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Dear Alumni and Friends:

Freedom of expression on university campuses has garnered much attention in recent years, and it has special importance at the University of Chicago. The University has seen the freedom to express and challenge ideas as central to its mission of discovering and advancing knowledge.

The Law School has had a distinctive role in clarifying and advancing the University’s commitment to this principle. Three University committees have examined matters of expression and issued important statements. All three were chaired by faculty members at the Law School: Harry Kalven, Jr. in 1967, David A. Strauss in 2013, and Geoffrey R. Stone in 2014. This pattern continued last year when the University formed the Committee on Discipline for Disruptive Conduct, and Randal C. Picker agreed to serve as its chair. The excellence of the Law School’s faculty make it no surprise that our colleagues regularly provide generous service to the University. Yet even by this standard, the Law School’s influence on the University’s approach to expression is extraordinary.

In this issue of the Record, we explore free expression at the Law School in depth. As clear as the University’s commitment to this principle has been, executing it is never simple. We grapple every day with how to make our school welcoming while still encouraging clear thought about the hardest legal questions. As the lead article describes, there is discussion about how free expression can coexist with other values such as our commitment to inclusion. Law schools can be places where the commitment to inquiry comes under particular stress. The law confronts some of society’s most troubling situations and difficult questions, and students can find the close study of these topics and discussing them challenging. For aspiring lawyers, there is often the additional responsibility of learning to advocate for a client whose views one vehemently opposes.

The processes of scholarly inquiry and professional development are not always easy, and their burdens are often not uniformly distributed. In the complex times in which we are living, the University and Law School strive to create a space where all individuals feel free to express themselves, vigorously if they wish, but always in a respectful manner. It is, and always will be, a work in progress, and I look forward to your thoughts on the article and the topic.

Also in this issue, as in every issue, I hope, you will find articles on exciting work going on at the Law School. I am very proud to share stories about the work our faculty and students are doing in two very different clinical programs, one with the Hopi tribe and one focusing on the Supreme Court. Our wonderful librarians share with you the story of a long-missing letter from John Marshall to George Washington that was found in our Rare Book Room as part of the collection of Louis H. Silver, ’28. You can also read an excerpt from the speech Martha C. Nussbaum delivered upon receiving the Kyoto Prize, as well as learn about the backgrounds of some of our exceptional students.

As always, it is a privilege to be here at the Law School every day. It has never been more important to train lawyers who are exposed to a wide variety of perspectives and experiences, and who are able to engage respectfully on even the most controversial topics. I hope to see many of you at Reunion, where I know you will hold me to my commitment to open debate!

Warmly,

Thomas J. Miles
GOOD AND UPSETTING?

Free Speech at the Law School

By Claire Zulkey
When Professor Martha C. Nussbaum approached Professor William Baude about teaching a class together last year, she was looking to cultivate vigorous but civilized argument in the classroom—the kind that digs beyond the surface-level debate to “see where the differences kick in.”

And for that, Nussbaum, who tends to draw liberal students, needed a more politically diverse crowd. “Will is a magnet for the conservative students,” said Nussbaum, the Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics. “He’s very nurturing, and they trust him.”

The move was quintessentially UChicago: put people with opposing views in one room and encourage them to practice one of the most difficult aspects of free expression—disagreement that combines both rigor and empathy. It was a particularly poignant time to emphasize those values. Universities across the country were—and still are—grappling with the tension between academic freedom and the need to foster inclusion, with controversies emerging over shouted-down speakers, potentially offensive Halloween costumes, and tense classroom discussions. For Nussbaum, a philosopher appointed jointly in the Law School and the Philosophy Department, the issue was of special relevance. Free expression and justice have long been areas of focus; in fact, a forthcoming article, “Civil Disobedience and Free Speech in the Academy,” examines the differences between free speech and deliberately illegal acts of protest, as well as the reasons universities should clearly distinguish between the two.

And so, as she approached Baude, Nussbaum had a specific goal: she wanted to model a productive exchange of ideas by challenging students to go deeper, applying philosophical methods—examining the truth of one’s premise and the validity of one’s reasoning, for instance—to the discussion of issues like sex laws, marriage laws, pornography, prostitution, and drug laws.

“When people are really analyzing an argument, they’re not fighting,” she said. “They’re actually curious, they want to know the structure of the other person’s argument.”

In the winter 2016 seminar, Public Morality and Legal Conservatism, Nussbaum and Baude emphasized that curiosity. To help students reach beyond contemporary disagreements, they devoted the first several weeks to discussing the philosophical debate between liberals and conservatives, studying Edmund Burke, John Stuart Mill, James Fitzjames Stephen, Lord Devlin, and Herbert Hart.

They also were deliberate in their structure and tone, and they looked for ways to inspire crosscurrents of discussion.

“Each week one of us would take the lead and the other would interject a lot of comments,” said Baude, the Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law. “We’d try to get the students talking.”

Nussbaum made it a point to discuss her own religious convictions and participation, and she and Baude were gentle in their treatment of differences. “People knew they couldn’t just hurl epithets at each other—there was a structure that we set up carefully,” Nussbaum said later. “We had to do things that went beyond the argument, and we had to model ourselves as the sort of people who like each other, who listen to each other.”

“These are emotional topics, but if lawyers cannot teach people how to come to the public square and talk, not just yell at each other, I don’t know who else can do it.”

— Herschella Conyers

In the end, there was vigorous discussion, though this didn’t mean that every student felt equally comfortable speaking up. But, perhaps more importantly, the class underscored a central piece of the Law School’s approach to the free exchange of ideas: the key to finding the balance between speech and inclusion lies not in the retreat from ideas but in the forthright examination of an argument’s premise, the quality of the persuasion—and the practice of civil debate.

A university “should instill in its students and faculty the importance of winning the day by facts, by ideas, and by persuasion, rather than by force, obstruction, or censorship,” Geoffrey R. Stone, the Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law, told incoming University of Chicago undergraduates at the annual Aims of Education speech last fall. “Indeed, for a university to fulfill its most fundamental mission, for a university to be a university, it must be a safe space for even the most loathsome, offensive, and disloyal arguments.”

Free speech has always been a tricky endeavor. But in recent years, as campuses have become more diverse and students have become more vocal in pushing for policies that foster inclusion, the biggest challenges have stemmed from the delicate balance between making all students feel welcome and preserving the free exchange of ideas.
“It is challenging as a school to figure out how we ensure that we’re living up to our promise of diversity of viewpoints and free exchange of ideas. Right now, we’re being told that we haven’t yet achieved it,” Bartlett said. “It’s a constant work in progress.”

The commitment to free expression has long been a core value at the University of Chicago, and one that requires consistent study. In the last 50 years, the Law School has produced influential work exploring the ways in which civil discourse, the law, and humanity intersect. From the 1967 Kalven Report to the 2017 Report from the Committee on University Discipline for Disruptive Conduct, Law School faculty have helped lead the University in examining institutional neutrality, dissent and protest, and disruptive conduct.

The exact nature of the challenges have changed over time—in the 1950s, during the McCarthy era, the threats to free speech were largely external; now they often come from within, with students sometimes demanding the censorship of potentially offensive speech—but rarely has the subject not felt relevant. As a result, the Law School continues to explore it in policy, during events, and in the classroom every day.

“I DON’T WANT STUDENTS TO THINK, ‘OH THAT’S WHAT FREE SPEECH IS, YOU GET TO GO AROUND AND USE RACIAL SLURS AND ENGAGE IN SEXIST OR HOMOPHOBIC TALK.’ THE DANGER IS THAT STUDENTS WILL COME TO BELIEVE: ‘IF THAT’S WHAT FREE SPEECH IS, I DON’T WANT ANY PART OF IT.’ AND THAT WOULD BE DEVASTATING TO US IN TRYING TO CREATE THE KIND OF CULTURE WE WANT, ONE THAT PLACES THE HIGHEST VALUE ON THE EXCHANGE OF IDEAS.” — DAVID STRAUSS

Universities often want their students to feel safe and they want them to feel challenged, and there is no perfect way to do both, especially when unfettered discussion leads some to feel silenced. Even at the Law School—which, along with the University of Chicago as whole, has been a national leader in promoting free speech—students report feeling unheard or disinclined to speak up, said Dean of Students Shannon Bartlett, who is part of a Law School Faculty Diversity Committee, which also includes senior staff.

“There are questions about whose voices are being heard and whether we really are getting a full diversity of viewpoints within the classroom,” Bartlett said. “Students of underrepresented backgrounds, whether racial, ethnic, religious or ideological, [have told the Diversity Committee that they] don’t always feel comfortable speaking out or aren’t certain that their viewpoints are welcome. On the other hand, I recognize the burden that comes with being a member of an underrepresented group or with holding an alternative viewpoint. When you are one of the only or one of very few, it can be exhausting to constantly raise your hand and articulate a differing viewpoint. The truth of the matter is that over time it can feel isolating, which means there is a personal cost that distinguishes students’ educational experiences from that of their peers.”

There is sometimes a fear, too, that what one says in class will be reported and amplified later on social media, either in or out of context—something previous generations never had to worry about.

“IT DON’T WANT STUDENTS TO THINK, ‘OH THAT’S WHAT FREE SPEECH IS, YOU GET TO GO AROUND AND USE RACIAL SLURS AND ENGAGE IN SEXIST OR HOMOPHOBIC TALK.’ THE DANGER IS THAT STUDENTS WILL COME TO BELIEVE: ‘IF THAT’S WHAT FREE SPEECH IS, I DON’T WANT ANY PART OF IT.’ AND THAT WOULD BE DEVASTATING TO US IN TRYING TO CREATE THE KIND OF CULTURE WE WANT, ONE THAT PLACES THE HIGHEST VALUE ON THE EXCHANGE OF IDEAS.” — DAVID STRAUSS

“IT IS CHALLENGING AS A SCHOOL TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE ENSURE THAT WE’RE LIVING UP TO OUR PROMISE OF DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINTS AND FREE EXCHANGE OF IDEAS. RIGHT NOW, WE’RE BEING TOLD THAT WE haven’t YET ACHIEVED IT,” BARTLETT SAID. “IT’S A CONSTANT WORK IN PROGRESS.”
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“He expressed disappointment in me for having been so naive as to think that the Law School should take the position,” said Stone, whose office, lit by a glowing neon mouth bearing the words “Free Speech,” is two floors away from where the upbraiding took place. “I, of course, later came around to understand how wrong I had been as a student on this question.”

It was a powerful early lesson in the conundrum of free expression: in order to make space for members of the community to probe ideas, the University couldn’t dictate a single right answer. It was a concept Stone would come to vigorously support as free speech became a focal point of his career—as a scholar, a Law School dean and University provost, and a sought-after advisor. In 2014, Stone led the University’s Committee on Freedom of Expression, which was formed to address national events that had “tested institutional commitments to free and open discourse.” The committee’s report reaffirmed the decades-old Kalven Report, concluding that “without a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university.”

Similarly, Stone’s Law School colleagues have served on committees devoted to teasing out the right balance on issues related to protest and disruptive conduct. Professor David Strauss led the Committee on Dissent & Protest, which was established after 2013 demonstrations at the Center for Care and Discovery, where students were among those charged with trespassing while protesting the age limit of trauma care at the hospital, a regulation that some saw as discriminatory to the area’s poor, black residents. For Strauss, the experience “made me realize how complicated it is” to design rules to regulate protests. He cited the range of facilities that the University operates and the difficulties that arise when students and community members mix in a potentially disruptive demonstration at a sensitive location. Ultimately, his committee decided to keep policy more general than specific.

“We wanted to keep the policies less detailed—to set out a series of guiding principles for both university officials and protesters, rather than detailed rules,” Strauss said. “We thought that having strict rules would either go too far in limiting the kinds of protests we should welcome or not far enough to protect sensitive University functions.”

The complexities institutions face were underscored this winter by demonstrations at the University of California at Berkeley over a planned speech by a right-wing writer known for using divisive language. In the weeks before the talk, the community was divided over whether it should be protected as free speech or whether it should be cancelled on the grounds that it was likely to constitute harassment, slander, defamation, and hate speech and violate the school’s code of conduct, a claim made in a letter signed by a dozen faculty members. In the end, public safety concerns drove the decision; Berkeley cancelled immediately before the event because protests had turned violent, a decision that still drew ire. The imbroglio highlighted just how difficult it can be to answer several root questions: when does free speech become a threat to the functioning of the school? How can a university protect the rights of demonstrators while ensuring that they don’t endanger the community or impede open inquiry and debate? How should a university deal with those who cross the line while protesting? And where, exactly, is that line?

Professor Randal C. Picker had to confront some of these questions after he agreed to lead the Committee on University Discipline for Disruptive Conduct, which was established last year following a series of disruptions at University events. “Everyone I talked to about [serving on
the committee said, "That’s a great issue; I’m glad I’m not doing it," said Picker, the James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law and the Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Teaching Scholar. His committee, which had not yet released its report when the magazine went to press, has several tasks: establishing rules for managing student demonstrations; laying out an appropriate disciplinary apparatus; and most importantly, helping to “create an educational atmosphere to make sure that our students who are actively involved in campus protest understand how free speech works, what’s a ‘good protest.’”

Creating an atmosphere conducive to a productive and healthy exchange of ideas isn’t easy, in part because culture isn’t easily codified. But instilling a commitment to civility and an ability to empathize with those who may be hurt by protected speech is so essential, Law School faculty say, that they make a point of discussing it, modeling it, and giving students opportunities to practice it—again and again.

“I don’t want students to think, ‘Oh that’s what free speech is, you get to go around and use racial slurs and engage in sexist or homophobic talk,’” Strauss said. “The danger is that students will come to believe: ‘If that’s what free speech is, I don’t want any part of it.’ And that would be devastating to us in trying to create the kind of culture we want, one that places the highest value on the exchange of ideas.”

The Law School works to teach that distinction—that just because you can say something doesn’t mean you should. “Part of our job here is to help students understand professional judgment,” Bartlett said. “The fact that we, as lawyers, should be protecting people’s rights to say whatever it is they need to say in whatever way they need to say it doesn’t mean that we don’t have a similar obligation to talk to students about how important words are and how important it is for us to think about the impact our words have on others.”

Sometimes that means helping students find productive ways to discuss sensitive topics without stifling debate. Other times it means getting the conversation started.

In his American Indian Law course [see story, p. 40], Todd Henderson, the Michael J. Marks Professor of law...
OPEN INQUIRY

In the spirit of honest debate, we asked Law School students and professors what they would ask their classmates or colleagues. In typical Law School fashion, they provided honest answers to thoughtful questions.

Professor David Strauss to Professor Randal Picker: Do you think [issues regarding student discipline for disruptive conduct] are best addressed through relatively clear rules, or should there be some flexibility?

Picker: It’s interesting—when we’ve talked to students, our sense is they very much want to know where the lines are. The University of Chicago Police Department and Deans on Call want clear rules as well. I assume we’re not going to succeed—there are so many different situations. There is a University statute that defines disruptive conduct, but it is pretty open-ended. One of the things you realize as a lawyer is you can’t necessarily specify everything. You have to let the process work and hope to get it right over time.

Professor Todd Henderson to Professor Will Baude: I’m a loudmouth and unfiltered. Will is just much more serene and sedate and academic. He’s finessing “I’m a strong conservative in a liberal world.” Is he deliberate about his strategies or is that just his personality?

Baude: That’s really funny. This is my personality; it’s not some strategic persona. I do think it would be really hard to stay sane in academia without a serene personality if you had really unusual views. This is an environment where people disagree with you all the time and you can’t just ask people to agree to disagree. I don’t know that I would enjoy this job if I didn’t have this personality.

Tom Molloy, ’18, to classmate Ayla Syed, ’18: Do you feel a tension between the free speech ethos and a desire to keep people safe?

Syed: While I want to protect people’s right to express themselves without fearing government action, I also want our community to speak to and about each other with respect. Freedom of speech does not mean having the freedom to go unchallenged. I don’t question the right people have to say whatever comes to their mind, but I do question their choice to do so. There’s a distinction between those two that is too often blurred.

Syed to Elizabeth Kiernan, ’17: During the [trigger warnings] event, Professor Henderson pointed out that conservatives were ideological minorities on many college campuses, and I have to ask: if conservatives believe in the marketplace of ideas and if their ideas are minority ideas, isn’t that just the marketplace working?

Kiernan: I agree that it is a marketplace of ideas, but we expect the market to respond to demand. It seems like there may be a disconnect between students and hiring committees. I’ve had conversations with students both at our law school and at law schools across the country about the desire for more intellectual diversity in the faculty. It seems like there is a monopoly of ideas on the faculties that don’t necessarily represent all of the ideological values of its student bodies. Thus, the market is failing to meet a clear demand.
Law, was mindful that some of the students had native backgrounds. He worked to make sure they knew they had freedom to express their views and that they were valuable to the discussion. “I jumped in on their side for the sake of argument and pushed them to what I thought was a better form of argument,” he said. “I recognize that the law impacts people differently depending on their circumstances—rich, poor, white, black, native, non-native. If you’re teaching law and you don’t recognize that fact, you’re an ignoramus.”

**LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES**

In September 2015, a Wesleyan student newspaper faced defunding after an editorial criticized the tactics of some Black Lives Matter protestors. A few months later, an email regarding potentially offensive Halloween costumes embroiled Yale University in a noisy public controversy. In spring 2016 a University of Missouri professor lost her job after calling for a student videographer to be removed during campus protests. And even at the University of Chicago, a letter from Dean of Students John Ellison to incoming students drew ire after its pro-free speech message sparked criticism that the University wasn’t sensitive to student concerns.

When expression butts up against issues of student safety, academic security, and personal identity, tensions flare. Understanding why is important, even if the ultimate goal is defend the speech—and Stone was able to gain insight on this when he attended a conference at the National Constitution Center that featured prominent student minority leaders.

“It was interesting to hear in the three-dimensional sense about how separate some students feel in these institutions,” he said. The experience left Stone torn between thinking “‘Grow up’ and ‘I wouldn’t want to feel that way myself.’” The challenge, Stone said, is figuring out how to address students’ issues without sacrificing free speech. “You don’t want to say, ‘Deal with it,’ but you also don’t want to create an environment that’s a fantasy land so that the day they graduate they discover ‘Oh my God—now what?’”

When students voice their needs and concerns, conflicts sometimes arise—like when students actively disrupt events with protest—but these situations also present learning opportunities. “It gives institutions the information to try to figure out how to alleviate those concerns,” Stone said. “It’s not a good thing to have students in your community feeling alienated, marginalized, and not valued.”

Similarly, conflict and discomfort in the classroom can help students develop intellectual empathy and critical thinking skills—which is why Herschella Conyers, clinical professor of law, all but hopes to make her students feel uneasy in her Life in the Law class.

“It struck me that the people who find capital punishment to be murder and the people who find abortion to be murder usually are not the same people and go right by each
friends who will tell you, ‘Oh call her, she’ll say anything!’ I will say anything that I believe to be true. I try to be more courageous about that the older I get.”

Those who attended the panel seemed pleased by the discussion: “Students came up to me afterward, and said, ‘You gave me something to think about.’” When that happens, she said, it allays any anxiety she may have about publicly defending an unpopular opinion.

Sometimes the path toward enlightenment can be a little rockier. Henderson, known as a more conservative member of the faculty, sat on a November 2016 panel on safe spaces and trigger warnings that was cosponsored by a dozen Law School student groups, ranging from OutLaw to the Federalist Society. Henderson described it as a “surreal experience,” because while he’s in favor of trigger warnings as a “standard part of human communications,” he sensed that the students in attendance had already decided what side he’d take. But Henderson thinks that the Law School’s faculty have a duty to publish and express their opinions publicly, even if they go against the grain.

“Richard Epstein, who was one of my favorite professors, wrote an entire book about how he thought civil rights laws were unnecessary,” he said. “Dick Posner, who was a professor of mine, wrote about selling babies.” (Epstein, the James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Law, published “The Problem with Antidiscrimination Laws” at the Hoover Institution, and Senior Lecturer Richard Posner, a judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, coauthored “The Economics of the Baby Shortage” for the Journal of Legal Studies.)

“I was exposed as a student to my professors not just talking a good game about how free speech and ideas should be met with counter ideas,” Henderson said, “but they actually walked the walk.”

Informally as well, Law School professors aspire to model civil discourse in their interactions with colleagues. “I’ll say some things that make my colleagues do a bit of a double take, but they’re always willing to engage me. I think they know me well enough to know that my heart’s in the right place,” Henderson said. “I count Martha Nussbaum as one of the biggest influences on my career and my way of looking at the world—and yet there’s probably a lot we disagree about.”

**DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS**

Thomas Molloy, ’18, was impressed. A former pastor who “avoided discussing politics, especially from the pulpit, to avoid alienating congregants,” the California
Ayla Syed, ’18, a member of the Law Women’s Caucus, organized the Trigger Warnings and Safe Spaces panel that Henderson took part in. “We thought it was important to invite Professor Henderson as a conservative voice on campus in order to actually have a conversation, to have an understanding of the topic instead of just having people agree with each other,” she said. It is also why she asked Elizabeth Kiernan, ’17, president of the conservative and libertarian Federalist Society, to help organize the panel. “The organizations planning it were a little more skewed toward having safe spaces, and we wanted to make sure all sides were heard,” Kiernan said, adding that FedSoc also tries to incorporate liberal perspectives at events to “start conversations that I don’t think are always started on their own.” Even though she feels like conservative students are in the minority at the Law School, she appreciates the freedom FedSoc has in organizing its events: “The school’s [tone is] ‘You’re adults.’”

Still, uncomfortable moments have arisen over classroom discussion of difficult topics. Students have described rifts that formed after a classroom comment was deemed by other students to be insensitive. Kiernan cited occasions when it seemed like liberal groups made assumptions they were delivered with a respectful tone,” he said. “I thought it demonstrated well how to discuss a contentious topic and provide a space for students to share their views.” This is where the impact of the modeling is evident: the seeking out of opposing viewpoints is so much a part of the culture that alumni often cite it as one of the ways in which the Law School shaped their thinking [see sidebar] and student leaders consider it a normal part of organizing a panel discussion.

“I THINK THAT’S A GOOD HABIT OF MIND TO GET INTO, TO THINK, ‘I BELIEVE THIS. MAYBE I’M RIGHT, BUT WHAT WOULD THE OTHER SIDE SAY?’”

—DAVID STRAUSS

MY CHICAGO LAW MOMENT: LEARNING TO DISAGREE WITHOUT BEING DISAGREEABLE

When alumni return to the Law School for Reunion and other events, we sometimes ask them to reflect on the ideas and experiences that have continued to resonate in the years since graduation. Once a month, we feature these interviews in a video series called My Chicago Law Moment. (You can see these at www.law.uchicago.edu/category/story-series/my-chicago-law-moment.) One topic that comes up regularly: the Law School’s long tradition of encouraging vigorous, but respectful, debate. Here are a few things alumni have shared:

“At the Law School [I learned how] to understand and work with people who might be ideologically opposed to the ideas that I hold dear. That was a great skill that I have taken with me throughout my life.”

—Laura Edidin, ’96

“At the University of Chicago and the Law School, people argued . . . [it made me] more willing to push back, but also more comfortable with give and take.”

—Bob Lichtman, ’55

“The Law School taught me that even if you have a position that people might think is crazy or different, if it’s well-reasoned and you can make your point well enough, you can potentially get people to your side—or at least get people to understand your position.”

—Ryan Dunigan, ’12

MY CHICAGO LAW MOMENT: LEARNING TO DISAGREE WITHOUT BEING DISAGREEABLE

When alumni return to the Law School for Reunion and other events, we sometimes ask them to reflect on the ideas and experiences that have continued to resonate in the years since graduation. Once a month, we feature these interviews in a video series called My Chicago Law Moment. (You can see these at www.law.uchicago.edu/category/story-series/my-chicago-law-moment.) One topic that comes up regularly: the Law School’s long tradition of encouraging vigorous, but respectful, debate. Here are a few things alumni have shared:
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about conservative students. “Conservatives and libertarians have a lot of competing viewpoints,” she said. “A lot of people would assume that if you’re conservative or libertarian you are pro-life, but I have friends who are incredibly pro-choice who are conservative or libertarian.”

Syed agrees that there ought to be less prejudgment between students with opposing views. “We could all do a better job of not assuming bad intentions,” she said. “You also have to be able to push back against someone saying your comments are racist, sexist, etc.” At the same time, she said, “I’m also not sure if it’s necessarily a bad thing if people are more careful with their words, especially at a law school, where we’re training to be masters with our language and to use precise language with our ideas.”

Often law professors will serve as a sounding board for like-minded students looking for support, but also push them to see the opposite point of view. “When students in the Federalist Society feel they’re being misunderstood, they expect me to approach it with a more sympathetic point of view. “When students in the Federalist Society feel they’re being misunderstood, they expect me to approach it with a more sympathetic point of view, but as I think about it, the students I’ve written recommendation letters for, they’re split roughly evenly,” Baude said. Despite how they may feel, he said, at the Law School, “conservative students and liberal students have a lot more in common than most Republicans and Democrats.”

Kiernan appreciates that Baude doesn’t always tell her what she wants to hear. “Professor Baude does a great job of drawing out both sides,” she said. “If you gave a conservative answer, he’d come at you from the liberal side and push you on it. The best way to facilitate a discussion is when the student gives one answer, to keep pushing from the opposite viewpoint.”

In the end, Stone said, a big part of protecting the free exchange of ideas is recognizing that there are inevitable costs—and they often “fall most heavily on those groups and individuals who feel the most marginalized, unwelcome, and disrespected.”

“Universities . . . should help those students learn how to speak up, how to respond effectively, how to challenge those whose attitudes, whose words, and whose beliefs offend, appall, and outrage them,” he said in his Aims of Education address. “This is a core responsibility of universities, for the world is not a safe space, and it is our job to enable our graduates to win the battles they will need to fight in the years and decades to come. This is not a challenge that universities can or should ignore.”

Contributing: Becky Beaupre Gillespie

“My first year, I went to watch Cass Sunstein deliver a paper [and the professors] went at each other. You know, really hard. But what struck me was . . . they all made concessions—[and they were] much more persuasive because they had made those concessions. They weren’t trying to spin anything. They were trying to get to the truth.”

—David Chizewer, ’91

“I was in a legislation class and one of my classmates challenged something the professor had said—it [had to do with] a different way of interpreting the Constitution. It was amazing—the idea that a student would challenge this. But everyone took it in stride.”

—Vanessa Countryman, ’05

“The great thing about the Law School is that it sponsors open debate—there are always two sides to every story. And that’s true in every legal argument, too. [I learned] that I can make my arguments more compelling when I understand what the other side is saying.”

—Casen Ross, ’15

“Professors and other students do a wonderful job of teaching each other that there are always different perspectives. I think that has helped me . . . to question assumptions that I’m making and to think about whether certain problems or certain questions can be answered in different ways.”

—Caroline Wong, ’16
In November, Martha C. Nussbaum, the University of Chicago’s Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics, was awarded the Kyoto Prize in Arts and Philosophy for achievements that include developing the Capabilities Approach, a measure of global welfare that focuses on human capabilities rather than only on economic growth. The honor, bestowed annually by Japan’s Inamori Foundation but given only once every four years in the Thought and Ethics subcategory, is among the most significant international accolades for scholarly work and is widely regarded as the most prestigious award in fields that are traditionally not recognized with a Nobel Prize.

Nussbaum—a world-renowned philosopher who was also chosen to deliver the 2017 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities on May 1 (see box, p. 19)—donated a portion of the 50 million yen (about $472,000) that accompanied her Kyoto Prize to the Law School and the University’s Department of Philosophy, where she is also appointed. The gift will create a financial award designed to encourage law-and-philosophy scholarship among graduate students.

At the 10-day event in Kyoto in November, Nussbaum—who has earned international acclaim for her work on moral and political theory, emotions, human rights, social equality, education, feminism, and ancient Greek and Roman philosophy—delivered several talks, including a commemorative lecture, “Philosophy in the Service of Humanity.” A portion of that lecture is excerpted below. Both the excerpt and photos are published courtesy of the Inamori Foundation.
Near the start of Plato’s famous work Republic, as the characters quarrel about how to define justice, Socrates reminds them: “Remember: it is no chance matter we are discussing, but how one should live.” Political philosophy, as practiced in the Western tradition and also in the traditions of East Asia, South Asia, and Africa, has always been a practical discipline, seeking to construct a theoretical blueprint for just and decent lives in a world full of division, competition, fear, and uncontrolled catastrophes. In this lecture I hope to provide some reasons for thinking that philosophy continues to play an important role as we work together for a better world. I’ll then propose some criteria for valuable philosophical work on urgent human issues.

First, why do we need philosophy? Most of the world carries on without it. In discussions of domestic priorities, philosophical theories of justice have received at least some respectful attention from politicians and economists. Thus John Rawls’s theory of justice is known, in at least its main outlines, to leaders in most Western countries, and the ideas of Jürgen Habermas about democratic discourse are well known in Europe at least, and have influenced at least the aspirations of the public debate. The Utilitarian views of 19th-century thinkers Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, though mostly misunderstood by today’s economists, have a vast influence on that profession all over the world.

When we turn to the global arena, however—to debates concerning welfare, human rights, and how to compare the achievements and quality of life of different nations—things are otherwise. Economists hold center stage, and philosophers, until very recently, were utterly ignored. . . . This neglect is new. Early economists such as Adam Smith were themselves philosophers. Even much later, great economists such as John Maynard Keynes and Friedrich Hayek took a very keen interest in philosophy. Today, the disconnect is almost total.

Of recent winners of the Nobel Prize for Economics, only Amartya Sen, with whom I have been privileged to collaborate, is also a philosopher. And, as I recorded in my acceptance speech for the Inamori Ethics Prize last year, even students and supporters of Sen frequently neglect philosophy when they consider how to forward or fittingly honor his ideas. I note that the great Japanese economist Kotaro Suzumura is a wonderful exception: he has continuously fostered the intersection between the two fields through seminars for younger scholars and in his own distinguished work. His younger colleague Reiko Gotoh, now a leading economist in her own right, is another exception: she has organized conferences and books dedicated to exploring these interactions, and she plays a pivotal role in the Human Development and Capability Association, an association dedicated to bringing philosophical insight to bear on the problems of development economics. (Amartya Sen and I are the two founding presidents of this association, but the real work has been done by a group of younger scholars within which Gotoh is prominent.)
More needs to be said, then, about what type or rather types of philosophy can really help the progress of humanity.

Income and wealth are not adequate proxies for ability to function in many areas. They are especially bad proxies for social respect, inclusion, and nonhumiliation. Even if we equalized wealth and income completely, that would not get rid of stigma and discrimination. There are some goods, moreover, that might be completely or largely absent in a society in which wealth and income are both reasonably high and pretty equally distributed. Such a society might still lack religious freedom, or the freedom of speech and association. Or it might have these and yet lack access to a reasonably unpolluted environment.

It was in response to these ethical deficiencies that the Capabilities Approach was born. Drawing insight from Aristotle and from the British socialists T. H. Green and Ernest Barker, Sen and I argued that the key question development needs to ask is, “What is each person able to do and to be?” Capabilities are defined as the substantive opportunities people have for valued choices. …

My well-known Capabilities List is a provisional attempt to supply this ethical content, saying that the protection of ten central capabilities, up to a minimum threshold level, is necessary for any society that is going to claim to be even minimally just. I connect this threshold to the idea of human dignity, saying that only the protection of these ten capabilities gives people lives worthy of the (innate and inalienable) human dignity that all possess. I shall not discuss the contents of the list here, but I simply note that it is humble and revisable, and that ample room is left for each nation to specify its thin content in accordance with its history and circumstances. More recently, I have also extended this approach to address the entitlements of nonhuman animals.

From this account of my theory of justice it is possible to get a sense of why philosophy matters in the development debate. But justice is not the only philosophical issue development practitioners need to consider. They need, as well, to develop sophisticated and philosophically informed accounts of other key notions well treated by philosophers, such as: the nature of freedom; the meaning and significance of ethnic and religious pluralism; the nature of human welfare and happiness; the concepts of desire, preference, and emotion. There is also the overarching metaquestion about how one ought to attempt to justify an ethical or political theory (for example whether by seeking some indubitable foundation, as Plato thought, or by seeking the greatest fit and coherence among all the contending concerns, as John Rawls thought). We will not make progress unless we continually wrestle with all of these large questions, and economics, as I’ve said, has an unfortunate tendency to seek premature closure so that mathematical sophistication can take its happy course.

However, it is not enough to say, “The world needs philosophy.” For philosophy takes many forms, some of those not conducive to a useful global dialogue about the enhancement of human welfare. To the task of supplying some norms for my own profession, I now turn.

II

Philosophy is many things. There are many world philosophical traditions, and in each there are different, usually opposing currents. More needs to be said, then, about what type or rather types of philosophy can really help the progress of humanity. In this section of my lecture I shall set out five criteria for philosophical work that can be truly helpful.

1. **Rigor and Transparency**

Philosophy, as I understand and love it, begins with the Socratic commitment to careful and explicit rational argument, and to transparency of speech. Socrates’s aim was to show people the inner structure of their own thought, or, at times, the lack of clarity in their thought. He did this by eliciting hidden assumptions, arranging the premises in order, and showing what conflicts and contradictions emerged when all was set forth in the open. At every step, Socrates and the person being questioned have to agree: indeed Socrates famously insisted that he himself added nothing. He was simply a “midwife,” eliciting thoughts that belonged to the person he talked to and setting those thoughts in a perspicuous order.
This commitment to reason has social importance. As Socrates saw, most thought in political life is sloppy, full of unclearly defined terms, fallacious reasoning, and hidden or not-so-hidden contradictions. When thought is sloppy, we don’t make progress; we talk past one another rather than understanding one another and really deliberating. Socrates said that he was like a “gadfly,” a stinging insect, on the back of the democracy, which he compared to a “noble but sluggish horse.” In other words, making clear and rigorous arguments is a way of waking democracy up so that public deliberation is conducted in a more productive and less confused way.

Clarity in argument is also a way of respecting other people. Nothing is concealed, and nothing relies on privilege or esoteric knowledge. Rational argument is common to us all, and Socrates insisted that rational argument must be forthright and not marred by hidden areas of secrecy and privilege. …

2. Respect for other Disciplines

When philosophy began in the Greek and Roman world (and also in the various philosophical traditions of Asia), it basically contained all rational inquiry. What was outside was tradition, mysticism, and so forth. But philosophy at that early date contained physics, chemistry, biology, cosmology, linguistics, and even history. Those disciplines gradually spun off, like planets from a star, and became their own separate disciplines. But until the 20th century philosophy still contained what we now call the social sciences: economics, psychology, anthropology, political science, and sociology. The American Philosophical Association at its founding in the late 19th century prominently included psychology, and early presidents of the association were psychologists, or, like the great William James, both philosophers and psychologists. As I mentioned in Part I of this lecture, economics was a part of philosophy in the time of Adam Smith in the 18th century (whose professorial chair was in philosophy), and of Karl Marx in the 19th (whose doctorate was also in philosophy). And, as I’ve mentioned, this concern with philosophy continued into the 20th century with the work of Keynes and Hayek.

As I’ve said in Part I of this lecture, this separation has had costs on the side of those social sciences, who too often forget that they might have something to learn from philosophy. But the same thing is clearly true of
philosophers: being in their own separate department, they forget that they need to care about the other disciplines and to draw on them for illumination. The need for cross-disciplinary curiosity and learning arises in different ways in connection with different philosophical problems. …

One way philosophers can learn what they need to learn is by being part of an interdisciplinary university community, and I have always found being partly in a law school especially fulfilling in that regard, since it then is possible to work and teach with economists, historians, and experts in a variety of other areas. Coauthorship is also valuable, though too rare in philosophy. I especially value my coauthored projects with legal economist Saul Levmore, which have taught me a great deal and made my work more fun. I teach Global Inequality with another economist, and I teach issues of discrimination and sexuality with an expert in constitutional law. The modern university is fond of hyperspecialization, and we must each find our own ways of avoiding being trapped.

3. Respect for Religious Belief and Practice
For much of its history in the Western tradition, although not during the medieval era, philosophy has been a skeptical critic of dominant forms of religious belief and practice. The pre-Socratic philosophers challenged traditional religious accounts of natural phenomena, which invoked the activity of gods in our world, by producing naturalistic causal accounts of how things happen. Socrates was charged with subverting the gods of the city and inventing new gods. Aristotle’s god was an abstraction, totally different from the gods that most people worshipped. Most leading philosophers of the 18th century, similarly, were Deists: that is, they accepted the existence of some type of god, but understood God in a rationalistic way, as an immanent order in nature. …

Today philosophers should not think this way. We observe that under conditions of freedom, and indeed wherever there is not brutal repression, people in every part of the world turn to religions for insight, community, meaning, and guidance.

Inamori Foundation Chairman Hiroo Imura presents Nussbaum with her Kyoto Prize medal.
Many people reject religion, but many reasonable people do not. Moreover, among the people who consider themselves religious in some regard, there is not much agreement about what that commitment entails. …

Respecting one’s fellow citizens means respecting their choice to live their lives in their own way, by their own doctrines, so long as they do not invade the basic rights of others. …

4. Curiosity about and Respect for the World’s Many Philosophical Traditions and Interest in Establishing a Cross-Cultural Philosophical Dialogue

All departments of philosophy in the US and Europe are really departments of Western philosophy. Only rarely is there any inclusion of the philosophical traditions of Asia and Africa. If those traditions are taught it is usually in other departments: religion, South Asian Studies, East Asian Studies, etc. But of course that is itself distorting, leading to a neglect of the mainstream philosophical issues within those traditions: for example to a focus on mystical religion in the study of India and a neglect of India’s traditions of logic, epistemology, and philosophy of science. Above all, there is little dialogue between scholars who pursue Western philosophy and scholars expert in these other traditions. A further problem is that, while Western philosophy gets coverage over its entire history, Asian philosophy is thought to be truly Asian only when it is very old: thus people think about Confucius and Mencius when they think about “Chinese thought,” but neglect the creative work being done by contemporary Asian philosophers; or they consider ancient Hindu and Buddhist thought to be truly Indian, while neglecting the great 20th-century Indian philosopher Rabindranath Tagore. Western philosophers don’t make the same mistake about their own traditions: they know that philosophy is a living and growing set of arguments, that John Rawls is a part of the tradition that began with Socrates.

There is no easy “fix” for these problems. In particular, I am a stickler for linguistic expertise, and I will not even consider for a faculty appointment anyone who does not demonstrate
the highest level of expertise in the original languages of the philosophers he or she studies. That’s hard enough: but then you have to insist on the same standards for PhD students. So it probably makes no sense for any but the largest departments to try to be pluralistic in the historical traditions they cover, since it’s hard enough to find graduate students competent to work on Plato or Descartes in the original languages, and it would right now be impossible to find a critical mass of US graduate students who had the linguistic preparation to work on Buddhist logic or on Mencius. (Tagore is different, since he wrote all his philosophical works in English.) So what do I recommend?

First, I recommend much greater awareness of the one-sidedness of our current approach. Thus, the expression “ancient philosophy” should never be used as it now is in the US, to refer to the Greco-Roman tradition. If that’s what people mean, let them say, “Ancient Greek and Roman philosophy,” as I have long insisted and annoyed my colleagues into doing. And if people try to use the word “classics” to mean “the Greek and Roman classics,” I give the same reply: you don’t mean the Sanskrit or African or Chinese or Japanese classics, so you should say what you mean. Precise language makes us aware of the partiality of our own approach, and the rich plurality of the world.

Second, and more substantive: philosophers should search for opportunities for dialogue and learning. One avenue is coteaching, often a way to learn more about an unfamiliar tradition without having to learn the languages. I’ve coteached courses with colleagues in the South Asian Studies department, for example. Another strategy is conferences. I recently attended a very illuminating conference on the philosophy of crime and punishment in Hong Kong, at which we had illuminating discussions comparing Asian and Western traditions. My university is hosting a conference on African philosophy this spring, inviting a group of leading experts in that area, most of them from Africa, to exchange ideas with those of us whose primary orientation is Western, and to see what avenues of cooperation might be opened up. This sort of thing is really essential, if global problems are to be confronted on a basis of mutual respect and understanding.

5. Concern with Previously Excluded Voices

Western philosophy has not simply excluded the rest of the world, it has excluded, for the most part, and for most of its history, the voices of women and racial minorities, and of people with disabilities. Today this is much less true, and a great part of my own work in philosophy is feminist in nature. Feminist philosophy today is an influential part of philosophy, and it is internally diverse, containing many approaches and arguments. The same is true of the philosophy of racial equality and the philosophy of disability. These changes in philosophy were long overdue, and they have been extremely valuable. However, they are not yet sufficiently integrated into the whole work of the profession, and this integration, and the perpetual atmosphere of healthy critique it prompts, must continue, if philosophy is to contribute justly to the service of humanity.

6. Concern with Real Human Life in All Its Messiness and Complexity

Philosophers are often fond of neat and highly general theories that omit a great deal of the complexity of life. General theories can illuminate, and we need them; but in the ethical and political area they will impede understanding if they omit too much of the messy detail and complexity of real human life. This is one reason why I have long insisted that philosophy needs a partnership with literature. But philosophy itself should educate itself to understand the messier aspects of human life better.

I’ve tried to restore the area of emotion to the center of philosophical work.

Study of the emotions and the imagination, once central topics in Western philosophy, from Plato straight through the medieval period to the 18th century, fell out of fashion for more than 200 years, and this was an immense loss. I’ve tried to restore the area of emotion to the center of philosophical work, where it was when Aristotle wrote the Rhetoric or the Stoics their major ethical works.

I think this insurgency of mine has succeeded, and there is currently a lot of good work in the area of emotion, and, more generally, what is known as “moral psychology.” But we always need to beware of simplification and reduction. We need, for example, to bear in mind the fact that emotions are in part social artifacts and vary with the cultural tradition within which people grow up. This makes their study very difficult. But complexity and difficulty should not prevent us from confronting the whole issue!

Another important aid to philosophy at this point is a partnership with the study of literature. I have spent part of my career fostering this partnership, and am currently engaged in the related enterprise of bringing literature into legal education. Literature needs the normative guidance of philosophy if it is to help humanity. Literature can embody bad values, such as misogyny and retributivism. Indeed
it is safe to say that one of the main sources of pernicious retributivism in modern culture is the almost universal popularity of literary works that teach small children that it is a great thing when wrongdoers get some gruesome punishment. Here I want to commend the great Japanese artist Hayao Miyazaki for creating a different type of art for children, a world that is full of gentle, well-intentioned people, where there are no villains who must be punished, and the creative imagination soars. In any case, a dialogue with literature, both admiring and critical, seems very important for any philosophy that intends to come to grips with the complexity of human life.

Philosophy can serve humanity. And indeed it ought to. The world needs the ideas that good ethical and political philosophy contains; and we who lead privileged lives in the academy would be selfish if we did not try hard to bring those ideas into the world where social and political decisions are made. But philosophy also needs to criticize itself, and in some ways to change itself, if it is to serve the world well, and it is fortunate that today there are so many young people eagerly taking up that challenge.

Nussbaum to Give 2017 Jefferson Lecture

Martha C. Nussbaum will deliver the 2017 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities at 7:30 p.m. EST on May 1 at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC. Her talk, “Powerlessness and the Politics of Blame,” will draw on her years of work on the role of emotion in politics to explore the emotional dynamics at play in American and other societies today—including the ways in which uncertainty leads to the blaming of outsider groups.

The Jefferson Lecture is free and open to the public and will stream live online at neh.gov. Tickets will be available to the public in April through neh.gov.

The lecture, established by the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1972, is the highest honor the federal government bestows for distinguished intellectual achievement in the humanities.
An unexpected discovery in the D’Angelo Law Library

UNEARTHED AN ORIGINAL LETTER FROM

John Marshall to George Washington. And that wasn’t all.

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie
On March 26, 1789, 22 days after the newly ratified US Constitution took effect, future Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall sent a letter to George Washington at his Mount Vernon estate, where the president-elect was waiting for Congress to count the votes of America’s first electors. It was, in many ways, an unremarkable note from a Richmond lawyer to his powerful, land-owning client, merely the latest in an ongoing conversation regarding Washington’s disputed claim to a piece of land on the banks of the Ohio River. But it was also one founder writing to another: a constitutional defender who would help shape the nation’s legal system advising the man who would soon assemble the nation’s first cabinet, oversee the creation of a national government strong enough to navigate partisan debate, and suppress the Whiskey Rebellion—and whose property holdings in the Ohio River Valley were already helping push the burgeoning nation west.

It was history, living and breathing among the syllables of routine correspondence.

Which is why, when Sheri Lewis, the director of the University of Chicago’s D’Angelo Law Library, opened an unfamiliar hardbound volume from the library’s Rare Book Room last summer and glimpsed Marshall’s 227-year-old letter—the original—pasted carefully inside, her first thought was, “Oh—wow.”

What’s more, the handwritten missive wasn’t alone. The carefully constructed album that had protected it for nearly six decades, maybe more, bristled with 18th- and 19th-century Supreme Court history, mostly hand-drawn portraits and letters signed by early justices, men like John Jay, Oliver Ellsworth, Samuel Chase, Salmon P. Chase, and Oliver Wendell Holmes.

And for years nobody at the University of Chicago Law School knew it was there.

* * *

There had been clues: an old catalog entry in the D’Angelo’s records; a note in an online database maintained by the National Archives; a plaque on the library’s sixth floor honoring the album’s donor, albeit
for a different generosity; and a couple of 1958 articles in back-to-back issues of the University of Chicago Law School Record. It had been the articles that ultimately led Lewis and her team to the well-preserved, but temporarily forgotten, collection in July.

“It took me awhile to really absorb how much is in here,” Lewis said one morning in early 2017, as the D’Angelo’s librarians were preparing to send the 154-page album to the central University of Chicago Library to be fully digitized. “Every piece of parchment in this book tells a story.”

It had been a busy several months since Lewis first saw the volume. In that time, she and her team created an inventory of the collection, examined it with a preservation librarian and Law School scholars, and worked to unravel the mysteries of the album, which had been given to the Law School in the late 1950s by a colorful Chicago hotelier, Louis H. Silver, ’28. The discovery was thrilling and unexpected but, for librarians and scholars versed in archival research, it wasn’t a shock. Library science has evolved significantly since the late 1950s; back then, there were no digital inventories and few finding aids—new items were catalogued and added to the shelf. As a result, the Supreme Court collection was, in fact, never truly lost: it was well-preserved and findable to those who went looking—it’s just that, after a while, there was nobody at the Law School who would have known about it without looking. And that’s why the rediscovery wasn’t a shock. History, after all, is a decidedly human affair that takes on a slightly different shape for each generation, molded by a combination of perspective, whim, and fortuity. People discover, forget, and rediscover; they choose what to protect, display, study, and discuss—and all of this ultimately shapes the historical narrative, often leaving a trail of breadcrumbs along the way.

“As historians, we tell our stories and build our analyses based on the evidence we have,” said Alison LaCroix, the Robert Newton Reid Professor of Law and a legal historian who was among the first to examine the rediscovered collection. “There’s always this question of what has been preserved, and why it’s been preserved. Sometimes things that are ‘lost’ don’t stay lost, and when we find them, we have new evidence. But what’s interesting, and important to remember, is how much of it is chance.” It was the point, she noted with a laugh, of the final number in the musical Hamilton, “Who Lives, Who Dies, Who Tells Your Story,” which centers on the twists of fate that ultimately shape one’s legacy.

“You think of history as being this thing that comes in nice, tidy boxes,” said William Baude, the Neubauer Family Assistant Professor of Law and a scholar of constitutional originalism who also has examined the collection. “But it doesn’t. There are things that we don’t know are out there—and things that we know are out there but don’t know we have.”

Before the Law School’s discovery, historians actually knew that Marshall had written to Washington on March 26, 1789; current-day researchers just didn’t know where the note was or what it said. Its entire public record was reflected in a short entry in the National Archives’ Founders Online database: “To George Washington from John Marshall, 26 March 1789 [Letter Not Found].” Other letters in the series had been catalogued as part of the Papers of George Washington at the University of Virginia and incorporated into Founders Online—including Washington’s April 5, 1789, reply to Marshall, which began, “Sir: I have duly received your letter of the 26 Ulto . . . ” (Note: Ulto is an abbreviation of the Latin ultimo mense, used
I shall obtain it. Should a suit be necessary this fact will be very material.

Your caveat against Cuomo has now become no longer depending. It was dismissed last spring under the law which directs a dismissal if the summons be not served. I wrote to you on this subject before that session of the court & supposed it to be your wish that it should no longer be continued.

I remain in

with perfect respect attached

John Marshall
“In these manuscripts, we hear the voices of the country’s greatest jurists, recorded in their own hand, along with portraits that put faces to the authors,” said Bill Schwesig, the D’Angelo’s Anglo-American and Historical Collections Librarian. “The great effort and expense that Mr. Silver put into building the collection resulted in a beautiful and engaging artifact.”

The written documents, which appear to be expertly affixed to preservation-quality pages, are arranged not by the order in which they were produced, but by the order in which the writer or signer served on the Supreme Court—starting with a 1783 letter written by the first chief justice, John Jay, and ending with a 1917 letter by Oliver Wendell Holmes. In between, the book holds a 1797 bank draft signed by the Supreme Court’s third chief justice, Oliver Ellsworth; an 1844 letter from Justice Peter Vivian Daniel to President John Tyler; and an 1823 note from Supreme Court Justice William Johnson to David Hosack, the physician who nearly two decades earlier had attended to Alexander Hamilton after his fatal duel with
Aaron Burr. One of the oldest documents is a 1762 writ from King George III summoning a man named William Keating to court in Charleston, South Carolina; it was signed by the state’s provost marshal, John Rutledge, who more than 30 years later would serve—briefly—as the US Supreme Court’s second chief justice.

“In these manuscripts, we hear the voices of the country’s greatest jurists, recorded in their own hand, along with portraits that put faces to the authors.”

“When we first started looking for the collection this summer, we knew it was important,” Lewis said. “But, until we saw it, we didn’t have any sense of the breadth of it. This collection is unusual, and it is something nobody else has. And the fact that it was given to us by an alum is significant.”

Louis Silver, who had been an engineer before attending the Law School, was known as lively, astute, and discriminating. His personal collection of rare books—some 800 of which were purchased by the Newberry Library for a record $2.75 million after his death in 1963—was considered among the most impressive in the world. Even before the rediscovery, D’Angelo librarians knew of Silver: the Rare Book Room was named for him decades ago, when it first occupied a space on the Law School’s second floor. Silver had been generous to the University of Chicago, and although nobody knows why he donated the Supreme Court collection—or where it and its individual pieces had been in earlier years—librarians have speculated that he may have acquired, or even assembled, it expressly because he wanted the Law School to have it. At any rate, when the D’Angelo’s rare books collection moved in 2008 to the two glass-enclosed rooms on the sixth floor, Silver’s name went with it. Quietly, so did the US Supreme Court Portraits and...
Letters collection, which ended up on a shelf in the western chamber, just feet from the plaque.

And there it slept until Lewis launched a research project this summer as a first step in rediscovering the rare books collection, which she and her team hope to strengthen and expand. That research turned up the 1958 Record articles, which referenced a “rare and important” collection that nobody in the 2016 law library had ever seen. One story contained the reprinted text of the Marshall letter, and the other included the text of the Chase letter.

“We didn’t even know it was assembled as a book—I first thought that the portraits and letters must have been displayed at some point in the Law School,” Lewis said. But she couldn’t find anything. She called retired D’Angelo Director Judith M. Wright; she, too, was stumped.

Finally, a member of the library’s staff found a promising entry in the library catalog. It was simple but accurate: “United States Supreme Court; portraits and autographs [collected by Louis H. Silver].” The call number led them to a shelf in the western chamber of the sixth-floor Rare Book Room.

And just like that, John Marshall’s words were back.

* * *

George Washington, Esquire
Mount Vernon

Richmond March 26th 89

Sir:
I had the honor to receive a letter from you enclosing a protested bill of exchange drawn by the executors of William Armstead esquire. I shall observe your orders, sir, with respect to the collection of the money. I shall only institute a suit when I find other measures fail. I presume Mr. Armstead’s executors had notice of the protest. If they had, you will please to furnish me with some proof of the fact or inform me how I shall obtain it. Should a suit be necessary this fact will be very material.

Your caveat against Cresap’s heirs is no longer depending. It was dismissed last spring under the law which directs a dismissal if the summons be not served.

I wrote to you on this subject before that session of the court and supposed it to be your wish that it should no longer be continued.

I remain Sir
With perfect respect and attachment
Your obedt servt
(signed) John Marshall

“Just looking at this, we can assume that this is Washington’s copy,” LaCroix said one afternoon in December, as she and Lewis were looking through the collection with a visitor. “You can see that it has been folded and postmarked—and it’s stamped, ‘FREE,’ so Marshall must have had franking privileges because he was a government official.” (Franking privilege, which dates to 1775, allows public officials to send mail without a postage stamp. Marshall was the Richmond city recorder—and therefore a magistrate—as of 1785, and that may well have been the office that gave him free postage in 1789.)

“It’s a little window into the founding,” LaCroix said. “It’s a slice of life. Marshall and Washington are writing to each other as lawyer and client, and that’s a relationship that had been going on for a long time, too.”

Someone would have copied the letter for Marshall’s files, LaCroix said, which means that at some point there was a second version that hadn’t traveled the 95 or so miles between Richmond and Mount Vernon. “But this one,” she said, “is addressed to ‘George Washington, Esquire, Mount Vernon.’” She paused. “Because, really, what else would you have needed to write? This must have been his.”

To a historian’s eye, the letter is filled with little insights, reminders, and curiosities: from the role of the founders in westward expansion to the quirks of letter writing; Marshall, for instance, used 11 words to sign off, but abbreviated the last two: obedient servant.

It was a little detail, but one that had a humanizing effect. It was hard not to wonder what Marshall had been thinking and feeling as he wrote the letter, or to consider the swirl of activity that must have surrounded Washington as he read it. There was something fascinating, LaCroix mused, about touching what they’d touched, and seeing the curves of their handwriting, and reading the words they’d chosen.

“It’s a little window into the founding,” LaCroix said. “It’s a slice of life. Marshall and Washington are writing to each other as lawyer and client, and that’s a relationship that had been going on for a long time, too.”
It was a time of transition for the young nation: the US Congress had met for the first time on March 4, and they were on the verge of certifying Washington’s victory in the first presidential election. “He was reluctant to become president,” LaCroix said. “He’d been away from Mount Vernon for so long, and he wanted to be back there and be the gentleman soldier in retirement.” But Washington felt a sense of duty, and on April 16, he’d begin a weeklong procession to New York City, the nation’s capital, for his swearing-in on April 30.

“He was getting ready to process to be the chief magistrate of this unknown experiment,” LaCroix said. “It’s pretty cool to think about.”

Marshall was a force in his own right. He’d been a leading champion of the Constitution as a delegate to Virginia’s ratifying convention, and he’d fought especially hard for Article III, which provides for the federal judiciary. (Years later, in 1803, the first major case before Marshall’s Supreme Court would be Marbury v. Madison, which established judicial review.) But now, he was practicing law in Richmond—and trying to help Washington settle a dispute over hundreds of acres of land in the Ohio River Valley, property Washington had claimed in 1770 and had most likely earned for his service in the area during the French and Indian War.

It was a typical frontier dispute: another man built houses on Washington’s land in 1773, and now, years later, Washington was still sorting things out with the man’s heirs. (According to research that accompanies the Founders Online entry, it appears that the dispute wasn’t fully settled until 1834, when a court upheld the title in favor of a man who had purchased the land from Washington in 1798.)

What’s intriguing to LaCroix about the timeline, though, is that it began in British America and was eventually settled in the United States—an important reminder about the continuity of law.

“You look at this and you remember: it wasn’t that Americans invented law on March 4, 1789,” LaCroix said. “They already had British common law, and they had disputes that had been going on under the British Empire.”

It is impossible to know, of course, whether Louis Silver shared this fascination or even envisioned contemporary and future scholars probing these sorts of details when he donated the album sometime during or just before 1958. His intentions are one of the collection’s enduring mysteries.

“He was this extremely well-known collector of his time, but law wasn’t his
science and technology books to the University of Chicago, and the collection acquired by the Newberry Library included valuable works in English and Continental literature and history. But there isn’t much indication that law was a top priority beyond the Supreme Court collection.

“Collectors collect things for different reasons, and—I don’t know—but you can imagine Mr. Silver thinking, I’m a lawyer and I’m really interested in Supreme Court justices, so let’s get all the documents we can pertaining to them.” LaCroix said. “But that could take so many different forms. He could have just been after the autographs. One of the letters, Roger Taney’s, is responding to someone who wrote [in September 1860] asking for his autograph. And Taney just sent it back with a note.”

LaCroix shook her head: “Of all the ones you’d want.” (Three years before sending the autograph, Taney had delivered the majority opinion in the landmark Dred Scott case, which held that black people, whether free or slave, could not claim US citizenship.)

But the Taney letter underscored another important point: motive aside, someone had collected these letters, portraits, and documents; and had taken care to preserve them regardless of writer or content; and had assembled them into one book, ensuring that, to some extent, they would be studied and considered together.

“This is the happenstance, and good fortune, of someone choosing to collect and preserve, and choosing to do it in a certain way,” LaCroix said.

This album, for instance, connected each writer to the Court, but also, at least in some cases, offered insight into other parts of their lives. LaCroix turned the pages until she found the 1762 summons that had been signed by John Rutledge.

“See here, in 1762, this is Rutledge as the provost marshal of South Carolina—it’s a future Supreme Court justice as a judicial official in the British Empire, carrying out writs signed by George III,” LaCroix said. “This, too, is a continuity we often don’t think about.”

Similarly, the album’s portraits captured some of the men as younger, or otherwise different, than the images we most often see. In the Marshall letter, Washington was a man eager to keep the land he’d claimed on the western frontier and Marshall was a practicing lawyer whose time on the Supreme Court was still a dozen years away.

“Sometimes the value in letters like these is that they tell us something we didn’t already know . . . but other times the value is that they make [the writers] real,” Baude said. “The artifacts bring them to life, and they’re more than
Any apprehension Chase might have felt was well placed, of course. The coming years would bring the secession of 11 southern states, a devastating civil war that would leave hundreds of thousands dead, and Lincoln’s assassination. But the future would also bring the end of slavery, a fitful reconstruction, and an eventual return to national unity.

“We think of ourselves as confronting all these new circumstances, and we think, ‘Who knows what’s going to happen?’ But they felt that way in 1860, too,” Baude said. “We see that, in some ways, our problems aren’t as new as we think they are. In a way, we’ve been here before.”

All of this—the perspective, the opportunities to connect with founders and shapers of law, the chance to see the evolution of America and its legal system through the words of those who were there—have underscored the very mission that led Lewis and her team to the US Supreme Court Portraits and Letters collection in the first place.

“We were focused on advancing the rare books collection when we found this and, now, it’s a nice reminder of the value that this material brings to the Law School,” Lewis said. “We are looking for ways to continue making rare books more accessible to faculty, and to strengthen and build our offerings.”

“Part of that means continuing to explore the existing rare books collection, which includes more than 2,800 items.

“All of this—the perspective, the opportunities to connect with founders and shapers of law, the chance to see the evolution of America and its legal system through the words of those who were there—have underscored the very mission that led Lewis and her team to the US Supreme Court Portraits and Letters collection in the first place.

“We were focused on advancing the rare books collection when we found this and, now, it’s a nice reminder of the value that this material brings to the Law School,” Lewis said. “We are looking for ways to continue making rare books more accessible to faculty, and to strengthen and build our offerings.”

“My dear friend,

Nothing in the future is even tolerably clear to me except the probability, approaching certainty, that Mr. Lincoln will be our next President, and that by his election the power of slavery in our country will be broken. What lies beyond I see not. I hope the Administration will be Republican, and that faithful Republicans will be called into the Cabinet, and that all will be well. To that end I shall honestly, sincerely and earnestly labor. I do not know Mr. Lincoln personally. All I hear of him inspires confidence in his ability, honesty and magnanimity. These qualities justify the best hopes, but we must remember that he has not been educated in our school, and may not adopt our ideas, therefore, either in selection of men or in the shaping of measures. …

Faithfully your friend,

S.P. Chase
One afternoon a few weeks into the school year, Joshua Pickar, ’17, spent three hours in a Washington, DC, hotel conference room hammering a former Illinois solicitor general with questions. The preparation session was intense and tiring, but it was worth it: the next day, Pickar watched as the lawyer, Law School Lecturer Michael A. Scodro, faced many of the same questions—this time from the eight justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. Scodro excelled during oral argument, and Pickar—who had been working on the case, Manuel v. City of Joliet, through the Law School’s new Jenner & Block Supreme Court and Appellate Clinic—felt a rush knowing he’d played a part in preparing him. Equally exciting was hearing the justices use language he and the other three students in his clinic had written in the brief before the Court, which centered on the relationship between the tort of malicious prosecution and the Fourth Amendment. “To hear the justices speak about our own ideas and words was just really rewarding and invigorating,” Pickar said.

The Supreme Court and Appellate Clinic, which the Law School launched last spring in partnership with Jenner & Block, gives students a chance to work with experienced litigators on US Supreme Court and federal appellate cases. Three of the four initial student members of the clinic—all but Pickar—graduated in the spring, opening up spots for new students this fall. The clinic currently has six students, with plans to continue to grow.
to approximately 12 students per quarter. According to clinic student Annie Gowen, ’17, the clinic is poised to be “one of the best appellate clinics in the country.”

Promise of the clinic’s launch is part of what led Pickar to transfer to the Law School at the beginning of his second year. Still, he never dreamed that he’d get to sit in the highest court of the land, listening to an argument that he had helped both brief and moot. Pickar was surprised that the clinic landed a merits case at all, let alone during its first week. He had expected to be assigned part of a petition-stage amicus brief, and with good reason: the Court grants roughly only one of every 100 petitions for certiorari.

Success on this front has continued into this academic year. The clinic currently is co-counsel for the petitioners in two additional Supreme Court merits cases. The first case, *Honeycutt v. United States*, involves the question of whether federal law mandates joint and several liability among co-conspirators for forfeiture of the reasonably foreseeable proceeds of a drug conspiracy. Another, *Kokesh v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, raises the issue of whether a five-year statute of limitations applies to certain claims for disgorgement. The clinic’s students have been hard at work on these cases—debating potential strategies, researching legal issues, and drafting arguments.

“The big issue for Supreme Court clinics is there are very few Supreme Court cases, and everybody wants them,” said David A. Strauss, the Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law, who co-leads the new clinic with Jenner partner Matthew S. Hellman. An assistant solicitor general of the United States before joining the Law School in 1985, Strauss has argued 18 cases before the Court, and he coedit the *Supreme Court Review* with professors Geoffrey Stone and Dennis Hutchinson.

Assistant Clinical Professor of Law Sarah M. Konsky, ’04, who supervises students day-to-day as the clinic’s director, agreed: “We have been quite fortunate to have three Supreme Court merits representations in our clinic’s first year. These cases have been tremendous learning opportunities for our students.”

Konsky also co-teaches a Supreme Court and Appellate Advocacy seminar, a clinic prerequisite, with Scodro. She joined the Law School last year from Sidley Austin, where she was a partner focusing on appellate and trial court litigation.

“Any Supreme Court litigator will tell you this: you never know where the next case is coming from,” Strauss said. “And we’re in the same position; you can’t count on a steady stream of cases. But, you know—knock wood—so far so good.”

In addition to its work on the three merits cases, the clinic has filed merits-stage amici briefs in two cases: *Peña-Rodriguez v. Colorado* and *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District RE-1*. The former concerns whether a rule prohibiting jurors from impeaching their verdicts constitutionally may be applied to bar evidence of racial bias. At issue in the latter is what level of educational benefits the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires.

The clinic students work closely with the faculty and clinic partners from Jenner. For all its cases, the clinic’s first step is the same: decide as a group whether to get involved.

The clinic leaders are “very flexible” and “open to whatever suggestions we have about taking a case,” said Jeongu Gim, ’17, who joined the clinic this fall.

Part of the calculus in deciding whether to file an amicus brief is “political capital,” Pickar said. You have to ask what your “value add” is—how you as a clinic might be able to put an “interesting spin” on things that might influence the justices. In *Peña-Rodriguez*, for instance, clinic members...
decided to file their amicus brief on behalf of the National Association of Federal Defenders to try to show that the practice the defendant in the case was advocating seemed to work successfully in many jurisdictions. In *Endrew F.*, the clinic filed on behalf of 108 members and former members of Congress who had been involved in enacting the statute that the Court was interpreting.

“We really want our students to feel and be part of the team and to be immersed in the process right alongside the partners and the others who are working on the case.” – Sarah Konsky

“Not being just carbon copies of other Supreme Court clinics has really stood out to me, because it’s kind of a transferrable skill,” Pickar said. “If you start a new company or organization, what is going to be different about it? What’s its value add? There’s kind of both the political part of the clinic and the legal part, and seeing how they interact has been really exciting.”

Step two? Strategize. The students discuss how best to present the case at hand: what arguments to make and what arguments to avoid.

Right after that usually is research. Konsky breaks down the work into specific projects for each student each week. For *Endrew F.*, for example, the students dug deep into the legislative intent behind the IDEA—from the original 1975 precursor to the IDEA, all the way through the most recent amendments to it.

“This is the only time in law school I’ve gotten experience doing legislative history research,” Gowen said. “If you’re on a journal, you can get a little bit of exposure to that; you learn how to use Hein for statutes. But trying to find substantive points is much different from cite checking a quotation.”

Gim said Konsky does a “really good job” of ensuring the students do only substantive work. “She makes sure that whatever time we put into the clinic really benefits us,” he said.
Konsky similarly noted that she and the other clinic leaders are very focused on the clinic’s goal of teaching students to be strong appellate advocates, and they make that a key consideration when crafting student projects and experiences.

“We really want our students to feel and to be part of the team and to be immersed in the process right alongside the partners and the others who are working on the case,” Konsky said.

And Jenner & Block is always there to help, students said. “I’m happy we have Jenner’s support, because they have an amazing team, and they are always there if things get really crazy, like if one of the legislative history reports is 1,000 pages,” Gowen said.

During weekly clinic meetings, the pieces of the puzzle come together. The students talk about what they’ve found and how to integrate it, which allows them to see the relevance of each of their individual contributions.

Next comes writing, editing, writing, editing—and then some more writing and editing. Often, after a student has researched a particular issue, he or she drafts that argument or section of the brief.

Gowen is grateful for the “incredibly detailed feedback” she has received on her writing through the clinic—“something you don’t get really all in law school, outside of maybe 1L Legal Research and Writing.”

“Your writing changes so much from the end of 1L to the beginning of 3L, especially after you’ve completed your 2L summer job,” Gowen said. “I really felt like I needed to get some more of that detailed, intensive feedback before graduation, and so I’m really glad I got the opportunity to do that.”

Gim noted that he has benefited from the collaboration among the attorneys, students, and sometimes clients. “All these different people having different voices and writing styles, but seeing [it] all come together—just one, single, coherent brief—was just a really cool experience.”

He also stressed that one doesn’t need a particular career trajectory to have such a positive experience with the clinic. He, for one, will be joining Skadden in DC to do regulatory work when he graduates.

And Pickar recently won a Rhodes Scholarship, which he will use to pursue a master of philosophy in International Relations at the University of Oxford next fall.

Some students do have their sights set on the Supreme Court, or appellate practice more broadly. Gowen, for example, will be starting a clerkship on the Seventh Circuit next year. She said she is drawn to appellate law in part because of the strong focus on writing and diverse, engaging subject matter.

Yet even for students who don’t want to take that route, the skills honed within the clinic—strategic thinking, analytical skills, good writing, working well on a team—will be essential throughout their careers.

Strauss also hopes students will walk away from the clinic with a strong sense of how the Supreme Court thinks about cases, and how that thinking affects litigation in the lower courts.

“The Supreme Court has a view of how litigation is proceeding, and what issues are important, throughout the country,” he said, and lawyers involved in litigation before the Supreme Court have to think the same way. “For students to have an idea of how the system looks from that point of view—I think that’s a valuable thing for any litigator and, in fact, for any lawyer in the United States.”
Among the Law School’s current students, there are a musical theater star, a former Supreme Court intern, an entrepreneur, a two-time national softball champion, and a mixologist.

The collective backgrounds of the Law School’s student body provide an academic environment that is both enlightening and challenging. Each student’s experiences urge him or her to examine the legal field through a unique lens, and they are constantly learning from and teaching each other. We spoke with five students about the distinctive paths that led them to the Law School and how their past careers have informed their approaches to studying the law.
At some point I realized, perhaps I can go further, because not only did I enjoy dancing, I also liked singing and acting—and the best industry to combine all of those is musical theater,” he said.

Though he hadn’t had substantial training in acting, he began auditioning for musical theater shows. Chicago, he said, was the perfect environment because many productions begin in the city. He auditioned for *Movin’ Out*, in part because of the show’s emphasis on dancing, and ended up getting cast in the musical’s only speaking role.

“That show was my catalyst and introduction to musical theater—it was a great road production with so much talent, and I got to see a lot of the country,” he said. “It really set in stone that this was what I needed to do.”

After *Movin’ Out*, Carter was cast in the Broadway musical *Spiderman: Turn Off the Dark*, which he performed in for two years, and, later, *On the Town*. It was around the end of his time with *Spiderman* that he thought again about applying to law school.

“I started getting more involved in the production side of things—looking into contract review, negotiations with the artists, negotiations with the theater, and how to present a promising production to a group of investors,” he said. “It was really interesting, and definitely sparked an interest in going to law school.”

Carter hopes to combine his experience in theater with his forthcoming JD by pursuing a career in entertainment law.

After *Movin’ Out*, Carter was cast in the Broadway musical *Spiderman: Turn Off the Dark*, which he performed in for two years, and, later, *On the Town*. It was around the end of his time with *Spiderman* that he thought again about applying to law school.

“I started getting more involved in the production side of things—looking into contract review, negotiations with the artists, negotiations with the theater, and how to present a promising production to a group of investors,” he said. “It was really interesting, and definitely sparked an interest in going to law school.”

Carter hopes to combine his experience in theater with his forthcoming JD by pursuing a career in entertainment law. He began law school at the University of Iowa, but decided to transfer after his first year. He filled out just one transfer application, and chose the University of Chicago for its outstanding faculty, knowing that he would one day want to teach law as part of his career.

“Great professors try to show both sides of the coin to have a more meaningful conversation, whereas less skilled professors, I think, will leave it to the responsibility of those students of color or students in the LGBT community to bring in their perspectives, which is a big burden on us,” he said. “We are here to learn just like all of our other colleagues.”

At the Law School, Carter said, fellow students and
I started working with the Innocence Project of Texas because I was interested in legal advocacy,” she said. “I wanted to give my 100 percent to defend the rights of people whose situations were more than hypotheticals in textbooks.”

During her senior year of college, Noor won a Bill Archer Fellowship and moved to Washington, DC, for an internship in the curator’s office in the US Supreme Court. There, she worked on developing public education programs for the Court and learned everything she could about the Supreme Court so she could teach visitors about its history.

“The thing I loved most was that one to two times a day, I got to take about a hundred visitors into the courtroom and give them a lecture about the rich history that has unfolded within those walls—where we still don’t allow cameras—and teach them about the branch of our government that most people know the least about,” she said.

Noor, who is Muslim and wears a hijab, often felt responsible for proving herself to the visitors, who seemed surprised to see someone who looked like her working at the court. It took effort, she added, but was worth it if she could change their perceptions.

“There were a lot of people who looked at me and didn’t think that I belonged there,” she said. “It wasn’t natural for them to view me as American, but there, I was in a position to teach them about our country.”

After completing her master’s degree, she applied to law school and was drawn to the University of Chicago after learning about the Kapnick Leadership Development Initiative and its emphasis on teaching lawyers to be leaders and team players. She also sensed that the student body was as focused on academic inquiry as she was.

“I liked that when I visited UChicago, it wasn’t a place where people were embarrassed by or tried to conceal their nerdiness,” Noor said. “I wanted my law school experience to challenge and push my intellectual limits, but I didn’t want to feel isolated or alone in how hard I was working.”

Overcoming the hurdles that led her to UTD, Noor said, taught her the importance of making the best of a difficult situation and offered her valuable perspective. At

“I wanted to give my 100 percent to defend the rights of people whose situations were more than hypotheticals in textbooks.”

Noor, who is Muslim and wears a hijab, often felt responsible for proving herself to the visitors, who seemed surprised to see someone who looked like her working at the court. It took effort, she added, but was worth it if she could change their perceptions.

“There were a lot of people who looked at me and didn’t think that I belonged there,” she said. “It wasn’t natural for them to view me as American, but there, I was in a position to teach them about our country.”

After completing her master’s degree, she applied to law school and was drawn to the University of Chicago after learning about the Kapnick Leadership Development Initiative and its emphasis on teaching lawyers to be leaders and team players. She also sensed that the student body was as focused on academic inquiry as she was.

“I liked that when I visited UChicago, it wasn’t a place where people were embarrassed by or tried to conceal their nerdiness,” Noor said. “I wanted my law school experience to challenge and push my intellectual limits, but I didn’t want to feel isolated or alone in how hard I was working.”

Overcoming the hurdles that led her to UTD, Noor said, taught her the importance of making the best of a difficult situation and offered her valuable perspective. At
the Supreme Court, she got a different kind of perspective, and one that has stayed with her throughout law school. “Seeing parts of the court that other people have never seen, running into the justices in the halls, and feeling like I was at the cusp of history at every step put the law in perspective for me,” she said. “My awe never faded, but it definitely took some of the fear away.”

MICAH KAMOE, ’19
Started a business selling musical instruments in India

When Micah Kamoe, ’19, moved to India to do consulting for an education-focused nonprofit, he didn’t expect that would also help start a business. The nonprofit, Food for Life, was located in Vrindavan, which is the birthplace of Hinduism’s Hare Krishna sect. The religion, he learned, places importance on drumming and dance in its worship services. “I’m a percussionist, so I would go to the services for that reason—to learn about different drumming techniques and have the opportunity to jump in and try out new things,” Kamoe said.

At one of the services, he met a recently unemployed teacher named Gopal, whose family had once run a business selling musical instruments. The business closed after Gopal’s father passed away, but they still owned the property and the building was located right at the city’s entrance. “Talking with Gopal, more and more information about the business came out over time,” said Kamoe, who double majored in business and psychology. “I started to piece it together, and at some point it occurred to me that maybe we could reopen the store.”

As they worked to restart the business (called Kishori Music Store), they encountered a number of obstacles—how would they find suppliers? Where would they access the funds to invest in the new store? What audience would they target?

“‘At the time, I didn’t mind if I failed because I was looking at it solely as a learning experience,’” Kamoe said. “Even if I failed completely, at least I would have learned from it, and actually applied the business model that my degree had supposedly given me.”

They traveled throughout India to find suppliers, and Kamoe helped fund the business with money from his and his wife’s student loans. Their target audience, they decided, would be the westerners who visited for Hare Krishna festivals; the store’s location at the city’s entrance made it ideal.

The business didn’t fail. In fact, it broke even in three months, and still supports Gopal and his family to this day. “It was obvious that Gopal just needed a start and a chance,” Kamoe said. “Now, the business is pretty much self-sustaining, and for him and his family, it’s huge.”

After leaving India, Kamoe interned for US Senator Mark Udall of Colorado, worked as a bank manager, and earned a master’s degree in American Indian Studies at UCLA, where his thesis examined entrepreneurship in native communities. It was his interest and experience in entrepreneurship that ultimately led him to apply to law school.

After leaving India, Kamoe interned for US Senator Mark Udall of Colorado, worked as a bank manager, and earned a master’s degree in American Indian Studies at UCLA.

“Because entrepreneurial endeavors here in the US require so much navigation in the legal space, I figured that if I had those skills myself, I would never have to hire an attorney,” he said. “It was another step to make it easier for me to continue to be an entrepreneur.”

Since he’s been at the Law School, his ambitions have evolved—now, he said, he wants to work with new business owners at a firm that focuses on emerging companies. “The legal field tends to be a more risk-averse industry with more risk-averse people, and that was another reason why I thought law school would be good for me,” Kamoe said. “Many entrepreneurs will want to work with attorneys who are business savvy and don’t mind taking risks.”

Kamoe chose the University of Chicago primarily for its efforts to bridge the gap between law and business with programs like the Kapnick Leadership Development Initiative and the Doctoroff Business Leadership Program. Knowing that he could supplement his legal education with MBA courses from the Booth School of Business made the Law School a perfect fit. In the classroom, he often refers back to the challenges he encountered when he
opened the Kishori Music Store in India.

“My experience in the industry is always leading me to ask how things apply in the real world right now,” he said. “It’s given me the framework to approach the way I study the law.”

MARÍA MONDEJA YUDINA, LLM ’17
Practiced law in Cuba and Chile and is a two-time national softball champion

María Mondeja Yudina, LLM ’17, grew up in Cuba and from a young age questioned why her country worked the way it did. It was these questions that led her to want to become a lawyer.

Soon after getting a law degree and practicing law in Cuba, she realized that the legal work there wouldn’t challenge her for long. She had grown increasingly interested in business law, and this field was difficult to explore in Cuba. Her brother had recently moved to Chile, and she decided to look for work there, eager to learn about the practice of law in a different country and economic system.

“When I went to Chile, I was looking for any job related to the legal field,” Mondeja said. “I knew there was a big difference between what I had studied and what people practiced there, so I sent my resume to all sorts of positions, including secretarial positions. I applied for a secretary position at BC&MC Ltda. law firm in Chile, but they gave me a job as a lawyer.”

At the law firm in Chile—which specializes in corporate and investment law—she had to learn a lot in a short amount of time. There were big differences between practicing law in Cuba and Chile, Mondeja said, including the working culture, the projects, the business practices, and the relationships with clients. At the same time, she found that her unique situation allowed her to better relate with many of her international clients.

“We have clients from Spain, Colombia, and Venezuela, so the law firm itself is very international,” Mondeja said. “I think it was good working there as a person from a different background, because when you have a client coming from, for example, Spain, you have the empathy to understand the struggles of working in a different country.”

Mondeja has always enjoyed playing sports, and is a two-time national softball champion in Chile. When she began working at the law firm in Chile, playing on the softball team helped her manage the stress of practicing law in a new country.

“You have this sense that you cannot fail because you don’t want to go back, and it’s a lot of pressure,” she said. “Playing sports helped me to leave all of that stress and frustration when I was on the field. And when you have more energy, you have a better attitude when dealing with any challenges.”

Mondeja has always enjoyed playing sports, and is a two-time national softball champion in Chile.

Mondeja earned an LLM jointly from the University of Chile and the University of Heidelberg in Germany, focusing on international law as it relates to investments, trade, and arbitration. After working at the firm in Chile for four years, she decided to pursue an LLM in the United States.

“I always wanted to get to know the US, because when you live in Cuba, you hear a lot about it,” Mondeja said. “And in 2015, when the relationship between Cuba and the US began changing, and I thought maybe this would be the best time to be in the US and see what’s happening from the other side.”

Mondeja won a scholarship from the Chilean Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica that made it possible for her to attend an LLM program in the US. She ended up choosing the University of Chicago because the LLM alumni were helpful in answering questions about the program and because she felt supported by the Law School throughout the admissions process.

“In the end, it was Dean Badger who convinced me to go here,” she said. “There’s a lot of angst in this process and a lack of knowledge, but the emails from Dean Badger contained really valuable information. It was the university that felt the most welcoming.”

At the Law School, Mondeja appreciates that the smaller LLM class size has given her the opportunity to better get to know her classmates, and during spring break she will travel...
to Singapore and Hong Kong for this year’s International Immersion Program. On campus, she is still involved in sports and has played volleyball with the University’s Divinity School and flag football with the JD students.

REEVES JORDAN, ’17
Worked as a cocktail bartender at Cotton Row Restaurant in Alabama

After graduating from the University of Alabama in Huntsville with a degree in philosophy, Reeves Jordan, ’17, moved to Tennessee to join a progressive rock band. “I thought, there isn’t a better time to pursue that kind of expression in a vocational sense—it would be hard to get a graduate degree and then try to do that,” Jordan said. “It was definitely the right call.”

Jordan stayed with the band for a few months, performed solo for a while afterward, and eventually moved back to Alabama, where he started bartending. He’d earned money as a bartender in college, but he had no idea how much he would enjoy it when he returned. “There’s a significant craft and community built around bartending,” Jordan said. “Particularly when you’re focused on cocktails. The opportunity not only to interact with the public, but to see the same faces over and over, gives it a much more meaningful quality. It’s what kept me in it for about three years.”

Jordan ended up securing a position as head bartender at Cotton Row Restaurant. At first, he wasn’t convinced he was qualified for the role, but he grew into it. After working at Cotton Row for about three years, Jordan began thinking about applying to graduate school. “I wanted to get back into something that was intensely intellectually involved,” he said. “I’d had a great time working in a job where most of what I was doing was being in front of people and working with a mechanical and largely repetitive craft process, but I missed steady, challenging mental engagement.”

For a while, Jordan was torn between going to law school and getting a PhD in philosophy. He ultimately chose law for its outward focus and day-to-day interaction with people—which was one of the things he loved about working at Cotton Row. “I knew that I really liked being around people, and in academia I figured I would have a very internally focused discipline,” he said. “I thought law would offer the opportunity to see different sides of the political world and the way that businesses function—and all of that’s proven to be true so far.”

“There’s a significant craft and community built around bartending,” Jordan said. “Particularly when you’re focused on cocktails.”

Jordan was drawn to the Law School for its emphasis on analyzing every side of different legal concepts and studying the relationships between law, business, and economics. “There’s a sense here—which stems from the professors more than anything—that people are trying to get the concepts right,” Jordan said. “It’s about more than getting a job—it’s about working through the ideas to their full extent. Which is much more intriguing than just going to school to land a position.”

At the Law School, Jordan—who will work in litigation at Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP in New York after graduation—continues to play music, and is in a band of Law School students called Tortious Interference. He has also found that the craft of bartending has applied to his work in the legal field. “What I learned from bartending was to treat your work like art, both in the way it’s put together internally and the way it appears to others,” Jordan said. “I could compare it to memo writing, where coming up with a rigorous answer is necessary, but not sufficient. Your audience is almost certainly reading to get to the point as quickly as they can, so once I have an answer, I spend at least as much time trying to deliver it in as clear and powerful a way as possible.”
EXPLORING TRIBAL JUSTICE

The Law School’s First Experiential Program in Native American Law Lets Students Clerk for the Hopi Appellate Court

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie
Charlie Baser, ’16, had considered becoming a photojournalist. But on a college assignment, she began visiting the Blackfeet Indian Reservation—and there, in northern Montana on the edge of Glacier National Park, she saw the ways in which history, culture, and a tangle of tribal, state, and federal laws can give rise to complicated disputes that sometimes echo an equally complicated past. There were questions of tribal sovereignty and jurisdiction, tussles between ancient tradition and modern American legal norms, and a visible connection between the courts and the daily lives of people on the reservation. Native American culture had illuminated the intricate threads binding law and society, and that was it—Baser knew she wanted to become a lawyer.

“Even if you … don’t work on Indian law issues after law school, the opportunity to be a law clerk for an actual judge on active cases during law school is a singular experience.”

What she didn’t expect when she headed off to the University of Chicago Law School, though, was that she’d have a chance to learn the law by working to unknot some of very questions that had drawn her in. In early 2016, Todd Henderson, the Michael J. Marks Professor of Law, and Justin Richland, a University of Chicago anthropology professor with expertise in Native American law and politics, offered her a rare opportunity: to work as a student clerk on the Hopi Appellate Court in Arizona—and help pilot the Law School’s first experiential program in American Indian Law.

“This is an area of law that is intellectually fascinating but also deeply important,” Baser said. “There are these really interesting, thorny questions that haven’t been fully, or at least satisfactorily, settled but can have a real impact on people’s lives. I also love the way history uniquely plays into Indian law—it’s all based on treaties that were drawn up at the founding of the country. This ended up being one of the best experiences of my law school career.”

This fall, Henderson and Richland, a Law School lecturer and an associate justice on the Hopi Appellate Court, officially launched the Hopi Law Practicum, which blends classroom instruction with cultural exposure and real-world experience. Participants take American Indian Law, a course cotaught by Henderson and Richland, and serve as law clerks on the Hopi Appellate Court doing legal research, writing bench memoranda, and drafting opinions on live cases. Although all of their coursework and most of their casework will be done in Chicago, the five students enrolled in the 2016–2017 practicum will make at least one visit to Hopi, where they will attend oral arguments, present findings to Hopi tribal officials, and participate in judicial deliberations.

“The practicum is an opportunity to broaden one’s horizons about the world by interacting with people who are approaching familiar legal problems—creating a good society, conducting your behavior in a way that comports with rules—but in a completely different cultural context,” Henderson said. “Even if you … don’t work on Indian law issues after law school, the opportunity to be a law clerk for an actual judge on active cases during law school is a singular experience. But, boy, I do hope some of these students pursue this area. There are huge issues about natural resources, water, gaming—and many of these are going to grow in importance.”

It’s also an opportunity the benefits both the students and the court, said Robert N. Clinton, ’71, Chief Justice of the Hopi Appellate Court. “It’s a fairly unique learning opportunity, and it’s something I didn’t have in law school in the 1960s. . . . This is a chance for students to become familiar with tribal government—they see that tribes have laws and functioning courts, and they learn how to do legal research with respect to the tribal courts. And obviously having law clerks is useful for any judge—it gives us the opportunity to bounce ideas off of some young minds. The clerks are utterly invaluable in...
putting in those tedious hours in spotting things in the record that, given the pressures of our docket, we might otherwise miss.”

In many ways, the story of the Hopi Law Practicum and how it came to be is one of converging interests, good timing, and the kind of intellectual curiosity that powers Law School life. Henderson typically focuses on securities regulation and law and economics but developed an interest in Indian law that was sparked, in part, by his experience living near Hopi in 2001 while his wife was completing a medical residency with the Indian Health Service. (Note: “Hopi” is both an adjective and a noun that can refer to the language, the people, and the geographic location of the tribe.) Henderson was drawn to the “amazingly warm and fascinating society” and intrigued by the ways it differed from other parts of America. But he didn’t begin writing about it until a few years ago, when a Law School alumnus who works on Capitol Hill told Henderson that few scholars were addressing Native American issues with a University of Chicago–style, big-picture, law-and-economics bent. After that, Henderson wrote several pieces on Native American issues for SCOTUSblog. Then he met Richland—their kids played baseball together—and the two decided to teach a Greenberg Seminar on Native American law. It wasn’t the Law School’s first class on this area of law, but it was the start of a new collaboration.

Richland, on the other hand, had discovered his passion for Native American culture and tribal justice as a law student at Berkeley in the mid-1990s. A fellow student, Patricia Sekaquaptewa, a member of the Hopi tribe and now also a Hopi appellate judge, helped recruit him to the new clerkship program, which had been created, in part, to help relieve a backlog in the relatively nascent and understaffed Hopi tribal court system. Hopi’s court system had been created just a quarter century earlier, replacing the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) courts that had been set up by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Richland was fascinated by the tribal courts, by the development of Hopi jurisprudence, and by the way it helped shape their sovereignty as a tribal nation. He eventually earned a PhD in linguistic anthropology, studying the ways Hopi and English languages were being used by litigants, lawyers, and judges to argue claims before the Hopi courts, and came to
the University of Chicago in 2011. He was looking for a way to bring the Hopi clerkship program to the Law School when he and Henderson came to know Baser.

For Baser, the timing was serendipitous. She had chosen the Law School for its academic prowess, but knew it was miles from the nearest reservation. She had assumed she’d engage with American Indian law peripherally, and she explored tribal issues for papers in several classes. But then other paths began to open up, too. During her second year, Baser enrolled in the Greenberg Seminar on Native American Law. Later, she launched an independent study project on water law that focused on federal and Indian reserved rights. Associate Clinical Professor Mark Templeton, the Director of the Abrams Environmental Law Clinic, oversaw that project, telling her that if there was something that was new to him he’d “learn right alongside me.” By her third year, Richland and Henderson were developing the practicum.

“I just grabbed on, and I made sure they knew I was deeply interested in being a part of it,” Baser said. Looking back, the different ways in which each player developed an interest in tribal justice made for a richer exploration of ideas, she said. “Ultimately, I probably had a much cooler experience dealing with Indian law than I would have anywhere else.”

The program fits a broader story of the University of Chicago’s engagement with Native American culture, history, and law. The late Law School Professor Karl Llewelyn cowrote the first great legal anthropological study of American Indian law, called *The Cheyenne Way: Conflict and Case Law in Primitive Jurisprudence*, in 1941. The late University of Chicago Anthropology Professor Sol Tax, PhD ’35, was an expert in Native American issues who created “action anthropology,” which sought to blend scholarly work with efforts to help the communities he studied. In 1961, Tax helped organize hundreds of American Indian tribal leaders for the weeklong American Indian Chicago Conference at the University of Chicago, a gathering that resulted in the Declaration of Indian Purpose and helped mobilize Native American activists.

The practicum has a natural interdisciplinary bent, combining philosophical and sociological questions with the practice of law. Students consider complex socio-legal issues in a wide range of areas, including constitutionalism,
crime and punishment, civil procedure, property, contract, and family law, often exploring the balance between Anglo-American legal structures and longstanding tribal norms and considering the ways in which law and culture intersect on tribal land.

“There are foundational questions in this area of law that are at the heart of what law is and does—and what it means to people whose cultural values far preexist the legal system that is now in place,” Richland said. “Hopi is a community that has a very strong sense of who they are as distinct and unique from the US, but is nonetheless integrated into it. For them, these questions are very complex but also incredibly interesting and lively.”

Unknotting Complexity

One afternoon in September, not long before Henderson and Richland held their first meeting with the law students who had enrolled in the practicum, a visitor to Henderson’s office asked how jurisdictional issues are decided on American Indian reservations. Does tribal law always apply?

When do state and federal laws come into play?

Henderson grinned and tapped the thick black book on federal Indian law that was sitting on table between them. “Here you go. Take a read of these 600 pages and then let me know,” he said with a chuckle. “It’s unbelievably complicated.”

Perhaps as a result, tribal citizens are often aware of jurisdictional issues in a way that they aren’t in other places. “People know that if something happens on this part of land, the federal government will be in charge of it, or if it happens here, the tribal government is in charge of it,” Baser said. “It’s a really interesting dynamic, especially in criminal issues.”

Baser remembers poring over Hopi law in a case in which a tribal citizen had waived his right to an attorney. The standards for the right to an attorney were different depending on the controlling jurisdiction and, what’s more, if the waiver had been deemed invalid under Hopi tribal law, it might also have been in violation of the
decisions about their citizens and property, tribal law doesn’t always apply, particularly when nontribal actors are involved. And not all tribal courts are the same. Some tribes are still covered by CFR courts, and among those with their own court systems, traditions vary widely. Some, like Hopi, hew closely to the US legal system. Nearly all are relatively young and many are understaffed.

In Hopi, appellate court clerks provide needed support, allowing judges to be more thorough and timely. In recent years, the clerkship program has given judges the space to focus more attention on issues involving tribal custom, and to integrate traditional norms into the common law, said Sekaquaptewa, the Hopi appellate judge who helped create the clerkship program as a law student two decades ago. “It made it so the Hopi community wanted to use their courts,” she said. “It helped instill faith in the system.”

The students, in addition to gaining practical experience, learn how to connect the ideas of a different culture and different legal system to their knowledge of US law. “It really helps them understand the US system better—and to have more tolerance and respect for other cultures,” Sekaquaptewa said. “There’s something about native judges and students working through these problems together that is extremely rewarding and valuable. You’re not getting outsider do-gooders in and imposing their sense of everything onto a different culture. It’s much more symbiotic—and necessary, too, because the modern world is interconnected.”

Baser can attest to the impact. After she graduated from the Law School last spring, she moved to Santa Fe to work for Holland & Hart in the Energy, Environmental, and Natural Resources practice group. Her work doesn’t focus specifically on American Indian law, but in New Mexico native issues intersect regularly—and she arrived ready for that. Sometimes, when she’s dealing with both federal and New Mexico state law, she hears echoes of the jurisdictional tangles she encountered as Hopi clerk. She was thrilled to see the clerkship become part of a formal program at the Law School, where it can offer other students the opportunity to explore the cultural, historical, and legal issues that captured her interest.

“In tribal court, you’ll see testimony from tribal elders right next to long-accepted common law from England. Indian law is unique in that way.”

Sterling Paulson, ’18, enrolled in the practicum this year in part because he has a personal interest in indigenous culture but also for the opportunity to learn about a different jurisdiction that exists alongside state and federal law.

“It’s been fascinating seeing how tribal custom is woven right next to US constitutional law and state statutes,” said Paulson, whose wife is a member of the Osage Nation. “In tribal court, you’ll see testimony from tribal elders right next to long-accepted common law from England. Indian law is unique in that way, and it’s so interesting to me.”

Hopi, for instance, is a matrilineal society, which means that disputes over property and inheritance are often tied to clan relationships through the female line. An inheritance claim that goes one way in state court might go the other way in Hopi court.

“It’s not just codified statutes that we’re working with—it’s tribal customs and unique history and heritage,” Paulson said. “With anything pertaining to Indian law there are always unique questions that you don’t encounter in other places. So as an outsider, you have to work to build that understanding.”

American Indian law is, of course, a product of the complicated history that created it. Tribes possess a nationhood status and retain inherent powers of self-government, a guiding principle of federal Indian law that was articulated by US Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall when the governmental authority of tribes was first challenged in the 1830s. But over the years, various treaties, acts of Congress, executive orders, federal administrative agreements, and court decisions have limited sovereignty. Although tribes participate in decisions about their citizens and property, tribal law doesn’t always apply, particularly when nontribal actors are involved. And not all tribal courts are the same. Some tribes are still covered by CFR courts, and among those with their own court systems, traditions vary widely. Some, like Hopi, hew closely to the US legal system. Nearly all are relatively young and many are understaffed.

In Hopi, appellate court clerks provide needed support, allowing judges to be more thorough and timely. In recent years, the clerkship program has given judges the space to focus more attention on issues involving tribal custom, and to integrate traditional norms into the common law, said Sekaquaptewa, the Hopi appellate judge who helped create the clerkship program as a law student two decades ago. “It made it so the Hopi community wanted to use their courts,” she said. “It helped instill faith in the system.”

The students, in addition to gaining practical experience, learn how to connect the ideas of a different culture and different legal system to their knowledge of US law.

“It really helps them understand the US system better—and to have more tolerance and respect for other cultures,” Sekaquaptewa said. “There’s something about native judges and students working through these problems together that is extremely rewarding and valuable. You’re not getting outsider do-gooders in and imposing their sense of everything onto a different culture. It’s much more symbiotic—and necessary, too, because the modern world is interconnected.”

Baser can attest to the impact. After she graduated from the Law School last spring, she moved to Santa Fe to work for Holland & Hart in the Energy, Environmental, and Natural Resources practice group. Her work doesn’t focus specifically on American Indian law, but in New Mexico native issues intersect regularly—and she arrived ready for that. Sometimes, when she’s dealing with both federal and New Mexico state law, she hears echoes of the jurisdictional tangles she encountered as Hopi clerk.

She was thrilled to see the clerkship become part of a formal program at the Law School, where it can offer other students the opportunity to explore the cultural, historical, and legal issues that captured her interest.

“The students who go to Hopi and work with the appellate judges will see what an interesting and vibrant culture there is—and how important tribal sovereignty and the existence of tribal courts and the existence of bodies of tribal law are,” she said. “This is a real facet of our legal world that people don’t see when they live far away from major reservations.”
The First Amendment’s Radical Roots

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

There’s a narrative about the First Amendment that has been amplified by the ongoing debate about the US Supreme Court’s 2010 ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, and it goes something like this: the Court’s willingness to extend free speech protections to businesses is new. Depending on who’s talking, this “new” direction is either a strengthening of the First Amendment and a win for political speech—or a perversion of our constitutional values and a strike against the “little guy.”

But there’s a problem with that storyline that has hampered analysis of the appropriate path forward, said Law School Assistant Professor Laura Weinrib: the developments aren’t as novel as advocates on both sides of the issue have assumed. The constitutional line between political expression and economic activity blurred long before the Court’s 2010 decision that independent political expenditures by corporations and unions are protected under the First Amendment. In fact, conflict over constitutional protection for business and labor speech is at the very heart of the modern First Amendment, Weinrib reveals in her new book, *The Taming of Free Speech: America’s Civil Liberties Compromise* (Harvard University Press).

“What the ACLU’s founders wanted to protect was something they called the right of agitation—the right to secure fundamental change through economic weapons such as picketing, boycotts, and strikes without state interference.”

School Assistant Professor Laura Weinrib: the developments aren’t as novel as advocates on both sides of the issue have assumed. The constitutional line between political expression and economic activity blurred long before the Court’s 2010 decision that independent political expenditures by corporations and unions are protected under the First Amendment. In fact, conflict over constitutional protection for business and labor speech is at the very heart of the modern First Amendment, Weinrib reveals in her new book, *The Taming of Free Speech: America’s Civil Liberties Compromise* (Harvard University Press).

“The celebrated protagonists of the Supreme Court’s First Amendment decisions are the civil rights demonstrators and political protestors who braved public hostility to express their controversial ideas,” Weinrib said. “But the early architects of the modern First Amendment, the individuals and organizations most responsible for our powerful constitutional commitment to free speech, had something radically different in mind.”

The book, which has been hailed as “utterly brilliant” by the *Wall Street Journal*, upends the common legend about America’s devotion to free speech, which tends to focus on judicial commitment to the marketplace of ideas and the integrity of the political process. In her book, Weinrib shares a complicated, early-twentieth-century tale of political maneuvering rooted in clashes over workers’ rights. Originally, many interwar-era progressives opposed strengthening the First Amendment because they feared it would legitimize the judiciary, which they associated with *Lochner v. New York*, the 1905 decision that invalidated a New York maximum-hour law for bakers, and with subsequent judicial blows to Progressive Era reform efforts like minimum wage and workers’ compensation laws. But labor radicals within the American Civil Liberties Union were less optimistic about legislative solutions to economic inequality, and they hoped that a constitutional commitment to free speech could protect workers’ right to organize.

“The vision of free speech espoused by the early ACLU is not the one we read about in constitutional law casebooks,” Weinrib said. “What the ACLU’s founders wanted to protect was something they called the right of agitation—the right to secure fundamental change through economic weapons such as picketing, boycotts, and strikes without state interference.”
Since the right of agitation wasn’t likely to attract the support of either mainstream progressives or conservatives, the ACLU went for a subtler long-term strategy.

“It expanded its operations into areas like academic freedom, artistic expression, sex education—areas where it could get broad-based consensus,” Weinrib explained. “And by challenging procedural irregularities and factual determinations, rather than pushing aggressive First Amendment claims, it began to achieve some small victories in the courts.”

As the ACLU tamed its rhetoric, however, the split among its supporters deepened. Many of the ACLU’s allies supported New Deal labor policy, including government efforts to regulate business speech. What’s more, when the Supreme Court signaled its new deference to legislation in the late 1930s, conservatives embraced civil liberties as a way to protect business from government regulation, seeing it as a stand-in for freedom of contract.

In the end, the ACLU ended up siding with business and parting ways with the labor movement—a decision that “nearly tore the ACLU apart,” Weinrib said.

“It was a profound crisis,” she said. “But this was not simply a matter of the ACLU abandoning its original goals. Rather, it felt that protecting business speech, even when it seemed more economic than expressive, was the only way to ensure that picketing and boycotts would be protected, too.”

At first, it seemed like the strategy was working. In 1940, the US Supreme Court handed down decisions that upheld the right to picket as an expression of ideas (Thornhill v. Alabama) and the right to peacefully publicize the facts of a labor dispute (Carlton v. California). In an interesting parallel to today’s debate over Citizens United, a University of Chicago Law School professor named Charles O. Gregory, a labor scholar, criticized the Court’s use of the First Amendment to insulate labor activity from local regulation, explaining that it revived “the doctrine of substantive due process” that progressives had long denounced.

Eventually, the Supreme Court retreated from these protections for labor speech. But judicial enforcement of the First Amendment stuck, and the Warren Court in the 1950s and 1960s steadily expanded the First Amendment’s reach as free speech became one of the nation’s most cherished values.

And it’s that “golden age of the First Amendment” that may cloud some of today’s Citizens United-fueled debate over the limits of the First Amendment and the extent to which the judiciary should intervene. But, Weinrib said, regardless of one’s view on those points, both sides should agree that the recent controversy didn’t emerge from nowhere.

“For too long, discussion of the First Amendment has rested on a mythologized account of how the Constitution came to protect free speech,” Weinrib reflected. “I hope that engaging with the modern First Amendment’s messy origins—with the ambitions as well as the disappointments of its champions—will push today’s advocates to rethink received wisdoms and to craft a First Amendment jurisprudence that is suited to our own, equally messy time.”

Laura Weinrib
Books by Alumni Published 2016

Nancy Albert-Goldberg, ’71
Your Rights When Stopped by Police: Supreme Court Decisions in Poetry and Prose (LegalEase Press)
The decisions of the Supreme Court on police-citizen interactions come to life in this whimsical, but accurate, rendition, presented as a series of rhyming true-crime vignettes.

Gene Caffrey, ’70
Two Souls (Automat Press)
Sweet Caroline (Automat Press)
These mystery novels set in Philadelphia feature amateur sleuth Owen Delaney, who solves crimes including the murder of one of his students and a suicide that may be more than it seems.

David Chaumette, ’93
100 Days: My Personal Journey in Gratitude (CreateSpace)
Chaumette shot one video a day for 100 days saying thanks for something in his life. In this book, he shares the messages of those videos and the approach to life they helped him develop.

Richard Chused, ’68
Gendered Law in American History (Carolina Academic Press) (with Wendy Williams)
This compendium of over 30 years of research explores an array of social, cultural, and legal arenas from the turn of the 19th to the middle of the 20th centuries.

Alan Devlin, ’05
Antitrust and Patent Law (Oxford University Press)
This book, intended for practitioners, educators, and students, explores the acquisition and use of patents under the law in both the United States and the European Union.

Michael Faure, ’85
Civil Liability and Financial Security for Offshore Oil and Gas Activities (Cambridge University Press)
Based on in-depth interviews with a wide variety of stakeholders, this book analyzes multiple legal regimes and provides insights into the liability and compensation regime for offshore-related damage.

Bob Goldberg, ’65
Reunion (Bethesda Communications Group)
Assigned as freshmen roommates at Cornell University in the late 1950s, two boys from very different backgrounds become close friends, and are then divided by the fraternity system.

Paul J. Heald, ’88
Cotton (Yucca Publishing)
Courting Death (Yucca Publishing)
The second and third novels in Heald’s Clarkeston Chronicles series focus on the people and secrets of Clarkeston, Georgia, a bucolic college town with more than its share of crimes to investigate.

David Hoffman, ’95
Through appellate opinions and policy writings, this casebook covers traditional crimes of corruption such as bribery and embezzlement and corrupt forms of governance such as patronage and nepotism.

Kim Kamin, ’97
The Tools & Techniques of Estate Planning for Modern Families (2nd edition, National Underwriter Company) (with Wendy S. Goffe and Stephan R. Leimberg)
This estate planning guide focuses on factors unique to modern families such as tax issues, premartial and relationship formalization considerations, and lifetime estate planning options.

Sanford N. Katz, ’58
Family Law in America (2nd paperback edition, Oxford University Press)
An examination of the present state of family law, with new content for this edition on the Supreme Court’s decision in Obergefell v. Hodges.

Len Lamensdorf, ’52
The Murdered Messiah (SeaScape Press)
A historical novel about the life of Jesus of Nazareth, based upon Lamensdorf’s decades of research.

Judith Weinshall Liberman, ’54
Anne Frank in My Art (Dog Ear Publishing)
The Bridge (Dog Ear Publishing)
Grandma’s Glasses (Dog Ear Publishing)
If I Had a Little Sister (Dog Ear Publishing)
If I Had the Power (Dog Ear Publishing)
If I Were a Mom (Dog Ear Publishing)
If I Were Rich (Dog Ear Publishing)
The Letters of the Alphabet (Dog Ear Publishing)
Lucy and the Snowman (Dog Ear Publishing)
The Secret (Dog Ear Publishing)
Tale of the Roman Numerals (Dog Ear Publishing)
What Will I Be? (Dog Ear Publishing)
The Whirlpool (Dog Ear Publishing)
Prolific author and artist Liberman has focused this year on picture books. Information about her many picture books, as well as her plays, volumes of poetry, music, and visual art, can be found at jliberman.com.

Nelson Lund, ’85
Rousseau’s Rejuvenation of Political Philosophy: A New Introduction (Palgrave Macmillan)
This book reads Jean-Jacques Rousseau, first great philosophic critic of the Enlightenment, with a view toward deepening our understanding of many political issues alive today.
Michael W. McConnell, ’79, and Thomas C. Berg, ’87
Religion and the Constitution (Wolters Kluwer) (with John H. Garvey)
For the fourth edition, this leading casebook in its field adds significant new sections on recent theoretical and political controversies over religious freedom claims and legislation.

Arbitration Law of Brazil: Practice and Procedure (JurisNet) (with Ana Tereza Palhares Basilio)
This reference provides international practitioners and arbitrators, even those without familiarity with Brazilian law, with a useful reference tool to understand the Brazilian arbitral framework.

Geoffrey Palmer, ’67
A Constitution for Aotearoa New Zealand (Victoria University Press) (with Andrew Butler)
The authors propose that New Zealand needs a new, modern, codified constitution that is accessible and clear, and they aim to stimulate debate about who New Zealand is as a nation and how it should be governed.

Russell Pelton, ’63
The Sting of the Blue Scorpion (Outskirts Press)
Pelton’s second novel follows Tony Jeffries, a new Air Force JAG, and his assignment to a near-unwinnable case. Based on Pelton’s own experience as a young JAG.

Lawrence Rosen, ’74
Two Arabs, a Berber, and a Jew (University of Chicago Press)
Following the intellectual developments of four ordinary Moroccans over the span of 40 years, Rosen details a plurality of viewpoints on culture, history, and the ways both can be dramatically transformed.

Hal S. Scott, ’72
This textbook provides comprehensive coverage of international finance from policy, regulatory, and transactional perspectives.

Cecilia Wang, ’15 (writing as Blanche King)
The Almshouse (CreateSpace)
The first novel in a planned series, this supernatural story finds 12-year-old Julia transported to the spirit realm when a bag of bones falls on her head at school.

Stephen Ware, ’90
Principles of Alternative Dispute Resolution (3rd edition, West Academic Publishing)
This hornbook provides a clear statement of the law and concepts central to ADR, rendering this challenging and rapidly changing body of statutes and case law accessible to the student or lawyer.

Andrew O. Smith, ’88
Financial Literacy for Millennials: A Practical Guide to Managing Your Financial Life for Teens, College Students, and Young Adults (Praeger)
A modern primer on consumer finance and personal money management intended for readers aged 15 to 30, this guide can also serve as a primary text for courses on personal finance.

Don Thompson, ’66
The Dead One Complicates (Donniesyellowballbooks)
This fourth entry in a series of comic mysteries set in a large Chicago law firm finds hero Graybourne St. Charles embroiled in a world of money laundering, tax evasion, and murder.

Bernie Zimmerman, ’70
Exploring Nevada County (You Bet Press) (with David Comstock)
Zimmerman, the chair of the Nevada County Historical Landmarks Commission, updated a local historian’s guide to 200 historical landmarks, including 14 maps and 200 photographs.

The preceding list includes alumni books published in 2016 that were brought to our attention by their authors. If your 2016 book is missing from this list, or if you have a 2017 book to announce, please send a citation and brief synopsis to m-ferziger@uchicago.edu. We look forward to including these books in the next Alumni Books column (Spring 2018).
The University of Chicago Campaign: Inquiry and Impact

A Message from the Law Campaign Co-chairs

It is a fascinating time to be involved in legal education. With the laws of our land debated daily in national media and in homes and hallways everywhere, law and the legal profession have an increased immediacy in our lives.

As alumni of the nation’s greatest law school, we are proud to support our tremendous faculty and the extraordinary students of today who learn, as we did, to value the rigorous debate of ideas. We believe, more strongly than ever, that our support of the Law School is an excellent investment in our values and future.

It has been our honor to serve as advisors to Tom Miles in his first year as dean. As we have watched him take on the myriad responsibilities of a modern deanship, we have been impressed to see him pursue priorities that reflect our community’s greatest aspirations for the future of our Law School.

Dean Miles has identified three areas in which there are special opportunities to enhance the Law School’s distinction:

• To integrate and sustain the exciting programs in the clinics, in business law, and in professional leadership that have been created over the past 5 years;
• To reaffirm our focus on our core academic values and intellectual standards, including continuing our support for path-breaking academic scholarship and clinical work; and to ensure that our excellent work and ideas are amplified and have an impact beyond the walls of the Law School;
• To build scholarship support for students to ensure that the most promising students come to the Law School and that they enjoy career opportunities, including in public interest, that are exciting and even world-changing.

Since the start of the University of Chicago’s Campaign: Inquiry & Impact, the Law School has made record-setting strides. Your support has enabled the Law Campaign to surpass our original goal of raising $175 million. We thank each of you who has invested in our shared vision and been part of this great accomplishment!

With Dean Miles, we look to the remaining two years of the Campaign with renewed urgency. The competition from peer schools for top student talent grows ever more intense, and scholarship aid remains a pressing need for 80% of our student body. Additionally, support for faculty research and our academic programs makes the Law School the place where students learn from the most innovative legal thinkers.

In today’s world, the Law School’s reputation and eminence depend heavily upon alumni philanthropy. With your tremendous engagement and investment, the Law School has played a remarkable leadership role in setting the pace for the University’s Campaign. At this important time in our shared history, we ask you to recommit to our vision for the Law School’s future: ensuring our continued place at the forefront of legal education, inquiry, and impact in our world.

Sincerely,

Debra A. Cafaro, ’82
University Trustee

Dan Doctoroff, ’84
University Trustee

Campaign Cabinet

Debra A. Cafaro, ’82, Co-Chair
Dan Doctoroff, ’84, Co-Chair

Jim Abrams, ’87
Leslie Bluhm, ’89
Tom Cole, ’75
Terry Diamond, ’63
Adam Emmerich, ’85
Steve Feirson, ’75
David Greenbaum, ’76
Dan Greenberg, ’65
Brett Hart, ’94
Jim Hormel, ’58
Lee Hutchinson, ’73
Joshua Kanter, ’87
Lillian Kraemer, ’64
Dan Levin, ’53
Emily Nicklin, ’77
Carla, ’82, and Tim Porter, ’80

Mimi, ’89, and Steve Ritchie, ’88
David Rubenstein, ’73
Richard Sandor
Mike Tierney, ’79
Bill Von Hoene, ’80
Chuck Wolf, ’75
Barry Zubrow, ’79
Law School Launches the Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz Program in Behavioral Law, Finance, and Economics

Funded by a generous commitment from Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz, the University of Chicago Law School has fortified its position at the forefront of the study of law and economics with a new program designed to bring insight and thinking from the growing field of behavioral economics to the study of corporate governance and finance. The Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz Program in Behavioral Law, Finance and Economics will include a two-year, post-JD fellowship for an aspiring academic or policymaker, as well as faculty and student research, a speaker series, faculty visitors, and conferences.

“We are enormously grateful for Wachtell Lipton’s generosity and support in this important area of scholarship,” said Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. “We look forward to welcoming our first Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz Fellow and continuing our history of producing influential research in behavioral law and economics.”

Behavioral economics takes human nature, behavior, and desires into account in a way that traditional economic models often cannot, offering scholars new tools for understanding how humans interact and economic systems function. The Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz Program initially will focus on behavioral law and economics within corporate governance and finance.

“We are very pleased to support the University of Chicago Law School in cutting-edge efforts to better understand the real-world dynamics of corporate governance, and help inform the crucial debate on how best to organize the governance and management of our public enterprises for the benefit of their shareholders and society,” said Martin Lipton, a founding partner of Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz.

Added Adam Emmerich, ’85, a partner at Wachtell Lipton specializing in corporate law: “The University of Chicago Law School has always occupied a place of particular importance in the study of law and economics, and we are especially pleased to be able to support the Law School in carrying forward that work into the twenty-first century.”

The program will be directed by Jonathan S. Masur, the John P. Wilson Professor of Law and David and Celia Hilliard Research Scholar. Masur is leading the search for the Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz Fellow, who will produce scholarship, teach, and participate in the Law School’s intellectual community. The speaker series, which is part of the school’s Law and Economics and Public Law Workshops, began this academic year, and the first conference is expected to be held in 2018.

The program is a fitting addition to the Law School, which is the birthplace of law and economics and remains a leader in the field, both with “second-wave” empirical law-and-economics research and with the development of behavioral law and economics, which Masur described as the discipline’s third wave. In 1998, Cass Sunstein, then a professor at the Law School, coauthored what is widely seen as the founding paper of behavioral law and economics. Current faculty, including Masur, continue to produce scholarship in the field.

“This is an incredibly fruitful area of research, and we’re just beginning to scratch the surface of it,” Masur said. “This program allows us to bring in experts and to fund the research of those who are interested in doing cutting-edge work in this area. A lot of this research can be expensive because, in a lot of cases, you’re running experiments on actual human beings. We’re learning more and more that standard, rational-choice economics just does not give us a full picture of the world. We need a richer set of tools to understand how people in groups make decisions. This is going to help us acquire those tools.”
Law School Women Earn Spots in Selective Leadership Program

By Jerry DeJaager

Four graduates of the Law School are among the 37 members of the 2017 class of the highly selective Leadership Greater Chicago Fellows Program. The 10-month program is widely regarded as the premier program engaging rising-star men and women with the civic issues shaping Chicago’s present and future.

The four Law School graduates are Katie Hill, ’07; Karen Schweickart, ’03; Kristen Seeger, ’02; and Asha Spencer, ’10. They were recommended and strongly supported by two previous LGC fellows, Michele Ilene Ruiz, ’94, and Alison Siegler, a clinical professor of law at the Law School. Now in its 34th year, the fellows program has convened more than a thousand racially and ethnically diverse participants from the private, nonprofit, and public sectors. Acceptance into the program is based on demonstrated leadership abilities and civic engagement, along with what the program describes as “the passion and drive needed to tackle major issues facing the Greater Chicago region.”

For a full day each month, LGC fellows learn from expert presenters about a crucial issue, such as education, healthcare, or crime.

“The learning is incredible,” Spencer said. “I grew up in Chicago and went to public schools here, and I follow local news quite closely, yet I have learned a vast amount at each session.”

Added Hill: “One of the most valuable parts of my Law School experience was the rigorous training in how to consider a broad range of perspectives and use them to tackle complex and thorny legal questions. I’m continuing to build on that and put those skills to use through my LGC experience, tackling some of the biggest challenges facing the region.”

Beyond the presenters’ content, the LGC fellows learn from each other as they work together to identify possible solutions for civic problems. “LGC is remarkably skillful at fostering open, constructive discussions among people with very different backgrounds, viewpoints, and experiences,” Seeger said. “It’s quite valuable to hear such a wide range of perspectives on these important issues.”

Schweickart cited another important broadening aspect of LGC participation: “Once you go to work at a particular place in a particular sector and you become really engaged with that work, your circle of acquaintances can narrow pretty substantially. LGC shows you many other points of view, ones that you might be missing. It takes you out of your comfort zone in very constructive ways.”

Scaling Up

In addition to preparing for and participating in the daylong issue-oriented sessions, LGC fellows also are expected to join in a substantial number of other activities that can include retreats, site visits, discussion groups, additional conversations with leaders and experts, out-of-area travel opportunities, service projects, and cultural and social events.

All of the Law School women in the LGC program have demanding jobs. When Hill began the program, she was a senior policy advisor to Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel; during the program she became director of policy, research and development for the Cook County State’s Attorney. Schweickart is deputy general counsel at Citadel LLC; Seeger is a partner at Sidley Austin LLP; and Spencer is a partner at Bartlit Beck Herman Palenchar & Scott LLP.

They have taken on additional civic responsibilities, too. Spencer is a trustee of Columbia College Chicago, and last year she chaired the Law School’s Law Firm Challenge; Seeger serves on the board of a community-based organization, Mujeres Latinas en Acción, and actively supports the work of Spark Ventures, a Chicago-based nonprofit focused on business-driven philanthropy; Hill serves on the Services Committee of Family Focus, and mentors elementary students in the Chicago Public Schools, helping them consider high school choices; and Schweickart is on the board of Urban Initiatives, a nonprofit that empowers Chicago youth to become agents of community change through sports-based programming.

Seeger said that a crucial lesson from the Law School helped her handle the responsibilities associated with participation in the Fellows program: “Like most of my peers, I’m working 60-hour weeks at my ‘real job,’ and doing other things, too. I knew how much busier it would make my life to do this, but there’s something very valuable you learn from being at the Law School—how to scale up when a situation calls for it.”

Ruiz, a 2006 LGC fellow who is now a member of LGC’s board of directors, remarked that the support she and Professor Siegler provided to the 2017 applicants is an important example of women going beyond mentoring to actively sponsoring opportunities for other women.

“These four women are all completely deserving of their places in this LGC class, and they wouldn’t be in it if they weren’t,” she said. “That Alison and I had Law School
current LGC participants would have a salutary effect on the fellows’ discussions: “When looking for solutions to big civic issues like education and criminal justice, multiple factors have to be taken into account. A Chicago law student learns to recognize that almost any problem is a systems problem and ought to be approached in that way. Asha, Katie, Kristen, and Karen bring that kind of thinking to everything they do, and the class’s deliberations will benefit from it.”

**NOW AND NEXT**

LGC fellows typically form into a cohesive group that continues getting together regularly, long after the 10-month program has ended. The program also offers many events at which alumni participate. “The Fellows program lasts for a lifetime,” Ruiz said. “The relationships only become deeper over time, and the strong and reliable network keeps growing.”

Added Schweickart: “I feel honored and very fortunate to have been chosen, and thankful to Michele and Alison for their support. I’d do it again in a heartbeat.”
Inside the Minds of Rubenstein Scholars

Featuring the Class of 2017

Last fall, David M. Rubenstein, ’73, generously renewed his commitment to the University of Chicago Law School’s Rubenstein Scholars Program with a $13 million gift, which will provide 60 full-tuition scholarships and stipends for outstanding students in the classes of 2020, 2021, and 2022. “David’s inspiring gift has transformed the Law School,” said Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. “His generosity makes it possible for some of our brightest applicants to receive the very best legal education—a University of Chicago legal education.”

The David M. Rubenstein Scholars Program was established in 2010 with an initial gift from Rubenstein, a University Trustee and the cofounder and co-CEO of The Carlyle Group. He renewed his commitment in 2013 and again in 2016 to fund an additional 120 three-year scholarships, ensuring that Rubenstein Scholars would account for approximately 10 percent of students at the Law School. The new gift brings Rubenstein’s support for the program to a total of $33 million since 2010.

The Rubenstein Scholars Program removes the burden of student-loan debt and opens up a wide range of professional opportunities for students, many of whom plan to pursue a career in public service upon graduation or in future years. The Class of 2017 included a record 24 Rubenstein Scholars. Immediately after graduation, 11 of those students will be working as law clerks for federal appellate court judges, six will be working as law clerks for federal district court judges, six will be working as associates at large law firms, and one will be working as a public defender.

Below are introductions to 16 Rubenstein Scholars from the Class of 2017. To read each of their responses in their entirety, visit www.law.uchicago.edu.

**ADAM DAVIDSON**
**Undergraduate Institution:** The Ohio State University  
**Hometown:** Cincinnati, OH  
**After Graduation:** Clerking for the Hon. James Gwin (US District Court, Northern District of Ohio); the Hon. Diane Wood (US Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit); and the Hon. Guido Calabresi (US Court of Appeals, Second Circuit).

*I was surprised at how willing Law School professors were to engage students both intellectually and personally outside of class.*

*I was involved in the Federal Criminal Justice Clinic and was amazed at the impact and complexity of the clinic’s work.*

**CARMELO DOOLING**
**Undergraduate Institution:** Arizona State University  
**Hometown:** Glendale, AZ  
**After Graduation:** Clerking for the Hon. G. Murray Snow (US District Court, District of Arizona)

*If I could go back to the first day of Law School, I would tell myself to go to office hours more—you don’t need to ask a brilliant question. Just get to know the professors.*

*My favorite Law School memory is a tie between President Obama’s visit last year and winning the Law Review Whirlyball Cup, then celebrating in Wrigleyville the day after the Cubs’ win.*

**CHARLES EATON**
**Undergraduate Institution:** Oakwood University  
**Hometown:** Loma Linda, CA  
**After Graduation:** Clerking for the Hon. Jesus G. Bernal (US District Judge, Central District of California)

*I decided to study the law because I wanted to have a direct and positive impact among minority communities.*

*My favorite course at the Law School was Constitutional Law III with Professor Strauss.*

**PHILIP EHRlich**
**Undergraduate Institution:** University of Chicago  
**Hometown:** Lancaster, PA  
**After Graduation:** Clerking for the Hon. Frank Easterbrook (US Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit)

*I love that the University of Chicago really is a place that cares about ideas. I also love the food at lunch talks.*

*The Rubenstein Scholarship will allow me to be more flexible in making career decisions and will let me pursue opportunities I care about.*
JASMINE JOHNSON
Undergraduate Institution: University of Pittsburgh
Hometown: Fort Washington, MD
After Graduation: Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP, New York office
I love the collegiality of my Law School classmates and how commonly the faculty interact with students outside of the classroom.

The Rubenstein Scholarship will allow me to pursue the career I am interested in while affording me the opportunity to help other minorities.

ELIZABETH KIERNAN
Undergraduate Institution: University of Alabama
Hometown: Metairie, LA
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Jerry Smith (US Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit)
I decided to study law because I wanted a challenging career that would allow me to make a difference.

I love how involved Law School professors are with their students. Professors here know us both academically and personally.

MAX FIN
Undergraduate Institution: University of Florida
Hometown: Lynbrook, NY
After Graduation: Latham & Watkins, Houston office
My favorite course as a 1L was either Torts with Professor Levmore or Property with Professor Helmholz. Since then, Chancellor Chandler’s Delaware Law seminar emerged as another favorite.

I would like our alumni to know that academic rigor is alive and well at the Law School, but there remains a sense of collegiality and camaraderie that will stay with us forever.

JULIA HAINES
Undergraduate Institution: Grove City College
Hometown: Hockessin, DE
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Thomas Griffith (US Court of Appeals, DC Circuit)
I was involved with the Federalist Society and the Edmund Burke Society. They challenged and formed my understanding of the law.

My favorite memory from Law School is ice skating with Professor Helmholz!

JONATHAN HAWLEY
Undergraduate Institution: Harvard University
Hometown: Oceanside, CA
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Philip Gutierrez (US District Court, Central District of California) and the Hon. Milan Smith, '69 (US Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit)
I love the Law School’s professors. They are not only the brightest people I’ve ever met, but also some of the warmest and most inspiring.

If I could go back to the first day of Law School, I’d tell myself to enjoy every minute of it. There’s nothing better than debating high principles with your best friends.

ERIK LEWIN
Undergraduate Institution: Brown University
Hometown: Fair Haven, NJ
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. A. Raymond Randolph (US Court of Appeals, DC Circuit)
I’ve loved all of my classes so it is hard to pick only one, but Antitrust with Professor Picker was exceptionally fantastic.

It is a pleasure to be surrounded by brilliant people who constantly think critically about the law and are also great friends.

Rubenstein Scholars continued on next page.
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ANDREW MACKIE-MASON
Undergraduate Institution: University of Chicago
Hometown: Ann Arbor, MI
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Judge Stephen Reinhardt (US Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit)
In ten years, I hope to be a public defender and a zealous and effective advocate for my clients.
The Law School is a place where people with wildly different views can debate and come to understand each other, even if they never agree.

ALEXANDRA SCOTT
Undergraduate Institution: University of Chicago
Hometown: Laguna Niguel, CA
After Graduation: Covington and Burling, Silicon Valley office
I love that the Law School has taught me to be more tolerant of different ideas and people and has changed my way of thinking.
A favorite memory from the Law School are the classes after the 2016 election: a reminder that not only does the world keep turning, but that we can do something about it.

MICA MOORE
Undergraduate Institution: Columbia University
Hometown: Chicago
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. William A. Fletcher (US Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit) and the Hon. Vince Chhabria (US District Court, Northern District of California)
If I could change one thing about the Law School? Soia Mentschikoff must be getting pretty lonely—she’s the only woman with a portrait in the main hallway.
The Law School has taught me the importance of practical thinking. Even the most complicated legal issue still happens in the real world, with real people.

LINDSAY STONE
Undergraduate Institution: University of Massachusetts Amherst
Hometown: Webster, MA
After Graduation: Working in the Office of the Colorado State Public Defender
I was involved with the Federal Criminal Justice Clinic, where I was able to directly represent clients and develop as an advocate.
I want alumni to know how crucial the law school’s clinical offerings have been to my legal education.

JOE WENNER
Undergraduate Institution: American University
Hometown: Radnor, PA
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Sidney Fitzwater (US District Court, Northern District of Texas)
If I could go back to the first day of Law School, I would tell myself to show up early so you’re not stuck in the back row of Contracts.
The Rubenstein Scholarship is an incredible opportunity to pursue a public service career. It truly is a privilege; I plan to make it count.

HOLLY NEWELL
Undergraduate Institution: Washington University in St. Louis
Hometown: Davis, CA
After Graduation: Clerking for the Hon. Richard A. Paez (US Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit)
I was pleasantly surprised by how wonderful the UChicago Law community was—it’s been both an intellectually challenging and enjoyable three years.
It’s hard to pick just one course, but I really enjoyed both Copyright with Professor Picker and Patent Law with Professor Masur.

Allen M. Singer, ’48, a notable San Francisco lawyer, passed away May 10, 2016. He was 92 years old.

Singer served as an officer in the Army Air Force during World War II and had just completed his air crew training when the war ended in 1945. Afterward, he attended the Law School on the GI Bill. Even though he spent most of his career in San Francisco and elsewhere away from Chicago, Singer’s relationship with the Law School played a central role throughout his life.

“Allen’s whole connection with the Law School was extremely important to him,” said friend Bob Raymer, MBA ’43. “Serving as chairman of the Bay Area Alumni Club in the earlier years of its existence, Singer identified continuously with the University community and always had something to relate about Chicago Law.”

Raymer continued, “At that time the Law School was, as it is now, a very intense and interesting place. It was a leader in nontraditional legal education—economics, logic, philosophy, history, and other disciplines unique to usual legal studies; and even today, plainly different from other schools. That experience hit Allen pretty hard, and he never forgot about it.”

In 2013 Singer established the Allen M. Singer Scholarship Fund and the Allen M. Singer Professorship Fund through the largest bequest intention in the history of the Law School.

“Allen was a true champion of our school,” said Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. “His continued support of the Law School throughout his career—and now through his generous bequest—is truly remarkable. I was lucky to have had the opportunity to meet Allen last winter and witness his genuine enthusiasm for the Law School. It spurred an inspiring and memorable conversation, for which I am grateful.”

Former Dean Michael H. Schill, the Harry N. Wyatt Professor Emeritus of Law and now the President of the University of Oregon, remembered Singer as “an incredibly dedicated graduate of the Law School.”

“He had a distinguished career, devoting himself very intensely to his law practice, and never forgot how the University of Chicago Law School contributed to his success,” Schill said. “In particular, he credited Edward Levi with influencing his intellectual growth. While I am saddened by his passing, Allen’s wonderful bequest will provide needed support for the school’s faculty and students and will ensure that future generations will benefit from the same experience Allen had.”

Singer was born on December 30, 1923, in Minneapolis to William Singer and Ida Simenstin Singer. He grew up in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and was an only child.

Upon graduation from the Law School, Singer practiced law at various firms in San Francisco. In 1958, he took time off from his own practice to continue his legal education. He earned an LLM degree from Harvard Law School and then spent several years as a faculty member at the University of Oregon Law School. He taught a variety of courses, and he was known to tap into his Law School roots and teach via the Socratic method.

When he later returned to San Francisco, he was a partner at the law firm of Erskine & Tulley. One of his clients was surrealist painter Gordon Onslow Ford. The two men established a lifelong friendship, which gave Allen a new appreciation for creativity and the arts. Art became an important part of Singer’s later life, and he built a fine collection of Onslow Ford’s works.

Soon thereafter, Singer left private practice to join San Francisco–based ABM Industries (formerly American Building Maintenance, Inc.) as vice president and general counsel. In 1962, Singer was instrumental in taking the company public. He loved his work there as it offered a wide variety of law practice.

“Allen was a key leader of a once-small community of Chicago graduates in San Francisco. He was warm, welcoming, dedicated, and unassuming,” said Roland E. Brandel, ’66, former president of the University of Chicago Alumni Club of the Bay Area. “Allen led projects, from fundraising to recruiting, in order to assist the University and also to integrate new Chicago arrivals to the Bay Area into the ex-pat UChicago community. His commitment to Chicago was infectious. Many of us followed where Allen led. The result: a strong, deep, supportive, and now large and vibrant alumni presence in the Bay Area that is an important part of Allen’s legacy.”

In his free time, Singer also loved to read and attend the San Francisco Symphony. He was also an avid Giants baseball fan, watching them on TV often.

“Allen was wonderfully farsighted,” Raymer said. “He continually sought to be an effective lawyer and at the same time to test the cutting edge of what was new or emerging in law practice—and in life. And he certainly did.”
Gareth Jones (Visiting Professor at the Law School)
April 2, 2016
Jones was a renowned legal academic, with a wide range of interests, including legal history, contract, property, and trusts. He studied law at University College of London, Cambridge, and Harvard. He began at Cambridge as a junior teaching fellow at Trinity in 1961 and continued there for the duration of his impressive career. He played important roles at Trinity, being appointed as Senior Tutor in 1972 and Vice Master from 1986 to 1992 and again from 1996 to 1999. His teaching, writing, and research were well recognized and received many formal distinctions. Jones was a fellow of the British Academy and a foreign member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is, perhaps, best known for the book The Law of Restitution, which he cowrote with Robert Goff. Since being published in 1966, the book is seen as the definitive text on English restitution law.

1948
George J. Francis
September 6, 2016
Francis was a native of Denver, Colorado, who served in the US Army during World War II and was awarded the Purple Heart. After the war, he earned his undergraduate degree at the University before entering the Law School, where he served as assistant editor of the Law Review. He began his law career in New York City, then returned to Denver to establish a practice. He appeared three times before the US Supreme Court.

Lawrence Howe
July 31, 2016
Before he entered the Law School, Howe graduated from Harvard University and served as a US Navy pilot during World War II. His law career included stints as a partner at the firm now known as Vedder Price, as chief financial officer of Bell & Howell, and as vice chairman and chief financial officer of Jewel Companies.

Joseph E. Sheeks
January 10, 2014
Sheeks earned his JD after serving as a lieutenant commander in the US Navy during World War II, during which he survived the attack on Pearl Harbor. A resident of Petaluma, California, he practiced law in the San Francisco Bay area for more than five decades and served both as mayor of Mill Valley, California, and as a director of the Golden Gate Bridge District.

1949
Jerald E. Jackson
May 17, 2016
Jackson served as a first lieutenant in the US Army Air Corps from 1944 to 1946. He earned an undergraduate degree from Western Illinois University before enrolling in the Law School, from which he graduated cum laude and was awarded the Order of the Coif. He was a resident of Decatur, Illinois.

John J. Naughton
October 29, 2015
Naughton, of Oak Lawn, Illinois, served in both the US Army and the US Navy during World War II. After graduating from the Law School, he joined the Chicago firm of Henslee, Monek & Henslee, where during his five-decade career he became well known as an advocate for the rights of railroad workers and other transportation workers—in particular, unions’ rights to operate departments of legal counsel and to engage in group legal action. He argued hundreds of cases before state supreme courts and five cases before the US Supreme Court.

Milton Semer
July 27, 2016
Semer served as general counsel for the US Housing and Home Finance Agency. In 1966, he joined the White House staff as counsel to President Lyndon B. Johnson. In 1972, Semer’s involvement in the presidential campaign of Democratic Senator Edmund S. Muskie resulted in his being placed on Richard Nixon’s enemies list. Semer was also well known for representing US Rep. Fernnd St. Germain, a Democrat from Rhode Island, during an ethics investigation by the Justice Department and the House ethics committee in the 1980s.

1950
Armand M. Coren
May 2016
Coren, a resident of Centennial, Colorado, served in the US Army during the Korean War.

Sherwin J. Stone
May 2, 2016
Stone, a resident of Highland Park, Illinois, earned his undergraduate degree at the University before entering the Law School. A senior partner at Altheimer & Gray in Chicago, he specialized in trial litigation and was a charter member of the Illinois Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. In 1991, he established the Braeside Foundation, an independent foundation that supports charities such as the ACLU Foundation, the American Indian College Fund, the AIDS Foundation of Chicago, and the American Jewish Committee.
1953  
**James R. Bryant Jr.**  
*April 22, 2012*  
Bryant served in the US Army during World War II.

**Ruth Miner Kessel**  
*January 29, 2017*  
Kessel, a professor for the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater from 1958 until 1985, earned an undergraduate degree from Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois, and served in the Navy during World War II. While attending the Law School, she met Abbas Kessel, PhD ’56, social sciences division, with whom she enjoyed talking about politics and how to achieve peace. They two dated for 30 years, married in 1984, and retired the following year. Kessel will be remembered for her deep commitment to peace, the environment, and social justice.

1955  
**Roger Cramton**  
*February 3, 2017*  
Cramton’s career in legal academia and public service began at the Law School, where he taught ethics and torts as an Assistant Professor of Law from 1957 to 1961. He served as chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States and Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office of Legal Counsel. He left the Department of Justice after infuriating President Nixon by concluding that withholding appropriated funds was unlawful. He then became Dean of Cornell Law School in 1973, during which time he also served as the first chairman of the Legal Services Corporation.

1958  
**William W. Brackett**  
*August 20, 2016*  
Brackett practiced energy law for four decades in Chicago and Washington, DC, and was chairman of the Arctic Gas Project. A longtime champion of civil liberties, he served on the boards of the American Civil Liberties Union and the NAACP’s National Voter Fund. His other accomplishments included playing a significant role in rewriting the Illinois Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code, helping to create Cook County Legal Services, and acting as an advocate for the LGBTQ community.

**Francis J. Gerlits**  
*April 13, 2016*  
Gerlits earned an undergraduate degree from the University of Notre Dame and served in the US Army Finance Corps before enrolling in the Law School. After graduating, he joined the Chicago firm of Kirkland and Ellis, where he specialized in corporate law and represented clients that included General Motors and Marshall Field’s; he also served as general counsel for International Harvester/Navistar. Gerlits was well known for his work in mergers, hostile takeover defense, financial structuring, and major litigation.

**Julius Y. Yacker**  
*May 28, 2016*  
A US Army veteran who served from 1943–1946, Yacker earned a master’s degree at the University before enrolling in the Law School. He was a partner in the Chicago firms of Yacker, Yacker, Gerson & Light; Overton, Schwartz & Yacker; and McDermott, Will & Emery; and was later with the firms of Keck, Mahin & Cate and Piper Rudnick. A nationally recognized expert in specialized cooperative housing, Yacker was the director of the National Housing Conference in Washington, DC, during the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

**Richard B. Wilks**  
*June 7, 2016*  
Wilks, who lived in Corrales, New Mexico, served in the US Navy during the Korean War and later earned his undergraduate degree at Antioch College. He moved to Arizona after graduating from the Law School. Wilks was active in the civil rights movement and in the United Farmworkers’ movement, and served as in-house counsel for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community in the metropolitan Phoenix area.

1963  
**Marvin Gittler**  
*September 8, 2016*  
After graduating from Syracuse University and the Law School, Gittler worked for the National Labor Relations Board before going into private practice as a founder of the Chicago firm Asher, Gittler & D’Alba. He led the assembly of the first-ever collective bargaining unit for Chicago Police Department sergeants, lieutenants, and captains, and in 2015 helped to negotiate a settlement in the Chicago Symphony Orchestra musicians’ strike. He was a resident of Chicago and Union Pier, Michigan.

1964  
**Melinda Aikins Bass**  
*May 28, 2007*  
Bass served on the staff of New York Governor Hugh Carey, who appointed her to the state’s Department of Health. While in Albany, she worked for the passage of the Equitable Distribution Law, which provides a gender-neutral framework for the division of marital property in divorce cases, and for the right of women to have Medicaid-financed abortions. She also worked to help eliminate credit discrimination against women.
Harold L. Henderson
November 1, 2016
A resident of Naples, Florida, Henderson worked as an attorney for law firms in Chicago and New York City and served as general counsel for companies that included Firestone and RJR Nabisco. In 1996, he joined Eastman Chemical Co. as senior vice president, general counsel, and secretary; he retired as a special advisor to the company in the early 2000s.

1966
Samuel S. Yasgur
June 23, 2016
Yasgur grew up in Bethel, New York, on his parents’ dairy farm—the site of the 1969 Woodstock music festival. He earned a bachelor’s degree from Cornell University before enrolling in the Law School. His first job was as an assistant district attorney in Manhattan, where he rose quickly to become one of the department’s youngest bureau chiefs, and where he led several high-profile prosecutions of organized-crime figures. Later, Yasgur moved to Westchester County, where he was the county attorney for 10 years before going into private practice as a litigation partner at the firm of Hall Dickler.

1968
William R. Wallin
November 8, 2016
Wallin earned a bachelor’s degree in political science at the University before he entered the Law School. After graduating, he moved to Washington, DC, where he served as an attorney for the US Interstate Commerce Commission and the US Department of the Interior. He returned to Illinois, where he worked as an attorney and later as chief of the Opinion Division for the office of the Illinois Attorney General in Springfield and Chicago. He spent the last several years of his career as legal counsel for the Illinois Department of Human Services in Chicago.

1972
William Jameson “Jamie” Kunz
November 20, 2016
Kunz earned an undergraduate degree at Yale University and was working on a doctorate in linguistics at Indiana University when he decided to change course. He joined the Peace Corps and taught English in Malawi, and enrolled in the Law School upon his return to the US. After graduation, he went to work for the Cook County public defender’s office, where he became well known for his refusal to break attorney-client privilege to reveal the true killer in a 1982 case involving the shooting of a Chicago security guard.

1980
Frank James Caracciolo
July 12, 2016
Caracciolo, a resident of Schenectady, New York, earned an undergraduate degree in economics from Johns Hopkins University and an MBA from the University of Chicago in addition to his JD. After graduating, he joined his family’s wholesale food business, F. Caracciolo and Son, as vice president of finance. He later worked in a similar capacity for United Foods and as controller at San Croix Tanning Salons.

1982
Elaine Ziff
December 13, 2016
Ziff graduated from Queens College before entering the Law School. After earning her JD, Ziff spent more than 30 years as an attorney at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher, & Flom, where she practiced in litigation and structured finance and became the firm’s first corporate intellectual property attorney in the late 1980s. She was well known for mentoring junior attorneys, and became Skadden Arps’ first part-time counsel while she raised her children. Ziff was a resident of Glen Rock, New Jersey.

1990
Russell Leon Pollack
July 10, 2006
Pollack earned an undergraduate degree from Columbia College, and after graduating from the Law School clerked for the Honorable Robert E. Cowen, circuit judge in the US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He then joined Davis Polk & Wardwell, where he worked in corporate finance at the firm’s New York City and London offices. He entered the securities industry in 1995 as an investment banker at Hambrecht & Quist (now JP Morgan) and Warburg Dillon Read (now UBS).
Arthur O. Kane, ’39, 1918–2016

Arthur O. Kane, ’39, a prominent Chicago attorney whose generous gifts to the Law School included funding the 10,000-square-foot wing that houses the school’s clinical programs, died in October. He was 98.

Kane, a lifelong resident of Chicago, was a recognized authority in the field of workers’ compensation law and occupational diseases. In 1996, he and his wife Esther contributed a significant gift to build the Arthur Kane Center for Clinical Legal Education, which houses the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic and other clinical programs at the Law School. The building, which opened on October 11, 1998, includes offices, conference and meeting spaces, and a library.

“The Law School community will remember Arthur Kane for his generosity and unwavering support, a legacy that is evident each day through the important work taking place in the clinical wing bearing his name,” said Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. “The Kane Center is a deeply important part of the Law School. Its creation nearly two decades ago allowed our clinical programs to grow in ways that have benefited both our students and the surrounding community. Arthur’s impact on the Law School will be felt for a long time.”

At the time of the gift, Kane said he wanted to encourage the clinic’s work because it offered both service to the community and real-world training for lawyers.

“Arthur Kane was a tremendous supporter and benefactor for the Law School’s clinical program,” said Clinical Professor Jeff Leslie, Director of Clinical and Experiential Learning. “His gift to create the Arthur Kane Center for Clinical Legal Education moved our clinics out of cramped basement offices into a modern, spacious legal center that is the envy of clinical programs nationwide. We were equally grateful that Arthur stayed in consistent touch with the clinics over the years, even teaching alongside us for a long stint in the Intensive Trial Practice Workshop. We will miss him.”

In 2015, Kane and his wife also made a bequest that will support two Law School positions for faculty members who have demonstrated expertise in constitutional law and/or administrative law. The Arthur and Esther Kane Research Chair is held by Eric Posner, who is also the Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law. The recipient of the Arthur and Esther Kane Teaching Chair has not yet been named.

Kane, who received his undergraduate degree from the University in 1937, joined the US Army in 1942 and served for more than three years during World War II. When he returned, he joined his father’s law practice, and they worked together until his father’s passing in 1963. He formed the firm that became Kane, Doy & Harrington in 1965, and it became a preeminent workers’ compensation practice, principally on the defense side.

At one time the firm’s 10 attorneys had nearly 6,000 active cases, and the firm often was handling as much as 10 percent of all of the workers’ compensation cases in Illinois, Kane said in 2015. His legal successes helped burnish the firm’s reputation, as his arguments established important precedents. He became a recognized expert on occupational diseases—for plaintiffs, he won the first asbestosis case in Illinois and also gained a major victory in a myasthenia gravis case. He served as president of the Illinois Workers’ Compensation Lawyers Association and as chair of the Chicago Bar Association’s committee on workers’ compensation, among several other major institutional roles.
Former Law School Dean Phil C. Neal, 1919–2016

Former University of Chicago Law School Dean Phil C. Neal, an antitrust expert, litigator, and law firm founder whose ability to cut through complexity earned him a reputation as a deft problem solver, died in September. He was 97.

Neal was a professor at the Law School for 21 years starting in 1961 and served as its sixth dean between 1963 and 1975. He taught a wide range of subjects, including Elements of the Law, Antitrust, and Constitutional Law. As dean, he hired many influential scholars, including Richard Posner, now a judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals; the late Ronald Coase, the 1991 recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics; Gerhard Casper; Norval Morris; Frank Zimring; Richard Epstein; William Landes; and Geoffrey R. Stone.

Neal began a new phase of his long career as senior partner at Neal Gerber Eisenberg, the Chicago-based law firm he helped found in 1986. During his time in private practice, Neal litigated cases on a wide range of issues, from antitrust to school desegregation, and advised the corporate boards of major companies. In the 1950s and 1960s, Neal was appointed to several high-profile government bodies, serving as chairman of the Pacific Regional Enforcement Commission of the Wage Stabilization Board, executive secretary of the Coordinating Committee for Multi-District Litigation for the United States District Courts, and chair of a White House task force on antitrust policy.

"Phil Neal led an exceptional career of service and responsibility," said Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. "He was one of our longest serving deans, and he led the Law School during a time of extraordinary change for our country and the legal profession. The Law School is forever better thanks to his leadership. Were that not enough, he was an elite practitioner, served in multiple high-level positions in the government, and even founded a major law firm. His career is a model of leadership for all lawyers."

Neal was an agile thinker who could “untangle Gordian knots where others were just sort of lost,” said his son, Andrew Neal. “He was very intelligent, quick-witted, and didn’t suffer fools gladly. But he was also incredibly gracious, and very deliberate and thoughtful in the way he approached problems—life problems or legal problems—and he would not stand pat on whatever the thinking of the day was about anything.”

This enabled Neal to “see the core simplicity” in even the most complex issues, said Stephen Fedo, ’81, Neal Gerber Eisenberg’s General Counsel and a Law School alumnus who first encountered Neal when he took Professional Ethics from him in 1980.

“He was brilliant at cutting away the underbrush from an issue, and he was wonderful at articulating the simple truth of a problem in the most simple, elegant prose I’ve ever read,” Fedo said. “His real strength, as a lawyer and as a friend, is that he was always present when he spoke to you. His focus was on that person’s concerns, and on finding a way to address those concerns.”
He joined the faculty at Stanford Law School in 1948 after working at a law firm in San Francisco for several years. While at Stanford, Neal introduced Justice Jackson to the student who would become his final law clerk. This meeting, which took place in Neal’s office in the summer of 1951, ultimately resulted in Jackson offering a clerkship to William H. Rehnquist. As it turned out, Rehnquist was one of two future US Supreme Court justices whom Neal taught at Stanford; the other was Sandra Day O’Connor.

Roberta Cooper Ramo, ’67, who was a student during Neal’s deanship, cited him as having played a pivotal role as she broke through gender barriers in the legal profession. Ramo—who was the first woman president of the American Bar Association and the first woman president of the American Law Institute—publicly recalled his support as she accepted the ABA Medal, the group’s highest honor. “In 1967 when I couldn’t find anyone who would even answer my letters as [my husband and I] were about to move to North Carolina . . . [Dean Neal] called me in to find out why I didn’t have a job,” she said. “When I explained, without hesitation and with me sitting right there, he picked up the phone and called [former North Carolina] Gov. Terry Sanford, who just stepped down from the governorship. He demanded that Gov. Sanford personally take on the job of finding me some place to work, posthaste. And out of fear of Phil Neal, he did.” Ramo joined a foundation working to end racial discrimination and poverty.

In 1986, Neal cofounded Neal Gerber Eisenberg, where he served in the firm’s Antitrust & Trade Regulation, Litigation, and Corporate Governance practice groups. He chaired the Litigation practice in the firm’s early years and served on the firm’s Executive Committee until recently. In addition to his legal work, Neal was a mentor to just about everyone in the litigation group, as well as many of the firm’s leaders outside the group.

Even during his years in private practice, Neal stayed on top of what was happening at the Law School and at the University. “He cherished his years at the Law School, and it was always in his heart,” his son Andrew Neal said. “He was very invested in the whole University, and remained so until the end of his life.”

Neal is survived by his wife, Linda Thoren Neal, ’67; three sons, Stephen (Michelle S. Rhyu), Timothy (Laurie), and Andrew (Holly A. Harrison); 13 grandchildren; and one great-grandson. He was preceded in death by his son Richard, who died in 2015.
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A Bankruptcy Law Legacy

Robert Martin, ’69, retired last year after serving for 38 years as a US bankruptcy judge, most of them as the chief judge in the Western District of Wisconsin. His legacy will be felt for generations.

He put himself forward in 1978 as a candidate for bankruptcy court, as the incumbent judge was nearing retirement. Martin had been at Ross & Stevens in Madison since graduating from the Law School, becoming a partner. “I really liked doing bankruptcy cases, but they weren’t high on the agendas of top firms like ours, so I figured becoming a judge was my best way to ensure a steady caseload of the thing I most liked to do,” he said.

“I owe my love of bankruptcy law in part to my incomparable law school professor Grant Gilmore,” Martin said. “He showed me that this was a richly interesting, intellectually challenging, and socially important area of law.”

The year 1978 was a heady time for bankruptcy jurisprudence, as the new Bankruptcy Reform Act was nearing passage. For about a decade after the law went into effect in 1979, Martin and his colleagues produced written opinions for virtually all of their cases. “We were defining what the law meant and how it should be administered—that was an exciting position to be in,” he recalled.

He continued shaping the understanding and practice of bankruptcy law through his three-decade collaboration with Robert Ginsberg, with whom he wrote what is now the three-volume treatise Ginsberg and Martin on Bankruptcy. That treatise is now in its fifth edition. Among his many other publications, he is coauthor of the Secured Transactions Handbook for Wisconsin Lawyers and Lenders.

He taught for many years at the University of Wisconsin Law School, and he has been a faculty member in courses for new bankruptcy judges. He served in several leadership positions with the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, including as the organization’s president. His preeminence has been recognized in many ways, including being chosen in 1993 for membership in the highly selective National Bankruptcy Conference and receiving the William L. Norton Jr. Judicial Excellence Award in 2011.

“In my earliest days on the bench, bankruptcy judges weren’t always highly respected,” Martin recalled. “My University of Chicago law degree was an important credential.” Local ties served him particularly well when as a traveling judge he became widely credited for helping to strengthen Chicago’s bankruptcy bar. “Let’s just say that the culture in Chicago bankruptcy practice 30 years ago was more relaxed than many thought it ought to be, and I think over time we were able to help bring it up to the exceptionally high standards it has today,” he said.

Martin and his wife, Ruth, whom he met in college, were married before he began at the Law School and now have six grandchildren. “When I graduated, people would ask me why I hadn’t taken a job in Chicago or some other big city. There was a lifestyle we wanted, and we found it in Madison, where we’ve been happy for 47 years,” he said. “I’ve had a charmed life, personally and professionally. I’m married to a woman who has always been much smarter and much better-looking than me, I have a wonderful family, I have had great friends and colleagues, and I have been permitted as a judge to be a public face of bankruptcy law to the innumerable people whose lives and businesses are affected by it. I owe that career to the Law School, and I am immensely grateful for it.”
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Their writing explores social, cultural, and legal arenas from the turn of the 19th to the middle of the 20th centuries, including concepts of citizenship at the founding of the republic, the development of married women’s property laws, divorce, child custody, temperance, suffrage, domestic and racial violence before and after the Civil War, protective labor legislation, and the use of legal history testimony in legal disputes. It is both an invaluable reference tool and an important new teaching text.

Darrell Johnson reports: Greetings to classmates and other friends. I’m still living in Fountain Hills, Arizona.

Janet and I spent part of the summer travelling and visiting friends in Utah, Wyoming, and across the plains to Minnesota where we spent the month of August in downtown Minneapolis. In Wyoming, we had a great visit with Pete Wales and our own private “wine mess.” In Minnesota, we spent much very enjoyable time with daughter, granddaughters and great-grandchildren, and other family members and friends. I attended my 60-year high school reunion and a Law School Meet the Dean reception.

I have found a new way to grow ever younger. Each time I get a replacement part I recalculate my age by averaging the age of my parts. May we all stay young without the need for a mathematical formula.

1969

Judge Judith Boggs was elected Vice Chair of the American Bar Association’s Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice.

Phil Gordon reports: I’m still actively (but not quite as actively as in the past) involved in the hotels and leisure (mostly) and private equity (less) practices at Perkins Coie LLP in Chicago. Ten grandchildren keep me working (luckily eight of them in the Chicago area) to assist in their endeavors. When the sun shines, I head off to the course to continue my pursuit of the Royal and Ancient game, to little avail I confess. Invitations gladly accepted and issued to hack around with contemporaries who don’t take the game seriously. It’s a great life but growing old is not for the faint of heart. Next year at St. Andrews!!
A Career Devoted to Fighting Discrimination

Marjorie Gelb, ’70, battled against discriminatory practices throughout her legal career, beginning at the Law School when she was part of a group of students that sought to prohibit law firms that discriminated against women from recruiting at the Law School.

Having carefully studied civil rights legislation in her classes and worked a summer at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, she concluded that the Law School could be considered an employment agency under the terms of Title VII, and that it therefore had a duty to prohibit discriminatory firms from interviewing on campus. She and her classmates filed an administrative charge with the EEOC. The commission’s regional office agreed with Gelb’s assessment, but that finding was later overturned by the national EEOC office. In 1974, a federal court agreed that the Law School was an employment agency, but it refused to require the Law School to bar discriminatory firms.

“I had been involved in civil rights causes since high school, and I had good instincts about what things the law could and should protect,” Gelb recalled. “It never had even occurred to me that somehow a woman shouldn’t have all the employment opportunities available to men. Despite my disappointment with some of the ways that the Law School handled that issue, my overall experience there was great. It built a firm foundation under my instincts and gave me the tools to create persuasive legal arguments.”

A year after she graduated, Gelb and her husband, Mark Aaronson, ’69, headed for California, settling in Oakland. Over the next eight years, she fought against discrimination at legal services organizations that included the Legal Aid Society of Alameda County and the Employment Law Center. “As California enacted punitive welfare legislation in those years, I found myself doing a lot of work related to injustice in public assistance programs, with some satisfying outcomes,” she recalled. “That’s another debt I owe to the Law School, which permitted me to take a great course in welfare law at the School of Social Work.”

From 1980 until 1985, as general counsel and then special counsel at the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing, she supervised important cases and worked diligently to disseminate knowledge and raise practice standards, speaking frequently before lawyers’ groups and interested parties, teaching classes at two Bay Area law schools, and publishing articles. “We had very strong civil rights legislation in California, stronger than Title VII in some ways, but too many people just didn’t know how our law worked,” she recalled. “Educating was a vital part of my job, and something I really liked to do.”

She served the City of Berkeley for 18 years as an assistant city attorney, as chief counsel to the city’s rent stabilization board, and as executive director of the rent stabilization board. “Berkeley was a progressive city with strong protections for tenants, and we made sure that they were enforced and that they remained strong,” she said.

After retiring from the city, she sustained a legal practice for some years, principally as a mediator. “I found real satisfaction in that mediator role, but after my third grandchild was born I found it even more satisfying to focus on the grandkids and my other interests,” she said.

Her other interests have included writing a published cookbook, The Lazy Gourmet, with one of her two daughters; mastering French (she takes classes and is in a French-speaking book club); and serving as correspondent for her Law School class. There are three grandchildren now, all living within five miles of Gelb and her husband. He has been on the faculty at UC Hastings College of the Law since 1992, created the clinical legal program there, and has a distinguished career as a civil rights and antipoverty lawyer and a prolific author.

“I was blessed with a career filled with satisfying work, for which I can thank the Law School,” she said. “I have a wonderful life with my husband, who I met at the Law School, and we have great children and spectacular grandchildren. I am so grateful for all of it.”
Success that Grew From Extraordinary Mentors

Gary Edson, ’82, has been a leader at the highest levels of the business, government, and nonprofit sectors—often at the intersection of all three of those sectors.

“\text{My career looks like a Jackson Pollock painting,}” Edson said. “\text{It’s far from linear. But the unifying thread is the presence of extraordinary colleagues and mentors who helped me make the most of the opportunities that were presented to me.}”

An early mentor was Kenneth Dam, ’57, who is now the Max Pam Professor Emeritus of American & Foreign Law. Edson had taken classes from Dam at the Law School, and when Dam was appointed deputy secretary of state in 1982, he invited Edson to become his special assistant, a role Edson held for three years. “\text{Kenn made that experience a three-year seminar for me on government and foreign affairs, from trade agreements to arms control,}” Edson recalled. “\text{He taught me to weigh the options, build consensus, act decisively, and remain true to your principles. If I could have half the career Ken has had, I’d consider myself successful.}”

Returning to Chicago, Edson took a job with real estate and investment tycoon Sam Zell. “\text{Going from George Shultz’s State Department to Sam Zell’s entrepreneurial world was quite a change,}” he said, “\text{but Sam gave me the opportunity to acquire hands-on deal-making skills that served me well in my later government roles.}”

The only time Edson practiced law was when he served as general counsel to US Trade Representative Carla Hills, though he says that job was “\text{more about negotiating deals than litigating cases.}” Nonetheless, he credits his Law School education with preparing him for his diverse career: “\text{Thinking critically, writing persuasively, analyzing different sides of an issue—those were skills I acquired in the Law School,}” he said.

After Edson helped George W. Bush prepare for the 2000 presidential debates, Bush asked him to fill a newly created dual role as both deputy national security advisor and deputy national economic advisor. He was also deputy assistant to the president for international economic affairs, and the president’s chief negotiator for the G8 and other summits of world leaders. “\text{There are far more good titles than good jobs in Washington,}” Edson said. “\text{I had more than my share of the former, and was lucky enough to have several of the latter.}”

In his White House role, Edson conceived and established the multibillion-dollar Millennium Challenge Corporation to fight global poverty; co-led the development of the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the largest commitment ever by any nation to combat a single disease; and launched initiatives on human trafficking and Africa peacekeeping. He also helped coordinate the crackdown on terrorist finance after 9/11, which allowed him to work once again with Kenneth Dam, who was then deputy secretary of the treasury. While his work earned praise from people ranging from Bono to former Secretary of State James A. Baker III, Edson credits others: “\text{Everything was a team effort. I was blessed with talented colleagues and mentors, such as Condi Rice, who encouraged us think big and act boldly.}”

After helping the president get reelected, Edson was forced to leave government due to a serious illness. Upon recovering, he found new challenges in the nonprofit sector. He served as CEO of the Clinton Bush Haiti Fund, helping Haiti rebuild after the devastating 2010 earthquake, and later became president of Conservation International. Today, he’s focusing on education, jobs, and other domestic issues as a principal at Civic Enterprises, a public policy and strategy firm. He is also an affiliate partner at the private equity firm Lindsay Goldberg LLC, and a founding board member of Pink Ribbon Red Ribbon, the premier global partnership fighting women’s cancers in Africa.

“I’m excited about what I’m doing now,” he said. “\text{I’ve learned from some great mentors that you should never be looking for your next job, but you should always keep an eye open for your next mission.}”

Helen Toor extends “Greetings all! I celebrated a birthday last July by hiking the Tour du Mont Blanc, a 10-day hike in the French, Italian, and Swiss Alps. I highly recommend it for a chance to see spectacular mountains, meet hikers from all over the world, and get in great shape while eating as much cheese as you want! If any of you pass through Vermont, please get in touch.” If you want a wonderful photograph of Helen from the mountaintops, be sure to ask. I am sorry we can’t reprint it here.

Back here in Chapel Hill, I can’t say it’s been boring. Besides the close presidential race, North Carolina was home to several other intensely close contests. Our governor’s race extended beyond Election Day; political (and other) fallout ensued from the state legislature’s enactment of a controversial law restricting how people may use bathrooms; and, shortly after the incumbent conceded, the state legislature enacted several new laws, which he signed, stripping the incoming governor of several powers and restructuring both the educational and electoral systems of the state. Litigation involving many of these actions, as well as a previously filed lawsuit.
A Career of Leadership, Service, and Advocacy

Since 2011, Nancy Rodkin Rotering, ’90, has been the mayor of Highland Park, Illinois. The position is the current culmination of decades of leadership, service, and advocacy—with more certainly to come.

At the Law School, where she was honored with the Ann Watson Barber Outstanding Service Award, she joined with Professor Richard Epstein to create a healthcare law course, and she founded and led the Health Law Society. Even before coming to the Law School, she had been drawn to healthcare issues, exploring them as an undergraduate at Stanford and making them the focus of the MBA she earned at Northwestern. She worked at the Mayo Clinic and then as a health benefits analyst at General Motors after earning her MBA.

Following law school, she worked for eight years in the healthcare practice of McDermott, Will & Emery. During that time, her advocacy took on an additional, more personal dimension when her young son was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. When he entered school, she was concerned by the lack of school-based medical care for children with chronic diseases, and she fought for better services, including helping to draft state legislation allowing non-nursing school staff to provide day-to-day care. She joined the family advisory board of what is now Lurie Children’s Hospital, served on the board of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, and worked alongside other families seeking better care for their children.

“I was applying so many things I had learned at the Law School,” she recalled. “Giving a voice to those who didn’t have one, finding ways to make things better, and standing up for what I knew was the right thing to do. Those things might not be explicitly in the curriculum, but they are at the core of the Law School’s special culture—expecting all of us to contribute as much as we can in the best ways we can find.”

In 2005, she was appointed to Highland Park’s environmental commission, where among other things she founded and led an education program that taught environmental awareness and advocacy skills to more than 5,000 young students. In 2006, she joined the city’s plan commission. Her effective lobbying of state officials regarding healthcare and other issues so impressed her local state representative, Karen May, that May asked Rotering to join her staff, where Rotering served for more than two and a half years as a legislative aide.

She entered elective politics in 2009, defeating three incumbents to win a seat on the Highland Park city council. “I felt that a new voice was needed, and the voters agreed with me,” she said. When she ran for mayor two years later, her campaign slogan promised that she would be “your voice at City Hall.”

In addition to her mayoral duties, she led the creation in 2015 of the Highland Park–Highwood Legal Aid Clinic. She’s now a board member of that clinic, where more than 80 volunteer attorneys have helped more than 200 clients with issues related to housing, immigration, and domestic abuse. Sustaining her focus on healthcare, she’s now a board member at the Lurie Children’s Hospital Foundation, Planned Parenthood of Illinois, and the Highland Park Healthcare Foundation.

She has four children with her husband, Robert Rotering, whom she married while she was in law school. “I did everything I could think of at the Law School, from moot court to organizing a talent show to serving on the LSA. And everything I did came back to me threefold in learning, friendships, confidence, and an even stronger commitment to making positive change,” she said. “One of the highlights of my life was when Abner Mikva—who graduated from the Law School, taught at the Law School, and was one of the greatest public servants this country has ever known—endorsed me last year for US Congress. The photo I have of him wearing my campaign pin at his 90th birthday party will always sit on my desk, as a reminder of what the Law School means and as an inspiration to the highest level of public service I can provide.”
“Lift Yourself Up, Lift Up Someone Else”

On a sunny morning in 2007, just a few years after he had graduated from the Law School, Jason Goitia, ’03, experienced double vision.

“It actually happened during an interview with Goldman Sachs, for a job I really wanted,” Goitia recalled.

He got the job, but the double vision led within a few months to a diagnosis of multiple sclerosis. Today, with an undaunted spirit, he deals with many challenging symptoms that include diminished vision, speech difficulties, and impaired coordination that requires him to use a walker to get around.

Now working for the National Organic Program at the US Department of Agriculture, where he’s been since 2012, he has also committed himself to helping others with disabilities.

“I always thought of myself as an empathetic person, but now I have a very real understanding of the struggles life can involve, even just to walk down a hallway,” he said. He chaired the Lawyers with Disabilities Involvement subcommittee of the Diversity and Inclusion Committee of the ABA Business Law Section, and he serves on the executive board of the National Association of Attorneys with Disabilities (NAAD), which advocates for opportunity, integration, and career advancement for attorneys with disabilities.

“A quote from Booker T. Washington has meant a lot to me after I was diagnosed with MS,” Goitia said. “‘If you want to lift yourself up, lift up someone else.’ I have been helped and supported by so many people—family, friends, coworkers, supervisors, and professional peers—that I want to keep giving back. Without having understanding allies in this battle, life would be so much harder.”

He counts many classmates from the Law School among his most supportive friends. “That was one of the best things about law school for me, the lifelong relationships that started there,” he said. He’s on the board of the University of Chicago’s Latino Alumni Network and serves as a liaison for DC-area activities.

“Another invaluable thing I got from my great education at the Law School was the ability to analyze and solve problems,” he noted. “I use those skills every day in my job, and in other roles I’ve been fortunate enough to have.”

One of those roles was as the Diplomat of the ABA’s Business Law Section, where his responsibilities included encouraging the participation of diverse lawyers in the section’s activities, providing a springboard to leadership opportunities, and developing future leaders of the section. He also served on the eLawyering Task Force of the ABA’s Law Practice Division (he created his own virtual practice in 2010, and it was named as one of eight of the most innovative practices of that type).

“My experiences with the ABA and NAAD have been amazing—sitting at the table with some of the best minds in our profession and becoming part of networks where I’m just a phone call or email away from getting advice or assistance from a leading expert whenever I need it,” he said. “Add my Law School friends to that, and it’s just an incredible array of talent and wisdom for me to call on.”

Regarding the future, he said: “You never stop trying to achieve the best you can from life, as you also hope for a miracle. There’s a quote that really hit me when I first read it, something that Einstein said: ‘Out of clutter, find simplicity. From discord, find harmony. In the middle of difficulty lies opportunity.’ That sums things up for me, along with one other quote, from a John Lennon lyric: ‘Life is what happens to you while you’re busy making other plans.”’

Ilya Shapiro has been traveling frequently to Chicago, but finally managed to find his way back to our alma mater in Hyde Park to speak at a Legal Forum symposium, where he and Professor Epstein “did a pro-Lochner tag team.” Ilya was amazed to find the neighborhood transformed: “Not only is there now a hotel on 53rd Street, but there are even a few restaurants/lounges where you can take a date! But wait, there’s more: in an incredible stroke of luck, my visit coincided with game 7 of the World Series; I only lasted till about 1 a.m. in Wrigleyville, leaving a group of current students to party it up the rest of the night. It gives me hope that the Leafs will break their 50-year Stanley Cup drought at some point in the next 58 years.” (As a lifelong Red Wings devotee, your correspondent was somewhat skeptical of the Maple Leafs pulling that off.)

On the home front, your correspondent is pleased to announce the birth of a third baby girl, Nina, this past November. Nina joins her big sisters Emma (5) and Mia (2) in pursuant of their goal of total father domination, which, in all honesty, I wouldn’t have any other way.

That’s it for this edition of the notes. Until next time, sayonara!
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I was very happy that so many of you responded to my last email. Grenfel Calheiros writes that he is still living in with his family as a resident partner of Simpson Thatcher’s Brazil office. Thanks, Grenfel, for dropping a line. Mary Mahler is still in Chicago and working at Northwestern with their LLM students. Her children are now 10, 8, and 6 and all at school. Mary spent Christmas back home in Australia visiting her family. Jimmy Hsu is enjoying his work at the Institute of Law at Academia Sinica. He holds the position of Associate Research Professor. During the academic year 2016–2017 Jimmy has been and will be at Harvard University as a Harvard Yenching Visiting Scholar. Congratulations! His two children, a boy and a girl, are now in sixth grade and in third grade respectively. His wife
Building a Business that Supports African Ventures

In 2014, Euler Bropleh, ’08, founded VestedWorld, a company based on a business model he began formulating while he was at the Law School. VestedWorld is a venture capital fund that allows investors to invest in carefully screened early-stage companies in Africa.

Helping African companies grow was an appealing business concept for Bropleh, whose family escaped civil war in Liberia and came to the United States when he was nine years old.

“As a kid, I saw these differences between the United States and various African countries, and I wondered why they were so great,” he said. “I wanted to make a difference in my homeland.”

At first, Bropleh thought politics would be his path for contributing toward improvements. “I imagined myself going back and becoming president of Liberia,” he recalled.

At the Law School, he attended a talk by one of the founders of Kiva, a nonprofit that crowdsources small loans for microenterprises in developing countries. If the business succeeds, Kiva’s donors recoup their principal but do not realize any additional financial returns.

“I loved how Kiva engaged nearly a million people in supporting thousands of small businesses, and I was learning how successful businesses can strengthen the overall social fabric of a community or a country,” he said. “I put my Chicago hat on and wondered how much more good might be accomplished if investing in emerging companies was incentivized by real profits for the investors.”

For a Law School class, he developed a business plan for the enterprise he had in mind. “My professor, John Rodkin, said he thought it was a great idea, and he encouraged us to pursue it,” he remembered. “But there was one big problem—regulatory requirements at that time prohibited the creation of such a company.”

He joined Latham & Watkins after graduation, specializing in corporate transactions. In 2011 he married his Law School classmate Ebba Gebisa, whose family is from Ethiopia. In 2012, when they were both working in Hong Kong (she is an associate at Skadden Arps, focused on corporate restructuring), seeing booming Asian economies reignited his desire to support African ventures. The timing was now right—the new JOBS Act had removed the regulatory constraints.

Today, VestedWorld and its investors have invested in six African companies, in four different countries. VestedWorld and its team of advisors scrutinize risks and assess potential returns. “Right now, there are more promising opportunities than we can fund,” Bropleh said. “We started relatively small on purpose, but I look at what David Rubenstein [’73] has achieved with the Carlyle Group and I’m inspired by that. I want VestedWorld to be one of the best venture funds focused on developing countries.” And they’re on their way: VestedWorld is in the process of raising a $25 million fund.

His contributions to the life of the Law School, as president of the Black Law Students Association and in many other roles, earned Bropleh the Ann Watson Barber Outstanding Service Award.

“The Law School has helped me in so many ways,” he said. “It reaffirmed my conviction that a healthy private sector can drive positive change throughout a society, and supported my specific idea for helping that happen. I made many great friendships, not to mention meeting the love of my life. Several Law School alumni are among our investors, and students at the Innovation Clinic help us evaluate opportunities. Also, coming to the Law School with views that were more left-leaning than those of many of my classmates, I learned how to listen better, consider other points of view, and state my own convictions more persuasively, all of which have helped me with running VestedWorld.”

Bropleh has a favorite question that he and his team often ask when interviewing the leaders of companies they are thinking of funding: If you weren’t doing this, what would you be doing?

“For me, the answer to that question is easy,” he said. “If I weren’t doing VestedWorld, I’d be doing something exactly like it. And I hope to be doing it for a very long time.”
A Passion for Justice Helps Clients Win Clemency

Last March, President Obama commuted the federal prison sentences of 61 people. Three of those were clients of a project supervised in part by Italia Patti, ’14. That wasn’t all: in December, a fourth client joined that list when Obama commuted his sentence, too.

From 2014 to 2016, Patti was the Justice Franklin D. Cleckley Fellow at the West Virginia Innocence Project at the West Virginia University College of Law. As part of that role, she supervised clinic students who assisted prisoners with clemency requests through Clemency Project 2014, a federal program to expedite clemency reviews for inmates who likely would have received shorter sentences today, and who meet other criteria, including having served more than ten years and having no history of violence in or out of prison. Patti and the clinic students also handled wrongful convictions and other matters.

Patti, whose work was overseen by Valena Beety, ’06, chair of the West Virginia Innocence Project and deputy director of WVU’s clinical law program, was the second of three Law School students to receive the Cleckley Fellowship. The fellowship is a partnership between the Law School and the WVU School of Law that is funded in part by a generous donation from William Von Hoene, ’80, and his wife Nikki, through the Charlotte Von Hoene Fellowship Fund.

“The Cleckley Fellowship provided me with an incredible experience, far beyond what a new graduate could reasonably hope for in most other situations,” Patti said.

Patti manifested a passion for justice before she attended the Law School. As a University of Chicago undergraduate, she held a human rights internship and tutored Chicago youth. Her commitment to social justice and her interest in becoming a lawyer were fueled by social justice and her interest in becoming a lawyer were fueled by American Law and the Rhetoric of Race,” taught by Dennis Hutchinson, who is the William Rainey Harper Professor in the College and a senior lecturer in the Law School.

After graduating from the College, she worked for two and a half years as a paralegal at Loevy & Loevy, where she supported the Exoneration Project and assisted with other civil rights cases, including class action lawsuits challenging unconstitutional police practices and unconstitutional conditions of confinement.

While at the Law School, her summer jobs included work with LAF, the largest provider of legal aid in Cook County; Cabrini Green Legal Aid; and the Public Defender Service in Washington, DC. With the Civil Rights and Police Accountability Project of the Mandel Legal Aid Clinic, she and another clinic student, Saul Cohen, ’14, presented the oral arguments before an Illinois appeals court panel that ruled in favor of their client, declaring that the public should have access to Chicago Police Department records of officer misconduct.

“Saul and I worked on that case for two years, and before us, previous clinic students had worked on it since 2009, so getting that outcome was a huge thrill,” she said. “Craig Futterman made it all possible. He was a phenomenal teacher and mentor, and he’s still an inspiration and a role model for me.”

Patti, who is now clerking for Judge Karen Nelson Moore at the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, met her husband, Seth Mayer, while they were undergraduates. They both majored in philosophy, and Mayer, who earned a PhD at Northwestern while Patti was at the Law School, is now a tenure-track faculty member at Manchester University in Indiana. They jointly authored a 2015 law review article, “Beyond the Numbers: Toward a Moral Vision for Criminal Justice Reform.”

“The College and the Law School were all I had hoped for and more,” Patti said. “I expected a rigorous education in an environment where ideas and action were both highly valued, and I got that. What I hadn’t fully expected was how much fun I would have and how many strong relationships I would form—friendships that I believe will continue for many years. Chicago was an exceptional experience, for which I am very grateful.”

January with Matheson (the firm he works for in Dublin) and also to NYC in late February (22 Feb) if anyone can meet him to catch up. Peter Klormann told that after passing the Second State Exam, in early 2017, Sarah and he will finally start their careers as associates in Frankfurt, Sarah with Gleiss Lutz and Peter for Sullivan & Cromwell. Before their first day in the office, the couple will travel to Mexico and Cuba in January to see some good LLM friends in Mexico City. Fanis Krallalis is an Associate at MoraitisPassas Law Firm in Athens, Greece. Olivier M. Van Wouwe will change firms and will start at White & Case LLP ( Brussels) as of January 2017,; he also attended Felipe de Castro Prado’s wedding in Trancoso (Brazil) together with Gert-Jan Hendrix, Melissa Erdogdu, Jorge Kou, and Clara Cruz.
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Hope everyone has been having a great 2017! Here are your class updates.

Logan Anderson sent warm greetings from São Paulo, Brazil where he is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Loop Luncheon, featuring Professor Anthony J. Casey, ’02 presenting on “The Short Happy Life of Rules and Standards”</td>
<td>The Standard Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Highlights Tour</td>
<td>Art Institute of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Alumni Clerkship Reception</td>
<td>McCormick &amp; Schmick’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>All-Alumni Wine Mess</td>
<td>Museum of Contemporary Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Class of 1967 50th Reunion Kickoff Dinner</td>
<td>The Fortnightly of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8:30</td>
<td>APALSA, BLSA, LLSA, OutLaw &amp; SALSA Networking Reception</td>
<td>Museum of Contemporary Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-10:30</td>
<td>LLM Alumni Dinner with Associate Dean Richard Badger, ’68</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Coffee + Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-11 a.m.</td>
<td>A Law School Colloquy with Dean Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.-12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Greenberg Seminars: A Faculty Masterclass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Feed your intellect on Conspiracy Theories or Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-2 p.m.</td>
<td>Law Journals Open House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3 p.m.</td>
<td>Class of 1967 Panel Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3 p.m.</td>
<td>Behind-the-Scenes: UChicago Library Tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3 p.m.</td>
<td>Campus Bus Tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Reunion Committee Reception (by invitation only)</td>
<td>Joe’s Seafood and Stone Crab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Reunion Class Dinners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.-Noon</td>
<td>Alumni Brunch @ Signature Room at the 95th John Hancock Center</td>
<td>875 North Michigan Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All alumni are encouraged to join us for Reunion Weekend! For the most up-to-date schedule and to register online, please visit: www.law.uchicago.edu/reunion