REFLECTIONS FROM A PROFESSOR OF THEORY & PRACTICE: AN INTERVIEW WITH CATHERINE CARPENTER JANUARY 21, 2025

Danielle ("Danni") Kie Hart*

My name is Danielle ("Danni") Kie Hart, I am a professor at Southwestern Law School, and I have been a colleague of Professor Catherine Carpenter's since I started working at Southwestern on July 1, 1999. I am also the person who got to interview her for this contribution to the Southwestern Law Review's symposium issue on Professor Carpenter's life and work.

Professor Carpenter retired *from teaching* at the end of the 2023-2024 academic year, but she hasn't retired from practicing law. That said, Professor Carpenter's retirement from teaching marks the end of an era for Southwestern Law School. She has been a towering figure at Southwestern for decades and has left an indelible mark on the institution, her colleagues (both faculty & staff), and her students. Her impact has been constant, unflagging, and immeasurable.

The occasion of Catherine Carpenter's retirement from teaching has made me reflect on my relationship with her over the 26 years that we spent together at Southwestern and the friendship that I think has grown out of it. It should come as no surprise that over these 26 years, Catherine and I did not always agree on things, and sometimes, some pretty big things. Notwithstanding these differences, what we have in common has always been more important. We both *love* teaching, especially our first-year

* The Honorable Arleigh M. Woods and William T. Woods Chair & Professor of Law, Southwestern Law School; LL.M. Harvard Law School; J.D. William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaii; B.A. Whitman College. I need to thank Dean Darby Dickerson and Southwestern Law School for their generous financial support that made the symposium celebrating Professor Catherine Carpenter and her work possible. Finally, I need to thank Mr. Jeremy Davison, the 2025-2026 Editor-in-Chief of the Southwestern Law Review, and all of the other Southwestern Law Review editors who worked on my interview transcript. Any remaining errors in the transcript are mine.

students. We are both scholars and, yes, *legal theorists*. (That Catherine now admits as much is a particular source of pride for me.) We now share the same office—she moved out, and I moved in—and I hope she kept her office key. And, perhaps most importantly, we share a very strong common interest in Catherine's daughter, Erica Jansson. You'll have to ask me or Catherine for an explanation on that last one.

The one thing I have *always* admired about Professor Catherine Carpenter has been her enduring and unwavering devotion, loyalty, and commitment to Southwestern Law School. This is not something you see modeled much anymore. So, Catherine's dedication really stands out and, I think, should be applauded. Speaking now for only myself, I personally want to thank you, Catherine, for your service.

Finally, this brings me to the reason for this interview, which Catherine graciously agreed to sit for. One of the things I think we do not do enough of is to learn the histories of the people who came before us. All of this knowledge and wisdom is often lost because we do not take the time to listen to and, hopefully, learn from what they have to say. My interview with Catherine below is an attempt to preserve at least a part of her story.

Interview: January 21, 2025

Question 1: When did you know or decide that you wanted to be a lawyer?

Answer: It's a pretty exciting gig. I decided I wanted to be a lawyer as a child. And what's interesting about that is that I did not have any role models when I was growing up. I'm a first-gen kid. My mother had an eighth-grade education. My father had a tenth-grade education. Nobody in my family was a lawyer. In my time, girls talked about being teachers and nurses. My parents were the only people around me who supported my decision to be a lawyer. And they didn't know anything about college or about law school, but they knew that that's what I wanted.

It was my singular desire to want to be a lawyer, but I still did not know much about the field.

Then, in my freshman year in college at UCLA, there was a law student who I had become friends with, and he let me come and sit in on classes as a freshman at UCLA Law School. I said to myself, "This is what I want to do. Can I just skip college? This is where I want to go."

The study of law turned out to be a great fit for the way that I think. I really appreciate that we have students who struggle with the ability to synthesize or adopt linear thinking. Some educational theorists call it

convergent thinking, the ability to distill large concepts and disparate facts. It is so natural for me. I'm very comfortable in that space.

Question 2: When did you know that you wanted to be a law professor?

Answer: What is interesting is my mother and father always saw me as an educator. They never talked about it that way. But they would tell me that when I was a child, I would teach my friends things. That carried over to when I was in law school. I was a teaching assistant for several classes. So, it looks like I was always interested in being a teacher.

In my first semester of law school, I remember leaning over to my husband, Marty Carpenter, who was also my classmate, and I looked at Professor Connie Rocha, who was teaching civil procedure. She was a civil defense lawyer, and she was one of two women professors in our law school. I leaned over to Marty and said, "That's what I want to do. I have to figure out a way to become a professor because that's really what I want to do."

For me, being a law professor was the best of all worlds. I am able to teach my passion, which is criminal law.

Question 3: What was your experience like in law school when you went to law school?

Answer: For the most part, it was an incredibly enriching and rewarding experience on both a professional level and a personal level because I went to law school with my husband. We were married before law school started, and we entered school together as first-year law students. We sat next to each other in all our first-year classes until we diverged in our second and third years, when we took different classes.

By and large, I loved my faculty when I was in school. At the time, 1973-1976, our law school was young. Even though Southwestern had been around since 1911, it was newly forming as a modern law school. And some of the faculty were incredible, and they were invested in the law school's growth. We had a dean who was extraordinary. He was a student-centered dean, and he took a special liking to my husband and to me. His name was Paul Wildman, and he was the perfect dean for this time period when Southwestern had just received ABA (the American Bar Association) and AALS (the Association of American Law Schools) approval.

In addition to receiving national accreditation, we were on the ground floor of starting the kind of co-curricular activities available in an ABA law school. It was exciting to be a student at the time. We were on the ground

floor of starting the Law Review. We were on the ground floor of starting Moot Court, and of starting the SBA (the Student Bar Association). There were five of us that started the Women Law Students Association that still exists at Southwestern more than 50 years later. My section of my law school class had five women in it. The other section had six women. So, we were 11 women in the full-time class out of a class of approximately 350 students in two sections. It was a huge class.

Overall, it was an incredible experience. But it was also important to recognize the timeframe and the landscape when I went to law school. It was the 1970s. I went to law school from 1973 to 1976. So, if you put it in that context, I entered law school even before the attempt to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. It was only a few years after passage of the Civil Rights Amendment or Title VII. During that time, we, as a group of women, suffered the sort of discrimination and offensive comments in our law school microcosm that was suffered outside in the work world as well.

Sexual harassment laws didn't come into being until the late 1980s. But in the early 70s, as a group of young women, we banded together to create the Women Law Students Association. At that time, it was not uncommon to have male students in class make disparaging comments about the looks or the smarts of women students or to question how they earned their grades. It was not uncommon for female students to be rejected from sought-after positions because those positions went to male students. The situation was not unique to Southwestern Law School. What I experienced occurred at other law schools as well.

But I'm happy to report that within a few years, it changed. I believe we went from eleven women in the full-time class to about 35%. Today, we're over 50%, depending upon the year. No longer are the chairs or heads of student organizations only male students. Instead, law students who were often excluded from these positions, including but not limited to women, non-binary, and other LGBTQIA+ identifying people, are assuming positions of leadership throughout the school.

I'm very excited by the tremendous growth in inclusivity in legal education, just as there has been in the working world outside of legal education.

Question 4: Why did you decide to focus on criminal law as your area of expertise?

Answer: For me, it is truly the most organic of the legal doctrines. It tells us so much about our society to look at a criminal law penal code, to look at how crimes are legislated, and to view what we do in response to

them. And we get it wrong a lot, and it's messy, and we have to go back and reconfigure. But criminal law is not just filled with passion and emotion, there is a drumbeat. There is a logic that is at the heart of it.

Because it is an organically developing area of law, we have gaps that have to be addressed. I love talking about all of this with my first-year students. For a long time, we texted while driving without legal consequences, until all of a sudden, we had a lot of car accidents. Then the criminal law says we have to condemn that behavior, not just civilly where insurance carriers play nice, but where we actually frame the behavior as criminal. When the criminal law gets involved at that level, it has the capacity to change behavior. So, it's not just condemning about murder, rape, and larceny and burglary. It's also about all those fringe kind of behaviors that we want to curb.

I have been passionate about criminal law since I was a little girl, and I mean truly little. We could say that it all started with having watched *Perry Mason*, which sounds like a joke, but that part is true. I've always been passionate about Criminal Law, even when I taught Property, which I did for eleven years. Criminal Law was a natural fit for me, and I've only grown to love it more. The deeper I am immersed in criminal law, the more familiar I am with it, the more I fall in love with it on a day-to-day basis.

Question 5: How did you approach teaching criminal law and, therefore, your students?

Answer: I think one of the best parts of being a law professor is that it was an intersection of my love for criminal law and my love for teaching first-year students. I can't stress enough what a gift we have been given as law faculty members to guide folks who come into law school, and to have front row seats on their development. Nothing makes me happier than to watch a student's growth from the time they are first-year law students until the time that they graduate. It's very, very exciting.

There were three goals I had in teaching students in my criminal law class. One was to get across the rules, no question about that. What is the essential structure of the crimes they will learn, the defenses, and the policies that shape them?

The second was to push them to think beyond those blackletter rules. One of my favorite things to do was to ask them—if you were starting fresh, how would you write these laws? What would you say? What would you do? And I'd pick some topics that are thorny for them to consider.

For example, take the crime of statutory rape, which is a voluntary sexual activity between somebody of age and somebody underage. I ask my

students whether they would make that activity a crime. How would they determine what underage looks like? And would they make that crime strict liability? No mens rea, no mistake of age defense allowed. These questions go beyond asking a student to learn the rules on statutory rape. It's now taking those rules and pushing students to think beyond that. That's very exciting to me.

The third thing, which I embraced when it came to teaching first-year students, was the understanding that, as first semester teachers, we are teaching students who can be vulnerable and fragile, or overconfident, or not confident at all. I understood that part of being a first-year professor was to help them manage their emotional side.

All three things happen in the classroom at the same time. I recognized that fairly early on, though not as early as I would have liked. I also recognized that our words as law professors really, really matter. They can be positive, encouraging, or they can be very hurtful; and we have to be strategic about how we approach students who twenty years later might remember something that we said.

I have been teaching for forty-eight years, and my teaching is always evolving. Even though the subject might be the same, I regularly change the way I think about something. I approach it from different perspectives all the time and that helps me to become a better professor.

Question 6: How do you think students have changed since you were a law student?

Answer: I think both the positive and the negative probably come from the same place. Our students are just so much smarter because of the introduction of technology and social media. Our students have access to so much more. That is a positive.

But, as we hear from psychologists, access to so much more information can also be a negative. There is less depth to their knowledge. It's shallow across a mile as opposed to deep across an acre. What they access and how they think about accessing information is often not intended to go deep. As professors, we have to push them in that regard.

I think they take in information differently than we did. As law faculty, it's not about meeting them where they are per se. It's about figuring out how to work with their skill set, which is considerable, to help them amass information in a critical and deeper way than they are used to.

When I was in law school, we were assigned law review articles to read. I don't think that is regular practice anymore. We see excerpts in casebooks,

but reading law review articles is not part of their regular first-year reading materials.

As faculty, we need to keep engaging in conversations about the best approaches. Some are traditional, and we can never lose sight of that. Deep reading of cases should never be taken over by case summaries. We need to give our students an appreciation that words matter, that language changes, and that an opinion can change just by a phrase. It is especially important for our students who are fed a diet of headlines.

Word choice matters, which is why it's very exciting to see that this dawns on our upper-division students when they are in their externships or Moot Court or Law Review, Negotiations, Trial Ad, or Law Journal.

I think law students today are as passionate as they were decades ago. What you notice in criminal law are the changes in ambition. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, students came in wanting to be public defenders. Through the 1990s and early 2000s, they entered law school wanting to be prosecutors. And now I think we're closer to a 60-40 kind of split.

Question 7: Can you tell me about your work with the American Bar Association (the "ABA")?

Answer: My ABA work, which you might think is completely divorced from my work inside the law school, is actually very connected to it. I owe my involvement with the American Bar Association Section of Legal Education to Dean Leigh Taylor who introduced me to the Section's work in 1990. What I discovered was that, not only do I adore talking about criminal law, I also love talking about legal education in general with people who are committed to making it as strong as it can be.

I also appreciate the value of the ABA Standards and Rules in helping to strengthen legal education. Over my time with the ABA, I have served as a site visitor, a member and Chair of the Accreditation Committee, which oversees all the ABA law schools, as a member of the Foreign Law Schools Committee, which reviews ABA programs abroad, and as a member of the Standards Committee that drafted or modified the standards that every law school in our nation uses.

I am an unabashed ABA wonk. I believe deeply in the accreditation process and project. And to the extent that I've been able to help schools on the outside, I've also been a resource for my own law school as we think about changing the curriculum or preparing for our own site visits. My work with the ABA has allowed me to provide consulting services to law schools around the country. In a way, my consulting is not far afield from my teaching. It has been a rewarding experience for me.

Through my work with the ABA, I have met many people who work in legal education. Legal academics are truly wonderful people. I have had the pleasure to work with so many from across the country, but I am really partial to our group at Southwestern. How lucky I've been to be able to be part of Southwestern since 1980.

Question 8: How has legal education changed since you started law school?

Answer: There are more ABA (American Bar Association) Standards. The increase in standards and regulations by the ABA has created a floor, which has enabled legal education to grow stronger. But law schools today are required to address issues that they did not need to consider twenty years ago. They're required to think about how to incorporate professionalism and competency into their education, how academic support programs may help their students, the attrition rate and the bar passage rate. And until recently, there was a standard that focused specifically on diversity and inclusion. It is equally true that critics of the Standards would say that legal education is now overregulated. It has made for an interesting debate that swirls around those familiar with the ABA Standards. It is not inappropriate to consider whether the tail wags the dog, or in other words, whether law schools now look a certain way because the ABA Standards control them to a large extent.

Question 8a: And do you think that that's a good thing?

Answer: I do think it's a good thing. Without some of these Standards, law schools would not do what is best for the students or would not achieve the bar passage minimums that are required for consumer protection. Without the Standards spelling it out, we might not offer tenure in law school. We now have a new Standard that strengthens academic freedom and offers protection of freedom of expression.

Because we're talking about a system that regulates a law school's ability to confer a degree, under Department of Education rules, ABA Standards must have teeth. Another example of a Standard designed for consumer protection is ABA Standard 501, which requires that law schools only admit students it believes can successfully complete its program of legal education and pass the bar. Until recently, a few law schools were accused of exploiting their applicants by admitting them and then attriting more than 30% of their first-year class. Under ABA Standard 501, an attrition rate of more than 20% raises a rebuttable presumption that the law school is out of compliance with the Standard.

Question 8b: But is there any substance to the critique that law schools are over-regulated now?

Answer: I think there is some substance to the critique. Standards regarding law libraries offer a perfect example. Until recently, there were five or six standards that impacted libraries, including the depth of their collections, how large the physical space was, and the size of the library staff. The ABA now recognizes that the physical facility and number of library books are no longer determinative of whether a law library can offer its students quality services because students may access so much information online. There is no longer the demand that law schools support such a massive budget requirement, and don't feel the need to support that massive budget requirement.

The change to library standards is a good example of the need for flexibility and change. The library standards were a good example of the ABA listening to that.

Question 9: For the past 20 years, you have devoted and continue to devote your time, attention, scholarship, and legal advocacy to sex offense registration laws. Why and how did that start?

Answer: In 2003, I was researching an article on statutory rape when two United States Supreme Court decisions were published, which authorized a state's enactment of sex offense registration laws. One of the two Supreme Court decisions was mentioned in another Supreme Court case, *Lawrence v. Texas*, which was decided that same term. It was only a small reference in *Lawrence*, but it piqued my curiosity because I did not know very much about registration laws.

So, I started to dig a little bit. In 2005, my first law review article on the constitutionality of sex offense registration laws was published in the Boston University Law Review. The article criticized requiring those convicted of strict liability crimes to register. These offenders were not proven to have any criminal mens rea (criminal intent) and were never shown to be a danger to society. But they were still required to register, and that, I thought, was really wrong.

Over the course of twenty years, I've written a number of law review articles. My research revealed that there is a mythical narrative that swirls around those who have committed sex offenses—it is that these offenders recidivate at very high rates—and that the ensuing panic over this falsehood

has resulted in unconstitutional laws. This is why I became angrier and angrier with each passing year.

It is important to recognize that I'm not objecting to their convictions or even to the long sentences that have been imposed. What I'm objecting to are the collateral consequences or extreme burdens faced by those who have served their debt to society and who are attempting to reintegrate. We have twenty years of empirical research to know that registration laws do not make the public safer; they're inefficient; they are too costly; and we know that they don't work. On top of that, they don't make sense. The biggest problem our community of scholars and advocates face is piercing the mythical narrative and the panic to help people absorb the true data and statistical facts.

My argument is that the United States Supreme Court was wrong in its decision in *Smith v. Doe*, which is the case referenced in *Lawrence v. Texas*. The registry is a criminal punishment, not a civil sanction, and consequently, it is governed by ex post facto principles and the Eighth Amendment argument on cruel and unusual punishment. But those constitutional principles also have limitations. For example, a win under ex post facto principles only helps those retroactively impacted by changes in registration laws. It does not help those who are convicted under new laws.

Most recently, I have focused on the unconstitutionality of the laws because they are based on animus.

I have evolved as a scholar and advocate in my position. I have become firmer in my opinion that the registry must be abolished. But when I first started writing, I didn't see that. When I first started writing and making presentations—you can see my talks on YouTube—I thought the solution for increasingly harsh registration laws was to return the registry to a time when it was much smaller with fewer burdens as it was back in 1994. In 1994, there were only roughly eight registerable offenses, and any community notification statute required that an interested person had to go to the police station to see who was on the registry. But now, on average, there are more than forty registrable offenses in each state. It used to be eight, now it's over forty. The burdens have increased as well, including the number of years that people have to register and where they can't live or work. Burdens have continued to increase for the registrant with no relief in sight, and this is despite the fact that registration schemes are not tied to empirical justification.

For a long time, I was comfortable with making the argument that we could solve much of the unconstitutionality of the regime if we returned the registry to its former reach. This is very similar to death penalty advocacy where advocates challenged certain laws—like picking the low-hanging fruit. Advocates argued and won that juveniles shouldn't be executed.

Insane people shouldn't be executed. At the time of those wins, death penalty abolitionists were very angry. They argued that selecting only certain provisions made it seem as though the remainder of the death penalty laws was lawful. It feels like a similar argument to me.

About two or three years ago, I came to the decision that I cannot fight only for incremental changes. Small wins are not enough. We need to abolish the registry. If we say that a registration regime is legitimate for those who have committed the most egregious of sex offenses, we have validated the registry. It took me more than fifteen years to realize that incrementalism alone is not sufficient. And that is the position of my advocacy organization the Alliance for Constitutional Sex Offense Laws (ACSOL), where I am President.

We have decided that we need to work on both fronts. We will continue our fight on specific laws, which is an incrementalist approach. So, we sue a lot to overturn specific regulations, and we win a lot. For example, we sued and won in Missouri to eliminate laws, which required that those who committed sex offenses place signs on their lawns at Halloween notifying the community of that fact. As a result of the legal battles we have fought, California no longer has residency restrictions. Registrants are no longer forced to put Halloween signs on their lawns. And now we're moving to other states, like Arkansas. We're going to start to work in Alabama. Florida is a real tough place. So, incrementalism is on the forefront there.

In California, we worked on getting a tiered registry, instead of a registry where someone convicted of a sex offense was on it for life. Without going into the weeds, until just a few years ago, we had a one-size-fits-all registry. Everybody was on the registry for life without many ways to be removed. It didn't matter what you did, didn't matter whether you portended future dangerousness. If you were convicted of any sex offense, you were required to register for the rest of your life and forced to endure onerous burdens that prevented you from reintegrating into public life.

So, we fought for seven years to get a tiered registry like forty-six other states have. Tier one for lesser offenses with shorter duration on the registry and fewer burdens, with tier three registry for life, only for the most egregious offenses. We received a lot of criticism from our community for fighting for a tiered registry. After all, we might be helping to reduce the burdens for many who would be reclassified as tier one offenders, but they felt that we were abandoning those who would remain on tier three. But that's incrementalism. We thought that it was important to pass a tiered registry so that some people would be moved to lower tiers and would have the ability to be removed.

What I have learned is that advocacy is a whole world unto itself; it involves a skill set that is far removed from scholarship. And I'm a novice at it. But I have joined forces with some exceptionally skilled messengers, and already, I have learned so much.

While my advocacy is important, it is my scholarship that fuels my passion to fight. I am honored to report that my scholarship has made inroads on its own. I am cited quite a bit; I am cited by law professors and attorneys alike. But when I am cited by a court, for me, that's the home run I am looking for because I believe that the most likely avenue for change is through the courts. Seven state Supreme Courts have cited my work in their review of registration laws. I was especially honored to hear the Sixth Circuit, in its review of Michigan laws, adopt my position and terminology that registration laws have become *super*-registration schemes.

When I started writing, I don't think there were five of us writing on the topic. Now, I am pleased to see that many scholars are shedding light on the topic. Not only professors' articles, student notes are appearing as well. That's terrific, too. The more we write about the unconstitutionality of the laws, the more likely it is that a court will topple the registry.

My next article, which I know will be spitting in the wind, is about sex exceptionalism in the Evidence Code. Without any systematic review of the changes and vetting, three federal rules of evidence were changed to treat those who commit sex crimes differently from other offenders. It's a great example of just what sex exceptionalism looks like.

Question 10: It sounds like you found your mission with the sex offenses registry. But what is it about the sex offenses registry that hooked you? What is it that made you go 'damn, you know, I need to do this?'

Answer: I have always fought for the underdog. Sex offenders are the most reviled group of people. They are isolated and ostracized without any factual basis for so doing. They have nobody to speak on their behalf. And I believe that we have an obligation to speak for those who can't speak for themselves. It has been both heartening and dispiriting for me. When I speak to groups, I will say in the presentation that I am fighting for them even though I don't have a loved one on the registry. I am fighting for them because I think these laws are wrong. And invariably, someone will come up to me after my talk to tell me that they cannot believe anyone would help them or act on their behalf.

I have been grateful that my own law school recognizes that this is a social justice issue, even though some at my school don't believe that those

who commit sex offenses deserve this brand of social justice. But they are kind to give me wide latitude to argue that it is. My faculty is incredibly supportive of my scholarship as is the administration. I think some people would prefer if I picked a different marginalized group. But they understand that this is my mission.

In fact, the Access to Restorative Justice Fund, which I started at Southwestern with help from a benefactor, is striving to help reintegrate those who have committed sex offenses, because isn't part of our criminal justice reform the importance of reintegration into society, right? I mean, how do you allow people to come out of prison but you don't allow them a second chance to secure stable housing and employment? We force them to live under bridges and on park benches. We don't allow them into shelters during wildfires or hurricanes. In 2020, when so many were dying in prison of COVID, those who had committed sex offenses were forced to remain in prison. We had to sue to obtain their release. Others who were released could be murderers, burglars, all those things, but not those who committed sex offenses. So, there's so much more to do.

If you hear passion in my voice recounting this, you would be right. This is my mission. I have become a dog with a bone.

Question 11: Why should someone pursue a legal career now?

Answer: I think pursuing a legal career is most noble. We are truly the last thinking discipline, and we have to honor and protect it.

Assuming AI doesn't take us over—and I'm serious about that—we are the practical implementation of anything that's theoretical. And you're right, Professor Hart, I am a theoretical person. I am. It doesn't matter which area of law you practice. Yes, you can practice it as a "here are the forms and fill them out" kind of thing. But the true practice of law, that kind of big thinking that says, "let's move the law in this direction." What other discipline does that? What other discipline actually affects the social order? We have been trained to think deeply about the larger problems and issues, about how to mine both sides of a problem, and how to resolve it.

Question 12: What are some of the most important lessons you've learned, or the main things that you've taken away from, your legal career?

Answer: My lessons aren't related specifically to my work with the ABA or to my work in criminal law. The first lesson is the importance of intellectual curiosity, the importance of having an open mind, and being open

to receiving information. The second is compassion and empathy. I try to bring those to my interactions with my students or my colleagues, or to another school I am inspecting or consulting for. I try to approach it from a place that does not judge. I would say that's been a journey for me, a continuing lesson.

Question 13: Based on all of your experiences and your career and everything else, what advice would you give someone interested in pursuing a law career or just in general?

Answer: It sounds trite because everybody says it. But it is important to know your "why" and work like hell to achieve it. You have to work as hard as possible every single day. Not only do you have to know what motivates you, you must work really hard to fight for those who are depending upon you to answer the questions that they cannot. You have clients who are frightened and this responsibility to counsel them is an awesome one that we must not take lightly. But hard work does not start when one becomes a lawyer. The hard work must begin when one starts law school.

I used to say to my students when they would say jokingly, or perhaps not jokingly, "Is this going to be on the exam?" Tired of hearing that question, I would say to them, "Do you want to think that your doctor asked that question while in medical school? I'm going to be an orthopedist, so do I really need to know about the stomach? Or do you want to think that your doctor has a deep understanding of everything they need to know when you come to visit them?" That's what being a lawyer is like. We need to have as deep of an understanding as we can to be able to help those who depend on us.

Isn't this what we do as law professors? Aren't we always the drill sergeant for our students? To help them maintain their "why," but to also recognize the hard work that is needed to achieve it. And for some students, it's easy. They've worked hard since they were small kids. But for others, this is the first time where they really do have to work hard. Our job is to show them how that pays off.

Question 14: Any last comments about anything?

Answer: I don't have words to describe how honored I am to have this symposium in my honor. When you put one foot in front of the other and you work seven days a week and you give so much, I don't think you can appreciate what the road you traveled looks like. So, I'm so grateful for this

symposium because it gives me the opportunity to look back at the road, and I can say it was well-traveled.