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Message from the Dean

Dear Alumni and Friends:

There are few things more satisfying than a good book, particularly ones that offer new ways to think about the world in which we live. In the past several months, I’ve had the pleasure of reading a number of extraordinary works by my colleagues, ones aimed not only at other academics but at general readers interested in the ways in which law and society intersect. Many of our faculty, after all, are frequent authors who draw on interdisciplinary expertise to examine current and historical events, propose novel ideas, and explain complex legal issues. Writing is part of our work as scholars, and the vigorous testing of ideas is part of our culture. The result is a steady stream of compelling material meant to offer insight and inspire conversation about issues that affect our families, communities, and nation.

Among the recent releases is Justin Driver’s The Schoolhouse Gate, which traces decades of Supreme Court rulings to examine how the law has shaped public education—and how schools have become a flashpoint for our larger cultural conflicts. The public school, Justin argues, is the “single most significant site of constitutional interpretation within the nation’s history,” and it is an area of jurisprudence that affects millions of Americans. In How to Save a Constitutional Democracy, Tom Ginsburg and Aziz Huq explore the structure, decline, and preservation of democracy, not just in the United States but around the world, and in Outsourcing the Board, Todd Henderson explores the benefits of outsourcing corporate governance. Other recent faculty books have included Martha Nussbaum’s The Monarchy of Fear, which examines the role of emotion in the aftermath of the 2016 election; Eric Posner’s Last Resort, which argues for expanded government bailout powers; and Radical Markets, a book by Posner and co-author E. Glen Weyl that offers five proposals aimed at using the free market to reinvigorate democracy. We’ve included articles about each of these books in this issue. In some cases, longer versions of the article as well as links to media coverage and book reviews can be found on the Law School’s website. These books are just a sampling of the spectacular intellectual energy and influence of our faculty.

As we embark on another academic year, we also look back at some of the successes of our previous one, including our 2018 graduates, the Hinton Moot Court Competition, the inaugural James B. Parsons Legacy Dinner, and the Festschrift and conference held to celebrate Richard Epstein’s 50 years in the academy. I remain proud, as always, of the contributions made by both our faculty and students. I hope you will join me in celebrating them.

Warmly,

Thomas J. Miles
THE CONSTITUTION GOES TO SCHOOL
In a New Book, Professor Justin Driver Explores How Education Law Became a Cultural Flashpoint
By Becky Beaupre Gillespie
Professor Justin Driver’s new book was either four years or three decades in the making, depending how you count it.

There are the recent years he spent researching and writing The Schoolhouse Gate: Public Education, the Supreme Court, and the Battle for the American Mind (Pantheon Books). And then there is the lifetime of personal experiences and scholarly endeavors that triggered his inquiry, providing myriad vantage points that inspired him, again and again, to consider how the law shapes public schools.

Driver is, at once, the public school student whose dad slept part of a night in his car outside a school so he could be among the first in line to enroll his son in an out-of-district junior high, and he’s the young man who spent a year teaching high school in Durham, North Carolina. He’s the Supreme Court clerk who watched his boss, Justice Stephen Breyer, wrestle with cases that shaped the legacies of two of America’s most momentous education decisions, and he’s the graduate student at Oxford University who examined school-funding disparities. He’s a scholar of constitutional law, one who developed a Law School class called The Constitution Goes to School, and he’s the father to two young children.

“I’ve been inexorably drawn to these concepts over the years,” said Driver, the Harry N. Wyatt Professor of Law. “This book represents the culmination of years of thinking.”

Driver grew up in a predominantly black neighborhood in Southeast Washington, DC, with parents who were determined to give Driver and his older brother the tools they needed to succeed academically. For years Driver commuted to a more affluent school on the opposite side of the city, taking a bus and two subway lines and then walking nearly a mile—a trek that gave him time to think about equality, education, and opportunity.

Not everyone, he knew, had parents like his.

Over the years, he also realized this: millions are shaped for better or worse by their early educational experiences—making the public school “the single most significant site of constitutional interpretation within the nation’s history.”

“No other arena of constitutional decision making—not churches, not hotels, not hospitals, not restaurants, not police stations, not military bases, not automobiles, not even homes—comes close to matching the cultural import of the Supreme Court’s jurisprudence governing public schools,” he wrote in The Schoolhouse Gate.

Part of it comes down to sheer size: most Americans are required to attend school, and few have options beyond public education.

“It is the first sustained exposure that most citizens have to a governmental entity,” Driver said. “These early encounters with the government play a foundational role in shaping attitudes that students will have with them for the rest of their days.”

Although Driver includes plenty of legal analysis, The Schoolhouse Gate is, at its core, a story about people. It’s about the children and families whose experiences led them to the center of precedent-setting cases—individuals like John and Mary Beth Tinker, who fought for their right to express a political belief by wearing black armbands to school; or Gavin Grimm, who fought to use the bathroom that matched his gender identity (an issue that still has not been resolved); or Oliver Brown, who fought to send his daughter Linda to the all-white school that was just seven blocks from their house. It is
also about—and for—the people who make up one of the book’s most important audiences: the millions of students, parents, and teachers whose lives are affected each day by the laws that govern their schools.

“I was aiming for a stimulating work of constitutional law that is also accessible to the people who confront these questions on the front lines—sophisticated students, parents, teachers, and administrators,” he said. “Many people who work in the educational profession are aware that constitutional principles inform what they do, but they might have only a vague understanding of the actual conflict that led to the rule and even the rule itself.”

Over more than 400 pages, Driver unpacks decades of history, examining broader messages about inequality, cultural anxiety, and the ways in which education law mirrors America’s broader scuffle with civil liberties. In the past century, the Supreme Court has considered public education cases dealing with religion, patriotism, free speech, due process, search and seizure, racial segregation, gender discrimination, unauthorized immigration, corporal punishment, random drug testing, funding disparities, transgender bathroom rights, and more.

“The public school has become a major flashpoint for the larger cultural conflicts that pervade our society,” Driver said.

At points, he questions cherished narratives—wondering, for instance, whether the mission to achieve unanimity in Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 hindered future efforts to address persistent racial isolation in urban school districts, particularly in northern cities like Chicago. He also challenges the idea that the Supreme Court tends to follow the predominant views of the American public, pointing to the 1962 ban on teacher-led prayer in Engel v. Vitale, which drew widespread public rebuke, and even the much-lauded Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, a landmark 1969 ruling that affirmed students’ right to engage in symbolic antiwar speech. Like Brown, Tinker has inspired decades of adulation: its 7–2 ruling was widely praised in the media, and the case ultimately paved the way for modern student protests like the 2018 anti-gun violence walkouts that took place in schools across the country.

But it was Justice Hugo Black’s vehement dissent that, in retrospect, most likely offered the better barometer of public opinion, Driver said. Although some dismissed Black’s view as an outlier perspective, it seems to have reflected “a deep wellspring of cultural anxiety” that schools would lose control of their students, Driver said, noting that several subsequent cases—including Morse v. Frederick, which allowed the suppression of speech that promoted drug use, and Bethel v. Fraser, which allowed the suppression of sexually suggestive language—limited Tinker’s reach. For some, those cases were a relief and an overdue restoration of schoolhouse order.

Throughout the book, Driver examines the interplay between education law and public sentiment, tracing a meticulous history from one case to the next through public polling data, newspaper editorials and opinion columns, scholarly analysis, and other contemporary...
reports that offer insight into how each case fit its era.

The pictures he paints are rich and multilayered. They are rife with public misunderstandings about the Supreme Court’s intent—Engel v. Vitale, for instance, didn’t prevent students from praying on their own, and Goss v. Lopez didn’t provide procedural protections more elaborate than simple hearings. He chronicles the complex tangle of fears that has driven public debate over discipline and safety—describing, for instance, how school shootings have stoked support for increasingly invasive searches of students and their property—and he discusses close decisions that, had the timing or other details been slightly different, could have shifted the entire trajectory of education law.

“When you situate a case in the historical context, you can better understand what outcomes were plausible,” Driver said. “I don’t believe that Supreme Court justices operate completely outside of society, but unlike many of my fellow law professors, I believe that there’s a much, much larger plausible range of outcomes on particular decisions rather than assuming, ‘Of course the justices have to decide this way because they were born in this era.’”

Driver takes a normative approach, heralding the bravery of families whose cases fomented change and celebrating many of the rulings that validated students’ rights. The book, in fact, draws its name from Justice Abe Fortas’s famous line in Tinker: “It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights . . . at the schoolhouse gate.”

But Driver also laments what he sees as the Court’s shortcomings, pointing to rulings that have upheld corporal punishment, suspicionless drug testing, searches without probable cause, and the suppression of certain types of speech.

These failures, he argues, have enormous reach.

**Fine Lines and Deep Impact**

It was Justice Breyer who hammered home for Driver just how deeply the Court touches American lives when it interprets the constitutional condition of public schools.

By 2006, Driver had already given both education and law more than a decade of serious thought. He’d worked as an undergraduate research assistant for a history professor who was writing a book on the legacy of Brown v. Board of Education, and he’d spent a year teaching high school civics and American history in North Carolina. As a Marshall Scholar at Oxford, he’d studied the history of school-financing disparities with a focus on the 1973 Supreme Court case San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez. He’d earned a law degree and had clerked for Judge Merrick Garland of the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit.
But it was during the 2006 term with Breyer that Driver witnessed two pivotal students’ rights decisions: Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School Dist. No. 1, which invalidated voluntary school integration programs in Seattle and Louisville, and Morse v. Frederick, which affirmed a school’s decision to suppress speech that promoted illegal drug use (in this case, a student sign that read “BONG HITS 4 JESUS”). Both cases grappled with powerful legacies: The Frederick decision limited Tinker’s scope, one of several rulings that found exceptions to students’ free speech protections. Parents Involved forced the Court to confront one of the lingering questions that emerged in the years after Brown: whether school districts could employ measures designed to counter racially imbalanced schools.

Breyer spent “enormous amounts of time and energy” on both cases—and Driver took note.

“Justice Breyer has stated publicly that he thought the Parents Involved case was the single most important dissent that he’s written in his close to 25 years on the Supreme Court—and it was clear that he felt passionately about that case,” Driver said. “He spoke from the bench for 20 minutes announcing his dissent, which of course signals vehement disagreement.”

Breyer disagreed with Chief Justice John Roberts’s color-blind reading of Brown—the idea that its precedent prohibited any racial classification, including to achieve balanced school assignments—and worried that the Court had taken from schools a critical tool aimed at combating racial isolation. The consequences would be far-reaching, Breyer said, proclaiming from the bench: “It is not often in the law that so few have so quickly changed so much.”

The stakes were clear to Driver: Education law shapes entire communities by influencing how the youngest members learn to share ideas and view authority, whether they interact with diverse peers or have access to life-changing opportunities, and in some cases whether they attend school at all.

Plyler v. Doe established that unauthorized immigrants have the right to attend school—and Wisconsin v. Yoder established that Amish children had the right not to attend school after the eighth grade. Goss v. Lopez provided basic procedural protections for students facing suspension, and—in a case Driver would relish seeing reversed—Ingraham v. Wright permitted schools to inflict corporal punishment.

“The idea that the Eighth Amendment has no purchase within the schoolhouse gate strikes me as quite wrongheaded and deeply in need of revisiting.”

—Justin Driver

Brown arguably helped set the stage for the next six decades of race relations in America.

In his discussion of the case, Driver devotes time to one aspect in particular: “I do have some skepticism about whether the unanimity of the opinion deserves to be as widely celebrated as it is,” he said.

Specifically, he wonders if Chief Justice Earl Warren could have written a “more muscular opinion”—perhaps a stronger condemnation of Jim Crow laws and a more emphatic stance against segregation—had he not needed to accommodate Justice Stanley Reed, who had been initially opposed. A stronger Brown, he argues, might have limited efforts to minimize the decision’s impact—and it might have opened greater opportunities for successful racial integration.

The frustration in considering what might have been, of course, is that “might have” was, in some cases, a fairly close call.

Driver can easily imagine, for instance, a different
outcome in *Rodriguez*, the funding disparity case he studied at Oxford. The case centered on the constitutionality of the San Antonio Independent School District’s financing system, which allocated funds according to local property tax revenue—in effect providing better school resources in richer communities. The petitioner claimed that the plan violated the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause, and the Court disagreed in a 5–4 vote. Had the decision arrived just a few years earlier—at the tail end of the left-leaning Warren Court instead of during Chief Justice Warren Burger’s Court in 1973—the outcome might well have been flipped, Driver said.

Of course, he thinks the same could be true of *Plyler v. Doe*, the 1982 decision that upheld the rights of unauthorized immigrants to attend school. Driver can imagine today’s Court deciding otherwise.

“I’m struck by the contingency of constitutional interpretation in this area,” Driver said. “It is quite plausible to believe that several momentous cases could have been decided the other way.”

### Real Experiences, Real Lives

Driver can also imagine a different outcome in a far more personal episode, one that sometimes causes him to think about Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr.’s dissent in *Goss v. Lopez*, the 1975 case that recognized the right to a brief hearing before suspension.

Powell derided the “frustrating formalities” of due process, criticizing the Court’s interference in school procedure and claiming that the vast majority of students viewed suspension as “a welcome holiday” free of lasting consequence.

Driver doesn’t quite see it that way. Nor did he see it that way in the ninth grade, when a youthful transgression—drinking with friends on an overnight field trip—earned him a three-day suspension. The experience was searing. It was the sort in which every detail etches a permanent spot on the brain: the long walk to the principal’s office, the tears, the burning shame.

It was not in any sense a “welcome holiday.”

But it could have been worse: it could have happened a decade later, after the rise of zero-tolerance policies.

“Rather than being suspended for three days, I would have, I believe, been suspended for the rest of the school year,” Driver said. “Had that happened, it’s very difficult to imagine that I’d be sitting here at the University of Chicago.”

Driver worries about some of the trends that have emerged in recent years: the rise of police officers stationed in schools, which has led to excessive arrests, “too many of whom are racial minorities,” Driver said. He worries about rulings that have exempted schools from certain aspects of the Fourth Amendment ban on unreasonable search—most notably by allowing suspicionless drug testing and searches of student belongings, without probable cause, to find evidence of school-rule violations. He is concerned about the erosion of *Tinker*, which can diminish the quality of discourse that is essential to the educational experience.

“The school itself has often been an important site for exchanging ideas on the topic of the day,” Driver wrote. “The student-led protests supporting gun control legislation in response to the mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, in February 2018 are but the latest, high-profile examples of this longstanding trend.”

But his area of greatest concern is the continued practice of corporal punishment, which he calls “a relic from a bygone era.”

“The Court made a grave misstep when it said that the Eighth Amendment prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment in effect has no meaning within the school at all and that corporal punishment isn’t punishment because it doesn’t stem from a criminal conviction,” Driver said, referring to the 1977 ruling in *Ingraham v. Wright*. “The idea that the Eighth Amendment has no purchase within the schoolhouse gate strikes me as quite wrongheaded and deeply in need of revisiting.”

Reforms in these areas are possible regardless of the makeup of the Court, he added, pointing to state courts and legislative bodies as possible avenues for change.

Whatever form it takes, however, change will probably require the courage of individuals, people like the Tinkers or the Browns, who encountered fierce criticism and harrowing legal experiences.

“They were standing up not only to their schools, but they were also standing up to their communities,” Driver said.

It is a point that is easy to forget amid the legal analysis: each of these issues stemmed from the real experiences of real people, he said. It is an idea he hopes his readers more fully understand after reading his book.

“[E]ven if one disagrees with the underlying constitutional claims, it is often difficult not to admire the students and their families for being willing stand up for their understandings of the Constitution,” Driver wrote. “[D]etailing these concrete personal sacrifices underscores that many otherwise ordinary citizens have exhibited extraordinary valor to make enduring contributions to our constitutional order.”

---
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HOW TO SAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY

A Q&A with Professors Tom Ginsburg and Aziz Huq

Without the necessary tools, it is difficult to know whether a democracy is actually in peril. The question of democratic quality in the United States has come up more and more often since the 2016 election, and in their forthcoming book, How to Save a Constitutional Democracy, Tom Ginsburg, the Leo Spitz Professor of International Law and Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Research Scholar; and Aziz Huq, the Frank and Bernice J. Greenberg Professor of Law and Mark Claster Mamolen Teaching Scholar, provide the tools to help answer this question. Drawing from their expertise in constitutional design, federal courts and legislation, and comparative and international law, Huq and Ginsburg explore the structure, decline, and preservation of democracy, not just in the United States, but across the world. Earlier this summer, Claire Stamler-Goody, the Law School’s assistant director of communications, sat down with them to discuss their new book and ask just how close the United States is to losing its constitutional democracy.

Stamler-Goody: In the wake of Donald Trump’s election, many Americans began to question the state of democracy in their country, and these questions have persisted well into his presidency. What nuance do you hope your book will add to these conversations?

Huq: We set out to write a book about the more general phenomena, not just behind the 2016 election, but behind Brexit, the rise of autocratic populism in Eastern Europe, and events happening as far afield as in India, Japan, and Israel. We want to provide not just an academic reader, but also a general reader, with an understanding of the forces that have brought liberal democracies to this junction, as well as the role that law and constitutions play in that process.

Ginsburg: We’re also trying to step beyond the immediate day to day. Right now, the news cycle is extremely fast, and we’re hoping we’ve written a book that will endure and be useful in a lot of different contexts for many years.

Stamler-Goody: Why did you decide to write this book together?

Huq: We both have long-standing interests in domestic and international law and in comparative constitutional law. But really, I think the book is a product of the Law School’s culture of collaboration. It’s a product of thinking across disciplinary and subject-matter boundaries, and wanting to use the available tools to tackle whatever the hard problem of the day is.

Stamler-Goody: You resist the idea that democracy can be boiled down to just the presence of competitive elections, saying that freedom of speech and association, as well as integrity of the rule of law, are also required. How did you decide on this definition, and what are some things that happen when these qualities disappear?

Ginsburg: I think our contribution as lawyers is to recognize that democracy is legally constructed—it depends on a robust set of legal rights and legal institutions. So the rule of law is something we would naturally emphasize. In the recent rounds of constitutional backsliding, the tools used by authoritarians are legal in nature. It’s not a coup that ends democracy overnight or a break in the legal continuity. They are using tools that are already within the legal system.
Huq: There’s a very minimal definition of democracy associated with the scholar Adam Przeworski to the effect that, in a democracy, you don’t know who’s going to win before an election happens. I find that concept helpful. When the administrator of an election is in the pocket of the ruling party and is willing to corrupt the process of counting ballots to help that party, you’re not going to have a competitive election.

In terms of free speech and association, if you have a ruling party that essentially controls the media space and determines whose views are represented—and this was true in the recent Turkish elections—you may have an election that has some elements of competitiveness, but is not truly competitive. If you have a ruling party that locks up its leading competitors, as Daniel Ortega did in Nicaragua in 2016, you’re not going to have an election that before the fact was truly uncertain.

One of the fallacies that we hope this book dispels is that it’s easy to tell when a democracy has tipped over the edge. There’s actually a broad range of possible outcomes at the end of a democratic backsliding. You can have something that looks, superficially, a lot like a competitive democracy—in Hungary and Poland, for instance, their policies in some ways don’t look terribly different from those observed today in Austria or Germany. There isn’t one end state. There are a variety of different ways in which, as Tom said, laws and constitutions can be used to unravel democracies from within.

Stamler-Goody: You say that “the antidemocrat’s toolkit has become more sophisticated of late.” How so?

Ginsburg: In terms of constitutional design, democracies innovate and authoritarians copy. Authoritarians are sophisticated in that they are learning how to use democratic forms for undemocratic ends. Ten or 20 years ago, people were talking about the end of the Chinese Communist Party or China breaking apart. Instead, it’s become an extremely resilient, sophisticated governance operation that uses all available tools—technological, legal, political, and ideological—to sustain its rule.

Huq: One thing that populists have learned is that if you make the right set of changes to the judiciary, you can fundamentally undermine its effectiveness as a check on an elected entity that wants to entrench itself. An example of this comes from Hungary and Poland, where the populist parties running those two polities enacted constitutional amendments that subtly shifted the selection processes of their judiciaries. In other words, they’ve learned how to take the facially innocuous instruments of legislative and constitutional change and strategically deploy them to undermine the effectiveness of democratic competition.

Stamler-Goody: One of the mechanisms of democratic erosion that you discuss is charismatic populism, which you say is having a global renaissance. Why do you think that is?

Ginsburg: It might have something to do with the decline of traditional party structures. A big part of the story is that parties have grown out of touch, and that the technology of mass parties makes much less sense in an era where left-right distinctions are changing. Whenever you have a changing party system, you have an opportunity for something to fill the void. The populists have come in, in many cases all over the world, to tell people that the reason they have less control over their lives is because of some nefarious globalist elite. Charismatic populists will put themselves forward as the cure for that. Emphasizing this sort of unity of the people can be pretty dangerous, even though we recognize that it’s grounded in a genuine need for accountability.

Stamler-Goody: You say that there is a tension in constitutional design between addressing the risk of erosion and pursuing policy responsiveness and flexibility. Is it possible to have both? Are there any constitutions that come close to achieving this balance?

Huq: One of the places to think about this is in terms of the amendment rule for constitutions. Scandinavian constitutions have a multiple votes system, where a
Stamler-Goody: The idea of American Exceptionalism may imply that the US is immune to the threats to democracy that plague other countries. How different is the US, and do these differences protect it from democratic decline or actually put it at a greater risk?

Huq: On the one hand, I don’t think there’s any reason to believe that the pressure of social change and the social stress of global economic transformations will spare the United States. If those are the things pushing a two-party system toward failure, and I think there’s some evidence of that, then it’s not clear why one would think that the United States is different.

On the other hand, we have a very old constitution, which you might think is a good thing, but it probably isn’t. The technology in our constitution is essentially a 19th-century technology, and it hasn’t been updated in 200 years. Or, it’s been updated, but only at the margins and only by judicial decisions, which isn’t quite the same thing. And that probably makes us more vulnerable. At the same time, there is some evidence that having a longer history of democratic competition inures a country to the risks of democratic backsliding. Younger, poorer democracies are more vulnerable than older, wealthier ones. That cuts in favor of the United States.

But even that shouldn’t be overestimated. The United States has a long and robust tradition of authoritarianism and one-party rule across the South, and it has a long tradition of excluding people from the franchise—be they people who are poor, women, or people of color. We have a long tradition of openly racist immigration laws that keep people out on the basis of their ethnicity or national origin. If you look at the long democratic history of the United States, it’s not really clear which way it cuts.

Stamler-Goody: How close is the United States to losing its constitutional democracy?

Ginsburg: I’m actually somewhat optimistic in the midterm. One of our points is that institutions and constitutions cannot save democracy. They can act as speed bumps to prevent backsliding from accelerating, but they can’t do everything on their own. Only democracy can save democracy. There are signs that people are mobilized and engaged in the issues on both parties, which we think is ultimately what’s necessary for democracy to thrive and survive. But I also think it would be naive to argue that there’s not a serious risk.

I should note that political scientists who rate democracies, cross-nationally and across time, have
downgraded American democracy recently. The Economist Intelligence Unit last year had us fall from the rank of Full Democracy to a Flawed Democracy, largely on the basis of the way we run the elections. According to Bright Line Watch, most Americans rate us really badly on a number of features of democracy, including the way we run elections, the way we draw districts, the way we do campaign finance, and many other things. So this isn’t just academics pointing this out. It’s a real felt thing out there. But I do believe that if people react and mobilize for change, we could be at the dawn of a new era of reform.

Huq: I would say that it’s not a binary—it’s not either we’re a constitutional democracy or we’re not. You can have a democracy that’s not particularly good, and there’s no reason that it needs to collapse into an autocracy or improve toward a better state. We can have a bad democracy that fails on multiple margins for as long as most of us will be alive.

More recently in the United States, there has been a substantial weakening of the institutions at the federal level that are meant to promote the rule of law: the Justice Department and the coercive instruments of the federal government. At this point, that damage is done. Some of it can be mitigated in the future, but it’s like getting an injury—once you’re injured, you’re injured. You can’t undo that. You could heal, but oftentimes the healing process is partial. Just to be clear, I don’t think that there’s a null possibility of a catastrophic end state, but do I think that everything is going to be better in the future? No, I don’t think that at all.

Ginsburg: One thing would be to take the drawing of the legislative districts and management of elections away from a partisan body. Everyone agrees that this harms the quality of democratic responsiveness, but the Constitution assigns the power to the state legislatures. This was written at a time before there were parties—they couldn’t have imagined that it would end up this way. So that would be one very important thing. The other thing I’d say would be to reduce the terms of Supreme Court justices to something like 15 or 18 years. This has been widely vetted in academia, and it would end the joke of an appointments process that we have right now.

Huq: I think we need to revisit the assumptions about how presidents get removed. We argue that other countries recognize that policies can get things wrong and that it’s possible to select bad leaders. We need mechanisms for dealing with bad leaders. We suggest in the book that impeachment could be reformed or reimagined to make it closer to what the framers thought it would be, which was that it would be used much more often than it has been. We also believe that the kind of robust accountability institutions, like the prosecutors for internal abuse that exist in South Africa and other constitutional democracies, are a good idea.

Stamler-Goody: You provide numerous examples in the book demonstrating that the executive is often the driving force for democratic decline. Knowing this, are there any reasons to favor a presidential government over a parliamentary one?

Ginsburg: If you look at the cases of backsliding, they happen in all different kinds of governments. You have parliamentary Hungary, you have semipresidential Poland, and you have presidential Venezuela. Turkey has toggled between the two. There’s no system that is foolproof. In the book, we do offer a tentative case for parliamentary government as a way of giving voice to populist and extreme forces without letting them take over the whole system. In a presidential system, the outsiders don’t have any power until they have all the power.

Stamler-Goody: What do you most hope your readers take away from the book?

Huq: That they’ll better understand the role that law and constitutions play in either supporting or undermining our democracy, and the fact that we have to make intelligent choices about law and constitutions.

Ginsburg: Agreed, and I’ll add one other thing: all is not lost.
REPLACING THE BOARD

Todd Henderson’s New Book Explores the Benefits of Outsourcing Corporate Governance

By Robin I. Mordfin
JP Morgan, one of the world’s largest financial services firms, has grown to more than 30 times the size it was in the Reagan era. It has $2.5 trillion in assets—up from $76 billion in the 1980s—operates in dozens of countries, and has become geometrically more complex.

However, one thing has not changed: the size of its board of directors. Three decades ago, JP Morgan had around a dozen members. Today, it still has around dozen members.

“Ultimately, you end up with 12 people running a business that is far more complex than anyone can imagine. What’s more, they need expertise in so many areas that they end up buying that expertise from other people,” said M. Todd Henderson, the Michael J. Marks Professor of Law. “There is a kind of pressure that boards should increase in size as businesses become bigger. But the efficiency of a board is going to decrease; it’s hard to imagine a group of 400 people making decisions.”

Fortunately, Henderson has a solution. In his new book, Outsourcing the Board: How Board Service Providers Can Improve Corporate Governance (Cambridge University Press), he and UCLA School of Law Professor Stephen M. Bainbridge propose giving corporations the option of hiring a new kind of firm, a Board Service Provider (BSP), to serve as their boards. Today, corporations hire law firms, accounting firms, and consulting firms to give them the expertise needed to run their highly complicated businesses. So why not a corporate governance firm?

“There is a whole literature that precedes us advocating for professional board members with standards and education,” Henderson said. “But even that plan has shortcomings because it focuses on the individual rather than on the entity. If there were firms that provided board services and that had employees with expertise in all the areas these corporations need, that would be much more efficient than 12 part-time people. The firm could hire all the experts they need and have them down the hall when information is needed.”

The truth is that most directors spend very little time overseeing the corporation to which they are attached. Typically, boards meet only four times a year, but a Board Service Provider would work full-time, throughout the year, providing far more efficient leadership than a corporation like JP Morgan does, with its array of experts on retainer. BSPs would also have the ability to hire notable individuals with important connections.

“When McKinsey hired Chelsea Clinton, they didn’t do it just because they thought she was a smart person. They also hired her because she is politically connected,” Henderson pointed out. “Networking is an important part of what a board does, and a BSP could do that just as effectively as current boards do.”

GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY

Unsurprisingly, hiring big names as directors is not always effective. In 1995, Michael Ovitz was hired as president of Disney, where Oscar-winning actor Sidney Poitier was a director on the compensation committee. When Ovitz was fired a year later, he received more than $140 million for his services. Disney stockholders were enraged and tried to sue individual directors, including Poitier, to recoup the losses. Ultimately, the directors were not held personally accountable.

Judges would be more likely to hold a BSP accountable for its decisions—including errors made while attempting to comply with oversight regulations, the authors said.

Since the Enron debacle of 2007, Congress has passed an enormous amount of oversight legislation in an attempt to curb large-scale fraud. The mandates are time consuming and complex and often require companies to retain outside experts.

“Right now, all that most boards have time for is oversight, but a BSP could spend time on other things because it would be a deeper entity, it would employ all the people it needs, and therefore, could be in compliance at a lower cost,” Henderson observed.
He also explained that BSPs, with their teams of experts, could overcome other corporate problems, such as having to make decisions without full information from management.

“Often directors do not know if they are getting too little information because they don’t have the experience and broad knowledge needed to make such a determination,” Henderson said. “But a full-service BSP would have that expertise and would be able to tell shareholders that management is not effective or is not cooperating and fire them. Individual directors can’t really do that.”

Henderson and Bainbridge also think that the option of a Board Service Provider could make it easier for shareholders to mount their own slates, and for considerably less investment. Rather than having individual candidates mount campaigns, the BSP could do so with greater efficiency and lower cost. Once elected, they could serve for a specific term. If the BSP was successful, it could be reelected. If not, the shareholders could go back to its old board of directors.

Henderson and Bainbridge say a BSP could provide a board of any size—in some cases it could be 12, in others, it could be just one person.

“We are not saying that the Board Service Provider will definitely be better, and we are not saying there is only one way for them to operate,” Henderson said. “We are saying that BSPs should be an option that shareholders and corporations can consider and try.”

OVERCOMING OBSTACLES

There is one hurdle: Legally, boards of directors must be composed of natural persons or individual human beings—not corporations. But Henderson said that shouldn’t be a concern—and could be fixed by abolishing the natural person requirement in Delaware, where most of the nation’s corporations are incorporated.

“This is a myth that should be debunked,” Henderson said. “There are only human beings. At the end of the day there are no such things as corporations, they are just fictions. Our BSPs would be composed of human beings, just like the current board. But, using the BSP form, they would be able to cooperate in ways that today’s board members cannot. And to be honest, no one is defending the natural person rule.”

Doing away with Delaware’s natural person rule would give corporations the opportunity to change their charters to allow board to be composed of natural persons unless otherwise stated.

Henderson and Bainbridge hope Outsourcing the Board will spark interest in making Board Service Providers an option. Their idea is getting coverage in Bloomberg, the Economist, and the Stanford Law Review, among other publications, and they are holding a conference in September at the UCLA School of Law.

The way the duo sees it, there may be many different types of BSPs, from large extant consulting firms who create BSP sections to new firms formed just for this opportunity. They will compete for different types and sizes of clients, and they will succeed or fail depending on their abilities and the corporations with which they work.

“It’s a very Chicago approach,” Henderson said, citing the work of Noble laureate and former colleague Ronald Coase as inspiration. “Coase asked why firms arise at all, concluding that they do when the benefits of cooperation within a firm is greater than the cost of individuals contracting with each other. Our idea is just this, for corporate governance services.”

It is important to note that there is currently no way of measuring corporate governance, which could change due to competition. Corporate performance is currently the best proxy for measuring governance, but at Enron—where for several years the board was lauded as the gold standard—that proved to be an ineffective measure. In fact, no one knows the cost of corporate governance, as it is not reported and is not compared.

Perhaps competition can change that, Henderson said. “We have no idea what kind of governance innovations lie on the other side of the natural person requirement,” he said. “What we have now might be as good as we can do. But it is worth seeing if something better is out there.”

Understanding Classical Liberal Principles

Professor M. Todd Henderson is also the editor of a new book of essays by lawyers, economists, philosophers, and other experts that takes a fresh look at the classical liberal principles upon which America was founded. The Cambridge Handbook of Classical Liberal Thought (Cambridge University Press), which includes contributors from a variety of political perspectives, explores how those classical liberal principles can help us deal with issues such as climate change, immigration, and the alarming rise in prison populations. It was released in August.
Eric Posner Argues for Expanded Government Bailout Powers

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

Professor Eric Posner has several points to make about the bailouts that took place during the financial crisis 10 years ago. First, the federal government broke the law, multiple times and in a variety of ways. Second, it made the right choice. And third, despite the public’s rage over the loans—and the widespread belief that such rescues inspire future recklessness—the answer is to expand the government’s emergency lending powers so it won’t need to break the law the next time the economy melts down.

And there will be a next time, Posner argues in a new book. The question is whether we’ll be ready.

“Lack of sympathy toward Wall Street, understandable as it may be, has obscured some of the important questions about how the federal government behaved during the bailout,” he writes in Last Resort: The Financial Crisis and the Future of Bailouts (University of Chicago Press). “The illegality of the government’s conduct is tied to the underlying question of what bailout policy should have been, and what it should be in future crises. If we think the government’s illegal actions advanced the public interest, then we’ll need to change the law so that next time around regulators will know what is expected of them.”

In Last Resort, Posner, the Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law, examines the legal maneuvering undertaken by the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and eventually the Department of the Treasury to bail out entities like the insurance corporation AIG, automakers GM and Chrysler, and the government-sponsored mortgage enterprises Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The rescues were unprecedented in scope, adding up to hundreds of billions of dollars, and in some cases veered from what was then the understood authority of the Fed and the FDIC—which function as “lenders of last resort” (LLR)—by including unsecured loans to nonbank financial institutions. The bailouts also elicited charges of favoritism because the government treated some institutions more harshly than others. The maneuvering, Posner wrote, included both “questionable interpretations” of the law and outright violations. For instance, he writes, the Fed broke the law when it took nearly 80 percent of AIG’s equity in exchange for an $85 billion loan, and Treasury broke it by seizing equity from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

The legal gymnastics ultimately helped the government bypass obstacles, but it came at a cost. In some cases, the government behaved too cautiously, and in others it structured transactions in unnecessarily complex ways, reducing transparency and raising costs. It also eventually resulted in costly and time-consuming litigation. (Posner does note, however, that contrary to popular belief, the government didn’t actually lose money on the bailout loans and investments—it made money. That profit stood at about $87 billion as of March 22, 2018, according to one estimate.)

Ultimately, Posner calls for legal reforms that expand the powers of the LLR to rescue financial institutions—a position that runs contrary to the post-crisis policy reforms already enacted. The Dodd-Frank Act, which was passed in 2010, was billed as an end to bailouts, and it tries to accomplish that by addressing the root causes of financial crises as well as by attempting to limit the power of government agencies to rescue struggling financial institutions.

The first response makes sense, Posner said. The second part does not—in part because bailouts are inevitable.

“The Dodd-Frank Act will not end bailouts because it cannot prevent financial crises from occurring, and if a financial crisis occurs, bailout is the correct response,” he wrote. “This means that Congress’s second response to the crisis—restrictions on the LLR—was perverse rather than wise.”

Instead, he proposes broadening the powers of the Fed and FDIC beyond the traditional bank model, allowing the LLR to transact with all types of financial institutions, as well as allowing them to seize and control financial institutions under the power of eminent domain (with just compensation), make unsecured and undersecured loans when collateral is unavailable or of low quality, and more. This, however, would require public buy in.

“At a minimum, [the LLR] needs the powers that the Fed, Treasury, and FDIC used, mostly illegally, during the last financial crisis,” he wrote. “The LLR will be able to survive in a democracy, regardless of how powerful and independent it is, as long as the public believes that it serves the public interest. Depriving it of the powers it needs will not advance that goal.”
The Radical Benefits of a Truly Free Market

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

Picture a society in which property is put to its most productive and valuable use rather than being held indefinitely by its richest citizens, and voters are able to cast ballots that reflect not only their interests but the intensity of those interests. In this world, ordinary people might be able to sponsor guest workers from other countries, creating income for both, or take part in a new digital economy that allows individuals to earn money for sharing the personal data that, right now, millions give up for free.

In this future, free competition would reign, all in the name of reducing income inequality, economic stagnation, and political instability.

This is the vision Law School Professor Eric Posner and economist E. Glen Weyl pitch in a new book that examines how a truly free market, one unencumbered by concentrated power and wealth, could reinvigorate our democracy. Radical Markets: Uprooting Capitalism and Democracy for a Just Society (Princeton University Press) puts forth five bold proposals for reforming market systems—property, voting, migrant labor, investment capital, and personal data—and pushes readers to reconsider the role that economics can play in social reform.

“Any new and radical proposal will be greeted by skepticism, even scorn,” he and Weyl write. “Yet all the institutions that we take for granted today—the free market, democracy, the rule of law—were at one time radical proposals. At a time of ‘stagnequality’—vicious inequality, economic stagnation, and political turbulence—there is nothing safe about well-worn ideas, and the greatest risk is stasis. If we aspire to prosperity and progress, we must be willing to question old truths, get to the root of the matter, and experiment with new ideas.”

The full story can be read on the Law School’s website at https://www.law.uchicago.edu/news/radical-markets.

Among their proposals is one that would rethink the private ownership of property, instead creating a system of partial collective ownership in which people self-declare the taxable value of their land, homes, and belongings—but agree to sell to anyone who offers that price. Under the “common ownership self-assessed tax” (COST), people could choose to keep their stuff nearly out of reach, but they’d compensate society for reducing access.

Posner and Weyl also pitch the creation of data labor unions; they argue that people should be paid for sharing the personal data that collectively powers the digital economy. They bring immigration and labor together, too, with their vision for the Visas between Individuals Program (VIP), which would allow ordinary people to sponsor migrant workers, expanding the labor market across borders and reducing the need to view immigrants as job competitors. Both ideas are aimed at reducing underemployment.

The authors also call for new rules for giant institutional investors like Vanguard, Fidelity, and BlackRock, banning them from diversifying their holdings within industries. And with quadratic voting (QV), Posner and Weyl rethink political markets, advocating a system that allows people to vote in proportion to the strength of their interests and values. With QV, each person would be given an equal number of “voice credits” to spend on votes, allowing people to save up for the issues about which they are most knowledgeable or care most deeply. The system uses quadratic math: one vote costs one credit—but two votes cost four credits, three cost nine, four cost 16, and so on. The system would encourage candidates to choose positions that maximize the well-being of their constituents, empower people by allowing them to better calibrate their influence, and make it costlier to express extreme views.

At minimum, Posner hopes to get people thinking in new ways, much the way reformers have in earlier decades.

“The country is facing a serious problem because our existing economic institutions are failing us,” said Posner, the Kirkland & Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law. “The book explains our specific proposals, but our larger point is that people should start thinking in a more radical way about our institutions and whether they’re working properly. And when I say radical, I mean it in the core sense of the word: we have to go to the roots of things and understand how they really work.”

Posner and Weyl are affirmatively pro-market, but concerned about capitalism’s tendency toward monopoly. They worry about institutional investors who dampen competition by diversifying their holdings within industries—for instance, by buying stakes in every airline and creating systems—property, voting, migrant labor, investment capital, and personal data—and pushes readers to reconsider the role that economics can play in social reform.

This is the vision Law School Professor Eric Posner and economist E. Glen Weyl pitch in a new book that examines how a truly free market, one unencumbered by concentrated power and wealth, could reinvigorate our democracy. Radical Markets: Uprooting Capitalism and Democracy for a Just Society (Princeton University Press) puts forth five bold proposals for reforming market systems—property, voting, migrant labor, investment capital, and personal data—and pushes readers to reconsider the role that economics can play in social reform.

“Any new and radical proposal will be greeted by skepticism, even scorn,” he and Weyl write. “Yet all the institutions that we take for granted today—the free market, democracy, the rule of law—were at one time radical proposals. At a time of ‘stagnequality’—vicious inequality, economic stagnation, and political turbulence—there is nothing safe about well-worn ideas, and the greatest risk is stasis. If we aspire to prosperity and progress, we must be willing to question old truths, get to the root of the matter, and experiment with new ideas.”

The full story can be read on the Law School’s website at https://www.law.uchicago.edu/news/radical-markets.
Martha Nussbaum Explores the Emotions Fueling a Political Crisis

By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

It wasn’t the way Martha C. Nussbaum’s work usually began: provoked by an unbidden sense of alarm, unfolding with the sort of restless urgency that preempts sleep and invites unplanned investigation. And yet there she was, alone in a Japanese hotel room the night after the 2016 US presidential election—and just hours after formally accepting the prestigious Kyoto Prize in Arts and Philosophy—probing her own visceral reaction to events at home, rethinking her work on political emotions, and trying to pierce the discordant fog that seemed to have settled over much of America.

“I was trying to get on top of my own very upset emotions, thinking, ‘What’s going on with me? What’s going on in the country?’” said Nussbaum, the University of Chicago’s Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics and one of the world’s leading philosophers. People on both sides of the political divide seemed angry, envious, and disgusted.

But even more, Americans seemed afraid.

And that, Nussbaum knew, wasn’t good: unexamined fear has a way of riling up the other emotions and clouding rational thought, often leading, as she’d later write, “to aggressive ‘othering’ strategies rather than useful analysis.”

“My previous books had taken the emotions one by one, but I saw that I needed to link them all together more closely and see how fear bubbles up and infuses them all,” said Nussbaum, who is appointed in both the Law School and Department of Philosophy. “I needed to go deeper.”

The result, just 20 months later, is The Monarchy of Fear: A Philosopher Looks at Our Political Crisis (Simon & Schuster), a book that blends ancient Greek and Roman thought, psychology, history, neuroscience, and even the musical Hamilton to explore the roots, structure, and political ramifications of fear, closely examining its interplay with envy, disgust, anger, and blame. Fear, she explains, is a trickster that lures people into believing that complicated problems have easy solutions, often convincing them that they can conquer their feelings of helplessness through scapegoating, revenge, and exclusion.

“It becomes not about fixing a complicated problem like [the labor market effects of] automation or outsourcing,” Nussbaum said. “That would require expertise and collaboration. No, [you start hearing words] like ‘immigrants’ and ‘infestation.’”

It’s a familiar trope, one that surfaces early in life in fairy tales like “Hansel and Gretel,” where serious problems like hunger and poverty are replaced by straightforward predicaments with obvious culprits, Nussbaum said, adding that the “simple fix” concept was likely aimed at soothing childhood terrors.

“Just find the witch in the woods, throw her into the oven, and then the world is just great,” she said. “Of course, it has bad social implications because rarely are problems that easy to solve.”

Nussbaum brings together many elements of her previous work—from the dangers of retributive anger to the ways in which projective disgust has been used to subjugate women and minorities—and weaves in ideas from a variety of disciplines. She looks to neuroscientist Joseph LeDoux to understand the amygdala’s role in producing fear, and draws on the work of the ancient Roman poet Lucretius to examine fear’s primacy, including its roots in infantile helplessness, its development into an adult fear of death, and its ability to infect other emotions. Aaron Burr’s desire to be “in the room where it happens” in Hamilton provides a vivid example of how envy can grow from a feeling of powerlessness and zero-sum competition, and ideas put forth in a recent book by the young philosopher Kate Manne factor into Nussbaum’s chapter on sexism and misogyny, which unpacks the “toxic brew” of blame, disgust, and envy that can fuel hostility toward successful women.

But fear, Nussbaum said, has a flip side: hope. The two emotions share a common foundation—powerlessness—but hope ultimately pushes its adherents in the opposite direction, she said. It’s what leaders like the late Martin Luther King Jr. did well. “King was very good at turning fear and anger into constructive, doable work and hope,” Nussbaum said. And that’s what is needed today: concerted efforts aimed at containing fear and nurturing good citizenship, Nussbaum said. She describes five “practices of hope”: engagement with the arts, critical thinking, religion, protest movements, and the development of theories of justice.

Ultimately, the path forward requires awareness, and Nussbaum hopes The Monarchy of Fear shines a light on fear’s harmful seduction. “I want people to understand the dynamic of fear and powerlessness, to see how it can lead to scapegoating, so they will catch it when it happens and subject it to scrutiny,” she said. “If they understand that dynamic in general, they won’t be duped. They’ll say, ‘Wait a minute, this isn’t really like ‘Hansel and Gretel.’ You can’t just put the witch in the oven.’”

A slightly longer version of this article is available on the Law School’s website at https://www.law.uchicago.edu/news/when-fear-becomes-hope.
“PURE INTELLECTUAL PURSUIT”
The Camaraderie and Competition of the Hinton Moot Court
By Becky Beaupre Gillespie

The Hinton Moot Court has existed since 1954. Here, Peggy Kerr, ’73, argues during the 1973 competition.
All eyes were on Andrew Hosea, ’18, as he approached the lectern in the Law School’s courtroom one afternoon last April in his navy suit and blue tie. Six months of progressive competition and two months of brief writing and oral argument practice hung in the air like, well, the weight of 100 dusky gopher frogs.

Which, by the way, is the approximate remaining population of the endangered Mississippi amphibian whose living space had occupied Hosea’s mind for weeks—along with the minds of the other finalists in the Edward W. Hinton Moot Court competition. Hosea and his partner, Samuel Johnson, ’18, and their opponents, Tate Wines and Abigail Majane, both ’18, had spent much of spring quarter immersed in Weyerhaeuser Co. v. US Fish and Wildlife Service, a pending US Supreme Court case centering on the federal government’s decision to designate privately owned Louisiana forest as “critical habitat” even though the rare species isn’t actually in residence.

It was a technical case featuring questions about statutory interpretation and judicial review—a bit more arcane than Carpenter v. US, the cell phone privacy case that Hosea and 55 other competitors had faced in the preliminary rounds that fall, or National Institute of Family and Life Advocates v. Becerra, the free speech case the 14 semifinalists had argued in February.

But it fit the major requirements for the final Hinton round: it was an actual Supreme Court case with two discrete questions, one for each half of the team. The real parties were still filing merits briefs, so the Hinton competitors, who are only allowed to read lower-court documents, wouldn’t be tempted to seek them out. Better yet—though this wasn’t mandatory—it had little chance of triggering preconceived biases. Before this, the competitors hadn’t spent much time considering this aspect of the Endangered Species Act.

“A somewhat dry case makes sense for the finals,” Hosea said.

After all, the Hinton Moot Court competition is less about the hot-button issues of the day and more about the battle itself: a mixture of competition and camaraderie laced with the inescapable sense that winning requires something akin to jumping fully clothed into the middle of a choppy lake and, through some combination of perseverance and creativity, swimming to shore.

“The deep dive and the full commitment to the project is the greatest lasting legacy and impact of moot court,” said Paul Niehaus, ’97, who argued on the second-place team 21 years ago. “It’s a great feeling knowing you’ve done everything you possibly can.”
Added his wife, Kimberly Ziev Niehaus, '96, who argued on the first-place team 22 years ago: “It’s so intense and all-encompassing. You just didn’t do anything else . . . it was a pure intellectual pursuit.”

Although moot court teams and competitions have existed at the Law School since at least 1915, the Hinton Moot Court Competition—named for Judge Edward W. Hinton, a University of Chicago law professor between 1913 and 1936—began in 1954 as a student-run program that had Law School Professor Soia Mentschikoff as its advisor. It quickly became a Law School institution.

Clinics sometimes give students opportunities to argue in court, and various classes and moot court competitions outside the Law School offer a chance to practice litigation. But the Hinton competition is a singular experience—one that, over the years, has bred deep and abiding friendships, woven itself into romances and marriages, and left hundreds of competitors with their first real sense of what it means to argue an appellate case.

“That was the first time . . . I felt so deeply in my bones the connection with the cause and the community on whose behalf I was advocating,” said Laura Edidin, ’96, who was Kim Niehaus’s partner in the 1996 final round. “That feeling of being . . . so completely absorbed in your work . . . just lit me up inside—it made me understand that litigation was what I wanted to do.”


In fact, Jeffrey B. Wall, ’03, who was on the winning team in 2003, appeared before a Supreme Court Justice—Scalia—for the first time during the Hinton finals. “It was an unbelievable honor to be able to argue in front of him,” said Wall, who now regularly argues before the US Supreme Court as the Principal Deputy Solicitor General under another Hinton alumnus: US Solicitor General Noel J. Francisco, ’96.

Gail Peek, ’84, remembers watching the final round her 1L year when Ginsburg, then a judge on the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, was part of the panel. “She had a habit of asking questions and then saying ‘Ah ha, in that case . . . ’” said Peek, who was part of the winning team in 1983. “When participants heard that phrase, they knew they were in for a battle royal with one of the best legal minds in the country. She made such an impression on me with her apparently simple questions that eviscerated the heart of one’s argument. It was clear that she was giving the students and the audience a learning experience, [one] that I took to heart. [It was] just brilliant!”

The Hinton competition is a major undertaking. Third-year students on the Hinton Moot Court Board—finalists and semifinalists from the previous year—choose the cases, coordinate competitor sign-up, update rules, and distribute materials to the competitors. They also recruit judges for each of the three rounds, beginning with the argument-only preliminaries, which are decided by panels of Law School alumni during a two-week period in the
The Hinton Moot Court finals in 2016.
group of judges could be so at odds with one another over something as seemingly simple as defining ‘critical habitat’ and whether or not it must be essential to the conservation of the species.”

But he read and reread the cases until they began to make sense. He crafted his arguments and chose the exact words he needed to make his points effectively. He and Johnson—who had competed in both moot court and mock trial as an undergraduate at Patrick Henry College, which has one of the top intercollegiate moot court teams in the nation—spent hours not only on their own questions but on each other’s.

“With a complicated issue, you have to make judgment calls, and it is helpful to take a step back and listen to input,” said Johnson, who prepares calmly and meticulously. “Two sets of eyes are better than one.”

By the time they arrived at the finals, Johnson and Hosea had each spent 60 or 70 hours preparing, and they were ready.

But then again, so were Wines and Majane, who sat steely eyed in navy jackets with matching American flag lapel pins before a coordinated tableau of identical water bottles, black padfolios, and green sticky notes.

“You honor, and may it please the court,” Hosea began, his voice steady as he looked up at the judges, Manish S. Shah, ’98, of the US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; William J. Kayatta Jr. of the US Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; and Lucy H. Koh of the US District Court for the Northern District of California.

Soon, the dusky gopher frog would be on their minds, too.

Earlier in the quarter, Wines and Majane had joked about making a road trip to Mississippi to take pictures with the frogs. They infused their process with humor, exchanging lighthearted banter and sending each other motivational emoji via Snapchat. (“Sometimes we talked about legal arguments, too,” Majane said, laughing.) There was some procrastination and a certain amount of joking about the procrastination.

But, the truth was, their preparations were still thorough and intense.

During the semifinals, Majane, who had participated in mock trial in college, had been swamped with other Law School commitments until close to the end. “Then I kicked into hyperdrive for 36 hours straight,” she said.

Majane is a fierce competitor who can summon blistering focus when needed, and one of her strengths is knowing what she needs to know.

“It’s strange because you become a subject matter expert, but it ends up being very specific,” she said.

She and Wines were friends before the competition, and they work well together. Wines processes the elements of an issue by creating a giant poster featuring relevant cases in different colors of pen.

“If anyone else were to see it—it’s a disaster,” he said.

“But to me it’s the solution.” During the finals, he folded it up and brought it to the argument in his padfolio.

Wines tended to work in the computer lab or at home, where he could listen to 1990s hip-hop (think Eminem’s “Lose Yourself”). Majane preferred her dining room table or the second floor of the D’Angelo Law Library, where she would pull the blinds open and bathe in the natural light.

“Early on, Tate and I would see each other in the Green Lounge, and I’d say, ‘I actually haven’t looked at the case in a week,’ and he would say, ‘Me neither.’ But then once [Hosea and Johnson submitted their] petitioner’s brief, we really got to work,” Majane said. “We wrote our own sides separately, then we swapped. We basically spent three days e-mailing each other new versions every three hours.”

Competitors say there is no one right way to prepare for moot court: either a long and steady prep or a concentrated push at the end can work, depending on the person. It is impossible to predict every question the judges will ask—or what arguments or details will draw their attention, skepticism, or ire. So the best thing a participant can do is develop a solid understanding of the case and assigned position, spend time writing a strong brief, and practice.

“I’ve learned that it is OK to pause before you talk,” Wines said. “You have to trust your preparation, and just say what you know.”

Johnson has competed in so many mock trials and moot
courts that he rarely gets rattled before an argument. He knows what he needs to do, and he does it.

“I read through the roadmap in my head and make sure I have my wording precise,” he said, “but that’s it.”

Peek, who served on the winning team in 1983 with Bill Engles, JD/MBA ’85, remembers that their preparation “was unstructured and based on our availability.”

“We got together and just generally talked about the case and what we thought, and we allocated responsibility,” she said. “And then we basically left each other alone for a while; there was a lot of trust and confidence.”

Peek, who came to law school after earning a doctorate in political science, felt good writing the brief, which she composed on a 25-pound Kaypro personal computer, the kind with green type on a tiny screen. She chuckled at the memory; it was such a big deal to have a portable computer in those days.

Kaitlin Beck, ’17, and her partner Joe Egozi, ’17, who won the Hinton Cup the year they graduated, experienced the intensity of both competition and camaraderie during finals prep, when fellow members of the University of Chicago Law Review jumped in to help them practice, throwing question after question at them.

Paul Niehaus benefited from what he calls “intergenerational” prep. Kim, his relatively new girlfriend and the previous year’s winner, had insisted that he participate in moot court. (“I believe her exact words were, ‘You’re an idiot if you don’t,’” he said.) She was working in New York City by then, and she and her roommate—who had competed in the Hinton semifinals in 1995—coached him over the phone, passing down wisdom from the previous years’ competition.

To this day, all three can be sent into fits of laughter as they recall the inside jokes that developed during that time.

There’s a psychological aspect to the competition, too, as participants look for ways to build and telegraph their own confidence.

Johnson, for instance, likes to argue without notes. During the finals, he strode to the lectern and jumped right in.

Majane goes the opposite way. In the finals, she struck a cool demeanor as she made her way to the front and methodically arranged her notes before addressing the panel. “I took a good 30 seconds,” she said. “It’s a gamble, but I didn’t want to look rushed or nervous.”
everything, at least, was going smoothly.
Courtroom simulation had been a part of Ertle’s life for years, ever since her undergraduate days on both the moot court and mock trial teams at Patrick Henry College. Her passion had led her to law school—and, before that, to her husband.

Today was a big day for him, and she watched with pride as he walked to the lectern and delivered a strong argument, no notes.

Johnson and Ertle met during the first mock trial meeting of their freshman year at Patrick Henry; his team recruited her, and she said yes. There was a spark, which they both acknowledged. But it didn’t seem right to disrupt competition by starting to date.

“There are funky relationship dynamics on a team when you get into a relationship with one another, so we waited until the end of freshman year,” Ertle said.

Then they fell in love.

A year later they were engaged—after going up against each other in the elimination rounds at the moot court nationals—and the summer after junior year, in 2014, they married. They applied to law schools together,
tallying up each matched pair as the acceptances came in. By the fall of 2015, they were settled in Chicago.

Ertle competed in the Hinton Moot Court Competition her second year—Johnson chose to wait—and made it to the semifinals.

When it was her husband’s turn and Ertle was on the board, they followed the rules to the letter: no discussing the semifinal or final cases until after he’d submitted his briefs. But once those briefs were in, the partnership they’d built alongside their relationship kicked into gear.

“I give him very honest feedback—I think I tend to be overcritical compared to other people. But there’s this established relationship there,” Ertle said. “Occasionally I’ll say, ‘That’s okay that I said that, right?’ And he’ll say, ‘Yes, yes, yes!’ He wants to do well. Sometimes the criticisms are really shallow, sometimes they’re substantive, but we talk about everything.”

Johnson doesn’t hesitate to ask his wife the same questions over and over: Does this argument make sense? Does my reasoning line up?

“Having someone who doesn’t mind running through the arguments five times—that really helped a lot,” he said.

Kim and Paul Niehaus get that. Moot court has become a part of their relationship lore, along with the time they spent together on The University of Chicago Legal Forum, where Kim was Paul’s editor. (“We established our relationship right off the bat,” he said. “She’s in charge.”)

The Niehauses have been married for 19 years now. He practices law, and she runs learning and development for a hedge fund. They have two kids. And, as often as they’re able, they go out to dinner with Edidin and her husband, who live nearby in New York. Kim Ziev and Laura Edidin barely knew each other when they started the Hinton competition; now they’re close friends.

Over the years, the Niehauses have told the stories of moot court: how Paul brought Kim Gatorade when she got the stomach bug shortly after filing her petitioner’s brief, how Kim returned to the Law School for the 1997 finals and met her future in-laws for the first time, and how Paul had been motivated by wanting “to win a cup as big as Kimberly’s.” (His second-place Llewellyn Cup is slightly smaller than his wife’s first-place Hinton Cup.)

They have both discovered, over the years, that moot court is something one doesn’t easily forget.

And also, when paired, a Hinton Cup and a Llewellyn Cup make a fantastic chip and dip.

***

It is hard to say what stories Wines, Majane, Hosea, and Johnson will tell about the Hinton competition years in the future.

Peek, who competed 35 years ago, remembers her dad, who is now deceased, coming for the final round. Peek recalls how proud he was when she won—and how he chatted up one of the judges afterward.

“The late Judge [Robert] Bork was very friendly and said he was impressed by my presence and composure during the oral argument,” Peek said. To this day, Peek still displays her winning gavel plaque (a predecessor to the Hinton Cup) in her law firm office in Waco, Texas.

Wall remembers Professor Adrian Vermuele coming up to him after he won the finals in 2003 and saying, “You should really think about going to the SG’s office.” Which Wall did, as an Assistant to the Solicitor General, five years later.

It is possible Hosea will remember drawing the dreaded 8 a.m. slot for the semifinals—which meant rising at 4:45 a.m. the Tuesday after a weekend spent in Park City, Utah, at his best friend’s bachelor’s party. (“Not ideal,” he said later, “but it was my best friend, and I wouldn’t have missed it for the world. Besides, I guess that’s a real-life lesson in balancing personal and professional obligations.”)

Johnson may remember strategizing with his wife, or trading briefs back and forth with Hosea dozens of times.

Wines and Majane might remember their supportive emoji texts or the green sticky notes or the intensity of their preparation.

They will almost certainly remember that they won. But more than any of that, all four are likely to remember what Paul Niehaus describes as the big takeaway from moot court: “Once you have been through this experience, you [feel like] you could go and tackle whatever other subject is out there,” he said. “You know then how it feels when you’ve mastered it, when you feel like there isn’t still a big question out there, looming.”

Contributing: Scott Jung and Stephanie Dorris
When the Honorable Ann Claire Williams, an African American and the only judge of color to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, was chosen to receive the Law School’s inaugural James B. Parsons Legacy Award earlier this year, she was thrilled. Parsons, ’49, the first Black federal district court judge to be appointed in the continental United States, is one of her heroes.

Now he’s also a hero to André J. Washington, ’19, one of the students who ultimately proposed and planned the award dinner. But until last October, Washington hadn’t known that Parsons was a University of Chicago Law School alumnus. It just hadn’t ever come up.

“We chose Parsons because he was one of the first Black students to graduate from the Law School. I also thought it was a huge milestone for him to be the first Black person to be appointed a federal judge on a US district court and to receive life tenure. It was especially relevant given the history of Black people in this country,” Washington said.

Last academic year, Washington and other members of the Law School’s Black Law Students Association created the James B. Parsons Legacy Dinner to shine a light on minority judges who were also good role models, choosing Williams as their first honoree. Nearly 120 alumni, students, faculty, and other guests attended the inaugural celebration.

Williams has a long list of firsts. She was one of the first two African-American women to serve as law clerks on the Seventh Circuit. After working as an assistant US attorney in Chicago, she was the first woman of color to serve as a supervisor in that office and was later promoted to chief of a criminal division. She was the first chief of the Organized Drug Enforcement Task Force, where she was responsible for a five-state region, and has led both local and national efforts to expand opportunities for minorities and women.

Williams started Just the Beginning—A Pipeline Organization in 1992 to encourage underrepresented students to pursue career and leadership opportunities in the law. Through Just the Beginning, hundreds of students
Kimberly Waters, ’19, one of the event’s organizers, said Washington approached a group of BLSA members and said, “Did you know that the first Black federal trial court judge with life tenure was a University of Chicago law student?” None of them did. A fire was lit.

The students quickly built a project plan. They met with then-Dean of Students Shannon Bartlett, and the Law School became a cosponsor for the dinner. Washington contacted potential law firm sponsors, as well as Parsons’s grandson and Williams. For much of Winter Quarter, the organizers—who included Washington; Laurel Hattix, ’19; Ngozi Osuji, ’19; and Waters—met once a week.

The students invited approximately 60 students, primarily 1Ls and students from different affinity groups, including the Asian Pacific American Law Students Association, the Latino/a Law Students Association, and the Law Women’s Caucus. The planning committee wanted to honor Williams and Parsons, but the dinner was also about making meaningful connections and creating an environment where students of color and those from low-income backgrounds have interned in federal courts across the country. In addition, JTB’s weeklong Summer Law Institutes in eight cities provide programming for middle and high school students.

It was Parsons’s example that inspired Williams to launch the organization. And that organization is how Washington learned about Parsons.

**Visualizing the Finish Line**

Williams told Washington about Parsons at a Just the Beginning fundraiser in October 2017. Washington felt joy when he first learned of Parsons’s affiliation with the Law School. But soon that joy was accompanied by surprise. How, as a student at the Law School himself, had he not known?

“One thing that makes it easier to survive the rigors of an elite law school is being able to imagine the finish line—which means seeing and hearing African-American success stories,” Washington said.

He decided to share Parsons’s story with his classmates. Kimberly Waters, ’19, one of the event’s organizers, said Washington approached a group of BLSA members and said, “Did you know that the first Black federal trial court judge with life tenure was a University of Chicago law student?” None of them did. A fire was lit.

The students quickly built a project plan. They met with then-Dean of Students Shannon Bartlett, and the Law School became a cosponsor for the dinner. Washington contacted potential law firm sponsors, as well as Parsons’s grandson and Williams. For much of Winter Quarter, the organizers—who included Washington; Laurel Hattix, ’19; Ngozi Osuji, ’19; and Waters—met once a week.

The students invited approximately 60 students, primarily 1Ls and students from different affinity groups, including the Asian Pacific American Law Students Association, the Latino/a Law Students Association, and the Law Women’s Caucus. The planning committee wanted to honor Williams and Parsons, but the dinner was also about making meaningful connections and creating an environment where students of color and those from low-income backgrounds have interned in federal courts across the country. In addition, JTB’s weeklong Summer Law Institutes in eight cities provide programming for middle and high school students.

Judge James B. Parsons (back row, center) returned to the Law School in February 1990 to help judge the final round of BLSA’s Midwest Regional Frederick Douglass Moot Court Competition, which was held at the University of Chicago that year as part of the Midwest Regional BLSA Conference. The panel also included Cook County Circuit Court judges Howard Savage, ’45, (back row, left) and Ellis E. Reid III, ’59.
opportunity for students to meet mentors and alumni. “It was really neat to watch people meet each other at the cocktail hour before the dinner,” Waters said. “Judge Williams went person by person to meet students and asked them why they wanted to go to law school. She made it a point to personally engage with all the students who were there.”

Waters said it was also great to see professors interacting with alumni who graduated many years ago. “It was like watching a big reunion taking place,” she said. Added Osuji: “We wanted the whole school to know about Judge Parsons, a giant in our midst. We also thought it was important to focus on helping students get jobs.”

Osuji believes that Parsons, and others like Earl B. Dickerson, ’20, the Law School’s first Black graduate, for whom the Law School’s BLSA chapter is named, should be better known to all students at the Law School. (Williams has also received the Chicago Bar Association’s Earl B. Dickerson Award.)

“There’s not a formal mechanism to tell us about Dickerson and others,” Osuji said. “I heard the details about Dickerson, one of the school’s trailblazers, when Professor [William] Hubbard told us about him in our Civil Procedure II class. We were discussing *Hansberry v. Lee*, a case Dickerson argued and won. That was where I learned Dickerson was the school’s first Black graduate. I think, with the Law School’s help, the Parsons Dinner and other events like it will bring more stories to light.”

André J. Washington, ’19, and Judge Ann C. Williams

Professor Randolph Stone [left] and Dean Thomas J. Miles [right] catch up with Eric Graham, ’53, an old friend of Judge Parsons’s.
Williams’s speech at the dinner sent a message to Osuji. “Listening to her speak, I started to see how a journey from law school to the bench could work,” she said. “I want the Class of 2021 to know that we are all capable of becoming federal judges.”

Washington said it was difficult to articulate just how much he got out of organizing and attending the dinner. “Meeting Judge Parsons’s family made his legacy more real,” he said. “Judge Williams’s talk was amazing. Her support and passion for Parsons and for the Law School Dinner were monumental.”

Dave Gordon, ’98, a partner at Sidley Austin, a sponsor of the dinner, agreed that the gathering was special. “I was deeply impressed by the commitment and energy demonstrated by the talented members of BLSA in organizing this first-of-its-kind event. When a group of law students shows this kind of initiative—and follow-through—the entire Law School community benefits,” he said. “I cannot recall attending an event at the Law School that connected generations of Law School graduates more effectively. It was a profound and inspiring experience to sit at a table both with Judge Parsons’s contemporaries and current Law School students, connecting the accomplishments of trailblazers with the promise of more great things to come.”

Hattix said that while there are still obstacles for minorities in the legal profession, Parsons and Williams and others like them have made great strides. “Judge
Williams thanked Parsons for knocking down barriers, and because of him, she was able to look forward and ask “What barriers can I move?” Hattix said. “One of the reasons the dinner was created was because we want to create traditions that might help others grow.”

Waters thinks that the accomplishments of Parsons and other minorities who have graduated from the Law School can’t be emphasized enough. “The fact that Parsons was trained in these classrooms and persevered when no one else looked like him is absolutely inspiring,” she said.

She was also inspired by listening to Williams. “Judge Williams showed us there are no limits. She repeated over and over to dream big, work hard, never give up, stand up, and give back. The message to me was that whatever you’re passionate about . . . you can do that,” Waters said. “The legal profession is extremely competitive, but this should not deter us. As long as we stay connected to the work and to each other, we can achieve it.”

**Standing on the Shoulders of Giants**

Hattix said the dinner also illuminated the importance of telling the truth.

“Honoring Parsons and other legal giants who followed him helps tell the story of how Black people were foreclosed from political, academic, and social spaces,” she said. “As a country, we’ve sanitized what oppression was like in the day-to-day in Black people’s lives.”

A critical aspect of the event, she said, was that it took place in the Green Lounge, which is a “sacred space” of sorts at the Law School. “It didn’t happen in a place that was hidden. It was out in the open, in the heartbeat of the school,” she said. “The Parsons Dinner is a way to give Black students and Law School alums a way to celebrate Black graduates and judges. My hope is that the Parsons Legacy Dinner will surpass what we imagine it could be.”

Part of telling the story, Hattix believes, is to acknowledge that success, especially in the legal arena, can be difficult. “The legal profession is one of the least represented by people of color,” Hattix said. “There are realized implications to that fact. The inaccessibility of the legal system can prevent Black individuals from having the same power and sway to direct laws and policies that have real implications for people’s lives.”

Hattix said while it is important to recognize the resilience and brilliance of people who blaze new trails, it...
isn’t enough to simply recognize success stories. It is also important to confront the dearth of role models. “We want to inspire students to want to be judges,” she added.

Hattix said it was powerful to see students mingling at the dinner with an important community that included Parsons’s family, faculty, alums, and many students—and it was inspiring to meet Parsons’s family. Washington agreed. “I wasn’t just reading about him in a book—the fact of him and his good works were magnified, and that was the next best thing to having actually met him,” Washington said.

Tacy Flint, ’04, a partner at Sidley, saw the dinner as a new way to enrich the Law School community. “One of the defining features of the University of Chicago Law School is that it is a community dedicated to rigorous analysis of ideas. The students of BLSA who organized the Parsons Dinner made a huge contribution to that community,” Flint said. “By presenting the experience and example of Judge Parsons, as well as the uplifting message of Judge Williams, the event allowed those of us privileged to attend an important new opportunity to learn about and discuss the law and each of our roles in the profession.”

Hattix was particularly moved when she met Parsons’s young great-granddaughter, Grace, who wants to be a lawyer. “As Black law students, we realize that we are standing on the shoulders of those who came before us. When I met Judge Parsons’s great-granddaughter and heard she wanted to be a lawyer, I realized the generational impact Parsons had embodied in her,” Hattix said, adding, “It’s the little things that get passed along when one is allowed to be brilliant in these spaces that inspire, and they are really important.”

The Parsons Legacy Dinner will be held each year at the end of February as the culminating event for the celebration of Black History Month.

“I had the pleasure to serve on the planning committee and watch fellow 2L BLSA members create an event that celebrated the life of a man who has broken both racial and judicial barriers,” said Amiri Lampley, ’20, BLSA’s new president. “The dinner reminded students of color that, although the path is not always easy, we owe it to the ones who came before us to pave the way for the ones who will come after us. The incoming BLSA Executive Board is excited to carry the torch and looks forward to sharing Judge Parsons’s legacy with an even larger audience this year.”

Judge Ann C. Williams, now retired from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, greets guests while then-Dean of Students Shannon Bartlett and Dean Thomas Miles look on.
CELEBRATING RICHARD EPSTEIN
ON HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY AND
50TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE ACADEMY
Richard Epstein: professor, mentor, happy warrior, unique thinker, singer, dancer, father, husband, friend. This is the Richard many know and love, the man whose estimated 996 writings and 50 years of teaching have undeniably influenced modern American legal thought—and the man to whom we dedicate this liber amicorum.

This is the beginning of the “book of friends” created to honor the University of Chicago’s James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Law—a scholar known not only for his enormous academic contribution but for his kindness, humor, and ability to speak extemporaneously in whole paragraphs.

In April, colleagues from around the country gathered at the Law School for a two-day Festschrift conference that explored many in the long list of legal topics that Epstein has addressed in the past five decades—contracts, legal history, Roman law, intellectual property, takings, administrative law, and more. The two-day event was co-sponsored with the NYU School of Law, where Epstein is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of Law. The book, Liber Amicorum for Richard A. Epstein, was distributed to all participants.

“Richard’s scholarship is remarkable for its range, erudition, and distinctive voice,” University of Chicago Law School Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics, wrote in an introduction to the book, which was a joint project between the Law School’s Coase-Sandor Institute for Law and Economics and NYU Law. “His influence on many areas of scholarship and the law itself is astonishing.”

But there’s another side to Epstein, Miles wrote: “his exceeding generosity as colleague and mentor. Richard has always taken an interest in the next generation and serves as a strong advocate and friend to younger scholars. I am one of a great many who have been fortunate enough to receive Richard’s advice and friendship.”

Epstein has written or contributed to at least 132 books and four dictionaries. He has written 480 law journal articles, 186 newspaper articles, 125 magazine articles, and 53 working papers. A study published in The Journal of Legal Studies identifies Epstein as the 12th most-cited legal scholar in the 20th century. One study of legal publications between 2009 and 2013 cites Epstein as the third most frequently cited American legal scholar after Erwin Chemerinsky and Cass Sunstein.

As his wife, Eileen Epstein, wrote, “Richard has a multitude of areas of expertise and is interested in almost everything. He never lacks for a topic to think about, to learn from others, or to explain and/or debate. He is known for his nonstop monologues on almost any subject that catches his attention, and the challenge for others is to know when they can interrupt with a question or even introduce a new topic. These characteristics have made him a fascinating spouse—but most of all his kindness and empathy are what have made Richard the best person I can imagine to spend my life with. He is a wonderful father, father-in-law, and grandfather and the best partner in the world.”

The 48-page Liber Amicorum for Richard A. Epstein contains 75 essays written by friends, family, and colleagues from across the country that capture both his expansive intellect and his bighearted grace. Here, we offer selected quotations, with full entries from members of the UChicago Law community and more photos available at www.law.uchicago.edu/news/celebrating-richard-epstein.
It has always been my sense that Richard welcomed me to the University of Chicago Law School because of and not in spite of the fact that when we first met I had done my best to tear his argument to shreds. For this, and for the many ways in which he inspired me to think harder and inform myself better, and for the wealth of information he has shared over the years, I am grateful.

MARY ANNE CASE
Arnold I. Shure Professor of Law

Every aspiring young academic wanted to go to Chicago in order, as one of my professors put it, “to let Richard Epstein battle for your soul.” Richard was the mentor most young academics can only dream of. Trying to take in everything he said was, as one person put it, “like putting a Dixie cup under Niagara Falls.” But even if you took only a fraction of what he said, you could learn how to teach, how to write, and how to think.

DOUGLAS G. BAIRD
Harry A. Bigelow Distinguished Service
Professor of Law

While much can be said about Richard’s scholarship, Richard was far more than a brilliant scholar, he could also be a brilliant friend. When I finally joined the faculty here I felt like I was joining the University of Epstein as much as I was the University of Chicago—perhaps because in so many respects they are one and the same.

LISA BERNSTEIN
Wilson-Dickinson Professor of Law
Richard’s generosity of spirit and infectious enthusiasm have been great influences on my development as a scholar. Before meeting Richard, I had not realized how much I could like and learn from someone with whom I often disagreed.

LEE FENNElL
Max Pam Professor of Law

It reminds me of Richard’s many incredible gifts. His passion for law. His love of his students. His accessibility and willingness to share ideas. His tirelessness. His intensity in everything, even the way he eats. And, most especially, the boyish enthusiasm that he brings to his, and my, chosen profession. We need more Richard Epsteins.

M. TODD HENDERSON
Michael J. Marks Professor of Law
There are a million Richard stories to tell, but what they have in common is his quirkiness alongside his generosity. That itself was something to learn from him; one could be a believer in markets and yet redistribute without any expectation of repayment in the small corner of the world one occupies. I was lucky to be in his corner.

**SAUL LEVMORE**
William B. Graham Distinguished Service Professor of Law

When I first arrived at Chicago as a faculty member, Saul Levmore invited me to a break-the-fast. I came with my one-year-old son. Although he was a very senior colleague, Richard took my son off me and told me to mingle and get to know my colleagues. Richard did not have to do that. It is a tribute to his kindness that he knew just then what this junior faculty member needed and was happy to lend whatever helping hand was required. This story, perhaps more than any other, captures for me the essence of Richard as a person.

**ANUP MALANI**
Lee and Brena Freeman Professor of Law

The greatness of Richard Epstein cannot be fully appreciated by those who have not been his colleague because he is so warm, generous, and supportive—a great man who happens also to be a great, innovative, and wide-ranging scholar.

**RICHARD H. McADAMS**
Bernard D. Meltzer Professor of Law

Whenever researching a new topic, I often think WWRT: What Would Richard Think?

**JENNIFER NOU**
Professor of Law and Ronald H. Coase Teaching Scholar
Richard was instrumental in maintaining the egalitarian culture at the University of Chicago Law School. He never pulled rank; I can’t imagine Richard acting as if he was entitled to deference because of his extraordinary stature as a scholar. He jumps in and engages on an equal footing with anyone, especially if their arguments are bold and counter-intuitive, and even if he completely disagrees. He is impatient only with people who seem to be lazily resting on their reputations, or to have sacrificed intellectual rigor for political advantage, even, in fact especially, if they are politically on his side of the fence.

DAVID A. STRAUSS
Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Richard is that rare thing in the academic life, a true original, going his own way no matter what fashions and trends are doing. [When] Catharine MacKinnon [was] asked whether she was not uncomfortable as a radical feminist in the University of Chicago Law School, she answered, not at all. “Because Richard does his thing, and I do my thing.” In other words, having a true original ensconced in the institution gives a new maverick permission to be herself.

MARTHA C. NUSSBAUM
Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics

FALL 2018 • THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL 37
Thank you so much, Dean Miles, for that generous introduction.

I want to recognize my current and soon-to-be fellow alumni, members of this esteemed faculty, and distinguished guests. Good morning all, it is a great honor and privilege to be with you today.

Let’s start with a HUGE congratulations to the Class of 2018!

I also want to recognize the family and friends in the audience today. Their lifetime of support has surely been as important to our graduates’ success as their intellect and hard work. You should all be proud of yourselves today. What a huge accomplishment!

Now, one receives much advice when preparing for a speech like this. And when you work at Nike, a lot of it is about what shoes to wear . . . so I hope you all appreciate my kicks.

But putting aside wardrobe-related matters, I’ll be honest: most of the advice I got was more panic-inducing than helpful. Be serious. Be funny. Be both—but not too much of either.

Be substantive—but don’t lecture. And the best: when you’re writing, keep in mind that this generation of lawyers will have to save the republic, so make sure it’s a call to action. Oh great, no pressure with that one. My favorite advice comes from my own father, who is here today. He said, “Hilary, just stick to the 3 Bs: be prepared, be brief, and be seated.” So now you all know that there is at least one member of the audience who is disappointed I’m not already wrapping this up.

But, alas, before I take my seat, there are a few things I want to share from my experience that I hope may be of help to you along the way.
Top of the list: value the people you are sitting with today. You and they are the leaders of tomorrow and the array of contributions you all will make is too vast to imagine today. When I sat in your seat, not only did I not expect to be where I am today, but I assure you I did not anticipate everything my classmates would accomplish either. My colleagues are partners at law firms and investment banks, law school professors and public-school teachers, prosecutors, public defenders, and pro bono leaders. They are general counsel to large public companies, cutting-edge start-ups, and leading universities. We have federal and state court judges, including a state Supreme Court justice, and senior government advisors from Chief of Policy for the City of Chicago to the chief of staff for a former vice president. From my world of sports, we have the CEO of the Women’s World Cup and the vice president of LA’s 2028 Olympic Games . . . The list goes on and on. And that’s just some of the women.

So, while the first-rate education and professional training you’ve received here will serve you well, your classmates are an unparalleled asset that will continue to give you pride, support, and inspiration throughout your careers. So, continue to invest in each other. You will find there is no greater return on investment out there—other, of course, than the ones made with family.

Speaking of which, this University is special to me not just because I once sat where you sit, as did my father before that and as my nephew does today, but also because my husband and two of my children were or are currently being educated here. One difference, however: all three chose instead to study philosophy. So, to avoid embarrassing them by my lack of erudition and, worse, being scorned for being too practical, which I assure you is a near-daily experience, I’m just going to go ahead and quote Aristotle to get it out of the way. He wrote in *Nicomachean Ethics*, “Excellence is an art won by habituation and training. We do not act rightly because we have virtue or excellence but rather we have these because we have acted rightly.” This thought has since been simplified as follows: “We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act but a habit.” Each
of you have been given an education that, along with your natural ability, gives you the potential for greatness whatever path you choose to follow. Whether or not you achieve that greatness will be decided by what you do tomorrow and each day thereafter.

This phenomenon is perhaps most easily demonstrated in the world of sport. One thing all of the world’s great athletes have in common is work ethic and the knowledge that consistent, everyday attention to the work has as much to do with greatness as innate gifts. Now I’m not going to argue that natural gift is not important; surely it is. But while helpful, it alone is insufficient.

When Michael Jordan first went out for his high school basketball team, he got cut. Instead, imagine this, MJ was relegated to junior varsity. When I was lucky enough to ask him how he went from the JV squad to six NBA titles, he said without hesitation, “I made it my business to be great every single day.” And when I followed up with, “So that’s how you brought it when it mattered?” He scolded me, “You missed my point, Hilary, it was every day that mattered.” (See what I did there, casually mentioning that I’m on a first-name basis with MJ. Shameful, I know, but impossible to resist.) In the same vein, Serena Williams has said failure to treat every trip onto the court as totally vital is to sacrifice the ability to summon that power when you most need it.

As it turns out, like in sport, muscle memory really matters in professional life.

So keep that in mind when you are called on to do some of the difficult and less-than-thrilling work that defines the earliest stages of lawyering (and just about anything else). Failing to read that last case or chase that last minor fact or tolerating a typo or misquote in the course of a mind-numbing assignment may seem small . . . but it isn’t. Bringing your best to small things will make you better at the big things.

What’s more, sometimes you do not even know when a big thing is upon you. It’s only when you look in the rearview mirror that you recognize a moment as being totally defining. Sometimes it is super easy to tell when something is important—the neon lights are flashing, endorphins are firing, and you bring all your focus. It’s a Supreme Court argument, a huge presentation, the closing of a massive deal. But more often, in the course of the everyday hurly-burly, you are asked to make a judgment or answer a question that may seem mundane . . . only to learn later that that moment, unaccompanied by any fanfare, was the decisive moment. When you look back on it, you will be either grateful for your habit of excellence, or despairing of your failure to develop it. I strongly recommend the former.

Now, for those of you sitting out there thinking “No problem, I have this excellence thing nailed—I got a perfect score on the LSAT, I can cite every case we ever studied, I can do multivariable calculus in my head”—and I know you’re out there—I have some challenging news. The kind of excellence I am talking about requires more than the ability to get precise things right.

It requires judgment, courage, and even humility. And, it should go without saying, the highest standard of ethics.

As it turns out, like in sport, muscle memory really matters in professional life.

So keep that in mind when you are called on to do some of the difficult and less-than-thrilling work that defines the earliest stages of lawyering (and just about anything else). Failing to read that last case or chase that last minor fact or tolerating a typo or misquote in the course of a mind-numbing assignment may seem small . . . but it isn’t. Bringing your best to small things will make you better at the big things.

What’s more, sometimes you do not even know when a big thing is upon you. It’s only when you look in the rearview mirror that you recognize a moment as being totally defining. Sometimes it is super easy to tell when something is important—the neon lights are flashing, endorphins are firing, and you bring all your focus. It’s a Supreme Court argument, a huge presentation, the closing of a massive deal. But more often, in the course of the
pace of change in society, technology, and global affairs only adds difficulty in solving the problems that you will likely confront. To address these challenges requires asking uncomfortable questions and delivering unwelcome messages. It requires nuanced thinking and the ability to see things not as they are now but as they will be in the future.

In this challenging environment, there is nothing more dispiriting, and in the end less effective, than people who see where the collective thought is moving and hasten to agree. There may be short-term gratification in agreeing with groupthink, but I warn against it. Ask the question no one else will ask! Speak truth to authority even when it’s scary! Having the courage to bring your unique perspective—especially when it challenges static assumptions about the future—will serve you, your clients, and society well.

Equally as challenging as the people lacking personal conviction are those too intellectually stubborn to even acknowledge a possible chink in their own intellectual armor.

So, in addition to excellence and courage, I encourage you to practice diplomacy as you practice the law. Cultivate your own style of disagreeing without being disagreeable. And, what’s perhaps hardest of all, at least for me, is learn to lose gracefully. (Well, everywhere but in court. There, zealous advocacy will require you to leave it all on the field.) No matter how sure you are, how much you’ve studied the issue, there are times when you will not win the day, no matter the depth of your conviction. In fact, there are times you might not even be right!

I had the pleasure to clerk for an esteemed alum of this school, the Honorable Milton I. Shadur, class of 1949. I learned an impossible number of important things from him. But my favorite was when he told me this: If I was at a party and one person told me I was drunk, I could stay. But if I was ever at a party and three people told me I was drunk, I should go home and lie down. Now given the time of my life when he knew me, it might be fair to assume he was actually talking about my social life, but he wasn’t. He was talking about my own intellectual stubbornness, my inability to step out of myself and look...
at an issue in a way other than how I first perceived it. He was rightly pointing out that I was more interested in winning the argument than in making sure I had thought through all the angles. He was encouraging me to see people disagreeing with me as an opportunity to learn, rather than as a challenge to my rectitude. It may well be the most valuable advice I ever received.

And so, it may not surprise you that one of my favorite books is one called *Being Wrong: Adventures in the Margin of Error* by Kathryn Schulz, which is all about the human capacity to be wrong about things large and small and be totally un-self-aware about it. I enjoy giving the book to lawyers who work for me. And as you might imagine, when I give them a book called *Being Wrong*, they often respond in an understandably discomforted way. My favorite was a woman who thanked me by saying, with tongue-in-cheek indignation: “Subtle, Hilary.” These reactions only remind me of our collective need to open our minds to our limitations as a way of unleashing our potential to be our best selves.

The bottom line? None of us has all the answers. We must cultivate the necessary skills to benefit from diversity of thought and experience . . . from deeply considering perspectives other than our own. We must not only challenge others, but surround ourselves with people who will challenge us, even when it’s unwelcome. In our increasingly fractured society, recognizing that the same question looks different to people with different life experiences is probably the most profound challenge and opportunity we have. In the end, graduates, my advice to you is this: Run straight at that challenge. Seek out those who think differently from you and learn from them. You’ve done this here, both in class and I suspect at Jimmy’s. Keep it up! Doing so will give you huge opportunities for personal and professional growth.

It was Woodrow Wilson who once said, “I like to use all the brains I have and all that I can borrow.” In order to make that come alive, other people need to be willing to share their brains with you. Do what you can to make that easy and desirable for them. You and whatever mission you are working on will be better for it.

So unlike what you may have heard at other graduations, I believe that life is not as much about finding yourself as it is about creating yourself. That is especially true in professional life.

I encourage you all to go out and create your greatness—valuing each other, with a habit of excellence, a courageous spirit, and an air of humility. I know you will do amazing things. Congratulations and Godspeed.
Remarks of Tom Ginsburg  
Leo Spitz Professor of International Law

Class of 2018, families, and friends, it is a tremendous honor for me and for all of the faculty to be here to join you on this momentous day. We call it commencement for a reason, for today after many years of schooling, you commence your professional careers and enter the learned profession of law. The phrase learned profession is a bit old-fashioned, but I’d like to spend a few minutes talking about it, because I think it is of tremendous importance in our current moment and for our democracy.

Let us start with the learned. All professions by definition involve the application of specialized knowledge to particular problems, and so they must be learned. Learning the law, in particular, is very much like learning a foreign language, in part because we lawyers we apply novel meanings to ordinary words. Venue is not just where you go to see a concert, a tort is not just an excellent Austrian cake, and a party is not just where you are going after graduation. Franz Kafka captured this when he noted that a lawyer is the only kind of person who can write a 10,000-word document and call it a “brief.”

Besides learning new meanings for old words, you’ve also learned new words, like curtilage, demurrer, joinder, and estoppel; if nothing else your Scrabble skills have advanced in these three years. And of course you now can impress your friends and family with Latin phrases ad infinitum, including res ipsa loquitur, mens rea, de novo, de jure, and de minimis. And if some of you are getting nervous right now because you don’t recognize all of these terms, don’t worry, because you’ll spend the next six weeks in bar review class learning them all over again. That brings me to another term you need to assign a new meaning to: bar review. Unbeknownst to many of you until now, this refers to an intensive period of study before the bar exam. Those of you who have actually studied a foreign language know that there is a steep learning curve. At first you are excited by all the new terms. Slowly, haltingly, you begin to put words and phrases together, you struggle with the new grammar and vocabulary, you have plateaus and breakthroughs, but you advance and then, one day,
eventually, you are ready to go out and walk the streets of a foreign city, to communicate with taxi drivers and street vendors, and it is here that the real learning happens.

Today is that day. You’ve spent three years learning a new language and are ready to go out into the world to try it out. In doing so, you will find that you know a lot of things, but there is also much more that you don’t. And you will need to continue to learn. As the Chinese sage Confucius observed 2500 years ago, “The essence of knowledge is, if you have it, to apply it; and if you do not have it, to confess your ignorance.”

Part of being a professional is to admit what you don’t know and to be responsible for your own continuing education. By this I don’t mean the bar-mandated Continuing Legal Education classes, though I do recommend that you attend these in accordance with the rules of your jurisdiction. I mean that you are now the designer of your own curriculum. You can choose what to read, who to listen to, who to ignore, and what skills to acquire. Discernment and judgment about these things are particularly important in our era, in which we are drowning in information and data. There is a kind of ethics of sorting through information in our era, an ethics not taught in the MPRE class. We did not teach you much about it, because no one does. But the ethics of sorting and acquiring information is essential for your continued education and may be relevant for the quality of our shared democratic future.

The legal profession, it has long been observed, has a special relationship with democracy. Tocqueville saw the profession as an American aristocracy, a keeper of civic virtue, and an important safeguard against the tyranny of the majority. His observation that scarcely any issue arises in the United States that does not end up in the courts is even truer now than it was in his day. This means that you all have just acquired not only a degree, but an extraordinary amount of social power. And you are graduating at an extraordinary time in which to use it.

The words used to describe our moment are all very familiar: we are swimming in outrage, polarization, and
mutual distrust. There is widespread concern for our civic discourse and even for the health of our democracy. But the moment is also one of great opportunity, for mobilization, articulation, and recommitment to our highest ideals of a learned profession in service of democracy.

Democracy should not be taken for granted, and to highlight the point I want to note that today, June 9, is the anniversary of two events, both relatively obscure to us now, that are separated by more than 2400 years. On this very day, in 411 BC, one of the world’s earliest democratic experiments in Athens was overthrown when a group of wealthy citizens established an oligarchy, the Council of 400. Like many oligarchies, the leaders fought among themselves and the regime did not last, but it did disrupt Athenian governance for the better part of a decade until democracy was fully restored.

Today is also the anniversary of the date in 1954 when at a televised hearing in the Senate, Army lawyer Joseph N. Welch asked Senator Joseph McCarthy a famous rhetorical question, “Senator, you’ve done enough. Have you no sense of decency, sir? At long last, have you left no sense of decency?” This exchange marked a major turning point in the downfall of Senator McCarthy and his chief counsel Roy Cohn, a man ultimately disbarred years later for ethical violations.

Welch’s story shows us the power of a lawyer, not in filing a motion or winning a case, but in speaking a simple truth at a time of great peril. It reminds us that professional ethics entails much more than simply following the relevant bar rules of the jurisdiction. It is not merely about avoiding comingling client funds or keeping communications confidential. It extends beyond acting in a traditional legal capacity. It involves acting with integrity, taking on an unpopular client or cause, saying no when a client asks you to do something you cannot, and treating adversaries with respect. It involves demanding decency, in public and in private. Each time you do one of these things, you act as an ethical professional. Each of these individual acts may be small, but in sum, repeated...
over the course of your career, they not only preserve the integrity of the profession, they protect the rule of law and democracy itself. As you go forth as learned professionals in this extraordinary time of challenge and opportunity, I’d like to suggest that some of the values of the University may be valuable touchstones in this regard. Now I know that we talk a lot about our values at the University of Chicago.

We have to admit that, like the country as a whole, we do not always realize those values perfectly, but this does not render them any less important or valid. The first value is that of rigorous and vigorous questioning of ideas. We talk a lot about how vigorous debate helps to get to the truth, and this is valuable and good. But debate has another quality that is particularly important in our era. When you debate to learn, your
opponent becomes not just an adversary to be defeated, but a source of potential information. And it can even be a source of empathy. As you fight in the courtroom or across the table over the contract terms, you would do well to try to see your opponent’s point of view. Indeed, this will make you a more effective advocate for your own side.

Debate also requires rules to structure it, and norms of mutual respect. As a lawyer, you fight zealously for your client, but at the end of the day, you may lose some cases or causes. When you lose, you don’t seek to overturn the rules which help to make the contest work, just as when you win you don’t demonize your opponent, but treat them with professional respect.

A second value of the University is the great Midwestern virtue of hard work. We like to think the University of Chicago is no longer the place where fun goes to die. That’s why I had to explain to you the other meaning of the term bar review. But the University is a place where we do work hard. Each of you has put in countless hours, and standing here today each of you has proven yourself to be in the 99.9th percentile of work ethic. This is a value that serves you well whatever you do. Some of you will go out and do mergers and acquisitions, others will be working on immigration cases or working for a federal judge, and some of you will return to your home countries to practice law. Some of you will be outside the law entirely. But all of you will be Chicago law school graduates, with the values of working hard for what you believe in and as professionals.

The third value is the importance of integrating ideas and practice. The law is called a learned profession because it is both a practical skill, but also grounded in ideas. You need both to be effective. Justice, the rule of law, equality, and even decency are all abstract concepts that only come to life through the everyday engagement of lawyers, who put the ideals into practice in their actions. I think the task of a lawyer in this regard is similar to that of a citizen in a democracy and was best summed up by a nonlawyer, Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American woman ever elected to the US Congress and the first woman ever to run for the Democratic Party’s presidential nomination. She said, “You don’t make progress by standing on the sidelines, whimpering and complaining. You make progress by implementing ideas.” I love that.

Today, you leave the University with the tools to go out and implement ideas. Your education as a learned professional does not end today, but you will set your own path in your education from this point forward. You have the work ethic and the values to do so. And you speak the local language. And, finally, if there is ever a time you get lost along the way, just remember to follow the Maroonbook road. Thank you, and congratulations to the Class of 2018!
The University of Chicago Campaign: Inquiry and Impact

Dear Alumni –

As we near the end of the University of Chicago Campaign: Inquiry and Impact in 2019, we remain vigilantly committed to increasing support for Law School students and faculty, clinics, programs and initiatives, and discretionary annual funds.

Now more than ever, our faculty remain uniquely committed to both scholarly and teaching excellence, our curriculum and clinical offerings have never been richer, and our students continue to impress us all with their intellect, work ethic, and commitment to serious debate.

The Law School’s tradition of unabashed enthusiasm for the life of the mind—the conviction that ideas matter, that they are worth discussing, and that legal education should devote itself to learning for learning’s sake—leads to an oftentimes passionate, even intense, engagement between and among faculty and students.

For more than a century, the University of Chicago Law School has molded students into analytical thinkers, producing not only the best lawyers, but leaders in government, legal education, entrepreneurial ventures, private and public law practice, corporate practice, alternative dispute resolution including arbitration and mediation, and nonprofit organizations.

Our achievements would not be possible without your support. With more than $215 million raised, thanks to alumni support, Inquiry and Impact will be the most successful fundraising campaign in the Law School’s history. Giving, at every level, is critical during the last months of the campaign. Your generosity not only strengthens the Law School today, but also ensures its growth and impact for generations to come.

On behalf of the entire Law School community, thank you for all you have done—and all you will continue to do—to support the people and programs that define our institution.

Thank you,

Thomas J. Miles
Dean and Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics

Scholarship Support

“Donors such as yourself empower first-generation college students from humble beginnings to pursue our dreams. My parents constantly remind me of how proud they are, and I walk into the Law School each and every day with my chin held high. This wouldn’t be possible without your support, and I aspire to exercise a similar degree of gratitude as soon as I am capable. Thank you.” —Scholarship Student, Class of 2019

Faculty Support

“The Law School is both a true intellectual community and a place that cares deeply about its students. These core values are what brought me here and keep me here.”

—Tom Ginsburg, Leo Spitz Professor of International Law, Ludwig and Hilde Wolf Research Scholar, Professor of Political Science

Clinics/Programs and Initiatives

“The opportunity to work for the Civil Rights and Police Accountability Project during my 1L summer was invaluable. The great thing about the clinic is that it’s designed to teach students. My supervisor invested a lot of time to not only expose us to all the work we’ll do as attorneys, but also to have us complete substantial projects that have a meaningful impact on the communities we serve.”

—Clinic Student, Class of 2018
Gift from David and Susan Kreisman Will Support Expansion of Kreisman Initiative for Housing Law and Policy

Thanks to a $5 million gift from David Kreisman, AB ’60, JD ’63, and his wife, Susan, the University of Chicago’s Kreisman Initiative for Housing Law and Policy will expand to include new programs aimed at advancing housing scholarship, building a community of scholars who will grow the program’s scope and impact, and creating research opportunities for graduate students, faculty, and practitioners.

The gift will establish a partnership between the University’s Mansueto Institute for Urban Innovation and the Law School, which hosted the Kreisman Initiative when it began in the fall of 2013. The two institutions will collaborate to expand the Initiative, bringing together the fields of urban science and law to develop new ideas about cities and housing.

“Cities are changing in America and across the world, and it is more important than ever to deepen our understanding of the economic and social implications of housing law and policy by bringing together top scholars and the best housing research and practice,” said Law School Dean Thomas J. Miles, the Clifton R. Musser Professor of Law and Economics. “We are deeply grateful for David and Susan’s generosity, and we look forward to working with the Mansueto Institute to create a permanent intellectual legacy rooted in rigorous inquiry, cutting-edge research, and interdisciplinary collaboration.”

The Mansueto Institute, endowed by a founding gift from Joe and Rika Mansueto, launched earlier this year to bring programs and scholars together to study cities and urban society.

The new Kreisman Initiative programming will include:

- The Kreisman Graduate Fellows Program, which will provide support for up to four fellowships per year for law and public policy graduate students, who will become part of a cohort of Mansueto Institute researchers from a variety of disciplines. It will expand the existing Law School Kreisman Fellows program to offer workshops, lectures, internships, and professional development opportunities to all fellows.

- A Kreisman Law Research Fellow, a legal academic who will conduct a research project on law, housing, and urban society. The fellow, who would be appointed by the Law School dean in consultation with the director of the Mansueto Institute, would participate in the intellectual life of the Mansueto Institute, furthering its connection to the Law School.

- A Kreisman Career Research Fellow, who will be a leading researcher or practitioner in housing at the Mansueto Institute. Kreisman Career Fellows will engage in research, present and organize workshops, advise and mentor students, and give lectures. Fellows will be recruited from around the world, helping to create a network of housing experts with whom students can interact.

David Kreisman is a co-founder of LOGS Legal Network, a multistate law firm that began in Illinois in 1971 as Shapiro & Kreisman. In 1996, Kreisman and his cofounder established the LOGS Group, the largest practice management services provider in the default legal services space. Kreisman has also been involved in funding and managing a number of commercial ventures.

“We are proud of what the Kreisman Initiative has accomplished since its founding and believe the results warrant substantial support as it continues to play an integral part in the law and policy environment at the University,” Kreisman said. “We look forward to seeing what will undoubtedly be important contributions from the new Kreisman Initiative fellows.”

Since its founding, the Kreisman Initiative has furthered its mission to bring Chicago ideas to bear on policy debates, policy making, and legal and business decision making through scholarly research, external engagement, and educational programming.
Annual Fund Highlights

Thank you to the 3,940 alumni and friends who made a gift to the Law School during 2017-18 fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$3.9 Million</th>
<th>Total dollars raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Percentage of gifts less than $500—Every gift counts!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>Dean’s Circle members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>First-time donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500+</td>
<td>Donors giving for 25+ consecutive years—Thank you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Law School Annual Fund provides vital resources for the students, faculty, and programs that make Chicago such an exceptional place.

Gifts to the Annual Fund:

- Provide scholarship assistance to attract the most promising students.
- Support faculty research and the influence of their scholarship on the important political and social issues of today.
- Enhance the programs and clinics that make our great school such a special place.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT OF THE LAW SCHOOL!

www.law.uchicago.edu/give

Reunion Weekend 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>720</th>
<th>Approximate number of alumni and friends who attended Reunion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 and 2013</td>
<td>Largest class attendance (65 and 78 people, respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.4 Million</td>
<td>Dollars raised by Reunion classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Reunion celebrants who made a gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Highest giving participation (Classes of 1968 and 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,483,435</td>
<td>Largest collective gift (Class of 1988)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAVE THE DATE: REUNION WEEKEND MAY 3-5, 2019
New Members of the Law School Council

For close to 70 years, the University of Chicago’s Councils have supported the Divisions, Schools, and Departments they serve, have communicated the work of those units to the world at large, and have enriched the relationship of the University and its closest friends.

Since 1962, the University of Chicago Law School Council* has supported Law School senior leadership, offering unique perspectives on law, legal education, and today’s ever-changing work environment, as well as sharing insight on important issues in legal education and the many challenges and opportunities confronting a contemporary law school.

Law School Council members bring a diverse set of talents and strengths to the Law School, contributing both individually and as a whole in many significant ways. Through their work, they help achieve the Law School’s core mission: to train well-rounded, critical, and socially conscious thinkers and doers. We thank them for their many contributions and welcome the newest cohort of members.

Mr. Paul Weidong Wang, LLM ’94, JSD ’99
Partner
Zhong Lun Law Firm

Ms. Lisa Monaco, ’97
Distinguished Senior Fellow,
New York University School of Law
Principal
WestExec Advisors
Former White House Homeland Security & Counterterrorism Advisor

Mr. Steven Koch, JD/MBA, ’82
Executive Committee Member
Chicago Community Trust

Mr. Jared Grusd, ’00
CEO
HuffPost

Visit vc.uchicago.edu to learn more about advisory councils at the University of Chicago.

*Formerly known as the Visiting Committee.
1947

John D. Lawyer
May 9, 2018
Lawyer served as an intelligence officer in the US Navy during World War II; he was posted in Brazil, where he practiced international law after the war. Upon returning to the US, he practiced with his father and uncle in Indiana. Later, he worked for Shell Oil in Denver, Colorado, and opened his own practice in Glenwood Springs, Colorado.

Robert A. Taub
March 7, 2016
Immediately after earning his JD, Taub was hired by Ford Motor Company, where he worked for more than four decades, retiring as the company’s director of corporate affairs planning. He served on the library commission of Dearborn, Michigan, for forty years, and founded and chaired the Dearborn Cinema Society. An avid collector of photographs, Taub left his collection to the Art Institute of Chicago.

1948

Hal M. Smith
January 6, 2018
A US Army veteran, Smith was a professor at the University of Maryland School of Law. He was a resident of Westminster, Maryland.

Bernard N. Marcantel
May 9, 2018
Marcantel was a World War II Army veteran. After earning a second JD from Tulane University Law School, he was elected Louisiana’s youngest district attorney, serving Jefferson Davis and Allen parishes. He practiced law in Jennings, Louisiana, for 68 years and also served as a city judge and as judge pro tem for a number of Louisiana judicial districts and the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Marcantel was an active volunteer in his church and in a number of community and professional organizations.

James J. McClure, Jr.
December 17, 2017
An Eagle Scout and later a captain in the US Navy during World War II, McClure spent his career as an attorney in Chicago. His volunteer work included two terms as president of the village board of Oak Park, Illinois; leading Oak Park Boy Scout Troop 16; and serving as a life trustee of McCormick Theological Seminary.

Milton I. Shadur
January 14, 2018
Shadur earned his undergraduate degree at the University and served as a radar officer in the US Navy during World War II. After more than 30 years in private practice, in 1980 he was nominated to the federal bench by President Jimmy Carter. As US District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Shadur wrote more than 11,000 opinions, oversaw a court-ordered desegregation plan for Chicago Public Schools, and approved a consent decree ordering the improvement of conditions at Cook County Jail. He never officially retired, continuing to work until the last weeks of his life. He was a resident of Glencoe, Illinois.

Richard H. Prins
May 4, 2018
A US Navy pilot during World War II, Prins was an attorney in the Chicago firm of Williams, Bennett, Baird & Minow before entering private practice. He was a Chicago resident.

Herbert I. Fredman
January 2018

Monroe Ackerman
August 15, 2017

Alexander W. Cook, Jr.
December 31, 2017
Cook served in the US military in Italy after World War II and worked as a bond broker at Smith Barney in Chicago. He lived in Burr Ridge, Illinois.

Merrill A. Freed
January 2018

1950

Robert Woodruff Hamilton
January 13, 2018
Hamilton’s first position was as a clerk for Associate Justice Tom C. Clark of the US Supreme Court. He then practiced at the Washington, DC, firm of Gardner, Morrison and Rogers before joining the faculty of the School of Law at the University of Texas at Austin. He authored many law textbooks, articles, and reviews during his career there, and retired as the school’s Minerva House Drysdale Regents Chair in Law.

Hamilton’s many volunteer activities included serving as chairman of the University Co-op, as a city councilman, and as chair of the zoning and planning commission of West Lake Hills, Texas.

1955

Seymour J. Kurtz
May 1, 2018

Samuel H. Mesnick
February 5, 2018
Mesnick served for two years in the US Navy and earned bachelor’s and master’s degrees in political science from Rutgers University before enrolling in the Law School. He had a long career in public service, including more than two decades as a prosecutor in Contra Costa County, California; he was later elected municipal court judge in Richmond, California, and retired as Contra Costa Superior Court judge. Mesnick was a cofounder of the Jewish Community Center of the East Bay (Berkeley branch).
1957

Robert M. Green
February 17, 2018
A second lieutenant in the US Air Force during the Korean War, Green spent most of his career at the Chicago law firm of Friedman & Koven; he later became in-house counsel at Jupiter Corporation. He was a longtime board member of the Gordon Center for American Public Policy at Brandeis University and of the Drexel Home for the Aged in Chicago; he was also active in the Jewish Federation of Chicago and the Epilepsy Foundation.

Marcus G. Raskin
December 24, 2017
Raskin was a piano prodigy who tutored the composer Philip Glass while living in Chicago, but was best known as a progressive activist and cofounder of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). While at IPS, Raskin cowrote the manifesto “A Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority,” urging young men to refuse to participate in the Vietnam War. In 1970, he and a colleague received the first batch of the Pentagon Papers from Daniel Ellsberg and passed them on to The New York Times. After stepping down as the director of IPS, Raskin remained there as a senior fellow and distinguished fellow. He lived in Washington, DC.

Payton Smith
September 22, 2015
Active in politics for decades, Smith was a delegate for John F. Kennedy to the 1960 Democratic National Convention. He served as chief assistant US attorney for the Western District of Washington before joining the Seattle law firm of Davis Wright Tremaine, where he worked for nearly 50 years. He was a member of the board of regents of the American College of Trial Lawyers and wrote a biography of Washington governor Albert Dean Rosellini.

1959

Merlin O. Baker
June 4, 2018
Baker served in the US Army Counter Intelligence Corps before enrolling at the Law School; after graduation, he returned to his home state of Utah, where he worked at the law firm of Ray Quinney & Nebeker in Salt Lake City before starting his own practice. He was a dedicated volunteer in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, leading the church’s Canada Halifax Mission in the 1970s and serving in the church’s addiction recovery program.

William E. Burns
December 27, 2017
Burns had a long career as an attorney and manager at Chicago Title Insurance Company in Edwardsville, Illinois, where he lived. He was a member of St. Andrew’s Episcopal Church and the Edwardsville Rotary Club.

Robert H. Gerstein
March 29, 2018
Gerstein’s first job after graduation was at Yates, Holleb & Glassel (now Holleb, Gerstein, & Glass). A longtime real estate attorney in Chicago, he was also a developer of residential, office, and retail projects in the Loop and Lincoln Park and built low- and moderate-income housing in Chicago and Highland Park, where he lived. He was the first chair of Highland Park’s Housing Commission and served on Chicago’s Metropolitan Planning Council during its court-ordered work to desegregate the city’s public housing.

Neale A. Secor
November 14, 2017
Secor practiced law briefly before earning a master of divinity degree at Union Theological Seminary in New York City; he served as rector of St. Mary’s Episcopal Church there for nearly two decades. After leaving St. Mary’s, he joined the maritime ministry, working at the Seamen’s Church Institute of New York and New Jersey, and then becoming director of the Seamen’s Church Institute of Philadelphia. He divided his time between Philadelphia and the Dominican Republic.

1960

Diana Standahl Eagon
April 9, 2018
Eagon was a family court referee in Hennepin County (Minnesota) for more than a decade, until she was appointed to a Minnesota District Court judgeship in 1995. She was an active member of the National Association of Women Judges.

David K. Floyd
February 1, 2018
A US Air Force veteran, Floyd was a pioneer in the field of environmental law at Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine & Huber, where he eventually became managing partner. He served as town justice in Aurora, New York, where he lived, and was involved in the town’s open-space planning work. Floyd was also a longtime volunteer with Habitat for Humanity and a director emeritus of the Western New York Land Conservancy.

Evan M. Kjellenberg
January 18, 2018
Kjellenberg spent his career in private practice, first in Illinois and later in Sister Bay, Wisconsin, where he lived at the time of his death. While in Illinois, he chaired the committee to rewrite the state’s Uniform Commercial Code and was a member of the Chicago Law Club. He volunteered as a member of the Lions Club and the Fourth of July association in Evanston, Illinois, and for the Sister Bay Historical Society.

Thomas J. McLaughlin
November 20, 2017
Kenneth L. Gillis
November 11, 2015
Gillis’s long career in the law included stints as a defense attorney, advocate, in-house counsel, prosecutor, mediator, and judge in Chicago, where one of his most famous rulings held that a city ordinance could not be used to prosecute artists who incorporated American flags into their works. Gillis taught remedies and trial advocacy at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law and received a teaching award there. In recent years, he was a consultant advising the Center on Wrongful Convictions at Northwestern University.

Miriam D. Balanoff
September 28, 2017
Balanoff was a married mother of three when she earned her undergraduate degree at the University and received a full scholarship to the Law School. Devoted to social justice and progressive causes, she went into private practice and taught a course on women and the law at Chicago-area colleges before being elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1978. She was elected Cook County Circuit Court judge in 1986 and served 14 years on the bench. Balanoff lived in Chicago.

Charles Kleinbaum
December 1, 2017
Kleinbaum earned his undergraduate degree at the University; he had a long career as an attorney, mainly in the Chicago area. He played the trumpet in a number of community bands, including the Madison College Big Band, near his most recent home in Middleton, Wisconsin.

Thomas H. Kabaker
January 5, 2016
Kabaker practiced law in Chicago for many years; he also served as an assistant state’s attorney and worked for the Federal Trade Commission. A committed civic volunteer, he served on the boards of directors of the Chicago Housing Authority and the Regional Transportation Authority. Kabaker lived in San Diego, California.

Robert A. Weninger
November 30, 2017
Weninger, a US Air Force veteran, began his legal career as a trial attorney for the National Labor Relations Board and the federal public defender’s office in San Diego, California, before joining the faculty of Texas Tech University School of Law in 1974. There, he pioneered empirical research that used sociological data in analyses of the US legal system; he was also a highly regarded teacher with a devoted following of students who dubbed themselves the “Order of the Weni.” Weninger was a resident of Lubbock, Texas.

Nicholas J. Bosen
May 14, 2018
Bosen, former dean of students and director of placement at the Law School, practiced law in Chicago for many years; he also served as an assistant state’s attorney and worked for the Federal Trade Commission. A committed civic volunteer, he served on the boards of directors of the Chicago Housing Authority and the Regional Transportation Authority. Bosen lived in San Diego, California.

Barbara J. Hillman
June 5, 2018
Hillman was a well-known labor attorney in Chicago, where she joined the firm of Cornfield and Feldman—eventually becoming its first female partner—after earning both her undergraduate degree and JD from the University. Hillman represented workers of all kinds, from coal miners to retail workers to ballet dancers, the latter joining her client roster when she became chief counsel for the American Guild of Musical Artists. Hillman was also a lifelong civil-rights activist, registering voters in Mississippi and volunteering for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s Chicago Freedom Movement.

Voyle C. “Tom” Wilson
March 20, 2018
Wilson, known to all as Tom, also earned his undergraduate degree at the University. After graduation, he practiced law for many years in Chicago, becoming partner at a prominent firm. His great passion was sailing, which he learned with his wife early in their marriage. A curious mind, he enjoyed history and antiques, and believed strongly in education, supporting many family and friends with their educational pursuits.

Stanley E. Ornstein
June 4, 2018
Ornstein earned his undergraduate degree at the University. After graduation, he practiced law in Honolulu and in Plains, Montana, before joining the Chicago labor-law firm of Cotton, Watt, Jones & King. She often represented workers at meatpacking plants and worked undercover at a Kansas plant in the mid-1980s, later testifying about the experience before a congressional subcommittee on meat safety. She also provided legal services pro bono to the nonprofit Women Employed. She was a resident of Indianapolis and of Lakeside, Michigan.

Peggy Anne Hillman
August 31, 2015
Hillman practiced law in Honolulu and in Plains, Montana, before joining the Chicago labor-law firm of Cotton, Watt, Jones & King. She often represented workers at meatpacking plants and worked undercover at a Kansas plant in the mid-1980s, later testifying about the experience before a congressional subcommittee on meat safety. She also provided legal services pro bono to the nonprofit Women Employed. She was a resident of Indianapolis and of Lakeside, Michigan.
1969
John H. Ferguson
December 26, 2017
Ferguson spent his career as a lawyer for the National Labor Relations Board; at the time of his death, he was associate general counsel in the Division of Enforcement Litigation, where he oversaw attorneys responsible for litigation in federal and state courts. He received a Presidential Rank Award from the US government for sustained extraordinary accomplishment and the American Bar Association’s Mary C. Lawton Outstanding Government Service Award.

1970
William A. Peters
December 21, 2017
Peters began his career in the Minnesota Office of the Attorney General and later went into private practice. After his legal career ended, he worked at a number of jobs, including as a sous chef, a butcher, and a car salesman. He was active in his church, an avid sportsman, and a lifelong learner.

1971
Michael McGuire Eaton
July 15, 2017
Eaton’s first stint at the University was as a preschooler at the Lab School; after graduating from the Law School, he was a clerk in the US District Court for the Southern District of Florida. He spent the remainder of his career practicing antitrust law at Arent Fox in Washington, DC, and volunteered as chair of the board of his local library for ten years. He was a resident of Reston, Virginia.

1975
Jack L. Uretsky
August 24, 2017
Prior to enrolling in the Law School, Uretsky served in the US Navy and earned three degrees—culminating in a PhD in theoretical physics—from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He worked as a professor and a physicist at a number of institutions, including the Argonne National Laboratory, before establishing a legal practice in Illinois, taking cases that ranged from veterans’ issues to patent law. At the time of his death, he was a guest physicist at Argonne and lived in Hinsdale, Illinois.

1977
Philip E. Harris
January 12, 2018
Harris earned a master’s degree in economics at the University before earning his JD. For nearly four decades, he taught agricultural law at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, where he was chair of the Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics. He also founded Tax Insight, LLC, a company that provides education for tax practitioners, and cofounded the Land Grant University Tax Education Foundation.

1979
Joseph Caleb Markowitz
January 25, 2018
Markowitz began practicing law at a litigation firm in New York City, later joining an international firm and working in Los Angeles, before moving to a smaller firm and then establishing his own practice. He specialized in commercial litigation as well as intellectual property, employment law, entertainment law, real estate, and bankruptcy litigation. He also conducted private and court-ordered mediations and was a board member and board president of the Southern California Mediation Association.

1980
William J. Paul
June 6, 2018

1988
Daniel John Taub
April 11, 2018
Taub worked in Chicago as a guardian ad litem for abused and neglected children before moving to Vermont in 1992. He devoted his time to raising his two daughters, volunteering for political campaigns, serving as the zoning administrator in North Bennington, Vermont, and volunteering at his temple and his daughters’ school.

1997
Jeffrey A. Greenblatt
November 2017
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for issues of privacy
A Lifetime Committed to the Law on and beyond the Bench

Lee Hyman Rosenthal, ’77, has served on the US District Court for the Southern District of Texas since 1992. She has been chief judge since 2016. Beyond her “day job” on the bench, she has had substantial influence in shaping a broad range of areas of the law.

“I can’t think of a more fulfilling position than being a district court judge,” she said. “You get all the issues you might see at an appellate court, plus all the everyday interactions with the parties and the attorneys. It could be a voting-rights case or some other constitutional challenge, or a criminal trial or a slip-and-fall at Walmart—the variety is great and the outcomes are consequential. What I do every day matters, and there’s no greater everyday motivation and satisfaction, for me at least, than that.”

Chief Justice Rehnquist appointed her in 1996 to the Judicial Conference’s advisory committee on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and he named her as the committee’s chair in 2003. Along with a sweeping simplification and clarification of those rules, the committee updated them to address e-discovery and other issues presented by new technologies. Just as that work was finishing, Chief Justice Roberts asked her in 2007 to chair the Judicial Conference’s committee on rules of practice and procedure, where she again led a major modernization.

“I worked with brilliant legal minds for more than 15 years on the federal rules, and every minute of it was wonderfully satisfying,” she said. While that major work might be her most notable contribution to the content of American jurisprudence, it’s far from her only one. At the American Law Institute, where she is now second vice president, she has been involved in legal reform projects related to sexual assault, conflict of laws, employment law, and other matters. She teaches a course each summer for state, federal, and international judges and has lectured or taught at law schools that include Yale, Duke, Cornell, and the University of Houston.

Awards and honors follow wherever she goes. She’s been named trial judge of the year three times by the Texas Association of Civil Trial and Appellate Specialists; she was awarded the Lewis F. Powell, Jr. Award for Professionalism and Ethics by the American Inns of Court; and the Fifth Circuit district judges have chosen her as their representative on the Judicial Conference. She’s a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

“I thank the Law School every day for giving me the tools, and the belief, that this kind of life in the law was not only possible, but worth committing a lifetime to,” she said. “It wasn’t just the great faculty, but also my fellow students who showed me that thinking hard and digging deep—and laughing and having fun—could all be part of the study and practice of law. I look at what my classmates and other graduates have accomplished in so many diverse fields, and it’s hard for me to imagine that there’s a better education for anything than what a person gets at the Law School.”

With her husband, Gary, she has four daughters. The oldest, Rebecca, was diagnosed with a substantial cognitive disability when she was 6 months old and now divides her time between the family home and a community-living facility. “Rebecca’s diagnosis is the only really bad thing that has happened in my life,” Judge Rosenthal recalled, “and I wouldn’t change it for anything.” Daughter Hannah served two tours in Afghanistan as an Army intelligence officer and now attends medical school, Jessica is a curatorial associate at an art museum, and Rachel is in business school. “No grandchildren yet,” Judge Rosenthal said, “but in the meantime, lots of grandclerks.”
Helping Chicago Remain a Livable City for Everyone

In 2012, after 27 years at Credit Suisse, where he became vice chairman and headed its global mergers and acquisitions business, Steven Koch, JD/MBA ’82, accepted the position of deputy mayor of Chicago, with a portfolio that included strengthening the city’s economic and social infrastructure.

“Serendipity has been a huge factor in my career,” he said. “I stumbled into investment banking at the right time with some applicable skills, and it worked out well. Then when Mayor Emanuel called, even though I was very happy where I was, I was ready for a new challenge and a chance to perhaps do something for the city I love, and that just plugged me into a whole new world.”

His path into banking began with a summer job during law school, when he worked with clients doing a bond transaction. He found the assignment interesting, and he was drawn to the financial firm’s robust energy. After a Court of Appeals clerkship, he joined Lehman Brothers. “M&A didn’t even exist as a field then, so I was in on the ground floor of the massive boom that was coming,” he said.

“Right place, right time; it’s pretty much that simple—except that I might not have succeeded if it hadn’t been for my time at the Law School,” he said. “That’s where I got the core skills that I was able to apply; where I learned how to think, how to analyze issues, how to separate what matters in a situation from what doesn’t. By the time I graduated it was like someone had opened up my head, removed my old brain, and replaced it with a newer version that worked much better."

He continued using those skills during his nearly five years as Chicago’s deputy mayor, leading the contentious process of addressing the city’s substantial financial challenges. He is credited as a major factor in putting the budget on a more sound footing; attracting hundreds of new businesses and more than 50,000 new jobs; revamping rules regarding real estate development and affordable housing; and rebuilding infrastructure, including substantial upgrades to O’Hare Airport and the city’s public transit system.

“The real challenge for Chicago going forward is how to remain a livable city, for everyone,” he said, citing income inequality as a particular concern that requires sustained long-term attention.

In the next phase of his life, he intends to make a dent in that issue and many others, but he first took some time to reflect and decompress. On the day after he left his city hall office for the last time, he was at the US-Canada border, about to begin a bicycle ride that would take him along the length of the Mississippi River, a journey of 2,320 miles that he accomplished in 44 days. In 2010, he and his son Jacob biked 3,100 miles together, from California to Florida. He had taken up bicycle riding as an adult as a way to purge some of the distress and anxiety during the time that his wife, Ellen Liebman, was suffering from ovarian cancer, from which she died in 2005. Koch and Liebman met at the Law School when he was a student and she was a Bigelow Teaching Fellow. “Meeting Ellen is another thing I’m thankful to the Law School for,” he said. “Every day I had with her was a blessing.”

His 2010 cross-country bicycle ride became a fundraiser for the Sinai Health System, where he had been chairman of the board; the most recent ride raised funds for the Greater Chicago Food Depository, on whose board he also serves. He is presently active on nine nonprofit boards, and he will chair the board of City Tech Collaborative, which incorporates grassroots engagement into technology strategies to upgrade city life. He’s also investing in a variety of small companies, and he’s considering opportunities to serve on public-company boards. “I’m only going to do things whose purposes feel deeply important to me,” he said. “I’m very mindful of using my time as well as I can.”
After Emigrating from Iran as a Teen, He Built an Exceptional Career

When Cyrus Amir-Mokri graduated from the Law School in 1995, it marked a transition from one exceptional part of his life to another. Today, he’s the general counsel of JPMorgan Corporate and Investment Bank, after a career path that has included high-level government service as well as a law firm partnership. In 1981, when he was 16 years old, he and his 13-year-old sister immigrated to the US from Iran, without their parents (who would come to the US some years later), going to school in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin. He went to Harvard the next year, graduating with a degree in biochemistry. Before he entered the Law School, he earned a PhD from the University of Chicago with a dissertation about Iranian constitutional history.

“I went to the Law School in part because it then had the Center for the Study of Constitutionalism in Eastern Europe, and I wanted to consider how different societies dealt with political, legal, and economic reform through constitutional processes,” he recalled. “It was a great program, but what turned out to matter most for me was really learning how to think about issues, a skill that the Law School built every day, in class and outside it. To have that ingrained has been an amazing benefit that has lasted throughout my career and influences me every single day.”

After graduating from the Law School he joined Skadden Arps, where he worked on and off until he assumed his current position in 2015. When he wasn’t at Skadden, he was senior counsel to the chairman of the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) between 2009 and 2011 and assistant secretary for financial institutions at the US Treasury Department from 2011 to 2014.

At the CFTC, his principal focus was on the design and passage of Dodd-Frank legislation and then implementing the Dodd-Frank rules assigned to the CFTC. At Treasury, he worked with all of the national’s financial regulatory agencies to help complete the process of financial reform, as well as carrying out other responsibilities that included administering investments, loans, and grants to speed recovery for small businesses and distressed neighborhoods. “I was honored to be able to serve the country during times of financial distress and recovery,” he said.

Before his government service, he clerked for US Court of Appeals Judge Bruce Selya. “I can’t begin to say how much I learned from Judge Selya,” he said. “His sense of fairness and justice was so deep—he cared about every case as though it was the only one he would ever decide. He made real for me the truest meaning of equal justice for all under the law.” When Amir-Mokri married some years after his clerkship, Selya presided at the wedding.

A recipient of the Ellis Island Medal of Honor for outstanding contributions by immigrants to the United States, he is troubled by the current American climate. He said: “My parents sent my sister and me to the United States, and later came here themselves, because they believed in the promise of a society that valued diversity, a cosmopolitan society that was interested in what you could contribute, not where you were from or what faith you practiced. Throughout my life I have observed and studied how countries have chosen different paths over time. A welcoming democratic society is created by humans, and they can undo what they have created, or they can sustain and build it. I think we’re all facing that choice now.”

In his current position heading legal services for one of JPMorgan Chase’s four business lines, he oversees a staff of approximately 600 persons, and he sits on several internal governance committees. He said that his previous experiences, including having served JPMorgan Chase as a client when he was at Skadden, have made the job less challenging than it otherwise might have been, but it’s still daunting. “The learning curve can be steep, and the business is undergoing significant change that has to be attended to every day. You can’t rest on your laurels, such as they might be. That’s true for individuals, companies, and countries—the challenge for us all is to use the best of what we have now to make things better for the future.”

My son Adi just turned 9 and will start fourth grade in the fall, and daughter Dia is 5 and will start first grade. They are enjoying being near lots of family up here where Parul grew up. I get to travel a bit for work, so if anyone knows of anything a mid-sized endowment might be interested in investing in, please let me know. I love to learn!”

Amy Courtin Sohl: “I’m Vice President and Assistant General Counsel at Information Resources, Inc., in Chicago. I joined IRI as a contract attorney in March 2014 and was hired on in September 2014, so am coming up on four years.”

Jen Wisner Kelly writes: Tucker Kelly and I are still in Concord, Massachusetts, after moving back from London 18 years ago. Tucker is the CFO of Deciphera Pharmaceuticals, an oncology drug company in Waltham, Massachusetts, that went public in the fall of 2017. I recently dusted off my bar card to volunteer at The Second Step, a domestic violence advocacy nonprofit in Newton, Massachusetts, where Carolyn Baker Ringel and I work together on family law cases. I have
Beating Cancer and Becoming a “Rising Star” in Appellate Litigation

Tacy Flint, ’04, a partner at Sidley Austin, has established herself as a premier appellate lawyer, recognized in 2015 by Law360 as one of seven nationwide “rising stars” in appellate litigation and named last year as one of the 60 most influential women lawyers in Chicago by Crain’s Chicago Business.

Her enthusiasm for a well-crafted legal argument began early, at a mock contracts class during Admitted Students Weekend. “Saul Levmore led the class, and he demonstrated to us what every Chicago student learns but wasn’t evident to me then as a newcomer to the law, about following the logic without being constrained by formulas and labels,” she said.

“It was thrilling, and that feeling of fog lifting and clarity settling in continued—I would still say that my Elements class was the most illuminating nine weeks of my life.”

After that high, Flint suffered a low during the summer between her 2L and 3L years when she was diagnosed with a relapse of Hodgkin lymphoma—a form of cancer she had first been treated for four years earlier. She spent the first quarter of her 3L year as a patient at the University of Chicago Hospital. Even though she took a step back from studies, she came to appreciate the Law School in a new way. “During that quarter, the Law School felt like home. Dozens of classmates visited me in the hospital and brought me books, movies, and board games. And Dean Levmore showed up with homemade cranberry bread.”

Flint returned to the Law School in winter quarter and graduated the following December. She went on to clerk for Richard Posner at the US Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and then for Justice Stephen Breyer at the Supreme Court. “Working with Judge Posner was a continuation of the eye-opening learning I had experienced at the Law School, and Justice Breyer’s pragmatism taught me a lot about how effective arguments are constructed,” she said. “Plus, they were both real characters, in the best sense of that word, which made work more fun than it’s sometimes supposed to be.”

She joined Sidley in 2007 and is a member of its Supreme Court and Appellate Litigation team. Her arguments have been instrumental in achieving favorable outcomes for her clients in a wide range of commercial cases, including intellectual property, antitrust, taxation, and privacy protection.

Her extensive pro bono practice has included cases related to legislative redistricting, First Amendment protections, and education reform. She is currently engaged in litigation contending that the State of Michigan has violated the federal Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses by excluding students in certain Detroit schools—which the state has run for many years—from access to literacy. “The literacy rates in some Detroit schools are close to zero,” she said. “Access to literacy is a right held by all children, and this systemic failure to provide that access needs to be rectified.”

She is the mentorship coordinator for Sidley’s litigation practice group and participates each year in the Law School’s Women’s Mentorship Program. “I thrived at the Law School because it offered both intellectual rigor that challenged me analytically and a close-knit community that held me up. I hope to help students and Sidley associates thrive in the same way by fostering mentorship,” she said. She is also one of Sidley’s recruitment partners—working, she said, “to bring the next generation of University of Chicago superstars to the firm.”

She said that the nature of her work has not only been a source of professional satisfaction, but it has helped her achieve a highly satisfying personal life, as well. “I get to spend my time thinking big thoughts about things that matter,” she observed, “and the flexibility in my work has helped me build and sustain a wonderful family life.”

She and her husband, Graham Meyer, have three children: an 8-year-old and twin 3-year-olds. Meyer, whom Flint met while they were in college, is a freelance writer, editor, composer, and crossword puzzle constructor. “We love living in Chicago, and I can’t imagine a better place to practice law than where I am right now,” she said.
“Building on What I Learned from the Law School”

Gilbert Dickey, ’12, clerked for Justice Clarence Thomas in the 2017-2018 Supreme Court term. “In my short career in the law, I have been so fortunate,” Dickey said. “I’ve been helped by so many people—people who were not only exemplars of how law should be practiced, but also great, caring mentors.”

After graduating from the Law School, Dickey clerked for Court of Appeals Judge William H. Pryor Jr., where he reaped two benefits. The first he described as “a one-of-a-kind learning experience with a judge of uncommon diligence and unwavering intellectual honesty.” The other he called “the best thing that has ever happened to me”—meeting his wife, Jennifer, who was also clerking for Judge Pryor. The two were married last year.

Lin, who had clerked for Justice Thomas, supported Dickey’s application for a clerkship, which Judge Pryor had encouraged him to submit. “I can’t say that a Supreme Court clerkship was really on my radar,” Dickey said, “but if they thought I could handle it, I felt like I must be ready, or at least ready enough. They had certainly given me all the preparation a person could hope for, building on what I had learned at the Law School.”

He said that the Law School helped him in the expected ways—through superb classroom experiences, challenging intellectual exchanges with other students, and invigorating interactions at various student organizations—and it also helped him manage daunting workloads. “Like many students, I felt overwhelmed at times, and I learned to create a system and work methodically through it,” he said. “That skill has come in handy.”

Lecturer Adam Mortara, ’01, who taught Dickey at the Law School and who himself clerked for Justice Thomas, has said that he wasn’t surprised that Dickey was selected by Thomas. “He has a quality that Justice Thomas looks for but sadly few with Gilbert’s incredible legal intellect possess, which is genuine humility,” Mortara said.

Observing that Judge Pryor and Justice Thomas both established very positive relationships with their clerks, Dickey said, “I feel like I’ve become part of two big new families just in the past few years, families full of very smart people who care about each other and who honor the highest standards of the legal profession in all that they do.”
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The Class of 2012 is on a tear as usual.

Patrick Castle and I went mano a mano in the courtroom of Judge John Z. Lee (N.D. Ill.) this past spring. Are we the very first classmates from the Class of 2012 to go head-to-head, toe-to-toe, one-on-one, in court? E-mail me if you and a classmate beat us to it!

Monica Castro has become an Assistant United States Attorney, prosecuting criminals in the Eastern District of New York. She joined the Brooklyn office after clerking for Judge LaShann DeArcy Hall. Monica now has one of those jobs where her cases generate news coverage, which is how I found out about this.

It is my professional responsibility to report that Sheldon Evans is now an Assistant Professor of Law at St. John’s University, where he teaches—you saw it coming—professional responsibility.

Valerie Farnum married Aaron Cahan in 2015. Some of you will remember Aaron as the enigmatic but likable figure who whiled away his afternoons in the Green Lounge while Valerie was in class. Those days are gone. Valerie and Aaron are now the proud but busy parents of baby Peter. Valerie is at Hughes Hubbard & Reed, in New York.

Carl Newman has joined the firm Cranfill Sumner & Hartzog LLP in its Raleigh office. After 4.5 years at Robbins Russell, Shai Bronshtein is now a trial attorney with the Department of Justice, Criminal Division, Money Laundering Section, International Unit, Team A. It’s a mouthful, but what government title isn’t?

Amy Beaux got married in New York this year to Sonia Brown, a real estate broker, songwriter, and musician. Amy recently moved to Simpson Thacher after six years at Paul Weiss. Amy, if Sonia can have three careers, what’s stopping you from working at both firms?

We end on a cautionary tale. I was in New York for a deposition recently, and I asked Peter Davis if he wanted to meet up for a drink. Peter said he would be working too late at the office. Fine. Until I bumped into Peter walking down Third Avenue at 8:00 p.m. Busted! Peter, I’m tabulating a figure for my emotional damages.
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Updates were not submitted for the Class of 2012 for this edition of the Record. Please submit your updates for the next issue to your class correspondent, Daniel D’Agostini.
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It was so energizing to catch up with many of you at our five-year Class Reunion in May! Thank you for your
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS OF 2018

For the Degree of Master of Laws
Ingo Albert
Ines Amar
Vinicius Azambuja de Oliveira
Pavel Bachleda
Sampada Bannurmath
Julio César Moreira Barboza
Luis Eduardo Bologna Tierno
Beatrice Bottini
Lauriane Caroline Françoise Chauvet
Yu Cheng
Erick Emmanuel Clavel Benitez
Viviane de Azevedo Rodrigues
Nino De Lathauwer
Kasper De Rycke
Chad Gerard de Souza
Eugénie Delval
Amber Doyle
Elettra Maria Gaspari
Xi Gao
Elette Maria Gaspari
Luis Filipe Gentil Pedrio
Alejandro Pezzolo Giacaglia
Remy Goosdon
Chul Gun Gu
Laura Hellwig
Lucas Johannes Theodor Hertneck
Yuting Zheng
Yue Zhang
Ye Zeng
Yuting Zheng
Domenico Zuccaro
Shahok Zuqurnain

For the Degree of Master of Legal Studies
Braden Fisher Dauzat

For the Degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence
Silvia Beltrametti
Xin Dai
Pramuda Azhar Oktavinarinda
Zoi Dorothy Robinson

For the Degree of Doctor of Law
Bijan Michael Aboutorabi
Teressa Acedo Betancourt
Phillip A. Acevedo
Teresita Acedo Betancourt

Rafael Gunth Romiti
Laura Kim Rothmann
Jessica Rowlands
Julien Sad
José Francisco Salem Ojeda
Thomas William Samuel
André Da Costa Santa Rita
Júlia Maira Benvenutu dos Santos
Luís Andres Schrader Mindreau
Rakshit Sharma
Sindoori Srinam
Nathalie Viviane Stauder
Adriana Josefina Tudela Gutiérrez
Andrea Vainer
Laurence Van Mullum
Nicolas Vande Velde
Flávia Villas Boas Kleinhalp
Luís Ignacio Villasmiil Bolinaga
Lukas Bodo Benedikt von Ditfurth
Dominic Andrews Wyss
Ye Zeng
Yue Zhang

Laura Noelle Casselberry
Gabriel P. Chamsnas
Bianca Gabriela Chamusco
Jeremy Chen*
Chinwe T. Chukwugwo
Eric J. Clamage
Madison Renee Clark
La’Nese S. Clarke
Taylor Bryce Coles**††
Brenton Hayes Cooper*
John Corfman*
Lauren Elizabeth Ivy Croft
Clayton James Cromer*
Cade Matthew Cross*
Katy Ruth Cunningham*
Andrew Jason Coja
Michelle Muxie Dang***
Joshua Thomas Davids
Lennit R. Davis-Sternitz*
Matthew J. Deates*
Hope Michaela DeLap
Marisa Katryna Demko
Sarah Denise Dobrofsky
Andrew Geyer Duble‡
Roisin L. Duffy-Gideon**††
Jacqueline Taylor Duhl
Matsion D. Enio
Therese Lenczewski Erickson Meyer
Elizabeth N. Ertle*
Lisa L. Fan
Wallace H. Feng
Katerina Fishchuk
Riley Patrick Foley
Stephen Doughs Ford, Jr.
Alison Elizabeth Frost
James Dahle Frost IV
Patrick J. Fuster***††
Michael Anthony Galides
Thomas M. Garvey, Jr.*
Amelia R. Garza-Mattia
Douglas Wilson Gates
Ryan Michael Gaylord
Hannah Elise Gately***‡
Makar Levon Gevorkian
Carly Gibbs
Alison Noel Giest
Robert Francis Golan-Vilella**
David Henry Garrison Golubock*
Aleksey Grabovly
Nicholas William Greiner
Taylor M. Grode
Kathrine L. Gutiierrez
Janice Emmeline Han
Ian Macaulay Hansen*
Joshua Hiram Harris
Alan Scott Hassler***††
R. Harrison Hawkes†‡
Janie Renée Heagen
Nicole A. Heise
Zachary L. Henderson*
Jordan V. Hill
Matthew T. Holloway

Dana Putney Horst‡
Andrew J. Hosea*
Allison K. Hugii**††
Dallin R. Jack
Amanda Paige Johnson
Danielle E. Johnson
Mary Essie Johnson
Samuel J. Johnson*
Victoria Evans Jones
Kyle Russel Jorstad***‡‡
Julius Isaac Kairey*
Zoi Celeste Kam
Carina Kan‡
Eian Katz*
Kevin Patrick Keating
Christopher Nicholas Keen
Michael Alexander Killingsworth‡
John W. Kim
Sara Kim
Loren Adriana Kole
Matthew Russell LaGrone**‡‡
Jun Oh Lee
Thomas Leo
M. T. Levine
Daniel Wade Lewis
Joyce Vicki Li
Gabriella Ruth Libin
Jinn-Min Lin‡
Jacqueline Hsiang Liu
Tahura Sultana Lodhi
Maria Michele Macià*
Ryan P. Maher*
Eric Joseph Maier**††
Abigail Eden Majane
Madison Ann Mapes**‡
Nabihah Sohail Maqbool
Christopher James Marsh**‡‡
Kathleen Anne Martini
Paul Carl Mathis IV
John Patrick McAdams
Christina Carey McClintock
Benjamin Joseph Meyer**‡‡
Blair Chukwuma Mbagida
Garrett George Miller
Thomas Murphy Molloy, Jr.*
Benjamin Henry Moss
Devin Scott Muntz*
Christian Matthew Myers
Kurt Andrew Naro
Isabella Salomão Nascimento*
Christina M. Norman
Noel D. Ottman*
Grace Euneha Paek
Chan Ik Park
Christopher Parker
Yogini Paresh Patel
Sterling M. Paulson
Piper Molly Pehrson
Andreas M. Petasis**‡‡
Lauren Ann Piette*
Sean Samuel Planchar‡
Eileen Ross Prescott
Abhinaya Nirmala Priyivii
Darien Hou Chan Pun*†‡
Jorgen Myre Rehn*§
Andrew Clark Richner, Jr.
John S. Rizner
Patrick J. Rodriguez
Daniel Nicholas Rojas
Blaise Talen Ross
Kathryn Anderson Running*†‡
Mila Borisova Rusafova**‡‡
Kathleen M. Ryan
Jenine Saleh
Oliveira Sanchez
Harrison G. Scheer
Stephanie Anne Schlitter
Sophia Ruth Schloen*†‡
Alexander T. Schulman
Daniel R. Shearer*‡
Cary J. Shepherd
Cheaolin Shin
Hope Sydney Silberstein
Shelbi Jo Smith
Nina Alicia Sobierajski
Justin Jeffery Sorensen
William John Soule
Andrew Reilly Soule*‡‡
Luke Larsen Speduto
Margaret Anne Steinford
Taryn Alicia Strohmeyer*
Daniel E. Sullivan
Irene Hickey Sullivan
Anagha Sundararajan*
Ayla Syed*‡†
Madeleine Paula Moss Tardif
Joseph Brown Thomas
Phillip Douglas Thomas
John Henry Tab Thompson***‡‡
John William Tienken***‡‡
Tianyu Tong
Alexander M. Vogler*
Joel Fung Wacks*‡‡
Nathan Thomas Wages*‡‡‡
Nicholas Alexander Weber
Lael Daniel Weinberger**‡‡
Brett James Wiereinga*
Evan Michael Williams*†‡
Brian F. Williamson*†‡
Samantha Rose Wilson
Tate Joseph Wines
Mary Caroline Wood*‡
Stephanie Wanjinyi Xiao*†‡
Paul Youchak
Daniel Ling Zheng
Jinzheng Zhi
Frances Ann Ziesing

* Honors
** High Honors
*** Highest Honors
† Order of the Coll
‡ Kirkland & Ellis Scholar
§ Dorroroff Business Leadership Program
WHERE ARE THEY NOW? THE CLASS OF 2018

ALABAMA
Birmingham
Bijan Aboutorabi
Hon. William Pryor, 11th Cir.

ALASKA
Fairbanks
Grace Bridwell
Hon. Andrew Kleinfeld, 9th Cir.

ARIZONA
Phoenix
Maria Macia
Hon. Andrew Hurwitz, 9th Cir.

ARKANSAS
Little Rock
Samantha Wilson
Quattlebaum Grooms & Tull

CALIFORNIA
Costa Mesa
Makar Gevkorkian
Paul Hastings

Irvine
Adam Aquino
Knobbe Martens

Los Angeles
Samantha Bronner
Sullivan & Cromwell

San Francisco
Jennifer Beard
O’Melveny & Myers

COLORADO
Denver
Evans Williams
Davis Graham & Stubbs

FLORIDA
Miami
Olivia Sanchez
Stearns Weaver Miller

ILLINOIS
Chicago
Philip Acevedo
Sidley Austin

Katie Cummings
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

JACQUELINE LIU
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

Nicholas Weber
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati

Pasadena
Patrick Foster
Hon. Paul Watford, 9th Cir.

Redwood City
R. Harrison Hawkes
Gunderson Dettmer Stough Villeneuve Franklin & Hachigian

San Diego
Kristin Bisely
Latham & Watkins

Joel Wacks
Hon. Margaret McKeown, 9th Cir.

San Francisco
Jennifer Beard
O’Melveny & Myers

Gabriella Libin
Winston & Strawn

COLORADO
Denver
Evans Williams
Davis Graham & Stubbs

DELAWARE
Wilmington
Katherine Gutierrez

FLORIDA
Miami
Olivia Sanchez
Stearns Weaver Miller

ILLINOIS
Chicago
Philip Acevedo
Sidley Austin

Christopher Bobby
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Kirstie Brenson
Schiff Hardin

Devin Carpenter
DLA Piper

Laura Casselberry
Sidley Austin

Eric Clamage
DLA Piper

Cade Cross
Mayer Brown

Andrew Czaja
Mayer Brown

Joshua Davids
Jenner & Block

Sarah Dobrofsky
Eqip for Equality

Andrew Duble
Latham & Watkins

Roisin Duffy-Gideon
Hon. Edmond Chang, N.D. Ill.

Therese Erickson
Winston & Strawn

Lisa Fan
Microsoft

Wallace Fang
Leydig, Voit & Mayer

Katerina Fishchuk
Sidley Austin

Amelia Garza-Mattia
Winston & Strawn

Alison Giest
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Robert Golan-Vilella
Hon. John Tharp, N.D. Ill.

Nicholas Greiner
McDermott Will & Emery

Taylor Grode
Jones Day

Ian Hansen
Shook, Hardy & Bacon

Nico Heise
Sidley Austin

Zachary Henderson
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, Staff Attorney’s Office

Irene Hickey Sullivan
Kirkland & Ellis

Matthew Holloway
Community Activism Law Alliance

Amanda Johnson
Jones Day

Kevin Keating
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Sarah Kim
Jenner & Block

Maura Levine
Winston & Strawn

Joyce Li
Latham & Watkins

Jinn-Min Lin
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Kathleen Martini
Sidley Austin

Benjamin Meyer
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.

Devin Muntz
Baker McKenzie

Jocelyn McNamara
Baker McKenzie

Christopher Parker
Winston & Strawn

Yogini Patel
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Sterling Paulson
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom

Lauren Piette
Earthjustice, Coal Program

Jorgen Rehn
Winston & Strawn

Sophia Schoen
Lawndale Christian Legal Center

Daniel Shearer
Kirkland & Ellis

CARY SHEPHERD
Illinois Environmental Council

Shelbi Smith
Baker McKenzie

Nina Sobierajski
Grubhub

William Soule
Sidley Austin

Joseph Thomas
Latham & Watkins

John Henry Thompson
Hon. Diane Sykes, 7th Cir.

Alexander Vogler
McAndrews, Held & Malloy

Lael Weinberger
Hon. Frank Easterbrook, 7th Cir.

Brian Williamson
Hon. Michael Scudder, 7th Cir.

Mary Wood
Hon. Rebecca Pallmeier, N.D. Ill.

Jincheng Zhi
Kirkland & Ellis

Evanston
Andrew Sowle
James B. Moran Center

Peoria
Eileen Prescott
Hon. James Shadid, C.D. III.

INDIANA
Lafayette
Douglas Gates
Hon. Michael Kanne, 7th Cir.

IOWA
Des Moines
John Corfman
Hon. Robert Pratt, S.D. Iowa

Margaret Steindorf
United States Attorney’s Office, S.D. Iowa

KENTUCKY
Covington
John Tienken
Hon. Amul Thapar, 6th Cir.

Louisville
Alan Hassler
Hon. Danny Boggs, 6th Cir.

LOUISIANA
New Orleans
Sofia Brooks
Hon. Sarah Vance, E.D. La.

Tahura Lodhi
Hon. Ivan Lemelle, E.D. La.

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston
Anagha Sundararajan

MICHIGAN
Detroit
Holly Berlin

Lansing
Brett Wierenga
Hon. David McKeague, 6th Cir.
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**WHERE ARE THEY NOW? continued**

**MINNESOTA**
- Minneapolis
  - Thomas Garvey Jr.  
    Hon. James Loken, 8th Cir.
- Omaha
  - Jacqueline Duhl  
    Debevoise & Plimpton  
    Marisa Demko

**NEBRASKA**
- Lincoln
  - Hon. Alison Nathan, S.D.N.Y.
  - Linnet Davis-Stermitz
  - Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz  
    Michelle Dang  
    Jones Day

**NEW YORK**
- New York
  - Hon. Sanket Bulsara, E.D.N.Y.
- Brooklyn
  - Boies Schiller & Flexner  
    Armonk

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- Teresita Acedo
  - Simpson Thacher & Bartlett  
    Mallika Balachandran  
    Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson  
    Henry Bergman  
    Sidley Austin

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- John McAdams
  - Boies Schiller & Flexner  
    Flexner  
    Mallika Balachandran

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- Bryan Beaudoin
  - White & Case  
    Jared Beim  
    Sidley Austin

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- Henry Bergman
  - Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson
- Emily Black
  - Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
- Ashley Burman
  - Jones Day

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- Michelle Dang
  - Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz
- Linnet Davis-Stermitz
  - Hon. Alison Nathan, S.D.N.Y.
- Marisa Demko
  - Debevoise & Plimpton

**NEW YORK (continued)**
- Jacqueline Duhl
  - Kirkland & Ellis

**NORTH CAROLINA**
- Raleigh
  - Matthew LaGrone  
    Hon. Gregg Costa, 5th Cir.
  - Tommy Leo  
    Gallei PLLC
  - Eric Maier  
    Hon. Gregg Costa, 5th Cir.
  - Thomas Molloy Jr.  
    Hon. Edith Jones, 5th Cir.
  - Benjamin Moss  
    Vinson & Elkins

**OHIO**
- Cleveland
  - Alexander Bolden  
    Squire Patton Boggs
  - Julius Carter  
    Hon. Solomon Oliver, Jr., N.D. Ohio
  - Hannah Gelbort  
    Hon. Karen Nelson Moore, 6th Cir.

**TENNESSEE**
- Memphis
  - Daniel Sullivan  
    Hon. Jon McCalla, W.D. Tenn.
  - Nashville
  - Mark Buente  
    Bass, Berry & Sims

**TEXAS**
- Austin
  - Clayton Cromer  
    Hon. Jeff Brown, Tex. S. Ct.
  - Jandi Heagen  
  - Daniel Lewis  
    Hon. Don Willett, Tex. S. Ct.

**WASHINGTON**
- Seattle
  - Bianca Chamusco  
    Foster Pepper

**WASHINGTON, D.C.**
- Roberto Borgert  
  Latham & Watkins

**WEST VIRGINIA**
- Morgantown
  - Hope DeLap  
    West Virginia Innocence Project

**WISCONSIN**
- Milwaukee
  - Mary Johnson  
    Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren
  - Abigail Majane  
    Hon. Michael Brennan, 7th Cir.

**INTERNATIONAL**
- London, UK
  - Luke Sperduto  
    Allen & Overy

- Nabihah Maqbool  
  Muslim Advocates

- Christopher Mart
  - Hon. Timothy Dyk, Fed. Cir.

- Paul Mathis IV
  - Crowell & Moring

- Isabella Nascimento

- Noel Ottman
  - Latham & Watkins

- Grace Paek
  - Microsoft

- Alexander Schulman
  - Paul Hastings

- Ayla Syed
  - Williams & Connolly

- VICTORIA**
- Morgantown
  - Hope DeLap  
    West Virginia Innocence Project

- WEST VIRGINIA
  - Morgantown
  - Hope DeLap  
    West Virginia Innocence Project

- WISCONSIN
  - Milwaukee
  - Mary Johnson  
    Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren
  - Abigail Majane  
    Hon. Michael Brennan, 7th Cir.

- INTERNATIONAL
  - London, UK
  - Luke Sperduto  
    Allen & Overy

- Nabihah Maqbool  
  Muslim Advocates

- Christopher Mart
  - Hon. Timothy Dyk, Fed. Cir.

- Paul Mathis IV
  - Crowell & Moring

- Isabella Nascimento

- Noel Ottman
  - Latham & Watkins

- Grace Paek
  - Microsoft

- Alexander Schulman
  - Paul Hastings

- Ayla Syed
  - Williams & Connolly

- VICTORIA
MEET THE CLASS OF 2021

GENERAL STATISTICS:
87 Undergraduate Institutions
37 Undergraduate Majors
41 States Represented
12 Graduate Degrees
46 Countries Lived In/Worked In
27 Languages Spoken

FUN FACTS:
48 government employees/interns/campaign staffers
43 research assistants
10 musicians
5 Fulbright Scholars
4 dancers/choreographers
4 AmeriCorps/Jesuit Volunteer Corps
3 Teach for America alumni
3 yoga teachers
3 veterans
2 black belts
2 antiques auctioneers
2 baritones
2 radio DJs
1 TEDx Talk speaker
1 licensed skydiver
1 bicycle builder
1 youngest-ever National Women’s Baseball Hall of Fame manager
1 musical author
1 political TV pilot writer
1 rhythmic gymnast
1 published poet
1 former football coach
1 producer/manager for Disney Broadway Productions
1 unicyclist
SAVE THE DATE
REUNION WEEKEND
May 3–5, 2019