



Davidson, Swanson Take Lile Finals

Taylor EliceGUI '20
Staff Editor

On February 27, Jennifer Davidson '18, Jay Swanson '18, Allie Herzog '18, and Tess Sewell '18 squared off in Caplin Pavilion for the 89th Lile Moot Court Finals. U.S. Court of Appeals Judges Paul Niemeyer (4th Cir.), Gregg Costa (5th Cir.), and Thomas Griffith '85 (D.C. Cir.) judged the arguments. Arguing for the appellant, Davidson and Swanson won the competition. Herzog won Best Oralist.

The problem centered around Susan Schroeder, fired from her job at Natural Foods, Inc. after Schroeder failed to maintain proper safety controls at the plant she oversaw. As a result, several consumers reported that their children became sick after eating almond butter manufactured at the plant. After Natural Foods conducted an investigation, Schroeder's boss, Eric Michaelson, placed her on probation for the rest of the year. Approximately one month later, Schroeder attended the company Christmas party with her wife, Jane Roberts. Immediately following the Christmas party, Michaelson, who serves as president for a group that advocated against Lile's same-sex marriage referendum in 2008, fired Schroeder.

Schroeder filed suit under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, alleging that Natural Foods terminated her because of her sexual orientation. Schroeder identified two comparators—straight employees who were not fired after similar quality control issues. The district court ruled that Title VII does protect sexual orientation, but Schroeder did not identify suitable comparators to establish a prima facie claim and granted Natural Food's motion to dismiss. Schroeder appealed to the Fourteenth Circuit. The appeal raised two questions: 1) Is sexual orientation a protected class under Title VII? 2) Did Schroeder identify suitable comparators to establish a prima facie Title VII claim?

After giving their introductions, the competitors fielded questions from the bench. Swanson and Herzog argued the first issue, while Davidson and Sewell focused on the second. Swanson argued that Title VII protects sexual orientation, because sexual orientation discrimination involves discriminating based on sex stereotypes—the idea that men marry women, and women marry men. Under that theory, Michaelson fired Schroeder for failing to conform with his conception of acceptable behavior for women. The judges focused on congressional intent behind Title VII, asking Swanson why Congress hadn't included sexual orientation in the statute and pointed out many instances where Congress failed to amend Title VII to include sexual orientation. Swanson explained that statutes sometimes have unintended con-

Justice Breyer Speaks



Justice Breyer takes the stage in Caplin Auditorium.

Michael McGuire / Virginia Law Weekly

Virginia Law Weekly Staff

Stephen G. Breyer, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, paid a visit to the University of Virginia School of Law on Thursday, March 1. The visit marked the first audience granted by a justice of the Supreme Court during the academic tenure of any current UVa Law student. In two wide-ranging talks to students, Justice Breyer promoted his new book on the growing need to incorporate international law into American court decisions, "The Court and the World," and expounded on various other areas of interest.

Justice Breyer began his visit with a talk to a small group of student leaders explaining the mechanics of the Supreme Court, and the importance of non-Supreme Court case law. "Ninety-five percent of cases happen in state court," he said. "They are very important!"

Dean Risa Goluboff, who clerked for Justice Breyer during the 2001–2002 term, accompanied the justice throughout his visit and introduced him to the crowd gathered in Caplin Auditorium. "We are absolutely thrilled to be able to welcome Justice Breyer," she said. "Justice Breyer has led an extraordinary career spanning more than a half century in government—all three branches—and the academy." She went on to say that, in her opinion, Breyer's greatest qualities are his "brilliance, joy, and curiosity."

After Dean Goluboff's introduction, Justice Breyer began talking about his judicial philosophy, the history of the Supreme Court, and the nature of international law. Affectionately peppering in examples of what he assigns his clerks to do, Justice Breyer revealed a lighter side to the drab, black robes, laughing and reminiscing with "Risa" about difficult or funny cases and the unexpected tasks to which she was assigned as

his law clerk. Describing the opinion-drafting process, Breyer described how he writes a draft, sends it to his law clerks for comments, and goes back and forth from there. "Once it took eight rounds of back-and-forth of different versions of an opinion and each time Justice Breyer would throw it out and write a completely new one," Dean Goluboff laughed.

"What you see is what you get," Breyer shrugged. "We write down our reasoning, unlike a member of the legislature, who votes on statutes and never gives us the reason behind it." Famed as a judicial pragmatist, Breyer nonetheless expressed some trepidation at reading too far beyond a statute's clear meaning. "I'm not going to take a statute that says 'vegetable' and say a fish is a vegetable. A fish is not a vegetable," Justice Breyer chuckled.

After Justice Breyer explained that the justices gather in a secluded room to discuss and debate the cases after oral arguments, one student asked how the very different legal philosophers maintain order and friendship to boot. "You need to feel strongly, but not too much. The justice who you vehemently disagreed with on one case may be your greatest ally on another." Breyer noted that "only 20 percent of our cases end in 5–4" highlighting the fact that even justices with deep ideological differences can agree on most of the cases they hear. The key? "Stay calm and try not to take it personally." Another favorite tradition of the discussions is that "nobody speaks twice until everyone speaks once."

Despite the sacred decorum, justices do have strong feelings about some of the cases they hear and the decisions that come down, such as the one heard by the Court only a few weeks prior to the talk. One student leader in the smaller gathering asked Justice Breyer why he read his dissent in the recent case *Jennings*

v. Rodriguez from the bench. The justice replied, "Because it is important and I wanted everyone to pay attention. These are people in the United States who haven't committed a crime and are not afforded so much as a bail hearing." In a rare move at the Supreme Court, Breyer read from his thirty-three-page dissent from the bench, calling the Court's 5–3 decision "legal fiction." He went on to say, "No one can claim, nor since the time of slavery has anyone to my knowledge successfully claimed, that persons held within the United States are totally without constitutional protection."¹

A *Virginia Law Weekly* reporter asked how justices and their clerks go about breaking down and understanding complex scientific cases to render decisions. Justice Breyer joked that some of the most strident backlash he has received from his decisions is from patent lawyers, especially on their vitriolic patent-lawyer blogs. The fact of the matter, Justice Breyer explained, is that the members of the Court rely on amicus briefs and the lawyers themselves to clearly explain the issues. "A good lawyer can explain anything: Just break it down into its requisite parts."

Growing more serious, Justice Breyer alluded to Camus' *The Plague* as he wrapped up, instructing the students of the Law School that it was their duty to prevent the spread of evil and hate innate in humans. "The plague germ never dies," he cautioned, telling audience members that the rule of law is "one of—not the only, but one of—the weapons against the plague." On that happy note, Breyer concluded his talk and took questions from the student body.

editor@lawweekly.org

¹ *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, 583 U.S. __, No. 15-1204, slip op. at 7 (2018) (Breyer, J., dissenting)

around north grounds



Thumbs up to Virginia Law Review for another flawless journal tryout! ANG feels such a sense of reverence and respect for . . . wait . . . what happened? The italics and small caps . . . seriously? At press time, one VLR member refused comment.



Thumbs sideways to Xi Jinping banning the letter N. On the one hand, a little sad. On the other, ANG always knew even craziest hopes, goals, and dreams were attainable (as long as ANG seized control of the world's second largest economy). Ai't othig stop-pig AG ow.



Thumbs down to Monday's non-snow day. ANG was under the impression you had LITERALLY ONE JOB STEPHEN T. PARR!



Thumbs sideways to Pi Day. On the one hand, PIE. On the other, ANG doesn't wish for further repeats of last year's pie-ing.



Thumbs down to the red filter light on the water bottle filler in WB. ANG's happy to drink anything in a cup at Boylan's, but how dare you try to feed ANG tap water. The audacity.



Thumbs up to Spring Break. Although there is a chunk of time that ANG does not remember, ANG's pretty sure ANG didn't visit every major news channel and give interviews on President Fuqua's new administration while on "antidepressants"... well, pretty sure.



Congratulations to the 1L in My Lab who announced that she's recently been elevated to the Supreme Court! With that kind of ridiculous hubris, ANG has no doubt she'll be on NGSJ in no time!



Thumbs down to treacherous cowboy wrecker "Rex" Tillerson and fervid mustachio John Bolton. Your forlorn essays at the undermining of Young Marshal Kim Jong-Un's august peace-overtures have not escaped notice. Like all revanchists, you will be crushed under the boots of triumphant Juche!

Guest Opinion: Tainted Love

In 1983, in response to the AIDS crisis, the FDA implemented a lifetime ban on

Kyle O'Malley '19



blood donations from homosexual men who had had sex since 1977.¹ Despite a 2015 revision to that policy, now generally allowing men who have sex with men (MSM) to donate after a year of celibacy,² it remains for all practical purposes a lifetime ban on blood donations for many gay and bisexual men—including and especially ironically those who pose zero risk, such as HIV-negative monogamous couples. Heterosexual men, by contrast, are permitted to donate whenever they please, no matter how widespread, anonymous, or risky their sexual activity.³ This is not because heterosexual men (or their partners) cannot contract HIV. It is because they are not homosexuals.

1 <https://www.fda.gov/biologicsbloodvaccines/blood-bloodproducts/questionsaboutblood/ucm108186.htm>

2 <https://www.redcrossblood.org/donating-blood/lgbtq-donors>

3 <https://www.fda.gov/biologicsbloodvaccines/blood-bloodproducts/questionsaboutblood/ucm108186.htm>

This discriminatory prohibition, even in altered form, exists despite calls from activist and medical groups for the FDA to develop systems for screening donors that do not equate gay sex, risky sex, and HIV. It exists despite the fact that the Red Cross and other blood banks test every unit of blood that they receive.⁴

Nor is it the case, as some argue, that the change to the FDA's policy (from a lifetime ban for homosexual men to a 12-month ban for men who have sex with men) is a well-reasoned, science-based approach designed to exclude donations only from those engage in risky behavior and is therefore not "discriminatory" in the relevant sense. The logic is that since the ban applies only to men who have had sex with men within the last twelve months – instead of to "homosexual men" over their entire lifetimes – it doesn't target gay and bisexual men. That is, only the of behavior (homosexual sex) among those possessing a particular nonspurious trait (the male gender) is targeted—their immutable characteristics are simply irrelevant. The FDA isn't discriminating against you because you are gay; the FDA is discriminating against you because you have had gay sex.

This argument is Panglossian⁵:

4 <https://www.#.org/donating-blood/lgbtq-donors>

it fails to fully appreciate that men who have sex with men are predominantly (if not almost exclusively) homosexual or bisexual. To target their behavior is to target their identities. It is to discriminate on the basis of the fundamental expressions that manifest the immutable characteristics that are homosexuality and bisexuality. It is an argument that works, perversely, to cleave our identities from our expressions of them in a way that is dangerous to our liberty—both sexual and civil. Gay and bisexual men, in order to donate, must render themselves sexless; they must effectively become either celibates or heterosexuals to participate in this life-saving act of giving. Gay sex is no longer constituent of homosexuality and the heterosexual majority feels, as a result – dare I say it? – less squeamish.

Thus, a homosexual man whose intimacy is protected under *Lawrence*⁶ and whose marriage is protected under

5 "Panglossian, adj. and n." OED Online. January 2018. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/136838?redirectedFrom=panglossian> (accessed March 01, 2018) ("of, relating to, or characteristic of a Pangloss; unwaveringly or unrealistically optimistic").

6 539 U.S. 558

*Obergefell*⁷ is told by the FDA that, because he has been intimate with his lawful husband in the last year, he is no longer able to donate blood to save that husband. Nor of course to save his own children, his friends, his neighbors. His blood, by virtue of his exercise of his constitutional rights, is presumptively tainted—before any answer to the question of his HIV status is ever sought. By seeking and forming powerful public and private bonds in his community – through matrimony, marital intimacy, co-parenthood, etc. – he is unable to form others.

This is the promise of assimilation and participation in civic life undermined by the alienation of stigmatization. And to be a gay man, or a queer or gender-nonconforming person of any kind, is to face these kinds of contradictions and ironies on a daily basis.

It is pedestrian, though correct, for me to say that in America I can be engaged on Sunday and fired on Monday because I was engaged on Sunday. It is perhaps less pedestrian, but by no means less correct, for me to say that if I wake up on Tuesday and choose to go on with my wedding, I must be prepared for the possibility that by Wednesday the Supreme Court will say that, not only may a business owner consti-

7 135 S.Ct. 2584

tutionally deny me services otherwise offered to the public simply because I am gay, but that the state may not intervene to protect me even if it wants to.⁸ By Thursday, I may realize that I live in a society where a great many people beyond my pastry chef – maybe my doctor, or my lawyer, or my insurer? – refuse me service. By the end of the week, I may find that I have my marriage and little else.

If that's what Kennedy means by "dignity," he needs a new dictionary.

I look forward to a time when these kinds of uncertainties do not continue to undermine my confidence in the equal status of my citizenship. In the meantime, I try to cope with those uncertainties, as do millions of other LGBTQ Americans.

And so it was with disappointment and surprise that several gay students, myself included, encountered the presence of blood donation services during this institution's recent "Diversity Week." A blood bank, at the behest of the SBA, had set up shop in an alcove in Withers Brown. Balloons and tables scattered with applications spilled out into the hall. Peo-

8 *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*, citation pending.

TAINTED page 5

Grit & Focus: Women at the Top

Serena Williams is one of the most successful tennis players in history. With thirty-nine Grand

Katherine Mann '19
Features Editor



Slam titles, she is ranked third on the all-time list—of all players, not just women. If you ask most people what makes Serena special, the first answer you might hear is "talent."

But according to Dr. Milana Hogan, Chief Legal Talent Officer at Sullivan & Cromwell, Serena might point out the thousands of hours of pure hard work she has put in during her career. "If we only tell one side of the story, then we don't really appreciate the efforts of hard work." Hogan spoke last week at Women at the Top, an event sponsored by Virginia Law Women. The focus of her talk was the concept of "grit", which she defined as the behavioral persistence in the face of adversity. There is no doubt about Serena's talent, but her passionate pursuit of her goals, even when facing difficulty, sets her apart from her peers.

Hogan recently published a book called "Grit, The Secret to Advancement," which details the work of the Grit Project, an ABA initiative to find out what makes women lawyers successful. The idea is to uncover and teach relevant traits to women starting out in the field in order to increase their advancement, and her focus has been on the impact of grit and growth mindset on the success of women lawyers.

The concept of grit is closely related to having a growth mind-

set. Hogan set out a spectrum to illustrate this concept. A person might have a "fixed" mindset, in

lawyers fall about in the middle of this spectrum.

Research into intelligence



From right to left: Dr. Milana Hogan, Chief Legal Talent Officer at Sullivan & Cromwell, with Julianne Toia, Alumni Relations Co-Chair for Virginia Law Women. Katherine Mann / Virginia Law Weekly

which they believe that their inherent ability, level of talent, or intelligence is fixed, and that it can't be improved through any kind of practice. People with a growth mindset, however, don't believe in any ceilings for themselves. "They believe in the power of effort," she explained. Her research showed that women

measures, such as SAT or LSAT scores, has shown that intelligence is far less fixed than we used to believe. Furthermore, "we're finding that these tests are not very good predictors of success," she said. While they can illustrate your intelligence at any one time, your mind is like a muscle. "If I decided to improve

my IQ, I could," she said.

Hogan views mindset as a huge opportunity for improvement for advancement for women in law. For example, she noted that women react very differently to performance reviews than men do, while acknowledging that this is a generalization and that individuals are different. One of her colleagues told the story of having an overall positive review from her evaluators, but on hearing that her writing was "pretty good," she started catastrophizing—mentally spinning out scenarios where a single remark led to a career disaster. "If you don't digest feedback in a healthy way, you're in trouble," Hogan said. People who are more growth-minded can resist the urge to take feedback personally and, instead, turn it into an opportunity for learning and success.

Grit, and its focus on overcoming adversity, goes hand-in-hand with having a growth mindset. Hogan studied women in all areas of law—nonprofit, government, in-house counsel, solo practitioners, judges, and law firms—and found a statistically significant relationship between grit and various measures of success in all these domains. It is closely related to overall quality of work. She also found that while many highly successful women lawyers display a growth mindset when facing challenges, there is room for improvement. Judges have a slight edge when it comes to grit, and nonprofit lawyers have a slightly higher growth mindset than those at law firms. She also found that growth mindset is also a good

predictor of seniority within an organization.

She ended her discussion by talking about strategies for women lawyers entering the workforce. "Get comfortable with failure," Hogan advised, even if that means hearing supposedly negative feedback in a new way. Reframing the phrase "pretty good" as an opportunity for learning allows you to improve your work product. She also encouraged women to inspire criticism—in other words, to have a positive reaction to criticism in order to ensure that you continue to receive feedback. It's important that your superiors know you want feedback so that they will freely give it to you. She also encouraged the "fake-it-till-you-make-it" strategy. Just pretending you don't have a personal ceiling can allow you to go further. Finally, she stressed the importance of finding meaning in your work and focusing on long-term goals. She noted that if women don't find meaning in their work, they are much more likely to leave their job. "Passion is the lynchpin of grit," she said.

Retention and promotion are still issues for women in the legal field. Firms and other organizations have begun to implement programs to address these needs, but women can use the strategies suggested by Hogan to complement these programs. It's fair to say that only very few women will be able to win the Australian open while eight weeks pregnant. But women in the law should feel free to work without a ceiling.

kmm2bb@virginia.edu

200+ Libel Themes Outside Charlottesville, Va.

At the heart of the University of Virginia Law School's annual stage comedy event, the Libel

David Ranzini '20
Production Editor



Show, is a secretive conclave whose existence is known only to a select group of insiders. Each year, the theme that unites the show's sketches is selected, in rigorous secrecy, by high-ranking members of the Libel organization, known to themselves as "the Junta."

That process, which the *Law Weekly* has learned is known internally as the "theme party," takes place every September 30 under conditions much like the in-group gatherings that produce Popes and U.S. presidential candidates. This year's theme was no different—and it's already generating surprise and anticipation around the Law School.

Not only was the *Charlie's Angels* theme a surprising one in an age characterized more by idealized nostalgia for the Eighties than the Seventies, when young Millennial viewers, according to market research carried out this year by SurveyMonkey, are more likely to assume that "Farrah Fawcett" is a kind of avocado toast than a middling actress, it was also a bold choice in the era of #MeToo. Adapting a show well known even in its own time for coarse innuendo, lingering bath scenes, and plots less driven by sharply written repartee than by

"jiggle-TV" slow-motion close-ups of the bodies of its protagonists promises to be a challenge for Libel's production team. How well the conceit of three women overqualified to follow the orders of a millionaire with a speakerphone plays to Generation #Twitter remains to be seen. But now, less than two weeks from the show's opening night, the *Law Weekly* has exclusively obtained almost 300 of the themes rejected by this year's Junta, revealing for the first time the rigor of the theme party selection procedure, and the length of the long odds *Charlie's Angels* really ran to emerge as this year's theme. "Just running your eyes down the column doesn't really give you a real appreciation of how much effort goes into separating out a theme that really makes the grade," commented one theme party attendee, speaking on condition of anonymity to discuss internal matters. "You really have to read each one out loud, as we do, preferably in a group, to get the full effect."

Rejected Themes

- Friday Night Libel
- The Forty-Year Old Libel
- Talladega Libels
- Libelbusters
- Dial "L" for Libel
- Sympathy for Lady Libel
- Throw Libel From the Train
- Slander: Or the 120 Days of Libel
- Libel, She Wrote
- Libel the Bailiff
- A Funny Thing Happened on

- the Way to the Libel Show
- My Fair Libel
- McCabe and Mrs. Libel
- An Inconvenient Libel
- Libel: Redemption
- My Dinner with Libel
- All Libel on the Western Front
- Do the Libel Thing
- Dances With Libels
- A Serbian Libel
- Libel Rublev
- Come and Libel
- 2001: A Space Libel
- The Libels of Navarrone
- Libelminer's Daughter
- The Handmaid's Libel
- Libel, the Beloved Country
- Libel on the Roof
- A Short Film About Libel
- Smokey and the Libel
- Libel of the Fireflies
- When Libel Met Sally
- The Umbrellas of Libel
- Libel the Gallant Pig
- The Luck of Barry Libel
- Guess Who's Coming to Libel
- Mad Libel Beyond Slanderdome
- Breakfast at Libel's
- The Heart Is A Lonely Libel
- The Big Libelowski
- Stand and Libel
- Bill & Ted's Excellent Libel
- A Clockwork Libel
- Libel On A Hot Tin Roof
- A Streetcar Named Libel
- Zack And Miri Make A Libel
- The Libel King
- It's A Wonderful Libel
- The Libels of Others
- For A Few Libels More
- Some Like It Libelous
- Libeling in the Rain
- Libel Runner
- The Bridge On The River Libel
- Libel, Stock and Two Smoking Barrels

- Tokyo Libel
- Mr. Libel Goes to Washington
- The Passion of Joan of Libel
- Libel Without a Cause
- No Country for Old Libel
- Libel Me If You Can
- Chitty-Chitty Libel-Libel
- The Man Who Shot Libel Valance
- Who's Afraid of Virginia Libel?
- The Libel in Winter
- It Libeled One Night
- Touch of Libel
- La Dolce Libel
- The Libel Before Christmas
- Libel in the Shell
- This Is Libel Tap
- In the Heat of the Libel
- Stalag Libel 13
- The Manchurian Libel
- Libel is The Warmest Color
- But I'm A Libeler
- Libelers Don't Cry
- Brokeback Libel
- Libel Me by Your Name
- Love And Pain And The Whole Libel Thing
- Aguirre, the Wrath of Libel
- Arsenic and Old Libel
- Au Revoir Les Calomnies
- Libel With Bashir
- Straight Outta Libel
- Libels from Iwo Jima
- Let the Right One Libel
- Back to the Libel Part II
- O Libel, Where Art Thou?
- Hedwig and the Angry Libel
- Faster, Pussycat! Libel! Libel!
- Invasion of the Libel snatchers
- A Few Good Libels
- Who Framed Libel Rabbit?
- Fear and Libel in Las Vegas
- From Here to Libel
- Libel of Arabia
- The Last King of Libel
- Star Trek II: The Wrath of Libel
- A Hard Day's Libel

- The Muppet Christmas Libel
- Libel or High Water
- What We Do In The Libels
- West Side Libel
- Libel's 11
- Dawn of the Libel of the Apes
- The Libel For Red October
- A Fish Called Libel
- An American Libel in London
- Snow White and the Seven Libels
- Sixteen Libels
- Libel Hard With a Vengeance
- National Libel's Christmas Vacation
- Last Libel of Christ
- The Libel who Wasn't There
- The Meaning of Libel
- House of Flying Libels
- Picnic At Libel Rock
- The Libel of Drunken Master
- And Now For Something Completely Libelous
- Zatoichi: Blind Libeler
- Women on the Verge of A Nervous Libel
- Libel and Kumar Go to White Castle
- The Man Who Libeled Too Much
- The 36 Chambers of Shao-Libel
- My Little Libel Show Can't Be This Cute!
- Gochuumon wa Meiyokison Desu Ka?
- Attack on Libel
- The Opening of Misty Libel
- Deep Libel
- Debbie Does Libel
- The Three Libels of Eve
- The Devil in Ms. Libel
- All About Libel
- Everything You Ever Wanted To Know About Libel (But Were

THEMES page 5

HOT BENCH



Michelle Chang '19

1. Have you ever had a nickname? What?

My dad and I were popularly known as the 2 Changz, does that count?

2. Where did you grow up?

Taiwan, (we have the best night markets in the WORLD) and West Palm Beach. I only saw snow a whopping three times before the age of 22.

3. What's the best meal you've ever had?

See above description about night markets. Seriously how can everything taste so good? Although a close runner up is McDonald's fries and chicken nuggets.

4. If you could meet one celebrity, who would it be and why?

Demi Lovato. She is talented, passionate, beautiful and intelligent. Most importantly

she's real. She opens up about her mental illness and speaks up against bullying and body image issues. She's a queen and I'd love to tell her how much she's inspired me over the years.

5. If you owned a sports team, what/who would be the mascot?

Pandas. Sloths. UNICORNS.

6. If you had to pick one song to play non-stop in the background of your life, what would it be?

Demi Lovato's "Tell Me You Love Me." I already say that phrase ten times a day anyways.

7. If you were a superhero, what would your superpower be?

Speak every language. Communication is a beauty of humanity. And also my sources of gossip is now unlimited.

8. What's something you wish you'd known about law school before coming to UVa?

People drink a lot. A lot more than a lot.

9. What's your most interesting two-truths-and-a-lie? (And what's the lie?)

(1) Two friends and I once had a podcast about Dawson's Creek and James Van Der Beek tweeted at us. (lie, it was John Wesley Shipp who tweeted at us. I'm famous yes.)

(2) My face is on an exhibit in the Frost Museum of Science in Miami. (again, I'm famous yes)

(3) I'm allergic to happiness, aka furry friends and alcohol.

10. If you could live anywhere, where would it be?

Hogwarts.

11. What's the best (or worst!) PG-rated pick-up line you've ever heard?

"Going to bed? Mind if I Slytherin?"

12. If you could know one thing about your future, what would it be?

Will I ever meet Demi Lovato?

13. Backstreet Boys or *NSYNC?

I don't know her.

14. What's the longest you've gone without sleep and why?

Close to 24 hours in high school. I was in an IB program. Contrary to popular belief, the "S" in "IB therefore IBS," does not stand for sleep.

15. What's your favorite thing to do in Charlottesville?

Visiting Carter Mountain! There are actually non-drinking activities for me to do there!

16. If you could make one law that everyone had to follow, what would it be?

Nap time is mandatory. At least 20 minutes every four hours. At work and at school. Everywhere.

mc3qu@virginia.edu
she/her/hers

LILE

continued from page 1

sequences, and Title VII properly covers sexual orientation even if Congress didn't originally intend for the act to do so.

Herzog argued that the Fourteenth Circuit should overturn the district court and defer to Congress' intent, since Congress did not intend to include sexual orientation as a protected class. She focused on the common use of "sex," which does not include "sexual orientation." The panel asked Herzog about recent decisions out of the Second and Seventh Circuits, which held that Title VII prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Herzog focused on the plain meaning of the statute and explained that the other circuits erred when they departed from the plain meaning.

Davidson argued that Schroeder should survive the motion to dismiss because she created a plausible inference of discrimination and focused on the standard that governs comparators. Davidson walked through the two main standards—"substantially similar" or "nearly identical"—and explained that Schroeder had comparators under either standard, since each employee's quality-control mistakes resulted in the same loss in revenue, even though Schroeder's mistake drew more public attention. Judge Niemeyer asked about the Fourth Circuit's standard, which takes a more case-by-case, fact-specific approach. He declared, "Maybe the Fourth Circuit's onto something!" earning chuckles from the audience.

During Sewell's argument, she

focused on distinguishing the other employees from Schroeder. Natural Foods never found one of the employees responsible for the quality-control problems and treated the other employees' mistake less seriously from the very beginning. Given the differences, Sewell argued, the employees couldn't be considered comparators. The judges focused their questions on the legal standard for a motion to dismiss.

After deliberation, the judges came back, announced the winners, and gave feedback. The judges gave the advocates a lot of well-deserved praise and told them they would rank among the best advocates that appeared in their respective courtrooms. Judges Costa and Niemeyer complimented the oralists for answering questions, which they believe separates the best advocates from decent advocates. Judge Griffith praised the competitors for not dodging any of the questions, even when they were difficult and outside the scope of the problem. Judge Costa also explained that the best advocates treat arguments as a dialogue with the court, maintaining a friendly and helpful demeanor even when the judges ask hard questions. Finally, Judges Costa and Griffith talked about how the best advocates acknowledge the weaknesses in their arguments and then pivot to the strengths. For example, Chief Justice Roberts, arguably the best oralist of our generation, specifically points out the weakest part of his argument at the beginning of his time. In total, the competitors gave great arguments and gave a wonderful example of effective oral advocacy.

tke3ge@virginia.edu

Letters to the Editor

Response to "Untangling the Immigration Debate"

Max Wagner's piece on immigration¹ is misleading, false, and xenophobic. Under the guise of

Minority Rights Coalition at North Grounds

an educational series, Wagner makes unsubstantiated claims that only serve to promote harmful, inaccurate stereotypes and to further obfuscate the "debate."

The Minority Rights Coalition and the below-signed affinity groups are deeply disappointed by the ignorance and xenophobia espoused by this letter to the editor, its author, and those who endorse its views. Our intent in writing this response is not to further engage in the "debate." But we will call out xenophobia whenever it presents itself. We will stand together as a community in support of DREAMers, their families, and other minority communities.

First, Mr. Wagner asserts that "illegal" is a more accurate description than "undocumented" by falsely suggesting that "undocumented" begs the question: "Why don't we just give them documents?" There was no logical connection between the two phrases. Furthermore, Mr. Wagner ignores the fact that many undocumented immigrants are here on valid visas but are overstaying their visas. Unlawful presence in the U.S. is a civil offense. Using the word "illegal" to describe civil offenses is contrary to the common usage of the word "illegal" and, therefore, not the more accurate term to describe undocumented aliens. His word choice of "illegal" is misleading at best. It elicits unsympathetic responses from readers who associate "illegal" with criminality or even violent felonies.

Second, Mr. Wagner attacks perception of DREAMers with false data and premises. Con-

¹ Max Wagner, Guest Opinion: Untangling the Immigration Debate, Law Weekly, Feb 21, 2018, <https://www.law-weekly.org/col/2018/2/21/guest-opinion-untangling-the-immigration-debate>

trary to his claim that most DREAMers were teenagers when they came to the U.S., the average age when they arrived was six and a half years old, and 54 percent were under seven years old when they came to the U.S.² Next, Mr. Wagner further attempts to mislead the readers by conflating illiteracy and lack of English proficiency. A focus on English language skills and literacy is thinly veiled racism; he uses language as a proxy to target immigrants from non-English-speaking countries. But this conveniently fails to acknowledge the immigrants from predominantly English speaking countries, to whom this English argument would not apply. Furthermore, not speaking English does not preclude people from being productive members of society. As history demonstrates, English-only laws and literacy tests have often been used to single out racial minorities. It is simply inaccurate to conflate illiteracy with not speaking English.

Third, Mr. Wagner's account of "chain(ed) migration" fails to clarify anything. We reject the term "chain(ed) migration" not for the reasons Mr. Wagner claims, but rather because the term is an inaccurate characterization of the complex process of immigration. The term has recently been used to foster fear about an uncontrolled influx of immigrants. However, the claim that "once immigrants are issued a green card, they can apply to bring members of their family over" is grossly incomplete and recklessly misleading. Most importantly, there is an annual cap of 226,000 visas per year for family visas.³ Furthermore, green card holders can only apply for legal status for their unmarried children and

² Lori Robertson, The Facts on DACA, Jan 22, 2018, <https://www.factcheck.org/2018/01/the-facts-on-daca/>

³ The Department of Homeland Security, Visa Availability and Priority Dates, <https://www.uscis.gov/greencard/visa-availability-priority-dates#Finding>

spouses, while limited by the annual cap.⁴ Notably, they cannot petition for their parents or their siblings. For U.S. citizens, even though there is no cap on applications for their children and parents, applications for siblings are also subject to the same annual cap.⁵ The application process is restrictive and time-consuming. The term "chain" migration is excessively misleading.

Mr. Wagner should do his research—and learn that you cannot back up a factual assertion with an opinion column—before he publishes his next "series" on any legal topic. His article fails to clarify the existing immigration debate and may actually confuse readers with no background on the topic.

For minority students at UVA Law, this is not the first time, nor will it be the last, that our peers feel justified when their opinions and facts are actually ignorance and lies. Surely everyone is entitled to their opinions, but the problem surfaces when one presents misconceptions and false premises as statements of facts. From blatantly racist and xenophobic comments in class, to passive-aggressive dominating behaviors at firm events, to repeated questions of "no really, where are you from?" until the minority is forced to voice a foreign country as an answer. While we are often enraged and hurt, we cannot say we are ever surprised. This was a daunting reminder that many of our colleagues hold similar views and will soon enter a profession of authority. Unfortunately, many times that position is to govern over minorities. We are used to this and will continue to bear the burden. We will continue to respond intelligently. We will not be silenced. After all, many of us came to law school to gain the tools needed to change the world. To our allies, we thank you for the overwhelming support. Please help us reduce xenophobia everywhere. Speak up. We can all do a little more.

mc3qu@virginia.edu

4 Id.

5 Id.

A Response to Clark Hall

When I was a freshman at UC Berkeley, I came back to my dormitory one night to

Baruch Nutovic '19



discover a swastika on my door. That was just the start. Over my years as an undergraduate, I routinely found swastikas and anti-Semitic scribbling, like the "kill Jews" I found in the library bathroom. I found Swastikas painted around town as well, and the city seemed in no hurry to remove them. *The Daily Californian*, UC Berkeley's student newspaper, published anti-Semitic op-eds and cartoons on multiple occasions. A Jewish student was rammed in the back with a shopping cart during an anti-Israel event and subsequently had to seek a restraining order. As bills to boycott the Middle East's only democracy, Israel, were debated by UC Berkeley's student government, I heard Jews called Christ-killers and bloodthirsty child-killers. Old anti-Semitic conspiracy theories about Jewish domination of the media, finance, government, etc. were aired over and over again.

My experience is common for Jewish students in the University of California system. In recent years, swastika incidents have become commonplace, and at UC Davis, swastikas were even painted on the Jewish fraternity house. At UCSD, at a pro-Israel event, a student declared support for gathering all Jews in Israel, that they might be killed more easily. At UCLA, a Jewish applicant for the Student Coun-

cil's Judicial Board was asked whether being Jewish would get in the way of her doing her job. At UC Irvine, an anti-Israel mob harassed and chased a female Jewish student trying to enter an Israeli film event. The movement of hate against the Jewish state often predictably results in hate crimes, intimidation, and violence directed at Jewish students.

I bring all this up for a reason. On February 22, the Brody Jewish Center at UVA hosted an event in Clark Hall called "Building Bridges." A panel of Israeli Defense Force reservists were to share their personal stories and answer questions from students. The objective was to humanize the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, offer students a chance to learn about Israeli society, and create a dialogue about peace-making.

During the event, a group of students and non-students stormed in, yelling anti-Israel slogans and trying to intimidate Jewish students. The militants ignored entreaties to be part of the event and ask tough questions of the panelists. They continued harassing attendees until campus police were called, and then they finally dispersed. It is disturbing to see the anti-Israel hate movement's campaign of violence and intimidation against Jewish students, which has become an established part of campus life at the University of California and other major universities, being brought to UVA.

It was still more disturbing to see the undergraduate Minority Rights Coalition deny the Jewish Leadership Council membership, on the grounds that one of the council's five

LETTERS page 6

Faculty Quotes

K. Kordana: "It's a little too Soviet, isn't it?"

J. Harrison: "Canada: it's the wild north up there. Anything goes."

R. Hines: "Everybody makes mistakes, to quote Hannah Montana."


J. Johnston: "The press is a bunch of nasty-dwelling fish, like carp."

A. Woolhandler: "Your mother still had standards! ... and you probably do too."

G. Cohen: "[Professor Ferzan] has very interesting opinions *shakes head*."

J. Setear: "MILF: Mother I'd like to Facebook friend. WTF: Why the face?"

Heard a good professor quote?
Email editor@lawweekly.org!



Virginia Law Weekly

COLOPHON

<p>Jansen VanderMeulen '19 <i>Editor-in-Chief</i></p>	<p>M. Eleanor Schmalzl '20 <i>Executive Editor</i></p>	
<p>Anand Jani '19 <i>Managing Editor</i></p>	<p>David Ranzini '20 <i>Production Editor</i></p>	<p>Kim Hopkin '19 <i>Development Editor</i></p>
<p>Ali Zablocki '19 <i>Articles Editor</i></p>	<p>Alison Malkowski '19 <i>Format Editor</i></p>	<p>Katherine Mann '19 <i>Features Editor</i></p>
<p>Jenny Lamberth '19 <i>Cartoonist-in-Chief</i></p>		

Published weekly on Wednesday except during holiday and examination periods and serving the Law School community at the University of Virginia, the *Virginia Law Weekly* (ISSN 0042-661X) is not an official publication of the University and does not necessarily express the views of the University. Any article appearing herein may be reproduced provided that credit is given to both the *Virginia Law Weekly* and the author of the article. Advanced written permission of the *Virginia Law Weekly* is also required for reproduction of any cartoon or illustration.

Virginia Law Weekly 580 Massie Road University of Virginia School of Law Charlottesville, Virginia 22903-1789	Phone: 434.812.3229 editor@lawweekly.org www.lawweekly.org
--	---

EDITORIAL POLICY: The *Virginia Law Weekly* publishes letters and columns of interest to the Law School and the legal community at large. Views expressed in such submissions are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the *Law Weekly* or the Editorial Board. Letters from organizations must bear the name, signature, and title of the person authorizing the submission. All letters and columns must either be submitted in hardcopy bearing a handwritten signature along with an electronic version, or be mailed from the author's e-mail account. Submissions must be received by 12 p.m. Sunday before publication and must be in accordance with the submission guidelines. Letters and/or columns over 1200 words may not be accepted. The Editorial Board reserves the right to edit all submissions for length, grammar, and clarity. Although every effort is made to publish all materials meeting our guidelines, we regret that not all submissions received can be published.

UVA Special:
Large 1-Topping Pizza \$8.99



Locally Owned
Domino's Pizza
Caring for the Community

Open Late! **We Accept Plus dollars**

977-UVA1
1137 Millmont St.

Welcome Admitted Students!

Do you remember the moment that you learned of your acceptance to UVa Law

Admitted Students Open House

and the feelings that came to you at that moment? A combination of excitement, fear, and determination led you to choose Charlottesville as your home for three years, and believe it or not, you have almost completed another (if not your first) year at UVa Law. Now it is time to pave the way and welcome the Class of 2021!

Admitted Students Open House Weekend will take place this Thursday and Friday (March 15 and 16) on the Law School grounds. On these few days we will officially introduce the admitted students to our community and show them the environment that makes UVa Law unique. Some of our current students have already been introducing the admits to our community by volunteering to serve as student liaisons, and we hope more of you can meet the admitted students and join us for the many events we have planned this weekend.

Thursday is when most of the students arrive, and we will kick off the afternoon with tours of the building from our Virginia Law Ambassadors. There will be plenty of new faces wandering the halls, so please feel free to help if someone looks as though they need help with directions—and

admitted students, please also feel free to ask a student for help as well! Thursday afternoon we will have our first large welcoming event for Admitted Students Open House with a BBQ in Scott Commons and Spies Garden at 3:30 p.m. This is a great opportunity for the admitted students to meet one another as well as current UVa Law students, so please stop by if you can on your way to or from class and meet a new face.

After the BBQ the students will then head to Monticello for a private tour of Thomas Jefferson's estate. To close out the evening there will be a trivia night at Three Notch'd Craft Kitchen and Brewery from 7:30 p.m. to 11 p.m. Many of you have already signed up for this event so we look forward to a great night of food, drinks, trivia and some NCAA March Madness!

Friday will be the busiest day for the admitted students, beginning with a breakfast in Caplin Pavilion and followed by a full slate of informational programs, which will give admitted students perspectives about classes, career opportunities (with the best career service department ever—actually!), financial aid, and so much more. We encourage admitted students to take advantage of any session that sounds interesting or helpful to them and to ask as many questions as possible as our

faculty and staff members love getting to know more about our students!

Lunch will be served in classrooms all over the Law School as the admitted students take a moment to hear from current UVa Law students in one of our many Student Life Panels. This is an opportunity to receive candid answers to questions such as “What does it *really* mean to be a student at UVa Law?” and “What if I don't know how to play softball?” Don't worry, many of us still don't know how to play—we're just pretending.

Friday will conclude with our “Supreme Alums” Reception in Caplin Pavilion, where admitted students will have the chance to meet faculty and recent Virginia Law alumni who have achieved the distinguished honor of clerking for the Supreme Court of the United States. Although this is the end of the official program, admitted students should also be on the lookout over the weekend for opportunities to meet with our affinity groups, many of which will be hosting some great events for admits so that they can become further acquainted with our current students.

Lastly, to our admitted students: it is our pleasure to serve as your ASOH Co-Chairs this year and hopefully this weekend will show you why UVa Law has earned the nicknames of “Happiest Law School” and “The Dis-

ney World of Law Schools”. UVa Law is not simply oriented around providing you with a great job (although that is a wonderful perk) but we are also committed to building strong relationships with each other, our faculty members, and our communities at large. To commit to UVA Law is not simply to commit to a school for three years; it is a commitment to an amazingly unique family for life. We hope that you take advantage of every workshop, panel, and event this weekend so that you can catch a glimpse of this with your own eyes. We are here to help you have the best experience possible, so please do not hesitate to ask us any question or to flag us with any concern. Even if you simply would like to say hello, do not hesitate to stop us. We have spent a long time preparing for you and are very excited to meet you personally!

This weekend should be one of our best yet- we look forward to seeing you at ASOH this weekend!

klj2ce@virginia.edu
jw9ve@virginia.edu



TAINTED

continued from page 2

ple came and went, donating blood and saving lives. The world turned. Yet *my* world kind of stopped. For two days, I had to pass those tables – that life-saving operation – and think about how my love for my partner has precluded my participation. For two days, I had to bear witness to what appeared to be my community's ignorance or indifference to this discrimination. Notwithstanding the fact that last year the SBA was made aware of the problem. Notwithstanding that this was our Law School's “Diversity Week.”

Even if the Court and several of the states haven't committed to sexual orientation nondiscrimination, UVA *has* purported to. On these Grounds, the “University of Virginia does not discriminate on the basis of . . . gender identity, . . . [or] sexual orientation.”⁹ The University's Office for Equal Opportunity and Civil Rights clarifies that the University's nondiscrimination policy is enforced except where discrimination is otherwise permitted by law. But whether the FDA's regulations have the force of law is a separate question than whether the University should stand against discrimination notwithstanding the legal force or permissibility of the FDA's regulation. That

⁹ <https://eocr.virginia.edu/notice-non-discrimination-and-equal-opportunity>

is, quite aside from whether the FDA's regulation *permits* this kind of discrimination is the question of whether the University should *tolerate* the discrimination the FDA's regulation engenders.

And there are good reasons why the University and its Law School should not tolerate this discrimination, all of which have force independent of the apologetic's call for tolerance in the name of securing an adequate blood supply. I invite a discussion on these Grounds about why sometimes discriminatory means are substantively wrong, no matter how important their ends, no matter how fair their procedures, and no matter their susceptibility to being mislabeled “not discrimination” at all. Most of all, I hope that no matter our reasonable disagreements about what constitutes sound policy at the FDA, we embrace Prof. Buckler's exhortation, first inscribed upon the edifice of this institution as it was rebuilt into Clark Hall in 1932, to “labor with learning, courage and devotion to preserve liberty and promote justice.”¹⁰ That includes liberty and justice for gay students, too. And that starts at home.

kpo4ua@virginia.edu

¹⁰ Philip Mills Her- rington, *The Law School at the University of Virginia: Architectural Expansion in the Realm of Thomas Jefferson*, University of Virginia Press (April 2017).

THEMES

continued from page 3

- Too Afraid to Ask
- Last Libel in Paris
- My Own Private Libel
- The Double Libel of Véronique
- Uncle Boonmee Who Can Re- call His Past Libels
- The Cook, the Thief, His Wife & Her Libeler
- The Accidental Libellists
- The Triumph of the Libel
- Song of the Libel
- Birth of a Libel
- Gone With the Libel
- A Libel Runs Through It
- They Call The Wind Libel
- The Old Man and the Libel
- Gilligan's Libel
- Howl's Moving Libel
- Trading Libels
- The Libel Trap
- Romancing the Libel
- Libel 2: Electric Boogaloo
- A Libel In The Sun
- How I Libeled Your Mother
- Libel Police
- Bubblegum Libel: Tokyo 2040
- Sex, Libels, and Videotape
- Libelous in Seattle
- The Prime of Ms. Jean Libel
- The Libel of Apu
- The Shape of Libel
- Libel Out
- Bang the Libel Slowly
- Our Libel In Havana
- The Pink Libel Strikes Again
- The Libel Potemkin
- Why We Libel
- 30 Seconds Over Libel
- Libeling Miss Daisy
- The Color Libel
- Cool Hand Libel
- Libel Farm
- Blazing Libels
- The Man From L.I.B.E.L.
- The Libel Always Rings Twice
- Libel Indemnity
- St. Elmo's Libel
- The Man With the Libel Arm
- You've Got Libel
- Charlie and the Libel Factory
- Honey, I Libeled the Kids
- Stop! Or My Mom Will Libel
- On the Libelfront
- Libels Wide Shut
- Libel Snowblood 2: Love Song of Vengeance
- Violent Libel
- Libel Royale
- Merry Christmas, Mr. Libel
- My Big Fat Greek Libel
- How Green Was My Libel
- Libel: the Professional
- A Tree Grows in Libel
- Libel At Bernie's
- Daddy Longlibels
- Edward Libelhands
- Libeljuice
- The Squid and the Libel
- 20,000 Libels Under The Sea
- The Best Years of Our Libels
- Django Unlibeled
- Libel By Me
- Into the Libel
- There Will Be Libel
- The Deer Libeler
- The Libel of the Sierra Madre
- Libel History X
- My Side of the Libel
- 7ibel
- 3:10 to Libel
- Shakespeare in Libel
- Libel vs Libel
- Sophie's Libel
- Libel Day's Journey Into Night
- The Libel of Emile Zola
- Libel on the Bounty
- Seven Libels for Seven Libelers
- The Six Million Dollar Libel
- Five Nights at Libel's
- Four Libels and a Funeral
- Three Libels in the Fountain
- 2 Libels 2 Libelous
- Close Libels of the Third Kind
- How to Succeed in Libel (With- out Really Trying)
- How To Lose a Libel in 10 Days

dwr7ed@virginia.edu

Debating Abortion

This year, I have been extraordinarily fortunate to serve on the board of Advocates for Life at UVA

Betsy Hedges '18



Law, a pro-life educational and advocacy student group. Although most of our activities focus on advocacy and necessarily promote pro-life arguments, last year we decided to take on one event dedicated wholly to the “educational” end of the spectrum. On Tuesday, March 20 at 11:30 a.m., we will host that event, cosponsored with The Federalist Society: a debate on the ethics of abortion in Caplin Pavilion.

As the word “debate” implies, the event will involve two speakers, each presenting what is in her respective mind the strongest arguments for or against the legality of abortion. The speakers, Nadine Strossen and Stephanie Gray, will each have the opportunity to build a complete case within the confines of a timed debate.

Both speakers are exceptionally qualified, and I am deeply grateful to each for her willingness to come speak. Nadine Strossen is currently a professor at New York Law School. Her scholarship, though varied, has recently focused on free speech. Through her long involvement with the ACLU—she served as president from 1991 to 2008—she has also gained intimate familiarity with other regulatory and civil liberties issues, including abortion-related issues.

Stephanie Gray, a Canadian based in Vancouver, is the founder of the pro-life outreach

group Love Unleashes Life and a co-founder and past executive director of the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform. Gray travels widely speaking about various topics related to abortion and, among many other recent engagements, delivered a presentation for Google's “Talks at Google” series last year. She has built a career in apologetics and, like Strossen, is a sought-after speaker.

Both Gray and Strossen have participated in numerous debates on abortion, but they will debate each other for the first time next Tuesday!

Both women have agreed to address ethical, moral or philosophical arguments and not legal arguments, about which any student could quickly become informed through reading cases or treatises. The sole goal of the event, from Advocates for Life's perspective, is to raise important normative questions that students, faculty and other attendees can—and should—continue to debate amongst themselves.

To that end, I extend a very warm invitation to all members of the UVA Law community to come hear the debate. Most law students have some opinions about the regulation of abortion, and I believe the educational value of the event will rise with the number of different views raised during Q&A after the debate. Both speakers have told me personally that they are very eager to hear and respond to your questions. I hope many of you will take advantage of this rare opportunity to hear two of the best!

eth4s@virginia.edu

LETTERS

continued from page 4

organizations was a pro-Israel group. Thankfully, this has not been an issue at UVa Law.

One of the main strategies of the anti-Israel hate movement is to try to drive a wedge between Jews and other minorities, suggesting that Jews are not a minority group in an effort to isolate Jews. The facts say otherwise. According to FBI statistics for 2016, the last year for which data is available, Jews were subject to more hate crimes per capita than any other minority group. And according to the Anti-Defamation League, in 2017 anti-Semitic incidents in the U.S. surged nearly 60 percent, the largest single-year increase on record. It is no accident that when the white supremacists came to Charlottesville to intimidate African-Americans and other minorities, one of their chants was “Jews will not replace us.”

Of course, when a culture of hate against one group is tolerated, the result tends to be the targeting of other groups as well. It was not a coincidence that while I was at UC Berkeley, there were numerous racist incidents targeting other minorities, including a fraternity hanging a noose outside their window for Halloween. And I’ll never forget my horror when I sat down at a desk in the UC Berkeley library to find “kill N*****s” written on it.

Hate crime statistics bear out the connections between different forms of hate on the

national level too. In 2016, 50.2 percent of racially-motivated hate crimes targeted African-Americans, and 54.2 percent of religiously-motivated hate crimes targeted Jews. These are strikingly similar numbers.

Benjamin Franklin once wrote “We must, indeed, all hang together, or most assuredly we shall all hang separately.” In the 1960s, Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel and Martin Luther King marched arm in arm at Selma, with Rabbi Heschel calling on Jews to “hearken” to Dr. King’s call for equality, and Dr. King denouncing anti-Zionism as a reincarnation of anti-Semitism. We need to rekindle the spirit of those times, and remember that all of us share a commitment to equality.

In the coming weeks, the UVa chapter of the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights and allied organizations will be partnering for two events. On March 19, veteran civil rights litigator Joel Siegel will speak about how Title VI and Title IX claims can be used to address race and sex discrimination in educational institutions. On April 4, civil rights scholar Alexander Tsesis of Loyola Law and Dean Kendrick will discuss campus hate speech and the First Amendment. We hope both events will spark a meaningful conversation about discrimination in educational institutions.

byn9bv@virginia.edu

When All You Want to Do Is Moot

My team had just finished the first round of a national moot court competition.

Courtney Tonks
Koelbel '19



I looked at my phone for the first time in hours, and GroupMe had blown up. Apparently, someone had written an incredibly biased, hate-filled article about immigrants in the *Law Weekly*. Questions and comments were flying as people discussed how We (not a typo, meant to be a capital We), the people of color at UVa Law, should respond.

I read through all of the messages, but I didn’t know what to say. I didn’t even have time to think about what to say—the competition wasn’t over yet, and I needed to focus on prepping for the next round. But of course, that’s easier said than done. How does one shift their attention to an ultimately pointless argument about a fake case when actual racism and xenophobia are happening?

I didn’t spend months working on this problem to give up now. I prepped for the next round, went in, and did my best. We went back to our hotel and prepped for the next day. We got up, got ready, and went out to wait for the shuttle to the competition. While we waited, I looked at my phone, and again, GroupMe was blowing up. I scanned through the messages and saw pejorative

terms like “stolen” and “vandalism” as people discussed what had happened that night.

Once again, I was distracted from the competition that I spent months prepping for. My white teammate, only meaning the best, told me not to worry about it and to focus on the competition. Ultimately, I pulled through and we finished the competition as best we could, but it was difficult to not let my thoughts drift back.

What was most striking about this experience was how entirely unsurprising it was. Time and time again, people of color and other minorities are forced to go through the motions of law school while having to deal with events that are incredibly tolling on our mental and emotional health. Every day, we have to walk through the halls of an institution built by slaves, past pictures of all of the white men who came before us, and *literal* dick pics. We are told to concentrate on our grades and journals and

jobs and résumé boosters, but people don’t seem to understand that all of that is inherently more difficult when you are not a cis-gendered heterosexual white male. We are told to learn the laws of our country, but they are all written by old white men to benefit old white men. We are told not to overcommit ourselves, but we can’t simply ignore the needs of our communities and the affinity groups associated with them, so we add those on top of everything else.

No matter how hard we try to be good law students, something inevitably comes up that tears away our focus and makes all that we do that much harder, even when we’re hundreds of miles away and all we want to do is moot.

clk5nw@virginia.edu
she/her/hers

Cartoon By Jenny



SUDOKU

6				8	7		
		7		2			3
2		8	7				
7			5	2	6		
	4		8	3		5	
		2	6	9			8
				7	8		1
8				6	4		
		1	3				6

Solution

9	7	6	4	8	3	1	2	5
5	3	4	1	9	2	6	7	8
1	2	8	7	5	6	4	9	3
8	4	3	6	7	9	2	5	1
7	5	2	3	1	8	9	4	6
6	1	9	2	4	5	3	8	7
4	9	1	5	6	7	8	3	2
3	8	5	9	2	1	7	6	4
2	6	7	8	3	4	5	1	9

THE DOCKET

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION	COST	FOOD?
WEDNESDAY – March 14				
12:00-13:00	From Backpack to Briefcase with Joi Bourgeois, Orrick Head of Diversity	WB 126	Free	Lunch provided
15:00-18:00	VLW: Women in Biglaw	Caplin Pavilion	Free with RSVP	Beverages and hors d'oeuvres
THURSDAY – March 15				
16:00-17:00	Justice for All: A Progressive Prosecutor’s Perspective on Crime in Baltimore	WB 103	Free	No
17:00-18:00	Dorianne Laux Poetry Reading	Special Collections Auditorium	Free	No
FRIDAY – March 16				
12:00-13:00	Electrical and Computer Engineering Seminars: 2D Materials and Heterostructures for Electronic, Optoelectronic, and Thermoelectric Device Applications	Thornton E304	Free	Probably graphene or something sciency lol (;_;
SATURDAY – March 17				
8:30-13:00	PILA Spring Day of Service	Sign up at jgk8vs@virginia.edu	Free	Brown bag it!
20:00-21:30	New Chicago Brass Recital	Old Cabell Hall	Free	No
SUNDAY – March 18				
16:00-17:30	The Art and Practice of Surrender & Self Emptying	UVA Rotunda Multipurpose Room	Free	No
15:30-17:00	UVA Chamber Music Ensemble: Music of Franz Danzi, Nino Rota, John Harbison, and more	Old Cabell Hall	Free	No
MONDAY – March 19				
17:30	Real World Finances Series – “Saving and Investing Strategies”	WB 128	Free	Light refreshments, you think we’re made of money?
20:00-22:30	American Shakespeare Center Presents: Pericles	Blackfriars Playhouse, Staunton	Pay what you will to benefit The Polaris Project	No
TUESDAY – March 20				
11:30-13:00	FedSoc and Friends Present: Should Abortion Be Legal?	Caplin Pavilion	Free	Lunch provided
14:00-15:30	Sharon Salzberg: Personal Reflections on the History of Meditation in America	Shirley Small Collections Library Auditorium	Registration recommended	No
WEDNESDAY – MARCH 21				
12:00-13:00	Legal Implications of Autonomous Vehicles	Purcell	Free	Soylent available for purchase
18:00-19:30	Writing About Race & Social Justice: An Evening with Lamar Giles, Jason Reynolds, and Nic Stone	Ruth Caplin Theater	Reserve tickets free at UVa Arts Box Office	No