WEISS RESIGNS AS CHANCELLOR: PMH COMMUNITY RESPONDS

Following an eight-year stint at the helm of the Paul M. Hebert Law Center, former Chancellor, Jack Weiss, steps down this month, citing “major differences” with the Law Center faculty as his reason for resigning.

“I am proud of the many positive developments at the Law Center during my eight years as Chancellor and look forward to the Law Center’s future.”

Though the specific events that led to Weiss’s decision to resign remain unknown, his resignation comes on the heels of a petition signed by Law Center faculty calling for an “urgently needed” change in leadership. The petition, which surfaced as a result of a public record request filed by 2015 law school graduate, Kyle Alagood, is signed by 25 of the 33 Law Center’s tenure or tenure-track faculty members and was presented to LSU’s provost in May.

“What I would like to say to students, though, is this: Since I announced my plan to step down as Chancellor, I’ve run into a number of you personally and heard from many more. Your encouragement and kind words of appreciation have meant more to me than you could possibly know. Thank you.”

Many alumni have spoken out in support of Weiss, condemning the faculty’s decision to circulate the petition. Among Weiss’s supporters is Gene Fendler, who has served as president of the Board of Trustees since 2008.

“I think what the faculty has done, is, on many levels, a really bad thing.” Fendler said. “I think that not only as a friend and supporter of Jack Weiss – which colors my opinion. But I think many alumni really hate how it happened. The process was absolutely despicable. Where was due process here?”

Adjunct faculty member, distinguished alumnum and local attorney Ed Walters also spoke out against the faculty petition, saying that he had no knowledge of any frustrations harbored by the Law Center faculty.

“The way it went down to me, as a relative outsider, is that it went down poorly,” Walters said. “I’d think that the Board of Trustees and adjunct faculty members should know about any problems, but this was a total shock.”

Students of the Law Center were also surprised and frustrated by the faculty petition.

“From what I understand, a number of faculty members were reluctant to have the letter publicized,” said Andrew Hairston, a third-year student at the LSU Law Center. “I don’t think there’s anything wrong with voicing one’s opinion, particularly in the setting of a professional school, but, as taught to me by my grandfather’s favorite maxim, one should not throw a rock and subsequently hide one’s hand.”

When contacted for an explanation for the petition, all but two faculty members declined to comment. The majority of the faculty who refused to comment replied to those requests with a uniform, guarded response, expressing a desire to move beyond the past and focus on the Law Center’s future. However, two of the 25 signatory faculty members, a professor who wishes to remain anonymous (“Professor X”) and Professor Carter, spoke out to clarify the events that necessitated the petition and the circumstances that led to the faculty’s overwhelming dissatisfaction with Weiss.

“I understand that many law school alums are unhappy with this petition,” Professor X said. “Jack was allegedly
a successful lawyer at the time that he sought the Chancellorship and seemed always to maintain cordial relations with people who moved in his elite circles. But I think that they really need to hear the other side of the story – not just Jack’s. I’m guessing that they never have seen Jack’s dark side, the side that he consistently presented to me and to my colleagues.”

Professor X contends that a large part of this concealed “dark side” stemmed from Weiss’s insistence on a hierarchical management of the faculty rather than a consensus-building approach.

“In my, and I believe most of my colleagues’, view, Jack saw his role to be little more – and nothing less – than imposing his will on the faculty,” the Professor X explained. “Everything in his administration was top-down. One small but revealing example: a former staff member told me that as soon as Jack replaced former Chancellor John Costonis, she was instructed to report to another staff member, not to Jack himself.”

Both professors also described the hostility Weiss directed at him in his administration and the supposedly prevalent fear of retaliation for speaking out against him.

“I believe that the faculty often passed Jack’s proposals not because they actually believed in them but simply because they were worried about him retaliating against them individually,” Professor X added. “For example, he would deny them promotion or tenure or withhold summer grant stipends, which many faculty depend on.”

Professor Carter described a personal experience when she encountered this kind of hostility in Weiss—which ultimately culminated in a colleague filing a Title IX complaint against Weiss on her behalf as well as Carter filing her own complaint. Those complaints remain under investigation by LSU.

She explained that she had become increasingly concerned with the lack of diversity amongst the law school faculty – particularly the adjunct faculty. She further explained that such a disparity and the ad-hoc process used to hire adjunct faculty could constitute a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; and LSU Permanent Memorandum 55.

“I was worried that we weren’t providing our students with a diverse faculty and thereby depriving them of skills they need to succeed in practice, but also that we may have been violating federal law,” she said. Professor Carter chose to voice these concerns during a faculty meeting concerning adjunct faculty appointments—where the faculty was asked to approve the appointment of more than 40 adjuncts, only one of whom was a woman.

“The Chancellor told the faculty that he had a few new candidates he wanted to appoint because he had gotten to know them, they had become good friends, and the Chancellor thought they’d be a good addition to the faculty,” Professor Carter said. “I explained to the Chancellor and the faculty that the process that Weiss had just described has led to a disparate outcome that likely ran afool of the federal law.” In response to her concerns, Carter said “the Chancellor yelled at me in front of the whole faculty, refused to allow me to continue to voice my concerns in a constructive manner, and told me that he was ‘not getting into it with me.’ It was very disturbing.”

Though each faculty member has not explained his/her motivations for signing the petition, Professor X gave a litany of specific instances that he/she believes may have driven the 25 faculty members to sign the petition.

“I believe that the specific events that finally prompted some members of the faculty to circulate the petition included Jack’s repeated claim that he did not have time during the worst of the budget crisis to do any significant fundraising, his repeated refusal to explain why he did not have this time, his alleged reluctance to address the diversity issue until it became public, his alleged microaggression against black law students (reported by Kyle Alagood ‘15 in the Huffington Post), his alleged bullying of Kenneth Barnes, Jr. ‘15 for reporting a racist incident at the law school to The Reveille, his alleged bullying of various students on The Reveille staff after this article was published, his alleged (and arguably actionable) sexually inappropriate comments at a law review banquet and to some faculty members, and his alleged (and arguably actionable) indifference to several female students’ and faculty’s complaints about sexual harassment and stalking,” Professor X opined.

Professor Carter believes that some faculty members may have signed the petition because they shared her concerns about Weiss’s management style.

“I think that people signed for many different reasons, but I think that that type of ‘bullying’ behavior was probably the most common reason why people signed,” she said. “Just… not a good leader.”

When contacted for a response to these allegations concerning his time as Chancellor, Weiss gave the following statement: “The latest round of charges from the Civilian’s two faculty ‘sources’ are so full of falsehoods and distortions that I can’t possibly respond to them in a Civilian news article. So please just put me down for a general denial.

I do hope that fair-minded readers of the Civilian will weigh carefully the credibility of your two faculty sources. One of them remains hell-bent on promoting her false claims in every medium that will publish them. Meanwhile, not one of her claims has ever been substantiated. Your other faculty source, whom you’ve dubbed ‘Professor X’, won’t even speak on the record. So your readers have no way of assessing his or her credibility or holding this accuser accountable at all.

It’s time to move on and look forward. The Law Center’s faculty revolutionaries must now face up to the hard decisions that are involved in running a competitive law school in 2015 and beyond. Among the difficult decisions on tap are those that involve setting priorities for spending the school’s limited budget and for fundraising, plus the vexing challenge of reconciling the school’s role as Louisiana’s flagship public law school with its need to attract, and the needs of, students from other states. I trust that the Civilian will keep the PMH community carefully and critically briefed on those decisions in the months to come.”

Regardless of the events that may have led to Weiss’s resignation, the LSU Law community has commended the initiatives he put into motion during his time as Chancellor.

Maryam Brown, member of the Energy Law Center Advisory Board and Assistant to House Speaker John Boehner for Policy, applauded Weiss’s ingenuity in creating the energy law program.

“I work around leaders for a living, and Jack Weiss was an exceptional leader,” Brown said.
“With the Energy Law Center he was leveraging Louisiana’s strengths to deliver what students as well as what the energy legal practice area needed. It was allowing our students to compete in this space on a national level on day one. He should have been hoisted on shoulders.”

Walters also spoke out in support of Weiss’s contributions to the Law Center, particularly his promotion of practice-oriented programs.

“Chancellor Weiss fostered good on-your-feet trial ad curriculum,” Walters said. “We teach people how to be lawyers. Supporting the NITA program, the clinical programs, the Apprenticeship Week program – all of these help us do that.”

As the Law Center turns its eyes towards the future, the LSU Law community weighs in on what this legal community should focus on in its selection of the new Dean.

“I hope the new Chancellor will be able to get the support of faculty and the alumni,” Fendler said. “It’s an awful thing to have this disruption that’s taking place. I hope the new Chancellor will see the value that Jack brought to the school with the help of faculty members and alumni. I hope it’ll be someone who can reach out to the alumni, because it’s going to take some real reaching out to bring everyone back together.”

Walters, who is on the selection committee appointed to find the new Dean, emphasized a need for unity amongst adjunct and full-time faculty.

“As an adjunct faculty member, I’m pretty isolated from what happens at the Law Center,” Walter said. “In the future, I would hope that the adjunct faculty and the faculty have a closer relationship.”

Some said that a renewed commitment to student learning should be the primary focus in the selection of the new Dean.

“Ideally,” Professor X explained, “the new dean will share the law faculty’s view that the law school should not be regarded as a factory that pumps out fresh lawyers, but rather as an academic enterprise that encourages learning as an end in itself, inspires curiosity, increases knowledge, and promotes the happiness and careers of all students and faculty.”

Others expressed a hope that diversity would be a strong consideration in the search for the new Dean.

“To be quite frank, I would love to see a woman of color ascend to the position,” Hairston said. “Such a selection would demonstrate the Law Center’s commitment to diversity, and I think that the unique perspective provided by such a candidate would be critical to the Law Center’s future development.”

However, regardless of what factors should influence the selection committee’s decision, the majority of the LSU Law community seems to agree that transparency will be crucial for the success of future administrations.

“It will always be difficult to achieve consensus among a group of highly educated people from various backgrounds,” Hairston said. “However, by fostering spaces in which open dialogues can be conducted, the Law Center can avoid some of the contentious exchanges that characterized the past year. It may take time, but it certainly can be accomplished.”

(For more information about this story, including Professor X’s full interview with The Civilian and a copy of the faculty petition, visit us online at www.sites.law.lsu.edu/civilian)
Dear Reader:

As you may have already noticed, our humble student paper has gotten a much-needed facelift. Thanks to our fabulously gifted team, the Civilian has adopted a whole new look complete with a new logo, a new layout, and a new online presence. (See p. 23). However, as I hope you’ll realize as you peruse this inaugural issue, our makeover goes a little deeper than skin-deep. As the Civilian turns over a new page this year, (pardon the pun) our talented staff has renewed its commitment to unbiased, professional story-telling. From a fresh new set of columns to balanced, well-researched news articles, we’ve taken strides to ensure that this is a student paper the LSU Law Center can be proud of. I know I speak for the entire staff when I say that we hope you’ll engage with us as we grow and transition into a more robust publication.

Cheers,
Mallory Richard

SBA STATE OF AFFAIRS

Welcome back, PMHers! 1Ls, we could not be more excited to have you here! We get tired of looking at the same people everyday, and your arrival means the rest of us have moved up a spot on the PMH High School totem pole.

To recap, this summer was a little more eventful than most for the law center. While most of us were planning our Fourth of July festivities, former Chancellor Jack Weiss was announcing his resignation, citing major policy differences with the LSU law faculty, including the reunification of the law center with LSU, the development of the energy law certificate, and his advocacy in eliminating certain upperclass course requirements.

Interim co-deans Bill Corbett and Cheney Joseph were appointed to fill the position, effective August 17. According to the law center’s August 10 press release, Dean Corbett will handle marketing, business and finance, and faculty and staff development. Dean Joseph will focus primarily on our academic mission, including institutional planning and assessment, and alumni and community relations activities. LSU’s Office of Human Resource Management is currently forming a committee to conduct a national search for a new permanent dean of the law center.

In keeping with this year’s fun theme of transition, this will be the first full year of the law center’s realignment with LSU. The good news is that this shouldn’t impact law students’ lives on a day-to-day basis because the realignment process has been primarily focused on behind-the-scenes financial and administrative operations. It can also open doors for those law students interested in the increased international programs, broadened access to funding, and additional opportunities for funded research. The bad news is that, by and large, students have felt that the administration has poorly communicated these changes and this process. To rectify this problem, SBA hopes to host an open forum in the coming weeks, during which we will ask the administration to fill in the gaps and provide us with more information on the impacts of the realignment and the events leading up to our former chancellor’s resignation.

On the SBA front, we have a jam-packed semester planned. If you prefer the sand court to the classroom, get ready to show your skills at the Annual Mago’s Volleyball Tournament. For the 2L and 3L ladies, the Powderpuff Football Game is on the docket this fall. In October, 3Ls and their families will take part in Hats n’ Canes, the annual toast to the 3L class. Also in October, SBA’s 1L Class Officers (elections coming soon!) will host a night of pure debauchery and depravity, commonly referred to as “The Halloween Party.”

We realize this is going to be a year of change in a variety of aspects, but SBA is determined to do everything possible to minimize any negative impacts of those changes and to keep students informed along the way. As fellow members of the student body, SBA understands and values the importance of transparency. We are committed to maintaining open lines of communication between students and the administration. We’d also like to work on SBA’s communication with students.

To achieve that goal, at least one SBA meeting each month will take place during the more convenient lunch hour. SBA will also have a weekly table hour, during which you’ll be able to find your SBA officers at a table downstairs. We encourage each of you to take that face time to share your opinions, voice your concerns, and complain about parking.

SBA will also be making better use of the LSU Law Student Bar Association Facebook page, so take a break from pretending to take notes in class and like our page. It will be updated daily with critically important information like upcoming events with free lunches and GIF drink specials.

As always, feel free to contact any member of SBA with questions, comments, or concerns at any time. I’m looking forward to a big year and I wish all of you a successful semester.

Geaux Tigers,
Clare Sanchez
SBA President
Third year LSU law student and current SBA Executive President, Clare Sanchez, has been elected to the prestigious Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors is the governing body for the entire LSU system. It represents approximately 250,000 students. The Board oversees expansions, renovations, new degree requirements, and approves new majors, among other things. It is a fifteen-member board, with fourteen being appointed by the Governor. Each member represents the districts of Louisiana.

Sanchez is the student member, which is the only position not appointed by Governor Jindal. Instead, Clare was elected by the other seven Presidents from each of the eight LSU schools. Those schools include but are not limited to: LSU-Eunice, LSU-Alexandria, LSU-Shreveport, and the Health and Science Center. Essentially, Sanchez is the voice of the students for all LSU schools.

When asked about what she is looking forward to most, Sanchez said, “I’ve made it a point to look out for the smaller institutions or schools that are typically forgotten. When people talk about LSU, you think of the main campus. However, the main campus is pretty well-represented. Looking out for schools like LSU-Eunice, LSU-Shreveport, LSU-Alexandria, the Health and Science Center, graduate programs, and those students is important because I think they are the most underrepresented and they get forgotten. That’s been my big focus.” With the realignment, Clare Sanchez has an exciting yet difficult year ahead of her, but she is up for the challenge! She is ready to be our advocate and our voice on the LSU Board of Supervisors.

The realignment is not the only thing that will pose as an obstacle but weathering the budget cuts will also be a hot topic of discussion for the Board. Sanchez is looking forward to collaborating with the other fourteen members of the Board to problem solve and create solutions to find ways to make the budget that is available currently to work for all LSU schools as well as LSU students across the state.

The position comes with some incredible opportunities for Sanchez. Although she has a year ahead of her full of responsibilities, she seems calm on the surface and offers advice to whomever her successor may be in the future. She says, “Take advantage of all of the opportunities [the position] presents.” The Board of Supervisors participates and creates a lot of amazing things across the state. One event that Clare will be able to participate in is a ribbon-cutting ceremony on Wednesday, August 26, 2015 at a brand new hospital in New Orleans. The unique experience was one that she is humbly grateful for but she also recognizes it is one that she may not have had in another capacity.

Sanchez advises her successors to get to know the other members on the Board and take advantage of opportunities to meet some of the people that are doing big things in our state. For example, gubernatorial candidate, Scott Angelle, is currently on the Board with Sanchez. She is taking advantage of her ability to get to know him on a personal level and the accessibility to ask and discuss topics of interest with him is a unique networking opportunity that could help further her on a professional level as well. In addition to Mr. Angelle, there are other prestigious members of the Board. “I might be a 3L juggling a 3L schedule and SBA but the members of this board are CEOs of major corporations and major companies in Louisiana, so my schedule pales in comparison,” Sanchez says. This opportunity has not only helped Clare to be able to network professionally but also on a peer-level. She has had the opportunity to talk to students at the smaller schools, such as LSU-Eunice and creates a lot of amazing things across the state. One event that Clare will be able to participate in is a ribbon-cutting ceremony on Wednesday, August 26, 2015 at a brand new hospital in New Orleans.

This position on the Board of Supervisors will open many doors for Miss Sanchez but she hopes to utilize her strengths to open more doors for the underrepresented graduate programs. Sanchez shared that her strengths include being assertive and the courage to speak up. Intimidation often floods a room when you are the youngest person by a minimum of thirty years and only one of two females. The ability to be assertive and not fear your own voice filling the room is a huge asset and a quality that the law school is lucky to have in our representative. Clare Sanchez’s leadership abilities are not new to the LSU Law community. As a 3L, she was section representative and has continued to flourish throughout her time here.

Even while juggling a 3L schedule and being our SBA Executive President, it seems that it would be nearly impossible to add another responsibility into the mix. However, Sanchez is juggling her responsibilities gracefully one day at a time. Although a logistical nightmare, it is one that she is not only glad to have but one that she is very grateful for.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE...
“I’m really excited to be involved in this capacity and I think our SBA executive board is really strong this year so I have no concerns about SBA. I know that Adam Boyer is going to be fantastic when I have to do one or the other. “I know I have plenty of support and plenty of backup,” Sanchez said.

Although the support from SBA, family, and friends will pose as an asset to Sanchez, support in the form of feedback from the student body would help her to continue to move us forward and allow her to advocate for the law students more efficiently. “If you have an opinion about something. If you have a view on changes structurally or you have views on things like fees…I think making sure you’ve told a member of SBA or how you feel about changes is the most important thing because it’s impossible for me to represent student views if I don’t know what the views are,” Sanchez stated.

3Ls Complete Trial Ad Program

On August 10-12, prior to the start of classes, 179 3L students participated in the National Institute for Trial Advocacy and Persuasion Training Program sponsored by Vinson and Elkins. Dominic Gianna and Lisa Marcy, the program’s directors, emphasize a “learn by doing” approach which calls for students to develop their oral advocacy skills by performing various phases of a typical trial in front of judges and attorneys from across the country.

During the program, the 3L students were divided into groups of approximately 20 students and 5 practicing attorneys who served as the group’s faculty members. Each day of the program was devoted to certain trial or pre-trial phases. The faculty of judges and attorneys began by demonstrating each phase and providing some preemptive advice while the students observed. The students then performed each phase on their own in front of a video camera and received feedback from the faculty both immediately after performing each phase and during one-on-one video review sessions.

On the first day, students practiced examining witnesses through direct and cross examination in addition to laying a foundation while questioning witnesses and discussing when and how to raise objections at trial. On the second day, students focused on impeachment and redirect examination along with motion practice and jury selection. On the final day, students concluded the program by performing opening and closing statements and mock depositions.

In addition to practicing trial advocacy skills, students could attend optional seminars conducted by faculty members. These seminars included the art of persuasion, how to deliver opening statements, workplace confidence for women, and how to effectively handle finances after law school. The program also provided a networking opportunity for students through the faculty-student reception on Tuesday evening in the Student Lounge.

Although attendance was mandatory, the program is a graduation requirement for LSU law students, the program provided many benefits for aspiring trial attorneys. As noted by LaToya Jordan, an associate at Long Law Firm in Baton Rouge who served as one of the program’s faculty members, aspiring transactional attorneys can benefit from the program as well.

“The program provides future attorneys with the tools to develop a winning case theory and the skills to effectively persuade any listener, whether they aspire to be a trial lawyer or a transactional attorney who will never set foot into a courtroom,” says Jordan.

In addition to 3L students and faculty participants, 2L students were also allowed...
Many 3L students shared these same concerns and added that they were less than thrilled with having to essentially start school a week early. Despite this inconvenience, Albert Adams, a member of the Trial Advocacy Board who is already well-versed in trial advocacy, found that all in all the program was effective.

“Although we did have to come to school a week early, the program did provide us with the opportunity to really take our trial advocacy skills to the next level. It basically allowed us to take advantage of opportunities that would have otherwise been unavailable,” said Adams.

Despite mixed reviews, the faculty was quick to note that many of the students made significant strides by the conclusion of the program. A consensus among the attorneys was that the students improved their public speaking skills and grew more confident as they spoke in front of the attorneys and their classmates.

Although Gianna and Marcy are constantly searching for ways to improve, overall, their “learn by doing” approach appears to have been effective. Regardless of their views on the NITA program, the 3L students are now one step closer to graduation. As for the 2L students, hopefully this article will be a preparation tool for next year. 1L students may not have participated in Trial Advocacy or Moot Court Competitions, Kennedy also notes, “The program was an opportunity to practice skills which many have probably not done since 1L year legal writing.”

The program also provided benefits outside the courtroom context. Based on his observations, Kennedy believes that the program allowed the students to not only develop a courtroom presence but also to improve their public speaking skills in general. “It allowed [the 3L students] to get up in front of legal professionals and their peers and talk and gain confidence,” says Kennedy.

Kennedy adds that the opportunity to see oneself on video “made it possible to point out everyone’s ticks and nervous habits that we may not know we have.”

Although the program’s benefits seemed obvious to both the faculty members and student volunteers, for the 3L students participating, the feedback was mixed. Alex Vozzella prefers transactional work over litigation. She recognized that the program has the potential to be helpful for those who have no desire to be trial lawyers. However, she considered the constant critiques counterproductive at times.

“The problem is that when you have a bunch of different people critiquing you, and they aren’t all doing it in the same room, many times you’ll get conflicting advice,” says Vozzella.
Had you been scrolling through your Facebook newsfeed on June 26, 2015, you might have seen a rather colorful display of newly updated rainbow-filtered profile pictures. On the day the Supreme Court handed down their decision in Obergefell v. Hodges, there was a raucous and emotional response on the Internet, on the steps of the Supreme Court building, and even on the exterior of the White House. There is no dispute that the decision in Obergefell created a tidal wave of change that is still crashing down on the social and political foundation of our country. For some, it marked the end of a decades-long battle for what they viewed as (and what SCOTUS has now declared) a “fundamental right” – marriage for same gender couples. For others, it rattled their view and definition of an ancient institution – marriage between a man and a woman.

It is somewhat moot to discuss the hesitancy many felt and still feel regarding the decision in favor of same gender couples. The highest court in the land has spoken and the issue of marriage as a fundamental right has been (somewhat) laid to rest. However, it is helpful to attempt to understand the social and political backlash that always accompanies major social change by delving into the arguments against the Supreme Court’s ruling, outlined in a dissenting opinion by Chief Justice John Roberts. And perhaps more importantly, many feel that this decision has unearthed a bevy of new questions that still beg to be answered.

Chief Justice Roberts’ dissent attacked the majority’s opinion on several fronts: the historical definition of marriage, the Supreme Court’s role in deciding what is and what is not an unenumerated “fundamental right,” and the role of public opinion and the judiciary in interpreting the Constitution. Roberts spoke of the historical inception of marriage and its purpose – as a union created to produce and raise children. His opinion articulated marriage as inseparable from the need for procreation and, as such, the “man/woman element” of marriage is essential. In addition to Roberts’ view that the purpose of marriage is to produce children, he also questioned the majority’s view that marriage was a “fundamental right” simply because it is beneficial to the interested parties and to society. Chief Justice Roberts declared, “If I were a legislator, I would certainly consider that view as a matter of social policy. But as a judge, I find the majority’s position indefensible as a matter of constitutional law… Allowing unelected federal judges to select which unenumerated rights rank as ‘fundamental’—and to strike down state laws on the basis of that determination—raises obvious concerns about the judicial role.” (Obergefell, p. 11.)

Roberts’ dissent raises many questions regarding the majority’s reasoning regarding “fundamental rights.” Are all things that are good for the people involved and good for society fundamental rights? Or is marriage a fundamental right because that was simply the most convenient explanation for the majority under mounting social pressure to legalize same sex marriage? Are fundamental rights like pornography – you’ll know it when you see it? He questioned the convenience of the majority’s opinion under social pressure, stating that the two-person component in a marriage is as essential as the male/female component. Roberts posed the question: why preserve the two-person element but change other components of the traditional definition of marriage? Roberts stated to all attorneys arguing on behalf of same gender marriage, “You’re not seeking to join that institution, you’re seeking to change what the institution is.”

While some of Roberts’ language is mildly incendiary, his concerns are not irrelevant. Roberts may consider multi-person marriages wildly unconventional, but could, or rather should, the definition of marriage one day expand to include more than two people? In many cultures, the concept of a multi-spouse marriage has historical roots. At various times in the Mormon faith and other Middle Eastern cultures,
polygamy was commonplace. The idea of legal three-or-more-marriages seems perhaps insulting to some, but social change is moving at a rapid pace. Social norms are being inverted and public opinion sways now more than ever towards tolerance of all people. In light of an increasingly more tolerant general public, the question remains: Should the Supreme Court simply declare unenumerated “fundamental rights” based upon society’s ever-changing idea of what is considered socially tolerable? Roberts acknowledged the role of the legislature to adapt the law to conform to the ideals of the general public. He admonishes, however, the judiciary from acting in the same manner. By simply declaring the right to marry as fundamental, Roberts and other dissenters argue that the judiciary is exceeding its Constitutional authority by creating law. Textualists shiver at the thought of writing something into the Constitution that simply is not present. The majority has spoken and those who have spent decades yearning for this decision are free to marry whomever they choose. Our Facebook feeds peppered with tiny rainbow filters are evidence of the impact of this landmark decision. Still, the court system has only begun to tiptoe into the minefield of other questions that now also must be grappled with. There are questions of the judiciary’s role, questions regarding gay couples’ ability to adopt, issues of enforcement in states with contradicting laws and strong religious objections, questions regarding the role of religious liberty in denying married gay couples services – the list goes on. With the majority’s decision in Obergefell, it seems the proverbial “can of worms” has been opened yet again.

Obergefell, stated, “History goes nowhere. With that, Obergefell is just the beginning. Probably the most important thing that wasn’t mentioned in Obergefell is whether homosexuals are a protected class, one entitled to protection from the federal government regarding discrimination. The second most important is whether laws regarding same-sex couples are entitled to strict scrutiny under judicial review. As American society continues to move towards cultural inclusivity, sooner or later federal courts are going to run head first into both issues, setting the stage for what is probably going to be the next major legal battle regarding homosexuality in the United States.

While all of the dissents of Obergefell are noteworthy, Justice Alito’s dissent is probably the one that’s the most realized. While Chief Justice Roberts writes about a reality that has already occurred—the changing definition of marriage—and Justice Scalia’s is full of pithy wit, Justice Alito alone looks towards the most immediate legal ramification of Obergefell, namely the ensuing battle over First Amendment protections of “religious liberties.” The word “protection” is exactly what is going to be at stake, as the initial round of legislation will most likely involve individuals stating that being forced to perform certain actions are an infringement of their religious rights. On the other side will be homosexuals looking for the benefits strict scrutiny provides, mainly heightened federal review of state statutes regarding their treatment.

Given the steady trend of substantive due process, it seems likely that the protection the First Amendment provides religious individuals will be redefined legally as a shield or defined in a way that keeps others from acting in a way that conflicts with your beliefs. While any sword, defined as a legal stricture, a claim to protections and a received discipline the inquiry but do not set its outer boundaries. When new insight reveals discord between the Constitution’s central protections and a received legal structure, a claim to liberty must be addressed.” Regardless of how the battle unfolds, one look at the recent trend of the court shows us that the end result will be the classification of sexual identity as a protected class. Whether or not this is a legal positive or negative depends on your perception of American society. Regardless, the trend and language, exists throughout time. Starting with Griswold v. Connecticut, the court has, with minor setbacks, steadily moved in a direction that affords substantive due process rights where they deem necessary. This concept of an activist court concerns quite a few—Justice Scalia’s entire dissent is aflame with it—but the bottom line is that a Supreme Court that is willing to extend rights to individuals is in line with the idea of equality that is enumerated within the Constitution.

By developing and then
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applying substantive due process, the Supreme Court of the United States has taken a direct role in mitigating the circumstances of those it deems victims of unequal governmental treatment in our time. While concern rightly exists regarding who the Supreme Court designates as victims, and what other powers the Supreme Court bestows upon itself, there is no doubt that legislative gridlock can grind the mechanisms of our democracy to a halt, and that the Supreme Court has found a work around. “Words,” Justice Antonin Scalia once said, “Have meaning. And their meaning doesn’t change.” This is another, more abstract, ramification of Obergefell. Words have meaning, but the court has held that their meaning changes. When you say thanks to someone for holding an umbrella over your head as you walk to your car, it’s a very different thanks than you say to someone who hits you with their car. Obergefell principally exists because the Supreme Court recognized this distinction and decided to redefine the term marriage. Marriage used to be a legal contract or union that exists between a man and woman. Now, marriage means a legal contract or union that exists between two individuals.
Immigration has quickly become a trending topic in the past years, working its way into almost every presidential debate and discussion. Louisiana itself feels the effects of immigration into the United States, with almost 4% of the state’s population being foreign-born, according to a recent study by the Federation for American Immigration Reform. In an effort to better prepare its future lawyers for immigration issues across the country, Paul M. Hebert Law Center offers courses in Immigration Law, as well as offering clinical components to give students hands-on experience with cases concerning immigration reform.

The law center is excited to welcome Professor Lauren Aronson to its faculty, as the new director of the Immigration Law Clinic.

Aronson received her Bachelor of Arts degree in English and Psychology from Rice University, and later earned her Juris Doctor from the University of Virginia. While earning her law degree, Aronson was able to work with post-conviction relief in conjunction with the Virginia Innocence Project, a non-profit legal organization that uses more modern technologies such as DNA testing to exonerate individuals wrongly convicted of crimes. Upon graduation from law school, Aronson moved to New York to work in tax law.

Her job in New York provided her with the chance to move to Spain for almost a year, which was where her interest in immigration law was sparked. In the process of obtaining her travel visa, Aronson learned firsthand just how difficult it is to be in a foreign-speaking country and having to deal with the foreign government agencies. This experience put immigration into perspective for her. She could only imagine how much harder it must be to attempt to legally enter a country like the United States permanently, where the consequences of having your visa denied could be extremely detrimental.

Upon her return to the United States, Aronson actively began searching for job opportunities in immigration law. She received a fellowship in the Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinic at Harvard Law School and worked there as an Immigrant and Refugee advocate. Her role in this position was to support other supervising attorneys on cases that were happening out of sync with the semester, while also providing interpretation for Spanish-speaking clients. The cases Aronson worked on at Harvard were almost exclusively concerning gender-based asylum, meaning the client was an immigrant from another country and was afraid to return home due to gender-based persecution.

After working at Harvard for a year, Aronson moved to Chicago to work

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE...
of two PMH students (one male, one female), who will serve as the official Fashion Police models. Now, here comes the fun part! If you follow the simple fashion guidelines laid out for you, the Fashion Police wants to know about it. Snap a photograph of yourself wearing the monthly highlighted piece/trend and then email it to The Civilian or post it to our Facebook page. Every month, the Fashion Police will determine which PMH student “Wore It Best!” Not only will your fashionable photograph be printed in the following month’s issue of The Civilian, but you will also receive a $30 gift certificate to the Baton Rouge Mall of Louisiana! (And who doesn’t want free spending money at the mall??) To make things fair, only one entry per student per month will be allowed. To kick things off, the Fashion Police is curious to see who out there has started off the school year with their fashion game on-point. For this month only, the Fashion Police is giving you free fashion reign. Now is your time to shine! Submit your best back to school look to the Fashion Police on Facebook or at www.sites.law.lsu.edu/civilian/. As the Fashion Police always likes to say, wear your clothes and don’t let them wear you! The one thing that never goes out of style is self-confidence. Good luck!

Lauren Aronson continued...

Center. While in Chicago, her work took place mostly in detention centers for unaccompanied immigrant children. Aronson would give the children presentations on their rights here in America and would try to determine if any of the children had eligibility for legal immigration relief. Those children that were eligible were then represented by Aronson and her colleagues in their claims for relief. Like her work at Harvard, many of the cases she worked on in Chicago dealt with asylum as well. Following her job in Chicago, Aronson received a teaching fellowship at Michigan State University School of Law, where she co-taught the Immigration Law Clinic and supervised the students in their casework. While at Michigan State, Aronson also had the opportunity to teach her own refugee and asylum seminar. After two years of working in Michigan, Aronson became employed at Paul M. Hebert Law Center as both director and professor of the Immigration Law Clinic. The Immigration Law Clinic here at LSU operates as a small legal aid clinic, in the sense that the school directly offers legal services to indigent people, specifically non-native-born individuals. The students who participate in this clinic are able to do actual casework, make arguments in immigration court, and represent their clients before several governmental agencies, all while directly interacting with these clients. The Immigration Law Clinic is available to all second and third year students, with no prerequisites. In the past years, the Immigration Law Clinic at LSU has worked frequently with detained immigrant individuals. One of Aronson’s objectives for this year is to see the clinic evolve and more directly address the immediate needs of the Baton Rouge community and its members, rather than being so heavily focused on those detained individuals who are more distant from the community. One of Aronson’s goals in her position as director is to see the clinic become a resource for the Baton Rouge community as a whole and develop a strong positive reputation within that community, while also giving students the opportunity to work within detention centers and counsel the detainees on their legal rights. The needs of any community are constantly changing, so Aronson wants to create a work environment that can adapt to those changing needs and be flexible in what the clinic is able to offer clients. In discussing her educational career in immigration law, Aronson stated that it is extremely rewarding being able to make a difference, but also getting to do so in the context of hopefully training other lawyers to do the same. She stated, “it is the pinnacle of the ‘pay it forward’ idea – you are doing meaningful work and changing lives while also making it possible for others to continue that work into the future.”

Flawless Fashion continued...
The October 2014 United States Supreme Court term produced some sixty-six decisions, a number of which will fundamentally alter the United States’ legal landscape for decades to come. It is no exaggeration to point out that significant shifts in the Court’s legal thinking, long sensed by court watchers, were made quite explicit this term. Certainly those shifts were displayed by the two headline cases, King v. Burwell and Obergefell v. Hodges. Volumes can and, likely, will be written about those marquee cases, but more instructive are cases such as Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. The Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. and Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency. What makes these cases so interesting is their huge impact on administrative law, legislative intent, and evidentiary standards of legal interpretation.

Stepping away from the above named cases, it is entirely appropriate to begin with a discussion of a local case that may have far-reaching consequences in criminal law. Brumfield v. Cain witnessed not so much a shift in the evidentiary standards for mental competence evaluations, but rather a solidification of those standards. Kevan Brumfield was convicted of murder in Louisiana, and his post-conviction appeal, while failing in state court, was upheld by Judge James Brady via a federal habeas petition. Although the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed Judge Brady’s holding that Brumfield was sufficiently mentally incompetent that his Eighth Amendment rights would be violated by sentencing him to death, the Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeals’ holding and agreed with Judge Brady, vacating Brumfield’s sentence and remanding his case back to the district court level. Writing for the majority, Justice Sonia Sotomayor broadened the standard for federal review of habeas petitions. Specifically, Sotomayor ruled that federal habeas review, while necessarily showing some deference to state post-conviction hearings, should not be bound by the results of said hearings, especially if reasonable minds might disagree about the interpretation of factual claims or if those factual claims raise questions of reasonable doubt. Second, that the grounds for habeas petitions to federal courts are rather broader than previously thought; this necessarily a result of her first ruling. Last, Justice Sotomayor affirmed that the Atkins v. Virginia defense, and, at the Louisiana state level, the State of Louisiana v. Williams defense, lightens the burden on a defendant seeking to challenge his sentence on mental capacity grounds. Sotomayor was particularly firm in noting that the defendant need not actually prove mental disability (or even show that such evidence would likely be forthcoming) to succeed in obtaining an evidentiary hearing to determine mental capacity. It would appear that...
the new, or at least newly affirmed, standard for mental competency hearings is that the defendant need only show reasonable doubt regarding their mental capacity to earn a post-conviction evidentiary hearing.

Returning now to the administrative law cases noted above, the Texas Housing case presents an interesting case for clarifying the evidentiary standard for proving discriminatory housing practices. The thrust of the Inclusive Community Project’s complaint concerned structural and/or institutional racism expressed by the Texas Housing Authority via its allocation of low income housing credits. Key to the Supreme Court’s holding, authored by Justice Anthony Kennedy, is the fact that plaintiffs need not prove intentional discrimination to successfully prosecute suits in Title VIII (Fair Housing Act) cases. Justice Kennedy spoke very clearly on this point, noting that disparate impact is not the same as disparate treatment, in which a higher evidentiary burden must be reached. Disparate treatment is demonstrating that the defendant had the intent or motive to treat the plaintiff in a discriminatory fashion. Disparate impact, rather, is now keyed to the result of policy decisions on minorities, regardless of intent. This places a powerful weapon in the hands of civil rights lawyers, who in order to establish disparate impact claims need only show that there is an adverse impact on minority clients, that this impact was the direct result of the defendant’s policies, and that there is an available alternative policy. Problematically, however, stripping intent away from the process of showing discrimination may potentially create situations where defendants are successfully sued who neither intended to discriminate nor were even aware that their decision would result in adverse effects on minorities. In criminal law terms, there is no mens rea requirement, which critics might charge creates a situation in which a person unknowingly and, indeed, unwillingly violates the Civil Rights Act. More cases will likely be needed to further clarify this issue.

Finally, in Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency, the Supreme Court fundamentally altered its approach to administrative agencies and their regulatory authority. State and regulatory groups, objecting to the EPA’s interpretation of clean air standards for power plants, filed suit challenging the EPA’s method of determining those regulations. Specifically, the plaintiffs objected to the EPA’s devising of regulatory guidelines without consideration of their costs. The EPA pointed to certain provisions of the Clean Air Act that explicitly mention that cost must be taken into account when devising regulatory guidelines, and to certain provisions that explicitly deny the use of cost as a relevant factor when developing environmental standards; in this case, cost is not mentioned one way or the other. The EPA’s argument also noted that cost might be a factor that would be considered at a later point in the regulatory development process. The majority did not accept the EPA’s arguments, as Justice Antonin Scalia noted in the Court’s opinion. For Scalia, the key points of the law under consideration were, first, the fact that the Clean Air Act contains a separate set of guidelines for power plants, that in the majority’s opinion, exclude power plants from the main portion of the Act’s explicit instruction not to take cost into account when deciding whether to regulate or not. Second, that the prior case law on this subject, Chevron USA v. Natural Resources Defense Council was overbroad in showing deference to administrative agencies. Indeed, the most far-reaching aspect of Michigan v. EPA may be that Chevron deference, the doctrine that in the absence of clearly expressed legislative intent, the interpretation of statute suggested by a regulatory agency should be shown considerable deference by courts, will no longer be shown to administrative agencies. In other words, activist courts may choose to more openly question statutory interpretations made by government agencies, or, at the minimum, make the process that an agency uses to interpret statutes more transparent in that they will have to explicitly state and defend their reasoning.
Statistical data provided by SCOTUSBLOG on key decision-making trends remains one of the most interesting aspects about the 2014 term. While previously it has been the received wisdom that the Supreme Court is composed of a liberal wing of four justices and a conservative wing of four justices with the ever-unpredictable Justice Kennedy as the swing vote, it now seems that this is no longer the case, if it ever was. A cursory examination of the sixty-six decisions handed down by the court shows the conservative justices in agreement or concurrence with each other seventy to eighty percent of the time, while the liberal justices were in agreement or concurrence with each other over ninety percent of the time. Justice Kennedy was in agreement or concurrence with conservatives sixty to seventy percent of the time, while being in agreement or concurrence with the liberal wing over eighty percent of the time; of note here is that Kennedy’s vote with the liberal wing tends more often than not to be with the young liberals Justices Kagan and Sotomayor, not the established liberals of the 1990’s, Justices Breyer and Ginsburg. This shows a clear shift toward the more liberal wing of the court for Justice Kennedy, although curiously, his legal reasoning may have more in common with newer legal philosophies embraced by younger justices (this is true in his agreements with the conservatives, as well, given that he agreed with Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito more often than with Justices Scalia and Thomas). What court-watchers will make of these interesting statistics is difficult to know, but it would seem that there is at least some indication that the Court is now liberal-leaning after years of conservative dominance.
WHERE IN THE WORLD ARE THE PMH-ERS?

The halls of PMH are rife with bright, accomplished law students. The fervor to succeed is palpable as students work tirelessly to earn a meaningful role in the legal community. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that in a law school stacked with such a wide array of academic talent, PMHers enjoy a host of coveted summer job opportunities. While the typical summer job usually involves a Big Firm associate position or judicial clerkship, several students pursuing niche legal fields have recently experienced unique opportunities that tilt the perspective of a customary career path. George Bonvillian is one such law student.

George Bonvillian, a third year law student, was offered a summer position at Sportstars NFL Player Agency in New York City. Sportstars consists of a group of eight NFL agents that collectively represent 150 active NFL clients. Furthermore, Sportstars boasts a track record of success in the NFL, recently dominating the 2014 NFL Draft with 25 clients drafted, 9 of which were picked within the top 100. In fact, Forbes concluded that approximately 10% of the players selected in the 2014 NFL draft were clients of Sportstars.

While George was able to flex his analytic skills, his assignments deviated from the standard memorandum or research project. “The projects I was assigned at Sportstars varied every day. I could be drafting a contract for a client’s trading card or memorabilia deal, revising an appearance agreement, or looking into new opportunities for our athletes. Some of the projects I enjoyed most were ones that involved structuring marketing deals for clients. I enjoyed negotiating with companies to get our guys the best deal possible.”

In highly specialized areas of the law, it is common to find practitioners with an underlying passion for the subject matter. This notion rings true for George, who fostered an interest in sports from a young age. His love for Louisiana’s home team runs deep as he claims he has “celebrated and suffered with the Saints since 1991.”

When George reached adolescence, he began to envision a professional life that allowed him to channel his captivation with athletics. “As I got into high school, I realized working in sports could be an actual career path. My original plan was sports journalism, but after switching majors from Journalism to Sport Administration my freshman year at LSU, I began to explore other opportunities.

After looking into fields like marketing and sales, I decided the right step was getting my law degree and working with sports teams and athletes.” The ability to link a personal passion with a legal profession is a goal many law students struggle to achieve. The immense workload and subsequent exhaustion that accompanies professional school seems worthwhile if this exertion leads to an engaging career prospect. Fortunately for George, this box is already checked. When asked what advice he would give those interested in pursuing this nuanced, often competitive field of law, he cited his mentor at Sportstars. “His most valuable piece of advice was to figure out your own personal style and stick to it – whether it was recruiting athletes or working on a marketing deal. Don’t try to be like someone else you saw in a movie or read about in a magazine.”

Drawing from his recent experience, George advises students considering sports law to keep an open mind when it comes to job possibilities. “There are so many niche areas in the sports world and you never know what’s going to turn into the perfect thing for you.” Although he has narrowed his preferred field of law, his future plans remain open ended. “While I’m not 100 percent sure it will be in agency, I definitely plan to continue on this career path. Other options include working at the NBA or NFL offices in New York.” Could he be the millennial Jerry Maguire, you ask? “It’s hard not to be inspired by pre-crazy Tom Cruise,” George asserts. Wherever he may land, the future looks promising for this PMHer.
Welcome back friends! I hope y'all had a fun and eventful summer. As usual, I will keep your social calendars buzzing this semester. There are a ton of Fall festivities planned in the Red Stick, and whether you're a foodie, hipster, beer connoisseur, tailgate enthusiast, or work-out junkie, I have something for you. I hope you take a break from the books and check out what's happening in the Red Stick!

The Baton Rouge Movie Tavern opened on August 18th. The new theater is located at 2610 Citiplace Drive. Go enjoy a movie in one of their comfy recliners and press a button for cocktails, appetizers, and entrees. There is a “Breakfast-and-Flick” feature on Saturdays and Sundays at 9:00am. They also offer discounts to college students, aka law students!

On August 28, 2015 from 7:00-10:00 pm is Fête Rouge: Baton Rouge’s Premier Wine and Food Festival at L’Auberge Casino. You’ll get the chance to taste food in a competition between local chefs, to sample over 200 different wines, or to participate in a silent auction. Tickets can be purchased at www.FeteRougeBR.com

Ladies!!! Fall Fashion Fest is August 29th from 3:00-7:00pm at the Tin Roof Brewery. Over twenty local boutiques and designers will have purple and gold attire to get you game day ready! There will be live music, beer, and food as well.

On August 31, enjoy Red Bean Monday at the Roux House. Every Monday night there will be jazz music for your listening pleasure accompanying the red beans and rice prepared by a local chef.

September 11th is Live After Five featuring Big Sam’s Funky Nation. Every Friday night in downtown BR at North Boulevard Town Square, there will be live music from 5:00-8:00pm. Food trucks surround the square and you can purchase beer and mixed drinks. At least the music is free!

Another cool & FREE event in the North Boulevard Town Square is Renegade Roux Camp every Thursday night from 6:00-7:00pm. Certified personal trainers lead this boot camp fitness class for beginners and fitness junkies alike. Just show up with a water bottle and enjoy the class. No equipment is needed. Try it out before it ends! The last class will be held on September 17th.

On September 12th at 8am in BREC Forest Community Park, there will be the Walk to End Alzheimer’s. Bring your furry friends out to this free event for a good cause and enjoy live music by DJ Deaf and LSU Elvis.

On September 25th, the Chris Leblanc Band will be playing at Superior Grill at 6:30 pm.

Let’s not forget Happy’s 5k every Tuesday night! Run one of several different routes throughout the downtown area every Tuesday at 6:15 pm. The start and end of your run is at Happy’s Irish Pub, and your reward for running or walking the full 3 miles is half-priced beer and live music in Happyland.

If Happy’s 5k is not enough for you fitness enthusiasts, Warrior Dash is on October 3rd at 9:00 am at West Feliciana Parish Sports Park in St. Francisville. This intense 5k is filled with muddy and fun obstacles and ends with a turkey leg, beer, and warrior gear!

Get your tickets early for the Eli Young Band at the Varsity on Friday, October 2nd at 8:00 pm. Tickets are $35 and can be purchased online.

I’ve already got my tickets for Brew-at-the-Zoo on October 2nd from 6:00pm-10:00pm at the Baton Rouge Zoo. It’s a little pricey at $40, but you will have access to beer tasting, food, live music, and good company. If you get there early enough, you can go through the zoo! This is guaranteed to be a super fun event!
It was a Wednesday morning in late September, and I was perched on the far right corner of the last row of the classroom. It was a location so remote that the roll sheet never even made it up that far. I thought that I was hidden from the world, that I was going to make it through this battle without a scratch. In fact by 8:30 a.m., I had already made it halfway though the Socratic shelling that had pulverized the left column of the classroom. You never forget the look of pure exhaustion and self-disdain on a student’s face after the debris and smoke settle from the quizzical bombardment.

I had been up late the previous night reading, reviewing, and revising every writ, remedy, and right that I managed to wrangle down with the rational side of my brain. Caffeine had no affect anymore, at least not a positive one. I was still trying to decipher the native tongue to make sense of all this tortious, jurisdictional, litigious, solitary, felonious, “offer and acceptance” drivel. I had clawed my way through footnotes, endnotes, sidenotes, sticky notes, and my own notes just to notice that I was as unhinged, unsettled, and unbalanced as I was after my first rotation on the case material.

As I tried to trail behind the “therefores” and “wheretofores” that the professor left thrown beneath him at the podium’s feet, my mind had gone askew. I couldn’t keep myself from playing out the day’s list of tasks: grocery shopping, reading for contracts, washing clothes, researching memo, washing dishes, reading for traditions, walking the dog, eat food, read assignment, do laundry, outline memo, wash dishes, read, eat, read, laundry, read, outline, read, READ, READ.

“Mr. Murphy.”

It was truly unsettling how softly that sound came sailing over the waves of quick gasps and short breaths that fluttered through the classroom. I had endured the hurling of my full birth-name in that direct, rapid, staccato articulation fueled by pure parental exasperation countless times, but those experiences never prepared me for the still, clam, asphyxiating tone and timbre of my first cold call.

As I looked up, the air left the room and took with it all sound and vibration. I was stuck in time with a lack of breath as the professor came around from behind his podium with his hands pulled behind his back all the while staring at the ground with his sadistic glare. He looked up at me and started to speak, but I couldn’t make out the words. Suddenly, they began to hit me in rapid succession - “You are representing the . . .” I was just able to catch my breath when the last word barreled into my chest… “defendant.” It knocked me back into my seat, back into the realization that despite all that I was terrified. I went through a disheveled review of everything I could remember from the semester as the professor paced in a circle and detailed an outlandish hypothetical situation. I ducked behind my casebook hoping to gain cover from the brunt of the attack, but it was to no avail. The professor had locked on his target, and it was now my turn to stand in judgment of my academic worth. My entire sense of being was suspended above me fatally vulnerable to the accuracy and quality of my response. The weight of everything that I had done and everything that I would ever do was pushing down on my shoulders.

Once he finished speaking, the professor offered me a welcoming smirk. Although still in shock, I opened my chest and began to speak. Each word, phrase, and sentence stumbled down the stadium seating carrying with it the weight and fear of disappointment and failure. Once I regained control of myself, I paused for silence and took survey of the damage that I had undoubtedly caused. A few of my classmates looked back at me with a mix of empathy and disbelief. The professor’s smirk melted away as I spoke, and he now stood tall with his left brow raised and his right thumb propping up his weary, bearded chin. He took one calculated step back onto his right heal and pivoted to the center of the room to launch an appeal for another student’s opinion.

To this day I cannot recall the verbiage that shielded me through that endeavor. I will never know if what I said was even close to a correct answer. Thinking back on this experience time and time again, I have come to realize that the answer was never the goal of the exercise, but merely the means to a greater end. Thankfully, my first cold call has not had the negative influence on my future that I feared. Instead, it planted in me a seed of fortitude. From that point on, I’ve continued to foster and grow from that seed the roots of academic and personal strength that I will use to withstand any storm that I face in my career. For that, I am eternally grateful.
Q: Dear Dr. Love, I can’t stop thinking about my Constitutional Law professor Nichael Doenen*. Help! –Hopelessly in Loving v. Virginia

A: Fear not, Hopelessly in Loving. Consistent with the holding in Clinton v. Jones, I too am offered no immunity to Prof. Doenen’s charms. Is it the excited gleam in his eyes when he discusses Marbury v. Madison? Maybe it’s his ability to make such topics as the Commerce Clause seem wild and thrilling? Either way, the Yale grad and “Scandal” aficionado has captured the hearts of many a PMH student.

My advice? Invest in a graphic t-shirt with the entirety of the Constitution emblazoned across it and cleverly position yourself at the front of the class. Memorize the entirety of the document so that at the drop of a hat you can launch into full Federalist mode and recite large paragraphs that are vaguely applicable to the conversation at hand. Study such topics as the winning contestants on “The Bachelor” and familiarize yourself with the Olivia Pope-President Grant-Jake Ballard love triangle on the off chance that an opportunity arises to discuss. Refer to Supreme Court Justices by their first names, i.e. “Wasn’t the Hammer v. Dagenhart opinion classic William?” If all else fails, flex your legal research muscles—see if there’s any existing case law to support the contention that his rejection of your dinner invitations is a deprivation of your life and/or liberty. Let the law be your wingman, and drag him into court so he’s forced to spend time with you only a table away.

In the words of the revered Benjamin Franklin, “The Constitution only gives people the right to pursue happiness, you have to catch it yourself!” Best of luck in your endeavors, and should all of the above suggestions prove fruitless, you may sleep easy in the knowledge that Professor Nichael Doenen’s first and only love is the Constitution.

*Out of respect for anonymity, names have been changed.

Q: Dr. Love, what’s the best way to hit on a classmate at a GIF?

A: Don’t.

Nothing is less appealing than a colleague who’s loaded up on one too many drink specials and trying to hit on you. Before you attempt this ungainly mating call, take a minute to understand the simple fact that PMH is relatively small. In all likelihood, you will see this person multiple times a week, even per day. There’s a reason that we’re required to take a course on professionalism—the legal community is close-knit, and any time you’ve made a fool of yourself will most likely haunt you and spoil future prospects. Instead of going after a classmate mid-GIF in full-view of your colleagues and soon-to-be-closest friends, try stopping him/her after class and extend an offer to grab more personal drinks at the Chimes.

Q: Dr. Love, I’m in a long-distance relationship, and I think the strain of law school is getting to be too much. What should I do to make it easier on my significant other? -1LDR

A: 1LDR, first of all let me say—yikes. Your first year of law school is a terrifying series of dramatic transitions, and this’ll wreak havoc on any relationship, especially one that’s predominately experienced via Skype. That being said, it’s totally doable with the right combination of patience and dedication.

I cannot emphasize enough that communication is the most important part of an LDR, and I don’t mean just texting between class and calling them once a week. Schedule Skype time like you would schedule time to do your reading for class, and STICK TO THAT SCHEDULE. Make talking to them as important as any of the other items in your daily agenda.

Secondly, leave law school at law school. They probably care about the finer points of Lucy v. Zehmer like they care about getting a root canal. Sure, tell them about your day and which professors picked on you, but avoid trying to explain why your corny law pun is hilarious because of this one thing that Ruth Bader Ginsburg said this one time on this one case. Exam season will turn you into a moody, oversensitive rage monster. I am firmly of the belief that if a couple can make it through the fall semester of 1L exams, they can make it through anything.

Finally, visit when you can! Pick a weekend where reading is light (Fall Break is October 8-9) and either fly or drive to see your significant other. Turn off the cell phones and go on a long, romantic walk on the beach—or whatever it is your crazy kids do. In a nutshell, make time for each other when you can, and don’t let law school stress get the better of your relationship.
Mills’ Beginners is an appropriate first movie review for several reasons: we’re beginning a new year at PMH, we’re all learning new things, and, hello, Ewan McGregor. Mills manages to capture all that is beautiful in life, the good and the bad, and he successfully maintains a consistent whimsical vibe throughout the film, beginning to end. In the opening scenes, we meet Oliver, played by none other than my lover-to-be, Ewan McGregor. Through Oliver’s quirky, Wes Anderson-esque flashbacks, we learn about Oliver’s childhood, his present, and how they both affect his future. Hal, played by the great Christopher Plummer, is Oliver’s deceased father. As an audience, we peer into Oliver’s life, often in shambles at times, effervescently joyful at others. We watch as Oliver and Arthur, Hal’s adorable dog, bond over their grief and attempt to understand where their lives will lead them to next. The scenes between father and son are simultaneously profound and awkward. The tongue-tied moments between them, mostly on Oliver’s part, are due to Hal’s recent coming-out. Oliver’s confusion is evident, but his acceptance and eventual understanding of his father is truly beautiful to watch unfold.

This isn’t just a story about grief; this is also a story about love. Oliver meets Anna, an elusive and sophisticated French actress, played by the charming Mélanie Laurent. Anna, too, is damaged by her past. They are both broken souls. We slowly try to put the pieces of their lives back together side-by-side with Oliver, Arthur, and Anna: the sadness, the affection, the friendship, and the memories. Life and death, love and grief go hand-in-hand in this film, as they do in our own realities. The beauty of this film is found in the deepness of loss, the unfathomable bliss of love, and the never-ending lessons we learn from our past.

This next year will be a fascinating one: the 1L’s will learn what law school is all about, the grief, the joy, the every day battle of cold calls and stress; the 2L’s will be thankful they’re not 1L’s anymore, but they will be caught in the middle, a transition period still troubled with the occasional breakdown and endless preparation for trial ad and such; the 3L’s will still have their moments of joy and sadness, based more now in nostalgia and apprehension, as we move on to the next step in our lives, leaving behind a place where all our lives were changed for the better...whether we like it or not. We’re all beginners, no matter what the “L” you are, but don’t fret. Sometimes starting over, starting at the beginning is the best place to be.

**Intoxicating to Watch?**

**Tissue Factor:**

**Where to Watch:**
Featured on Netflix

**What to Drink:**
Nik Weis Selection, UrbanRiesling

There is nothing that pairs better with tears and life lessons than a good Riesling, and this bottle does not disappoint. Upon opening, you should note the sheer bliss of peach, honeysuckle, and pure childlike joy. Urban doesn’t stop there; wet stone, green apple, lime, and grapefruit blend together in a satisfyingly sweet and crisp sip. Don’t fear the sweetness, Urban doesn’t go overboard here; it’s just right. This wine can be found at Bet-R and Trader Joe’s for $13.
There is nothing better than finding the perfect brunch spot with friends on a Sunday afternoon and enjoying a great lunch at one of the many hidden gems located here in Baton Rouge. If you don’t have the time (and let’s face it, you’re in law school so you definitely don’t) to try out all of the places on your “lunch-and-brunch” bucket list, don’t worry…we’re going to do all of the legwork for you.

Every month, Professor Brooks and I, along with a rotating “mystery diner” guest, will order three separate lunch/brunch dishes from restaurants that are not only reasonably affordable, but that are a bit off the beaten path. All restaurants will receive an overall rating between 1-5 gavels, with a 1 gavel rating being “poor” and a 5 gavels rating being “excellent.”

This month, we decided to have brunch at one of the two City Pork locations. (2363 Hollydale Ave. 225-300-4550)

If you have a lunch or brunch location you would like to see reviewed, please feel free to e-mail your suggestions to jeffbrooks@lsu.edu or avalur1@lsu.edu.

**Review from Professor Jeff Brooks**

City Pork offers an impressive array of tasty brunch-y food choices, largely centered around their wonderful smoked and cured meats. My bacon waffle ($10) was light and fluffy, and the hint of smoke from the miniscule bacon bits scattered throughout the batter was pleasantly subtle. The side of bacon (yes, bacon waffle with bacon) was superb; City Pork’s bacon is probably the best in the city. The drinks were similarly extremely well-made. My Vietnamese iced coffee ($4) was creamy deliciousness, but they didn’t overdo it on the sweetened condensed milk, and my French 75 ($8) was a cool, crisp, and perfectly blended mix of gin, champagne, and lemon juice. My only gripe would be the lack of table service. If you’re looking for a chance to kick back, relax, and read the paper while you brunch, City Pork’s hopping service and small amount of table real estate might make that a challenge. Overall, it was an excellent way to kick off a lazy Sunday.

Verdict: 4.5 gavels!

**Review from our monthly “Mystery Diner”**

Brunch is by far my favorite meal of the week, and I was excited to give City Pork a try. From the minute I walked into the door, the smell of freshly cooked bacon began to call my name. The venue itself was a tad on the small side, with only ten four-tops available for diners. The line to order our food moved quickly, but it extended past the front door at 11:00am. Brunch hours on Sunday are 9am-3pm, so my suggestion is to get there as early as possible in order to secure a table. Reservations are not accepted, so tables fill up quickly. Although I found the menu to be a bit limited with only five main entrées, it certainly did not disappoint. I decided on the Eurobreakfast, ($14) which is one of the two Breakfast Boards City Pork offers. The Eurobreakfast Board consisted of Provolone, Cheddar, and Gruyere cheeses, a healthy dose of Prosciutto, fig preserves, fresh fruit, a smoked hard-boiled egg, and multigrain bread. It was more than enough to share and the butcher block presentation was very appetizing. All three of us tasted everything that was included, reaching the consensus that the smoked hard-boiled egg was our least favorite item, (Too much smoke flavor was present.)

Like Professor Brooks, I chose a Vietnamese Iced Coffee to drink. I found it to be the perfect beverage to accompany my meal. It was not made too heavily with condensed milk and they allowed the dark roast coffee to take center stage. Angelina was gracious enough to share the generous portion of thick cut bacon that came with her entrée and I must admit, it was perfect. It was cooked crisp all the way through with just the right amount of chew. Overall, I would describe City Pork to be a “come as you are” type of brunch spot. The vibe was relaxed, the meal was satisfying, and the bacon was truly the shining star of the show. The slow table service left something to be desired, but I still can’t wait to come back!

Verdict: 4.5 gavels!

---

**DATES TO REMEMBER:**

- Labor Day Holiday: September 7th
- Reading Days: October 8-9th
Review from Angelina Valuri

City Pork “brought home the bacon” this year and was selected as 225 magazine’s Best New Restaurant of 2015. It definitely lived up to its title because my brunch experience there was nothing short of amazing. City Pork is owned and operated by two LSU alumni, and all of their local meats are smoked, slow-roasted, or braised on a daily basis. I’m convinced the main goal of this restaurant is to have all of their patrons fall in love with (get addicted to) the delicious variety of pork that they offer.

We arrived for brunch at 11am and to our surprise, found a crowd of people already extending past the doorway. Our orders were taken quickly and the line moved with a steady rhythm. The Brunch Gods must have been smiling upon us because we were lucky enough to secure a table right by the front window, which was perfect for people watching. As we waited for our food to arrive, I observed a toddler in a highchair double fisting two strips of bacon. As she chowed down, she gleefully shouted, Yuuuuuummmm! Clearly a good sign.

Being the classic girl I am, (cough, cough) I settled on the tried-and-true brunch beverage standard, a mimosa. ($5) Nothing too special to report, but how can you go wrong with orange juice and champagne? Little did I know that my entrée choice, the Lil’ Pig, ($7) would be just the opposite. It was, in fact, quite special. I’m talking six, yes SIX, pieces of thick-cut bacon type of special. The Lil’ Pig turned out to be an “amped up” version of the perfect classic breakfast sandwich. A freshly baked brioche bun housed a fried egg, a slice of honey ham, cheddar cheese, and a mountain of thick, salty, meaty bacon. Although I didn’t initially want to share my sandwich with anyone, I decided to allow our mystery diner to share in my winnings of the bacon lottery. In my opinion, every breakfast sandwich I have ever eaten pales in comparison to the Lil’ Pig. It was just THAT GOOD. Trust me on this one, folks.

The Lil’ Pig was accompanied by a small bowl of smoked corn grits on the side. After all three of us at the table tried to enjoy said grits, we unanimously decided that it was similar to the hardboiled egg that came with the Eurobreakfast Board. The smoke flavor was simply too overwhelming.

City Pork provides a non-typical brunch in a non-typical location. What it lacks in seating and service, it makes up for in taste and food quality. After paying my bill, I felt like I had just walked out of an establishment where one goes to worship and appreciate locally-raised meat that is locally prepared by local folks. AMEN.

Verdict: 5 gavels!

---

Top 18 Advocates Selected as Members of the Wex Malone Inn of Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George Bonvillain</th>
<th>Clare Sanchez</th>
<th>Kristen Meeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabbi Alessi-Friedlander</td>
<td>Nashon Route</td>
<td>Contessa Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Amond</td>
<td>Brittanie Wagnon</td>
<td>Ross Sims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Smith</td>
<td>Sinnott Martin</td>
<td>Mallory Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Capello</td>
<td>Reyan Lubin</td>
<td>Angelina Valuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Somers</td>
<td>Mahogane Reed</td>
<td>Joy Reily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: Why LSU Law?
LS: I always wanted to go to law school but in all honesty, I never really had the guts to go for it. I had a year off a school this past year and after a year into my master’s degree decided that I know I would regret it if I didn’t do it. I just had a newfound energy for education so I studied for the LSAT and just hoped it would all work out.

Q: What are you looking forward to most as a law student?
LS: I’m looking forward to the community most. It really seems like everyone is eager to be here. Everyone is excited about learning and that motivates me to do better and be a part of the community and not just be another student going to class but be involved with the school and do as much as I can.

Q: How do you juggle extracurricular activities with school and/or work?
LS: I have to plan everything! I keep my planner with me at all times and write absolutely everything down otherwise I know I will miss something. I’m a bit of a neat freak because I think organization is key too! If you keep everything (room/car/school work) organized it's much easier to meet all of your responsibilities. This takes a little extra time but saves time in the long run.

Q: What’s the biggest challenge you face in your extracurricular activities?
LS: I want to do it all but I never seem to have enough time! I’ve had to learn that there just isn’t enough time to do everything so I dedicate quality effort into the things I’m really interested in.

Q: What was your favorite appearance as Miss Louisiana 2014?
LS: It’s hard to pick just one! I rappelled down a 20-story building, ran a half marathon through Disney World, and competed at Miss America. My favorite appearance would have to be taking a private tour through Angola State Penitentiary. I was so intrigued by the morality driven programs they provide inmates. I had the opportunity to talk with inmates and hear their stories of how the morality and faith-based programs have positively changed their lives. I’m an outdoorsman so I loved visiting the stables and quail farm there. I even got to run a bloodhound for a mile in a training exercise!

Q: Are you excited to no longer be Miss Louisiana or do you miss it?
LS: Yes and no. I’m excited to get back to being a student and interacting with people my own age. The majority of my job had me in elementary schools interacting with students or interacting with people significantly older than me so I’m excited to be interacting with people my own age again. I really think the year as Miss Louisiana taught me to take everything in stride and handle anything that comes. For example, I’d show up to 1,000 people in a room and have to give a talk on a certain topic and thought there were only going to be a few people there. You learn to just roll with it and I think that’s going to benefit me here at school.

Q: What’s your favorite place to eat?
LS: I’m really boring. Usually, I bring my lunch. I would have to say Louisiana Lagniappe. They have the absolute best seafood so anyone coming in from out of state definitely has to hit that up.

Q: What do you look for in a guy?
LS: I like a good conversationalist, someone who is physically active, and faith-based.

Q: Turn-offs?
LS: Someone who is lazy and not family-oriented.

Q: What are some of your weird quirks?
LS: I still have my Pokemon cards. I have three chickens in my backyard. Their names are Barbra Streisand, Celine Dion, and Whitney Houston. They’re my divas.

Q: What’s something you’ll never do you in your life?
LS: Skydive.
Q: What is an embarrassing tidbit about yourself?
LS: I wear my retainers on the reg. You might see me with them walking around school.
Q: What career path are you hoping to move forward in? What kind of attorney, etc.?
LS: I’m actually hoping to do something involving the media. You might not see me in a courtroom, but hopefully on a TV.
Q: What’s something you can’t live without?
LS: Coffee, Froyo, and steak. I have a general rule that I have to have steak at least once a week. It’s a personal life rule I’ve made for myself.
Q: What would you say your bedtime routine is?
LS: I require sleep. I go to bed fairly early.

I get everything ready the night before because I’ll get up at like 4:00 a.m. and study so I have to have everything ready for the next day. I’m a creature of habit. Basically, I’m a grandma.
Q: What’s your life’s motto?
LS: I don’t like when people tell me that I can’t do something. Being Miss Louisiana, being a pole vaulter, etc. all sort of came as a result of someone telling me no. No motivates me.
Q: What’s something in law school you’re hoping to do to be involved?
LS: I want to do the running club. I ran my first half-marathon last year through Disney World. I ran it through the Magic Kingdom and I want to keep my running up.
Q: What do you do outside of law school?
LS: I love to fish. I like to go fishing or hunting as much as I can. If anyone would like to take me fishing or hunting, I would accept their offer. I’m always looking for a hunting and fishing companion. My current hunting companion is a 74-year old heart transplant survivor that I met randomly through a mutual friend.

Elizabeth Wong
Staff Writer

LET’S GET SOCIAL
Follow The Civilian on Facebook and Twitter and check out our newly refreshed website at:
sites.law.lsu.edu/civilian/