financial support has now made it possible to present leadership training to all first-year students during orientation. The Kapnick program is the first of its kind at a top law school and is already showing dividends for the first class to participate. Other law schools regularly inquire about Kapnick in hopes of replicating it.

Practical contract-drafting skills have been taught at the Law School since early in Schill’s tenure, when he brought on an experienced attorney to handle that responsibility, and an endowed lectureship provides another source of pragmatic learning. As the lectureship’s donor, Steven Feirson, ’75, has described it: “My goal was to add the seasoning of real-world experience and perspective to the Law School’s superb scholarly tradition.” Students considering academic careers gained an additional opportunity to immerse themselves deeply in the kind of scholarly work that is the hallmark of law professors through the new yearlong class, Canonical Ideas in American Legal Thought.

**The Long Run**

Just as he led enduring change at the Law School, Schill says that he was personally changed during his tenure: “I became a Chicagoan. I came to the institution really being quite different—I came from NYU, which is definitely not Chicago, and then I came from UCLA, which is most assuredly not Chicago. I like to think that at least in some ways I came to embody and articulate the virtues of this unique and extraordinary law school.”

He expects to remain a Chicagoan. “I want to stay a part of the lives of those I have connected with here, and I want them to stay a part of my life,” he says. “I think that a dean has a role to play even after leaving the institution,”
and I hope to be able to play that role; I hope to be invited back for events and I hope to be able to come to a number of them.” He’ll be in Chicago regularly—about once a month, he expects—because his parents and sister, with whom he is very close, continue to live here.

When Brian Leiter, the Karl N. Llewellyn Professor of Jurisprudence, reported the dean’s impending departure at his blog, he wrote: “It breaks my heart to have to post this, since Mike Schill has been a terrific dean here the last five and a half years. … I know I speak for everyone at Chicago in saying that Mike Schill will be greatly missed.”

Missed he will be, and it’s plain that he will miss Chicago, too. It is already evident that Michael Schill has established an important legacy. His successor, Geoffrey Stone, ’71, the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law who is now serving as interim dean, views Schill’s influence through the lens of more than forty-five years as a student, faculty member, former dean, and University administrator.

“The Law School today is in the best shape that it’s been in my entire time here,” Stone says. “As much as I am proud of what the Law School has accomplished in the past, I’m even more proud of what it’s accomplishing in the present and what I know it will do in the future.”

As knowledge has grown from more to more in the past five-plus years, and life has been enriched both inside and outside the Law School, so will the next deans take up the challenge to continue making an exceptional institution even more exceptional. “This was a great law school the day I came here,” Schill says. “I would like to think that I’ve left it a better place. Deanships are a bit like relay races, and I hope that the dean a half-century from now looks back and says that over the previous fifty years Chicago again changed the world more than any other school.”

“The Once and Interim Dean”

Geoffrey Stone, ’71, the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law, is serving as interim dean of the Law School, as a search committee seeks a more permanent replacement.


In an interview, he shared his thoughts about the nature of his responsibilities as interim dean:

“I have deep commitment to this institution, and a profound admiration for its values and culture. In undertaking this responsibility, my goal is to preserve and protect those values and that culture.

“The Law School today is in the best shape that it’s been in my entire time here in terms of the intellectual culture of the institution, the educational experience for our students, the engagement and productivity of our faculty, and the overall quality of the student experience.

“Michael Schill has made a great contribution, and we all stand on the shoulders of those who made this institution what it is, people like Edward Levi, Gerhard Casper, and Phil Neal, along with generations of faculty and students, and especially alumni who have supported the institution and made possible the remarkable culture that now exists.

“I am looking forward to this opportunity to serve this place that has meant so much to me, and to so many.”
MAKING OF A MOOC
Professor Randy Picker’s massive open online course was a chance to teach—and learn

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

Professor Randal C. Picker was standing in front of the cameras, his black shoes skimming the thick strips of electrical tape stuck to the carpet. This was good. “On the first day of filming, I moved about eight inches forward,” Picker said, adjusting the argyle sweater his wife had picked out for the shoot. “Now I have a mark.” He looked up at Andy, a University of Chicago multimedia specialist who was standing behind one of the cameras in the makeshift studio in the University’s Harper Court building. “But right now I’m wondering whether my hand gestures should be muted, if I’m too big for the screen.”

These weren’t things Picker thought about much before he became the first Law School professor to teach a massive open online course, or MOOC, a project that has been as much about testing the boundaries of traditional education as lecturing on the relationship between law and technology. But in the year leading up to the July 13 launch of “Internet Giants: The Law and Economics of Media Platforms”—months in which he took a filmmaking class at Second City, created 1,213 PowerPoint slides, and spent roughly 40 hours in the Harper Court studio—Picker found himself considering movement, props, lighting, color correction, and other things that generally don’t matter during live Law School instruction. His tendency to wander in class, he learned, didn’t work on camera; his talkative hands did. “Muting your gestures would be terrible,” Andy told him. Picker nodded toward a guest and offered a translation: “Whatever personality I have is in my gestures.” Which seemed to be at least partly true. His
hand movements, smooth and effortless, lent a cohesive energy to his monologue. It was as if he already knew his future audience, which would number nearly 3,000 people from 124 countries just three weeks after launch and would continue grow steadily throughout the summer. It was as if they were right there.

“Are we ready?” Andy asked, as Picker, the James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law, checked his feet and his microphone. Andy counted down and the other three members of the crew took their places—behind the second camera, on the audio board, and at a table making postproduction notes. That day’s topic, one of seven collections of segments that would make up the final twenty-hour course, was music platforms. But it was May 4, so Picker opened with a Star Wars reference.

“This is a day when Star Wars geeks walk around saying, ‘May the Fourth be with you.’ It’s funny how a particular piece of storytelling takes on this kind of significance,” he said, smiling slightly as he slid from pop culture into the main topic. “But that can’t happen without the platforms for distributing that content.” For the next four minutes—a nice, short, MOOC-friendly chunk—he stuck to his mark as he spoke, pivoting among two cameras and a PowerPoint display before finishing to nods of approval from his team.

As usual, he’d nailed it on the first take.

***

Much in the way that digital platforms have transformed music, video, and publishing, they have changed the ways people learn and scholars teach, and MOOCs are a part of that movement. Unlike traditional university instruction, open online courses are generally free and accessible to anyone with an Internet connection; much of the fervor has stemmed from the vehicle’s potential to democratize education. In the past few years elite universities, eager to throw open their gates in this way, have launched what is essentially a giant pedagogical experiment, partnering with major MOOC providers like edX, a nonprofit startup from Harvard and MIT, and Coursera, the for-profit platform that hosted Picker’s Internet Giants. UChicago has offered five not-for-credit MOOCs, including Picker’s, drawing tens of thousands of participants and contributing to the University’s broader look at digital learning.

Nationwide, the conversation about MOOCs has followed a predictable path, with breathless start-up frenzy giving way to sober dismay that the medium hadn’t yet “disrupted” higher education. But amid the chatter, Picker’s course—and UChicago’s strategy—have deftly advanced the cause, exploring the vehicle’s power not as a digital replacement for face-to-face instruction but as a way to extend, layer, and even scale the academic experience. Picker has been skeptical of both hype (MOOCs will change everything!) and defeatist backlash (MOOCs are over!), preferring instead to act as a patient, curious fact gatherer steering toward an evolving, and increasingly well-informed, goal.

“The MOOC bubble has passed, and we’re at the next stage, doing the hard work,” said Picker, who was appointed in 2013 to the University’s online education committee, which considers faculty proposals for digital courses. Internet Giants wasn’t designed to replace any part of the Law School experience but to test new avenues of learning and to engage alumni in powerful new ways. It is the first UChicago MOOC to be released as an on-demand package rather than rolled out week by week and the first to include an alumni component featuring video chats, discussion groups, extra videos, and a blog available only to UChicago graduates.

“Higher education is evolving, and there is more demand for lifelong learning,” said Mark Nemec, the Dean of the Graham School of Continuing Liberal and Professional Studies, which oversees the alumni piece. “President Zimmer has suggested, and I fully agree, that we’re seeing a potential redefinition of what it means to be a student and an alumnus. And one of the things that might accelerate that redefinition is online learning, which allows teaching to be asynchronous—anywhere and at any time. What it means to be an alumnus is becoming interesting.”
“Finishing the binge was psychologically identical to finishing the last episode of the last season of an involving TV show,” a participant with the Twitter handle @drewmmichaels wrote to Picker on July 30.

Picker—who had commented that he wasn’t sure if he’d created something more akin to *Citizen Kane*, considered by many filmmakers to be the best movie ever made, or *Ishtar*, a notorious box-office failure—joked that “maybe *Breaking Bad* should have been the target.”

“A thousand times more cohesive than *Ishtar*, a thousand times more entertaining than *Citizen Kane*,” @drewmmichaels assured him.

A participant with the handle @kovacsLLC chimed in: “Agree — it’s a one man tour-de-force. Can we nominate @randypicker for a Webby?”

Internet Giants also had tremendous global reach, with more than two-thirds of the students coming from outside the United States, from places such as India, China, Brazil, Russia, and Germany. “There are four people in the course from Malta,” Picker marveled in early August. “There are three people from Zambia, there’s two people from the Ivory Coast, I have someone watching from Iraq. The idea that across the planet people are watching this—wow. That’s not bad.”

Alumni engagement was also strong: In the three weeks after Internet Giants launched, about 1,000 UChicago alumni—about one-fifth of them Law School graduates—had registered for the exclusive UChicago extras, and 600 had actively participated in some way.

For Richard B. Leverett, ‘10, the course offered an opportunity to finally take a class from Picker, something he hadn’t had a chance to do in law school. Even better, it was directly useful to him as the Director of External Affairs at AT&T Indiana. “This class is right on point with a lot of what’s going on in the industry right now—and things like network theory are relevant to my position,” said Leverett, who has recommended the MOOC to colleagues. “This class has been perfect for me.”

Leverett has devoted about an hour a day to the class, which covers topics such as the debate over network neutrality, the fight over Google Search, the complex legal infrastructure of smartphones and tablets, the US and European Union antitrust cases against Microsoft, and the legal issues that followed the rise of music, video, and publishing platforms. Leverett has participated in the alumni video chats and discussion boards, where he said Picker is able to make jokes that “only alumni would get.”
“To be able to go online and have multiple videos of Professor Picker—it really is like binge watching a Netflix series over and over again. And these topics are just amazing,” he said. “It’s a perfect way to get high-level interaction—and it’s so refreshing to be back in that space a bit.”

Which is exactly the point.

“The idea of taking the residential experience and moving it online so it can be a continuing experience in their lives—that’s what this makes possible,” Picker said. “Is all of residential education going to go away? I don’t think so. But this is something new and different that is also valuable.”

***

Founding President William Rainey Harper could never have predicted the MOOC, but the platform fits his early vision for the University of Chicago. Harper pioneered correspondence education and started what became the first university extension program in the United States.

“The MOOC is completely consistent with that founding vision,” Picker said. “It’s another way we convey ideas and reach out to a larger audience.”

This vision of the MOOC as a complementary layer is a subtle but important distinction that sets UChicago apart from the mainstream conversation about MOOCs, which has focused on accelerating credentials.

“At the University of Chicago we’re not interested in the credentialing potential of online learning—we’re interested in the pedagogical potential,” Nemec said. “This is important because when you have debates about online learning, people are worried about the credential without thinking about this as an instrument. It hasn’t helped that, early on, the rhetoric from the MOOC providers was that they were going to replace the universities. Now, they’ve stepped back, and it’s more about being part of this multichannel approach.”

This is how Picker sees the MOOC, as a third way of teaching, a mode that offers its own distinct advantages. Law School seminars, for instance, focus heavily on class discussion, and Law School courses rely on the Socratic Method of questioning until contradictions are exposed and the heart of a topic or analysis has been revealed. MOOCs, by contrast to both, are primarily lecture based. Participants don’t have many opportunities to engage with classmates during the lecture, and nor do they follow ideas down blind alleys, backing up to figure out where their analysis went wrong. MOOCs, however, do offer students a chance to self-pace, pause and digest, and rewatch intriguing or complicated portions of a lecture. And the discussions that happen on boards and in video chats often involve a wide

Picker and a small crew filmed the MOOC in a makeshift studio in the University’s Harper Court building.
variety of perspectives and levels of experience.

"The first topic in the course is Microsoft antitrust, and we had people in the discussion who were participants in those cases," Picker said. "One of the people taking the MOOC was a computer science professor from Utah who had been an expert witness in the case."

Internet Giants is easy to navigate, laid out in nine sections that include an overview at the beginning, seven modules, and a course review. The modules—for example, "Microsoft: The Desktop v. the Internet," "Nondiscrimination and Neutrality," and "Google Emerges"—are divided into lessons, which are further divided into short videos. Participants are able to gauge their understanding of the material by taking three-question practice quizzes at the end of each segment, eight-to-twelve-question graded quizzes at the end of each module, and a seventy-question final exam. Users can access the Picker's PowerPoint slides, as well as reading lists, sources, and an "Updates and Corrections" section, where Picker is able to share recent changes in the law. He used this in the "Smartphones" module, for instance, to note that a US appeals court had partially overturned a nearly $1 billion jury verdict Apple had won in a patent-infringement case against Samsung over smartphone design—a decision that came down in May, after filming had wrapped.

"I like the flexibility and the fact that people can come into MOOCs with different kinds of backgrounds," said Rose, a staff attorney with Public Knowledge, a nonprofit that promotes an open Internet and access to affordable communications tools. "You can focus on what is new to you, as well as things that are particularly interesting or relevant to where you are."

Of course, the biggest difference between a live class and a MOOC: scale. Picker, who teaches an average of 104 students per quarter in his Antitrust class, would have to teach that class more than 28 times to reach the same number of students as he did during the first three weeks of Internet Giants. (To be fair, not all of those 3,000 participated fully, but it does help illustrate why the "M" in MOOC stands for "massive.")

"I had a waiting list of thirty-eight students for my winter Antitrust class," Picker wrote in July in a guest column on the Volokh Conspiracy blog on the WashingtonPost.com. "But the room holds what the room holds. All that makes education expensive—I say that as a writer of college tuition checks—and intensely local." Of course, this isn’t an argument against face-to-face instruction; Picker’s hope is that the MOOC engages students who will never go to law school, or who have already been and want to learn something new, or even those who are trying to decide whether to go.

"I talked to a woman today who is a second year at the College who is trying to decide if she’s going to go to law school," Picker said in May. "She’s going to watch the course over the summer. I would regard a perfect result as her applying to the Law School in two years. I hope when people watch the course they will see what I find exciting about the law. If that makes them all want to go to law school, great. But if instead it just makes them pick up the newspaper the next day and see a story about one of these subjects and say, ‘Oooh, I have to read that,’ that’s good too."

All of these benefits were among the reasons Picker decided in May 2014 to join the MOOC movement. Over two hours on a Sunday evening, Picker wrote a four-page proposal for Internet Giants, reimagining three of his face-to-face Law School courses—Antitrust, Network Industries, and Copyright—as a whole new course, one geared for a MOOC audience.

There was a learning curve. Picker had to divide ideas into many short chunks—an ideal MOOC segment runs about six to nine minutes—and he had to adjust to being the only one talking. “If I lecture for fifteen minutes during a sixty-five-minute class, that’s a lot,” he said. “And in a seminar, I’m really more of an orchestra conductor.”

Picker kept his lectures relatable by pretending that the cameras were students.
He also had to engage an audience that didn’t yet exist, and he had to speak in a way that is both accessible and sophisticated, perhaps stopping to define a term like “externality” but not shying away from robust ideas. “The big change for me was recognizing that I might be talking to people who hadn’t read anything,” he said. “I can count on my students at the Law School to do the reading before class. Here, I explain things more directly and fully.”

By early summer, postproduction was in full swing and the launch date was looming.

A University multimedia specialist, on a tight turnaround between filming and release, was working long days editing video. Picker and Reggie Jackson, a UChicago academic technology analyst, were building the final product on Coursera, debating structure and overview language. A small Law School focus group was offering feedback on two different versions of the trailer, one of which would soon be released, and Picker and his production team were exchanging flurries of emails about things like color correction.

“Look at this video—it looks too red to me,” Picker told a visitor one afternoon, pointing to a rough cut of MOOC footage on the computer screen in his office. These were things he noticed now.

By late summer, the MOOC was well underway, enrollment was climbing, and the book-lined set that had been built for Picker was being used to record lectures for faculty from the Biological Sciences Division. Picker, no longer focused on hand gestures and electrical tape, was thinking about his MOOC’s future.

He’d been experimenting with different ways to engage his students, recognizing that there were many valuable ways to participate and that not every way would fit every student’s schedule, interests, and learning style. For instance, he’d recently run an Internet Giants blog exercise in which he’d posted a topic and invited participants to pick a side and argue. Picker received 35 responses to that, and he planned to use the discussion as the basis for an additional video. He had also taught a version of Internet Giants live to visiting international scholars who were part of the Law School’s Summer Institute in Law and Economics, some of whom participated in the MOOC as well.

Now, rather than focusing on a second online course, he was adding more layers to Internet Giants, continuing the test the MOOC’s engagement potential. The segments, by themselves, are like a video textbook, he said—the real power comes from the discussions and interactions that grow out of them. Figuring out which pieces best achieve that is part of the experiment.

“How do you turn a video book into an ideas community? I don’t want you to read the book and be done,” he said. “How do I bring the next 3,000 students in, and for the people who are already here, what is the next part of our process together?”

That week, he tacked on a bonus module titled Internet Giants: Experimental. He had three ideas in mind: an online reading group on topics related to the MOOC, a series of podcasts, and additional video chats on Google Hangouts. He launched the book group first with a discussion of BlackBerry’s demise, offering up a list of suggested readings that included the 2015 book by Jacque McNish and Sean Silcoff, Losing the Signal: The Untold Story Behind the Extraordinary Rise and Spectacular Fall of BlackBerry. The group planned to discuss the readings online, with a video commentary and video chat at the end of August. Down the road, he said, video chats might function as small workshops, and podcasts might feature Picker in a dialog about topics related to Internet Giants.

As it had been from the beginning, the process was still one of curiosity and discovery. But it was also one that had already succeeded in its central mission: to bring people together to share, learn, and celebrate new ideas.

“The University of Chicago is the most exciting intellectual community on the planet, and we want to capture that,” he said. “I am excited that people who have responded the MOOC most directly love the material and see what I love about the material—that is incredibly gratifying.”
Being one of the nation’s best-respected civil libertarians comes with a certain amount of responsibility, and that’s one reason Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and the Law School’s Interim Dean, keeps saying “yes.”

In the past two years, Stone has weighed in on some of the highest-profile issues of our time, offering his perspective at the highest levels of all three branches of government. He spent nearly five months holed away with four other experts to review National Security Agency practices in the wake of the Edward Snowden leak; joined a highly confidential group advising the Director of National Intelligence; met with White House officials on issues related to sexual violence on college campuses; and coauthored an amicus brief in the historic Obergefell v. Hodges case in which he and other scholars urged the Court to apply heightened scrutiny when determining whether laws, such as same-sex marriage bans, discriminate against gays and lesbians.

His work has had an impact. On June 2, 2015, President Obama signed the USA Freedom Act, which included several of the most important of the 46 recommendations Stone and the other members of President Obama’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology made in their 304-page report. The new law, among other things, imposes new limits on the bulk collection of US citizens’ telecommunications metadata by American intelligence agencies.

A few weeks later, on June 26, the Supreme Court handed down the much-anticipated 5–4 ruling in
Stone: It was just one meeting, in January, at the White House. They brought together five law professors—two from Harvard, one from Cornell, one from Penn, and me—to get our perspectives on how Title IX [which prohibits gender discrimination in federally funded programs and includes an obligation to protect students from sexual violence and harassment] is being enforced by the Department of Education. The five of us shared some pretty strong concerns, mostly focused on due process. We all agreed that campus sexual assault needs to be dealt with—either or both by the criminal law and by the universities. But we had two central questions: how do you define sexual assault, which is complicated; and what are the procedural mechanisms that should be employed in serious disciplinary matters against students? Before expelling or suspending a student, should the burden of proof be “preponderance of the evidence,” which is what the Department of Education has imposed, or should it be the more rigorous standard, “clear and convincing evidence,” which the five of us felt was more appropriate? It was interesting to us because as lawyers we have a particular sense of due process, and as law professors we understand that there’s a special harm done to law students who are expelled because this goes on their bar records and can destroy their careers. Law schools are therefore particularly sensitive.

Gillespie: Did you find yourself drawing not just on your expertise as a legal scholar but on your experience as a former Law School Dean and former University Provost? Did that change how you approached the questions?

Stone: When I asked them, “Why me?” part of the reason they gave is that it would be useful to have the perspective of someone who had been a dean and a provost. Did that actually have an impact on the way I think about these questions? Probably to some degree. Having experience overseeing disciplinary committees, I do understand the dangers in this process. You’re dealing with an institution that has no expertise—universities are not designed to sort out complicated factual disputes about what happened in a particular situation. We just aren’t very good at this.

Gillespie: Yet they’re being called upon to fill this role. How will this play out—or, rather, how do you hope it will play out?

Stone: My own view, like that of the other four individuals who were there, is that there needs to be a
is whether the characteristic is relevant to the ability of people to perform in society; and fourth is whether the group is fully capable of protecting itself in the political process. We explained why each of those criteria satisfy here and urged the Court to adopt that approach.

**Gillespie:** Let's talk a bit about your work on the NSA review panel. Two weeks ago, President Obama signed the USA Freedom Act, which must have felt like a big achievement.

**Stone:** That work has had an enormous impact, much more than I expected at the time. The USA Freedom Act, and a number of other reforms that the President has instituted himself, simply would not have existed but for the fact that we wrote the report. The potential impact of our work became clearer to me as the process went along. It became apparent that the attention being paid to us by members of the House and Senate, the intelligence agencies, and the various privacy and civil liberties groups was escalating as our work went along. And as it became evident that these groups were taking us seriously, other groups realized they had to take us seriously, too. By the time we finished our report and turned it in to the President, it seemed possible that it would have a real impact.

**Gillespie:** And there was consensus among the members of your group, which represented a mix of very different perspectives and backgrounds.

**Stone:** It remains surprising to the five of us. Michael Morell [former Deputy Director of the CIA] and I had lunch recently, and we noted how incredible it was that we all—especially Mike and I—agreed on all these things. Part of it was that we learned to trust each other, and we learned from each other, and the combination of those two things enabled us to find common ground in lots of situations we otherwise never would have imagined possible. Once I understood more fully why certain aspects of the programs were important and valuable, I agreed to things I previously didn’t think I’d agree to. And Morrell and Richard Clarke [cybersecurity and antiterrorism advisor to two presidents] similarly came to understand better why civil liberties and privacy were critical and that it was possible to modify these programs in ways that would retain their effectiveness while still preserving these other interests. A lot of it was understanding from each other how we could make things better. It wasn’t, “Let’s throw out national security” or “Let’s throw out privacy and civil liberties”—it was trying to figure out how to do a much better job of achieving both.

**Gillespie:** Developing this kind of trust and finding this kind of common ground isn’t easy, especially when...
the stakes are so high and the issues are so big. It’s not something that happens often in, say, broad public discourse or in Congress. How did your group do it?

**Stone:** The main thing is that it wasn’t necessary for any of the sides to throw their concerns out the window. The goal was not to “win.” We were able to recognize that the programs, as they existed, could be made better without sacrificing one interest for the other. So why is this able to happen here and not in politics? Well, first of all, because this isn’t politics. Politicians, even if they’re capable of seeing a better approach, feel constraints that prevent them from being able to do the right thing. Happily, within this group, we were able to figure out how to do the right thing without feeling like we were betraying anything important, and not feeling answerable to anyone but ourselves.

**Gillespie:** Has this work impacted your beliefs in any way? Are there things you look at differently now?

**Stone:** My confidence in Congress is even lower than it was before. I don’t think Congress was effective in meeting its oversight responsibilities. One of the recommendations I regret not making—and this just didn’t occur to us—is that entities like the Review Group should be appointed on a regular basis. Inside this intelligence world, people get obsessed with compliance, with making sure people are not violating the rules. They forget to ask if the programs can be made better. The best way to do that is to have fresh eyes. The reason we were able to contribute as much as we did is because we came in with fresh eyes.

**Gillespie:** Participating in the Review Group has given you a unique vantage point. What have you learned about the people working in the intelligence community?

**Stone:** The responsibility of keeping the nation safe against a potentially grave terrorist attack is awesome. Those people live with the feeling every day that it is on their shoulders to prevent another 9/11—or a chemical attack, a biological attack, a nuclear attack. Seeing the dangers as they do—the real dangers that exist out in the world—is pretty impressive. Most of us happily assume that those risks aren’t as great as they are. But the fact is, these government officials are good at what they do, and we haven’t had another 9/11, and people think we don’t have to worry about it. But we do have to worry about it, and there are people who are worrying about it. I came away with a real sense of respect for the work they do and the burden they carry. On the other hand, the NSA needs to understand that we should never trust the intelligence community. The potential for them to do bad things, even for good motives, is enormous. The pressure on them to keep the nation safe could lead them, in the absence of very serious checks and balances, to err too much on the side of keeping us safe without fully preserving our civil liberties and privacy.

**Gillespie:** You’ve made no secret of the fact that you developed immense respect for the NSA over the course of this work. Were you surprised to feel this way?

**Stone:** I went into this with the assumption that the NSA had run amok, that the NSA was a law unto itself, that
it was devising these programs without approval and without supervision. That’s what the media had led us to believe. What I found—and this was really was surprising to me and it really impressed me—was that the degree of oversight in this realm was far greater than what I had ever imagined, and that the executive, the Congress, and the judiciary had approved and authorized even the most problematic of the NSA’s programs. Even beyond that, what I found was that the NSA was a pretty scrupulous entity in terms of attempting to stay within the authorities it had been given.

**Gillespie:** How have these experiences informed what you do as a law professor, both in the classroom and in your scholarship?

**Stone:** It certainly affects my work in the classroom because I can draw upon all this when I teach. I’ve drawn upon this kind of material in my Elements class and in my First Amendment class. In terms of scholarship, though, I’ve been ambivalent about writing about it. I’ve written a lot in terms of op-eds and the *Huffington Post*, but I’ve avoided writing about it in a more serious way because I have so much classified stuff in my head. Anything I write has to be cleared. It’s more of a pain than its worth. It’s hard to write seriously about this, too, when there are things I know that are relevant but that I can’t talk about.

**Gillespie:** How is this work like being a law professor, or a law school dean, or a university provost? Do you flex some of the same muscles when you’re working on an advisory committee?

**Stone:** What I bring to every meeting, whether it’s the discussion of the sexual assault issue or the Senior Advisory Group or the NSA Review Group, is who I am as a thinker, a lawyer, and a law professor. I ask questions, I make arguments, I push people hard. I make them confront their own beliefs. I do the law professor thing. Within the Review Group, there are recommendations we made that are, at least in part, the product of that perspective. One of the things we talked about in the very beginning of the report, and which shaped a lot of the report, was the work I did writing *Perilous Times* [Stone’s 2005 book examining how free speech and other civil liberties have been compromised during wartime]. A key part of educating other members of the Review Group was talking to them about our history and about the fact that, during periods of crisis, we have always overreacted. It was critical for them to understand this. We had to start from that assumption. That helped all of us see the ways in which we could better critique the existing programs. I brought to bear in these conversations a lot of the work I did in *Perilous Times* and in another book, *Top Secret*.

More than that, though, I brought into the mix a certain intellectual style, a distinctive way of approaching questions. Part of that is being a lawyer, and part of it is being a law professor. The kind of probing I attempted to bring to our discussion—not only to educate myself but also to get others in the groups to think critically about their own perspectives—is the same thing we do in class and at faculty workshops every day.

**Gillespie:** Were there pieces of this work that felt less familiar or were difficult for you?

**Stone:** Oh, it was a nightmare—both in the NSA context and now in the SAG context. The intelligence world is incredibly complex, and everybody talks in acronyms. Of the five of us in the Review Group, I was the one with the least inside-the-government experience.

**Gillespie:** How did you deal with that?

**Stone:** It felt like being a first-year law student thrown into a third-year class. It was an extraordinarily challenging learning experience, trying to figure out how to get up to speed. There were things I knew, and things I could bring to bear, that the others didn’t have. But fundamentally, to even talk the talk, you had to know what NIST [National Institute of Standards and Technology] was and what ODNI [Office of the Director of National Intelligence] was. And I didn’t. So from the outset, I had the sense of being dropped into a black hole and having to scramble to know what everybody else was talking about. It was daunting, and it really did remind me of being a first-year law student.

A first-week law student. I had to figure out how I could justify my existence in this group. In some ways, I think each of them felt that—but I think I felt it the most because I started the farthest from the starting line. But, because I always feel a need to contribute in important ways in everything I do, it made me work harder. I needed to figure out how I could make a meaningful contribution. And that was both fun and deeply, profoundly challenging.

**Gillespie:** In the end, was that a valuable part of the experience—to be at your level of accomplishment and still be pushed in such profound ways?

**Stone:** Yes—it was a great experience in every way. It was fascinating to learn about this part of the world. It was fascinating to deal with the group and to experience those interactions, which were really remarkable. It was a unique experience in my life. We were asked to solve insoluble problems in a ridiculously short period of time and to write a 300-page report. We had a hundred different meetings with all parts of the intelligence community, with privacy and civil
liberties groups, with the House and Senate intelligence and judiciary committees, with individual members of Congress and the Department of Justice, the CIA, FBI, Homeland Security, and on and on. It was endless. Each entity had its own perspective, and we constantly had to try to absorb all this input and grasp all the different perspectives. It was an amazingly challenging experience.

Gillespie: Other than the obvious reason of not saying no to the President, why say yes to these opportunities?

Stone: Partly a sense of public responsibility and partly a sense of curiosity. I agreed to do the Senior Advisory Group mainly for those reasons. My sense was that, possibly for the first time, the intelligence community trusted someone they perceived as a civil libertarian enough to invite him into this world, and to the extent that I could offer a perspective that might not otherwise be voiced, I knew I could be valuable. I figured I should do that. If I’d said no, they probably wouldn’t have asked someone else like me. I’d gained credibility from my experience on the Review Group.

Gillespie: This last question gets to the root of our theme for this issue of the Record. Why is it important, from the Law School’s standpoint, for scholars to accept, or even seek out, opportunities like these?

Stone: We, across the University, have expertise that is extremely valuable not only to other academics, our primary audience, but to the general public. One of the reasons I’ve taken to writing a lot in the Huffington Post and in newspapers is because I came to the view that educating people in general is something we can do that is a real public service. And this is true across the whole university—it doesn’t matter whether you’re an anthropologist, a historian, an astronomer, or a law professor—we know all sorts of stuff that can help educate the American public about issues ranging from science to sociology to art. I get great satisfaction from knowing that I’ve helped people better understand issues that matter to me. It’s important for people in the academy to realize they can add great value by sharing their insights with the public. With the government work, it’s the same thing. We have a perspective that is different, and it’s useful for people in government to hear that. It will help them do better.

As professors, we focus so much—appropriately—on scholarship, but I think it is also important to recognize that we can contribute to the larger society precisely because we are scholars.
India needs new cities. The nation’s metropolitan areas are overcrowded, and those who want to leave rural areas are having difficulty finding places to live and work. According to Anup Malani, Lee and Brena Freeman Professor of Law, as many as 16 million new people are coming into India’s cities every year, and the situation is getting worse. Fortunately, among the organizations and individuals who are doing something about this crisis are recent University of Chicago graduates who have found a role to play through the International Innovation Corps. Malani founded the IIC to bring the talents and education of UChicago graduates—including College, graduate school, and professional school alumni—to some of the most challenging problems in the third world. Fifteen Chicago grads, or Fellows as they are called in the program, came to India last August, and five began work with the Delhi Mumbai Industrial Corridor Development Corporation (DMICDC), a government-run $90 billion infrastructure program that will run new train lines between the two megacities and that plans to build twenty-four new cities in the corridor itself. The IIC fellows worked on one of those planned cities.

“The intent of IIC is to bring the research capabilities and the general competence of postgraduate students to government institutions. They help the governments to become more facile, more competent, and more independent,” explained noted architect, city designer, and IIC Mentor Peter Ellis, who works with the DMICDC. “The Fellows who came to work on the new city have done a brilliant job by bringing a depth of analysis and a kind of boldness to the group that was not present before. I was very impressed.”

In addition to planning cities of the future, IIC fellows are implementing microgrid solar power technology in villages without access to the electrical grid and are developing training programs for the Indian textile industry, the third-largest industry (by employment) in the nation. But such work is just the beginning. The program, which was first conceived in the fall of 2013, has just begun its second year, and its leadership could not be more excited about the changes the Fellows will bring in years to come.

The idea to create IIC came to Malani while conducting his own research. Since 2010 he has been studying how health insurance can be provided to more low-income individuals and families in India. While undertaking this study, Malani kept coming across government officials who were looking for assistance in many different areas. For example, one official asked for help with how to clean up a database of information on household assets so that such information could be placed on cards that individuals could carry with them. The portable cards would make it easy for them to sign up for a variety of government services all at the same time.

“The questions and requests for help kept coming in and I thought that these were really neat problems to solve, but I simply didn’t have the bandwidth to do it.”
The government officials sought help because the Indian government, which does not pay well, has a shortage of well-educated, well-trained employees. “Talented graduates there are going into the private sector,” Malani explained.

Then he met Sanjay Bhargava, one of the chief business architects of PayPal, in June 2013. Bhargava also felt that that the Indian government was interested in taking on intriguing projects but was unable to execute them because of a lack of trained labor. “I realized we had to figure out a way to bring the skilled labor from Chicago to India. And we had to raise funds for competitive wages, wages that the Indian government wouldn’t or couldn’t pay,” Malani said.

Malani, Bhargava, and Phoebe Holtzman, who led development and operations for Malani’s health insurance project, decided that they could raise philanthropic funds to provide both expertise for the Indian government and good jobs for the potential fellows. Over the next several months, the trio began searching for funding with assistance from the University’s Office of Alumni Relations and Development. By February 2014 they had funding in place for three projects and began active recruitment. They hired both Chicago graduates and accomplished Indian university graduates to join the project.

“The idea is that, while we pay less than our graduates might make if they joined corporate America, the cost of living is so low in India that if they take these jobs they will have the opportunity to save a lot of money,” Malani explained. “And these salaries are quite high for Indian graduates, which means we could attract some of the best that their universities have to offer.” Moreover, along with good pay, these jobs offered levels of responsibility that new graduates rarely acquire. After a year in the program, the Fellows have high-level government and industry contacts in a number of different sectors and have significant experience that will allow them to take on more advanced positions than they otherwise might have been able to get so early in their careers.

Ayesha Khan is an IIC fellow who was educated in India. An attorney who trained at the National University of Juridical Sciences, she spent two years at a law firm working on corporate, contract, employment, and intellectual property law before joining the program. Khan was assigned to the National Skills Development Corporation (NSDC) to help create sustainable jobs in the textile and apparel industries. While the textile industry employs between forty million and sixty million people, few of its workers are trained, much of the work takes place in homes, and the lack of uniformity in the products makes sales to companies like Gap and H&M very difficult. Khan spent a year working with the state governments of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab, Karnataka, West Bengal, and New Delhi to initiate training programs for youth and women.

“All of these projects involved extensive negotiations with government leaders, strategizing innovative models of skilling, arranging funding from various stakeholders, and, finally, implementation with the relevant industries and skilling partners,” Khan explained. One project she worked on was the Khadi Village Industries Commission, which plans to up-skill a million artisans and village workers in the next five years, thus improving the quality...
of their production and their livelihoods.

“Now I see a lot of change in people’s perceptions towards vocational education, largely due to NSDC’s efforts. People, especially youth, are looking more favorably at vocational training as an alternative to formal education,” Khan added.

The Chicago and Indian fellows meet in Chicago for three weeks of training before they begin their work in India. “The training is sort of a mini, practical MBA, which teaches people how to look at a problem, how to conceptualize it, and how to solve it as a team,” Malani noted. “One of the neat things is that we don’t just sit in a classroom, we hook teams up with a nonprofit and have them solve a particular problem for the nonprofit as part of the training. It’s a small-scale project before they go abroad for a large-scale project.”

Booth Associate Professor of Marketing Oleg Urminsky is an IIC mentor who teaches in the training program. “One of the things I talk about is scaling the data to the problem at hand,” Urminsky said. “I have to say they do a great job of recruiting talent—the caliber of questions they ask and the skills they come in with are really impressive.”

Mentors are another key component of IIC. Malani finds mentors as he goes about finding projects. The mentors are experts in various fields on both sides of the world who volunteer to answer questions and to direct fellows to specific resources when they need assistance.

“The point of a mentor is to help Fellows find their way. None of them has ever designed a city. My role was to lead the students through the process to determine what is important, what they should focus on, and how they could be effective. They received instruction from DMICDC and then they asked for help,” Ellis said.

Matthew Klein, who graduated in 2014 from the College with a degree in economics and environmental studies,
worked on special projects for the DMICDC. His long-term assignment was determining how best to structure the governments of the proposed urban areas. “These new cities are charter cities, so there are many questions about how their governments can work, what responsibilities cities can have, and what authority they can command.” He also worked on a project focusing on how the central government can best engender the start-up movement.

Last year, IIC had a highly competitive selection process. Leadership reviewed more than 130 applicants and chose the Fellows whose skills best matched projects’ needs. For example, a team with knowledge of marketing, business, and legal work was assigned to the third project for the 2014–15 year. Central Electronics Limited is a government corporation that manufactures electronics. The team assigned to it was tasked with determining if solar technology can be used for rural electrification in villages not on the grid. They are currently running a pilot program with the government and an NGO. “They are trying to expand this to roughly thirty villages and are also working with the charter city’s team to try to set up LEED-type standards for the new cities,” Malani added.

For the 2015–16 year, IIC leadership is hiring between twenty-one and forty Fellows, depending on the funding they receive. They have already gotten generous grants from the Tata Trust to do work in sanitation and sustainable energy and the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation to do work in education. They also have a project with the US Agency for International Development and the UK’s Department for International Development to build out a new social impact fund, in part by providing business incubation services to social entrepreneurs.

The following year, Malani hopes to expand IIC to Latin America and perhaps to Cambodia, Kenya, and Afghanistan. “Of course, we need to find the right people and the right connections for the right project, and we can’t do anything without funding,” he commented. “But we would really love to get some of our LLMs involved in IIC. A lot of them go back to their countries and work for their governments, and perhaps they can point us to good projects.”
mostly between the ages of 15 and 18. The new class, a modified version of the seminar Buss teaches Law School students, was designed for a small group of University-affiliated high school pupils interested in delving into the complicated issues of youth justice. For eight weeks this winter, the teens—eight from the Laboratory High School and seven from the University of Chicago Woodlawn Charter School—studied law, engaged in frank discussion and analysis, and offered their unique perspectives on juvenile offenders, culpability, disproportionate minority contact, crime prevention, and youth interactions with police. Eight law students, all 2Ls and 3Ls enrolled in Buss’s Law School seminar, served as teaching assistants (TAs)—an experience that introduced them to new views on youth justice and led to unexpected mentoring relationships.

“There is a freshness about how young people approach things, what they’re willing to say,” Buss said. “They are...
full of ideas, they are full of enthusiasm, and when they’re excited about something, the sky is the limit.”

As Conley’s group grappled with questions of racial bias and school discipline, they were passionate and pensive and often delivered what seemed to be deeply personal commentary.

“I think the schools with students of color have tough rules because they know that’s how the real world is going to treat us,” Conley, then a senior at Woodlawn, told her classmates. “I don’t think they always go about it the right way, but they’re letting us know that’s how the world is going to handle us, and this way, we can learn to react.”

After a few minutes of discussion, law student Keiko

Later, as Buss reflected on the exchange, she noted that what made the discussions especially interesting, for the students and for her, was that for every student viewpoint, there was a counterview. “The students learned about developing an argument and also showed an openness to persuasive counterarguments,” Buss said. “And I got the valuable reminder that there is no more a single youth view than there is a single adult view on these issues.”

The idea to offer the Juvenile Justice seminar to high school students grew out of Buss’s scholarly interest in how young people’s experiences with, and observations of, law enforcement affect their social identity development.

“Adolescents are in the process of crossing over into adulthood, and in this sense they challenge the law’s age-based categories,” Buss said. “They aren’t children. They aren’t adults. They’re in a transitional phase, and while much of the law is designed to try to help children, the law is not well designed to help adolescents to grow out of childhood. We’re better at drawing lines and having two sets of rules than figuring out how to get young people from here to there.”

So part of it was wanting to hear from young people and wanting some of her law students to hear from them, too. But Buss, who has strong ties to Lab as a parent and a former board member, also wanted to foster interaction among students from Lab, a private school that is more than half Caucasian, and Woodlawn, a public charter school that is nearly 98 percent African-American and operated by the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute.

What she didn’t know at the beginning was how the relationships and discussions would unfold among the participants. The project was an experiment, a concept

Eight law students, all 2Ls and 3Ls taking a Law School version of the class, served as teaching assistants.

High school students in Professor Emily Buss’s Juvenile Justice seminar studied law and engaged in frank discussion and analysis.

...
Buss encouraged the students to embrace, offering them opportunities to give feedback through weekly “plus/minus cards.” In addition, there was this: law professors, and law students, don’t traditionally spend their time teaching high school students. Buss believed that the project was valuable, in part because it offered the law student TAs a chance to engage deeply on the issues they were studying in their Law School class.

“I found this rewarding both because I’m a law professor and because I’m a citizen of this city and this University community,” Buss said several weeks after the class ended. “I felt that the work I was doing, and the wonderful work the law students did, enriched the intellectual life of 15 high school students. The truth is, there are lots of things that we do, and things that are worth doing, that build only indirectly upon our professional responsibilities.”

The high school and Law School versions of the seminar met in back-to-back, two-hour blocks and covered roughly the same topics, though the law students of course had more reading and delved deeper into legal issues. In the high school class, law students spent a chunk of each session leading small groups in working through tough questions: Why do young people commit crimes? How should society respond, and who should be held responsible? What rights do young people have, and is the criminal justice process fair? How do teens differ from adults, and how should that affect how juvenile offenders are treated?

“Juvenile justice isn’t a topic that is discussed much in my other classes,” said Elizabeth Chon, a then-junior at Lab who volunteers at a youth crisis hotline and hoped to bring a new layer of thinking to that experience. “I hear a lot about juvenile justice issues in my volunteer job, but it’s not something I ever understood deeply. Before this, I was unaware of a lot of the issues and flaws in the juvenile justice system—a lot of the decisions are arbitrary, and there isn’t as much control over the system as I thought there was.”

For the law students, several of whom were drawn to the opportunity because they have worked as teachers or hope to focus on juvenile justice issues as lawyers, the class offered a peek into how teens think, interpret, and process information about the law.

Aasiya Glover, ’15, enjoyed seeing the teens experience sudden breakthroughs in understanding as they connected the dots between different topics. One student, following a discussion on Miranda rights, sent her a text message saying he thought the discussion had “gotten to the heart of the problems of the twenty-first century.”

“He was so self-aware, and he found himself identifying with this particular issue in juvenile justice,” she said. “It got him excited, and he related it to larger systemic issues.”

As the weeks passed, moments like this continued to unfold, and something else—something less tangible—began to emerge. Many of those involved felt sure it had something to do with the broadening sense of community, the subtle shifts in understanding, and the friendships that had begun to take shape. There were sparks of recognition even when experiences differed, or moments when one student “got” what another student was saying. For some, there was a growing sense that these interactions mattered far beyond the classroom.
“The kids from the two schools seemed to enjoy working with each other so much, and we enjoyed working with them, too, and that’s really encouraging,” said Jamie Schulte, ’15. “So much of our juvenile justice system is socioeconomically driven, but we saw that this idea of collaboration among different populations could be helpful.”

Schulte, who worked for two years as a sixth-grade English teacher in Houston, said the two groups talked candidly about differences but also found common ground. “It’s been interesting to see how different some of their experiences are, but how similar their ideas are,” she said.

Added Shelton Meyers, then a sophomore at Woodlawn: “It was an amazing pleasure to interact with the Lab students and law students. Many of the kids in that seminar were outstandingly different and had very vigorous imaginations that could come together to create possible solutions on how we could better our community. It was really refreshing to hear from other students that think and observe the way I do.”

Some law students were surprised to find themselves identifying with the high school students they mentored or developing bonds as they swapped texts after class. This was the case for Ethel Amponsah, ’16, who was assigned as the teaching assistant to two female Woodlawn students.

She regularly exchanged text messages with the students and sometimes met them for brunch, where they talked about school issues, college, and the future. The students taught her things, too.

“I’ve learned that I probably underestimate the abilities of young people,” she said. “They have far exceeded my expectations. I don’t know if it’s just that I don’t remember what it’s like to be 17, but I am always blown away by what they’re thinking and what they can do. And I’ve learned that I have something to offer them.”

It has added depth to her understanding of the juvenile justice issues she explores in the Law School class, too.

Sometimes, the teens’ perspective reflected their unique spot at the intersection of childhood and adulthood.

“Some of the students strongly rejected the Supreme Court’s recent analysis concluding that adolescents should be considered less blameworthy for their crimes based on their age. This resistance makes sense because, more than anything, they want to be and be treated like adults,” Buss said. “But, in another exercise where they were asked to use a pie chart to divide a budget among various sorts of programming in response to juvenile crime, a lot of them were drawn to programs that focused on avoiding youth incarceration. In this exercise, they were heavily influenced by the social science that suggests that incarcerating young people just turns them into criminals.”

***

Later that spring, once the class was complete and Buss had some distance, she was able to reflect more fully on what it meant. By then, the seniors in the group had heard from colleges, and Buss knew that at least two, including Jala Conley, had been admitted to UChicago. She’d seen their final projects—they either wrote a paper or produced a PowerPoint presentation on an issue addressed in the class—and she’d had a chance to process the experience.

She was impressed, for instance, by how much the students had grown in just eight weeks.

“The high school students got increasingly good at thinking about other people’s participation in the group and making sure there was room for disagreement,” Buss said. “In that way, they showed the best kind of intellectual humility and humility about the limits of their own experience.”

But what really struck Buss was how valuable it was to simply have an opportunity to share the UChicago way with younger members of the University community.

“It was hugely rewarding to create, alongside eight talented and committed law students, a new intellectual community for this group of high school students,” she said. “I think the creation of this community had tremendous value for both groups of high school students, for the law students, for all of us. We were all playing out the University of Chicago ideal: engaging with one another about ideas, and testing our own and others’ ideas in a very positive and supportive context. Sharing our intellectual culture with young people felt incredibly important.”
REVIEWING WITH THOUGHT

Eric Posner’s New Rambler Review Brings Academic Skills to Bear on Book Reviews

By Robin I. Mordfin
Journalists write most book reviews these days. It makes sense—they tend to be good writers and are often already on the payroll of the magazines, journals, and blogs that publish reviews of new books. But Eric Posner thinks there is a better way. “Academics are an underutilized resource. They know more about their fields than other people do, and they often will write for free because they consider such work part of their professional obligations,” explained Posner, Kirkland and Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law. “I think it is important to get more academic voices into public debates.”

“Academics are an underutilized resource. ... They often will write for free because they consider such work part of their professional obligations. I think it is important to get more academic voices into public debates.”

To make those voices more accessible Posner, along with Adrian Vermeule of Harvard Law School and Blakey Vermeule of the English department at Stanford University, started The New Rambler Review (newramblerreview.com). Launched in March, the editors publish two new reviews, written by faculty at colleges and universities across the country, each week. The books are largely nonfiction and range across a wide variety of fields, from religion to film studies and from law to linguistics. The site holds the promise of books in even more areas—reference books and classics, for example, are still empty categories—but with the enthusiastic efforts of those involved, they are not likely to remain barren very long.

“I wish we had more literary fiction reviews—we have had a couple and a few more are coming—but it is a little bit harder. It would be great to get another editor; my areas of knowledge overlap a lot with Adrian’s, and Blakey does what she can in this area, but another editor is my main ambition. Of course, since we don’t pay anything, it might take a while,” Posner added.

The editors of The New Rambler all enjoy reading book reviews and believe that they are an important way to get academic ideas into public circulation. However, with the departure of Leon Wieseltier from the New Republic (where he had spent decades creating a book review section similar to that of the New York Review of Books), even fewer review conduits are available to cover books like Conflict in Ukraine: The Unwinding of the Post–Cold War Order, reviewed in The New Rambler by Professor Daniel Abebe in July 2015.

Consequently, The New Rambler the editors created their site with the intention of saving more well-researched, well-conceived books from being overlooked. David Strauss, Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law, who contributed a long piece on The First Amendment Bubble by Amy Gajda of Tulane, heartily supports the site and its intentions. As he put it, “I think there are not enough places like this where academics and other people with specialized knowledge write for a more general audience. I hope that audience gets a lot out of these reviews, and I am sure it is good for the authors of the reviews have to think about how to say things in a way that will speak to an interested but nonspecialist audience.”

With a press release from the Law School and mentions on both Posner’s blog and those of several academic friends, The New Rambler has gotten off to a strong start. The site is named after The Rambler, a series of short papers published by Samuel Johnson from 1750 to 1752. Posner acknowledges that Johnson, a famous stylist and perhaps the most revered book reviewer in history, would not find all the writing on the website up to his high standards; he explains that the editors chose the name because Johnson believed in public debate and in bringing ideas to the public. Funding came in the form of a loan from the Law School to get the project off the ground and a donation by Gifford Combs who supported the mission of the website.

Professor Eric Posner
The New Rambler came into its own quickly, receiving a big jolt of attention in June when Steven Lubet of Northwestern University Law School reviewed Alice Goffman’s highly praised and very popular sociology book, On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City. On the Run was the result of Goffman’s six-year ethnographic study in a poor black community in West Philadelphia. Lubet stated that he did not believe two events described in the book and pointed out that a third implicated Goffman herself in a crime. His review, which was adapted for the New Republic, was also mentioned (along with the site) in The New York Times, Slate, New York Magazine, and a score of other sites and publications.

“The review made a big splash because it raised serious questions,” Posner said. “We got a lot of publicity from it, but we are pleased because it was an important review.” Lubet had chosen On the Run himself to review, which the editors appreciate, but other books are assigned. Alison LaCroix, Robert Newton Reid Professor of Law, had previously written a long paper on Hilary Mantel’s Wolf Hall and Bring up the Bodies, historical novels about Thomas Cromwell and the Tudor court, for a conference on Crime in Law and Literature that she organized with Martha Nussbaum and Richard McAdams in February 2014. In that work, she discussed the Tudor revolution in government and the historiography of the period. When Posner asked her to adapt her research for The New Rambler, she refashioned her paper to look more at the character of Cromwell as a man and as a government official.

“I really enjoy writing for The New Rambler because the form is more open and I can reach a wider, educated audience,” LaCroix explained. “And I am doing it again. I walked into my office yesterday and found another book on my desk awaiting my review.” And, as the world of academia is not quite so broad, the site has thinkers whose books are reviewed and who have also reviewed books. For example, Cass Sunstein of Harvard Law School wrote about Richard H. Thaler’s Misbehaving: The Making of Behavioral Economics and Chris Taylor’s How

Consequently, The New Rambler editors created their site with the intention of saving more well-researched, well-conceived books from being overlooked.

While the site is mainly intended for new books, the editors would like to cover some classics. They have a writer lined up to rethink one of the books by Walter Bagehot, an influential nineteenth-century British journalist, businessman, and essayist. However, as Posner pointed out, they don’t want to create any artificial constraints such as topic or length. Which is just what the writers want.

“I’d say what is distinctive about writing a review for the *New Rambler* is that there is a great deal of freedom to decide what to write on, whether a book is more or less recent, and to decide on content,” noted Michelle Karnes of Stanford, who wrote a review of Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Buried Giant.* “There’s no ideological agenda for the journal, and so you can write what you really think without worrying about offending anyone.”
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EXPLORING A RIVER OF IDEAS WITH THE CLINICAL FACULTY

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie
Herschella Conyers looked intrigued. But beyond that, the clinical professor betrayed no emotion—not pride or annoyance or delight, just the patient, measured visage of a woman who has seen a thing or two and knows the value in letting a conversation play out unjudged. She simply listened as the fourteen Law School students in her Life in the Law seminar batted about various hot-button topics—at that moment, it was the ethics of human cloning—jumping in only to offer nuance, challenge assumptions, or prod the conversation in novel directions.

"Why the repugnance?" she asked as words like "Frankenstein" and "unnatural" and "playing God" filtered into the discussion, which had expanded to include abortion, stem cell research, and the destruction of unwanted frozen embryos. The room was buoyant and respectful even though many of the comments were bathed in swells of emotion or tinged with religious conviction. Conyers paused.

"What is it to be human anyway?"

This was the real question, or one of them. And in many ways it’s the reason the longtime defense lawyer and director of the Law School’s Criminal and Juvenile Justice Clinic teaches a class that, at first glance, appears removed from her usual work. Conyers is one of several Law School clinicians who do this, stretching beyond their core expertise to teach topics that interest them. Clinical Professor Randall D. Schmidt, the Director of the Employment Discrimination Project, teaches Admiralty Law, for instance, and Assistant Clinical Professor Mark Templeton, Director of the Abrams Environmental Law Clinic, last spring taught a two-day session on nonprofit leadership as part of the UChicago-led Civic Leadership Academy.

“They don’t merely illustrate diverse passions and talents, they stand in tribute to the choose-your-own-adventure nature of true intellectual exploration, monuments to the far-flung places that a set of ideas can take you.”
But in each case, these seemingly disparate endeavors have meaningful connections to, or even have grown from, the clinicians’ core work. They don’t merely illustrate diverse passions and talents, they stand in tribute to the choose-your-own-adventure nature of true intellectual exploration, monuments to the far-flung places that a set of ideas can take you. Admiralty law, for instance, offers new ways to think about workers’ rights—there are special remedies for injured seamen that don’t exist in land-based employment law, and this has always been part of the draw for Schmidt. Conyers has long been struck by the complex meaning-of-life questions that ripple through so many aspects of criminal law. And Templeton’s Civic Leadership Academy experience was infused with the same themes that have trickled into nearly every corner of his diverse career—his desire to effect change, his willingness to tackle big issues, and his ability to understand and manage risk.

“The University of Chicago Law School has this broad understanding of how we can have an impact—it allows and encourages us to engage in these kinds of opportunities,” said Templeton, whose career has included nonprofit, government, consulting, and higher education work.

This openness, imbued so thoroughly into the culture of the Law School, serves as a powerful backdrop for many endeavors; it’s all part of the common understanding that there are infinite tributaries to explore in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding.

***

The popular story about why Schmidt teaches Admiralty is that he’s an avid mariner.
And indeed he is: he and his wife own a forty-two-foot sport fishing vessel and recently spent a year, on and off, cruising down the river system to Mobile, Alabama, out to Key West and then navigating back to Chicago via the Great Lakes. But the hobby isn’t really why he began teaching the class fifteen years ago.

“The myth is that the Law School asked me to teach Admiralty because I’m the only faculty member with a boat,” he said, laughing. “I don’t disabuse my students of that myth, but it’s not true. I do have a boat, but I said I’d teach Admiralty because I was interested in jurisdictional issues and the rights of seamen and injured workers.”

Admiralty law, he explained, is a complex and often difficult area that is rooted in centuries-old sea code and contains a mix of federal and state law, as well as federal common law that doesn’t exist on land. What’s more, maritime law often contradicts land-based rules.

“Even very experienced judges and lawyers, because they don’t take the time to really understand admiralty, get it wrong,” Schmidt said. “Judges describe this as one of the most difficult areas of law.”

Early in the quarter, students tend to view cases through a land-based lens, and Schmidt needs to push them to think in admiralty terms. “They’ll say, ‘This is what I learned in Torts,’ but that doesn’t necessarily apply in Admiralty,” Schmidt said. “And that’s where a lot of the class discussion is focused.”

The cases that provoke the most discussion are often centered on seamen’s rights. In addition to the fascinating complexity, there’s a deeply human piece that Schmidt works to impart to his students.

“Sometimes seamen do very stupid things,” he said. “The myths we hear about the bad habits of seamen are too often true. But the law protects them from their ‘bad habits.’ Whether they are falling from a balcony because they’ve had too much to drink on shore leave or they are injured doing very dangerous work in terrible conditions on the high seas, the law protects them, at least up to a point.”

For Schmidt, teaching Admiralty keeps him connected to other areas of the law outside employment. “More than anything,” he said, “it keeps the intellectual curiosity going.”

For Templeton—who has served as the executive director for the Office of the Independent Trustees of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Trust and worked at Missouri’s Department of Natural Resources, the US Department of State, and McKinsey & Company, among other places—the Civic Leadership Academy offered a chance to use his broad experience to help a variety of midcareer professionals move in new directions.
The leadership development program, which was created in part by the University’s Office of Civic Engagement, gave twenty-eight rising professionals from nonprofit organizations and local government agencies the opportunity to hone skills in civic innovation, human capital, strategy and management, data analytics, financial planning, and strategic communications over the course of ten, two-day modules that ran from January to June. Templeton’s session—which he taught in April with Darren Reisberg, Secretary of the University, and Brian Fabes, CEO of Civic Consulting Alliance—examined the roles of top nonprofit leaders in achieving great missions while managing risks. It was called Leading Boldly, without Sinking the Ship.

“I think it is important that the University is engaging with these people and offering some of our experiences and ideas to try to bring about positive change in Chicago,” Templeton said. The students included, among others, the operations director for Austin Coming Together, a group dedicated to improving education and economic development in Chicago’s Austin neighborhood, officials with the Cook Country Forest Preserve and Cook County Health System, and the pastor of a North Side church.

“These were midcareer professionals, and they’re at a different point—a lot of them could apply what they learned immediately,” Templeton said. Many of the participants were working through very specific issues, and Templeton enjoyed the challenge of helping them think strategically. The pastor, for instance, had an enviable puzzle: the church had, somewhat unexpectedly, reaped a large return from an investment—and the leadership needed to figure out the most effective way to spend the money. Should they use it to improve the building? To start a new program?
“They decided to share the good fortune with parishioners, who then used the money to effect good deeds themselves,” he said. “I never would have thought of this—and that’s what was fun.”

In this way, the work tapped into the same challenges that drew Templeton to his work on the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, when he was tasked with ensuring that BP met its cleanup commitments, and to the Law School’s Environmental Law Clinic. It has all been about weighing and thinking through big ideas, often balancing risk with the need to act boldly.

“What is the right balance between protecting the environment and the use of natural resources? What are the incentives? What are the appropriate accountability mechanisms?” he said. “These are timeless questions.”

Conyers’ questions are timeless, too. These are issues she’s thought about as a defense lawyer and clinical professor for years. After all, criminal law is rife with discord rooted in the emotional complexity of how one defines and values human life.

“It has always struck me that the people who oppose abortion say, ‘it’s a human life’ and the people who oppose the death penalty say, ‘it’s a human life’—they use the same language and rhetoric,” she said. “So you would think those two contingencies would come together, but they rarely do. I think life means something different depending on who’s saying it. So that made me think: how do we think about life in legal terms, and in the law?”

Abortion and capital punishment bookend her Life in the Law class, which Conyers has taught for four years, with right-to-die, assisted suicide, cloning, and other reproductive issues filling out the middle. Students explore how definitions and valuations of life play out in the law, reading cases, discussing policy making, and debating the impact of social, medical, and religious values in legal analysis. Conyers pushes the students to think past their own beliefs and politics. She pushes them, too, to think about life in terms of race and gender—sometimes difficult areas, but ones Conyers thinks are important to explore.

“People operate under assumptions that we don’t even know we’re operating under,” she said, adding that it’s particularly important for future lawyers to confront the underlying beliefs and assumptions they bring to the table. People tend to compartmentalize, and they often believe that their personal views don’t impact their work—but that’s often wrong, she said.

The course’s title, for this reason, has a bit of a double meaning: it is both about how life is viewed and valued in laws, policies, and court cases and about how one navigates the intellectual waters of life as a lawyer. Conyers works hard to remain neutral as the students unpack emotionally fraught concepts.

“For me, the most damning thing that happens in a classroom is you say, ‘no judgment’ and then everything you do exudes judgment,” she said. “So when I say, ‘no judgment,’ I then have to work on it to make sure there’s no judgment.”

The exercise in nonjudgment gives Conyers a chance to check in with herself, to examine her own underlying beliefs. And, as with Templeton and Schmidt, her class has given her a chance to connect ideas in a different way—and to teach students to do the same.

“I hope they will live their lives as lawyers with integrity and thoughtfulness and leadership,” Conyers said of her students. “Being a lawyer shouldn’t be just a job, it should be a worldview about how to have impact.”

Conyers works hard to remain neutral as students debate controversial issues.
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Remarks of James B. Comey, ’85  
Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

I loved going to law school here. I was very fortunate to go to law school here, and I mean that in two different senses.

One, I was very lucky to get in—that’s not false humility, that is fact-based humility. That is LSAT-number, GPA-based humility. I was on the margins. In a post-—U.S. News world, I’d have been dead. But I was wait-listed. So I came to visit this great place with my girlfriend, now the mother of my five kids and my beloved wife, and we walked around, and she said, “You know, I can picture you here.” So we went over to the Law School building and she told me, “Go in and ask to speak to the dean of admissions.” I said, “Are you out of your mind? That would be embarrassing, I’m not doing that.”

So she sat down on a bench right by that statue that I’ve never quite understood, the black one, and she said, “I’m not leaving until you go in there and let them come to know you.”

So I went in, I talked to some nice lady, and I said, “Is the dean of admissions, Dean Badger, available? I don’t have an appointment.” She had me wait, and I waited a long time. Then I met a remarkable man, and we had a great conversation, and then I left. Shortly thereafter I was admitted to the University of Chicago Law School.

Dean Badger in those days, rumor had it, and I think it’s fact, kept in his pocket what he called the number of “professional promise” admittances—people he thought might work out in their careers. He would take those people on the bubble. I was extremely, extremely fortunate to have met him and to have had this opportunity.

Fortunate in a second way, because this changed my life. I am a better person, a better thinker, a better lawyer, a better leader, for having gone to this great law school; for having professors who pushed me, who insisted on scrubbing my thinking; and to be surrounded by classmates of decency and of rigor and of fun. This place changed my life.

What I thought I would do is, very briefly, because I’m having flashbacks to the 30-years-ago humidity in this place—they did not have fans back in the day—I want to share with you just two brief reflections from my career in public service that I hope are useful to the graduates. Then I want to close by saying a brief word about why public service means so much to me, and why I hope you’ll give it a shot.

The first reflection is that judgment is an extraordinarily valuable and rare commodity, and that it is different than intelligence.
People with good judgment listen carefully, with a sense of humility and a constant knowledge that they could be wrong—that there could be another fact that I don’t know, there could be a better argument I haven’t thought of. They are people who have internalized some advice that Mark Twain gave: “It ain’t what you don’t know that gets you into trouble. It’s what you know for sure that just ain’t so.”

Where does this come from? I think it mostly starts with your family—with the way you were raised. Then it comes from making mistakes and seeing how people react to it: “Oh, I did this and that really ticked people off. Got it—gotta remember that.” It comes from trying to develop emotional intelligence—to see the world outside the trap that is you; to see the world through the eyes of people of very different perspectives.

There’s another way in which it is nurtured: by the experience you’ve just gone through. Think about what you’ve just done for the last three years. It’s probably too soon, it’s too raw, but think back to what you have done. You have looked for facts, you’ve sorted facts, you’ve grouped them, you’ve tried to reason from them; you’ve tried to understand motives and biases. You’ve tried to understand what’s known, what’s not known; how would this conclusion change in a different place and time?

You’ve tried to confront unspoken assumptions. You’ve tried to understand alternative explanations. And you’ve asked, and been asked by your professors, “How sure are you of that? Where do you stand with respect to that conclusion?”

Most of all, you have learned, whether you know it or not, to instinctively mentally operate in an adversarial environment—in a cauldron where everything you conclude, everything you see, will be criticized, will be cross-examined, will be ridiculed, will be rebutted.

People who have learned that way, who have practiced that discipline, instinctively have a courtroom in their mind. They’re instinctively able to travel in time to the future. They ask themselves, “How sure am I, and what might make this different?”

That was drilled into you by great professors. You have spent three years orbiting facts and traveling in time, whether you recognized it or not. That is a great gift. It is a down payment on judgment—but it is just a down payment.

Judgment is something that must be nurtured. Believe it or not, there’s the occasional person who gets out of here and doesn’t demonstrate great judgment in the rest of their life. It requires constant attention, it requires continuing humility, and it requires balance in your life.

The ability to orbit a situation—to exercise judgment—is materially assisted by stepping away from your work. By getting away from whatever it is you’re focusing on, by doing whatever you do, whether it’s kickboxing or
kayaking or reading. It allows you that physical distance to refresh, and to better orbit a situation and exercise judgment.

Let me put in another plug, for sleep. I’ve always known it was important to sleep, but now we’ve got lots of great science. What’s going on while your brain is off-line one-third of every day? The neuro-chemical process of judgment. Your brain is mapping the data you took in during the day—making connections, laying it down, to form your basis for deriving meaning and having perspective. Sleep.

And one last piece: Love somebody. This great hall is filled with people who are called your loved ones. There will be many others in your life. They are called that because you are supposed to love them.

There is a danger in the life of a lawyer: it’s “get-back-itis.” It’s the sense that “I’ve got this thing to do, so I will get back to …” fill in the blank: my kids, my girlfriend, my boyfriend, my parents, my siblings, the people I care about—I’ll do this thing, and then I’ll get back to it.

There is no getting back. They will not be there when you turn to go back. You must fight to achieve a balance in your life. You must fight for the space to love somebody. It’s the right thing to do, and very good for protecting judgment. It refreshes you mentally, refreshes you physically, allows you to orbit in a better way. So please love somebody.

The second reflection, very briefly, is that the ability to say “no,” particularly under great pressure, is essential to the life of a lawyer—especially one working in public service. This reflection is aimed mostly at lawyers who work in government, but I think it is relevant no matter what kind of law you are going to practice. Frankly, the ability to say “no” in a good way is important if you’re going to raise children as well.

It can be very, very hard to be a conscientious attorney working in government, especially when it comes to counterterrorism or war fighting. It is not because you won’t work with great people. You will. You will work with people who spend every single waking hour trying to protect people and to save lives.

It will be difficult, instead, not because of the people, but because the stakes couldn’t possibly be higher. Because you’re likely to hear these words: “If we don’t do this, people will die.” You can supply your own this: “If we don’t collect this type of information,” “If we don’t extend this authority,” “If we don’t use this technique”—“people will die.”

It is extraordinarily difficult to be an attorney standing in front of the freight train that is the need for “this.” Those lawyers standing on those tracks don’t want people to die. In fact, they have joined organizations, they have taken oaths as part of those organizations, for the very purpose of saving lives.

But it’s not that simple—although during times of great crisis, at times of great threat, it can surely seem very simple. But lawyers know—or should know—better than anyone, that it’s never that simple.

At the outset, lawyers know what you’ve just spent years learning: we are a nation of laws. You have chosen a profession that internalizes that truth. And when you join the government, you not only have been trained to
understand that the rule of law is the bedrock of this great nation; you took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

Lawyers know that there may be agonizing collisions between the duty to protect and the duty to the Constitution and the rule of law. When they encounter those moments of collision, and they will come, I hope those lawyers are aided by judgment—by an ability to travel in time and picture the future, to transport themselves to another place, in front of an imaginary fact-finder, in an environment very far from the storm of crisis and tension, and look back on the decision they’re about to make.

They will be aided immeasurably by the judgment you have spent years developing and that I hope you will nurture.

They must be able to imagine that they won’t be alone in that future calm, well-lit room—a room blazingly lit by hindsight. With them will be the reputations of their great institutions that will be harmed for years by scandal and abuse of authority.

That lawyer is the custodian of a great deal: the custodian of a personal reputation, for sure; but more importantly, the custodian of institutional reputation, and most importantly of all, the custodian of the Constitution and the rule of law. That lawyer must never, ever lose sight of the obligations of that custodian.

It is the job of a good lawyer to say “yes.” It is as much the job of a good lawyer to say “no”—and “no” is much, much harder. “No” must be spoken into a storm of crisis and tension, with loud voices all around, and lives maybe hanging in the balance. And it must be spoken in competition with the voices of other lawyers who may not have the courage to echo it.

It takes more than intelligence, more than a sharp legal mind, to say “no” when it matters most. It takes moral character. It takes judgment. It takes an ability to see the future. It takes an appreciation of the damage that will flow from an unjustified “yes.” It takes an understanding that, in the long run, government under the law is the government so many have died for.

* * *

Those are my two reflections about judgment and about the importance of “no.” Let me leave you briefly with some words about public service.
I have left government service twice. Each time it left a hole in my life.

The first time is when I moved from New York with my family to Virginia and there was a hiring freeze, and I couldn’t get into the government. So I went to a law firm, a big law firm, and they brought me matching furniture, which I had never experienced before. I had a parking space, they made me a partner, and I was making good dough, and I was living in a nice place, and I had colleagues that I liked—and there was something missing.

It was my wife, Patrice, who noticed it first. She said, “What’s wrong with you?”—something she says in all different contexts. She said, “What’s wrong with you? We have a five-bedroom colonial we paid $252,000 for. We’ve got great schools, you’ve got a great job. You’ve got matching furniture. What is wrong with you?”

And I said something that seems obnoxious and corny, but I said, “You know what it is? I miss having a job with moral content. I miss getting up in the morning and being part of trying to do something good for other people.” Once you have done that, it becomes addictive.

Now look: public service can be very hard on your credit cards and a lot of other things. It can be even harder when you look over at friends and colleagues who are making all kinds of dough, and making it in jobs that are “prestigious.”

But at times like that, I hope you will remember words like those that Albert Einstein spoke. He said this to young people: “Try not to become a person of success, but rather try to become a person of value.”

If those friends making all that dough in those prestigious jobs never take the chance to represent the poor, or to protect old people from predators, they may have found success, but they will have missed real value—and that’s a tragedy.

The many personal responsibilities of life can make it hard to do public service and can make it very hard to do for an entire career. But I quietly ache for my classmates who never even tried it when they could have, or don’t stay with it when they could afford to, because of the siren song of some prestige.

Augustine wrote, “Human honor is . . . smoke, which has no weight.” It would be an awful thing to get to the end of this short life and realize you have accumulated the smoke of success, but nothing of real value.

Let me close with my most depressing piece of advice for you, which is that you periodically imagine yourself about to die. I hope in your imagination—and in reality—you are old and gray. From that vantage point, look back and ask this question: “Who do I want to have been?” Because if you ask it that way, the stuff that obscures your view, living life in the normal way forward—human honor, prestige, money, cars, houses, boats—all of that stuff is stripped away, and what matters comes into view.

Everybody’s answer will be different. For me, the answer is, I want to have been somebody who had quality relationships with the people around me. I want to know my children, their children, and God willing, my children’s children’s children. And I want to be somebody who, with whatever gifts I have, with the great training I got, if I had the chance, took it to try to do something for people who needed me. The rest is smoke.

Whether you see it now or not, this great university, this amazing law school, has prepared you well to see through the smoke and to be people of value. I hope you find work you love. I hope you live lives filled with laughter and joy and the love of those around you. And I hope you continue to be part of this extraordinary Chicago family.

Congratulations and good luck.
Remarks of David A. Strauss
Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Thank you, Mike, for that very generous introduction. As Dean Schill said, this is his last graduation as the dean of our law school. But great leaders of institutions do work that lives on after them. All of us here today—we’re all members of the law school community—will always be very much in Mike’s debt for everything he has done.

But this day is about celebrating you—all of you who are graduating, your families and friends who are here with you today, in person or in spirit, and have been with you throughout. People who graduate from this law school, without exception, have been so successful in so many ways that it would be easy for you, I think, to take your achievements for granted—as something you’re accustomed to—and to think your success is not a big deal. But what you’ve accomplished is a big deal. So I hope, while you’re in the middle of all the events, and of looking after your guests, and of all the arrangements and the celebrations, that you take a second to reflect on how much you’ve accomplished both here and in your lives so far.

Now I’m sure this is not the end of your success. You’ll do more great things in the future, too. But for nearly all of you, this is the end of at least one chapter of your lives, because this is probably your last graduation. Some of you have been in school for as long as you can remember; others of you have spent some time, maybe quite a lot of time, doing other things. But for all of you, now, school’s out—probably, school’s out forever. Maybe you haven’t thought of yourself as a kid for a while, but now, for sure, you’re not kids any more. You’re lawyers, or at least you’re going to be working with the law in some way.

So let’s think about something that was said by Charles Lamb, who was a late-18th and early-19th-century English poet and essayist. He was born and raised around lawyers and seems at times not to have had a high opinion of them. Charles Lamb said: “Lawyers, I suppose, were children once.” You get the idea. Being a lawyer is more or less the antithesis of being a kid. Children are carefree and full of life and energy and promise. Lawyers are cynical, jaded, overworked, joyless, beaten-down drones. That’s the image, anyway.
Well, here’s the thing. If that’s what Charles Lamb meant, I think he had it backwards. I think if you want to be a successful lawyer, successful both in your profession and in your life, you have to keep the kid inside of you alive. Part of this, actually, has to do with the law itself. When my own daughters were little, it occurred to me that you could teach the entire first-year law school curriculum if you spent just one nerve-racking afternoon with them. There’s “Daddy, you promised!” That’s contracts, of course. Then there’s: “She hit me.” “It was an accident!” “I don’t care.” Torts, right? Intentional torts, negligence, strict liability. “I’m telling,” a fair approximation of criminal law. “That’s mine. Give it to me!” That’s property. “Be quiet. It’s my turn to talk.” The essence of Civil Procedure. And, although it’s not a first-year course here, there’s my own main subject, Constitutional Law: “No fair!”

Now obviously if it were all that simple, your legal education would have looked a lot different. You wouldn’t have had to put up with us on the faculty, and getting called on, and all the exams and papers. And, more seriously, I don’t have to tell you that the law has its share of perverse or weird or even destructive features. But we can’t let that obscure the fact that the law is ultimately about trying to make sure that people’s lives are improved and that people are treated fairly and decently and respectfully in ways that even children understand. So while the law might be complicated, the highest ideals of your new profession are really not so complicated after all. And one way to honor those ideals is to make sure you do what lawyers can do, maybe better than anyone else, which is to stand up to the bullies and the thoughtless or abusive authority figures, because, as you know, bullies show up in adult life just as surely as they do on the playground.

The second thing that being a lawyer has in common with being a kid has to do with curiosity. I think law is a great profession for curious people. You can’t do your best for your clients if you don’t understand what they’re doing, and clients do all kinds of things—some of them interesting in a not-so-good way, in the sense of, “hmm, well, that’s, um, interesting”—but some of them just plain interesting. Depending on what you do as a lawyer, you might deal with software engineering one day, health care the next day, and a municipal zoning dispute after that. You can engage with questions that are not strictly legal—policy and strategy questions in the government, or in business, or in the not-for-profit sector that might be really difficult but are not boring.

Or you might specialize in a field and learn so much about it, in a short time, that you can work side by side
experience of people coming up after class and beginning by saying “this may be a stupid question, but . . . .” When you hear that, actually, it usually means that it’s a pretty good question, because it’s coming from someone who has been thinking hard and for whom something is just not clicking, and that means, if you’re a teacher, you have to explain it better.

One of the most important things we hope you’ll take away from here really has nothing to do with learning a lot of law: it is being willing to ask a question when things aren’t quite clicking—being willing to ask the question that no one else is asking because they’re afraid to ask the “stupid question.” If something is nagging at you, something that doesn’t seem to make sense, something that just seems wrong, something everyone else in the

with people who’ve spend their careers in the area. And if you represent people who have not had the privileges many of us have had, you might find that you learn things from them in ways that you never would have imagined.

Being open to learning things and, if need be, looking for new ways to take advantage of the opportunities a legal education offers you to find things that will keep you curious, and keep you interested and inquisitive, like a kid—that’s a way of making sure you’re not one of the people Charles Lamb warned us about.

Then there’s a third part of your inner kid that you should never leave behind. That’s the part that asks questions, and asks questions without worrying about whether the alleged grown ups will think the questions are naïve or embarrassing. All of us who teach have had the
room is assuming but you don’t understand why they’re assuming it, do what a kid would do: ask why. I think it’s actually not an exaggeration to say that a lot of misfortune in human history could have been avoided if only grown-ups had been more willing, like kids, to ask questions without being afraid of looking dumb, or naïve, or like someone who is not a team player.

So school’s out, and you’re not kids. But moving on doesn’t mean leaving everything behind. It means keeping alive what is best from your past, best from here, I hope, and the best from other phases of your lives. And, yes, we were all children once, and, in the right ways, I hope we always will be. Good luck to you all, and the warmest congratulations for everything you’ve done and everything you will do.
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New International Human Rights Clinic Director Claudia Flores Brings ‘Leadership, Energy, and Good Judgment’

Claudia Flores has spent nearly her entire career advocating on behalf of the world’s neediest people. She fought for women’s equality in East Timor, helped incorporate human rights principles into the national constitution in Zimbabwe, served victims of human trafficking in Indonesia, advocated on behalf of Chicago’s homeless, and represented Mexican immigrants who had been fired from jobs at a Wisconsin sauerkraut farm.

Now, she is bringing her broad experience to the Law School as an Assistant Clinical Professor and the new Director of the International Human Rights Clinic.

“Claudia has dedicated herself to international human rights and civil rights advocacy and litigation in a wide variety of settings,” said Clinical Professor Jeff Leslie, the Director of Clinical and Experiential Learning. “She is an experienced, highly skilled litigator and advocate, and her strengths in these areas will serve our students well in her new clinical role. Claudia brings the leadership, energy, and good judgment to build on the clinic’s strong record of accomplishment and to take the clinic in exciting new directions.”

Flores hopes not only to expose Law School students to the kind of advocacy work that has inspired her over the years but to give them the “opportunity to do this work in a way that’s responsible, thoughtful, and sustainable.” She is deeply committed to helping develop a new generation of human rights lawyers, though she defines that purpose broadly and said the clinic will be valuable even to students who don’t plan to pursue human rights work.

“The clinic provides a really amazing opportunity for students,” said Flores, who most recently worked as a partner with the Chicago law firm Hughes Socol Piers Resnick & Dym, Ltd., where she concentrated her practice in the areas of civil rights, constitutional law, labor and employment, and class actions. “I was a part of the immigrants rights clinic at NYU, and it was by far the most important experience I had in law school. I was able to take on real cases, and my supervisor’s primary purpose was to develop me as a lawyer. Now my primary purpose is to give students experience that will make them better lawyers when they go out into the world.”

Clinical Professor Alison Siegler, the founder and director of the Federal Criminal Justice Clinic, said the Law School was fortunate to have landed Flores.

“Her extensive experience working in Africa, Indonesia, East Timor, and Mexico—and the relationships she’s developed through that work—will make her an extraordinary asset to the clinic and our students,” Siegler said. “Claudia’s litigation experience will enable her to implement clinical projects that will tangibly impact people’s lives, while her energy and engagement will make her a tremendous clinical teacher.”

Flores received an undergraduate degree in philosophy from UChicago in 1997 and graduated from the New York University School of Law in 2002, where she received the prestigious Root-Tilden-Kern scholarship, which is awarded to students who have demonstrated a commitment to public service, academic excellence, and the potential for leadership.

In her United Nations positions, she advised governments on constitutional and legislative reforms to increase legal protections for human rights and civil liberties. Before that, Flores worked for the AFL-CIO American Center for International Labor Solidarity in Indonesia, where she managed a program that focused on providing services for victims of human trafficking. She has also worked for the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, where she focused on women’s rights in the workplace. As Skadden Fellow from 2003 to 2005, Flores directed the Immigrant Household Workers Project in the International Women’s Human Rights Clinic at the CUNY School of Law. Prior to that, she clerked for Judge Harry Pregerson of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and, during law school, worked as a law clerk on projects in Tanzania and South Africa.

She is thrilled to be a part of the Law School’s clinical faculty.

“They really walk the wonderful line of thinking about themselves as practitioners and also being intellectuals,” she said. “It’s an exciting environment to join, and really a collegial and lovely one.”
Intellectual Curiosity and Innovative Scholarship Drive New Faculty Member Daniel Hemel

When Daniel Hemel was a Marshall Scholar at Oxford University, he wrote his master’s thesis on financial regulation. It was 2008, and the world economy was in disarray. And so Hemel did what came naturally: he applied his intellect as a way of making sense of the world. “I wanted to use my master’s thesis to understand this phenomenon that was transpiring around me,” said Hemel, a 2012 graduate of Yale Law School. “The more I learned about financial regulation, the more I became convinced that tax, while not the sole driver of the sorts of financial innovations that put the economy at risk in 2008, was an important driver and a poorly understood driver.”

And so began Hemel’s interests in taxation and the regulation of risk, two research areas he will continue to explore as a new member of the Law School faculty. Hemel joined the Law School as an Assistant Professor of Law in July after finishing a clerkship for US Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan.

“Daniel is a tremendously innovative scholar with unlimited potential, and his broad range of interests and deep engagement with ideas make him a perfect fit for Chicago,” said Lee Fennell, the Max Pam Professor of Law and the cochair of the Appointments Committee that hired Hemel. “We are excited to have him joining us.”

Hemel graduated from Harvard in 2007 with a bachelor’s degree in Social Sciences and earned a master’s degree in International Relations from Oxford in 2009. Before clerking for Justice Kagan, he also clerked for Judge Michael Boudin of the First Circuit Court of Appeals in Boston and Judge Sri Srinivasan of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals.

In law school, Hemel was editor-in-chief of the Yale Law Journal, and as a student, “this brilliant young scholar produced more papers than many faculty do before tenure,” said Deputy Dean Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law. Among them was a 1L student note he wrote on regulatory consolidation that stemmed from his master’s thesis. The paper, “Regulatory Consolidation and Cross-Border Coordination: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom,” was published in the Yale Law Journal in 2011.

Hemel has been praised by Law School faculty for his scholarship and deep intellect. “Daniel is already an accomplished scholar and will continue to bring novel perspectives on his wide-ranging research interests,” said Jennifer Nou, the Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law. “He’s going to be a terrific colleague.”

Added Richard McAdams, the Bernard D. Meltzer Professor of Law: “Daniel is a brilliant addition to our faculty. He has a wonderful curiosity and intellectual energy.”

Those are qualities Hemel hopes to share with and instill in his students. “I will bring intellectual curiosity and a deep interest in my students’ ideas,” he said. “I hope to demonstrate to students that even as 1Ls and 2Ls they can contribute to scholarly debates. Ideas that begin in Socratic dialog in their 1L or 2L classes, or in cafeteria discussions afterward, can in relatively short order become student notes and law review articles that are cited and read by scholars with years more experience.”

Hemel said he is already “extraordinarily impressed by the creativity and engagement of the UChicago faculty and students.” “It seems to me that the most innovative scholarship happens at the intersection of multiple fields, or when scholars rooted in different fields collaborate,” he said. “The University of Chicago is ground zero for that sort of collaboration. Professors writing on their own draw from multiple disciplines and, perhaps more so than any other school, they team up with colleagues who are rooted in different fields.”

He has already experienced the UChicago ideals at the Supreme Court: several of the other clerks were Law School alumni and Kagan is a former Law School professor. “I saw unmatched intellectual rigor both in the way that they recounted their experiences and in the way they approached the law,” he said. “I can’t imagine working in a more exciting environment.”
For Genevieve Lakier, a Crossroads Became a Rich Interdisciplinary Study

A decade ago, Genevieve Lakier found herself at a vexing crossroads, torn between anthropology and law. It was the beginning of an interdisciplinary expertise that would ultimately make her an ideal fit for the Law School’s faculty, which she joined as an assistant professor this summer. But, back then, it felt like a wrenching choice: she had an offer to teach anthropology at a prestigious university in one hand and a scholarship to law school in the other. Did she want to be a professor—or a 1L? Lakier had invested a lot in anthropology, earning degrees from Princeton and the University of Chicago, and she’d already begun research for the anthropology PhD she would later receive from UChicago.

But law had begun a seductive, beckoning whisper. While researching her doctoral dissertation, which focused on the rule of law in Nepal, her Nepalese subjects had delighted in her work, eager for the policy solutions they hoped she’d identify and suggest.

“But the task of an anthropologist is not to make recommendations,” Lakier said. “Anthropologists describe and analyze.”

By the time the two offers arrived, near the end of a two-year fellowship at Harvard, the beckoning had reached a crescendo. Lakier wanted to be engaging in policy debate, and she wanted to be thinking and writing about the law. So she turned down the faculty job—not an easy move; “it was a great program, and a tenure-track job is nothing to sneeze at,” she said—and enrolled at the New York University School of Law.

“It was a big gamble, but I wanted to go where my curiosity was taking me,” she said. “I thought, ‘I’m not going to compromise on this. I’m going to go for it.’” And she did, pursuing a distinctive intellectual blend that has given her a perspective well suited to the rigorous interdisciplinary atmosphere of the Law School.

“Few scholars in American law schools have this kind of training, so she helps advance our goal of diversifying our set of methodological approaches,” said Deputy Dean Tom Ginsburg, the Leo Spitz Professor of International Law. Added Professor Daniel Abebe, Walter Mander Teaching Scholar and the chair of the entry-level Appointments Committee: “Genevieve’s unique skill set will hugely benefit our students in the classroom.”

Lakier has been working on two long-term projects that follow her intellectual interests: One involves the changing role of the state in the regulation of sexuality and sex work, and the other examines the cultural history of free speech.

“It is important to understand why speech means something different today than it meant 100 years ago,” Lakier said of the latter project. “That’s the kind of question that an anthropologist is well equipped to try and understand because it has to do with our cultural assumptions.”

Lakier noted that renowned constitutional scholar Geoffrey R. Stone, the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and the Law School’s interim dean, played a big role in bringing her to Chicago. The two met when Stone was a visiting professor at NYU and Lakier was a student in his First Amendment course.

“I got to know her fairly well, and I thought she was terrific,” Stone remembered. He wrote recommendations for her two federal judicial clerkships and later strongly encouraged her to apply for the two-year Bigelow fellowship. Lakier earned a bachelor’s degree in Anthropology from Princeton University in 1997 and a master’s degree in Cultural Anthropology from UChicago in 2001. She graduated in 2011 from NYU’s law school, where she was editor-in-chief of the NYU Review of Law and Social Change. She earned her PhD from UChicago in 2014. After law school, she clerked for judges Leonard B. Sand of the Southern District of New York and Martha Craig Daughtrey of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals before beginning the Bigelow Teaching Fellowship, where she reveled in the culture of the Law School.

“This is an embarrassment of riches, being here at the Law School. I want the students to appreciate that, and to be able to participate in that,” Lakier said. “I hope to bring that—and I hope to bring joy—to the classroom.”
Law School Hires Rising Star in Criminal Law and Procedure

Criminal law grabbed John Rappaport’s attention early in law school. “I’ve always been interested in the interaction between individuals and the state, and to my mind criminal law is where those issues arise in sharpest relief,” said Rappaport, a rising star in criminal law and procedure who joined the tenure-track faculty in July after completing a two-year Bigelow Teaching Fellowship. “You have the state not just regulating its inhabitants’ behavior but locking people up and executing them. It presents all of these vexing questions, from the moral and philosophical to the administrative, and the stakes are very high. It always struck me as where the action is.”

These are the questions Rappaport will continue to explore as an Assistant Professor of Law, bringing to bear both intellectual gravitas and practical experience as a lawyer. Before becoming a Bigelow Fellow, Rappaport clerked for US Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and worked in both the private and public sectors. “We have been hoping to hire a scholar and teacher of criminal law and procedure for some time, and in John we have found exactly what we’ve been looking for,” said Professor Daniel Abebe, Walter Mander Teaching Scholar and the chair of the entry-level Appointments Committee. “John’s great combination of real-world practice experience, outstanding clerkships, and a deep interest in the operation of the criminal justice system will make him a tremendous asset to our students. We are very excited to have him as a colleague as well.”

Added Deputy Dean Tom Ginsburg, the Leo Spitz Professor of International Law: “John Rappaport brings a terrific background in practice and scholarship, and he is going to be a major scholar of criminal law and procedure.”

Rappaport earned his undergraduate degree in mathematics, graduating with distinction from Stanford University in 2002. In 2006, he graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School, where he served as cochair of the Articles Committee of the Harvard Law Review. In addition to his Supreme Court clerkship, Rappaport clerked for Judges Stephen Reinhardt and Paul Watford of the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. He also worked for two years in the Capital Habeas Unit of the Los Angeles Federal Public Defender’s Office and for two years as an associate at a law firm in Los Angeles.

“The public defense work plunged me deep into my own field, while the law firm experience gave me a chance to see how high-stakes civil litigation and regulatory work happen,” he said. “I enjoy being able to advise students on either path.”

Rappaport has been working recently on a project that examines whether municipal liability insurance helps reduce the incidence of police misconduct—work that he hopes will contribute a new element to the wider national debate about police accountability. “The vast majority of municipalities around the country take out liability policies that cover police misconduct,” said Rappaport, who started work on the project last summer, before the recent string of high-profile cases including Ferguson and Staten Island. “But no one in legal circles is talking about the insurers. Some people might think that if the police know they have insurance, they will feel like they can do whatever they want and the insurer will have to pay for it—it’s a license to misbehave. But you have car insurance and that’s not how you feel about it, right? An insurer in this industry is a business with a financial incentive to try to reduce police misconduct. We need to understand how well the insurers are doing their jobs by calibrating incentives to respond to and shape the behavior of the insured municipalities.”

Rappaport said he has relished his two years at the Law School and feels “truly fortunate” to be continuing to both teach and learn in an environment that pushes him to think in new ways. “The culture is very active, very involved, and very intimate,” he said. “I like coming to work in the summer — there are actually people here, and there are lots of chances for short informal exchanges about ideas. There’s a real energy.”
EXCITING MOMENTUM
A Message from the Law Campaign Co-Chairs
Dear Fellow Alumni and Friends of the Law School:

It is our privilege to update you on the tremendous progress of our Law School Campaign over this past year. What a year it has been! At the public launch of the University’s $4.5 billion campaign just last fall, the Law School announced its own goal of $175 million. By the close of the fiscal year on June 30, we had achieved our second-highest fundraising year on record ($39.7 million, compared to $40.7 million in 2013) and a cumulative campaign total of $162 million.

This success has come from the investment of alumni and friends at all gift levels: from the naming gifts that you’ve read about in these pages and on our website, to the stretch commitments that many alumni made for their class reunion gifts, to our terrific 54% alumni participation in our Firm Challenge (2014-15 winners noted below), and the impressive $4.6 million raised through the Annual Fund. Along with our fellow members of the Campaign Cabinet, we extend our sincere thanks to all of our donors for this outstanding show of support.

Dean Mike Schill led the charge through both the quiet phase and the first public year of the campaign, and we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his remarkable vision and passion for our alma mater. He would be the first to say that although we have made great progress, there is still much more to do. With Geof Stone’s experienced guidance as Interim Dean, and with a new dean to be named in the coming months, we are confident that we will continue to generate the additional resources we need in order to support the many exciting initiatives that make possible world-class faculty research, essential financial aid for our students, and broad alumni engagement with our school.

We are enormously proud to have hundreds of alumni involved each year in the life of our Law School as alumni leaders and faculty lecturers, guest speakers in classes and at myriad student organization events and professionalism programs, student mentors (both local and national), and in our more than 40 alumni events each year across the country and the world. We hope you will continue to take advantage of these many opportunities to stay connected, read the updates in these pages and on our website, and join us in investing in this extraordinary institution so that it remains at the very forefront of legal education.

Warmly,
Dan Doctoroff, ’84
Debbie Cafaro, ’82

University Trustee
University Trustee

Congratulations to the winners of the 2015 Firm Challenge for having the highest percentage of alumni to make a gift to the Law School!

**Group 1 (40 or more Alumni)**
Sidley Austin LLP

**Group 2 (25-39 Alumni)**
Bartlit Beck Herman Palenchar & Scott LLP†

**Group 3 (15-24 Alumni)**
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz

**Group 4 (15 or fewer Alumni)**
Crowell & Moring LLP†
Fox, Swibel, Levin & Carroll, LLP†
Irell & Manella LLP†
Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP†
Steans Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson, P.A.†
Sugar Felsenthal Grais & Hammer LLP†

*To see full 2015 results for the Law Firm Challenge, go to www.law.uchicago.edu/give/firmchallenge.

†Firms with 100% Alumni Participation
Creating Enduring Positive Impact through Scholarships

A $1 million gift from Roger Orf, JD’79, MBA’77, and his wife, Lisa T. Heffernan, MBA’80, will provide scholarships for financially disadvantaged students who have demonstrated outstanding academic accomplishments.

Orf is senior partner at Apollo Global Management, running the firm’s expansive real estate business throughout Europe. Based in London, where he has been since 1991, he’s been named as one of the 30 most influential people in European private equity real estate, winning awards that include “Entrepreneur of the Year,” and “European Industry Figure of the Year.”

He came to Apollo when it acquired his previous employer, Citigroup Property Investors, where he had been president and CEO, managing more than $6.5 billion of investments around the world. Before joining Citigroup, he was head of operations at Lone Star Management Europe, and before that he was the managing director of Pelham Partners, an investment company that he cofounded.

He also founded a data storage company, e-shelter, in 1999. He and his partners sold it earlier this year for €1.1 billion to the Japanese company NTT.

He began his career as an associate at Kirkland & Ellis but soon found that law practice wasn’t an ideal fit for his entrepreneurial nature. He joined Goldman Sachs in New York, becoming a vice president and managing large transactions that included the sale of the Sears Tower. Goldman assigned him to London in 1991 to lead its European real estate department activities.

“My law school education helps me every day, whether it’s being able to quickly analyze situations and respond effectively, communicating clearly with a wide range of stakeholders, or in more technical matters such as considering the structural alternatives or tax consequences of a deal,” he says. “A lot of my success results directly from my law school training.”

The designation for financially disadvantaged students of the Roger Orf and Lisa T. Heffernan Scholarship reflects Orf’s background and his civic commitments. “I came up the hard way,” he says, “as the son of hardworking parents who never had the opportunity to go to college. I relied on financial aid to go to Georgetown and then to the Law School. By the time I finished law school I was in hock to the tune of $36,000 dollars—an amount I thought I’d never be able to repay. Lisa and I want to do our part to help assure that everyone who is qualified to study at the Law School is able to do so.” They have made an equivalent gift to the Booth School to fund similarly oriented scholarships there. He has served twice on the Law School’s Visiting Committee and is currently serving on the Council of the Booth School.

His civic commitments have also led him to become European chairman of the Urban Land Institute. He’s beginning his third year in that role. Internationally, ULI is the largest not-for-profit real-estate-related organization in the world, with more than 35,000 members. “ULI is not about making money, it’s about building better buildings and helping to create better communities,” he says. “It’s an important mission and I’m honored to have been chosen to help lead it.”

“The nicest thing for me about being in real estate is that the product is something you can point to; you build something,” he observes. “If you build it right, it has an enduring positive impact. Lisa and I are looking at this scholarship fund in much the same way—we hope that each recipient will be someone who will take the great education they receive and build a fulfilling life of enduring value. It’s a very good feeling for us to be able to make a difference in this way.”
Wolf Family Challenge Increases Class Gifts and Class Unity

If you could make a modest financial contribution that would help ensure that Dick Badger got hit with in the face with a pie (with his consent, of course) or that Martha Nussbaum would attend Wine Mess dressed as the goddess Athena, would you do that?

Students from the JD and LLM classes of 2015 arranged those events, and several more, as they raised money for their class gift. Each event was triggered by the achievement of a new level of participation by their classmates. “The way that the faculty and administration pitched in inspired us as a committee, and it certainly caught and sustained our classmates’ interest throughout the fundraising process,” says Paige Braddy, ’15, who cochaired her class’s gift campaign.

A big added financial incentive also encouraged giving. Through a fund created by Chuck Wolf, ’75, his son Pete Wolf, ’10, and Pete’s wife Erin Wagner Wolf, ’10, the Law School offered to add $40,000 to the class’s gift if 76 percent of the class’s students gave something toward the campaign. Blair Bradford, ’15, the committee’s giving chair, says that the Wolf Family Challenge was a powerful motivator. “Knowing that even a small personal contribution could help bring about a much larger class gift definitely won over more than a few of our classmates,” she says.

Elevating participation helps the Law School in a larger way than just boosting the class gift: there is strong evidence that giving while a student leads to a much greater likelihood of giving in the years shortly after graduation, and giving in those early postgraduation years contributes to more giving over the long run.

Chuck Wolf says: “We like to support the Law School in whatever way will do the most good. When Daren Batke, in the Law School’s development office, suggested this challenge, we liked it right away, because it has an immediate effect on giving and it also has two cumulative effects, influencing later individual giving and also promoting a sense of class unity that can have a sizable effect on subsequent reunion gifts—reunion gifts that create scholarships, support faculty, improve facilities, and do lots of other things to help keep the Law School great.”

2015 was the third year that the Wolf Family Challenge was in effect. The 76 percent goal for the class of 2015 was 1 percent higher than the participation level reached by the class of 2014. That class received $30,000 for reaching its goal, and the class of 2013 earned $25,000 for exceeding 70 percent participation. The class of 2015 substantially exceeded its challenge goal, reaching 86 percent participation.

Outdoing previous classes was a driving force for the campaigns. 2014 cochair Christine Ricardo observes: “Chicago law students are just wired to respond to challenges. Set a standard and we’ll try to beat it. We told ourselves that we were at least as creative, interesting, and energetic as the 2013 class, so with some effort we ought to be able to do better than them.”

Individuals’ contributions can be designated for application to the general fund, or for faculty, scholarships, or clinics, and a portion of the funds that are raised is used for a tangible gift. The 2014 and 2015 gifts were poignant—benches in the Law School’s garden in memory of deceased classmates Laura LaPlante, ’14, Jay Brooks, ’15, and Abbie Harper, ’15. 2014 LLM chair Mishita Jethi reflects: “Laura’s death was tragic, but we took some solace
from knowing that because of the garden bench dedicated to her, she will still be remembered many years from now. We were glad to use part of our gift in that way, as a lasting remembrance from all 2014 graduates. It was moving to join together for that purpose.”

Grassroots canvassing was a vital part of each class’s strategy. 2013 cochair Matea Bozja reports: “The members of our committee met individually with almost every classmate at least once to make a personal appeal.

We caught people in the Green Lounge or in class, we sent individual emails—we did whatever was necessary to be sure we reached everyone. Even those who didn’t give got the message, and I think that will affect their likelihood of giving in the future.”

For the LLM graduates, there was another mobilizing factor, as 2015 LLM chair Thibault De Boulle explains: “Many of us come from countries in which philanthropy isn’t as crucial for academic institutions as it is in the US, and many of us received scholarships. So we came to see the importance of giving and the direct connection between giving and opportunities for ourselves and for future LLMs.” LLM participation has outpaced JD participation in each of the three years: 85 percent in 2013 and 2014, and 89 percent this year.

“It’s been wonderful to see each class surpassing what the previous one achieved, having fun while they put in that effort, educating their classmates about the importance of giving, and helping to create a habit of giving that will have very substantial long-term benefits for the school that means so much to so many of us,” Pete Wolf says. “Even something close to 100 percent participation seems like it might be within reach in the future, and that’s an exciting prospect that is more than our family ever thought might happen when we funded this challenge.”

Chuck Wolf adds, “It has been very nice for Pete, Erin, and me to fund this challenge as a family entity and to share in the energy that it helps create. I think more families might want to consider some kind of shared involvement.”
1938
Quintin Johnstone
June 27, 2014
Johnstone was the Justus S. Hotchkiss Professor Emeritus of Law at Yale Law School, where he taught for more than 55 years and was called “a treasured landmark” by Robert Post, Yale Law School dean. He specialized in property law, land transactions, and professional responsibility in the legal field; he was also well known as the coauthor of three books: *Lawyers and Their Work* (1967), *Paralegals: Progress and Prospects of a Satellite Occupation* (1985), and *Land Transfer and Finance* (4th ed., 1993). A Chicago native, Johnstone earned an AB from the University as in addition to his JD, and also held an LLM from Cornell University and a JSD from Yale Law School.

Warren R. Kahn
January 8, 2015
Kahn, who earned both an undergraduate degree and a JD from the University, lived most recently in White Plains, New York.

1940
Thelma Brook Simon
February 7, 2014
A Chicago native, Simon was one of two women in her Law School graduating class and worked in private practice during World War II. Between 1946 and 1961 she served as chief clerk for three members of the Illinois Supreme Court—Justices George W. Bristow, Roy J. Solfisburg Jr., and Ray I. Klinbiel—and later worked in the Illinois federal court system. Simon also taught administrative law and torts at the John Marshall Law School; served two terms as a trustee of the village of Wilmette, Illinois; and was active in the League of Women Voters and the Women’s Bar Association of Illinois.

Seymour Tabin
April 27, 2015
After graduating at the top of his Law School class, Tabin served as an officer in the US Navy during World War II, where he commanded a tank landing ship and a submarine chaser. After his service, he became a partner in the Chicago law firm of Froelich, Grossman, Teton & Tabin and later served as counsel to the firm of Gottlieb & Schwartz. Tabin also helped to establish the First Bank of Highland Park and served on the board of the Bank of Elk Grove.

1941
Edward R. Gustafson
April 24, 2015
Gustafson, who earned both his undergraduate degree and his JD at the University of Chicago, had a long career as a corporate attorney and was also a longtime administrative law judge for the Social Security Administration.

1947
Maurice Liebman
March 12, 2010

Mary P. Roemer
January 7, 2013
Roemer clerked for Alabama Supreme Court Justice John L. Goodman after earning her JD and practiced law part-time as a partner in Roemer & Roemer in Montgomery, Alabama. After raising her family, she worked as an attorney for Alabama Legal Services and for the Social Security Administration.

1948
James Hurlburt Evans
May 11, 2015
Evans was a lieutenant in the US Navy during World War II, after which he joined Harris Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago and began a distinguished career that included serving as vice president and director of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.; chairman and president of The Seamen’s Bank for Savings; and president of Union Pacific Corporation. He then served for eight years as chairman and chief executive officer of Union Pacific, a position from which he retired in 1985. Evans was a director on a number of corporate boards, including American Telephone and Telegraph Company, Citicorp/Citibank, General Motors Corporation, and Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. A dedicated volunteer, he was also a life trustee and former chairman of the Central Park Conservancy and served on the governing boards of New York–Presbyterian Hospital, the University of Chicago, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and the American National Red Cross.
George E. Wise  
March 30, 2015  
Wise served as a naval aviator during World War II, following which he earned his JD at the University. He clerked at the California Supreme Court before entering private practice in Long Beach, California. When the US Navy closed its Long Beach base, Wise helped to negotiate the formation of the Long Beach Navy Memorial Heritage Association, a $4.5 million trust that makes grants to support community projects. In addition to his community service in Long Beach, Wise was also an election observer in Nicaragua in the 1980s.

Bernard S. Kaplan  
March 8, 2013  
A well-known Chicago attorney for more than 60 years, Kaplan served as the national president of Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity and was an honorary life director of the Zeta Beta Tau Foundation.

Calvin C. Campbell  
February 12, 2015  
A World War II veteran who was awarded the Bronze Star and other honors, Campbell worked in the Illinois Attorney General’s office for nearly two decades after earning his JD and went on to serve as a justice of the Appellate Court of Illinois for 30 years.

Joseph H. Balsamo  
March 6, 2015  
Balsamo had a long legal career in Rockland County, New York. The county bar association honored him with the creation of the Joseph Balsamo Award, given annually to the member who has gained significant respect from members of the bar and the public for personal and professional contributions, integrity, and professionalism.

Watha H. Lambert  
March 6, 2015  
A World War II veteran, Lambert was a US Army machine gunner who served in five campaigns in Germany and France. While at the University, he served as business editor of the Law Review; after graduating, he practiced law first in Tennessee and later in Arizona. A civil rights activist and volunteer with the Boy Scouts, Lambert was also a published poet.

Richard B. Berryman  
May 15, 2015  
Berryman began his career in the Office of the General Counsel of the Navy in Washington, DC, and later became a partner in the firm of Cox, Langford & Brown. In the late 1960s, he joined the Washington office of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, where he practiced corporate law for domestic and international clients for more than two decades.

Roy Sanders  
August 10, 2013  
An Army veteran, Lieberman practiced law in Chicago for more than 40 years.

Mark S. Lieberman  
March 1, 2015  
A native of Aberdeen, Scotland, Meston was a well-known legal historian and a leading authority on Scotland’s law of succession. He taught jurisprudence and later Scots law at Aberdeen University from 1964 until his retirement in 1994 as professor emeritus. His many volunteer activities included serving as president of the UK body the Society of Public Teachers of Law (now the Society of Legal Scholars) and as a member of the complaints committee for the Law Society of Scotland.

William M. Hegan  
March 1, 2015  
A veteran of the US National Guard, Kelley practiced law in Chicago until 1972, when he moved to Austin, Texas.

Michael Charles Meston  
February 8, 2013  
A native of Aberdeen, Scotland, Meston was a well-known legal historian and a leading authority on Scotland’s law of succession. He taught jurisprudence and later Scots law at Aberdeen University from 1964 until his retirement in 1994 as professor emeritus. His many volunteer activities included serving as president of the UK body the Society of Public Teachers of Law (now the Society of Legal Scholars) and as a member of the complaints committee for the Law Society of Scotland.

Richard E. Poole  
April 24, 2015  
After serving as a law clerk to Judge Collins J. Seitz in the US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Poole joined the Wilmington, Delaware, firm of Potter Anderson & Corroon as an associate. He became a partner in 1972, and served as chair of the firm from 1997 to 1999. A litigator, he specialized in the field of insurance coverage and was a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Peter E. Riddle  
March 4, 2015  
Riddle was a US Navy veteran who entered the Law School after concluding his service, later volunteered to serve in Vietnam, and retired as a captain in the Naval Reserve. He practiced law in Coronado, California, for many years, served on the city council, and was appointed a judge of the California Superior Court for the County of San Diego in 1987. After his 2000 retirement, Riddle continued to work part-time in juvenile justice, advocating for neglected and abused children.
1967
Alvin J. Geske
March 15, 2015
Geske was a longtime resident of Kensington, Maryland, and had practiced law in Washington, DC, since the early 1970s.

Don S. Samuelson
April 4, 2015
A resident of Lake Forest, Illinois, Samuelson was a lawyer, real estate developer, legal recruiter, and president of DSSA Strategies and DSSA Management, Inc., companies that developed and managed subsidized housing for seniors.

1972
Brian K. Smith
March 10, 2015
Smith served in the US Army, attaining the rank of major, as a Judge Advocate General officer. Following his military service, he worked for Huntington Ingalls Shipbuilding in New Orleans, Louisiana, and later lived in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

1976
Dale E. McNiel
June 8, 2015
McNiel was an attorney in Washington, DC, who specialized in international trade and agricultural policy. He began his career as a civil litigation specialist in Chicago; he later taught courses in international trade at Central Michigan University before joining the US Department of Agriculture in 1984, where he ultimately served as the department’s chief legal advisor on the US national sugar program and as an advisor on international trade rules. He reentered private practice in 1997 and started his own firm in 2000, advising clients on agricultural and trade law issues.

1977
Richard M. Schwartz
February 21, 2015
A noted specialist in environmental law, Schwartz headed the environmental practice of the firm Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson. He began his legal career at Skadden Arps, then joined the US Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York, where he headed the environmental unit before moving to Fried, Frank in 1992. Schwartz won awards from the Environmental Protection Agency for the negotiation of a major Superfund settlement and from the Department of Justice for superior performance in civil environmental enforcement. He also did pro bono legal work for GrowNYC, the nonprofit sponsor of many New York City greenmarkets.

2012
Samuel Paul Delay
April 28, 2015
Delay was an associate at the New York City firm of Latham & Watkins, where he worked in mergers and acquisitions. He also spent many hours providing pro bono legal services to entrepreneurs.

Friend
Marguerite A. Walk
February 28, 2015
Marguerite Walk emigrated from Amsterdam to Chicago in 1939 and married the late Maurice Walk, ’21, in 1940. They lived in Highland Park and later Chicago and together supported many causes. They endowed full-tuition scholarships at the Law School and for the past 48 years sustained the Grand Teton Music Festival in Jackson, Wyoming in countless ways. She is survived by her three children and two grandsons.

Faculty
Robert A. Burt
August 3, 2015
Robert “Bo” Burt was an Associate Professor of Law at the Law School from 1968 to 1970. A graduate of Yale Law School, he served on their faculty beginning in 1976. At the time of his death he was the Alexander M. Bickel Professor Emeritus of Law. He was an expert on constitutional law and on issues found at the intersection of law and medicine, as well as a scholar on questions of religious culture and law and the relationship between psychoanalysis and social order.
Gidon Gottlieb, the Law School’s Leo Spitz Professor Emeritus of International Law and Diplomacy, died July 5 in Zürich, Switzerland, after a long illness. Professor Gottlieb, who served on the Law School’s faculty between 1976 and 2003, taught courses in international law, jurisprudence, human rights, and negotiations. He introduced the course The Lawyer as Negotiator in 1985.

“When Gidon joined our faculty, he added an international perspective that had been lacking since the retirement some years earlier of Max Rheinstein,” said Interim Dean Geoffrey R. Stone, the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law. “In his teaching, writing, and collaboration with colleagues, Gidon brought to bear a sharp intellect, a deep curiosity, a wonderful sense of humor. His presence added immeasurably to our intellectual community.”

Added Douglas G. Baird, the Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service Professor of Law and the Law School’s Dean between 1994 and 1999: “He was very much a man of the world, as illustrated by his standing instructions to the dean: ‘If you need to find me, all you must do is place an ad in the International Herald Tribune.’”

Professor Gottlieb was born in Paris and was educated at the London School of Economics and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was a senior exhibitioner, before attending Harvard Law School, where he earned an SJD. During his doctoral studies, he taught in the Government Department of Dartmouth College.

After graduation, he joined the law firm of Shearman & Sterling, as well as the faculty of the New York University School of Law, where he directed the Peace Studies Program. He served as United Nations representative of Amnesty International from 1966 to 1972, served as personal adviser to President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, and was a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. As a Distinguished Visiting Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Professor Gottlieb carried out an unofficial, prediplomatic Middle East peace initiative during the late 1990s under the auspices of former Secretary of State George P. Shultz.

“Gidon Gottlieb was always a cautious pessimist in matters of international affairs,” said Senior Lecturer Richard A. Epstein, the James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Law and an Interim Dean between February and June 2001. “He could see that solutions were hard to come by in so many long-standing disputes but never gave up on the prospect that a long shot could come home. His 1989 article in Foreign Affairs about the longstanding Israeli-Palestinian dispute predicted in broad outline the erratic course of negotiations until today.”

Professor Gottlieb is the author of The Logic of Choice: Concepts of Rule and Rationality and Nation against State: Ethnic Conflicts and the Decline of Sovereignty, as well as numerous essays on international law, diplomacy, political theory, and jurisprudence.

He is survived by his wife, Antoinette Marie-Genevieve Rozoy Gottlieb.
Big-Picture Litigator Takes Pride in Being Civic and Professional Leader

Right after he graduated from the Law School in 1962, David Hilliard entered the Navy, and not long after that he participated in a full-scale naval assault on the coast of Spain, involving hundreds of warships. It was only a war games exercise, of course, conducted with the approval of the Spanish government, and Hilliard was a judge advocate assigned to the admiral in charge, but the sweep and energy of the undertaking are consistent with the way that Hilliard has approached his work, his service, and his life since then.

When he returned from his military service, he joined the firm that is today Pattishall, McAuliffe, Newbury, Hilliard & Geraldson. Focused on intellectual property protection, the firm is consistently ranked at the top of its field. He’s the “Hilliard” in the firm’s name, and he served as its managing partner for twenty years.

Another of the firm’s managing partners has described Hilliard as “the epitome of a big-picture trial lawyer, able to marshal troops and craft creative, winning strategies.” He has represented Ford Motor Company in IP matters for 35 years. When Ford first came to him, Hilliard says, he considered its slogan to be “always sued; never sue.” He changed that in a dramatic way, launching 50 suits in a short time.

“I was constantly on airplanes,” he recalls, “but we won every one of those cases—that I can remember.” For PepsiCo, he initiated and won more than 60 gray-market cases. Those cases, along with many others he has handled for a broad range of clients, established legal standards for anticounterfeiting protection, protection against illegal imports, and many other crucial intellectual property matters.

If you were to start counting the prestigious awards and recognition he has garnered for the quality, importance, and integrity of his work, and you began working backward from 2015, you’d run out of fingers and toes before you got very far into 2013. He has said that an award he received just ten years out of law school means a great deal to him—the Maurice Weigle Award from the Chicago Bar Foundation, which he earned in part for his role as the founding chair of the Chicago Bar Association’s Young Lawyer’s Section. The group now has more than 9,000 members, twenty-six committees, and fifty public-service projects.

He has served as a past president of the Chicago Bar Association, as a director of the International Trademark Association, and on the Illinois Commission on the Rights of Women, among many other professional and civic responsibilities. He has been a trustee of the Art Institute of Chicago since 1979 and is a past vice-chair of that board.

The author or coauthor of five books and textbooks on intellectual property law, he has also served as an expert witness in major litigation for clients that include Chrysler, Blue Shield of California, 3M, and the Internal Revenue Service.

He has taught at the Law School, served as chair of the Visiting Committee, chaired reunion committees, and—together with his wife of more than 40 years, Celia—provided financial support that includes an endowed fund and the David and Celia Hilliard Research Fellowship. “I was taught by the best legal faculty anywhere—Soia Mentschikoff, Karl Llewellyn, Bernie Meltzer, and so many others,” he recalls. “They not only made possible a great career for me; they enlarged my personal and professional horizons in ways I will always be grateful for. Whatever I can give back is relatively small compared to the deep gratitude I feel.”

While he was serving in the Navy, Hilliard bought a ceramic plate by Picasso in Portugal, for $100. That was the start of art collecting by him, an activity in which Celia would soon join him. Their passion and discernment led to a world-renowned collection, 115 pieces from which were exhibited at the Art Institute last year.

In the sumptuous published catalog from that exhibit, Dreams & Echoes, the Hilliards close an essay with words that echo the past but point toward the future: “We continue on, curious to see what lies ahead. Tennessee Williams expressed something of this spirit. . . . ‘Make voyages!’ he exhorts us. ‘Attempt them!—there’s nothing else.’ ”
A Lifetime of Exemplary Social Justice Work Kickstarted by a Dean

Earlier this year, Roberta Cooper Ramo, ’67, received the highest honor conferred by the American Bar Association, the ABA Medal, for “conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence.” She is one of seventy-six people to have received the award in its eighty-six-year history; other recipients include Oliver Wendell Holmes, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and Thurgood Marshall.

Ramo lives in Albuquerque and is a partner at Modrall Sperling. She served as President of the ABA in 1995 and 1996—the first woman to hold that post—and she has been President of the American Law Institute since 2008—also the first woman to hold that post. She is the only person to have been President of both of those organizations.

In her acceptance address for the ABA Medal, she thanked three people, aside from her family, who had helped her career. The first of them was former Law School dean Phil Neal. When she was looking for a postgraduation job near Duke University—where her physician husband would be undertaking advanced medical training—no law firm responded to her letters. She recalls: “When Dean Neal heard about my situation, he called Terry Sanford, who had just left office as governor of North Carolina, and demanded that Sanford find me a place to work. He made it clear that he was not taking no for an answer.”

Sanford did as Neal had insisted, and she got a job with a foundation addressing the administration of antipoverty programs in North Carolina. From there, she joined the faculty of Shaw University, a historically black university, where she taught constitutional law. In both of those positions, she tried to advance social justice—something she has done throughout her career. As head of the ABA, one of her principal successes came from staving off concerted congressional efforts to defund the Legal Services Corporation, and she also led the creation the ABA’s Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence. “I couldn’t be more proud of anything I’ve been associated with,” she says about that commission, “and I am also so sad that twenty years later it still needs to exist.”

At Modrall Sperling, which she joined in 1993, her practice includes arbitration, mediation, business law, real estate, and estate planning, and she assists organizations with their governance and strategic legal planning. She’s board Vice President of the Santa Fe Opera and was President of the Board of Regents at the University of New Mexico. She was a founding director of, and currently chairs, Think New Mexico, a bipartisan think tank committed to research and advocacy to improve the quality of life for all New Mexicans, especially those who lack a strong voice in the political process. She has received honorary degrees from six universities, is an honorary member of the Bar of England and Wales and of Gray’s Inn, and was elected into the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2011.

“In all honesty, I’m the least impressive member of my family,” she says. Her husband, Barry, is a cardiologist whom she refers to as “New Mexico’s doctor” for his broad and visionary service; their daughter, Jenny, a lawyer, is Executive Director of New Mexico Appleseed; and their son, Joshua, is Vice Chair of Kissinger Associates and author of the best-selling book The Age of the Unthinkable.

“Without Phil Neal, I don’t know what career I might have had,” she reflects, “and his help for me reflected the support I experienced from many people throughout my time at the Law School. I wasn’t a great student in my first year, but faculty and students stepped up to help me get better. That’s the way it was: People didn’t dismiss you because you weren’t as great as they were; they helped you become better. Bernie Meltzer and David Currie were among the many who inspired me and supported me—and I think Phil Kurland must have written four hundred recommendation letters for me! I finally figured out how to think and analyze like a lawyer thanks to the Law School, but I also learned vital lessons about how people can bring out the best in each other, and those lessons have shaped my life.”
Breaking Barriers and Representing Industry

When Anne Kimball, ’76, told her father—himself a lawyer—that she wanted to go to law school, he wasn’t enthusiastic. “He told me that as a woman, I’d never get into a good law school, and if I did, I’d never get hired by a firm, and if I was hired, I’d never make partner,” she recalls.

He was wrong, wrong, and wrong—and if he had also forecast that she’d never have an extraordinary career that shaped large parts of the American business landscape, he would have been very wrong about that, too.

As a partner at the legacy firm Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon, she has focused on complex litigation, particularly in the areas of class actions, emerging theories of liability, and industry-wide defense. Not long after she joined the firm, she began representing the gun maker Smith & Wesson against lawsuits filed under a number of different legal theories. Most commonly, those theories could be classified as “negligent marketing” or “negligent distribution.” “These weren’t product liability claims,” she says. “The product was not defective; it did what it was supposed to do. The usual contention was that firearm manufacturers had committed a tort simply by legally marketing, promoting, and advertising their products to the general public. The plaintiffs didn’t like guns, and they hadn’t been satisfied with outcomes from the legislative process, so they went to court.”

She won all of those cases, and in addition to serving as counsel to Smith & Wesson, she also acted as its public spokesperson for many years. During a particularly important 1999 trial, she served as the national spokesperson for the firearms industry in general, commenting almost daily on radio and television and in print media.

The brewing industry also turned to her to rebuff similar types of lawsuits, involving claims that the marketing of its products led to alcoholism, drunk driving, and underage drinking, among other things. She won case after case, usually having them dismissed before discovery. In none of these cases was any money paid to plaintiffs or an attorney. For 20 years, she was primary outside counsel to the Beer Institute, a Washington-based trade association, and she has worked closely with industry representatives to help develop effective public service advertisements, educational campaigns, and public statements.

“The firearms and brewing cases had the potential to damage two large industries, which were already highly regulated,” she observes, “and they also presented major constitutional issues regarding separation of powers and First Amendment rights. I think we won them for all the right reasons, and those reasons are important.”

Having been recognized consistently as one of the most effective and influential attorneys in the United States, she is a frequent mentor and advisor to young women leaders, and she serves on the Women’s Board of the University of Chicago. She’s vice chair of the board of trustees of the school in Brooklyn that she attended from pre-kindergarten through high school, Packer Collegiate Institute. At her firm, she was a longtime member of the management committee and she was the firm’s general counsel for five years.

She has also handled cases, often involving product liability, in a range of other industries, including pharmaceuticals, agricultural products, insurance, and medical products. “I’ve been pretty successful in a very broad range of settings, many of which were completely foreign to me at first. I attribute that in large part to qualities that were strongly reinforced by my education at the Law School, including a deep respect for facts, a lively curiosity, and a willingness to ask questions,” she says.

She has demonstrated her appreciation for her Law School education in many ways, including two terms on the Visiting Committee, service on Reunion Committees, and chairing the Annual Fund campaign. “The list of professors I have to thank for helping me succeed amounts to a Who’s Who of legal giants—Bernie Meltzer, Walter Blum, David Currie, Richard Epstein, William Landes, and so many more,” she says. “I’m grateful to them every day, and I think that I can honor all that they did for me by being the best advocate I can be, and by giving back to the school that enabled me to learn from them.”

David Applegate wrote, “After 35 years of practicing commercial and intellectual property litigation (which I continue to do), I found new satisfaction in law and public policy work and have begun an active US Supreme Court law practice by representing amicus parties on petitions for certiorari. So far I am two for two in having cert petitions granted, first in Kimble v. Marvel, No. 13-720, decided June 22, 2015, and most recently in Friedrichs v. California Teachers Union, No. 14-915, which will be heard next term. In addition, I write a monthly column for the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin entitled “Plain Speaking,” in which I challenge orthodoxies of the day from a primarily libertarian standpoint. On the nonlaw front, I organized and self-curated an exhibition of original newspaper strip cartoon art from my collection entitled...
Ambassador to Germany and Active Civic and Law School Volunteer

Anyone who doubts that a University of Chicago law degree can support many vibrant career opportunities need look no farther than the accomplishments of John B. Emerson, ’78. Since 2013, he has been serving as the US Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, after a career that has included a firm partnership, a top-level position in a major city attorney’s office, high-profile service in the White House, and the presidency of a large international investment firm. Even that chronology leaves out a lot, including twice running vital parts of presidential campaigns and an expansive portfolio of board leadership at civic and educational institutions.

“I’ve done a lot of different things,” Emerson says, “and I give a great deal of credit for whatever successes I have enjoyed to the education I received at the Law School. I learned skills of critical thinking and communicating that I’m still conscious of applying every day.”

As he applies those skills in his ambassadorial responsibilities, we’re all better off. “A large part of my work involves national security issues, and another sizable part involves economic matters,” he says. Counterterrorism collaboration, action regarding climate change, resisting Russian overreach, the fight against ISIS, and support for the negotiation a major transatlantic trade agreement are among the matters that occupy his days.

“It’s hard to imagine a more interesting time to be an ambassador here,” he says. His tenure started out interestingly enough—not long after he arrived, leaked documents suggested that the United States had tapped the phone of German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Going far beyond expressing understanding of German concerns and urging that the incident should not harm an important relationship, Emerson devoted himself to meeting with media editorial boards, urging that the incident should not harm an important relationship, and engaging in Berlin. He has been a great friend and counselor to me during my time here. He represents the very best of the Law School—brilliant, charming, forthright, erudite, and wise. Being with him is another reminder of what made my law school experience so very special and of the heritage that keeps it such a great place today.”

In the 1980s, he was deputy campaign manager of Gary Hart’s presidential campaign, and in 1992 he ran Bill Clinton’s campaign in California, a state that Republicans had carried in nine of the last ten presidential contests. When Clinton won California, Emerson’s skill was recognized with a series of White House positions, including serving as the administration’s liaison to the nation’s governors. Clinton also relied heavily on Emerson to keep California in the Democratic fold; Clinton later wrote that Emerson was so devoted to this responsibility that “he became known around the White House as the ‘Secretary of California.’”

Before his years in the White House, Emerson had served for six years as Los Angeles Chief Deputy City Attorney, and before that, he was a partner at Manatt, Phelps, & Philipps, the Los Angeles firm that he joined after graduating from the Law School.

When he left the White House, he signed on at Capital Group, one of the world’s largest investment management firms, quickly becoming president of the company’s Private Client Services group. He was in that position until his ambassadorial nomination. He has been very active in the civic life of Los Angeles, serving for more than eight years as the board chair of the Music Center of Los Angeles County, which includes as resident companies the Los Angeles Philharmonic and the LA Opera, and as a member of the Los Angeles Mayor’s Trade Advisory Council, among other things.

“Secretary of California” might not be the most exalted honorary title Emerson has enjoyed—some of his law school classmates remember him as “King of Wine Mess,” because he ran that activity for two years. He has continued to serve the Law School and his classmates, as a two-time member of the Visiting Committee, a reunion chair, and an always-ready volunteer.

He says that a highlight of his ambassadorship has been reconnecting with Gerhard Casper: “Gerhard was one of my favorite professors, and he is now the president of the American Academy in Berlin. He has been a great friend and counselor to me during my time here. He represents the very best of the Law School—brilliant, charming, forthright, erudite, and wise. Being with him is another reminder of what made my law school experience so very special and of the heritage that keeps it such a great place today.”

Jeff Berkowitz

Jeff Berkowitz has started to solicit some underwriting for the television show you have read about previously in this column. If you are interested in contacting him about this, please get in touch with him at JBCG@aol.com or (312) 560-9300. Jeff’s younger daughter, Lauren, has graduated from the University of Washington Law
Bringing the Future of Hospitality to Life

Kim Sinatra, ’85, is General Counsel, Executive Vice President, and Secretary at Wynn Resorts Ltd. The company, whose 2014 revenue was $5.4 billion, owns casino hotel resort properties in Las Vegas, Macau, and elsewhere.

When Sinatra joined Wynn in 2004, she was its 318th employee, and it had no active properties. Today the company employs more than 20,000 people and has four properties, with two more on the way. “Things happen at what seems like warp speed in Las Vegas,” she says, “and Steve Wynn is one of the greatest entrepreneurs ever. So it’s never a dull moment for me.”

Dull moments have been rare throughout her career. Not long after law school, when she was working at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher as a real estate lawyer, she became involved in a pitched battle between Donald Trump and Merv Griffin over control of a company with properties in Atlantic City. Griffin, her client, came out on top, and he hired her to work at his company, which was expanding its portfolio of hotels and gaming facilities.

Later, at Caesar’s Entertainment from 2001 to 2003, she was deeply engaged in an effort to build a $500 million casino and resort in upstate New York in association with a Mohawk tribe.

“I really got into this business because of the hospitality and development aspects, more than the gaming side,” she says. “I joined Merv Griffin because he was building hotels, and my first position with Wynn was as a development person. It’s still really all about building things for me. I like building new things. I love taking a new idea and working with a great team to bring it into physical reality.”

Her resume is replete with firsts. She was a key member of the Wynn team that created the Macau property—among the first wave of American companies to build multibillion-dollar projects in China. She led the legal team for the public offering that made Wynn the first US company with a subsidiary traded on the Hong Kong stock exchange. Last year, her leadership contributed to Wynn’s victory in a high-stakes multiyear competition for the coveted license to build a casino in Everett, Massachusetts, just outside Boston. “A lot of people told us we’d never get that license; that it would go to a local company,” she recalls. “When we started in Macau, we were told that we’d never be able to create a great property there. But we had a vision, and we had people who wouldn’t settle for less than the best—the rest is history.”

“So much of what I do relates to issues of first impression, and my experience at the Law School has been invaluable in helping me handle those,” she says. “You have to have a clear viewpoint, be ready for anything, have all your arguments lined up, and think on your feet. Great professors taught me how to do those things. I still remember how terrified we all were—or at least I was—the first time Professor Helmholz called on someone. I still remember who that student was, thirty years later. Helmholz, Isenbergh, Baird, Landes, Stone, Meltzer, and so many others—I have them to thank for the wonderful opportunities that make every day of my life so fascinating.”

Her days are further enlivened by additional responsibilities for overseeing Wynn’s philanthropic, community relations, and governmental affairs functions, and by her five children, who are between the ages of 16 and 25. She’ll have an increased role at the Law School, too, as a new member of the Visiting Committee.

“My affection for the Law School has never waned,” she says. “I was part of something very special when I was there, and I feel like I still am. The incredible standards of quality, the exceptional teaching, the passionate students, and the amazing leadership that recent deans have provided to keep the school flourishing while retaining the core values that make it so special—there’s real magic there. Wherever I am, I’ll never stop being a very proud Chicagoan.”
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On My Missing Our 30th Reunion
By Joshua Hornick

To miss this reunion’s a crime, And because I am missing it I’m feeling such sharp regret That I’ve already set My resolve to attend the next time.

Josh—we missed you and a few other people! But we did have quite a turnout for our 30th Reunion in May! And there are not enough column inches allotted here for me to summarize all that occurred on that weekend. A few highlights: Professor Helmholz held court at our dinner along with his delightful wife Amy Klobuchar took to the stage with Professor Stone and shared stories about her life in the US Senate. Randy Picker educated us all about M00C0s. And, in addition to the “official” gatherings, there were quite a few “unofficial” gatherings and lots of renewed connections. It was relaxed and fun with great food and even better company. If you missed it, then take Josh’s resolution to heart and come next time! But, in the meantime, I hope you will satisfy yourself with these reports from your classmates!

Ken Cera sends his best from steamy Manhattan with this report: “At our recent 30th Reunion, in addition to the more formal gathering, several of us spent much of the weekend in smaller and much more informal gatherings, where we enjoyed the company of several of our classmates. The lucky hostess for this was Kathy Roach, who was generous enough to share
“So Much on Her Plate, It’s Become a Platter”

Last year, when Noni Ellison Southall, JD ‘97, MBA ‘97, received one of the many honors she has garnered during her career—in this case, from the Georgia Association of Black Women Attorneys for service to the community—the presenters were asked to describe one of her distinctive characteristics: the capacity to do more than most people, and do it brilliantly.

“She has an indomitable spirit and will,” said Comer Yates, Executive Director of the Atlanta Speech School. “You would think that she’s been cloned about five times,” said Cesar Mitchell, Atlanta City Council President. “Noni has so much on her plate that it’s become a platter,” said attorney and author Patricia Russell McCloud.

She was like that at the Law School, too. Realizing after her first year that she wanted to become an international corporate finance attorney, she decided to get an MBA, so she entered the Booth School, participated in the international business exchange program based in Manchester, England, and worked as a Junior Foreign Service Officer for the US State Department in Accra, Ghana. That wasn’t all—she also studied the economics of international health systems for two years on her way to earning a certification in health administration and policy at the University of Chicago, and she held several student leadership positions at the Law School, including as a cofounder of the International Legal Study Program, organizing the inaugural Israeli legal study tour.

She achieved her professional goal. As an associate at Vinson & Elkins for three years after law school, her responsibilities included international and domestic acquisitions and financings in various industries, reaching up to $3.5 billion valuations; she then served as the director of business and legal affairs at Scripps Networks in New York before moving to Atlanta with Turner Broadcasting. During her tenure at Turner, she rose quickly through the ranks, finishing her time there in the role of Assistant General Counsel and head of the music division. Her international experience at Turner was broad, including a posting in Hong Kong, where among many other things she handled an array of deals across the Asia-Pacific Region.

Now she has joined W.W. Grainger, Inc., the $10 billion Lake Forest–based industrial supply company. As Associate General Counsel for Finance and Assistant Corporate Secretary, she’s managing everything related to finance and treasury matters around the world as part of her far-flung responsibilities, which include being assistant corporate secretary of the company’s numerous international subsidiaries. “This is the exact role I started preparing myself for back in law school,” she says. “Grainger is a great company that takes the right approach to doing business. The company believes in placing an equal focus on its customers, team members, and the communities in which we work and live, which is very important to me.”

This brings us to all those other things that she has on her platter, the ones that make people wonder how many times she might have been cloned. She’s been married for eleven years to patent attorney Kenneth Southall, and they have two children. A partial list of her civic service includes two terms as chair and two as vice chair of the Urban League of Greater Atlanta, and ongoing responsibilities as vice chair of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Board, as a member of the board of visitors at Emory University, and as a director of the National Association for Multi-Ethnicity in Communications, the Atlanta Speech School, and the Southern Center for Human Rights. She has been honored by more than 15 organizations and publications for her service and accomplishments.

She says that her time at the Law School influenced her in many ways: “From my professors and fellow students, I was inspired to gain in-depth knowledge of differing views and perspectives on sometimes controversial issues, find common ground, and work together despite differences. All of those things have helped me succeed in the practice of law and in my other endeavors. Additionally, my experience as a law student working in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Clinic under the tutelage of Randolph Stone instilled in me the importance of public service.”

Ben Cooper was appointed to the new Frank Montague, Jr., Professorship of Legal Studies and Professionalism, a professorship especially for scholars in professional responsibility. In addition, he has been asked to become a Reporter for the ABA Commission on the Future of Legal Services.

Marc Jenkins and his family are enjoying living in Dallas, where Marc is the Chief Operating Officer of Learfield Sports. His girls are 7 and 4, and by all appearances in Facebook, they may be possibly the most adorable girls ever.

Molly Stadum Garhart joined Apple last September, working in Business Affairs in Marcom on the Apps Team. Personally, the family moved to Outer Richmond by the beach.

I was able to see Bo Rutledge in the winter in Washington, DC, when the Deanship was new, even though as of now he has finished his first semester as Dean of the University of Georgia Law School and doing really well. His kids are growing up fast—Anna is already a teenager! Birgit is still teaching German at a school in Athens.

Joe Eandi have been building my privacy and cybersecurity practice at Jenner & Block. I have been able to visit with Joe Eandi (who is the founder of cybersecurity-information-sharing
Building the Corporate Lab and a Law School Network

After Sean Kramer, ’10, graduated from college, he was not fully certain that he wanted to go to law school. He had excelled in a liberal arts curriculum with a concentration in legal studies at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and he drew inspiration from his aunt, Maureen Sheehy, ’87, who served as both a role model and a sounding board.

Wanting to be completely sure that law school would be right for him, he worked for roughly two years as a litigation paralegal—technically, a “project assistant”—in the Chicago office of Kirkland & Ellis LLP. That turned out to be a very positive experience for all parties, so much so that Kramer decided to apply to law schools and to maintain a close relationship with Kirkland. He received letters of recommendation from several Kirkland partners, summered at Kirkland’s New York office during law school, joined its Chicago office after graduating, and became a partner there earlier this year.

Along the way, he made a substantial and enduring impact on the Law School by cofounding the Corporate Lab while he was still a student; he also contributed to the growth of a dynamic new company, Gerchen Keller Capital, LLC (cofounded by Ashley Keller, ’07), which is pioneering the relatively new field of commercial litigation finance.

The Corporate Lab (which is now the Kirkland & Ellis Corporate Lab) is one of the Law School’s clinical offerings; it and its related programming have become central elements of the Law School’s business-related curriculum. Students work directly with legal and business leaders at household-name Fortune 500 corporations, nonprofits, and start-up companies, and they also benefit from an extensive speaker series, conferences, and symposia open to the greater Law School community.

Kramer helped Professor David Zarfes—who was then an assistant dean of the Law School—establish the Lab in 2009, transforming what had been a successful relationship with Microsoft into the dynamic learning experience that is the Lab today. Its “client” roster includes more than 15 leading companies, and more than 50 students are taught there each year. Kramer has maintained his relationship with the Lab, as a lecturer in law and the Lab’s cochair, along with Professor Zarfes, who heads the transactional curriculum and oversees adjunct faculty at the Law School. Zarfes’s appreciation for Kramer is unstinting: “Sean Kramer is among the most able and intelligent students I have encountered in my time teaching, at both Chicago and Columbia. He is pure gold,” he says.

Kramer worked as an analyst at Gerchen Keller from last May until April of this year. The company invests in commercial litigation by providing capital to help companies and law firms manage costs and expand working capital, de-risk legal exposures, and monetize fees, judgments, and settlements. During Kramer’s tenure, Gerchen Keller zoomed to prominence and became the world’s largest investment firm in its field.

“I was honored to have the opportunity to work at such a great company with a lot of very brilliant people,” Kramer says. “But I found that my heart was still with Kirkland, and I was thrilled when Kirkland invited me to come back on a fast track to a partnership.”

“It goes without saying that I received a top-flight legal education at the Law School,” Kramer observes. “But what I really loved about it was the extraordinary network of people, inside the school and among its graduates, who will step up to support your passions and goals. Professor Zarfes, Dean Schill, and many others were completely supportive as the Corporate Lab developed, and after I graduated and joined Kirkland, Steve Ritchie, [’88], a senior corporate partner and a tremendous supporter of the Law School, helped me grow within the practice group that best fit my personality and desired career path. Many Law School graduates from Kirkland have spoken at the Lab and mentored students there, and the decision to put the firm’s name on the Lab was very important to me. I can’t begin to say how grateful I am for this great school and the amazing people who make up its community.”

Garrett Garfield is living and practicing as a commercial litigator in Portland, Oregon. He has become a true Portlander by getting rid of his car and riding his bike to work rain or shine. He is happily married with three kids.

Rahwa H. Ghebre-Ab is finishing up her first year as Director of Business and Legal Affairs at Lionsgate Entertainment in Los Angeles, California.

Carl Gismervig is a patent litigator working at Dechert in Silicon Valley, California, and just celebrated his three-year wedding anniversary.

Eric Gyasi is a corporate lawyer, working in New York City at Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison. He is married to a fellow lawyer (she is a litigator at Simpson Thacher).

Brandon Hale is working in Phoenix, Arizona, as a commercial litigator at Osborn Maledon, PA. He is happily married with three kids.

Allison Handy is a corporate and securities lawyer at Perkins Coie LLP in Seattle, WA. She is married (since 2L year) with a 2-year-old daughter and expecting another baby in December.

Alia M. Horwick had a baby boy, Samson Rhys, on April 27, and he is super cute. She now has three kids total, with sister Hannah and brother AJ. The
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For the Degree of Master of Laws

Teresita Acedo Betancourt
Ferhat Afkar
Masaaki Aono
Kristhika Ashok
Masayuki Atsumi
Thomas Banwell Ayres
Vanessa Bertonha Felício
Maria Cecília Canepa Olachea
Alexandre Carvalho Pinto Rios
Kan-Hsueh Chiang
Calvin Tinlop Chui
Leonardo de Abreu Birchal
Marcelo De Antuñano Aguirre
Thibault Pieter Linda Nelson
De Bourle
Rafael Thor De Moura Rebelo Rocha
Astrid De Winne
Carla Do Couto Helli Battilana
Fan Dong
Vitor Fernandes de Araujo
Jue Gao
Miguel Ángel Luque
Roberto Luciano Lupini Pinzani
Jierui Luo
Raquel Lucas Herraiz
Hosuk Lee
David Emilio Kuroiwa Honma
Masakazu Karakawa
Flavia Jardim de Oliveira
Eleanor Breeda Healy-Birt
Carl Oscar Henning Sebastian
Adi Grinapell
Luisa Godinez Puig
Jue Gao
Vitor Fernandes de Araujo
Fan Dong
Carla Do Couto Hellu Battilana
Astrid De Winne
Marcelo De Antuñano Aguirre
Leonardo de Abreu Birchal
Calvin Tinlop Chui
Kan-Hsueh Chiang
Vanessa Bertonha Felicio
Masayuki Atsumi
Masaaki Aono
Ferhat Afkar

For the Degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence

Christoph Michael Ritter
Nicolas Rivera Montoya
Renato Rodrigues Ruschi
Boanerges Herman Rodriguez Velasquez
Patrick Schari
Fritz Nikolaus Schuchmann
Thomas Anthony Smithurst
Nathalie Alisa Paula Ghislaine Smuha
Quentin Pol Soavi
Fernanda Mary Sonoki
Shane Geoffrey Stewart
Yanu Tao
Chun Tseung
Susan Uquillas Mosquera
Lauren Willen
Kayo Yamamoto
Glad Yaniv
Alessandro Zanini
Fang Zhao
Xueling Zhong

For the Degree of Doctor of Law

Alumni 2015 Graduates

Xingxing Li
Jianlin Chen
Kendall R. Coates
Won Ho Cho
Robert Catmull
Nicholas Angelo Caselli *
Philip Joseph Ainsworth Caruso *
Mary Kaitlyn Burk **†‡
Joshua Hart Burday
William W. Bucher *
Corey Keenan Brady *
Paige D. Braddy
Rachel Ilana Block *
David Israel Birnbaum *
Elpitha Betondo
Benjamin Andrew Berkman *†‡
Nora Estefanía Becerra
Benjamin Andrew Berkman *†‡
Kathryn Elizabeth Boucher Bi *
Rachel Iana Block *
Erim Marie Boyd
Paige D. Braddy
Blair Rebecca Bradford *
Corey Keenan Brady *
Matthew J. Brincks **†‡
Peter Jacob Brody **†‡
Benjamin D. Brooks **†‡
William W. Buchar *
Joshua Hart Burday
Mary Kaylín Burk **†‡
Philip Joseph Ainsworth Caruso *
Nicholas Angelo Caselli *
Robert Catmull
Won Ho Cho
Kendall R. Coates

Matthew B. Kugler ****
Lee Rochelle Laxamana
Lyle Benjamin LeBlang *
Annika J. Lee
Dong Hun Lee
Robert James Lee
Karen Leung
Jeffrey Paul Levine *
Lingfeng Li
Ian Scott Lindsay
Louis Brandon Liss
Bryan J. Lowrance
Myles R. MacDonald
Thomas Malinowsky
Timothy A. Markey *
Christina Crane Matthias *
Vasily Mayer
Katherine L. McClain
Jeffrey S. McIntosh *
Matthew M. McKay
Tammy Lee Meikle
Justin Aphonse Mercurio *
Rachel Laurie Miller
Jayorro Errol Mitchell
Abigail Behr Molitor *
Misoo Moon
Timothy Jihoon Moon *
Brandon T. Moore
Sean Ward Moore
Chad Dreixer Morin
Zachary Sweet Moskowitz
John Patrick Moynihan
Sean L. Munpper *
Sarah Elizabeth Neuman *
Jacqueline Maria Newsome
Julianne Tho Nguyen
David S. Nimmons
Michael J. O’Brien *
Yasamin Nicole Oloomi
Jeffrey S. Ohlan
David G. Palay *
Alex Atticus Parkinson ***
Catalina Santos Parkinson
Stephen M. Payne ****
Katherine Marie Peaslee **
Sara Elizabeth Peele *
Sririnica Pernankil
Scott Robert Plecki
Jonathan Nathanial Powers
Ralph J. Poffenbarger
Rachael M. Pinney
John Patrick Moynihan
Zachary Sweet Moskowitz
Joe S. Palley
Joseph C. Schroeder ****
Daniel J. Schufreider
Josephine M. Schulte **†‡
Sarah J. Schultes
Olga Sergeyevna Vinogradova
Schwier *
Gillian P. Seaman
William Morris Segal *
Anthony-Ray Sepulveda
Mikaela R. Shaw
Nora Yasmeen Shawk **
Min Shen
Camille Maria Shepherd
Lindsay Lee Short
Daniel A. Sito **†‡
Kaitlin Patricia Siler
Philip Smoke
William Joseph Smolinski
Samuel Gregory Stucker
Kelsey Nicole Sullivan
Lauren C. Swadley
Alexandra Marie Tate
Deepa Thimmapaya
Ian J. Todd
Daniel Chester Toren
Julia Lins Trotta
Steven Gordon Trubac *
Gregorios Tsonis *
Amy L. Twohig
Jasmina Vajovic
Patrick J. Valenti *
Daniel Vinson *
Ryan W. Wallenstein
Katherine T. Wailing **†‡
Christopher James Washington
Valdemar Luther Washington, II
Laura Marie Watson *
Jeramy Daniel Webb
Raleigh G. Williams
Kira Katrina Wilpome-Jordan
Steven John Winkelman **†‡
David John Winkler
Carole M. Wurzelbacher
Lirinu Xu
Wen Yang
Joyce K. Yoon
Sunha Youn
Kevin P. Zimmerman **†‡
David Dwayne Zobell

*** Highest Honors
** High Honors
* Honors
1 Order of the Coif
1 Kirkland & Ellis Scholar
WHERE ARE THEY NOW? THE CLASS OF 2015

ALABAMA
Birmingham
Daniel Vinson
Hon. William Pryor, 11th Cir.
Montgomery
Steven Winkelman
Hon. Ed Carnes, 11th Cir.

ARIZONA
Phoenix
Peter Brody
Hon. Andrew Hurwitiz, 9th Cir.
Sara Hershman
Hon. Mary Schroeder, 9th Cir.
Stephen Richer
Steptoe Johnson

ARKANSAS
Little Rock
Siobhan Fabio
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

CALIFORNIA
Century City
Robert Catmull
O’Melveny & Myers
Costa Mesa
Annika Lee
Rutan & Tucker
Irvine
Linjun Xu
Knobbe Martens
Los Angeles
Brittany Gorin
O’Melveny & Myers
Robert Lee
Quinn Emanuel
Katherine McClain
Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
Timothy Moon
Munger Tolles & Olson
Joseph Rosner
Morrison & Foerster
Menlo Park
James Robinson
Latham & Watkins
Palo Alto
Joshua Real
Paul Hastings

COLORADO
Denver
Daniel Hammond
Hon. Allison Eid, Colo. S. Ct.
Sriinj Perlnakil
Office of the Colorado State Public Defender

CONNECTICUT
New Haven
Lydia Mead
McGlinchey Stogin

DELAWARE
Wilmington
Myles MacDonald
Hon. Christopher Sontchi, Del. [Bankr.] 

FLORIDA
Miami
Fabiana Cohen Levy
Boies Schiller
Rachel Miller
Miami Dade Public Defender

GEORGIA
Atlanta
Corey Brady
Hon. Beverly Martin, 11th Cir.
Sarah Neuman
Hon. Julie Carnes, 11th Cir.
Kelsey Sullivan
Paul Hastings

HAWAII
Honolulu
Sean Mumper
Keiko Rose

ILLINOIS
Chicago
Andrew C. Adair
Sidley Austin
Tabitha Atkin
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, and Flom
Nora Becerra
K&L Gates
Elipha Betondo
Jenner & Block
David Birnbaum
Kirkland & Ellis
Blair Bradford
Sidley Austin
Joshua Burday
Better Government Association
Mary Burk
The University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration
Roni Cohen
Jenner & Block
Emma Cone-Roddy
AIDS Legal Council of Chicago
Christopher Eby
Mayer Brown
Troy Edwards
Hon. Amy St. Eve, N.D. Ill.
Daniel Emas
Mayer Brown
Daniel Epstein
Jenner & Block
Paige Epstein
Sidley Austin
Evan Feinauer
National Resources Defense Council
Alan Freedman
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
Sonia Fulop
Kirkland & Ellis
Lior Gelt
Latham & Watkins
Monica Ghosh
Chicago Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Jacqueline Giannini
Dentons
Alex Grabowski
McDermott Will & Emery

JOHN GREN IV
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
CAROLINE HENRY
Drinker Biddle Reath
BENJAMIN HUDGENS
Jenner & Block
THOMAS HUYNH
Mayer Brown
KARA INGELHART
Lambda Legal
WHITNEY ISING
Winston & Strawn
ERICA JAFFE
Jones Day
MILES JOHNSON
Kirkland & Ellis
SARAH KANG
Kirkland & Ellis
MATTHEW KUGLER
Hon. Richard Posner, 7th Cir.
IAN LINDSAY
Mayer Brown
LOUIS LISS
McDermott Will & Emery
JEFFREY MCINTOSH
Sidley Austin
MATTHEW MAKAY
Mayer Brown
JUSTIN MERCURO
Kirkland & Ellis
JAYVAN MITCHELL
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, and Flom
BRANDON MOORE
Kirkland & Ellis
ZACHARY MOSKOWITZ
Dentons
JOHN MOYNINAN
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, and Flom
YASMIN OLOOMI
Perkins Coie
DAVID PALAY
Kirkland & Ellis
SCOTT PLECKI
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, and Flom
DANIEL SCHUFRICER
Schiff Hardin
SARAH SCHULTZ
Kirkland & Ellis
ANTHONY-AYE SEPULVEDA
State of Illinois, Office of the Executive Inspector General
MIKAELA SHAW
Morgan Lewis

DANIEL SITO
Kirkland & Ellis
KATLLEIN SITLTER
Jones Day
SAMUEL STUCKER
Kirkland & Ellis
LAUREN SWADLEY
Kirkland & Ellis
IAN TROD
Schiff Hardin
DANIEL TROEN
Schiff Hardin
JULIA TROTTA
Katten Muchin Rosenman
STEVEN TRUBAC
Bryan Cave
GREGORIOS TSONIS
Kirkland & Ellis
JASMINA VAJZOVIC
Perkins Coie
PATRICK VALENTI
Kirkland & Ellis
LAURA WATSON
Mayer Brown
KIRA WILPONE-JORDAN
Lawyers’ Committee for Better Housing
DAVID WINKLER
DLA Piper
DAVID ZOBELL
Kirkland & Ellis

INDIANA
Indianapolis
Joshua Ruff
Faegre Baker Daniels

IOWA
Davenport
Katherine Walling
Hon. John Jarvey, S.D. Iowa

DES MOINES
Abigail Molitor
Hon. Steven Colloton, 8th Cir.

LOUISIANA
New Orleans
Viviana Aldous
Hon. Susie Morgan, E.D. La.

Morgan Lewis
WHERE ARE THEY NOW? continued

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston
Paul Formella
Goodwin Procter
Jeffrey Olshan
WilmerHale

MICHIGAN
Lansing
Rebecca Rickett

MINNESOTA
St. Paul
Jacqueline Newsome
Hon. Alan Page, Minn. S. Ct.

MISSOURI
Kansas City
Matthew Brincks
Stinson Leonard Street

NEBRASKA
Omaha
Misoo Moon
Fidelity National Title

NEW YORK
Armonk
Jackie Scotch-Marmo
Boies Schiller

New York
Mateo Aceves
Sullivan & Cromwell
Andrew M. Adair
Debovoise & Plimpton
Faridat Arogundade
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP
Rhiannon Batchelder
Sullivan & Cromwell
Benjamin Berkman
Quinn Emanuel
Benjamin Brooks
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
William Bucher
Debovoise & Plimpton
Philip Caruso
Sidley Austin
Henrik Dumanian
King & Spalding
Judson Finnegan
Sullivan & Cromwell

MAURIO FIORE
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
KATHERINE GARCEAU
Fried Frank
ARI GLATT
Nixon Peabody
JESSICA GONZALEZ
Cleary Gottlieb
MOLLY JAMISON
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
SAMITA KHAN
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
CLAIRA KIM
King & Spaldling
JOSHUA KORNFIELD
Curtis Mallet
DONG HUN LEE
Morrison & Foerster
JEFFREY LEVINE
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
LINGFENG LI
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
BRYAN LAWRENCE
Cleary Gottlieb
THOMAS MALINOWSKY
Davis Polk
TIMOTHY MARKOV
Sullivan & Cromwell
CHRISTA MATTHIAS
Neighborhood Defender Services of Harlem
AAIYA MIRZA
Debovoise & Plimpton
CHAD MORIN
Proskauer Rose
JULIANNE NGUYEN
Morrison & Foerster
ALEX PARKINSON
Hon. Robert Sack, 2d Cir.
CATALINA PARKINSON
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
KATHERINE PEASLEY
Hon. Katherine Failla, S.D.N.Y.
EDWIN ROSENFIELD
Davis Polk
CAMERON RUSSELL
Freshfields
CHRISTOPHER RYDER
Proskauer Rose
GILLIAN SEAMAN
Sullivan & Cromwell
CAMILLE SHEPHERD
White & Case
PHILIP SMOKE
Morrison & Foerster
WILLIAM SMOLINSKI
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett

DEEPA THIMMAPAYA
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
CHRISTOPHER WASHINGTON
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
VALDEMAR WASHINGTON
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
JEREMY WEBB
Proskauer Rose
JOYCE YOON
Cravath, Swaine & Moore
SUNHA YOON
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett

OHIO
Cleveland
NATHANIEL GOLDFINGER
Baker Hostetler

OKLAHOMA
Oklahoma City
DREW HARRIS
Hon. Robert Bacharach, 10th Cir.

OREGON
Portland
LINDSAY SHORT
K&L Gates

PENNSYLVANIA
Pittsburgh
MICHAEL O’BRIEN
Hon. Thomas Hardiman, 3d Cir.

WILLIAMSPORT
NICHOLAS CASELLI
Hon. Matthew Bran, M.D. Pa.

TENNESSEE
Memphis
SARA HALEY
Shelby County Public Defender’s Office

TEXAS
Dallas
VASILIY MAYER
Fish & Richardson

HOUSTON
ANI AVAGYAN
Norton Rose Fullbright

LAREDO
PAUL QUINTANS
Hon. Diana Song Quiroga, S.D. Tex.

WASHINGTON
Seattle
RACHEL BLOCK
Davis Wright Tremaine

WASHINGTON DC
Louis Balocca
Mayer Brown

WON HO CHO
Covington & Burling

SEAN COLLINS
Hogan Lovells

TENNESSEE
Memphis
SARA HALEY
Shelby County Public Defender’s Office

INTERNATIONAL
Tokyo, Japan
CHANGHO KIM
Human Rights Now

NEW DELHI, INDIA
ALEXANDRA TATE
Human Rights Law Network

INDIA
CAROLE WURZELBACHER
International Innovation Corps
MEET THE CLASS OF 2018

GENERAL STATISTICS:
102 Undergraduate Institutions
46 Undergraduate Majors
17 Graduate Degrees
34 States Represented
37 Countries Lived In/Worked In
25 Languages Spoken

FUN FACTS:
15 Congressional interns
12 Teach for America alumni
7 collegiate varsity athletes
5 Eagle Scouts
4 members of the military
4 non-profit organization founders
3 Fulbright Scholars
3 PhDs
2 competitive flute players
2 pastors
1 Peace Corps volunteer
1 certified scuba dive master
1 classically-trained pianist
1 Soviet-style gymnast
1 German folk dancer
1 Team USA international figure skater
1 performer of Hawaiian & Polynesian dance
1 second-degree Taekwondo black belt
1 salsa/merengue dancer
1 cowboy
Save the Date
REUNION WEEKEND
APRIL 29–MAY 1, 2016