What did the First Amendment mean to the Founders?
Celebrating our graduates

The family of Etahjayne Harris, L’18, was among the many friends and family who celebrated the 188 members of the Richmond Law Class of 2018 in May.
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Challenges, opportunities, and optimism

Dear friends,

Each year, as one academic year ends and another approaches, I like to reflect on what went well, along with areas of possible improvement. This year, in my role as president of the Association of American Law Schools, I’ve been thinking about not only issues that impact us here at Richmond Law, but those shared across legal education.

In the good news category, law schools have seen an increase in applications, particularly from applicants with higher LSATs. Surveys and anecdotal evidence suggest that the increased interest in law school reflects a renewed sense that law matters and that lawyers can be agents of change. Here at Richmond Law, we see this commitment to service reflected in the admissions essays of prospective students and in the thousands of hours of pro bono service that current students are providing within our community.

On the challenges side, proposed changes in the federal education loan program have brought into sharp focus the obstacles that law schools — and all of higher education — face with respect to finances. Quality legal education, like other types of quality higher education, is expensive, and there are relatively few funding sources aside from tuition. For the past decade, the federal government has been the primary education loan lender — but the PROSPER Act, pending in the House, would change that by capping at $28,500 the amount that graduate students can borrow per year and would also eliminate Public Service Loan Forgiveness. Irrespective of whether this law passes, it has brought into focus an obvious point: Most students today cannot fund their legal education from accumulated wealth or current income. If we want a legal profession that is diverse and open to all students with the requisite drive and ability, we need to look hard at both the cost side and the financing mechanisms for legal education.

But even as we explore new financing mechanisms and ways to keep costs down, we must make the case to policymakers and the public that high-quality education is, at least in part, a public good that warrants public investment. Just as society needs well-educated engineers to build and maintain our physical infrastructure, we need well-educated lawyers to build and maintain our legal infrastructure. As Carel Stolker puts it in his book *Rethinking the Law School*, “No matter where you find yourself in today’s globalized world, good legal education and research are of utmost importance for social stability, the rule of law and economic growth.”

Looking at the challenges and the opportunities, I see reason for optimism. In March, Congress increased funding for the Legal Service Corp. by $25 million, resulting in its largest budget allocation since 2010. And our Richmond Law community is doing its part to assure both access to justice and access to quality legal education. Each year our students provide thousands of hours of pro bono legal services. And our alumni, in addition to their own pro bono service, continue to financially support this outstanding law school. Indeed, this year was the highest giving year in the history of Richmond Law.

The challenges confronting law schools will not magically disappear, but they will be easier to solve against a public backdrop that recognizes the importance of law and justice — and the education that makes them both possible. Thank you for being a part of a community that invests so strongly in the legal education here at Richmond Law.

Wendy C. Perdue
Dean and Professor of Law
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A CLEAN GAME

The International Olympic Committee is applying the last word of its “faster, higher, stronger” motto to its efforts to curtail corruption. Richmond Law students and their professor are taking an ongoing look at how it’s working.

When cities and countries commit to hosting the Olympics, the World Cup, and other major international sporting events, a bonanza of public spending on stadiums, infrastructure, and more follows. Corruption often ramps up alongside it, says Andy Spalding, a leading expert on international anti-corruption law. Since 2015, he’s been taking students in his Corruption in International Sports course around the world to study firsthand efforts to fight it.

In 2015 — a year in which Brazil had just spent billions on hosting the World Cup and was already spending billions more on the 2016 Olympics in Rio de Janeiro — Spalding led a group of Richmond Law students to Brazil. Their purpose was to study the impact of games-inspired anti-corruption reforms by meeting with attorneys, activists, and government leaders.

“The physical infrastructure is not the most important legacy of the games,” Spalding said. “It’s the legal and cultural infrastructure. The Olympics can be an occasion to take an honest look at governance and implement reforms.”

In 2017, Spalding did it again, this time taking students to South Korea a year before it hosted the PyeongChang Olympics so they could examine another country’s anti-corruption efforts. In February, the cohort returned to attend the International Sports Business Symposium at Yonsei University in Seoul. There, they presented their findings with legal experts, press, and other audiences. They also took in some of the 2018 Winter Games.

Heidi Drauschak, L’18, who focused on the bidding process and how anti-corruption measures could be implemented, said part of the allure of the course was the opportunity for tangible impact.

“The legacy we’re trying to leave is actual change,” she said.

Spalding believes that the International Olympic
Committee is driving further substantive change with a new provision to its model host city contract that requires hosts to adopt anti-corruption measures. Students say that watching these legal reforms unfold over time was another draw for the course.

“We’re not studying specific laws that have been written down for 200 years,” said Stuart Hamm, L’18, who was also on the trip. “We’re on the forefront of the international anti-corruption field.”

REAL QUESTIONS ABOUT ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

A criminal defendant awaits a court pre-trial decision. The defendant has been told he will be sent home either on bail, with conditions, or on own recognizance.

The judge looks at the defendant before checking the computer-generated algorithm results on the screen in front of her. The “risk assessment algorithm” advises the judge as she makes her decision.

But how can the judge be certain the computer doesn’t have the same biases as the humans who created it? Can the judge really trust the algorithm? And if so, what’s to stop the court system from turning the decision over to AI?

This scenario was raised by Sharon Nelson, president of Sensei Enterprises, at the Richmond Journal of Law and Technology’s annual symposium in February. Each year, the symposium focuses on an area of cybersecurity; this year’s theme was Artificial Intelligence and the Law.

“Everyone left with a higher concern for where this technology is heading in the future,” said Ellie Faust, L’18, the annual survey and symposium editor. “Moving forward and getting into self-driving cars and cybersecurity systems, if the artificial intelligence can create its own algorithm, how are those going to be manipulated (by it) versus having a human in control?”

Another speaker, Ed Walters, CEO and co-founder of Fastcase, described AI’s prevalence in everything from Alexa to stocks and airplane takeoffs, yet many people don’t even realize it. More complex examples — driverless cars and algorithms in courts — create ambiguities that are difficult to address.

“There are a lot of these black boxes, and do we really want to make societal decisions based on something we can’t see?” Nelson said. “I do think that we have the ethical responsibility as attorneys to make sure that if these systems are to be used in things like sentencing, that we understand how they operate and how they got biases out of the system — because they do seem to be biased.”

JOLT, the first law review in the world published exclusively online, is tackling a cloudy issue that many lawyers don’t yet know how to address. Yet, as the speakers repeated throughout the symposium, this area of the law is constantly evolving.

“Companies trying to hire technology lawyers or just experts in the field of AI feel that there are not enough people out there who truly understand the technology,” said Brian Kuhn, co-creator and co-leader of IBM Watson Legal. “Law is such an old profession, so to bring new attorneys into the field of technology and getting them up-to-date with laws and regulation is really important.”

FACULTY

Time well spent

At the end of the 2017–18 academic year, four members of the faculty bid adieu to Richmond Law. Ron Bacigal, Ann Hodges, and John Pagan began their retirements. A new professional opportunity lured Bill Fisher to the Great Plains. Collectively, the four accumulated more than a century of experience at the law school.

Bacigal joined the law school in 1971 and achieved tenure two years later. The leading authority on Virginia criminal law and procedure, he is the author of more than a dozen books and nearly 50 articles on these subjects.

Hodges joined Richmond Law in 1988 and became its third tenured female faculty member in 1994. Her extensive scholarship focuses on labor and employment law, feminist legal theory, and nonprofit organizations. She is also co-founder of the Legal Information Network for Cancer.

Pagan’s 21-year tenure includes six years as dean. His 2003 book, Anne Orthwood’s Bastard: Sex and Law in Early Virginia, won the American Historical Association’s Rawley Prize.

Fisher, an expert in securities regulation and corporate law, departed after 10 years to serve as a visiting faculty member at the University of Nebraska School of Law.

“I’m so grateful for the immense time and talent that all four of them have given to the school,” said Wendy Perdue, dean. “These faculty have made an impact on generations of students.”

Summer 2018 5
Parting advice

Spring’s graduates heard one last argument before going forth to begin their legal careers. Look around you in your communities, recognize when something isn’t right, and work to fix it.

The lawyer making this case was commencement speaker Doris H. Causey, president of the Virginia State Bar and managing attorney of the Richmond office of the Central Virginia Legal Aid Society. Here’s an excerpt from her remarks to the Class of 2018:

“Many successful and busy lawyers volunteer in my legal aid office and others across the state and across the country. They do pro bono legal work not because they are required to do so but because they want to be the change agents that help more young girls and boys of every color to grow up and become what they are meant to be without having to overcome obstacle after obstacle to do so.

“They write protective orders, they fight unfair evictions, they lobby the General Assembly, and they assist with immigration issues to give those who may never go to college, much less attend law school, a chance to gain a foothold in a sometimes incredibly tough world.

“I admire and applaud those lawyers, and I ask you to use your law degrees for as much good as you can. I know, I know — you probably have some loans to pay off. But I also remind you: There is no better way to see the inside of a courtroom and to get to know the judiciary on a first-name basis than to handle legal matters for indigent Virginians. The practice you will get helping others will be invaluable to your paying clients and invaluable to your soul.”

THE PROFESSOR AND THE PRODUCER

Law professor and copyright expert Chris Cotropia could have tried to hide his glee during a panel discussion in March, but he didn’t see why he should. It’s not every day a law professor sits with one of his musical idols to talk about intellectual property.

Cotropia, director of the Intellectual Property Institute, was joyful as he shared a stage with Rock & Roll Hall of Fame inductee Hank Shocklee to talk about the legal implications of sampling. Sampling is the reuse of sound snippets in new recordings, a practice that can cause copyright disputes.

As a member of the rap group Public Enemy, Shocklee broke new musical ground with the practice, layering sample upon sample to make records in the late 1980s and early ‘90s that are now considered classics. Cotropia said that long before becoming a legal scholar, he was a Public Enemy fan.

Shocklee provided the audience with an artist’s perspective on sampling — what it adds and why it’s appealing. Cotropia was there to explain the legal peril it can cause artists. In one memorable exchange, Shocklee made a case for distinguishing between minor and extensive sampling.

“There are stone-cold thefts, and there are nibblers,” Shocklee said. “I try to put myself in the nibbling category. ... If I’m taking a snare drum, if I’m taking a little blurb of a bass line — two notes going bum-bum — is that your song? Should you be entitled to money?”

Cotropia explained the legal context in which artists today must make these creative decisions. Notable copyright cases, he said, have focused on substantial samples, “but there are mechanisms in copyright law that would suggest that the nibbles that are looped and reversed and chopped up — maybe those aren’t the ones that copyright law says you should have to pay for. The problem is you’ve got an industry or individuals that are very risk-averse. Their view is, ‘Hey, let’s just clear it.’ The concern is that starts to stifle creativity.”

This public event was part of a spring semester course called The Voice of Hip Hop in America offered by the University’s School of Professional and Continuing Studies.

LATEST RANKINGS

Richmond Law achieved its highest ranking ever in U.S. News & World Report’s latest rankings, clocking in at No. 50. PreLaw Magazine ranked the school No.
18 for best law school buildings. In addition, Richmond Law ranks 28th for federal clerkships and 16th for state clerkships, according to Law.com’s analysis of ABA data. Our hometown got some love recently when Forbes named the city of Richmond as a “Coolest City to Visit” and Lonely Planet named it a “Top Destination” for 2018.

NEW LEADERSHIP
Alex Sklut joined the law school staff in June as associate dean of students. Sklut comes to Richmond from the University of Georgia School of Law, where she had served as associate director of student affairs since 2015.

“Dean Sklut brings with her a true passion for the job as well as a great wealth of skill, talent, and innovation,” said Wendy Perdue, dean.

Courtney Curry in the law school’s advancement office was promoted to assistant dean for development following the retirement of Karen Thornton. Under Curry and Thornton’s leadership, the law school saw its highest year ever of giving.

LEARNING BY DOING IN D.C.
Richmond Law’s D.C. Externship Program is hitting its stride as it finishes its third year.

Launched in 2015, the program offers 3Ls practical experience in federal agencies and nonprofits. The students live in Washington for a semester, complete 500 hours of substantive legal work, and meet with each other and program director Steve Allred to explore how their jobs are structured, discuss management techniques, and hear from guest speakers.

The seminar component sets aside time for processing and discussion of the experience and the legal profession, a key benefit as students are “trying to navigate what can be a very intimidating profession,” Grayson Orsini, L’18, said.

Orsini was one of 11 students in the fall 2017 cohort, up from four in the program’s pilot year. Placements this year included Sen. Tim Kaine’s office, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and the general counsel office for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Lindsay Lehmen, L’18, completed her externship in the Department of Justice’s Office of Human Rights and Special Prosecutions. She spent most of her time in research and writing for HRSP, which investigates and prosecutes people accused of human rights violations and international crimes.

“I love working for Justice,” she said. “I like the issues that it allows you to work on. I like the people. I like the culture.”

Nicole Desbois, L’18, spent her time with the Competition Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission. The organization handles net neutrality rules, among other issues.

“You’re on the cutting edge of all these new emerging communication technologies,” Desbois said. “You get to be there and see how it works. It’s fascinating.”

With an entire semester in Washington, networking opportunities abound, she added. Their experiences are what faculty envisioned when establishing the program.

“At a time when employers are seeking law graduates who are practice-ready, this program offers one way to gain valuable practice experience,” Allred, the program director, said. “It has also led to some great permanent placements of our students, including Honors Attorney positions.”

Mario Mondays
Certain rituals become rites of passage for every Richmond Law student: getting cold-called in class the first time, making the long walk from Lot B3, and finding a date for the Barristers Ball, to name just a few. Students studying at Richmond Law this year added a happier one to their list: Mario Mondays.

Mario is Mario Mazzone, L’18. The Mondays are at the Cellar — the university’s pub-like restaurant — where Mazzone continued a long tradition of law students tending bar.

Like any good bartender, Mazzone knows that patrons are coming in for more than a drink. If raising a glass has a way of breaking down barriers and encouraging conviviality, then Mazzone’s tag “Mario Mondays” put law students and the first night of the work week on a first-name basis.

On a Monday near the end of spring semester, Mazzone made it known that he wouldn’t be pocketing his tips. Instead, he’d donate them to the 3L class gift. Students and faculty showed up to be sure he’d have plenty to give. With this boost and gifts from other 3Ls in the Class of 2018, class gift participation topped 50 percent a week before final exams started.

“I am so grateful for my time at UR and all the patrons that made this possible,” Mazzone said. “Mario Mondays — and this past one in particular — have always represented the strong sense of community at UR.”

A post about it on the law school’s Facebook page drew 100 likes, but it was a comment left by Camila Conte, L’18, that probably best summed up everyone’s general feelings.

“Mario Mondays forever in our hearts!” she wrote.
‘A RESPONSIBILITY TO BE A PART OF THE COMMUNITY’

Alumni and faculty recollect the history and talk about the impact of the Carrico Center for Pro Bono and Public Service as it celebrates its 10th anniversary.

By Emily Cherry

Serendipity is the word that comes to Tara Casey’s mind when she thinks about the 2008 creation of Richmond Law’s Carrico Center for Pro Bono and Public Service. “It just seemed fortuitous that there were all these forces happening at the same time,” said Casey, the founding director of the center.

The forces took different forms — financial gifts, institutional support, and community interest — but came together at the right place and the right time. Now, 10 years later, the Carrico Center has grown in reach and impact.

One place to start its story is with its namesake: Justice Harry L. Carrico, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia from 1981 to 2003. He was a visiting professor of law and civic engagement and frequently hired Richmond Law graduates to be his judicial clerks. Although not an alumnus of the law school, Carrico in many ways “adopted us,” Casey said. So when author David Baldacci and his wife Michelle, friends of Carrico, wanted to create a legacy for the justice, the law school was a natural fit.

At that time, the University of Richmond was in search of a presence in the city center that would increase community engagement and service-learning opportunities for all of its students. Simultaneously, the law school was looking to strengthen and provide structure to its pro bono offerings. When Ted Chandler, L’77, and his wife, Laura Lee Chandler, W’74, made a gift to support a presence in the city center that would come to be called UR Downtown, the Carrico Center for Pro Bono Service was born.

This year, a record number of students received the Pro Bono Certificate for completing 120 hours of service during their three years, continuing the
commitment to community service that the law school has had since its founding. The students, in turn, have gained valuable experience. We sat down with Carrico alumni, supporters, and administrators to hear about their experiences, learn about how pro bono service has shaped the school and the city, and to celebrate the impact of the Carrico Center.

The following excerpts come from interviews with Carrico Center staff, students, and partners and are lightly edited for clarity and length.

ALL THEY NEEDED WAS A LEADER

John Douglass (professor and former Richmond Law dean) One of my first tasks as dean — and it was a blessed task — was to go out into the Richmond community to see if we could find a director for the project. We solicited applications, and one of them clearly stood out: Tara Casey. I’m proud to say that the first person I ever hired as dean of the law school was Tara. It was an easy choice. Of course, Tara gave it form and energy. She was a dynamo who just made things happen.

Tara Casey (founding director) I had been an adjunct at the law school for four years — I taught while I was an assistant U.S. attorney. So I had these connections to the law school to begin with. Prior to coming to the law school, I had chaired the pro bono service committee for the Richmond Bar Association and the public service committee for the Metropolitan Richmond Women’s Bar Association. I saw this position announced, and honestly, when I read the description, I felt like this was calling to me.

‘Pro bono work is important to legal education because of how much it opens your eyes to the world that’s around us.’

— Morgan Faulkner, L’16

THE EARLY DAYS

Casey When I first came on board, it wasn’t like there was no pro bono happening at the law school. It was often organized by student organizations or individual faculty members. That first semester I was here, I just met with as many students and faculty as I could — especially with the students — because I wanted to hear from them what they were interested in and what they were doing. I wanted to respect the fact that they had been carrying that water before my arrival. That was really helpful. I met with the head of every student organization on one on one to talk about what they saw as the need, priorities, capacity, interest — all of those pieces.

Ben Pace, L’02 When the Carrico Center started and Tara took over, it was at a time when the Richmond Bar had really started to address pro bono more seriously, at least from my perspective. Firms in Service, which is a group of firms in Richmond that meets to discuss pro bono needs, was really getting its legs under it about that time. In particular, we had been struggling because Legal Aid would always tell us they had 200 to 300 no-fault divorce cases on a backlog at any given time. Tara had always wanted to address that need.

When she came over to the Carrico Center, working with Firms in Service and the Richmond Bar Association, Tara really created the first viable no-fault divorce project by injecting the help and assistance of University of Richmond law students in the process. As we stand here today, there is no backlog for no-fault divorces. I give Tara and the Carrico Center a lot of credit for that.

A CENTRAL LOCATION

Ted Chandler, L’77 We loved the idea of UR Downtown [at 626 E. Broad St.] and the ability to take the Carrico Center concept and actually make it more accessible and able to deliver the kind of pro bono services that our community needs in a way that we go to the people that are underserved, and not expect them to come on campus.

Casey I don’t know if people realize this, but the original [UR] law school is in the Fan [neighborhood], at the corner of Lombardy and Grace. We were in the city originally. So much of the law school’s work is still in the city — I think probably a third of our students at any time are in the city during the course of a semester. And so here was this desire to create a city-based presence.

Wilton Cos. offered to give us the first-floor office space in the former Franklin Federal Savings & Loan at 7th and Broad with a generous lease. That gave us more opportunities for bigger thinking. We then were able to design a space that could be used
for the public and have more community engagement in the space itself.

REAL PEOPLE, REAL SKILLS
Morgan Faulkner, L’16 I think that pro bono work is important to legal education because of how much it opens your eyes to the world that’s around us. I liked that I was able to go and meet with a mother who was having issues with the heating in her house through the housing law program. It connects you more to the law that you’re studying in school in a practical way. I think it’s really important for everyone, especially people that are in law school, to understand that the law touches everyone, not just those who can afford to hire some of the big firms out there. The Carrico Center really gave us a vehicle to do that.

Cassie Powell, L’16 I think the Carrico Center is really important for all law students, even ones who are not interested in doing public service work and who are not necessarily interested in working with families and individuals in poverty.

What I’ve found in practice at the Virginia Poverty Law Center is that other attorneys that I work with — who may be representing the opposing party — have to understand my clients and their particular situations and the challenges that they face as individuals and families in poverty. Those attorneys who seem to have some compassion and understanding for the situations that my clients are in are more likely to come to an outcome that’s beneficial for both of our clients. So I think that having an opportunity for students to engage in public service and to promote public service really enriches all lawyers and budding lawyers because it allows them to connect and be exposed to all these different broader perspectives.

Kathleen Dwyer, L’14 I’m able to reference experiences that I wouldn’t have had otherwise, such as working on a published article in the Federal Circuit Bar Journal or arguing as a student in the Virginia Court of Appeals. These are some of the projects that I worked on. Later, when I’m in interviews or meeting potential employers, I come to the table with work history that I otherwise wouldn’t have had.

A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY
Chandler It’s not enough for a university to simply be in a community. There’s a responsibility to be a part of the community. And the Carrico Center is, it seems to me, where it all comes together.

You have the opportunity to demonstrate that commitment to public service and to train the students experientially on that commitment, so they don’t just hear public service as an obligation; they actually get to see and feel the impact on clients when it’s presented.

And it’s good for the bar. I think the Carrico Center has essentially become the meeting place for the practicing attorneys and their commitment to public service, combined with the clinician work and student volunteer time.

Amari Harris, L’12 The center has had a major impact on my development as an attorney. I think that for a lot of us, when we come to law school, our focus is just to get the best grades you can, get a job, and kind of figure out what you want to do.

The Carrico Center brought a more holistic approach, not only to law school but to my career as well. What the Carrico Center reminded me, and I think a lot of my colleagues, is that our primary responsibility is to help others. You’re given a significant amount of power and responsibility when you choose to enter the legal profession. You should use it for good.

Rosanne Ibanez, L’12 I think that the Carrico Center is really good at giving students the opportunity to realize what is out there and that they have both a power and a privilege as people fortunate
A Focus on Community

Maggie Bowman, L’13
You’re connecting with the community in a way that most law students don’t. We’re sort of holed up here in law school, and you don’t really venture out and get to know your city and your community. I think pro bono provides that kind of opportunity.

Amy Howard (assistant vice president of community initiatives at UR’s Bonner Center for Civic Engagement) The Carrico Center is at the leading edge of community engagement for the University of Richmond. The law school has always been one of the leading schools at the University of Richmond in connecting with the community in substantial ways — to help students learn more, but also to contribute skills and talents to the region. With the advent of the Carrico Center, that work has been amplified through Tara Casey’s strong leadership and the number of students who’ve taken the time to practice their skills while building our city to be a more thriving place.

Casey A lot of what we do through the Carrico Center at UR Downtown is the community engagement piece — not just picking up students and doing what we’re doing here but in a different building.

It’s using UR Downtown to connect the broader community with the University of Richmond closer to where that community is.

A lot of that is our community partners. For the Carrico Center, all of our programs are in partnership with outside organizations because they have to be. Law students cannot provide independent representation or legal advice or counsel; they have to be supervised by a licensed attorney. So all of our programming is in partnership with outside organizations.

Most of those outside organizations are located downtown. To be able to provide that ability to connect with them and meet with them closer to where they are is big. Part of it is to make sure the legal community is aware of issues of societal import. The other is to make sure the legal community is connected to where they’re needed.

The Spirit of the Students

Casey Our student body is full of really smart people. They had different paths they could have pursued, but at some point, they were called to the law. Often times, the reason was to be of service. That’s the spirit that I see consistently every class year. And that spirit of service does not necessarily diminish because you’ve chosen to become a corporate tax attorney at a large firm.
Jacob Tingen, L’12 The law students that I’ve had the chance to work with today as adjunct faculty and those I’ve mentored through pro bono programs — they get it. They get it a lot more than I did [when I was a student at Richmond Law]. They get that there are people out there that need to be helped. They get that there are rights that need to be defended. And so it’s been a real pleasure to work with law students here at Richmond Law.

MOMENTS OF PRIDE
Tingen For me personally, when I graduated law school, I decided that I should continue to participate in the Virginia Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Pro Bono Clinic. Eventually, we decided to move part of that program here to the law school, and I started as adjunct faculty last semester teaching an immigrants’ rights practicum. I’m mentoring a set of law students who are taking pro bono cases, and so it’s kind of come full circle for me.

It’s been an exciting time to share what I’ve learned and my passion for pro bono service and the immigrant community generally. Especially in political times like these, there’s a lot of opportunities to help people preserve and defend their rights. It’s important work.

Casey A number of years ago, we started a name and gender marker change clinic for members of the transgender community with the Virginia Equality Bar Association. It’s a need of the community. I like to think that our thoughts and our perspectives are open to the needs of communities, regardless of who they are, but I didn’t know what the reception was going to be like.

So I just said, “OK, let’s do it and see what happens.” And I remember when we recruited law students for it that it was one of our most popular programs right out of the gate. I had a waitlist of 30 students who wanted to volunteer. That made me proud that our students are stepping up to help a very marginalized community.

PRO BONO PLUS PUBLIC SERVICE
Casey In 2017, the Center changed its name from the Carrico Center for Pro Bono Service to the Carrico Center for Pro Bono and Public Service. Ultimately, what we want to be are good civic stewards, and to do that, you have to be connected with your community.

Do you have to be connected with your community in just providing legal services? Not necessarily. Sometimes that community connection happens in other arenas, and that’s where the community need is, too. So I think it’s important for our students to recognize the gifts they can give to our community outside of their roles as lawyers.

AN IMPACT ON CAREERS
Tingen I came to the law school with plans to do mergers and acquisitions and big corporate work, but that kind of mission for my legal career changed when I got to know real people with real problems. That definitely influenced the direction that I’m taking now with how I go about practicing law. My involvement with the Carrico Center was a big catalyst for the rest of my legal career today.

Faulkner The Carrico Center has definitely impacted my career, especially now that I am at the public defender’s office here in town. When I first started law school, I felt like my classmates talked mostly about going into big firms or just firm life in general, and I never felt like that was 100 percent what my calling was.

When I started out doing some of these things like wills for seniors and the no-fault divorce program, it opened my eyes to how big the legal network is in the Richmond area for different public interest jobs and that I would be able to make a living and do something I’m passionate about at the same time.

TEAM CARRICO
Bowman Easily my favorite part of the Carrico Center is Tara Casey. And since I have graduated, she brings back all of the former and current Carrico Center student employees for lunch, maybe twice a year. It’s really exciting and important, I think, to see the Carrico Center past, present, and future, and Tara Casey does that.

Ian Vance, L’14 My favorite Carrico moments are the continued moments. What I mean by that is director Tara Casey does a great job of keeping all of the current and past project managers together. We are now the staffers and volunteers at these programs and at these events.

THE CARRICO CENTER TODAY
In the past 10 years, the Carrico Center has launched more than a dozen programs aimed at serving a specific community needs. These offerings provide today’s students with an extensive collection of skills and experiences.

- Pro bono criminal appeals program
- Assistance to disabled veterans
- Estate planning
- Housing law program
- Immigration assistance project
- Law over lunch
- Legislative research and analysis
- No-fault divorce program
- Public schools project
- Richmond Global Health Alliance
- Street Law
- Trans Law Collaborative

For more information about the Carrico Center, including how Richmond Law alumni can get involved, go to law.richmond.edu/public-service/pro-bono.

Emily Cherry is director of law school communications.
When Virginia’s leaders responded to the Brown decision with a long campaign of massive resistance, a new generation of lawyers picked up the fight for equality. Leading the charge was Henry L. Marsh III.

In his memoirs published this spring, Henry Marsh III describes and reflects on his path from a young boy educated in segregated schools to one of Virginia’s greatest champions for civil rights. The memoirs are edited by Danielle Wingfield-Smith, L’14, and Richmond Law professor Jonathan K. Stubbs. Stubbs also provided the book’s epilogue, which here serves as an introduction. An excerpt from Marsh’s memoir follows, with minor changes to match this magazine’s style guide.

FROM THE EPILOGUE BY JONATHAN K. STUBBS:
In December 1933, three momentous events took place. Oliver White Hill took the Virginia State Bar and passed it. His bar review study partner Samuel Wilbert Tucker (S.W. Tucker) sat for the bar and passed it, too. Last, but certainly not least, in the segregated St. Phillip’s Hospital in Richmond, Virginia, Henry L. Marsh III was born. Oliver Hill helped to found the Virginia State Chapter of NAACP Branches. He quickly attacked Jim Crow and racial discrimination in the legal system. Among many accomplishments, Hill became the founding president of the Old Dominion Bar Association, chair of the Virginia NAACP legal staff, and one of the first blacks to hold elective office in the South following Reconstruction. Hill was also co-counsel in Davis v. School Board of Prince Edward County, one of a quartet of school desegregation cases which the Supreme Court consolidated into Brown v. Board of Education.

When S.W. Tucker passed the bar, he was too young to be admitted. The next year, Tucker began a nearly 60-year legal career which revolved around civil rights litigation and social activism. Like Hill, Tucker served during World War II in the European theater in a segregated army. He fought valiantly so that others could enjoy freedom which the law denied to him. Tucker returned to the United States determined to complete the fight for his own freedom and that of many others.

Along with Hill and a number of other courageous lawyers, Tucker served as a member of the Virginia NAACP legal staff. The staff was a voluntary association of African-American lawyers around the state of Virginia who responded to requests from NAACP members for legal assistance, particularly when the law was used to squash the enjoyment of freedom.
and equality. S.W. Tucker became the lead lawyer in one of the most significant post-
Brown cases, namely Green v. School Board of New Kent County. Decided in 1968, 14 years after Brown, the Green case established that local school authorities had to come forward with desegregation plans realistically designed to work now.

During this period, other members of the Old Dominion Bar Association were doggedly fighting to hold America’s proverbial feet to the fire so that liberty and justice for all would not just be a high-sounding slogan but a practical reality. So, for instance, Roland “Duke” Ealey and Hermann Benn represented Ford Johnson, who refused a judge’s order to sit in the black section of a segregated Richmond, Virginia, courtroom. Ealey and Benn were successful in persuading the United States Supreme Court to ban segregated courtroom seating. Similarly, Joseph A. Jordan Jr. argued Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections, which struck down the poll tax, one of many devices used by American oligarchs to maintain a small electorate for their benefit, as opposed to the common good.

These and other lawyers were joined, encouraged, and shielded by a sea of lay persons. Many individuals at the grassroots level offered support in low-key, virtually anonymous ways. Sometimes financial resources, other times insight regarding local community conditions, and yet other times safe physical and emotional spaces were all part of local community support.

Some community leaders were better known — for instance, W. Lester Banks, the executive secretary of the Virginia NAACP State Conference, Dr. Jesse Tinsley, president of the Virginia NAACP, and the Rev. Francis Griffin, pastor and community spokesperson in the Prince Edward Schools case. Together, members of Virginia’s African-American communities, along with some courageous progressive whites, confronted the entrenched, mainstream segregationist views of religious, political, and business leaders. Such individuals believed and advocated racial segregation often on widespread beliefs in white supremacy — especially that desegregation would lead to widespread interracial sexual relations. Mixed offspring, white supremacists feared, would pollute white communities and destroy the white race. Perhaps one of the most striking examples of such a perspective was proclaimed in 1965 in a judicial opinion by Circuit Judge Leon Bazile, who stated, “Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay [sic], and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his [arrangement], there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separates the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.”

On this basis, Judge Bazile refused to modify his earlier decision to convict Mildred Jeter Loving and Richard Loving of a felony because they had the nerve to marry one another. It happened that Mildred Jeter Loving was a woman of color and Richard Loving was a white man. The Lovings endured scorn, ridicule, and threats of physical violence emblematic of the malice underlying America’s racial caste system.

Henry L. Marsh dared to challenge such bigotry. He had his hands full.

AN EXCERPT FROM MARSH’S MEMOIR
From Chapter 1, “Backlash Against Brown: The Segregationist Empire Strikes Back”

[In 1955], the Virginia General Assembly debated a proposal to fund nonsectarian and private schools. While the debate took place, I was president of the Virginia Union University Student Government Association. When I read in The Richmond News Leader that the General Assembly was planning to hold public hearings on the proposal, I decided to testify on behalf of Virginia Union University students.
I said to the other student government officers, “You all want me to testify at the General Assembly on behalf of the students tomorrow, don’t you?” They readily agreed that it would be a good idea for me to go to the General Assembly to represent the students. The next morning, November 30, 1955, I was one of about 38 speakers and the only student who testified.

Attorney Oliver Hill led the opposition to the Virginia General Assembly proposal, which attempted to do an end run around Brown v. Board of Education by using taxpayer money to fund private, segregated schools.

At the time Mr. Hill addressed the General Assembly, he was a well-seasoned civil rights lawyer. Born May 1, 1907, Mr. Hill had spent his early years in Richmond before his mother and stepfather moved first to Roanoke and later to Washington, D.C. He had attended and graduated from Howard University, first as an undergraduate and later as a law student. He was greatly influenced by the superb Howard Law School Vice Dean Charles Hamilton Houston, who taught his students that a lawyer who was not a social engineer was a parasite upon society. At Howard Law, Mr. Hill had met Thurgood Marshall, and they were not only classmates at Howard University Law School but also lifelong friends. When I heard Mr. Hill address the General Assembly, he and his law partners, Spottswood Robinson and Martin A. Martin, had already litigated teacher salary and school facility equalization cases, as well as transportation desegregation cases. Robinson had argued the Prince Edward, Virginia, school desegregation case, which was one of the four cases consolidated as part of the Court’s decision in Brown. Robinson would later become dean of Howard Law School before serving many years as a distinguished federal judge. Incidentally, all three of these lawyers were Howard Law School grads and had to varying degrees been influenced by Charles Houston.

I was inspired by Mr. Hill’s presentation. He was quite a courageous figure, particularly since nearly all of the members of the General Assembly were white men, and many of them were elderly. I admired Mr. Hill for standing up in the joint session of the Virginia General Assembly on behalf of the NAACP and shaking his fist at Virginia’s legislators. If they did not obey the Court’s mandate in Brown v. Board of Education and desegregate, Mr. Hill thundered, “We will beat you!” Mr. Hill spoke passionately. I could see the veins on the side of his head throbbing.

I had never heard any black person speak to white folks like that. When Mr. Hill said emphatically, “We will beat you!” I ducked down in my chair.

I got up and made my speech on behalf of the student body. I was angry. I spoke from the gut. I had been brought up with interracial dialogue groups like the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Young white people and young black people like me were talking to one another. That inspired and impressed me. We were making progress and were on the cusp of making more. When Brown came, all of a sudden, many white folks cut out such dialogue among the youth.

The same thing happened with the Urban League; white people abruptly withdrew support from the Urban League. It was awful. I was frustrated. I read in the paper what was going on and realized that these people who were engaging in so-called “massive resistance” were acting unlawfully. So I expressed my indignation at this behavior. I said it was wrong. On behalf of the students, I said, “It’s our country and you shouldn’t do this. You should follow the law. It’s our future.” We, the people, didn’t want this.

When I finished, Oliver Hill came over and patted me on the shoulder. He said, “Good talk, young man.” I replied, “Yours wasn’t too bad either, sir.” Mr. Hill then asked, “What are you going to do when you grow up?”

I said, “I want to be a lawyer.”

Henry L. Marsh III is a retired civil rights attorney. He was Richmond’s first African-American mayor and served in the Virginia Senate for 22 years. In March, the Black Law Students Association hosted him on campus for a book signing.
The founders’ understanding of the concept of rights would leave them confused by how we make decisions about freedom of speech today.

By Jud Campbell
Illustrations by Robert Meganck

The First Amendment says that “Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” For Americans, this language is familiar. But what exactly does it mean? How far do the speech and press clauses restrict governmental power? The founders, as we will see, answered these questions very differently than we typically do today. And the reasons why highlight fundamental shifts in American constitutional thought.

At first glance, the text of the speech and press clauses might appear to prevent Congress from imposing any restrictions on expression. But this reading can’t be right, and it never has been. Every well-functioning government needs to restrict at least some speech. Laws against committing perjury, disclosing classified information, and making terrorist threats, for instance, all restrict “speech,” but no one seriously doubts their constitutionality. In any event, the First Amendment says only that Congress cannot abridge “the freedom of” speech or the press; it doesn’t say that Congress cannot restrict speech or the press at all. By itself, the text is unclear.

When faced with opaque features of our Constitution, judges and legal scholars often look for what those provisions meant when they were enacted. Nowadays, we typically associate this approach with political conservatism, and particularly the claims of many self-proclaimed “originalists” who aim to interpret the Constitution according to its “original meaning.” But the truth is that virtually everyone puts enormous weight on history. The Supreme Court has the power only to interpret the Constitution, not the power to change it, so arguments about original meaning have always had special force.

With only peripheral exceptions, however, modern judicial decisions about expressive freedom do not consider original meaning at all. For jurists of all stripes, interpreting the First Amendment is a historical dead zone.
What Did the First Amendment Originally Mean?

But why? The most straightforward reason, it seems, is that nobody knows what the First Amendment originally meant. As leading First Amendment scholar (and former dean of Richmond Law) Rodney Smolla puts it, “One can keep going round and round on the original meaning of the First Amendment, but no clear, consistent vision of what the framers meant by freedom of speech will ever emerge.” A quick look at the history reinforces Smolla’s point. Only a decade after the Constitution went into effect, Americans vehemently disagreed over whether Congress could pass the Sedition Act of 1798, which banned false and malicious criticisms of the federal government. If the founders couldn’t even agree among themselves about that type of law, then surely looking for the First Amendment’s “original meaning” is like searching for the Holy Grail.

But perhaps we have framed the question in entirely the wrong way, seeing hopeless confusion where the founders would have perceived a more ordered disagreement. Of course, attitudes toward speech and press freedoms were not uniform. Constitutional disagreements were commonplace back then, just as they are today. But maybe there was an order to the chaos in a way that we haven’t previously appreciated.

The key to understanding the original meanings of the speech and press clauses is to step back from a search for the meaning of particular rights and instead try to appreciate how the founders thought about rights more generally. In other words, we’ve been focused on discerning an image in a single puzzle piece rather than looking for its place in a broader puzzle. For us, a constitutional “right” is a legally enforceable privilege or immunity — something that the government has to provide us (e.g., our “right” to a jury trial) or something that the government cannot take away (e.g., our “right” to possess personal firearms for self-defense).

But American elites in the late 18th century understood their “rights” in a very different way. For the founders, rights were divided into two categories: natural rights and positive rights. Unless we approach the task of constitutional interpretation on their terms rather than on ours, the First Amendment’s original meaning will remain elusive.

Natural rights were all the things that we could do simply as humans, without the intervention of a government. As Thomas Paine once put it, “A natural right is an animal right, and the power to act it, is supposed … to be mechanically contained within ourselves as individuals.” Eating, walking, thinking, and praying, for instance, were all things that individuals could do without a government, so they were all easily identifiable as natural rights.

Meanwhile, positive rights were defined explicitly in terms in governmental authority. The right to a jury trial and the right to habeas corpus, for instance, were positive rights because they were procedures provided by the government.

With these definitions in view, the founders had no need to write out long lists of which types of rights were natural and which were positive. The distinction, to them, was obvious. Speaking, writing, and publishing, for instance, were all things that people could do without a government, so they were readily recognizable as natural rights. When James Madison introduced the Bill of Rights in the first Congress, for instance, he only mentioned in passing that freedom of speech was one of the “natural rights, retained.” Madison’s audience easily understood his point. Expression is an innate human capacity, so it is a natural right.

But we still haven’t quite arrived at the original meaning of the speech and press clauses. For that, we need to understand how natural rights constrained governmental power. Surely the First Amendment imposes some limits on Congress. (It says, after all, that “Congress shall make no law … abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.”) What were those limits?

For the founders, natural rights were rooted in a philosophical system called social-contract theory. According to this theory, the proper scope of governmental authority is discoverable by first imagining our situation as if there were no government and then considering why we would come together and agree to form a political society through an agree-
ment known as a social contract. The political society would then agree to a constitution that created a government and granted it certain powers.

Although some ancillary features of social-contract theory were contested, virtually every American political leader in the late 18th century agreed about its core features. Most importantly, the founders recognized two crucial limitations that social-contract theory imposes on governmental power to restrict natural rights. First, natural rights can be restricted only when the people themselves consent to the restriction, either in person or through their political representatives. This principle was a rallying cry for American colonists advocating for independence rather than submitting to British taxation when they had no representation in Parliament. Second, the government could restrict natural rights only when doing so promoted the public good — that is, the aggregate happiness and welfare of the entire political society. Individuals entering a political society, John Locke explained in his widely read Second Treatise, surrender “as much … natural Liberty … as the Good, Prosperity, and Safety of the Society shall require.”

As a general matter, therefore, the concept of natural rights helped define who could restrict individual liberty (namely, a representative legislature) and why they could do so (namely, to promote the public good). But natural rights were not a set of determinate legal privileges or immunities that the government could not abridge. Natural rights, it bears emphasis, could be restricted by law to promote the good of the society. “[T]he right to speak and act,” American patriot James Otis explained in his widely read Second Treatise, “is limited by the law — Political liberty consists in a freedom of speech and action, so far as the laws of a community will permit, and no farther.” Effectively, this put the legislature — not judges — in primary control over how far to restrict expression. The freedoms of speech and of the press, in other words, were a primarily philosophical concept — not a strictly legal one.

At the same time, the founders also appreciated that certain regulations of speech were not in the public interest and were, therefore, beyond the scope of legislative power. The famous “rule against prior restraints” — prohibiting the government from requiring preapproval of publications — is one example. Another is that well-intentioned criticisms of the government could not be punished. (Deliberate efforts to mislead the public were an entirely different matter.) The First Amendment thus prevented temporary legislative majorities from abandoning these settled principles.

How much further the speech and press clauses went, though, was up for debate precisely because the founders often disagreed about exactly what restrictions of expression promoted the public good. This conflict was especially clear in the late 1790s as Americans clashed over the constitutionality of the federal Sedition Act.

Members of the Federalist Party — the party of President John Adams — argued that maintaining a republican government required punishing those who falsely and maliciously criticized the government. “[E]very individual is at liberty to expose, in the strongest terms, consistent with decency and truth all the errors of any department of the government,” Federalist jurist Alexander Addison wrote. But this hardly implied constitutional protection for deliberately misleading the public. “Because the Constitution guaranties the right of expressing our opinions, and the freedom of the press,” Federalist congressman John Allen asked rhetorically, “am I at liberty to falsely call you a thief, a murderer, an atheist?” Stopping the spread of lies, Federalists insisted, was essential to maintaining a well-informed electorate and, thus, a republican government.

In response, Jeffersonian-Republican opponents of the Sedition Act did not even try to defend the notion that all speech is beneficial. “It may perhaps be
urged, and plausibly urged, that the welfare of the community may sometimes, and in some cases, require certain restrictions on [an] unlimited right of enquiry," Elizabeth Ryland Priestley wrote. The problem for Republicans, however, was the prospect of governmental abuses of power. Authority to punish sedition, Priestley explained, "once conceded, may be extended to every [opinion] which insidious despotism may think fit to hold out as dangerous."

In other words, Republicans still assessed questions of free speech in terms of the public good — the core principle set out by the First Amendment — but Republicans were worried that Federalists were pursuing their own narrow partisan interests rather than the general welfare and that these abuses of power would stifle useful public debate.

In sum, the founders thought that the First Amendment required Congress to restrict speech and the press only in promotion of the public good, while also guaranteeing more specific legal rules that had long protected expressive freedom. The amendment, in other words, stood for a general principle — one that left room for considerable debate about how it should be applied in practice — and also for the entrenchment of more specific settled principles. The speech and press clauses thus shaped debate about expressive freedom while also standing as bulwarks against constitutional backsliding. The amendment was not simply a counter-majoritarian limit on legislative power. However, once the people agreed on core features of expressive freedom, the legislature could not turn back.

This process of accumulating and refining constitutional principles over time through political means is foreign to us. Rights in the modern sense are counter-majoritarian limits on legislative power, so it seems strange that their scope could somehow depend on political decisions. For us, judges have that job.

For people born and raised in the tradition of the customary British constitution, however, the logic of recognizing constitutional limits through political rather than judicial means makes perfect sense. "[C]ustomary law carries with it the most unquestionable proofs of freedom," explained James Wilson, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and later Supreme Court justice. Politicians do abuse power, of course. But for the founders, once legislators agree on a constitutional principle, and once that settlement remains in place for some time, the principle becomes binding. "[L]ong and uniform custom," English jurist Richard Wooddeson noted in 1792, "bestows a sanction, as evidence of universal approbation and acquiescence." It was, in other words, as if the people themselves had spoken.

For the drafters of the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment fit within this familiar tradition. Well-established principles about expressive freedom would limit Congress, and judges and juries could enforce these settled boundaries of governmental authority. But, otherwise, the First Amendment would leave the task of defining the public good to the people and their representatives. For the founders, judges could not create new limits on governmental authority. That development came a century and a half later as the Supreme Court began to strike down state and federal restrictions of speech in the 1930s. The vision embraced by the justices was still evolutionary — recognizing new constitutional principles over time. But going forward, courts, rather than legislatures, assumed primary responsibility for determining the scope of constitutionally enumerated natural rights.

This is when we began to lose touch with this part of our constitutional past. The rights recognized in the Bill of Rights all started looking the same, without distinctions between natural rights and positive rights. All of these rights, in turn, became trump cards that individuals began to play against legislative claims to the common good. Political settlements no longer mattered; judges were now supreme exponents of the Constitution. Questions of policy — questions about what types of laws promoted the general welfare — transformed into an abstruse web of legal doctrines. Rather that promoting engaged civil debate in the political sphere, invoking "rights" is now a way of shutting that debate down.

Perhaps the way the founders understood the First Amendment is ill-suited for our modern world, where distrust and disdain for politics constantly seems to reach new heights. From abortion restrictions to gun-control laws to limits on speech, Americans by and large look to courts, rather than to ourselves and our political representatives, to define and protect our rights. Constitutionally speaking, we live in a different world. Perhaps we can’t or shouldn’t go back. But at the very least, history can help open our minds to new ways of thinking and help us appreciate the foreignness of our constitutional past.

Rights were not always claims against the public good, and judges were not always the ones who decided their full scope. Where we go from here is up to us.

Jud Campbell is an assistant professor at University of Richmond School of Law.
The ninth edition of Carol Brown’s book *Landlord and Tenant Law in a Nutshell* was published by West Academic Publishing.

Hamilton Bryson’s *Reports of Cases in the Court of Chancery in the Time of Lord Coventry (1625-1640)* was published by Dog Ear Publishing, and the 2018 edition of his book *Virginia Circuit Court Opinions* was published by LexisNexis.

Jud Campbell’s forthcoming scholarship on the invention of First Amendment federalism in the *Texas Law Review* was selected for presentation at the Harvard/Yale/Stanford Junior Faculty Forum. He participated in a National Constitution Center event with Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer; it featured a panel conversation with constitutional law scholars on hate speech. For a look at some of his scholarship, see his article “What Did the First Amendment Originally Mean?” on Page 18.

The Chronicle of Higher Education quoted Tara Casey in a discussion on how she has made her office space more inviting for students. According to The Chronicle, she “decluttered her office, to avoid sending the unspoken message that she is too busy to meet with students. She swapped out her original desk for a smaller one, which allowed her to add chairs, an ottoman, and a small table ‘on which sits a box of tissues,’ creating a more inviting place for students to sit down and talk. Finally, she bought a mini-fridge and keeps it stocked with sparkling water. Now Casey is able to offer students a place to sit and something to drink: the same gestures of welcome she would make for a guest at her home.”

Dale Cecka’s *Virginia Family Law: Theory and Practice* was published by Thomson Reuters.

Hank Chambers’ chapter on Justice Antonin Scalia’s employment discrimination law legacy is forthcoming in *The Conservative Revolution of Antonin Scalia*.

Erin Collins’ “Punishing Risk” is forthcoming with *The Georgetown Law Journal* and was highlighted as “interesting and recommended” on the Legal Theory Blog.

Chris Cotropia’s “Who Benefits from Repealing Tampon Taxes? Empirical Evidence from New Jersey” is forthcoming in the *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*. He was featured in a Richmond Magazine article about smart-home technology, warning that many of the free apps that run home technology come with a cost to users’ privacy. Customers should look for service providers who promise to disaggregate data about users from personally identifiable information, he suggested. “It’s up to consumers and consumer advocacy groups to vote with their dollars if disclosures are violated,” he said.

Joel Eisen was named a member scholar of the Center for Progressive Reform, a nonprofit research and educational organization working to protect health, safety, and the environment through analysis and commentary. He was quoted by numerous sources including Law360 on wholesale electricity markets, Bloomberg BNA on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s environmental review timelines, and Greenwire on the coal and nuclear bailout. Eisen presented and moderated a discussion at the Collaborative Conversation on Electrified Transportation at George Washington University Law School and on “The New (Clear?) Electricity Federalism” at the Energy Law Symposium at Texas A&M Law School.

Champion Magazine highlighted Jim Gibson and Corinna Lain’s “Death Penalty Drugs & the International Moral Marketplace” in a “Getting Scholarship into Court” project.

Meredith Harbach completed her sabbatical year as a visiting scholar with the Vulnerability and the Human Condition Initiative at Emory University School of Law.
Her scholarship on “Childcare, Vulnerability, and the New Prens Patriae” will appear in Yale Law & Policy Review, and she has chapters forthcoming in The Oxford Handbook of Children’s Rights Law (Oxford 2019) and Reproductive Justice Rewritten (Cambridge 2018). She was quoted in an April 17 New York Times article about controversies over school dress codes. The Times article focuses on the case of a Florida high school student who was reprimanded under her school’s dress code policy for not wearing a bra. By “foisting this notion that unrestrained breasts are sexual and likely to cause disruption and distract other students,” Harbach said, the school sends a message that “deflects any and all conversation about appropriate mutually respectful behavior in schools between boys and girls.”

Mary Heen was invited to speak at the American Law Institute Conference on the Future of Insurance Law and Regulation in Washington, D.C.

Ann Hodges presented a training on employment law for federal district judges at the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. The second edition of her co-authored book Principles of Employment Law was published by West Academic, and her article on protecting law enforcement officers who blow the whistle is forthcoming in the UC Davis Law Review Online.

Hayes Holderness was quoted by The Washington Post, Law360, and Kiplinger on online sales tax and the “Kill Quill” movement. His op-ed on the subject was published by The Hill. For more about that, see the profile of Holderness on the following page.

Chiara Giorgetti, who was promoted to professor of law, joined her co-authors for a talk on their book International Claims Commissions: Righting Wrongs After Conflict at Yale Law School.

She has been asked to serve as a member-at-large of the American Society of International Law Executive Committee and was elected a member of its executive council. Giorgetti was also named chair of the Academic Council of the Institute for Transnational Arbitration. Her students’ research on customary international law was cited in a United Nations memorandum.

Joyce Janto authored a chapter on legal ethics and was the editor for the eighth edition of the Guide to Legal Research in Virginia.


Lain joined in an amicus brief in Bostic v. Pash calling on the Supreme Court to reject a 241-year sentence for a juvenile. “Those who commit crimes as children, while their brains are still developing, have a unique capacity to reform and grow out of the transient immaturity that may have led to their criminal conduct,” the brief reads. “As the sentencing judge in this very case now recognizes, condemning a juvenile non-homicide offender to die in prison ‘without any chance of release, no matter how they develop over time, is unfair, unjust and, under the Supreme Court’s 2010 decision [in Graham], unconstitutional.’”

Kurt Lash was a panelist at the AALS Annual Conference on “Reconstruction: The Second Founding.”

Juvenile Law and Practice in Virginia included five chapters by Julie McConnell on such topics as the Children’s Services Act and psychiatric commitment of minors. She was quoted in a Daily Press article about pretrial juvenile appeals.

Kristen Osenga’s scholarship on the Patent Trial and Appeal Board was published by the Chicago-Kent Journal of Intellectual Property. She contributed to an IP Watchdog blog post on Oil States v. Green Energy and authored the first chapter in the newly released Patents and Standards: Practice, Policy, and Enforcement. She was featured in a video produced by the Federalist Society on why intellectual property matters, and her op-ed “U.S. takes one step forward, two steps back on innovation” was published by The Hill. “When a country that used to be among the best in innovation and productivity falls out of the top 10, that’s a sign that we’ve taken too many steps backward,” she wrote.
Jack Preis’ article “Qualified Immunity and Fault” is forthcoming in the Notre Dame Law Review. His article on jurisdictional idealism and positivism was published by the William & Mary Law Review.

Kimberly Robinson’s “Disrupting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s Approach to Equity” is forthcoming in the Minnesota Law Review.

Roger Skalbeck was promoted to professor of law.

Andy Spalding addressed the International Anti-Corruption Academy and the Vienna Chapter of the American Bar Association Section of International Law on global anti-bribery enforcement trends.

Allison Tait was promoted to associate professor of law. She presented on “Writing Family Constitutions” at the International Society of Family Law North American Regional Conference and on “The Entry and Exit of Marriage” at the annual conference of the Association of Law, Culture, and the Humanities. Her chapter on feminist judgments in trusts and estates is forthcoming with Cambridge University Press, and her article “Trusting Marriage” was published by the UC Irvine Law Review.

The Washington and Lee Law Review Online published Carl Tobias’ article “President Donald Trump and Federal Bench Diversity.” Tobias has been quoted extensively on such topics as federal judge nominations, upcoming Supreme Court rulings, and quotas on immigration judges in such publications as The Washington Post, The Guardian, and The Hill.

司法官托比斯引用了凯文·沃尔什2010年发表在《纽约大学法律评论》上的文章“部分不成立”。“部分不成立”一词在案件中意味着法院可以对法律进行更广泛的解释。最近，托比斯在接受《联邦法庭》、《华盛顿邮报》和《凯利普》的采访时被引用。


NEW FACULTY

Luke Norris was an associate-in-law at Columbia Law School and a visiting assistant professor at Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University before coming to Richmond, where he will teach labor and employment law. Norris earned a J.D. from Yale Law School, his Master of Science degree from Oxford University, and his bachelor’s degree from Gettysburg College.

Kevin Woodson joins the Richmond Law faculty from Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law, where he was an associate professor of law. Woodson’s scholarship focuses on race and the legal profession and corporate culture. He earned his J.D. from Yale Law School, his doctoral and master’s degrees from Princeton University, and his bachelor’s degree from Columbia University.

Hayes Holderness

If you’ve been following the “Kill Quill” movement, you might already be familiar with Hayes Holderness, a tax law professor who joined the Richmond Law faculty in fall 2017. Put simply, “the Quill case is why you don’t pay sales tax on things you buy online,” Holderness said.

The 1992 case ruled that if a vendor doesn’t have a physical presence in a state, then the state can’t require the company to collect sales tax. The Supreme Court is currently taking a closer look at that ruling — making Holderness’ research on state sales tax a valuable resource to media outlets. Most recently, he’s been interviewed by The Washington Post, Law360, and Kiplinger about what he identifies as flaws in the reasoning behind Quill.

It’s that topical and timely nature of tax law that attracted Holderness to the field in the first place. “You’re always at the cutting edge of the law and how it should apply to certain situations,” he said. Plus, “there’s a lot of creativity involved in it because it’s a lot of statutory interpretation and a lot of really hard issues.”

Holderness fell in love with the field when he took an elective course as a 1L student at New York University Law School. But now as a tax law professor, one of the challenges is getting students in the door in the first place.

“People get concerned that there’s going to be a lot of really hard issues.”

Prior to joining the faculty at Richmond Law, Holderness practiced tax law for four years at McDermott Will & Emery in New York before serving as a visiting assistant professor of law at the University of Illinois College of Law. But at Richmond, Holderness has found what he calls almost a “familial” community.

“I’ve had students pop in to ask about Quill or state tax law or just to talk about whatever,” he said. “There’s a nice integration between faculty and students here.”

—Emily Cherry
CREATURE COMFORT

A fair number of students arrive at law school knowing they want to be an attorney, but not what kind. Through classes, mentors, clerkships, and such, they gravitate in one direction or another. Not Rachel Snead, L’19. She knew where she wanted to make a difference well before she decided that law was the best career for doing it: animal welfare.

“I wanted to be a veterinarian for a long time,” she said. When she took the necessary prerequisites as a VCU undergraduate, she discovered that the relevant sciences weren’t her strong suit. Plus, a thought kept nagging at her: “I realized that I didn’t want to be responsible for an animal’s day-to-day welfare.”

Enter law school, which ticked many of the same boxes for her. With a little research, she discovered that Virginia — with its animal law unit in the attorney general’s office — was a good place to pursue a career in animal welfare. And Richmond Law — with its animal law course and student-organized Animal Law Society — was the right place to do it.

Next year, Snead takes over as the Animal Law Society’s president. She puts its membership at around 30 students, with 10 or so very active in organizing and running events. One recent event — a CLE charmingly called FURisprudence — drew strong attendance, she said.

Animal law is “intersectional,” touching on family law (e.g., divorce disputes over pets), criminal law (e.g., abuse cases), wills and trusts (e.g., pet care after death), and so on, she said. “Animal law intersects with any areas of law you can think of.”

And, like in some other areas of law, the needs of those who benefit from this advocacy are great. “You’re representing a group that is voiceless,” she said, analogous in some ways to representing young children or people with severe disabilities or who are incapacitated. “The difficulty in animal law is that animals are not recognized under the law as anything more than property.”

And so Snead helps organize and advocate on their behalf at the student level in preparation for a career trajectory she has chosen because, as she tells those who ask, she expects to find it deeply fulfilling. “It’s an answer most people aren’t satisfied with,” she said. “If you’re interested in protecting animals, that kind of compassion usually correlates to other areas.
Compassion of one kind leads you to be compassionate for anyone and everyone. I want to leave the planet better than I found it, and I think this would be a really awesome way to do that.”

The Animal Law Society is one of three dozen student organizations at Richmond Law, spanning interests from service to affinity groups and practice areas.

**PRECEDENT SET**
Fifty faculty members hosted admitted students at the annual open house this spring, a Richmond Law tradition for more than two decades.

This year, approximately 115 students from around the country came for a daylong introduction. From the Children’s Defense Clinic to the Institute for Actual Innocence, faculty and current students offered perspectives about clinics, externships, student associations and organizations, international education, and more.

“One of the most exciting experiences is the opportunity to meet with law faculty in what students fondly call faculty speed dating to see how many of our faculty they can speak to and engage with in about an hour,” Michelle Rahman, associate dean for admissions, said.

A highlight is lunch, when the faculty serve the guests. The act is “a very visible demonstration that [the faculty] are at the law school to serve our students and support them in pursuing their goals,” she said.

**A STRONG ADVOCATE**
Let’s start here: Caitlin Yuhas weighs 150 pounds, but she has deadlifted 420 pounds from the ground to her knees and can flip a 700-pound tire. Yet, her ability to lift 200 pounds over her head is only just fine, and just for now.

“I have bigger goals than that,” she said.

Yuhas is a professional strongwoman and the 2017 U.S. Strongman champion for middle-weight women. And, by the way, also a rising 2L at Richmond Law.

She entered law school determined not to set aside her competition, but she admits that her dual physical and intellectual goals sat uneasily beside one another during her first year.

“I was convinced coming in that I would be able to compete with just as much fervor while I was in school,” she said. “My energy level and my body went through a lot in the fall. I wasn’t anticipating how much of a change school would be for me.”

People working as trainers and prepping for competition are on their feet a lot, even when they’re not actively exercising. Law school requires a steady regimen of sitting down.

“The hardest part was learning to be a student again,” she said. “I hadn’t had 60 pages to read in a night since undergrad.”

The legal profession runs in Yuhas’s family — both of her parents are attorneys — but no one pushed her to pursue law, she said. The idea took shape when she began casting about for a graduate program that would offer both versatility and purpose.

“I’m definitely part of the Trump bump,” she said, referring to the increase in law school applications and LSAT test-takers since the 2016 election.

She’s found that the challenges of law school aren’t so unlike strongwoman competitions. Both require discipline and practice, offer formidable but indifferent obstacles, and reward resilience. In one important way, they complement each other.

“If you have a bad day, it’s good to take it out on the iron,” she said.
FELLOWS TOGETHER IN HAMPTON, THEN OPPOSING COUNSEL

Ryan Asalone and Dylan Arnold, both L’17, work opposite sides of the courtroom in Hampton, Virginia, but each arrived there by following the same track.

Asalone and Arnold, recipients of Bridge to Practice fellowships, are beneficiaries of a highly successful post-graduate program created by the law school in 2012.

“The program has been absolutely essential to my success so far,” said Arnold, who joined the “gangs, guns, and drugs” prosecution team with the Hampton Commonwealth’s Attorney’s Office full time after a bridge fellowship there last year.

“You come out of law school kind of in flux” until you’ve passed the bar exam, said Asalone, who works in the Hampton Public Defender’s Office. The fellowship provided the income “to keep the lights on and landed me here doing what I’d hoped to do. It’s really exciting stuff, fast-paced, interesting. I’m getting tons of experience.”

The bridge program began with five fellows and has grown steadily, with 18 fellowships awarded to members of the Class of 2018.

Fellowships come with a $2,000 monthly stipend and extend for up to four months. Fellows are not paid otherwise.

Students apply for the program during spring semester of their final year and are selected by a faculty committee “on the basis of a demonstrated interest in government or public interest law and overall professionalism in the field.”

Among the most important considerations are the applicants’ efforts to secure a placement in nonprofit organizations, the courts, governmental agencies, and public law firms with public interest or pro bono practices.

The program demonstrates Richmond Law’s commitment to students after graduation, according to Tara Casey, the professor who directs the program.

The program provides more than financial support. Casey meets with each fellow by phone or in person at least once a month.

“Is this experience helping fellows to develop support networks around their work and then to maximize those networks? It’s a professional coaching program.”

So far, more than 90 percent of fellows have landed jobs by the end of their fellowships, Casey said.

“The program is successful because of the quality of the fellows,” Casey said. “They’re good lawyers, good people, and strong ambassadors for the law school.

“It’s been great for the fellows, their employers, and the communities where they work.”

—Rob Walker
We want to hear from you. Send us your note via the “Submit a Class Note” link at lawmagazine.richmond.edu; email us at lawalumni@richmond.edu; contact us by mail at Law Alumni, University of Richmond School of Law, University of Richmond, VA 23173; or call 804-289-8028.

1950s
Pat Graybeal, R’52 and L’59, has retired and is writing a memoir called Justice and Luck that will be available on Amazon.

James W. Morris, L’57, was inducted into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame by Virginia Lawyers Weekly.

1960s
Virginia Lawyers Weekly inducted Irving Blank, L’67, into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame.

1970s
Virginia Lawyers Weekly inducted Edward Barnes, L’72, into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame.

After 24 years, Edward D. Berry, L’73, retired as the longest-serving judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for the 16th District of Virginia. In 2002, he helped start the Charlottesville-Albemarle Family Treatment Court, which helps parents address addictions and regain or retain custody of their children.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly inducted David S. Mercer, L’73, into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame.

1980s
Then-Gov. Terry McAuliffe reappointed Robert “Cham” Light Jr., L’80, to the board of the Library of Virginia. In October, Robert drew on his career as assistant general counsel and claims director with Nationwide Insurance as a panelist for a Virginia Law Foundation Continuing Legal Education course.

1990s
Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Lewis T. Stoneburner, L’76, a Leader in the Law.

Mary Lynn Tate, L’76, was inducted into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame by Virginia Lawyers Weekly.

Ted Chandler, L’77, and Laura Lee Hanks Chandler, W’74, completed a 72-mile, high-altitude trek in the Himalayas of Bhutan in November.

Robert Leonard Flax, L’77, served on a panel for the Virginia Workers’ Compensation Commission, discussing Linda Jones v. King William County. Robert was Jones’ attorney.

Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan appointed Mary M. “Peggy” Kent, W’77 and L’80, as Worcester County Circuit Court judge. She previously was a juvenile and domestic relations magistrate.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly inducted Lynn Jacob, L’82, into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame.

Chambers USA recognized Edward O’Hanlan, L’82, in the real estate zoning/land use category for his work at Robinson+Cole Land Use Group.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly inducted Mary M.H. (Molly) Priddy, L’82, into the inaugural Virginia Lawyers Hall of Fame.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Brewster Rawls, L’84, a Leader in the Law.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Timothy S. Coyne, L’86, a Leader in the Law.

Geoff McDonald, L’89, is a principal with Geoff McDonald & Associates, a Richmond-based personal injury law firm. The firm launched a drive to purchase teaching tools and collect enough school supplies for nearly 500 students at Albert Hill Middle School.

1990s

Monica Kowalski-Lodato, L’91, spent the past 12 years as a solo practitioner in Neptune, New Jersey. She says she cheers the education that allowed her to establish her lifestyle and wonders whether Professor W. Wade Berryhill ever found the answer to the burning question, “Now tell me why you’re wrong.”

The CLEAN Carwash Campaign honored Victor Narro, L’91, with the Ally Award for his advocacy for the workplace rights of car wash workers in California.

The YWCA awarded Nadine Marsh-Carter, L’95, the 2018 Asch Fellowship for Social Justice.
Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Shannon L. Taylor, L’95, a Leader in the Law.

Bonnie Atwood, L’96, won first place in the National Federation of Press Women communications awards for her profile “Emily Couric: What Might Have Been.”

Richard Garriott, R’91 and L’96, was elected president-elect of the Virginia Bar Association. He continues to practice family law at Pender & Coward in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

After her term as interim district attorney of Philadelphia, Kelley Hodge, L’96, rejoined the staff of Elliott Greenleaf and was named a 2018 Distinguished Leader by the Legal Intelligencer.

Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam re-appointed Carlos Hopkins, L’96, as Virginia’s Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs, a role he served under the previous administration. From 2008 to 2009, he was chief of military justice for Joint Task Force Guantanamo.

Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Kim MacLeod, L’96, a Leader in the Law.

Kristine Dalaker Kraabel, WC’92 L’97, served as co-editor of a new book, “Governance of Arctic Shipping: Balancing Rights and Interests of Arctic States and User States.”

Stephen E. Scarce, L’98, was elected managing director of Parker, Pollard, Wilton & Peaden.

Ian Wexler, L’98, U.S. Navy Judge Advocate General’s Corps, was promoted to the rank of captain in February. He is serving with the U.S. Northern Command.

Connie Kuykendall, L’99, is an attorney and legal editor for LexisNexis. She recently published the Christian romantic dramedy novels Love Ain't No Soap Opera and Love Ain't No Reality Show.

Tracey D. Watkins, L’99, was named director of employee and labor relations for the Department of Homeland Security National Protection and Programs Directorate.

2000s

Rita Poindexter Davis, L’00, joined the administration of Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam as counsel to the governor. She had been a senior assistant attorney general for Virginia since 2016. Previously, she was a litigator at Hunton & Williams for more than 15 years.

Ramona Leigh Jester Taylor, L’00, is president of the Oliver White Hill Foundation Board of Trustees/Directors. Ramona’s recent films Looking Up and Days of Togetherness were recognized in international film competitions and accepted by several national film festivals.

Melissa Libertini Creech, L’01, was promoted to deputy chief counsel for economic affairs in the Office of General Counsel, U.S. Department of Commerce. She advises on statutory, regulatory, and administrative matters related to the statistical programs of the Bureau of Economic Analysis and the U.S. Census Bureau, including the decennial census.

Amandaep Singh Sidhu, L’05, is a partner at McDermott Will & Emery, based in Washington, D.C. He focuses on compliance counseling, complex civil litigation, and disputes involving regulated industries. He lives in Washington, D.C., with his wife and daughters.

David Ryden, L’03, and his wife, Caylin Ryden, welcomed a son, Wesly James Ryden, in February. He joins sisters Tenley and Harper. David is a deputy state’s attorney for Harford County, Maryland, and is running for state’s attorney.

Brandy M. Poss, L’03, joined Barnes & Diehl in Richmond as a shareholder.

Naomi Andrews, L’06, is a candidate for New Hampshire’s First Congressional District. She served as Congresswoman Carol Shea-Porter’s chief of staff and campaign manager.

Meg Sander, L’07, is director of the master’s program in education at Eastern Mennonite University in Harrisonburg, Virginia. She holds a
Anne L. Roddy, L’08, joined Barnes & Diehl in Richmond. Anne is president-elect of the Chesterfield Bar Association.

Melissa “Missy” Isbell York, L’08, is a partner at Harman Claytor Corrigan & Wellman. Her practice focuses on defending governmental entities and their employees, as well as matters involving employment discrimination, defamation, products liability, and commercial litigation.

Chivonne Thomas, L’09, was elected president-elect of the Virgin Islands Bar Association for 2018.

2010s

Virginia Lawyers Weekly named Faith Alejandro, L’10, an Up and Coming Lawyer. She works for Sands Anderson in Richmond.

Lindsay Jefferies Mohler, L’10, was named partner at Atwill, Troxell & Leigh in Leesburg, Virginia. Lindsay chairs the firm’s divorce and family law practice group.

Michael Giordano, L’11, is an assistant general counsel for the FBI.

Sands Anderson promoted Madelaine A. Kramer, L’11, to counsel in the McLean, Virginia, office. She represents health care providers and legal professionals in liability matters and other clients in product liability, premises liability, toxic tort, employment, and complex commercial litigation.

Carter Keeney, ’08 and L’11, and wife Taylor welcomed Carter “Taliaferro” Keeney Jr. in August.

Sands Anderson promoted Christopher M. Mackenzie, L’12, to counsel in the Richmond office. He represents companies, local governments, and community associations and handles transactional and intellectual property matters.

---

**ALUMNI PROFILE**

'A thank you' to veterans

**Greg McCracken, L’89**

In his office, Greg McCracken, L’89, is surrounded by artifacts from our nation’s wars. Photos, prints, and books — many of them autographed — flags, medals, and shells are all over.

“I have sand from Iwo Jima given to me by one of the men who went ashore there,” he said. His collection also includes a German coal scuttle helmet, a spike bayonet from Vietnam, and model ships and airplanes he has been building for years.

Of greater value, McCracken says, are the stories told by the veterans who provided many of these artifacts and the friendships he has developed with them.

McCracken hesitates to call all this a collection. “It’s not like baseball cards or something,” he said. Instead, the material he has pulled together “inadvertently” is “a tribute, a memorial, a thank you” to veterans who fought for their country in wars from World War II to the present.

Since his boyhood in Bristol, Virginia, McCracken has been interested in military history and machinery, and he has read voraciously on those subjects.

He convinced his parents to let him enlist in the Army Reserve in high school. He joined ROTC at East Tennessee State University.

After graduating from law school, McCracken went to Virginia Beach, Virginia, where he worked for law firms in general practice. In 1997, he took a job with the Navy, managing its federal tort claims division. It was an office job that included running investigations and providing litigation support for the U.S. Attorney.

In 2006, he joined his wife Michelle Phillips McCracken, also L’89, at Fine, Fine, Legum and McCracken.

Living and working in Tidewater, Virginia, he is regularly in contact with active and former military people, which helps fuel his interest.

Much attention has been given to the passing of “the Greatest Generation” of veterans from World War II, and that era comprises the bulk of McCracken’s collection. But he points out that veterans from Korea and Vietnam are dying now in increasing numbers.

“This is a golden moment to talk to them about their experiences,” he said. “It’s important that we just sit and listen.”

McCracken intends to catalog his collection “to find out what all I have.” Then he’ll seek an appropriate place — probably a university or museum — where it can be kept as a memorial.

—Rob Walker
Richmond Law

Sands Anderson promoted David C. Tait, L’12, to counsel in the Richmond office. He defends local governments in tax assessment matters and represents clients in commercial transportation and product liability claims.


Brittney McClain Powell, L’14, joined Fox Rothschild as an associate in the corporate and international trade departments. She represents clients in antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings such as investigations, scope ruling requests, and reviews before the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. International Trade Commission.

Barry Gabay, L’15, joined the Richmond firm of Burtch Law.

James M. Giudice, L’17, joined the business and corporate practice at Williams Mullen in Richmond. He also is a captain in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve.

C. Lydon Harrell, L’41, of Chesterfield, Virginia
July 26, 2017

Richard C. Rakes, L’51, of Roanoke, Virginia
Dec. 12, 2017

Gordon W. Poindexter Jr., L’59, of Waynesboro, Virginia
Dec. 13, 2017

Donald H. Kent, R’60 and L’63, of Richmond, Virginia
Jan. 19, 2018

Demetrie J. Liatos, L’67, of Greenville, South Carolina
April 29, 2018

Thomas D. Barnett, L’76, of Georgetown, Delaware
Jan. 9, 2018

In Memoriam

B. Leigh Drewry Jr., L’83, of Lynchburg, Virginia
Dec. 1, 2017

Joseph W. Hood Jr., L’84, of Virginia Beach, Virginia
April 10, 2015

Margaret “Tutti” Cuthbert Broaddus, L’91, of Mechanicsville, Virginia
Oct. 19, 2017

Dwight R. “Buckey” Hall, L’91, of Beverly, West Virginia
Oct. 5, 2017

H. Clay Gravelv IV, L’04, of Martinsville, Virginia
Dec. 21, 2017
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Power player

Carter Reid, L’93

Carter M. Reid, L’93, was just three years out of law school when a fascinating job offer came along. Thomas F. Farrell II, then Dominion Resources general counsel, now its chairman, president, and CEO, asked her to join Dominion’s holding company in a three-person legal office.

“I’d never thought about working in the energy industry, but I had done a lot of financing work and M&A” as an associate at McGuire Woods and then Hunton and Williams. Soon, she found herself executing international mergers and acquisitions at a higher level than she would have seen for years at a big firm.

“It was an incredibly exciting opportunity,” she said.

Today, she may have the longest title of anyone working at the company now called Dominion Energy: executive vice president, chief administrative and compliance officer, and corporate secretary.

In Reid’s more than 20 years at Dominion, her role has expanded to include oversight of a variety of support functions for the firm’s subsidiaries and working with the board of directors to be sure “they see what they need to see” to ensure they stay on top of the projects, approvals, and governance trends the highly regulated industry requires.

Each of Dominion’s subsidiaries is responsible for its own compliance, and Reid works with them as a facilitator and coordinator.

“We talk about trends, emerging issues, and share best practices,” she said. “Compliance is an incredibly complex area in today’s environment.”

Reid also plays a leading role in Dominion’s proposed $7.9 billion acquisition of SCANA Corp. She works alongside the CEOs and other leaders of the two companies “to make sure the merger goes through.” Given the regulations, financing, politics, and massive scale of the merger, “we have to make sure everything is done properly.”

The keys to success in these complex proceedings are “having really good people on the team and having an appreciation for the importance of change management,” she said. “It requires careful coordination in so many areas to make sure everyone is going in the same direction.”

Reid is enthusiastic about her career at Dominion.

“I enjoy coordinating, coming up with a goal, and then driving to reach it, even when you think there’s no way to get this done,” she said. “And then when you do, it’s great.”

—Rob Walker
Thank you for making an impact.

Did you know that tuition covers only 65 percent of the actual cost for a student to attend law school? Past and current gifts make up the difference — which means that every gift has a direct impact on our students. Want to see what we mean? Here are just five examples of how gifts can help shape the opportunities for a Richmond Law student.

- $100 purchases one library book.
- $300 funds a prospective student’s visit to campus.
- $1,000 allows a team to travel to a moot court competition.
- $3,500 funds one Summer Public Interest Fellowship.
- $8,000 covers a Bridge to Practice Fellowship for a recent graduate.

Learn more about recurring gifts, matching opportunities, and bequests. Call 804-289-8029 or give online at uronline.net/GivetoURLaw.
FORTY PERCENT

That’s the approximate percentage of the Class of 2018 that tried a case or argued a motion before graduation — including 17 students who tried a jury case.

“When you hear ‘practice-ready,’ this is what comes to mind,” said Janet Hutchinson, associate dean of career development.