One hundred and fifty years ago, our founders put forth a bold vision that would transform the future of legal education. They established entrance requirements to ensure students were well equipped for the intellectual rigor of law school, and they introduced a sequenced, three-year curriculum that would soon set the standard for legal education in the United States. Alumni from our early years would go on to found other law schools in Boston, across the country, and around the world, extending the influence of BU Law’s innovations even further.

Yet, despite their extraordinary vision, neither our founders nor the 60 students who comprised the inaugural class could have imagined the BU Law of 2022—a school of more than 1,000 students, over half of whom are women and more than 35 percent people of color, operating under the leadership of a Black woman. The complexities of today’s legal landscape may have confounded them as well. In the interconnected world of the 21st century, our faculty, students, and alumni are engaged in cutting-edge scholarship and practice related to data privacy and cybersecurity, free speech in the internet age, and artificial intelligence. Such topics may well have been inconceivable to students pursuing law school before the advent of the telephone.

Today, as I sit in the law tower overlooking the Charles River and reflect on the school’s 150-year legacy, I am reminded that I am but one of 18 deans privileged to steward this venerable institution for a time, and that many more will follow in the decades to come.

Admittedly, I cannot begin to imagine the law school of 2172 any more than GEORGE S. HILLARD could have envisioned the law school of today when he took the helm as founding dean in 1872. But, given trends I have observed in recent years, I can identify some changes that are likely to occur.

Students entering law school today have a highly developed understanding of their identities, the ways those different identities intersect, and the way that their identities have influenced—and have been influenced by—their place in society. These students recognize that there are inequities built into our legal system and embrace an approach to law school that accounts for identity and its influence on legal doctrine. In turn, they reject the long-held notion that the law is inherently neutral.

In response, I anticipate that law schools will do more to interrogate the neutrality of legal doctrines and reconsider the traditional manner in which we teach the law, drawing from approaches like critical race theory, feminist legal theory, and queer legal theory to reshape core elements of pedagogy.

New accreditation standards adopted by the AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION earlier this year are already causing law schools to take steps in this direction.

There are other ways in which legal pedagogy is on the precipice of radical change, due in large part to emerging technologies. As of this past spring, the ABA had accredited nine JD programs delivered primarily online, some with as few as 10-in-person sessions required to earn the degree. The pandemic may have accelerated growth in demand for such programs, but the trend toward adopting online options was already well underway among US law schools.

Technological advancements are also impacting the job market. Firms have begun to use artificial intelligence to review documents and handle other routine work that was previously assigned to associates, and we anticipate that AI will handle more legal work over time. Law schools will need to help students deepen their practice-ready skills, such as critical thinking, that cannot be replicated by machines.

Environmental shifts like these will continue to increase the emphasis on clinical and experiential education as well. At the time of our founding, most lawyers learned the trade as apprentices to practicing attorneys, an inherently experiential approach. As formal education in the law became ubiquitous, legal training shifted primarily to classroom instruction. Today, in order to meet the expectations of both students and employers, clinical and experiential education are once again considered essential components of the law school experience, though they are often disconnected from doctrinal education.

At BU Law, experiential and doctrinal faculty are now working together to integrate theory and practice in new ways. Experiences like these, both here and at other schools, will lead to more integrated coursework of this kind, and I expect the lines between doctrinal, experiential, and other faculty will begin to blur.

Future generations of students, faculty, and alumni will undoubtedly witness many fundamental shifts in law and society over the course of the next 150 years. No one knows for certain what the future will hold, but BU Law’s history is one of continuous adaption and innovation, and I am confident that we have the will and the talent to meet any challenges that may come.
IT’S A SMALL ROOM that possesses a lot of memory. The archives at Boston University School of Law contain letters, memos, and other administrative documents, as well as yearbooks, old exams, photos, rare books, and even handwritten scrolls. Here are just a few of the treasures we unearthed in our quest to learn more about the school’s past.

PROFESSOR TAMAR FRANKEL WAS THE FIRST WOMAN AT BU LAW TO EARN TENURE.


JOSEPH J. FEELEY (1884), THE RECIPIENT OF THIS TROPHY, SERVED AS PRESIDENT OF THE BU LAW ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

A GROUP PHOTO OF THE CLASS OF 1918.

FUN FACTS:
- The law school’s football team, the Blivots, won the 1969 intramural championship against the School of Theology’s team, the Saints in Hell’s Half Acre.
- After considerable debate, BU Law faculty voted in March 1969 to confer JDs instead of LLBs.
- When BU Law was founded in 1872, tuition was $100 for the first year and $50 for the second year. The third year was free.
- Elaine Denniston (’77) worked as a keypuncher for Project Apollo at the MIT Instrumentation Lab.

PRESIDENT WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT TAUGHT LEGAL ETHICS AT BU LAW FROM 1914 TO 1921, AFTER HIS PRESIDENCY BUT BEFORE HE JOINED THE US SUPREME COURT.

INEZ FIELDS (CLASS OF 1922), THE FIRST BLACK WOMAN TO GRADUATE FROM BU LAW, JOINED HER FATHER’S PRACTICE IN VIRGINIA AND TOOK OVER THE FIRM IN 1932.

BU LAW STUDENT JOURNALISTS PUBLISHED COMMENT FROM 1966 TO 1985.

INEZ FIELDS (CLASS OF 1922), THE FIRST BLACK WOMAN TO GRADUATE FROM BU LAW, JOINED HER FATHER’S PRACTICE IN VIRGINIA AND TOOK OVER THE FIRM IN 1932.
THE 74TH BEST OF BU ALUMNI AWARDS RECOGNIZED THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SEVEN ALUMNI FROM ACROSS BU’S SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WITH THE DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AND YOUNG ALUMNI AWARDS. THE MOST PRESTIGIOUS AWARDS CONFERRED BY THE BU ALUMNI ASSOCIATION. BU LAW IS PROUD TO RECOGNIZE TWO MEMBERS OF OUR COMMUNITY WHO WERE HONORED FOR THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

When Enoch Woodhouse II enlisted in the US Army Air Corps in 1944, at the age of 17, he wasn’t allowed to train as a pilot. Black soldiers were used only in support positions like truck drivers, laundry people, or oil fillers for airplanes. But that would change with the formation of the Tuskegee Airmen, the first Black military aviators to serve in the US Armed Forces. The group of primarily African American aviators that trained under the Black Power Movement who was serving as lead counsel in the trial of Angela Davis.

Howard Moore Jr. led several precedent-setting civil rights cases in the 1960s and 1970s. He advised the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and successfully defended its communications director, Julian Bond, and leader, Stokely Carmichael, in high-profile cases that challenged the state’s overreach of power. In 1971, he served as lead counsel in the trial of Angela Davis, the self-proclaimed communist and prominent face in the Black Power Movement who was charged with conspiracy, kidnapping, and murder in connection with a shootout in a California courtroom. The trial drew international attention due to the weakness of the prosecution’s case and the politicized nature of the proceedings. In June 1972, Davis was acquitted of all charges.

Howard Moore led several precedent-setting civil rights cases in the 1960s and 1970s. He advised the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and successfully defended its communications director, Julian Bond, and leader, Stokely Carmichael, in high-profile cases that challenged the state’s overreach of power. In 1971, he served as lead counsel in the trial of Angela Davis, the self-proclaimed communist and prominent face in the Black Power Movement who was charged with conspiracy, kidnapping, and murder in connection with a shootout in a California courtroom. The trial drew international attention due to the weakness of the prosecution’s case and the politicized nature of the proceedings. In June 1972, Davis was acquitted of all charges.

“Antibiotics are unlike other medicines. As bacteria evolve to become resistant, the problem keeps getting worse.”

“Antibiotics” have saved countless lives since they were introduced in the 1940s, curing infections and making procedures like chemotherapy and surgeries safer. But as bacteria evolve, many have become resistant to antibiotics. An estimated 1.27 million people died worldwide in 2019 from infections caused by drug-resistant bacteria, according to a study published in The Lancet. It’s an estimated death toll that has nearly doubled in the past five years.

Since 2016, BU has been at the forefront of an international effort to combat antimicrobial resistance, leading CARB-X, a nonprofit partnership that channels funding and expertise to companies developing new antibiotics, vaccines, and rapid diagnostics.

Now that work has been given a boost, with CARB-X receiving up to $670 million in additional funding. The Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA), part of the US Department of Health and Human Services, will provide CARB-X up to $300 million over 10 years. Welcome, a global charitable foundation that supports biomedical research, will provide up to $70 million over three years. Both were founding supporters of the initiative, contributing $355 million in its first six years.

“Antibiotics” are unlike other medicines. As bacteria evolve to become resistant, the problem keeps getting worse, says Kevin Outterson, CARB-X’s founding executive director and BU Law professor, who has spent much of his career researching business models and incentives for antibiotic development. “We have to run faster, just to avoid falling behind.”

Despite their importance—and in contrast to drugs that treat chronic conditions and make blockbuster profits for drug companies—antibiotics lose money. The pipeline of new antibiotics to treat resistant infections has been dwindling for years, even though demand continues to increase. With low sales volumes, small antibiotic companies have been filing for bankruptcy, and many large pharmaceutical companies have shuttered their anti-infective divisions.

CARB-X brings together leading scientists, biotech experts to accelerate projects with the greatest potential to target the most dangerous bacteria. Since its founding, the organization has received 1,163 applications for support, awarding $361 million to 92 projects from 12 countries.

Although CARB-X’s efforts to foster research and development are beginning to pay off, Outterson believes sustained innovation needs to be supported by policy reform that pays for value rather than volume. Members of Congress are developing bipartisan legislation, the PASTEUR Act, which would function for antibiotics like Netflix for movies, charging a subscription fee regardless of how many shows customers watch. Under this model, the US government would pay developers an annual fee for a predetermined period based on the product’s value to public health. Without the pressure to sell a high volume of drugs, companies could recover their upfront expenses and be incentivized to continue developing new antibiotics, while physicians would maintain good stewardship practices to slow the spread of resistance.

“The best-informed estimate is that the world needs four breakthrough antibiotics every decade. The last new FDA-approved class of antibiotics against Gram-negative bacteria was discovered in 1962. I’m 59 years old. That’s my lifetime,” says Outterson. “More than 30 therapeutics in our portfolio qualify as a new class. If any one of these makes it through, that will be the biggest antibiotic news in more than 60 years.”

The best-informed estimate is that the world needs four breakthrough antibiotics every decade. The last new FDA-approved class of antibiotics against Gram-negative bacteria was discovered in 1962. I’m 59 years old. That’s my lifetime,” says Outterson. “More than 30 therapeutics in our portfolio qualify as a new class. If any one of these makes it through, that will be the biggest antibiotic news in more than 60 years.”
YOUR STORIES ARE PART OF OUR STORY. As we celebrate the school’s anniversary, we want to hear about the moments, people, and places that made your time at BU Law special. We put out the call on social media and in our newsletters for your memories, and you answered. Here is a lightly edited selection of responses.

DO YOU HAVE A MEMORY TO SHARE? VISIT BU.EDU/LAW/SHARE.

MEETING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG WHEN SHE SPOKE AT BU LAW IN SEPTEMBER 1995. MICHELLE TARSON ('98)

I WENT TO BU LAW to become a lawyer and serve veterans. I’m so grateful for the law school’s part in my journey toward achieving that goal. My path to law school wasn’t easy. I was a high school dropout from Gardner, Mass., the Chair City, where most people (myself included) expected I would work in a factory someday like my father, who dropped out of high school before me. But I started undergrad after three combat tours as an army medic, and in 2015, I was admitted to BU Law as a Public Interest Scholar. It didn’t take me long to make my way to the lone east-facing seventh-floor classroom where I could watch the sunrise over Boston all by myself, because the rowers on the Charles River and I were the only people foolish enough to brave those cold Boston mornings. I felt so privileged to be there, watching the sunrise over the river’s basin gleaming off the State House’s gold dome, and bathing Beacon Hill in the light of a new day. I think that perspective let me truly appreciate each and every morning that I got to study the Constitution and its rights and protections, for which I’d once put my life on the line (long before I understood them). Although I love the work I do now, I sure do miss those quiet mornings reading my casebooks, pacing my reading with the Ivy League rowers, sipping a Pavement coffee and eating a bagel. I hope a new student has found that bank of windows. I hate to think of that view going unused. Go Terriers!

KENNETH L. MEADOR ('18)

CONGRATULATIONS TO BU LAW FOR ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY. It is wonderful to see it thriving 37 years after I graduated. I was impressed with my professors in the 1980s (concepts I learned then have stayed with me throughout my career, whether as a finance lawyer on Wall Street or as general counsel), and the rich tradition of teaching excellence has grown. A special thank-you to Professor Larry Yackle. I took any course I could with him as he combined a genuine passion to teach with an endearing humility.

It was also wonderful to see the son of one of my closest friends (also LAW’85) graduate from BU Law (in facilities that I am jealous of!) and thrive in our profession.

JEFF HURWITZ ('85)

BU LAW’s first Annual Public Interest Retreat. A full-day event focused on bringing together public interest students, alumni, and the community. Planned and executed by a committee of public interest students.

BRITTANY HACKER (’20)

ATTENDING BU LAW was an amazing experience. I learned a lot there but, more important than that, at BU I met friends that turned into part of my family. Those folks (Cristian Casanova and Barbara Rezania from Chile, and Beatriz Spera and Nicolas Castellanos from Uruguay) were by my side in very happy moments (such as when I got married or when my two daughters were born) and also in very sad moments (when my father passed away). My friendship with Cristian, Barbara, Beatriz, and Nicolas is a true BU legacy!

CYRO GOLDSTEIN TROPER (LLM’09)

APALSA 2017–18 E-BOARD MEETUP. HENRY ZENG, DIANA TAO, CYNTHIA LIANG, JULIA LI, ALDA CHAN, AND HELEN HUANG.

I REMEMBER Professor Henry Monaghan’s angst after he won the US Supreme Court decision in Southeast Promotions v. Conrad (1975), holding that the City of Chattanooga violated the First Amendment when it denied use of city facilities to a group seeking to perform Hair (the musical). Professor Monaghan was livid that he did not receive a unanimous decision.

GREG FRIEDMAN (’76)

MY GRADUATION CEREMONY WITH MY GRANDFATHER, HON. JUAN TORRUELLA (CLASS OF 1957).

MICHAEL TORRUELLA (JD’18, LLM’18)

I REMEMBER Professor Henry Monaghan’s angst after he won the US Supreme Court decision in Southeast Promotions v. Conrad (1975), holding that the City of Chattanooga violated the First Amendment when it denied use of city facilities to a group seeking to perform Hair (the musical). Professor Monaghan was livid that he did not receive a unanimous decision.

GREG FRIEDMAN (’76)

BU LAW Memories

I WENT TO BU LAW to become a lawyer and serve veterans. I’m so grateful for the law school’s part in my journey toward achieving that goal. My path to law school wasn’t easy. I was a high school dropout from Gardner, Mass., the Chair City, where most people (myself included) expected I would work in a factory someday like my father, who dropped out of high school before me. But I started undergrad after three combat tours as an army medic, and in 2015, I was admitted to BU Law as a Public Interest Scholar. It didn’t take me long to make my way to the lone east-facing seventh-floor classroom where I could watch the sunrise over Boston all by myself, because the rowers on the Charles River and I were the only people foolish enough to brave those cold Boston mornings. I felt so privileged to be there, watching the sunrise over the river’s basin gleaming off the State House’s gold dome, and bathing Beacon Hill in the light of a new day. In combat, sunrise was special—sacred even. I think that perspective let me truly appreciate each and every morning that I got to study the Constitution and its rights and protections, for which I’d once put my life on the line (long before I understood them). Although I love the work I do now, I sure do miss those quiet mornings reading my casebooks, pacing my reading with the Ivy League rowers, sipping a Pavement coffee and eating a bagel. I hope a new student has found that bank of windows. I hate to think of that view going unused. Go Terriers!

KENNETH L. MEADOR (’18)
When we invited a state judge—Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.—to give an address at the opening of our new building. The speech, titled “The Path of the Law,” set out the course of thinking about law for more than a century to come. But now, at this 150th anniversary, I would like to mention two other things that were even more important, and more to our credit. First, our law school—from the moment it began—has played an important, formative role in the structure of modern legal education in the United States. Second, our law school—again, from the moment it began—has offered access to the legal profession for members of groups previously excluded from such avenues to advancement.

To appreciate BU Law’s importance in the history of legal education in America, we must remember that in 1872, going to law school was not a necessary or ordinary way to become a lawyer. The vast majority of American lawyers had not attended law school at all. Instead, nearly all of those aspiring to a legal career sought out an established lawyer who would allow them to “read law” in his office. When BU Law was founded, there were only around 30 law schools scattered across the US, none of them offering anything more than a three-year course, none setting entrance requirements other than payment of tuition, and only Harvard announcing that it was going to begin setting examinations for students completing its courses. Attending law school was simply that: if you enrolled, paid the tuition, and attended the lectures, you received the degree. Boston University, chartered in Massachusetts in 1869 as a Methodist school of theology, announced in 1872 that its law school, opening in the fall of that year, would be a new departure. No other law school in the US offered an academic program lasting longer than 18 months except Harvard, which under its new dean, C. C. Landell, projected a two-year curriculum. BU invented the third year of law school. By the end of the 1870s, Harvard would take up our innovation. After many decades, state bars would begin to require three years of instruction for admission to practice, and every other American law school would follow the leader, BU Law.

By changing the curriculum, we also invented the first year of law school. BU interrupted the previous “round robin” system in which a law student could begin attending lectures on any day, and then attend continuously until the same point was reached by the lecturers, completing the school’s 6- or 12- or 18-month program. BU required that students take examinations and pass first-year courses before they could begin second-year courses, and so on from the second to the third year. Langdell at Harvard was also beginning to require examinations at the end of each course. In these respects, BU could well boast being the new model of a modern and rigorous law school in America, joined in a friendly rivalry with Harvard as national standard setters.

These two Greater Boston schools, previously the only law schools in Massachusetts, were far ahead of other American law schools in raising the standard of classroom instruction. Harvard trumpeted Langdell’s case method, with a faculty of eight picked for their expertise in reading law, emphasizing theory. BU started with a large faculty of 18, mostly prominent practitioners and judges, including retired US Supreme Court Justice Benjamin R. Curtis. BU Law promised that students would learn “what to do and how to do it,” and its graduates would not require a law office apprenticeship before practicing. Other law schools would begin to open in the Boston area starting in 1899. Two were founded by BU Law alumni and the rest had BU Law alumni on their first faculties. The second source of pride that BU Law rightfully celebrates is its open access, since our school began, for all qualified applicants regardless of race, sex, religion, national origin, or other identifications. Many other law schools did not admit women until the 1940s, after World War II. The first woman enrolled at BU, Elizabeth G. Daniels, joined in 1874, and the second, Mary Dimon Sturges, in 1877. With Daniels were the first Black student, James Spriggs Payne Jr., from Liberia, and the first Asian student, Michikazu Nawa, from Japan. These “firsts” did not complete the “path” to legal education that allowed young aspiring lawyers to be taken under the inquisitive wing of a prominent, experienced practitioner. BU had a high proportion of students who were immigrants or children of immigrants, first-generation students, or the first in their family and community to aspire to legal careers. We are rightfully proud of our long history of inclusiveness.

The essay is also published in 150/150: People, Places, and Precedents, a book celebrating BU Law’s anniversary. For more information about the school’s anniversary and how to order a copy of the commemorative book, visit bu.edu/law/150.
Over its 150-year history, BU Law has been home to trailblazers who have made their mark on the law and the world.

BY REBECCA BEYER

In the early 1890s, a man named Owen Young applied and was accepted to Harvard Law School. But when the son of farmers informed the Cambridge institution that he would need to work while earning his law degree, his acceptance was rescinded. Harvard, in that era, was a place for gentlemen. And gentlemen apparently didn’t need jobs.

At Boston University School of Law, Young’s admission came with a personal offer from Assistant Dean Samuel Bennett (1882) to work in the library. BU Law had created the three-year model of legal education, but Young graduated in two and then went on to implement worker-friendly policies as chairman of General Electric, serve five presidents in various capacities, and head up negotiations with Germany on the question of the country’s reparations following World War I.

Fortunately for Young (1896, Hon.’46)—and the world—BU Law was a place for everyone. Since its founding in 1872, the Boston Law School, as it was known at the time, had admitted men—and women—of all races and religious backgrounds. Did Bennett know, when he welcomed Young into the Class of 1896, that his student would go on to make history? Probably not. It’s hard to know how the future will reflect on the present once it becomes the past. It’s more likely that what Bennett and the other founders of BU Law knew was that not admitting certain people—because they were women or because they were poor or because they were Black—would foreclose even the chance that they would go on to make history.

“Boston University School of Law was remarkable because it was much more open” than other law schools at the time, says Professor David J. Seipp, a scholar of legal history and the unofficial historian of BU Law. “We were willing to offer an academically rigorous program to any student of whatever background.”

That openness was a first step toward making the legal profession more diverse, a goal that the school is still working toward today. It also made BU Law a place for trailblazers whose groundbreaking ideas—about race and gender and equality and innovation—continue to be discussed and debated today.

TOWARD MORE JUST JURIES
In 1883, thirteen years before Young graduated from BU Law, Wilford Smith, a Black man from Mississippi, earned his law degree at the school and then opened a thriving practice helping Civil War veterans with their pension applications in his home state. Smith’s reputation as a leading litigator began with a murder trial in 1900. Representing defendant Seth Carter, he became the third Black attorney to argue before the US Supreme Court and, when the court dismissed the indictment against Carter because no Black people had been selected for the grand jury proceedings, the first to win.

“As a scholar who studies racial and linguistic discrimination in jury selection, I had long known of the Supreme Court case Carter v. Texas, which held that states violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment when they exclude people...
on the basis of race or color from serving as grand jurors,” says PROFESSOR JASMINE GONZALES ROSE. Although the case was not the first to successfully challenge grand jury discrimination, “it was an important win for jury justice and for diversity and inclusion in the [Supreme Court] bar.”

And Smith wasn’t finished. He would go on to argue another US Supreme Court case, Giles v. Harris, which challenged a new provision of the Alabama Constitution that reduced the number of eligible Black voters in the state from nearly 200,000 to about 3,000. (The work was so sensitive that Smith and Recorder T. Washington, who funded the litigation, used code names to correspond about it.) Smith lost Giles in a decision that one law review article described as “controversial and convoluted” and another called the “focal point” for “(anti-) democracy in American constitutional law.”

“He was coming up against a system that was so stacked against him, he could do everything right and still he was not necessarily going to get anywhere,” says PROFESSOR GERALD F. LEONARD, an expert in constitutional law.

Because jurors are selected in part through voting records, Smith’s Carter and Giles cases were tied up in the same broader effort to protect the rights of people of color.

In 1979, another BU Law graduate and longtime professor, PAUL J. LIACOS (CAS’50, LAW’52, Hon.’96), then a justice on the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, played his own part in that ongoing effort.

That year, Liacos wrote a groundbreaking opinion, Commonwealth v. Soares, that forbid the “use of peremptory challenges to exclude prospective jurors solely by virtue of their membership in, or affiliation with, particular, defined groupings in the community,” as outlined in the Equal Rights Amendment of 1923.

The Soares opinion was later cited by the US Supreme Court in its 1986 Batson v. Kentucky decision. Following Batson, jury cases became more about intentional discrimination against jurors. But, in 1985, Liacos took a broader approach, Leonard says. “Batson starts with race and then grudgingly moves to gender, and, as far as I know, the [US Supreme Court] has gone no further than that,” Leonard says.

Liacos wrote, “Whereas Liacos from the start says impartiality means a cross-section of the community, that means a lot of categories.”

In 20 years on the bench, Liacos was reportedly proudest of the Soares decision, which, according to THOMAS F. REILLY, then attorney general of Massachusetts who spoke at Liacos’ 2000 memorial, “made a visionary observation about decisionmaking in a democracy”: namely, that true impartiality depends on a diversity of opinions since everyone has biases.

The ruling “was issued at a time when racial tensions in the city of Boston were high and few public officials had taken an affirmative stand against racism,” Reilly said at the memorial. “In that setting, the Soares decision became a powerful symbol.”

FURTHERING THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

Around the time that Smith argued the Giles case at the US Supreme Court, a BU Law professor and former Massachusetts attorney general named ALBERT E. PILLSBURY was trying to generate support for a federal anti-lynching law. In 1901, a bill he drafted was introduced in the US Senate.

The law was not the first proposed federal legislation to prohibit lynching nor was it the last: when President Biden signed the Emmett Till Anti-Lynching Act earlier this year, the law’s enactment came after more than 200 attempts in more than 120 years. Nevertheless, the bill Pillsbury worked on was the first “thought to have a chance of passing,” Seipp says.

In a 1902 Harvard Law Review article, Pillsbury based his argument for the bill’s passage on the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which Smith had relied on in his jury and voting rights cases. Just a few years after Pillsbury’s death in 1930, a BU Law alumnus named BLANCHE CROZIER proposed that the same amendment could—and should—he interpreted to protect another group from discrimination: women.

Crozier, whom Seipp has been researching recently, graduated sum laude in 1933 after serving as an editor of the Boston University Law Review. By November of that year, she was divorced. According to the decree granted to her husband by a probate court in Cambridge, it was Crozier’s habit of typing early in the morning that doomed the marriage.

The “practice…made [the husband] very nervous and constantly uptight,” a newspaper reported. The practice also made Crozier a harbinger of the women’s rights movement. Between 1933 and 1937, Crozier published a series of articles in the BU Law Review that advanced arguments for women’s equality. One of those, the “Constitutionality of Discrimination Based on Sex” (18 H. L. Rev. 723), posited that discrimination against women was just as unconstitutional as discrimination against Black people.

“Race and sex are in every way comparable classes,” Crozier wrote. “And if exclusion in one case is a discrimination implying inferiority, it would seem that it must be in the other also.”

PROFESSOR LINDA C. MCCLAIN, an expert in gender and law, says there is a connecting thread between Crozier’s 1933 article and Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s later description of the Constitution as an “empty cupboard” for women for much of US history: “There’s a bit of that flavor” in Crozier’s piece, McClain says. “This article is really powerful in pointing out how, from the beginning, some feminists were saying abstract terms like ‘liberty’ and ‘equality’ should apply to us and the court just really didn’t see it.”

Crozier’s article was decades ahead of its time, but her “incisive thinking…was not wasted; only delayed,” according to PAULI MURRAY, another pathbreaking person with ties to BU Law, whose work served as a sort of bridge between Crozier and Ginsburg.
In 1965, Murray cowrote an article about sex discrimination and its relationship to racism that cited Crozier’s work. Murray would in turn be credited by Ginsburg when the future US Supreme Court justice won her 1971 case, Reed v. Reed, which finally established that discrimination against women violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, just as Crozier had argued four decades earlier.

Murray, who self-identified as a “he/she personality” in letters to family and for whom the Pauli Murray Center for History and Social Justice now uses he/she pronouns for descriptions of Murray’s early life and she/her for later years, was as forward-thinking as they pronouns for descriptions of Murray’s early life. They were an icon of the Civil Rights Movement—and the first Black woman to be ordained an Episcopal priest. McClain, who teaches Murray’s work in her classes on feminist jurisprudence and gender equality law, says Murray was “there at so many pivotal moments in history.”

Murray was also at BU Law. In 1972, she taught a course on civil rights.

“She was quiet but dynamic,” says Professor Emerita Frances H. Miller (50), who was a lecturer at the time. “You knew you were talking to someone who knew what she was talking about. Someone who knew. She knew.”

Nevertheless, Murray, like the handful of other women on the faculty at BU Law at the time, was relegated to the “ladies’ section” on the second floor of the tower, according to Miller. Although BU Law had admitted women since its founding a century earlier, there was only one woman on the full-time faculty in those years: Professor Tamar Frankel.

Murray wasn’t on campus regularly—she was also a professor of political science at Brandeis University—and Miller wasn’t aware then of the extent of Murray’s contributions to the civil and women’s rights movements. But it is likely that another BU Law graduate, Clarence B. Jones (59), was.

Jones was working in Los Angeles as an entertainment lawyer when Martin Luther King, Jr. (GRS’55, Hon. ‘59) visited him at home to ask him to join his legal team. Jones was reluctant, but King was determined and applied a full-court press. Soon, Jones became one of the civil rights leader’s closest advisors. He helped to get King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” to the public and to organize the March on Washington where King delivered his iconic “I Have a Dream” speech, which Jones helped write and had copyrighted.

Murray also played a role in the March on Washington. As described in the book The Firebrand and the First Lady, they—and others—protected the marginalization of women in the event.

The Civil Rights Movement has since expanded to include advocacy for other historically marginalized groups—including the LGBTQIA+ community that now claims Murray as its own—and the Fourteenth Amendment that Pillsbury, Crozier, and Murray wielded has been a popular and powerful tool in those efforts.

“…I was not included in that ‘We the people’... but through the process of amendment, interpretation, and court decision, I have finally been included...”

—Representative Barbara Jordan (Law’59, Hon.’69)
Her message was so powerful that one Houston man paid to display “THANK YOU, BARBARA JORDAN, FOR EXPLAINING THE CONSTITUTION TO US” on 25 billboards. Jordan went on to deliver a keynote address at the 1976 Democratic National Convention in New York. She received a three-minute standing ovation before speaking for 25 minutes in remarks that called for unity but also acknowledged the Democratic Party’s past mistakes.

PROFESSOR JACK M. BEERMANN, who studies civil rights litigation, was a newly eligible voter at the time and watched Jordan’s speech.

“I remember being just blown away by how inspiring she was,” he recalls, noting that Jordan viewed the Constitution as an aspirational document. “That’s what Barbara Jordan did for her entire career: embark on the hard work of realizing the ideals of the US Constitution for all people.”

Jordan held Nixon to account for abusing the power of the presidency—a quarter-century later, PHILIP S. BECK (’76) made a name for himself in part as a member of the legal team that paved the way for George W. Bush to assume that office.

Beck, who served as editor of the BU Law Review, is a well-known trial attorney who spent 16 years at Kirkland & Ellis before forming his current firm, Bartlit Beck, in 1993. He was at home for Thanksgiving when his partner called him to tell him they had been hired to assist Bush in his ultimately successful effort to prevent a recount in Florida of disputed ballots in the 2000 election. The team ultimately won a ruling from the US Supreme Court that a recount would be unconstitutional.

Beck later downplayed the significance of his role—I was briefly a minor celebrity for that small undertaking—but, as he studies history, he recognizes the danger of that power even as he set out upon his own career.

A few months later, they went to law school. “Let each day count for something,” Murray wrote in a 2006 interview. But the public’s— and any public opinion against impairment of the liberty of every segment of the population that cares about political ends—has been held up as an example of the importance of the rule of law in a democracy.

THE POWER OF A LAW DEGREE

At GE, Owen Young was a pioneer of what was known at the time as “welfare capitalism.” He implemented a series of programs designed to improve the lives of his employees and their families, including pensions, profit sharing, mortgage loans, and life and unemployment insurance. He also advocated for what he called a “cultural wage.”

“No man is free until want is removed from his door and until his intellect may be developed to take advantage of all the opportunities which may be available and are guaranteed to him in a free country,” he said in the 1920s.

Within two years of his chairmanship, workers at GE were making 25 percent more than they had previously.

“Today, he would be right in the midst of the Seqential wing of the Democratic Party,” says PROFESSOR DAVID I. WALKER, an expert in business and corporate law. “He would probably be dismayed to see how little progress we have made on a social safety net.”

What stands out most about Young is his “ability to move seamlessly” between roles— at law firms, at major corporations, in government— while always prioritizing the public interest, Walker says. But, of course, when you open your doors to everyone—one at BU Law did at its founding, as a democracy does in every day of its existence—you equip people to act on their best and worst intentions.

Albert Pillsbury was a longtime ally of the Black Civil Rights Movement—he was a founding member of the NAACP and a friend of W.E.B. Du Bois—but when it came to equality, he drew the line at women. Pillsbury campaigned against women’s suffrage and, upon his death, left significant contributions to several schools to “create and develop sound public opinion against impairment of the family by taking women out of the home.”

A law degree is a powerful tool. Young seemed to recognize the danger of that power even as he set out upon his own career.

In 1896, speaking as class orator, Young told his fellow graduates their duty was “to use, not to abuse, the law.” And fulfilling that duty is what so many BU Law students, alumni, and faculty have tried to do for 150 years.

Because history repeats itself, all of the efforts described here—on behalf of women and workers and people of color and democracy itself—continue to this day. It can be overwhelming to contemplate how much history must still be endured before, as Crozier wrote in 1935, “the privileges which citizens enjoy might be expected to increase.”

But Smith and Crozier and Murray and Jones did not just endure. Instead, in even the most trying of times, they engaged. Smith and Jones left successful private practices to devote their considerable legal talents to the Civil Rights Movement. Crozier had two daughters and published a novel before she went to BU Law, where she typed her way to a divorce as she developed one of the most influential legal arguments of the 20th century. In 1940, Murray became an advocate for Odell Waller, a Black man sentenced to die by an all-white jury for the shooting death of a white man.

“Let each day count for something,” Murray wrote in one letter to Waller. “You have no time to get blue and down. You have a stake in democracy also, and you must try to find the part you are playing.”

Murray took their own advice. Until then, they had contemplated becoming a writer, but, as they wrote to a friend, “the exigencies of the period have driven me into social action.”

A few months later, they went to law school.
Boston University School of Law has never been afraid to break with convention in pursuit of higher values. The school’s early embrace of diverse groups of students and perspectives fostered an academic ethos of intellectual rigor and innovation that continues to this day.

Judge Sandra L. Lynch (LAW’71, Hon.’12), of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, recalls the inspiration of taking courses with pathbreaking professors like securities regulatory law expert Tamar Frankel, when almost no other law schools hired women as faculty. “I consider BU Law to have been a pioneer in so many ways, to be pre-scient about what the future of the law would hold,” Lynch says. “That history will help the law school as it approaches its future.”

What the future holds is anybody’s guess. So The Record asked eight BU Law students, alumni, staff, and faculty to share their predictions for what comes next. What skills does the future law student need? Which novel areas of law will catch fire? Will technology be a blessing or a bane for the legal profession? And how can BU Law meet the challenges of the next century?

We heard musings on everything from holographic law books to defending democracy to the seismic impact of artificial intelligence on the practice of law. (One student’s proposed future 1L course title: “How to Best Serve Our Computer Overlords.”)

One theme came up repeatedly: the nation is at a pivotal juncture on many fronts—climate, race, politics, international affairs, even deciphering truth itself—and future generations of lawyers, advocates, and judges will play a consequential role in determining the course of American life in the years to come. There is also an unshakable optimism about the potential of BU Law and its dynamic community to shape a better world.

“It’s a ‘put up or shut up’ moment for the law,” says Ronald E. Wheeler, an associate professor of law & legal research and the director of the Fineman & Pappas Law Libraries. “It’s lawyers who are going to make or break it. We need lawyers who believe in the system and want to fix it and make it work for citizens of the world.”
FEATURE | WHAT'S NEXT?


From AI recruiting first-year associates to fortiﬁcation of data centers against hackers, our panelists recognized the profound disruptive force new technologies are already exerting on the legal profession. “[I]f sometimes feels like the dinosaurs smilling around right before the asteroid hit,” says Kiernan Majerus-Collins. “AI can be a powerful tool or a disaster.”

MANDIE LEBEAU: “Several law ﬁrms are now embracing AI personality assessments as part of their recruiting. They say it’s to help them see qualities in candidates they may have missed, but I’m concerned it might be used to weed people out, which could go against what we’re trying to do to increase diversity in the profession. Algorithms are never neutral, so they’re inherently biased.”

IMARA JOROFF: “My generation is quick to adopt new technology, especially if it makes our lives easier and more interesting. If it takes time away from things like document review, we can spend more time doing things like pro bono work or connecting with our clients.”

RONALD E. WHEELER: “Data security is going to be more and more important. With governments evolving to transact a lot of business electronically, we have to get better at securing our nation and government. No one has ﬁgured out how to do that yet. It’s the dirty secret of the tech world. Law ﬁrms are paying ransoms on the sly to get information back. It’s craziness. It’s like the Wild West.”

“Data security is going to be more and more important. With governments evolving to transact a lot of business electronically, we have to get better at securing our nation and government. No one has ﬁgured out how to do that yet. It’s the dirty secret of the tech world. Law ﬁrms are paying ransoms on the sly to get information back. It’s craziness. It’s like the Wild West.”

KIERNAN MAJERUS-COLLINS: “AI could make lawyers much more efﬁcient and bring costs down for ordinary people and potentially allow many more clients to be served and that much more justice be done.”

JUSTICE FOR ALL

In expanding access to legal training and services, our panelists emphasized that a more just world is not inevitable—it must be intentional. “We need to see equity as a form of innovation,” says Jonathan Allen. “Equity as the premise, as the lens through which we see equity as a form of innovation.”

IMARA JOROFF: “One of the big things I’d like to see change is the need to ﬁt in and conform. I hope in the future there’s a societal shift in terms of what qualities we look for in a successful and professional person. You shouldn’t need to be in a black pantsuit to conform to the stereotype of what we’ve deemed a good leader.”

CHRISTOPHER ROBERTSON: “If I was a judge, I would ask some straightforward questions. We’re seeing similar eﬀorts to provide legal services in an automated or quasi-automated fashion. I think we’d see a diﬀusion of legal practice beyond JD-trained professionals.”

THE LAWYER OF TOMORROW

Future generations of legal professionals will need to possess a combination of tech savvy and emotional intelligence. “Even more, the soft skills and higher-order skills will be essential. Being able to negotiate, being able to predict what that judge will decide because you understand the underlying legal values and principles at stake. Seeing how this case is just one case in a larger chess game where that judge is resolving the technical ambiguities with a broader sense of the law. Those sorts of big picture skills and human skills are going to be even more important for the lawyers of tomorrow.”

MANDIE LEBEAU: “Courts are conducting hearings via Zoom. How to present yourself virtually, appear convincing to a judge, or connect with a client through a computer screen is a whole new skill set that law students will need to develop.”

RUS-COLLINS: “Not only does technology change fast, governments change; laws are always changing. Students will need to understand the importance of ethical rules as they apply to technology, client information safety, threats from external governments. They’re going to have to have a truly global mindset.”

JOHN ALLEN: “The next generation of diverse lawyers, practitioners, and social engineers have overcome so much. They are so resilient and brilliant and creative—even on issues of race, gender, sexuality, and economic equity. They’re not looking for ways to solve the big social issues that they care deeply about, and they are unwilling to accept no for an answer.”

BU LAW 5.0

How should we prepare future lawyers for a rapidly evolving legal landscape?

KIERNAN MAJERUS-COLLINS: “Law school should reorient toward skills that are most diﬃcult for AI to acquire, whether that’s interpersonal skills or oral advocacy. AI has the most ground to make up in areas where humans interact with other humans. Law schools should be training students to be as eﬀective as possible in the things that AI is worst at and avoid training them to do things that will be automated in a decade or two.”

NAOMI MANN: “Having law school without a required experiential component is like having a panelists recognized the profound disruptive force new technologies are already exerting on the legal profession. “[I]f sometimes feels like the dinosaurs smilling around right before the asteroid hit,” says Kiernan Majerus-Collins. “AI can be a powerful tool or a disaster.”

Mandie Lbeau: “Several law firms are now embracing AI personality assessments as part of their recruiting. They say it’s to help them see qualities in candidates they may have missed, but I’m concerned it might be used to weed people out, which could go against what we’re trying to do to increase diversity in the profession. Algorithms are never neutral, so they’re inherently biased.”

Imara Joroff: “My generation is quick to adopt new technology, especially if it makes our lives easier and more interesting. If it takes time away from things like document review, we can spend more time doing things like pro bono work or connecting with our clients.”

Ronald e. wheeler: “Data security is going to be more and more important. With governments evolving to transact a lot of business electronically, we have to get better at securing our nation and government. No one has figured out how to do that yet. It’s the dirty secret of the tech world. Law firms are paying ransoms on the sly to get information back. It’s craziness. It’s like the Wild West.”

Kiernan Majerus-Collins: “AI could make lawyers much more efficient and bring costs down for ordinary people and potentially allow many more clients to be served and that much more justice be done.”

Justice for all

In expanding access to legal training and services, our panelists emphasized that a more just world is not inevitable—it must be intentional. “We need to see equity as a form of innovation,” says Jonathan Allen. “Equity as the premise, as the lens through which we see equity as a form of innovation.”

Imara Joroff: “One of the big things I’d like to see change is the need to fit in and conform. I hope in the future there’s a societal shift in terms of what qualities we look for in a successful and professional person. You shouldn’t need to be in a black pantsuit to conform to the stereotype of what we’ve deemed a good leader.”

Christopher Robertson: “If I was a judge, I would ask some straightforward questions. We’re seeing similar eﬀorts to provide legal services in an automated or quasi-automated fashion. I think we’d see a diﬀusion of legal practice beyond JD-trained professionals.”

The lawyer of tomorrow

Future generations of legal professionals will need to possess a combination of tech savvy and emotional intelligence. “Even more, the soft skills and higher-order skills will be essential. Being able to negotiate, being able to predict what that judge will decide because you understand the underlying legal values and principles at stake. Seeing how this case is just one case in a larger chess game where that judge is resolving the technical ambiguities with a broader sense of the law. Those sorts of big picture skills and human skills are going to be even more important for the lawyers of tomorrow.”

Mandie Lbeau: “Courts are conducting hearings via Zoom. How to present yourself virtually, appear convincing to a judge, or connect with a client through a computer screen is a whole new skill set that law students will need to develop.”

Romas-Collins: “Not only does technology change fast, governments change; laws are always changing. Students will need to understand the importance of ethical rules as they apply to technology, client information safety, threats from external governments. They’re going to have to have a truly global mindset.”

John Allen: “The next generation of diverse lawyers, practitioners, and social engineers have overcome so much. They are so resilient and brilliant and creative—even on issues of race, gender, sexuality, and economic equity. They’re not looking for ways to solve the big social issues that they care deeply about, and they are unwilling to accept no for an answer.”

Bu law 5.0

How should we prepare future lawyers for a rapidly evolving legal landscape?

Kiernan Majerus-Collins: “Law school should reorient toward skills that are most difficult for AI to acquire, whether that’s interpersonal skills or oral advocacy. AI has the most ground to make up in areas where humans interact with other humans. Law schools should be training students to be as eﬀective as possible in the things that AI is worst at and avoid training them to do things that will be automated in a decade or two.”

Naomi Mann: “Having law school without a required experiential component is like having a
“People cannot become disengaged from the political process. The assumption that we will always have a constitutional democracy is not necessarily accurate.”

—Hon. Sandra L. Lynch (Law’71, Hon.’12)

The Record | Fall 2022

Mandie Lebeau: “There used to be rules and timing guidelines of when law firm recruitment could happen. Historically, firms waited for grades at the end of the 1L year. But some employers aren’t willing to wait anymore, so 1Ls are being recruited before they finish the 1L year. This early recruiting trend continues, the summer on-campus interview programs that law schools pride themselves on—1Ls slowly see that being obliterated.”

LAW’S NEXT BIG THING

Some new frontiers of law are being fueled by headlines, while others will be driven by science.

Mandie Lebeau: “Health law is booming. Data privacy is on fire. Voting rights and immigration continue to stimulate growth.”

Chris Robertson: “One of the most radical shifts we’ll see in the decades ahead is the changing of what it means to practice medicine. We’re just now starting to experiment with medicine being practiced by intelligent devices and systems. Increasingly, the role of the physician will change as expert systems get smarter, and the law around them will have to change. It won’t be medical malpractice so much as product liability or product regulation. The thing that delivers treatment or tells you what kind of leukemia you have will be some weird amalgam of the institution, the software, and the human doctor.”

Naomi Mann: “We have a legal profession that does not represent all of the communities in our country, especially those that are disproportionately impacted by the legal system. So we are essentially upholding a caste system based on racism and systems of oppression. To shift the tide will require us to see that playing out in real time with Supreme Court decisions. The law has been created and structured in a way that prioritizes certain identities over others. The challenge for us is, how can the legal system recognize the full panoply of identities and determine what justice means and how we achieve justice.”

People debate vigorously whether the law itself creates social change or whether social change creates changes in the law. We see that playing out in real time with Supreme Court decisions. The law has been created and structured in a way that prioritizes certain identities over others. The challenge for us is, how can the legal system recognize the full panoply of identities and determine what justice means and how we achieve justice.”

Kiernan Majerus-Collins: “There’s a crying need for thoughtful and talented lawyers all across the country. We desperately need the sorts of people who go to BU Law to end up in a wider variety of places and to engage in politics and civic life. The era of saying ‘this is how I make my living, and I’m not interested in the broader social ramifications’—that can’t continue. People need to think about jobs they want to have, the clients they want to take, and what values they do and don’t hold.”

Jonathan Allen: “We have a legal profession that does not represent all of the communities in our country, especially those that are disproportionately impacted by the legal system. So we are essentially upholding a caste system based on racism and systems of oppression. To shift the tide will require us to see that playing out in real time with Supreme Court decisions. The law has been created and structured in a way that prioritizes certain identities over others. The challenge for us is, how can the legal system recognize the full panoply of identities and determine what justice means and how we achieve justice.”

People cannot become disengaged from the political process. The assumption that we will always have a constitutional democracy is not necessarily accurate.”

The evolution of the law

The nation is at a crossroads and the next generation of lawyers must act with a recognition of the gravity of this moment.

KIERNAN MAJERUS-COLLINS: “Climate justice. People suffering the effects of climate change often did nothing or next to nothing to cause it. How can the law deliver some recompense to them while holding those most responsible accountable?”

IMARA JOROFF: “Societal norms exist side by side with legal norms, and there is an interplay between the two. Lawyers are called upon to be leaders in the community, to articulate what those norms are, and build a consensus that people agree with. Law schools are going to have to be even more mindful of that role.”

Christopher Robertson: “If [AI] models are based on data that don’t represent populations that have been systematically, economically excluded, that’s another institutional bias that can be baked into the data. It’s really important for law students and future lawyers to become fluent in those systems, be curious, and learn continuously about how these technologies work under the hood.”

Caitlin Denning: “The law is a tool of oppression, and it is our job to break it.”

Panlists

• Christopher Robertson is the N. Neal Pike Scholar in Health & Disability Law and an expert in health law, institutional design, and decision-making.
• Ronald E. Wheeler is director of the Fireman & Pappas Law Libraries and associate professor of law & legal research.
A PLACE TO FIND ONESELF

Reflecting on a time and place that shaped my experience of law school.

BY KIMBERLY ATKINS STOHR
(COM ’98, LAW ’98), BOSTON GLOBE SENIOR OPINION WRITER AND THE EMANCIPATOR COLUMNIST

I’m not easy to pick my favorite place from my time as a student at Boston University School of Law—the oasis of the BU Beach right outside the building, the panoramic views from the student lounge (then on the 12th floor), and the couch just inside the Student Bar Association office, where I spent countless hours with friends, all come to mind.

But for me, the winning spot is the auditorium, because that is where an event that changed my entire experience—I excelled. To understand this, it’s important to understand a little something about me when I was a law student at BU. I was neither at the top nor the bottom of my class. I surfaced the school’s B+ grading curve, so to speak, meaning that I would stay at or around the peak and usually (but not always) avoided sliding down either side. Having been a stellar student throughout my life, including in college, being in the middle of the pack was foreign and frustrating to me.

So was the competitiveness of law school. While I spent some time before law school preparing for the Socratic method and how to write a law school exam essay, I wasn’t ready for all the ways law school would require me to compete with and compare myself to other students. The curved grading system itself made adversaries of us all. Then there were the bids to secure interviews and callbacks for summer associate positions. And of course, there was what I referred to as “nerd rush”: the frenzied competition to get on a law journal.

None of those things came naturally to me. As a journalism major who spent most of college writing for newspapers, the style of legal journal writing held no appeal. I had no aspiration to go into Big Law, so I felt a bit adrift in the large pool of students who did. I had trouble finding where I belonged.

Then, as a 2L, I entered the Stone Moot Court Competition. I knew I wanted to be a litigator, but the competitiveness of the school’s trial clinics was also a turnoff for me. Stone, on the other hand, welcomed me. Yes, it was itself a competition, but it was one in which you worked as a team, and winning wasn’t my goal. It was a chance to challenge myself and test my chops doing what I thought I’d do for a career: arguing before a court.

I absolutely loved it, and—for the first time in my law school experience—I excelled.

My performance earned me an invitation to the Albers Moot Court Competition. The finalists in that contest would argue before a panel of real-life appellate heavyweights: Justice Bruce Selya of the First Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Guido Calabresi of the Second Circuit, and US Supreme Court Justice David Souter.

The stakes were obviously high, and for me personally, they were even higher. I’d already been hired to be a summer clerk at the Boston law office of Robert Harrington (’64) at the end of that semester. I knew Bob had won Albers when he was a 2L in 1963. His name was etched in bronze, along with all the past champions, in one of the school’s halls.

Also, by pure coincidence, the Albers finals were scheduled during a week my mother planned to come visit me from our home state of Michigan. I had no idea if I would be among the last two teams standing when she made her travel plans. But as luck would have it, she would be sitting in the front row of the law school’s auditorium as we made our final arguments.

And finally, I didn’t want to let down my moot court partner, Nicole (Cooper) Rooney (’98), who was and is still one of my closest friends. On the first day that we met up to begin researching and writing our brief, she looked at me with the most serious expression I’d ever seen on her face and said simply: “I want to win.” I knew I had to crush this.

The day of the finals arrived. I remember my navy suit, the best one I owned at the time, and Nicole’s gray one. I remember the audience being packed with friends, classmates, professors, and my mother and brother. I remember not being able to feel my feet as I heard the words “All rise!” and watched as Selya, Calabresi, and Souter entered.

Nicole went first and was brilliant. Then it was my turn. I don’t remember much about the merits of the most court case, but I do remember that there was a weak point in my argument I needed to make. In a previous round, I tried to stand my ground on it. One judge in that round, Professor Tracey Maclin, absolutely eviscerated me from the bench. Somehow, Nicole and I still advanced to the next round, but afterward Maclin gave me some advice: when one of your arguments is bad, it’s OK just to acknowledge it and move on. During my argument in the finals, Souter homed in on the same weak link in my case. I remembered Maclin’s advice and conceded the point and moved on to my stronger ones. I made it through and remember the relief I felt when I sat down.

After deliberating, the judges announced—to my shock and glee—that Nicole and I had won. I had successfully argued a case before a Supreme Court justice and came out a winner. But the best moment was to come.

Souter announced that I had been chosen by the judges as the best oral advocate. He specifically said they were impressed by my ability to concede a weakness in my argument and focus on its strengths instead. After nearly two years of feeling like I was lost in a place where I didn’t fit in and couldn’t stand out, I had a moment to shine. And for the first time, I stopped worrying that going to law school might have been a mistake. I was too overwhelmed in that moment to take in the expression on my mom’s face, but I’m glad a photographer captured it.

The silver award bowl I received as best oral advocate still sits on my shelf at home. The decades have brought some tarnish to the silver, but the memory still gleams.
BU Law has minted thousands of lawyers in its 150 years. Ask any one of them what they remember most about law school and you might hear about a favorite professor, an achingly difficult class, or how it felt to represent a client for the first time in a clinic.

And you might find out that their ties to the school carry beyond what’s listed on their résumés and into their personal lives. Over the decades, many students have found lifelong partners at BU Law. Others have formed lasting friendships with students or professors. Countless alumni send their children and grandchildren to BU Law, creating multiple generations of these family ties.

“Through history, BU Law has done an exceptional job of preparing people to have success in their careers,” says Zachary Dubin, assistant dean for development & alumni relations. “The older generation has confidence in knowing their kids are going to get the same training and grounding and be set up for success.”

Those alumni also continue to stay involved in the BU Law community, supporting the school in a variety of ways—through networking and programming that fosters community and through contributions to the school’s scholarships for veterans, first-generation students, and others.

“We define family broadly here,” Dubin says. The relationships students create at BU Law not only help support their careers but often become partnerships they can lean on throughout their lives.

The Record spoke with three of these families to learn more about how BU Law played an integral role in their personal lives. Here are their stories.

**BY LAURA ERNDE**

BY LAURA ERNDE

**ROHAN AND CATALINA BOND OVER COFFEE**

Years before they married in 2020, Rohan Kazi (’17) and Catalina Kazi (’18) would hang out in the International Law Journal offices at BU Law, a popular meeting spot in part because of the free Keurig coffee that fueled the study process.

“I remember that Rohan would always put this blueberry coffee in and it smelled so bad,” Catalina says.

Rohan joins her in a laugh, explaining that the better coffee flavors would disappear quickly, leaving him few options for a caffeine boost. “Yeah, yeah, it’s gross,” he concedes. “I don’t recommend it, but I drank a lot of it.”

The two would often study together in the evenings. And since they lived near each other in Allston, they ended up walking home together along Commonwealth Avenue. One of their favorite stops along the way was Hopewell Bar & Kitchen.

Rohan’s friendship helped Catalina get through the last two years of law school, as she struggled with the loss of her mom, who was diagnosed with terminal cancer and later passed away in Bogotá, Colombia.

“Rohan, from the very beginning, was always so supportive, and really there for me—first as a friend, and then as my partner,” she says. “The fact that he was able to support me through literally the worst thing I’ve ever experienced meant a lot to me.”

After Rohan graduated and took a job as a corporate lawyer in New York, they continued to see each other on weekends. When Catalina graduated, they both found jobs in Boston and moved in together in the South End.

But when the COVID-19 pandemic hit the following year, they realized how isolated and far away from family they felt. They married in late 2020 and began scoping out jobs in the San Francisco Bay Area, where Rohan was born and raised. Both found in-house opportunities. Catalina is compliance counsel at investment company Edward Jones and Rohan is legal counsel at fintech company BlueVine.

“Boston is always going to be so special, because I left Colombia when I was 17 and then moved around a lot,” Catalina says. “After living in Boston for almost a decade, I will always think about that place and all the memories very fondly.”
The Rozier-Byrds

Band of Brothers

TIMOTHY ROZIER-BYRD (23) started at BU Law in the fall of 2020, when the pandemic ushered in remote learning and postponed many in-person events. But he was able to navigate those challenges partly thanks to his brothers, TERENCE ROZIER-BYRD ’06 and TREVOR ROZIER-BYRD ’10. “I’m thankful for having that unique foundation. It’s really special,” says Timothy, who is pursuing a career in health law. “Having my brothers there as support has been really helpful.”

All three brothers grew up in Lakeland, New Jersey, and got introduced to the legal profession through their grandmother, Elizabeth Rozier. She served as the town prosecutor and had a small general practice handling real estate, family law—before going in-house at State Street. He held senior sales strategy, business development, and corporate development roles. In 2021, he left to found Stackwell, a fintech startup aiming to address the racial wealth gap by empowering Black investors.

Both Trevor and Terence remain engaged with BU Law, continuing to give back as active members of the alumni network all over the country. I really want to take advantage of the connections they have made in-person at an early campus mixer. In another twist of fate, Chris met Paul’s friend ALEXANDRA GUTIERREZ ’13 on his first day of classes. “We just happened to hit it off and become very good friends, not even knowing that she was Paul’s roommate,” Chris says. Chris and Paul hung out in the same social circles and often studied together, pushing each other to get the most out of their time in law school. Paul wanted to become a litigator, while Chris specialized in tax law; so they could support each other when the coursework got tough without allowing their competitiveness to get in the way of their growing bond.

The library was always crowded, with students fighting for space to study. But there always seemed to be open seats at the tables near the entrance to the student lounge. “We just kind of laid claim to that. And that’s where we would always go,” Chris says. “It’s a great network to be a part of.”

The following year, Paul’s goal of working in litigation took him to Chicago, where he clerked for the US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Chris joined an accounting firm in Boston with the goal of eventually joining Paul in Chicago. “Both of us were excited to spend time in Boston, it’s such a cool city, but we each have more connection to Chicago, so that’s how we ended up back there,” Paul says. Both now work for large law firms, Chris at Kirkland & Ellis and Paul at Greenberg Traurig. They married in 2018 and invited many of their BU Law friends to their wedding party the following year. “It’s amazing how BU Law alumni are just everywhere,” Chris says. “It’s a great network to be a part of.”

Supreme Court of North Dakota for a year, while Chris continued his studies at BU Law and earned his LLM in Taxation. The following year, Paul’s goal of working in litigation took him to Chicago, where he clerked for the US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Chris joined an accounting firm in Boston with the goal of eventually joining Paul in Chicago. “Both of us were excited to spend time in Boston, it’s such a cool city, but we each have more connection to Chicago, so that’s how we ended up back there,” Paul says. Both now work for large law firms, Chris at Kirkland & Ellis and Paul at Greenberg Traurig. They married in 2018 and invited many of their BU Law friends to their wedding party the following year. “It’s amazing how BU Law alumni are just everywhere,” Chris says. “It’s a great network to be a part of.”
From Commencement 2022 to the 150th Anniversary Gala on October 1, BU Law held celebrations and symposia that brought the community together. We hope to connect soon at one of our lectures, dinners, or networking events held at the law school and beyond.

Maureen Leo (fourth from the left), director of the American Law Program, organized a reception with alumni and admitted students in Paris, France.

Dean Onwuachi-Willig welcomed students admitted to the new Antiracist Scholars for Progress, Innovation & Racial Equity program.

The Women of Color Collaborative (WOCC) closed out the 2021–22 academic year with a celebratory dinner.

In April, BU Law invited judges and former clerks to campus to celebrate graduating 3Ls who secured judicial clerkships.

Graduates of the Class of 2022 celebrated their Commencement at the Track & Tennis Center in May.

Maureen Leo (fourth from the left), director of the American Law Program, organized a reception with alumni and admitted students in Paris, France.

PHOTOS COURTESY OF MAUREEN LEO (1), WEI-HAN CHEN (2, 3), CYDNEY SCOTT (4), JOHN GILLOOLY (5, 6).

The BU Law community commemorated the school’s 150th anniversary at a gala on October 1, where W. Kamau Bell began his keynote with hugs for audience members.

Find upcoming BU Law events at bu.edu/law/calendar.
If you would like to submit an update for The Record, please visit BLEDU/LAW/CASE-NOTES.

1982

HON. VICTORIA W. CHAVEY was named to the Connecticut Superior Court by Governor John G. Rowland. She served in that capacity for over 17 years before retiring in 2010.

KEITH GOTTFRIED launched Gottfried Shareholder Advisory LLC, a boutique firm focusing on advising public companies and their boards of directors with regards to shareholder activism strategies.

STUART KATZ has practiced in Connecticut and various locations for 52 years, with a focus on personal injury and civil rights cases.

Peter Rosenthal recently started his own law firm in New York City and is handling cases related to drug and alcohol use.

2023

ROBERT L. COOK was elected a member of the Massachusetts Legislative Council.

MATT CHAUCER was named a partner in the New York office of Greenberg Traurig.

PETER KALS was named senior vice president and general counsel of the Cybersecurity Industry Council.

ANGELA GOMES has been named a partner in the Washington, D.C., office of Willkie Farr & Gallagher.

2002

HON. ROBERT R. BRENNAN was named an associate justice on the Massachusetts Appeals Court.

MELANIE JACOBS will serve as the 25th dean of the University of Louisville Brandeis School of Law.

2016

DAVID BRODSKY was honored with Boston magazine’s Five Star Wealth Management Award.

KEVIN HAYDEN was named interim Suffolk County district attorney by Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker.

C. MAX PERLMAN has joined Gundersen Litchfield & Cavallaro in its Boston office.

ADRIENNE BANKS PITTS was named an independent director for the board of Speciality Chemicals company, Atrea Chemicals.

KRISTEN J. FALLON was named general counsel of Surface Oncology.

2004

CHRISTIAN PUGACEWSKI, a structured finance attorney with nearly two decades of experience in structuring innovative financial products and documenting derivative transactions, has joined Horvath & Partners as a partner in the New York office.

MICRO STARFAM was named to the Executive Committee of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

RUSSEL STEIN (JDL in Taxation’03) was elevated to partner at Partidge Snow & Halpin.

2005

ABI BEREH is an associate at Latham & Watkins.

PADMA CHOUDRY was named a fellow of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel.

EDWARD D. MCCARTHY was named a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

2008

MARK J. ESPOSITO has been named a shareholder in the Springfield, Massachusetts-based law firm of Shatz, Schwartz and Freiman.

MARISSA RACUNWAY joined Ay Strauss as a partner and chair of the firm’s franchise group.

JEFF ROBIN was named a partner in Holland & Knight’s real estate section.

2009

JENNIFER LAURIE was named chief investment officer at TIAA.

TAYLOR CHANCE was named a partner in the Washington, D.C., office of WilmerHale.

ANDREW H. BROWN was named a partner in the New York office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton.

2010

MARK ASPIN and his wife had their third child, Bella Claire Aspis.

Gibbons PC as counsel in the firm’s environmental group.

2011

ZACH COCHRAN returned to King & Spalding as a partner.

MARK J. ESPOSITO has been named a shareholder in the Springfield, Massachusetts-based law firm of Shatz, Schwartz and Freiman.

MARISSA RACUNWAY joined Ay Strauss as a partner and chair of the firm’s franchise group.

JEFF ROBIN was named a partner in Holland & Knight’s real estate section.

2012

MAGGIE BALTIMORE was named a partner in the New York office of WilmerHale.

MARK J. ESPOSITO has been named a shareholder in the Springfield, Massachusetts-based law firm of Shatz, Schwartz and Freiman.

MARISSA RACUNWAY joined Ay Strauss as a partner and chair of the firm’s franchise group.

JEFF ROBIN was named a partner in Holland & Knight’s real estate section.

2013

JULIET KENNEDY was named a partner in the New York office of Greenberg Traurig.

TIMOTHY FREEMAN was named a partner in the New York office of Latham & Watkins.

ZACH ROSENBLOOM was named a partner in the New York office of Skadden.

2014

DAVID BLUM was named a partner in the New York office of WilmerHale.

KERRY KENNY was named a partner in the New York office of Dechert.

CHRISTINE WRIGHT was named a partner in the New York office of DLA Piper.

2015

DAVID BLUM was named a partner in the New York office of WilmerHale.

KERRY KENNY was named a partner in the New York office of Dechert.

CHRISTINE WRIGHT was named a partner in the New York office of DLA Piper.

2016

JACQUELINE SCHWARTZ was named a partner in the New York office of Winston & Strawn.

CALVIN LEE was named a partner in the New York office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton.

AMANDA KELLEY was named a partner in the New York office of Latham & Watkins.

2017

JENNY VENTORIO was elected partner at Willkie Farr & Gallagher.

MARGARET BROWN was named a partner in the New York office of Iain Partners.

JESSICA ROSS was named a partner in the New York office of Sidley Austin.

2018

MARGARET BROWN was named a partner in the New York office of Iain Partners.

JESSICA ROSS was named a partner in the New York office of Sidley Austin.

2019

MARGARET BROWN was named a partner in the New York office of Iain Partners.

JESSICA ROSS was named a partner in the New York office of Sidley Austin.

2020

MARGARET BROWN was named a partner in the New York office of Iain Partners.

JESSICA ROSS was named a partner in the New York office of Sidley Austin.
MICHAEL GREENWALD was appointed global lead for digital assets at Amazon. He will be working remotely from Palm Beach, Florida, where he lives with his wife Nolan, while also traveling globally and spending time between Amazon headquarters in Seattle, Washington, and Arlington, Virginia.

2012
CAROLINE DOTOTO was elected partner at Willers Ha.
CAROLYNN LEAR has been reappointed to the position of assistant commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration.
VALERIE MOORE was named partner in Nutter’s real estate department.

2013
BRIAN BALDUZZI (LLM in Taxation ’14) was awarded the 2022 Rainbow Revolu-

tionalized Distinguished Alumni Award from SUNY Geneseo.
KIERSTEN ZAZA BOTHELHO joined Hercules Capital Inc. as a general counsel and chief compliance officer.

GREG CORBIN recently led a merger for a large financial services firm in Denver, Colorado. The combined firm, Werge & Corbin LLC, will operate under the name of Werge Law Group.

CRISTINA I. RAMIREZ joined the Travis County Public Defender’s Office. She is proud to return to her hometown and serve her fellow Austinites.

CORY J. ROTHBORT was trial counsel (second chair) for an excessive force lawsuit that recently settled for $410 million. It is believed to be the largest settlement of any police brutality case in New Jersey history and one of the largest ever nationwide.

RYAN VEOY took advantage of BU Law’s postgraduate fellowship program at the ACLU of Pennsylvania in his hometown of Pittsburgh. That year, he worked to legalize same-sex marriage in Pennsylvania and strike down a voter ID law. After the fellowship, he started a law firm out of his attic, which has grown to a downtown firm of seven people.

2014
DEBORAH BETH MEDOWS published an article with the Harvard Journal on Legislation, titled “A Beginner’s Guide to Legislative Drafting,” using lessons learned in drafting legislation as an attorney for the New York State Legislature. The UN cited her article to describe how to draft legislation in the guide Promoting Women’s Political Participation: From Quotas to Parity. A Guide to Legal Options for the West and Central Africa Region, a project by UN Women in partnership with Canada.

2015
ROXANNA MEHDI welcomed her first child, Caspian Hook, and in February 2022 joined the Ohio Attorney General’s Office.

2016
KRISTEN CHASSÉ recently joined Pierce Atwood LLP as an associate for the firm’s trusts and estates group.

2017
GERARD FISCHETTI joined Ginkgo Bioworks as corporate counsel in March 2022, focusing on SEC and corporate governance matters.

2020
KATI-JANE CHILDS moved to Baltimore in February 2022 to begin work as an assistant public defender with the Maryland Office of the Public Defender.
ELIZABETH DREIBACH joined Landman Corsi Ballaine & Ford.

2021
MICHAEL FARRE (LLM in Banking & Financial Law ’20) joined Hill Ward Henderson as an associate in the firm’s corporate group.

2022
VISIT bu.edu/law/pate to read more about Patel’s work with former Russian official Grigory Rodchenkov.

ADAM VENESS has joined Cyteir as a new position as an attorney with Pierce Atwood LLP in the Providence office.

LYDIA EDWARDS was elected to the Massachusetts State Senate to represent the first Suffolk and Middlesex District.

HARSH ARORA was recognized with the 2022 Diversity Leader Award by Profiles in Diversity Journal. The award recognizes those who work every day to expand and improve diversity, inclusion, and equity in the workplace and beyond.

2023
ANN MARIE MACCARONE started a new position as an attorney with Pierce Atwood LLP in the Providence office.

IN MEMORIAM
Thomas H. Abraham (’57)
Samuel S. Antor (’52)
George W. Anthes (’71)
Philip W. Bouchard (’57)
Margaret W. Bill (’74)
Charles H. Brown (’74)
Charles Burlingham (’59)
Robert T. Butler (’56)
Robin R. Rausch Butler (’83)
Lawrence A. Chaletsky (’64)
Anne W. Chisholm (’86)
Donald C. Cross (’72)
Michael M. Davis (’70)
Michael P. Defanti (’69)
Margaret-Joyce Diamond (’53)
Gerald A. Field (’72)
Elliot Field (’73)
Gregory C. Flynn (’79)
Betty R. Franklin (’77)
Marion R. Fremont-Smith (’51)
David A. Hession (’75)
John F. Herlihy (’63)
Dale G. Stoeffel (’62)
Mary M. Sullivan (’72)
Ann H. Varney (’69)
Keith A. Taggart (’96)
Robert G. Stetson (’60)
Edward J. Marcaccio (’57)
Paul R. Marte (’53)
Carolyn T. Marks (’70)
Lois M. Lewis (’69)
Lois A. Merlino (’79)
Paul A. St. Amour (’52)
Norman R. Stanley (’58)
Joanne M. Whittemore (’78)
Marc D. Goldberg (’69)
Samuel B. Goldberg (’85)
Forrest L. Griffith (’72)
G. D. Grisét (’67)
Gerald F. Haggan (’98)
Peter G. Hastings (’60)
John F. Herlihy (’63)
David A. Hession (’53)
Stephen M. Hillman (’67)
Christine F. Kenmore (’84)
Donald N. Kline (’59)
Samuel M. Lapin (’54)
Joanne R. Landy (’51)
John F. Herlihy (’59)
Milan M. Leporic (’71)
Robert S. Lawley (’56)
Joseph T. Little (’52)
Edward J. Marcaccio (’57)
Paul R. Marte (’53)
Darla P. Newman (’76)
Thomas Poppenhouse (’90)
Roger A. Putnam (’51)
Allan Rodman (’76)
Josef G. Saloman (’67)
Rachel A. Shanfieldt (’85)
Warren C. Shay (’74)
Stuart M. Shotwell (’73)
David J. Shuman (’77)
Marvin H. Siegel (’54)
Paul A. S. Smith (’52)
Norman H. Stanley (’58)
Gilbert Stein (’52)
Robert G. Stetson (’60)
Dale G. Stoeffel (’62)
Mary M. Sullivan (’72)
Lois A. Merlino (’69)
Phillip I. Weinberg (’80)
Sandra L. Voorhees (’73)
Ann H. Varney (’69)
Stuart J. Young (’80)

This list reflects community members who passed between December 1, 2021, and May 31, 2022.

Learn the many ways to stay connected with BU Law and its alumni at bu.edu/law/keep-connected.

Email lawalum@bu.edu to receive The Record Monthly, our newsletter for alumni.

To submit a class note, please visit bu.edu/law/class-notes.
WE’VE COME A LONG WAY IN 150 YEARS...

...AND WE DON’T JUST MEAN ACROSS BOSTON. From the professors and alumni who are responsible for originating or pushing legal thought forward to the many alumni who have worked on significant cases, shaped policy, and led major companies, BU Law and its community have been foundational in shaping the legal field and the country. Learn more about BU Law’s legacy of innovation in 150/150: People, Places, and Precedents, the recently published commemorative book celebrating the school’s 150th anniversary.

PUZZLE IT OUT

TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF BU LAW TRIVIA.

ACROSS
1. Professor and scholar who influenced Ruth Bader Ginsburg
5. BU Law’s ‘singing professor’
9. US Supreme Court case that Wilford Smith won
10. US Supreme Court chief justice who spoke at the law tower dedication in 1964

DOWN
2. Alum, founding dean of Stanford Law
3. Cost of tuition for the third year of study when BU Law opened
4. Name of BU Law’s football team in the 1960s
6. First LLM program of its kind in the country, established in 1959
7. Former US president who taught at BU Law
8. First woman to earn tenure at BU Law

FEELING STUCK? FIND THE ANSWER KEY ON PAGE 38.

RECEIVE YOUR COPY by making a $150 gift to the School of Law 150th Anniversary Fund. Visit BU.EDU/LAWGIVING or contact the Esdaile Alumni Center at 617-353-3118 or LAWALUM@BU.EDU.

PUZZLE IT OUT: ANSWERS

ACROSS
1. Professor and scholar who influenced Ruth Bader Ginsburg
5. BU Law’s ‘singing professor’
9. US Supreme Court case that Wilford Smith won
10. US Supreme Court chief justice who spoke at the law tower dedication in 1964

DOWN
2. Alum, founding dean of Stanford Law
3. Cost of tuition for the third year of study when BU Law opened
4. Name of BU Law’s football team in the 1960s
6. First LLM program of its kind in the country, established in 1959
7. Former US president who taught at BU Law
8. First woman to earn tenure at BU Law
"I CONSIDER BU LAW TO HAVE BEEN . . . PRESCIENT ABOUT WHAT THE FUTURE OF THE LAW WOULD HOLD. THAT HISTORY WILL HELP THE LAW SCHOOL AS IT APPROACHES ITS FUTURE."

—Judge Sandra L. Lynch (LAW’71, Hon.’12), United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

Read more in What’s Next?