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Message from the Dean

Dear Friends,

The academic year is in full swing. Our Visiting Committee was here this weekend and met many of our eight (!) new faculty members. The talk was of globalization and our grading system. Perhaps you can guess which attracted more passionate observations and advice. The remarkable thing about our newcomers is how quickly these new faculty and students pick up our culture. The biggest difference between this year and the last four, or perhaps I should say the last twenty, is that our building's revitalization is, essentially, complete. The library has become a lovely place where students gather and work; student services are on the third floor in nice quarters, befitting a place that is determined to put students at the center of the enterprise; a new ethics course is to be field tested; a new clinical program is well underway; and we have already started our series of lunch programs and other "extras" that keep students in the building for most of the day. Even our front yard is complete. The zero-depth water element lends a kind of serenity that makes the intensity of the human activity all the more obvious. The energy is palpable.

I write this as Congress fiddles with financial distress and as the Election looms. It is fitting that this Record focuses on graduates who have served as political appointees, because we are surely on the verge of thanking many for their service and wishing new Chicago grads well as they enter a new administration in Washington. We wish them success and insight. At our first Coffee Mess of the year, some students arranged for faculty to spread around the Green Lounge in order to lead groups of students in discussion on the bailout proposals (voted on in Congress that week). The intensity and ideas reminded me that today's 1L students will in fact be tomorrow's leaders and policymakers — and, if not that, their leading critics. We will do our best to educate them, and train them for the issues they will face.

By the time you have this publication in your hands, I hope some of the financial markets will have settled, and I know the Presidential debates and contest will settle in the usual way. It would be corny to say that things here will — and should — never settle down. We work at unsettling conventional wisdoms. The pieces in this Record testify to that.

Yours,

Saul Levmore
"UNDER GOD": THE PLEDGE, PRESENT AND FUTURE

By Martha C. Nussbaum
Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics
INDEED, THE MORE ONE THINKS ABOUT WHAT “ONE NATION UNDER GOD” MEANS, THE MORE RELIGIOUS PEOPLE IT EXCLUDES.

Many public school districts in America require daily recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance. At this point, school authorities know that they have to permit an exception for any child who conscientiously objects to participating. Moreover, *Barnette* by now commands not just grudging acceptance, but widespread approval. Most Americans think it very bad to force children to make statements that offend their conscience.

What, however, about the timid child, or the child who has reasonable worries about stigma and peer pressure? The history of the pledge and of the related school prayer issue makes it obvious that nonparticipation often comes at a cost. If Ellory Schempp was greeted with outright persecution for reading from the Quran, we can expect that children who refuse to say the pledge—whether they stand in silence, sit, or leave the classroom—will be courting the hostility of teachers, administrators, and, perhaps most clearly, their fellow students. From the point of view of these concerns, the non-participating child is bound to look at the very least weird and not fully American, at the worst subversive and threatening.

Lee v. Weisman recognized the coercive role of peer pressure, and this problem, studied in famous experiments by Solomon Asch, has been prominently recognized in recent studies of the Holocaust and of the social importance of dissent. It is clear that even adults are highly vulnerable to peer pressure, to the extent of being willing to say things that they know to be false, and to do things that are terrible.

At the time of *Barnette*, the children involved objected to the pledge because it asked them to swear loyalty to an entity other than God, which their faith did not permit them to do. Although Jehovah's Witnesses were not the only Americans who had such conscientious objections, the other concerned groups were relatively small. It seemed at the time that arranging exemptions for a small number of children was feasible without undue stigmatization and upheaval. When the words “under God” were added to the pledge in 1954, the whole issue suddenly became much more complex.

At this point, many new groups of Americans acquired conscientious grounds for objection to the daily recitation: atheists, agnostics, believers in a detached God who does not take a direct interest in human affairs, believers in a God who looks for right conduct and thus does not take a particular interest in Americans over Russians just because Americans (many of them) believe in God and Russians (many of them) are atheists, believers in a plurality of gods, believers in religions that do not assert the existence of a God. Hindus, Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs, Unitarians, and some types of Jews and Christians now have conscientious grounds for objection.

Indeed, the more one thinks about what “one nation under God” means, the more religious people it excludes. As a Reform Jew, I hold that God loves truth and righteousness, and that these values can be imagined as residing in an ideal community—rather like Immanuel Kant’s “kingdom of ends.” I also believe, however (again, with Kant), that no actual nation instantiates them adequately, and that, in consequence, no actual nation enjoys God’s sponsorship. Merely recognizing God’s existence cuts no ice: what interests God is the committed pursuit of justice. So I myself would object to the pledge on such grounds and would now not want to recite it, although in high school I did so, not having thought very much about religious matters. I don’t think that America is “under God” any more than Israel, or India, or Britain, or Germany, or Syria, or, for that matter, the Soviet Union in the 1950s is “under God”: all nations should strive for right conduct, and if they do what is just, God will approve their actions. But God doesn’t play favorites: God loves justice, peace, and righteousness, and doesn’t single out a particular nation, flawed as all nations are flawed, for special loving protection. Or so I hold. But at the time, the phrase (introduced by the Knights of Columbus) was clearly intended to show why the U.S. was superior to godless communism. Well, one could argue convincingly that it is in fact superior, but that argument would have to be made, and the mere fact that the U.S. is a nation of believers (on the whole) certainly does not make it a nation of righteous believers.

Maybe “under God” means “subject to God’s judgment,” not “enjoying God’s favor and protection.” That is not
what the people who introduced the words meant by them, on the whole, since most believers think that all human beings are subject to God's judgment, but the whole point of the language was to introduce a distinction between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. This, however, is a reading through which someone like me might attempt to reconcile the disharmony between the pledge and my beliefs. Still, this leaves many Jews on the outside: those who, like many leaders of Reform Judaism through the centuries, have denied the existence of a personal God and who have conceived of God as a force of rationality and order in the cosmos, in the manner of Spinoza. Isaac Meyer Wise, one of the greatest leaders of Reform Judaism in America, was a Spinozist, and he could not have accepted the pledge in its current form.

"IT SEEMS RIGHT TO BE MORE FORGIVING ABOUT SOMETHING THAT IS A HISTORICAL RELIC THAN ABOUT SOMETHING CONTENTIOUSLY INTRODUCED IN RECENT TIMES."

Even if we did have a situation in which the theological views of all Jews and Christians were consonant with reciting the pledge, which we don't, that would hardly deal with the legitimate grievances of Hindus, Buddhists, Unitarians, agnostics, atheists, and others. It's important to notice, then, that it is not simply a matter of excluding nonbelievers, and that the issue cannot be solved by retreating to a nonpreferentialist version of the Establishment Clause. Lots of believers, and more every day (as Hinduism and Buddhism continue to grow), have cogent objections to the morning ritual. It states that America is a monotheist nation with a particular type of theistic conception, and this statement, in turn, entails the further statement that they are not fully equal to those monotheists in the public square. There is bound to be stigma in this, particularly in the light of the history of the demonization of Hindu polytheism in India by British monotheists, a history that the "reasonable observer" would be sure to learn.

At this point we might try to say that the pledge, while sectarian, is voluntary, and does not coerce anyone. Certainly it is a good thing that after Barnette, recitation of the pledge cannot be made mandatory. The question is whether this disposes of the constitutional question. Justice Kennedy, as we've seen, has prominently emphasized a coercion-based theory of the Establishment Clause. His theory of the Establishment Clause, however, is unconvincing, for surely an establishment issue can be present even when an observance, or a display, is utterly noncoercive, as Justice O'Connor's endorsement test has repeatedly emphasized.

Even if we liked the coercion theory, however, it would not help rescue the pledge, at least not if we accept Justice Kennedy's analysis of Lee v. Weisman. If the suggestion that one ought to stand during someone else's reading of a graduation prayer is viewed as coercive, on the grounds that peer pressure and fear of stigma are coercive to young people, the pledge is surely much more coercive. The children involved include far younger children, and the act of not reciting, while other children are reciting with their hands over their hearts, is more conspicuous than the act of nonparticipation in the graduation prayer—even if one thought that sitting down was the only way to express nonparticipation. Justice Thomas, in his opinion in the pledge case, helpfully recognized that under Lee v. Weisman the words "under God" are unconstitutional. His radical solution was to deny the incorporation of the Establishment Clause and to throw out a whole series of precedents. If we are not ready to accept his doctrine, we should still accept his reading of Lee and the problem it poses for the pledge.

There is one remaining way out, and this is to say that the pledge is one of those traditional historic ceremonies that does not create a problem because it is part of "ceremonial Deism" and simply expresses our historical tradition. In her opinion in the pledge case, Justice O'Connor plausibly points out that some manifestations of religion in our public life can be defended along such lines. (The Court has often said similar things.)

Some references to God may indeed be defensible in this way: the use of "In God We Trust" on our currency, the "God Save this Honorable Court" that opens the sessions of the Supreme Court. These ceremonial manifestations of religion may bother some people. And yet, they have been around for a very long time, and perhaps we now accept them as part of our history rather than as containing any devotional message. Or so Justice O'Connor's argument goes.

Let's now look at Justice O'Connor's four criteria for saying that a traditional observance does not constitute a constitutional violation. And let's compare "In God We
Trust" to the pledge. Although Justice O'Connor herself tries to argue that the pledge is all right under her criteria, I think we'll see that this argument is unconvincing.

First, Justice O'Connor mentions **history and ubiquity**: the questionable item must have been in place for "a significant portion of the Nation's history." This criterion is important because it seems right to be more forgiving about something that is a historical relic than about something contentiously introduced in recent times. Here "In God We Trust" looks very different from "under God" in the pledge: the former has been in place since right after the Civil War, the latter only since 1954. "Reasonable observers have reasonable memories," Justice O'Connor once said, and many living Americans remember the sudden change in the pledge, as well as the debate surrounding it, which was highly theistic in content, stressing the need to get Americans to stand behind a symbolic affirmation of our difference from "godless Communism."

Second, she mentions **absence of worship or prayer**: there is a difference, she says, between asking someone to join in a ritual observance and simply making a statement that doesn't ask people to affirm anything. Here "In God We Trust" looks pretty good: we pass money around all the time without thinking of ourselves as endorsing that sentiment, and it would take a real haggler (of the sort that Justice O'Connor spoke when she mentioned the possibility of a "heckler's veto") to be very upset about the presence of time-honored words on the coins we use. The pledge is of course entirely different: impressionable children are being asked to join in a ritual observance that is an affirmation of God as well as of country. The whole point of the pledge was that it was an act of quasi-worship, suited to inculcate strong patriotic emotions in young children. The whole point of adding the language of God was to make those same children think that we (unlike the Soviet Union) are in a nation that is protected by God. Barnette has sufficiently established that the recitation is not devoid of affirmation: that's why the children had a legitimate grievance. Now the affirmation includes religious affirmation.

The third criterion, and an important one, is **absence of reference to particular religion**. As we've seen, it's virtually impossible to construct a religious reference that is not somehow particular, and Justice O'Connor acknowledges that the pledge is indeed particular, excluding Buddhists,
Hindus, and others. She then retreats to the position that it derived from a time "when our national religious diversity was neither as robust nor as well recognized as it is now." I find this unconvincing. First of all, the numbers of people who accept a divergent religion should not decide the constitutional question. Second, the reason there were not many Hindus here until recently was that immigration law kept them out by restricting immigration quotas to the proportion of the population that a given national origin occupied in 1895; this imbalance was rectified only by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. So it seems doubly churlish to keep people out unfairly and then to say, "Because we succeeded in keeping you out for so long, we don't have to take your religious sensibilities into account."

**GIVEN PUBLIC FEELING ON THE ISSUE, IT WOULD CAUSE A NATIONAL CRISIS WERE THE SUPREME COURT TO SAY THAT THE WORDS "UNDER GOD" ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL.**

Third, there were lots of agnostics, atheists, Reform Jewish Spinozists, Deists, Unitarians, and others who could not endorse the religious conception of the pledge all along. Moreover, there can be little doubt that the movement to add "under God" to the pledge was connected to a desire to denigrate most of these people, as fellow travelers with "atheistic communism." ("Ceremonial Deism" is an odd name for a ritual affirmation that a Deist would be very reluctant to endorse, since Deists think of God as a rational causal principle but not as a personal judge and father.)

What about "In God We Trust?" Well, it has in principle the same problem, but it was not introduced with intent to exclude and denigrate, and the fact that it does so much better on the first two criteria seems to me to suggest that the third criterion might be waived in that case. The criteria are not supposed to be necessary conditions of acceptability, just good things to look for.

Finally, minimal religious content: the reference must be "highly circumscribed" and easy to avoid. On this count the pledge does well enough, if one imagines that children who object could simply drop those two words, while reciting the rest. We do have the *Lee v. Weisman* worry, however, again in this case: if what the objector wants to do is to make it clear that she doesn't go along with the ritual as the majority practice it, she will have to do something more than silently omit two words. She will have to ask for an excuse, or stay seated, and this will make the pledge every bit as onerous as the prayers that were rejected in the whole string of school prayer cases. If the defender of "under God" now says that the words don't mean anything much, have no content, she has the history of the addition of the words to contend with: for people felt that they were very important and had significant religious content. Moreover, defenders of the pledge today argue that it does have substantial content.

Here again, "In God We Trust" seems on stronger ground: most people don't think of it as religious at all, and are able to use the currency without noticing it.

We should agree with Justice O'Connor and the entirety of the tradition that I've described: there are traditional references to religion in our public life that should not be pruned away and that pose no constitutional problem. It is extremely doubtful, however, that the pledge, in its current form, is among them.

Given public feeling on the issue, it would cause a national crisis were the Supreme Court to say that the words "under God" are unconstitutional. If we adopt Justice Breyer's theory of interpretation, then, we can find a way round the problem: a test of constitutionality is whether deciding the other way would threaten civil peace. This principle seemed, and seems here, unfortunately ad hoc, favoring majority beliefs and making a virtue of convenience. As an account of the meaning of the religion clauses, Breyer's conflict principle should be rejected. Nonetheless, one might reach the conclusion that the Supreme Court ought to hold off in this case by a different route—for example, one might introduce considerations of judicial modesty and caution, arguing that, for institutional reasons, judges should usually be reluctant to cause a national crisis. If there is uncertainty about the correct way of proceeding in such a momentous case, it is probably wise for the Court to avoid the issue as long as possible—hoping that, in the meanwhile, greater public understanding of Hinduism, Buddhism, and other related religions, as well as a greater appreciation for conscientious moral atheism and agnosticism, will undermine the perception that the opponents of the pledge are all dangerous subversives.

From the vantage point of these practical concerns, it was extremely unfortunate that the case that went to the Supreme Court was brought by an outspoken atheist who...
openly scoffs at religious belief. It was a good thing that the Court was able to find a way around the case, by holding that Newdow did not have standing, since he did not have custody of his daughter. It was also basically good for Justice O'Connor to do what she did, misapplying her own analytical criteria: it is much better to have the analytical framework right and make a mistake about this or that case than to veer to a new analytical framework that is on balance weaker (as Justice Breyer did in the Ten Commandments case).

On July 19, 2006, the U.S. House passed, by a vote of 260-167, a bill removing jurisdiction, in the matter of the words “under God” in the pledge, from the federal appellate courts and the U.S. Supreme Court. This move is deeply to be regretted, because it undermines judicial independence and the very idea of the separation of powers. Proponents seem to be pursuing their immediate goal in a way that neglects the larger long-term structural issues the bill implicates. Fortunately, a companion bill in the Senate is likely to fail.5

How can we make progress on this divisive issue? First of all, we simply need to talk about the issue and its history far more than we do, and members of affected minority religions need to get involved. It would be good if all Americans understood the history of “under God” in the 1950s, and understood, as well, the reasons many believing Americans, as well as nonbelievers, have for being troubled by the words. The participation of the Hindu and Buddhist communities in the recent Ten Commandments case is a welcome sign for the future. Hindus sometimes duck away from challenging monotheism, and can even represent themselves, at times, as quasi-monotheists, because they are tired of being pilloried for their polytheism and, as new immigrants in a vulnerable position, they desire respectability. It would be wonderful if they would tell Americans frankly that they worship Rama and Shiva and Ganesha and other gods, and that the pledge refers to a monotheistic conception that denigrates them. Buddhists, whether immigrants or American converts, should also join this conversation, explaining that theirs is a genuine religion and yet recognizes no God. Confucianists, Taoists, and others should enter the debate as well. It would also be very helpful if more Jews and Christians who hold views that render the language of the pledge problematic would say forthrightly what these reasons are.

Meanwhile, we need to talk more about Justice O’Connor’s helpful criteria and how they apply in a wide range of cases, refining the criteria themselves, adding to them if new helpful criteria can be found, and saying more about how many of them need to be present in order for a religiously divisive practice to be constitutional.

This national conversation is not taking place. One reason is the reluctance of many dissident religions to get involved in public discussions of their dissident conceptions, for fear of stigma for themselves and their children. That is why it ended up being an atheist who brought the famous case, a fact that proved very bad for public understanding of the issues. The pledge, as I’ve argued, is offensive to many believers, as well as to atheists. Most Americans, however, currently think that only atheists have a problem with it.

Another reason the conversation is failing, more problematic still, is the reliance of American liberals on the language of “separation of church and state”: because they think it’s self-evident that “under God” violates “separation” and is bad for that reason alone, many liberals don’t bother to investigate the deep inequalities and hierarchies that it constitutes. Let’s, then, try speaking the language of equality and endorsement, and see how far we can get.


---

1 Asch’s experiments are discussed in detail in both Christopher Browning, Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland (New York: Harpercollins, 1992), and Cass R. Sunstein, Why Societies Need Dissent (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

2 See also Douglas Laycock, “Theology Scholarships, the Pledge of Allegiance and Religious Liberty,” Harvard Law Review 118 (2004), 155–246, who similarly likes her criteria but not her application of them to the Pledge.


4 See Laycock, discussing a number of interpretations by believers.

A Different Kind of Calling: Law School Alumni and Religious Life
by Alison Coppelman

This is the first in a planned series of pieces about Law School alumni who work in professions less frequently pursued by our graduates. If you have a suggestion for a piece in the series, please email m-ferziger@uchicago.edu.

On May 23, 2007, nearly thirty Law School alumni gathered to honor one of their fellow classmates on one of the most momentous occasions of his life. Although it was an interest in the law that had first brought them together more than ten years earlier, the cause for this celebration was, surprisingly, not related to the world of law at all. On that spring day, with so many of his friends from Chicago present, Father Joseph Pius Pietrzyk, O.P., a 1997 graduate of the Law School, was ordained as a priest in the Catholic Church.

There are actually several Chicago alumni who have experienced a religious calling after graduation. For Father Pius, attending the Law School turned out to be a very important step in his path toward joining the priesthood. "At Chicago I met a lot of people who were very serious about their religious beliefs, which made a strong impression on me and inspired me to revisit my own faith," Father Pius said. After graduating from the Law School, he went on to work as an associate at Sidley Austin in Chicago, where he served as counsel on a case involving GE that led him to Milwaukee. It was there, in a new city where he knew few people, that Father Pius experienced a further resurgence in his faith: "I spent a great deal of my free time in prayer, examining where I was in my own faith and with my vocation. Soon I realized that God was calling me to do something else." Returning to Chicago in 2000, he entered a religious community on the west side of the city, an experience he recalls fondly, before pursuing his religious studies at Holy Apostles College & Seminary in Connecticut. Father Pius was drawn to the Dominican Order in particular because of its dedication to rigorous study and the life of the mind. While he would eventually like to pursue his doctorate and teach at a seminary school, his next step will bring him to Zanesville, Ohio, where he will become the parochial vicar of St. Thomas Aquinas Church this fall. Father Pius anticipates that his legal experience will serve him well in this new role, for "as a lawyer, you become comfortable with thinking on your feet, with understanding a subject so well that you can speak about it without notes."

Reverend James B. Pratt, a 1989 graduate of the Law School, similarly found his experience as a lawyer to be of great relevance and value in his religious life. Like Father Pius, Reverend Pratt also worked as an attorney after graduation, for a mid-sized law firm in Boston. During this time he was active with his local parish, singing in the choir and serving as scout master, and soon it dawned on him that the work he was doing with his church in the evenings and on weekends was far more fulfilling than his work as a lawyer. Reverend Pratt went on to attend Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he was one of three lawyers in his first-year class of twenty-five students. "Seminary was a cakewalk compared to the Law School," he exclaimed, noting that Chicago's analytical rigor and focus on critical thinking prepared him well for his religious training. Indeed, he describes his work leading two Bible study groups as one of the most gratifying aspects of his role as Rector of the Parish of Cow Head in Newfoundland, Canada, a position he has held for six years. "Seeing the light bulbs go off, watching such learning happening, and witnessing people putting what they've learned into practice in their daily lives is very rewarding," he said.

Of the dozen or so Law School alumni currently active in religious life, many worked as attorneys before following a religious calling. Brother André Petty, '98, known to his classmates as Neil, was a corporate tax attorney with Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom and also with Sachnoff & Weaver before realizing that his true calling was of a religious
nature. He can still recall the exact moment he realized a legal career was not for him. “I woke up that morning and knew that this was not what I was supposed to be doing with my life,” he remembered. “Fortunately I had saved enough during my years working for law firms that I could quit my job and take about eighteen months to redirect my life.” For several years, Brother André had been attending a Presbyterian church in Chicago, but he felt a strong pull toward Catholicism. As he explored the Catholic faith, he found himself drawn specifically to the Franciscan Order, with its tradition of scholarship and dedication to service in the community. Indeed, as a brother with Sacred Heart Friary in Chicago, he has been able to pursue his greatest passions: helping others and rigorous study. “My work with the elderly and the sick, as a chaplain intern at Northwestern Hospital, is unbelievably rewarding,” he stated. He is also hoping to continue his studies in classical languages and literatures; he holds an M.A. in this subject from the U of C, and is currently investigating the possibility of completing his Ph.D. studies at the University.

Throughout history, the connections between religion and the law have been many and varied, as the Reverend John Johnson, ’69, observed: “So much of the theory of law, and the origins of the law, reside in the Old Testament. And so many of the great thinkers throughout history—Aquinas, Pascal, Descartes—were theologians.” Reverend Johnson actually did not practice law after leaving Chicago, choosing to enter the business world instead. He describes himself as a “left-brained minister,” one who earned a law degree because of his political aspirations, started his own company that integrated his love of physics and engineering, and who jokingly says he came to be a Presbyterian minister by accident—though it was, in all seriousness, by conviction. Somehow he ended up on the mailing list for the U of C’s Divinity School, and in 1995 he participated in one of the School’s academic conferences that tapped into his lifelong religious stirring. He went on to attend the McCormick Theological Seminary in Hyde Park, and this October will mark the tenth anniversary of his ordination as a minister in the Presbyterian Church. Though he has recently retired from his position as pastor of Highlands Presbyterian Church in La Grange, Illinois, he remains actively committed to the church and to his religious calling and is currently working on two books.

Like Reverend Johnson, Elizabeth Dickey, ’91, will seek ordination within the Presbyterian Church upon graduating from the McCormick Theological Seminary, where she is currently pursuing her Master’s in Divinity degree. Ms. Dickey was working for the Cook County Public Defender’s Office in Chicago when she was commissioned by her home church to serve as a Stephen
Minister, an individual trained to listen to people in the midst of a crisis. This experience inspired her to pursue the ministry full time; her work with the Public Defender’s Office also had an impact on her decision. Indeed, it was a desire to help others and to be a voice for the oppressed that inspired Ms. Dickey to attend law school in the first place. “I claimed one Bible verse as a motto,” she recalled. “Proverbs 31:8—9 says, ‘Open your mouth for the speechless, in the cause of all who are appointed to die. Open your mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and the needy.’” Though she is not certain yet what she is specifically being called to do, whether it is teaching or pastoral work, Ms. Dickey will continue to help those in greatest need.

The Reverend Doctor Jay K. Longacre also experienced a call to action within the community and the world at large. An avid long-distance runner, Reverend Longacre, ’59, had competed in marathons and scaled mountains around the world. In 1981, during a run around the Annapurnas, he and his son faced a life-and-death situation. “For seven hours, I prayed fervently for God to save us; and, if He would, I would turn my life over to Him. He did and I did,” he stated. Reverend Longacre went on to earn his M.Div. degree and an M.S. in social work and was ordained in the Presbyterian Church. While in the midst of his studies to earn a licentiate in systematic theology he discovered he was Catholic; during a visit to India in 1992, he met Mother Teresa for the first time, and it was through her counsel, and that of a priest friend, that Reverend Longacre realized that he, as a married Protestant minister, could stay married and become a priest. He was ordained on June 15, 2002, in the new cathedral in the Diocese of Rajkot in Gujarat in India and has gone on to do vital and rewarding work in India and many other countries. “I am president of a small 501(c)(3) tax-exempt foundation,” he explained, “and my wife Barbara and I have educated about 200 children in India, Nepal, Guatemala, and Sri Lanka. We have helped people start small businesses and helped develop new schools and a few libraries. We have financed a volunteer pharmacy and first-aid center and many other such projects.”

The call to religious duty is a deeply personal one, and no two paths are the same. For some alumni, the calling came later in life; for others, it came earlier. Yet the work of Law School alumni active in religious life involves a shared dedication to service, to critical thought, and to the community. And while the connection between a legal education and a religious calling may not be apparent at first glance, it is one that many alumni, from Father Pius to Reverend Pratt to Brother André, are quick to point out. As Reverend Longacre noted, “I believe that the Law School taught me to work with a great intensity for long hours and in the face of adversity.” A sentiment no doubt shared by the majority of Law School alumni, wherever their paths may have led them.

The call to religious duty is a deeply personal one, and no two paths are the same. For some alumni, the calling came later in life; for others, it came earlier.
Congratulations. Welcome. Welcome to the profession of law. Welcome also to the family and friends who have joined us today who have helped to make this day possible.

I want to talk about ice. On a day like today, I don’t know if that is cruel or optimistic. If we graph the states of water on the y-axis against temperature on the x-axis, we will see a well-known pattern. For substantial temperature ranges, we see no changes at all. Water remains solid—ice—below 32°F; between 32°F and 212°F it exists as liquid; and above 212°F it becomes a gas, steam. Over very narrow temperature regions, as we move from 31°F to 33°F and again from 211°F to 213°F, we see sharp changes in state. This are phase transitions.

That is what I want to talk about today. I have studied phase transitions of this sort professionally in computer simulations that I did on game theory and the law. I was trying to get a sense of where individuals could order their affairs sensibly and where they might get stuck in inferior outcomes. In doing that research, I found emerging exactly the sharp phase transitions we see in water. That is the joy of discovery and it happens every day in academic institutions. New ideas, new thoughts, new discoveries, those are one of the essential tasks of universities and our Law School in particular.

But I have been studying phase transitions this week in a more directly empirical way. I have three kids and two of them had graduations this week. I went to my son Adam’s eighth grade graduation on Tuesday and that was an appropriately modest affair. Yesterday, I was here attending my son Ben’s high school graduation. Ben was born roughly two weeks before I started teaching at the Law School. High school graduation is a more substantial transition point, but the business of college—day-to-day learning in the classroom—is very much what he has done since he started nursery school a block away from here many years ago.

That is what makes this graduation so different, as this commemorates what is now the start of a sharp phase transition. For most of your lives, you have gone to school each day. The actual mix of your day has changed somewhat over time. We don’t have recess at the Law School—fire alarms going off in the middle of class don’t count really—and very few nursery school teachers use the Socratic method, though maybe they should.

Think about it: for the last two decades, each day you have dedicated yourselves to the task of classroom learning.
But we do more than that today, and this is the nature of the phase transition. For as we celebrate the end of the first phase, we now start the second. We produce two things at the Law School: ideas and students. For the faculty, today is product launch day, a day on which we send out into the world great students ready to become great lawyers.

I think that we are pretty good at product launches at the Law School. One part of a product launch is showbiz and razzmatazz. Watch Steve Jobs do a product launch.

Graduation is usually a very nice day, the hooding ceremony gives us a chance to come together as a group, and the party afterwards—this year in our newly completed space—is a chance to talk and reflect on the day. I graduated from our Law School in 1985. One of my favorite photographs is a picture of my wife Gretchen and me, arm in arm, at the post-graduation party at the Law School.

But the more important part of a product launch is to have the product ready. As I hope the friends and family gathered here together today appreciate, we have worked hard together with your sons and daughters over the last three years. Our students bring a seriousness of purpose to their education that I admire. You can go to any law school in the country and can count on first-year students to be ready to learn. But we may be the only law school in the country where you can rely on that same level of engagement from third-year students in their last quarter of education. So today, we the faculty launch you into the world. You are, in a very real sense, the faculty's representatives in the world. You are ready for the next phase, ready to become great lawyers.

As is traditional in speeches of this sort, I should offer some advice on this next phase. You should, in the words of the bumper sticker, practice random acts of social welfare maximization. Nothing against kindness, but you should maximize social welfare. That is what the bumper stickers at the Law School say at least. That isn't true actually. Two of my colleagues have their own bumper stickers. Geof Stone has a bumper sticker that says “dissent in
wartime can be the highest form of patriotism.” That’s a pretty good bumper sticker. And I see a few bumper stickers for another of my colleagues, a senior lecturer whose leave from the Law School is at risk of becoming permanent.

So practice random acts of social welfare maximization. That is how a law-and-economics person says go out and do great things. Make the world a better place. Random acts of social welfare maximization. No, that isn’t quite as catchy as the original and it doesn’t seem quite right. You should maximize social welfare at all times and should act randomly only when it is optimal to do so, such as if you are running a police force and want to catch criminals.

But all of that is a little general and says nothing about the distinctive role of lawyers. Lawyers are institutional engineers. Our tools have changed somewhat over time—from quill pen and parchment to the laptop and the Blackberry—but the central role that lawyers play in creating new institutions has remained constant.

Institutional engineering takes place at all scales. The United States Constitution is an exercise in engineering, in building an institutional structure that has survived through great stresses and over many different times. Compare the Constitution with the Articles of Confederation as an exercise in building durable institutions. It is hard to understand how we engineer institutions without looking at both the successes and the failures, by looking at the institutions that have stood strong in high winds and those that toppled over at the least bit of pressure.

Now if all goes well, we won’t get too many exercises in constitution making in this country. But the good news is that building institutions is the day-to-day life of the lawyer. Lawyers construct new institutions and new regimes each time new legislation is created, each time a deal is closed and a conference roomful of contracts are executed. I have participated in both of those activities—often in the wee hours of the morning—and know the feeling of great satisfaction that comes from participating fully as a lawyer in building institutions.

So today we celebrate the completion of one phase in your lives and the start of a second. Speaking for the faculty, we share the pride that your gathered friends and family feel in having reached this moment. You now join the generations of graduates of the University of Chicago Law School who have come before you and those who will follow you. That status is a shared, collective good. You are our representatives. Take that seriously. Make us look good. I know you will.

Thank you.
Public Service on the Hill: Appointees in the Bush Administration

By Robin L. Mordfin
Politically appointed positions—they don't pay terribly well, the hours are long, and the complaint factor is enormous, but these jobs provide unparalleled opportunities to make policy and effect change. Because so many graduates of the Law School have a keen interest in public service work, it is unsurprising that such positions in the federal government are well populated by University of Chicago Law School alumni. But as the Bush administration draws to a close, these attorneys are making every moment count.

“The opportunity to do something in an administration is a unique and powerful situation,” notes Paul Rosenzweig, ’86, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy at the Department of Homeland Security. “For most Americans, the only way they can make change in the government is with their vote. But I am at a point in the department where I get to create stuff, where I get to build a foundation and make things happen. The things I have done over the past three years have made the world a safer and better place.”

WASHINGTON IS ALWAYS FOCUSED ON WHO IS GOOD AND WHO HAS MERIT THAT THEY WANT TO CULTIVATE.

Of course, getting the political appointment is the necessary first step to working for the administration, and there are two key components to this task. First, candidates have to be very good at what they do. And second, they must know the right people.

“The key to getting one of these jobs is to have a good reputation for doing your job well,” says Deborah Garza, ’81, who is deputy assistant attorney general in the Antitrust Division at the Department of Justice. “And go in young—get a job in government and build from there. My first job was as a special assistant under Reagan, and as always, the people higher up were very attuned to who were the young, up-and-coming people. Remember, Washington is always focused on who is good and who has merit that they want to cultivate.

“It’s almost like there is a list somewhere for people in various areas who are in the Republican Party, and then you get asked to do jobs,” Garza continues. “I have never actually had to lobby for a job; I have always been asked.”

And having skills others do not is also helpful, explains Margaret Peterlin, ’00, who is the deputy undersecretary of commerce for intellectual property and the deputy director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. “I know how to sort the issues and figure out what the relevant question is that needs answering, what the problem is that needs solving,” Peterlin says. “And that is something the training at the University of Chicago has really helped me with. Because otherwise, there are a lot of lawyers finding solutions to the wrong things.”

But there is more than one route to a political appointment. “It’s very interesting that internationally, there is a very specific path to advancement, especially in places like Japan and France,” notes John Dudas, ’93, undersecretary of commerce for intellectual property and director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. “But here there are all kinds of ways to move up, often in ways that cannot be anticipated. Often small things can end up making a difference and offering you huge opportunities.”

Unsurprisingly, one of the biggest parts of actually obtaining a politically appointed position is the vetting process. And, of course, the bigger the job, the more in-depth the investigation into a candidate’s life becomes. Dudas, whose position required Senate confirmation, found the process difficult.

“It was not fun, even though I ended up being approved unanimously by voice vote,” he says. “Everything and anything you’ve ever done in your entire life, any case you tried, every piece of financial information, is delved into. And then there are the things you don’t even think about initially that they end up questioning you about. Fortunately, in the end, it was worth it. But it was not fun.”

Not every candidate has such a smooth experience. Benton Campbell, ’91, has been the interim United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York since October 2007. In July, he was nominated by the president as U.S. attorney but has not yet been confirmed by the Senate.

“They may get to it, they may not, before the recess,” Campbell explains. “If they confirm me before the recess, I may get to serve the usual four years, but then again, when a new president comes in—both Clinton and Bush did this—they may ask for everyone to resign. It’s all really unclear. If I don’t get confirmed and appointed, I can go back to my career job as an assistant United States attorney. Or, either way, I can go into private practice. It remains to be seen.”

Fortunately, most of the political appointees from the Law School do find their jobs to be both fun and challenging.
“Every day is so exciting, I just love it,” says Gerald Masoudi, ’93, chief executive council for the Food and Drug Administration. “There is so much to learn, so much to regulate, and not a day goes by that I don’t learn about a new legal issue and there are all these issues in the press, so it never gets dull. It’s also interesting because everything at the FDA is done through statutes, so it is very detailed and interesting because you have to dig through the various sections to find answers.

Troy Eid, ’91, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, also extols the joys of his work. “In this job you absolutely live on the adrenaline of investigation,” Eid says. “Sometimes the most interesting cases can be where you don’t prosecute but you end up knowing things that are compelling and interesting. Because you have to remember that your duty in this job is not just to win convictions, it is to do justice.”

The responsibilities of those in politically appointed jobs are also somewhat different than those in career positions. “Although it is very political getting this job, the job itself is not political,” Eid explains. “My approach has been that you have to be prepared to be fired or to resign any day that you go in to work for a principle or simply because you don’t believe in the way a case is being handled. I am from Colorado and my heart is in Colorado and that is why I wanted to work here, but I had fierce disagreements with the previous attorney general. Although I was ultimately successful, I was willing to leave at any point.

“If you are not prepared to take another job, if you are not prepared to walk away, then you are not fit to be a U.S. attorney.”

claims. “Sometimes the most interesting cases can be where you don’t prosecute but you end up knowing things that are compelling and interesting. Because you have to remember that your duty in this job is not just to win convictions, it is to do justice.”

Regardless, some alumni, like Peterlin, have spent their whole careers in public service work. “When I graduated from college, I joined the [military], and I thought that would be my time in public service,” Peterlin explains. “That would be my way of giving back—of paying my debt to society. But I have been doing public service work now since 1993, so I guess my debt to society must be huge! But it really has been great because of the wonderful opportunities I have had to do really interesting work.”

Appointees take comfort in knowing that many options are available, in the public and the private sectors. And many have worked repeatedly in both. “I have been back at the FTC three times,” Garza says. “They are going to put barbed wire up soon to keep me out. Even though we leave for the private sector, we are always interested in coming back. We sound like groupies, and it is because it is public service work and the staff is wonderful and you are working with all these wonderful, committed, talented people. It is just such an honor to get to do this at all.”

dockets are full of narcotics-related crimes, violent crimes, gang issues, organized crime, and a lot of economic crimes—both corporate and securities related. It is our job to handle these cases fairly and intelligently, or we are just adding to the problem.”

Of course, political appointments are not necessarily an end unto themselves. Steven Duffield, ’99, leveraged his years as a policy analyst for Senate leaders into a variety of positions for the Republican Party, including positions as chief counsel and deputy staff director for the Republican Policy Committee. He recently completed his most recent position as executive director of the Republican Platform Committee.

“This job is the perfect blend of my background, because it is heavily policy based and messaging based, but it is so exciting,” Duffield explains. “The job itself is political in the sense of people management and getting important issues adopted with the least amount of grief. I really enjoy it.”

Still, working in a position with a finite term can be a bit anxiety producing. “When I took this job [I knew] it was finite,” Rosenzweig notes. “I believed everybody changes jobs these days, so it was no big deal and it was not terribly scary. After all, I have a unique skill set, and I should be able to find something I like. But now that I am five months away from being out of work, it is weighing on my mind a bit more.”

Regardless, some alumni, like Peterlin, have spent their whole careers in public service work. “When I graduated from college, I joined the [military], and I thought that would be my time in public service,” Peterlin explains. “That would be my way of giving back—of paying my debt to society. But I have been doing public service work now since 1993, so I guess my debt to society must be huge! But it really has been great because of the wonderful opportunities I have had to do really interesting work.”

Appointees take comfort in knowing that many options are available, in the public and the private sectors. And many have worked repeatedly in both. “I have been back at the FTC three times,” Garza says. “They are going to put barbed wire up soon to keep me out. Even though we leave for the private sector, we are always interested in coming back. We sound like groupies, and it is because it is public service work and the staff is wonderful and you are working with all these wonderful, committed, talented people. It is just such an honor to get to do this at all.”
NEW FACULTY PROFILES

Daniel Abebe
Assistant Professor of Law
Having spent two years as a Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, Daniel Abebe will be a familiar face to returning students. A former clerk for Judge Damon J. Keith of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and later a corporate associate at Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP in New York City, Abebe holds a J.D. from Harvard Law School and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Political Science here at the University.

Abebe particularly enjoys teaching that combines his research interests in political science and law. Students enrolled in his courses this year will have the opportunity to examine modern conceptions of international law through an international relations theory framework and explore the constitutional and statutory doctrines regulating the conduct of American foreign relations.

Omri Ben-Shahar
Frank and Bernice J. Greenberg Professor of Law
Contracts scholar Omri Ben-Shahar comes to Chicago from the University of Michigan Law School, where he had been a full-time faculty member since 1999. At Michigan, Ben-Shahar founded and directed the Olin Center for Law and Economics. He previously taught as a professor of law and economics at Tel-Aviv University, was a research fellow at the Israel Democracy Institute, served as a panel member of Israel’s Antitrust Court, and clerked at the Supreme Court of Israel. He earned his LL.B. from Hebrew University and his S.J.D. as well as a Ph.D. in economics from Harvard University.

Mr. Ben-Shahar’s research interests include contract law, products liability, and game theory and the law. This year he will be teaching Contracts, Sales, Insurance Law, and eCommerce. Ben-Shahar holds no illusions regarding students’ typical preconceptions about his chosen area of focus. “Which LL comes to law school wanting to take contracts!” His own contagious enthusiasm for the topic, however, pervades his teaching. “I particularly enjoy the LL students’ transformation throughout this course, as they become fascinated with legal reasoning and the intuitive appeal of the Contracts cases.”

Anu Bradford
Assistant Professor of Law
Before joining the faculty of the Law School, Anu Bradford spent time in practice with Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton in their Brussels office and later held teaching appointments at Brandeis University, Harvard College, and the University of Helsinki. Bradford holds a Master of Laws and Licentiate in Laws from the University of Helsinki and an LL.M. and S.J.D. from Harvard Law School.

Early in her career, Bradford held positions with the European Parliament and the Parliament of Finland. “I wanted to become a diplomat but discovered the love of research and writing when pursuing my Master’s thesis. However, my initial passion for international law remains the same—now I just participate in those debates as an academic rather than as an envoy for my country.” Bradford is looking forward to teaching Chicago’s “smart, hard-working students whose engagement will remind me every class that this is the best profession in the world.” Her courses for the year include International Trade Law, International Antitrust Law, European Union Law, and The New Economic Order in the Post-American World.
When asked what project she is most excited about, she responds, "All of them! But if I need to single out something, maybe writing and teaching about the shifts in the strategic structure underlying the global economy. What happens when new powers including China and India emerge as key players in the WTO and transform the negotiation and implementation of international trade agreements."

Bradford and her family are pleased with their new home city. "We have been particularly delighted to discover its lively cultural life and many fabulous restaurants. And as an avid runner, I of course love the lake. My nineteen-month-old son, Oliver, really enjoys Chicago. We live between the Lincoln Park Zoo and the Children's Museum, which he loves. But I think his favorite has been the North Avenue beach where I took him for a swim throughout the summer."

Rosalind Dixon
Assistant Professor of Law

The daughter of two lawyers, Rosalind Dixon recalls playing moot court as a child. As an adult, she found that law was a good fit for her, as it "combined an interest in social justice with a more analytic set of interests." A former clerk to Chief Justice Murray Gleeson of the High Court of Australia, Dixon has held teaching appointments and fellowships with Harvard Law School (where she earned her LLM. and S.J.D.) and the University of New South Wales Law School since 2003. "An academic career offers an amazing opportunity to combine one's own intellectual interests with engagement with students and the wider community."

This year, Dixon will be teaching Socio-Economic Rights, Elements of the Law, and Comparative Constitutional Law, which she cites as her favorite course to teach: "As a subject, it opens our eyes not only to the rest of the world, but to ourselves, and the true nature of our constitutional traditions." She is currently collaborating with fellow new faculty member Tom Ginsburg on a handbook on the topic, and is working on a project on constitutional inflation, "which looks at the way in which the real value of numerical provisions in constitutions can change over time."

Running and walking along the lake are among the things Dixon is enjoying about Hyde Park. "My fourteen-month-old daughter, Isobel, is very much enjoying being in her new home. She also seems to be particularly enjoying all the Obama signs she sees around, because B-A-M-A is one of her twenty or so words."

Thomas Ginsburg
Professor of Law

As a teenager growing up in the San Francisco Bay area in the 1980s, Tom Ginsburg wanted to be an IP lawyer. "Had I done so I would likely be retired already. Instead, I studied East Asia. After college, I was a program officer for the Asia Foundation working on law and democracy programs. I sent Martin Shapiro, a Boalt Professor, to Mongolia to work on constitutional drafting. The work was so interesting I decided to go back to school to study with Martin."

Ginsburg earned his J.D. and his Ph.D. in jurisprudence and social policy from the University of California at Berkeley and held his first professorship at the University of Illinois, where he directed the Comparative Constitutions Project. He was drawn to the University of Chicago Law School because of its "unique intellectual energy, which is like nowhere else." His interests are well reflected in his teaching load this year, which includes East Asian Law, International Human Rights, Comparative Legal Institutions, Public International Law, Comparative Constitutional Design, and a Greenberg Seminar entitled Terrorism and the Law.

Ginsburg has edited or authored five books, including Judicial Review in New Democracies, which won the C. Herman Pritchett Award from the American Political Science Association for best book on law and courts. Among his current pursuits,
Ginsburg is particularly excited about Constitutionmaking.org, a joint project of the Comparative Constitutions Project (CCP) and the United States Institute for Peace (USIP) that will provide constitution designers with "systematic information on design options and constitutional text, drawing on the CCP's comprehensive dataset on the features of national constitutions since 1789." "We're starting the analysis now, even as we gather data, and are finding out lots of interesting things."

Having taught at Chicago as a visiting professor last year, Ginsburg is already well settled into the community with his family. When asked what he most enjoys about Chicago, he responded enthusiastically with "the music scene!" Look for him and his youngest daughter wailing on the slide guitar and accordion at the Old Town School of Folk Music.

Brian Leiter
John P. Wilson Professor of Law and Director, Center for Law, Philosophy, and Human Values

Brian Leiter, who holds a J.D. and a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Michigan, comes to Chicago from the University of Texas at Austin, where he held the Hines H. Baker and Thelma Kelley Baker Chair in Law and also served as Professor of Philosophy and Founder and Director of the Law and Philosophy Program.

"One thing I found attractive about Chicago is that faculty take the teaching seriously," says Leiter. When asked about favorite classes when he was a student, he recalls his undergraduate days at Princeton: "Richard Rorty on Kant to 1900, Jerrold Seigel on European Intellectual History, Raymond Geuss on Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud. Issues raised in these classes have occupied me, in one way or another, ever since."

Leiter will be right at home among Chicago's prolific faculty. He is co-editor of the journal Legal Theory, editor of the Routledge Philosophers book series, author of Nietzsche on Morality and Naturalizing Jurisprudence: Essays on American Legal Realism and Naturalism in Legal Philosophy, and editor of numerous other volumes. Googling "Leiter blog," however, reveals the extent of his passion for a more immediate publication venue.

Alison Siegler
Assistant Clinical Professor of Law and Director of the Federal Criminal Justice Project

A Lecturer in Law at Chicago last year, Alison Siegler is another familiar face at the Law School. Before joining the clinical faculty, she represented indigent criminal defendants in federal district court and in the Seventh Circuit a staff attorney with the Federal Defender Program. A former clerk for U.S. District Judge Robert W. Gettleman in Chicago, Siegler was a Prettyman Fellow at Georgetown University Law Center's Criminal Justice Clinic, where she represented indigent clients in D.C. Superior Court and supervised and taught third-year law students in the clinic.

Siegler earned her J.D. from Yale Law School and her LLM from Georgetown University Law Center. This year, she will be teaching Federal Criminal Procedure and Federal Sentencing. "I love teaching about sentencing because it's the aspect of the federal criminal justice system that's most in flux right now, and it's exciting to teach a subject whose legal landscape has shifted so dramatically in recent years. Federal sentencing is a complex legal universe that has dramatic real-world effects. Although popular depictions of the criminal justice system tend to focus on the trial, the sentencing is frequently the most momentous stage of a federal criminal case."
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1934
John N. Fegan
February 19, 2008
Fegan passed away at age ninety-seven after a long and fulfilling life. His career included politics, service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and over thirty years as an attorney with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Securities Department of Oregon. Fegan was an Emeritus member of the Michigan State Bar Association.

1935
Jerome B. Rosenthal
August 15, 2007

1936
Solaman G. Lippman
June 19, 2008
A graduate of the College, Lippman was an Associate Editor of the University of Chicago Law Review. He became one of the first attorney-appointees at the newly formed National Labor Relations Board. After serving the NLRB, Lippman became General Counsel to the Retail Clerks International Association, where he served for twenty-five years. He served as General Counsel to the National Organization for Women (NOW), the Associated Fur Manufacturers and United Fur Manufacturers, and the House Education and Labor Committee, Pension (ERISA) Legislation and Amendments, where he drafted pension and Equal Opportunity reform legislation. He also served as an arbitrator in numerous private and public disputes. Lippman deeply loved the Law School and credited his success to the education that he received.

1938
Thomas I. Megan
December 29, 2008
A retired federal administrative law judge, Megan passed away at age ninety-three. He was admitted to the Illinois bar in 1939 and was an Army major during World War II. Megan was a former vice president in the law department of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Co.

1948
Robert S. Gruhn
April 3, 2008
Gruhn served in the United States Army in World War II and the Korean Conflict. After spending twenty-seven years in the Army Reserves as part of the Judge Advocate General Corps, he retired as a full Colonel. He was a member of the bars of Illinois, California, and Washington, and was licensed to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court. He and his wife, Eileen, helped found KFAE Radio, bringing public radio to Eastern Washington. He volunteered for the Washington Museum Association, providing pro bono legal services to museums around the Northwest. He also served as the Chair of the King County Landmarks Commission. His lifelong commitment to historic preservation continues with the Robert S. Gruhn collection at DePaul University.

1950
Jack E. Bowers
December 11, 2007
Bowers was a dedicated public servant, strong leader, and an accomplished businessman. He served his country in the U.S. Army during World War II. He was partner in the law firm of Hooper, Bowers, Calkins & Carney in Downers Grove and served as city attorney for several Illinois municipalities. Bowers was Assistant State’s Attorney and later became the State’s Attorney for DuPage County and President of DuPage County Illinois Bar Association. He was both an Illinois State Representative and an Illinois State Senator.

Lawrence W. Rabb
March 30, 2008
Rabb was an attorney, community, and civil rights activist. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II and the Korean Conflict. A native of Lexington, MS, Rabb and his wife moved to Meridian in 1952, where he practiced law until 2005. He was involved during the civil rights movement in Mississippi. In the 1960s, Rabb and law partner Bob Deen filed a landmark federal lawsuit that forced Lauderdale County, and eventually all Mississippi counties, to redraw county supervisor districts following the "one-man, one-vote" doctrine established a few years earlier by the U.S. Supreme Court.

1951
Harold Bowman
June 23, 2008
A native of Chicago, IL, Bowman was a World War II veteran. After practicing law in Illinois, Florida, and Texas, he and his wife retired to Marietta in 1994 to be near their children and grandchildren.

1953
Ralph E. Brown
April 8, 2008
After Law School, Brown, a life-long Chicagoan, began as a Public Defender in Cook County. He then ran his own practice for ten years, then joined Walsh, Case and Brown. From 1989 to 2005 he was a shareholder in Schuyler, Roche and Zwerin. In October of 2007 he was among those honored for fifty years of membership in the Chicago Bar Association. He was admitted to practice in many court systems, including the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Illinois and Wyoming Supreme Courts. His interests reached beyond the law, championing various causes, including population control.

Robert Saxon Milnikel
February 28, 2008
A graduate of the College, Milnikel was a partner in Peterson, Ross, Schloerb & Seidel and other firms. He headed the Cliff Dwellers Foundation for several years. His daughter, Elizabeth Milnikel, is the Director of the Institute for Justice Clinic on Entrepreneurship at the Law School.
1954

David Lester
July 3, 2008

Lester died in Chicago at the age of 83. A graduate of the College, he was a partner of Antonow, Fink, Gunther & Lester and then of Alheimer & Gray. He was devoted to teaching young corporate lawyers and later in his career he enjoyed working for extended periods with the attorneys in the Alheimer offices in Warsaw and Kiev. After his retirement from full-time practice, he went in-house part-time with his client of nearly fifty years, A. Epstein and Sons International, Inc.

1956

Robert E. Mann
March 26, 2008

Mann was a proud representative of the Hyde Park district as a member of the Illinois House of Representatives from 1962 to 1978 and received several best legislator awards. In addition to his law practice, he taught business law at the University of Chicago, where he had a master’s degree in business administration. He was well known for his vigorous debates on the House floor on issues such as the death penalty, the increase of welfare benefits, gun control, and the protection of the Lake Michigan shoreline.

Dr. J. Ward Wright
June 13, 2008

Wright passed away in Richmond, KY, at age eighty. A graduate of the College, he was a retired professor of management, law and ethics at Eastern Kentucky University and a former U.S. Army Ranger.

1957

Alan C. Swan
June 8, 2008

Swan was a devoted teacher and well-respected scholar. Prior to joining the University of Miami Law School faculty in 1972, he was assistant vice president for special projects and professorial lecturer in law at the University of Chicago. He then worked as assistant general counsel for the U.S. Agency for International Development, and as an associate in the New York office of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy. Best known for his classes in international business transactions, international economic law, commercial law, contracts, and antitrust, Professor Swan was former director and co-chair of the UM Law School’s LL.M. program in International Law and was widely liked by his students.

1958

Deane S. Bennett
April 26, 2008

Bennett served with the U.S. Army in South Korea. He was hired in 1968 as an assistant attorney general in Oregon, then began a private law practice, concentrating on criminal defense and appeals to the Oregon Court of Appeals and the Oregon Supreme Court.

1961

James Valentino, Jr.
February 21, 2008

A graduate of the College, Valentino practiced law in Illinois for many years. He was a photographer later on in life.

1964

Anthony J. Valentino
August 25, 2007

Valentino graduated from Law School three years after his brother, James. He practiced in Illinois and California.

1965

A. Richard Taft
June 6, 2008

Taft began his career as a lawyer but found his calling in the financial world. His early financial career began as an investment banker in New York City and subsequently continued in Chicago, where he spent the majority of his career in asset management with the Chicago Corporation. In January 2000, he founded Chesley Taft Associates, an asset management firm, in partnership with Ferris Chesley. Taft was an avid nature lover and he enjoyed hiking, fishing, and skiing. He kept his friends entertained with a never-ending supply of jokes.

1968

Harve H. Mossawir, Jr.
April 1, 2008

Joel Stephen Seidenstein
July 4, 2008

Seidenstein was a beloved social studies and Constitutional law teacher at the Bronx High School of Science. He founded Bike the Big Apple sightseeing tour company in 2001. His passions included educating, cycling, and his family.

1982

David Dickerson
March 1, 2008

Dickerson practiced in Illinois, then opened a successful solo tax practice in Phoenix, AZ.

1990

Carol Messing
June 5, 2008

A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Colgate University, Messing moved to the Washington, DC, area to work after graduation from the Law School. She worked as senior enforcement lawyer in the Department of Commerce, Office of General Counsel for Enforcement and Litigation at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. She prosecuted many fisheries cases, suing to protect scallops and halibut. In her free time, Carol was active in breast cancer support groups and was an English as a Second Language volunteer instructor in Silver Spring, MD.

1984

George G. Nelson
February 4, 2008

Nelson was a graduate of the College and practiced law in New York for many years.

1989

Gerald K. Bolkema
May 25, 2008

Bolkema, age fifty-three, was involved in a fatal bicycle accident. A graduate of Calvin College, Bolkema was an international partner with Baker & McKenzie, LLP in the Chicago office. He was a dedicated family man and an avid cyclist.

1990

Carol Messing
June 5, 2008

A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Colgate University, Messing moved to the Washington, DC, area to work after graduation from the Law School. She worked as senior enforcement lawyer in the Department of Commerce, Office of General Counsel for Enforcement and Litigation at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. She prosecuted many fisheries cases, suing to protect scallops and halibut. In her free time, Carol was active in breast cancer support groups and was an English as a Second Language volunteer instructor in Silver Spring, MD.
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Up for the Challenge

After he had completed his service as an artillery officer in the Second World War, Harry Groves, ’49, came to Chicago to pursue a graduate degree in education. After a year in graduate school, he was challenged by a friend who told him that the Law School was really hard to get into. He applied and was accepted. Thus two consistent themes in Groves’s career were manifested early: his love of teaching and his propensity for accepting and surmounting challenges.

Not long after completing law school he was called back to military service, after the outbreak of the Korean War, to serve in the Judge Advocate General’s Corps at Fort Bragg in North Carolina. When he was discharged he set up a solo law practice in nearby Fayetteville. Add a third career theme—altering racial perceptions—to the two mentioned above. “Let me tell you,” he says, “a lot of jaws dropped in the courthouse when I walked in with white clients from my Fort Bragg contacts. I’m pretty sure I was the first black lawyer with white clients that most folks there had ever seen. For some reason, I was regularly asked where I got my law degree. I can’t tell you the respect that the name ‘The University of Chicago Law School’ evoked.”

In 1956, Groves became dean of the law school at Texas Southern University, a traditionally black institution in Houston whose ABA accreditation was in jeopardy. In addition to straightening out that challenge, Groves began accepting white students. “I wanted to make it a school, not a black school,” he says.

His accomplishments brought him to the attention of Harvard Law School, which offered him one of ten positions it had created for up-and-coming legal educators to conduct postgraduate study. He chose to study the constitution of the recently formed Federation of Malaya, and his analysis was published in a law review. Add a fourth theme: scholarly writing. In his career, he has had six books published, including a casebook on comparative constitutional law, and many influential studies and articles. In two 1951 articles he helped lead the way toward the momentous Brown v. Board of Education decision by arguing that Plessy v. Ferguson was being misinterpreted and misapplied.

Back at Texas Southern after his year at Harvard, he was contacted on behalf of the University of Malaya, which was looking for an American to come teach Malayan constitutional law. He and his wife Evelyn went to Singapore, where the university was located. Within two years he was asked to take on both of the law school’s top leadership roles, as head of the law department and dean of the law faculty. He did so, and within a couple more years he was asked to accept a permanent chair, which he agreed to do. On the day that he and Evelyn were preparing to go back to Houston on leave prior to their permanent move to Singapore, riots broke out. All travel within Singapore was forbidden, and they required a police escort just to get to the airport. Add two more themes: tumult and an abidingly devoted marital relationship.

Unable to return to Singapore, he hung out a shingle in Houston and soon brought on an associate. He agreed to undertake a study of
75 Years of Success and Service

In a family marked by close and warm relationships, it seems fitting that Bob Gerstein, ‘59, and his son Mark, ‘84, will both be attending milestone Law School reunions next year. Not just attending—each will serve on his class’s reunion committee, and each is determined to draw as many classmates as possible to the festivities.

It is just scratching the surface of Mark’s professional accomplishments to mention that his transactions have included Koch Industries’ $22 billion acquisition of Georgia-Pacific, which was at the time the second-largest going-private in U.S. history, and representation of the special committee of the board of directors of the Chicago Board of Trade in connection with its $12 billion merger with the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

It would also be just scratching the surface of the two men’s contributions to list only their impressive private-sector accomplishments. “A lot of what my father shared with us as I was growing up was the work he was doing for the public good, and that has definitely inspired me to try to follow his path,” Mark says. Bob was a founding board member of the Home Investment Fund, which helped minority families finance homes in the Chicago suburbs, and he was a board member of the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, which increased integration and housing opportunities in the Chicago area. As a member and chairman of the Highland Park Housing Commission, he was instrumental in the development of three low- and moderate-income housing developments in Highland Park. He currently serves on the board of the Legal Aid Society.

Mark’s civic works include serving on the boards of Youth Guidance and the J. Kyle Braid Leadership Foundation. Youth Guidance creates and implements school-based programs for at-risk children; the Braid Foundation provides community-leadership training and peer counseling to hundreds of student-athlete leaders. Mark also leads a supportive partnership with the National Teachers Academy, a Chicago public school aimed at excellence and equity in instruction for young children, and he represents the international microfinance organization Unitus on a pro bono basis.

Mark’s respect for the Law School is reflected in the most practical way: “We work really hard to get Chicago graduates into our practice and into the firm in general,” he says. “As new associates, they are among the best prepared of any law school’s students, and it just gets better from there. The Law School was a great place to learn when I went there, and it seems to me that it has somehow become even better since then.” Bob’s perspective is just as pragmatic, but phrased differently. He says, “I learned something at Chicago that I believe Mark also learned, and that might be one of life’s most important lessons—never give up. You can solve a problem, reach an agreement, and overcome practically any obstacle if you use the skills you learned from the great faculty and you persevere. There is a confident mental toughness and determination that you see in Chicago grads that you don’t find in many other places.”
High-Level Diplomacy

On February 29 of this year, Mary Ann Glendon, "61 J.D., '63 M.C.L., presented her credentials to Pope Benedict XVI and took her place as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Holy See.

The ambassadorship extends her lengthy, influential, and historic relationship with the Vatican. In 1995, she became the first woman ever to head a major Vatican delegation when Pope John Paul II appointed her to lead the Vatican delegation to the United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing. A year before that, John Paul selected her for membership in the newly formed Pontifical Academy of Social Science, which Glendon describes as "a kind of think tank to help the Catholic Church keep abreast of developments in economics, law, political science, and sociology." Ten years later, in 2004, she became president of that academy, making her the highest-ranking female adviser to the Holy See. The group produced a white paper on the ethical dilemmas posed by declining birthrates and greater longevity, about which Glendon notes, "I am particularly pleased that our research in that area has been well-received by policy makers in several countries."

Glendon, who is currently on leave from the professorial post she has held at Harvard Law School since 1986, has written ten books, the most recent of which is A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. An Italian edition of her 2006 collection of essays, Traditions in Turmoil, won first prize in the annual Capri book awards this year. That book surveys developments in human rights, comparative law, constitutional law, and legal theory.

Early in her career she coauthored The Law of Decedent's Estates with her former University of Chicago Law School professor Max Rheinstein, of whom she says, "Hardly a day goes by when I do not recall with gratitude all that I owe to the great Max Rheinstein. From Rheinstein I acquired an abiding curiosity about how other legal systems handle problems with which we in the U.S. are struggling, and a fascination with the relations among law, behavior, and ideas."

Between 2001 and 2007 she served two terms as an appointee of George Bush to the President's Council on Bioethics. She views the Council as playing a particularly important societal role, observing, "New developments in science and technology are occurring with such speed that they have outpaced reflection on their social, political, and moral implications. The remarkable reports issued by the Council under the leadership of University of Chicago professor Leon Kass are, in my view, models of how people with differing religious and political views can collaborate constructively to clarify what is really at stake in controversies over embryonic stem cell research, cloning, new reproductive technologies, and end-of-life care, among other things."

Glendon reports that her time as ambassador has occurred during "an unusually eventful year," which has seen both a visit by Pope Benedict XVI to the White House and a visit to the Vatican by President Bush. "In addition to helping with the arrangements for those meetings," she says, "our embassy is celebrating twenty-five years of formal diplomatic relations between the U.S. and the Holy See with a series of conferences to commemorate the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."
Entertainment Executive Goes Green

You might say that Neil Braun, ‘77, didn’t let any grass grow under his feet during his exceptional career in the entertainment industry, during which, among other things, he was head of Viacom Entertainment and president of NBC Television Network. You might also say that today he is doing his part to make our world a greener place as chairman and CEO of GreenLife, a company he launched last year that helps businesses and individuals analyze, reduce, and redress their carbon footprints.

After he graduated from the Law School, Braun headed back to his native New York, where he worked at Paul, Weiss for a while; then joined International Film Investors; and not long afterward went to HBO as its film financing and distribution specialist.

In 1988, when Ron Howard and Brian Grazer decided to start the film production company Imagine Entertainment, they brought Braun on board as president and chief operating officer. He remained there for several years, until it became clear that he would have to move to the West Coast to further his career at Imagine. “It’s possible that I might have accomplished more in the entertainment business if I had been willing to live in LA,” he recounts, “but my family, my friends—my life—are all in and around New York.”

So he joined New York–based Viacom and became chairman and CEO of its entertainment division … and then that fateful choice came up again. Viacom bought Paramount Pictures and Braun was asked to relocate to Hollywood. Again—no dice. He landed instead as president of NBC Television Network, where he served during the tempestuous years when Fox launched a fourth network and began competing with the other networks for the top broadcast stations in each market.

In 1998 he started two Internet-based companies, including one that would host user-generated video—“A lot like YouTube, just a bit too far ahead of its time,” he says. More recently, he formed Vanguard Animation with the producer of Shrek and also joined the board of directors of IMAX.

Now he has focused his entrepreneurial energies and leadership experience on GreenLife, where he is chairman and CEO. GreenLife helps companies analyze their carbon footprints (their greenhouse gas emissions) and then develop plans to reduce them. Since no organization can reduce its footprint to zero through internal measures alone, GreenLife also helps each client offset its global-warming impact by funding emission-reducing projects outside the company. With improved internal practices and offsets, a company can approach “carbon neutrality” so that, overall, it has virtually no deleterious impact.

“The criteria for a legitimate offset are quite strict,” Braun explains. “Among other things, there have to be benchmarks showing that the project actually results in less emitted carbon dioxide than an alternative, and the specific outcomes must be independently verified. The projects also must be beyond business as usual and must provide a long-term reduction, not just a temporary one. Because such projects often are not economically feasible in conventional terms, it’s the funding from GreenLife’s clients that makes them possible.”

“We intend to be the industry leader in helping companies use less and offset the rest,” Braun observes. At the time of this writing, he was actively exploring merger possibilities that would make GreenLife a global presence in its growing field.

How has he made the transition from his lengthy entertainment career to his new field? “The University of Chicago Law School gave me the confidence to believe that, even if I am not the smartest guy in the room, I can bring a valuable perspective to solving problems,” he says. “Great professors like Walter Blum and Richard Epstein taught me that most complicated things can be broken down into simpler pieces and understood or even mastered. That’s what I’ve always done, and so far it has served me well.”

Maureen got herself elected to the Kane-DuPage Soil and Water Conservation District Board and practices her craft in the field by ensuring that every acorn that sprouts in our yard is forthwith protected and nurtured.” Ken and Maureen’s eldest daughter, Alice, graduated from Lawrence and nurtured.” Ken and Maureen’s eldest daughter, Alice, graduated from Lawrence and nurtured.

Rich Nehls and Sharon dined together and hung out for a couple of days. The previous weekend, the Nehls had a party to celebrate Sharon’s retirement from teaching. She called the gathering the Beginning of Endless Summer party. Ed Roche and his wife, Connie, and Chet Stern and his wife, Annie (as well as our two kids, Brittany, 25, and Michael, 22, and the Nehls’ elder son Chris, 26) were in attendance. All are doing well and look no worse for the wear. All relevant kids are surviving or thriving and no one seems to be letting painful pursuits take an inordinate priority. In short, life is pretty good. Maybe it’s the altitude.” Or maybe it’s the attitude?

Karen Austin reports, “My daughter, Kira, married June 7. Her husband is doing his medical residency at Vanderbilt, where Kira attends divinity school. It’s the first time we have had a kid in the same town with us in many years. The wedding was awesome, with a live
Selection Process Improvement

It was in a sophomore-year class at Princeton that Chris Eisgruber, '88, then a physics major, discovered his passion for constitutional law. That passion led him, as scholarly passions for the law often will, to the University of Chicago Law School. Last year it also led him to compose a book, *The Next Justice*, which aims to right what he sees as the wrongs of the selection process for Supreme Court justices.

When Eisgruber determined, at some point between that sophomore-year class and the conclusion of a year at Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar, that studying and teaching law was to be his vocation, it greatly streamlined his decision about which law school to attend. “I wanted to be at a place that combined interdisciplinary legal scholarship with a deep commitment to teaching; that put Chicago right at the top of my list,” he says. “It didn’t hurt,” the lifelong Cubs fan adds, “that Wrigley Field is in Chicago.”

After graduating from the Law School, he clerked for Court of Appeals Judge Patrick Higginbotham and Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens, and then he taught at New York University’s law school for eleven years. In 2000, he returned to Princeton to be part of the university’s new program in Law and Public Affairs, which he headed from 2001 to 2004. Today, he is Princeton’s provost as well as its Laurance S. Rockefeller Professor of Public Affairs in the Woodrow Wilson School and the University Center for Human Values.

He says that his work at Princeton, where he was charged with bringing the best legal minds to campus to provide insight on academic and contemporary issues, also reflected his Chicago experience: “Chicago is famous for the intensity of its intellectual engagement, as exemplified by the faculty roundtable and reflected in arguments that often spring up in the Green Lounge. Some of my best memories of the School involve informal conversations about the law with classmatees and professors like Geof Stone, Dennis Hutchinson, and Cass Sunstein. It’s the kind of thing I have tried to facilitate at Princeton.” His connection to the Law School is strong in another way, too—he met his wife, Lori Martin, ’88, during their first year there. She is currently a partner at WilmerHale.

In *The Next Justice*, which is his third book, he argues that the Senate’s evaluation of potential justices has become little more than political theater, driven by a false dichotomy that depicts nominees as either impartial “umpires” or ideological “activists” and providing virtually nothing of substance to illuminate the senators’ decisions or advance public understanding of fateful legal matters.

He offers three primary recommendations for improving the confirmation process. First, “We have to get past empty slogans like ‘judicial restraint,’” which suggest that a justice will never intervene in a legislative or executive decision. The Constitution as it is written demands that justices make political judgments; the correct question is about the specific circumstances in which a justice believes that it is proper for the judiciary to trump another branch.”

Second, “The Senate has to put the burden on the nominee to show that his or her views are not extreme. There’s no way to do that through ‘Gotcha’ questions about how a nominee might rule in a particular circumstance; it would be done best by asking open-ended questions.” For example, Eisgruber recommends that senators ask nominees to identify some clear examples of times in their public lives when they have crossed party lines or broken ideological ranks. “If a nominee will not satisfactorily answer questions like that, then a senator has every right to vote against confirmation,” he says.

Third, “We should all be interested in seeing more moderates appointed to the Supreme Court, even if we are not moderates ourselves. There are no sound arguments, either constitutional or practical, for requiring deference when presidents nominate persons whose judicial philosophy is ideologically rigid or extreme.”

From the glowing evaluations of *The Next Justice*—including Sunstein’s description of it as “superb and provocative … careful and exceptionally illuminating”—it is plain that Chris Eisgruber’s commitment to scholarship and teaching may advance his colleagues’ thinking as it also captivates a broader public with the kind of appreciation of the law that he first experienced in a Princeton classroom and nourished so importantly at the University of Chicago Law School.
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Preserving the Rule of Law

As Eric Ha, '03, was riding the train to his job atSidley Austin one summer day last year, he received a phone call from his wife, Liz.
"I just heard a story on the radio," she told him. "You have to read about it. We have to do something."

Later that day he did read about the situation she had mentioned, concerning events in Jena, Louisiana, where six African American high school students were accused of having beaten a white student. The trial of the first of the accused students was underway. Although he was sixteen at the time of the assault, he was being tried as an adult, originally charged with attempted murder.

Many circumstances surrounding the case elevated it to considerable national attention. Before the beating incident, racial tensions at the school and in the town had flared after some white students hung nooses in a tree on campus and then were perceived by many as having been laxly disciplined for their action. All of the members of the jury in the trial that was underway were white. The local district attorney had made a statement that many considered inflammatory.

Ha agreed with his wife that he needed to act. "I grew up in the South, where discrimination and racial prejudice were not uncommon. The overall circumstances of the Jena case, and especially the image of the nooses, were deeply troubling," he says. He took up the issue with his partner mentor at Sidley, Evan Westerfield, '93, and Westerfield encouraged him to pursue a pro bono engagement to provide assistance to the Louisiana-based defense team.

"I was so impressed by how extraordinarily supportive the entire firm was in helping me create this engagement and then encouraging me and others to work on it," Ha recounts. At the height of the firm's involvement, eight associates were dedicating substantial amounts of time to Jena matters. Westerfield says, "Eric organized the associates and assigned projects. He wrote strong briefs on key issues that proved to have a major influence. . . . Throughout, Eric managed the matter virtually by himself, from the engagement to client interactions to the supervision of others' work." The Louisiana-based lead counsel in one of the cases wrote, "[T]here is no doubt that Eric's contribution has been enormous for the defendant."

Awarded Sidley's highly regarded Thomas H. Morsch Pro Bono Service Award for his efforts, Ha donated the monetary component of his award to the Law School's Mandel Legal Aid Clinic. "My experience at the Law School really transformed me, and this was a way for me to give something back as a reflection of my gratitude," he explains.

"Through the employment discrimination clinic with Professor Schmidt, through many of my courses—particularly those with Professor Strauss, but many others, too—and just by knowing so many students and faculty who cared deeply about justice, I came to understand that along with our many opportunities and advantages comes a significant responsibility to serve others and to help preserve the rule of law. There's been a lot of talk about the 'Jena 6' in the media. My commitment, and that of my Sidley team members, was to the cause of justice, and I think we helped serve that cause well."

Today Ha, who is a member of Sidley's Environmental Practice Group, continues to provide pro bono services to the Jena defendants. "To have work that I love at a firm I admire—I am so fortunate and so grateful," he says. Ha and his wife celebrated the birth of their first child, Bethany, earlier this year.

Eric Ha, '03

With more free time, Amy also sends news of classmate sightings: "A few weeks ago I was in the Museum of Contemporary Art gift shop and they were selling Drew Oliver's Giant Microbes, and I saw Aleeza Strubel at an American Constitution Society discussion featuring a partner from her firm discussing the EOCS case, which Aleeza worked on. I also literally bumped into Anna Bradley Debah and her adorable son on the sidewalk, and have gotten to have dinner with Ameri Giannotti, Beth Larsen, and Ms. (Martha) Pacold a few times recently. Martha has a fabulous new condo with great views over Millennium Park, perfect for fireworks viewing."

Amy's not the only one adding a hometown degree to the resume. In May, Gary Scanlon graduated with honors from Northwestern University's LLM Taxation program. He writes, "I have accepted a position with Ernst & Young's National Practice Office in Washington DC as a Senior Associate in their M&A Tax Group."

On the baby front, Amy Rubenstein reports from a "maternal hiatus" that daughter, Arden Sage Rubenstein, arrived these summer last year.
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Michael David Yanovsky
Michelle Sabrina Ybarra
Cathy Chaoan Yu
Huyue Zhang
Gongxin Zhou
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CALIFORNIA

Irvine
Don Pua
Knobbe, Martens, Olsen & Bear LLP

Los Angeles
Jorge Fernandez
Irell & Manella LLP
Shani Fregia
O’Melveny & Myers LLP

Andrew Galvin
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Jacob Harper
Morris & Foerster
Hane Kim
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Marie Ly
Latham & Watkins LLP
Katharine Mercer
Hon. Stephen Wiltos, C.D. Cal.
Gregory Packer
Latham & Watkins LLP
Jacob Poorman
Arnold & Porter
Drury Rossbacher
BCG (The Boston Consulting Group)

Menlo Park
Amy Kim
Latham & Watkins LLP

Newport Beach
Stephanie Noble
O’Melveny & Myers LLP

Palo Alto
Christopher Bors
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Stacy Chen
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher
Leizel Ching
WillmerHale

Brendan McCarthy
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
Laura Vaughn
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

Pasadena
Benjamin Maro
Hon. Pamela Rymer, 9th Cir.

Redwood Shores
Heather Belville
Quinn Emanuel

Sacramento
Sean Leonard
Penango, Inc.

San Diego
Jessica Gioia
Heidi Ehman
Daniel Gutierrez
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
Scott Morris
Latham & Watkins LLP
Lewis Russell
Latham & Watkins LLP

San Francisco
Nathan Brill
Sidley Austin LLP
Frank Busch
Bingham McCutchen
Helen Gilbert
Hon. William Fletcher, 9th Cir.
Lauren Kramer
O’Melnick
Kathy Lee
Latham & Watkins LLP
Preston Swapp
Sidley Austin LLP
Marc Tarlock
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Michelle Ybarra
Howard Rice

COLORADO

Boulder
Jonathan Gillam
Faegre & Benson

Denver
Donosal Knobloch
Hon. David Ebel, 10th Cir.
Matthew Maxwell
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James Abell
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
Lauren Beck
Akin Gump

Marin Boney
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Courtney Brown
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
Nathan Cardon
Wiley Rein LLP
Scott Dahlquist
Latham & Watkins LLP
Jonathan Falkler
Dickstein Shapiro LLP
Andrea Forton
Jones Day
Brittany Hameleers
Arnold & Porter
Erik Lamb
White & Case
Mary Lovejoy
Dentos & Pimento LLP
Sebastian Miller
Sidney Austin LLP
Adam Preiss
Hon. Stephen Williams, D.C. Cir.
Kyle Reynolds
Arnold & Porter
Maya Song
Mayer Brown
Matthew Tokson
Hon. A. Raymond Randolph, D.C. Cir.
Shine Tu
Foley & Lardner
Ross Tucker
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meager & Flom LLP
Liliy Voskanian
O’Melveny & Myers LLP

DELAWARE

Wilmington
Nicholas Harper-Smith
Hon. Christopheronti, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, D. Del.

FLORIDA

Miami
Joshua Sellers
Hon. Rosemary Barkett, 11th Cir.

ILLINOIS

Chicago
Albert Arboagast IV
Mayer Brown
Thomas Bell
Shiff Hardin
Jeffrey Bergman
Shiff Hardin
Jessica Boehm
Latham & Watkins LLP
Euler Bropel
Latham & Watkins LLP
Vincent Buccola
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
Elizabeth Carlson
Mayer Brown
Katherine Casale
Mayer Brown
Pamela Chasman
Sidney Austin LLP
Nathan Christensen
Hon. Michael Place, 7th Cir.
John Cise
Mayer Brown
Bryce Cooper
Winston & Strawn
Seema Dargar
Mayer Brown
Enrique de Vera
Latham & Watkins LLP
Marlo Del Perico
Holland & Knight
Michael Derksens
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
Matthew Diller
McDermott, Will & Emery LLP
Sara Feinstein
Sidney Austin LLP
Elizabeth Ferrari
Winston & Strawn
Daniel Fine
Hon. Robert E. Dow, Jr., N.D. III.
Joseph Fisher-Nartker
Locke, Lord, Bissell & Liddell
Grant Folland
Sidney Austin LLP
James Fostoris
Sidney Austin LLP

Ebba Gebisa
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
William Guerrieri
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Claire Hausman
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Emily Hertz
BCG (The Boston Consulting Group)
Matthew Hofheiner
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Zachary Holmstead
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.
Marylynn Hunt-Dorta
Goldberg Kahn
Stephanie Jean-Jacques
Jenner & Block
Elsa Jillson
Sidney Austin LLP
Evan Kanter
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meager & Flom LLP
David Keller
Greenberg Traurig LLP
Andrew Kettenbrink
Foley & Lardner
Anne King
Legal Assistance Foundation of Metropolitan Chicago
Kelly Lazaroff
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meager & Flom LLP
Alison Leff
Sidney Austin LLP
Daniel Lewis
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Jake Linford
Patricia McCallUFilmore Newbury
Hillard & Geraldon
Conor Looney
Darwin Capital

Lindsay Marcus
Hon. James Moran, N.D. III.
Katherine Markowski
Lovells LLP
Matthew Martinez
Sidney Austin LLP
Rachel McLaughlin
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
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INDIANA
Indianapolis
Jeffery Stovall
Baker Daniels

NEW YORK
New York
Manuel Alvarez
Hughes Hubbard & Reed

Chicago Medical School

Vincente Tennerelli
Jenner & Block

Michael Amiet
BCG (The Boston Consulting Group)

Paul Bauer
Latham & Watkins LLP

EmiNam
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Sarah Waxman
BCG (The Boston Consulting Group)

Zoe Robinson
Hon. Diane Wood, 7th Cir.

James Cleveland
Sidley Austin LLP

Michael Walsh
Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Michelle Wolf
Grippo & Elden

New Orleans
Cadence Mertz
Hon. Jacques Wiener, 5th Cir.

Shreveport
Veronica Root
Hon. Carl Stewart, 5th Cir.

Massachusetts
Boston
Catherine Denene
Foley Hoag LLP

MINNESOTA
Minneapolis
Kimberly Anderson
Dorsey & Whitney

Allison Benne
Mayer Brown

Casey Davison
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP

Shawn Choi
Siemens Thecher & Bartlett

Matthew Fan
Sidley Austin LLP

Jennifer Ganes
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

Carlos Garcia
Sullivan & Cromwell LLP

Missouri
St. Louis
Angle Agarwal
Hon. Raymond Gruender, 8th Cir.

David Jelenko
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

MISSISSIPPI
Jackson
Jeffrey Dutson
Hon. E. Grady Jolly, 5th Cir.

Eryn Karpinski
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

Las Vegas
Carina Ciluffo
Clark County Public Defender's Office

Hong-Wei Kuo
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
Candace McKinley
Dechert LLP

Tara Hurley
Norton Rose

Texas
Austin
Rebecca Fike
Vinson & Elkins LLP

Dallas
Shermon Williams
Baker Botts LLP

Houston
Edward Costrell
Baker Botts LLP

McClanahan
Baker Botts LLP

James McElver
Vinson & Elkins LLP

Gus Neck

Sarah Vinson-Cottrell
Baker Botts LLP

Virginia
Reston
Christopher James
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP

Virgin Islands
St. Thomas
Hon. Curtis Gomez, D.V.I.

Washington
Seattle
James Little
Karr Tuttle Campbell

Matthew Milholt
Karr Tuttle Campbell

Eric Wood
Holker & Ehrman

International
Canada
Matthew McCarthy
Hon. Elaine Houghton, Washington Ct. of Appeals

International
International

Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
Candace McKinley
Dechert LLP
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11 Varsity Athletes
34 States Represented
184 Students
35 Countries Lived and/or Worked In
45 Undergraduate Majors
1 Chemistry Ph.D. Student
1 Fulbright Scholar
1 Documentary Film Producer
1 Hot Grill Salesman
1 Volcano Hiker
1 Competitive Cheerleader
1 Bluegrass Mandolinist
91 Undergraduate Institutions

Meet the Class of 2011

1 One Poet
22 Master's Degrees
2 2008 Presidential Campaign Staffers
2 Mountain Climbers
1 One Amateur Cartoonist
2 Cattle Ranchers
5 Teach for America Participants
1 Highland Team Captain

1 Walt Disney World Employee
1 Professional Soccer Player
2 Yoga Teachers
Two Taekwondo Black Belts
1 Junior Olympics Silver Medalist
1 Video Game World Champion
1 One Video Game World Champion
1 Olympic Champion
1 One Olympic Champion

4 Fourteen Languages Spoken Fluently
1 Fourteen Languages Spoken Fluently
Times change but some things stay the same.
The University of Chicago Law School is a place where great achievement is expected.
Where it is comfortable to be smart.

With your gift to the Annual Fund even greater things are possible.
www.law.uchicago.edu/alumni/giving.html