Justice Breyer Speaks around north grounds

Davidson, Swanson Take Life Finals

On February 27, Jennifer Davidson ’18, Jay Swanson ’18, and Emily Loomis ’18, forayed into the fray. After several months of preparation, the arguments, and the inevitable legal jargon, the judges—representatives of the American Bar Association—awarded first place to the team of Davidson and Swanson. Their victory, however, was not without its challenges.

The problem centered around Susan Swanson, fired from her job at Natural Foods, Inc. after Schroeder failed to maintain proper safety controls at the plant. She sued, arguing that her termination was based on sex stereotypes—the idea that employees must conform with traditional gender roles. The court agreed and awarded Swanson substantial damages, setting a precedent for similar cases.

Justice Breyer takes the stage in Caplin Auditorium. (Michael McGuire/virginialawweekly.org)
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Justice Breyer Speaks

Justice Breyer began his visit to the Law School with a talk to a small group of UVa Law students. In two wide-ranging talks to students, Justice Breyer promoted his new book on the growing need to incorporate international law into American law, including the mechanics of the Supreme Court's decision making. Breyer said that during his tenure as a Supreme Court justice, he has seen more cases on which the Court has ruled by 5–4 votes. He stressed the importance of understanding the Court's decision-making process and the significance of the different opinions written by the justices.

After giving their introductions, the competition focused on questions from the bench. Swanson and Davidson argued the first issue, whether Natural Foods, Inc. had properly maintained safety controls at the plant. In a separate case, they faced the question of whether the employer had violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act by discriminating against employees based on their sex. The judges were impressed by the thorough preparation and legal arguments presented by the competitors.

After a discussion of the legal principles involved, Justice Breyer asked the students to consider the role of judges in the legal system. He emphasized the importance of understanding the different perspectives and opinions expressed in legal arguments, and the necessity of considering the potential consequences of legal decisions. He also highlighted the significance of effective communication and reasonable exceptions in legal arguments.

The audience was captivated by Justice Breyer's insights and enthusiasm, as he shared stories from his tenure in the Supreme Court. He discussed his decision-making process and highlighted the importance of considering the potential consequences of legal decisions. The students were grateful for his willingness to engage with them and share his experiences.

The competition concluded with the presentation of the final decisions, and the audience was left with a deeper understanding of the complexities involved in legal arguments and the importance of effective communication and consideration of potential consequences.
Serena Williams is one of the most prominent tennis players in history. With thirty-nine Grand Slam titles, she is the most successful tennis player in women’s singles, and her career streaks are closely related to her growth mindset. When facing challenges, she considers them as opportunities for learning and growth rather than obstacles to be avoided.
200+ Libel Themes Outside Charlottesville, Va.

At the heart of the University of Virginia Law School’s annual stage comedy event, the Libel Production Editor Daniel Ranzvi ’20 Production Editor. Show is a, re- creational whose existence is known only to itself. Each year, the theme that animates the show is selected, in rigorous secrecy, by high-ranking members of the Libel organization, known to themselves as the “Junta.”

That process, which the Law Weekly has followed exclusively for 300 of the themes rejected by this year’s Junta, revealing for the first time the rigor of the theme party selection procedure, and the length of the long odds Libel’s Angels really to emerge as this year’s theme. “Just running your eyes down such a list, you do get a real appreciation of how much effort goes into separating out a theme that really makes the grade,” commented one theme party attendee, speaking on condition of anonymity.

“If you’re going to do a top four list, you’ve got to know what you’re in it for. I can’t write a theme myself, but I can appreciate,” said one reviewer.

Rejected Themes

Friday Night Libel

From Forty Year Of Libel

Talladega Libels

Libelbusts

“7 for Lady Libel

Sympathy for Libel Lady

Throw Libel From The Train

Slander: Or the 120 Days of Libel

Libel, She Wrote

A Funny Thing Happened

on the Way to the Libel Show

Tokyo Libel

McCabe and Mrs. Libel

Libel Redemption

My Dinner with Libel

Libel: The Western Front

Do The Libel Thing

Dances With Libels

Libel Ruble

Come and Libel

Libel the Libels

The Libels of Navarre

Libelmie’s Daughters

Lanterns, Libel, and Libel, the Beloved Country

Libel on the Roof

American Libel

Libel’s Flames

The Umbrellas of Libel

Libel the Gallant Pig

The Luck of Barry Libel

Guess Who’s Coming to Libel

Mad Libel Beyond Slander

deepest at breakfast:

The Heart Is A Lonely Libel

Libel: A Chaos of Ribbons

Libel On A Hot Tin Roof

A Streetcar Named Libel Zachary

The Sad Little Make A Libel

The Libel King

It’s A Wonderful Libel

The Libel Fairies

For A Few Libels More

Some Like It Libelous

Libel of the Rain

Libel Runner

The Bridge On The River Libel

Library Rock and Two Smoking Barrels
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sequences, and Title VII properly covers sexual orientation even if Congress didn’t originally intend for the act to do so.

Hergot argued that the Fourth

circuit should defer to the district court and defer to "Congress' intent, since Congress didn't have the luxury to include sexual orientation as a protected class. She focused on the message of "yes," which does not include "sexual orientation." The panel asked Hergot about recent decisions out of the Second and Seventh Circuits, which held that Title VII prohibits discrimina- tion on the basis of sexual ori- entation. Hergot focused on the plain meaning of the statute and emphasized that when courts are faced with an ambiguous statute, they should step back and defer to the legislature. She explained that Schroeder should have moved to dismiss because she created a cause of action for discrimination and focused on the standard that governs comparators. Davis

called through the two main standards—"substantially similar" or "nearly identical”—to argue that Schroeder had comparators under either standard, since each employee’s treatment was comparable and in the same loss in revenue, even though Schroeder’s mistake drew more media attention. Justice Neiman asked about the Fourth Circuit’s standard, which takes a "worse-than-normal" approach. He declared, "Maybe the Fourth Circuit’s on something."

During Sewell’s argument, the

Mappet Christmas Libel

Libel or High Water

What We Do In The Libels

Women In The Libels

Libel’s 11

Down of the Libel of the Ape

The Libel For October

A Fish Called Libel

An American Libel in London

Snow White and the Seven Li- bels

Sixteen Libels

Libel Haunted by Vengeance

National Libel’s Christmas Va-

cation

Libel’s Christ

The Libel Who Wasn’t There

The Meaning Of Libel

Fishing Libel

Picnic At Libel Rock

The Libel of Drunken Master

And Now For Something Com- pletely Libelous

Zatoichi: Blind Libeler

Women on the Verge of A Ner-

vous Libel

Libel and Kumar Go to White

Coke

The Man Who Libeled Too

Much

The Chamber of Shao-Libel

My Little Libel Show Can’t Be

This Cute!

Glen Morgan & Meiyokison

Deus Ka

Attack on Libel

The Libel of Misy Libel Deep

Deliboe Does Libel

The Devil in Me. Libel

All About Libel

Libel Ever, You Ever Wanted

To Know About Libel (But Were
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focused on distinguishing the other employees from Schroeder. Natural Foods never found one of these em- ployees for the quality-control problems and treated the other employees’ mis- takes less seriously from the very beginning. Given the differences, Sewell argued, the employees should not be considered comparators. The judges focused their questions on the legal standard for motion to dismiss. After deliberation, the judges came back, announced the win- ners, and praised the competitors.

The judges gave the advocates a lot of well-deserved praise and told them they would rank among the best advocates that appeared in their respective courthouses.

Judges Cote and Neimercom-

mented on the onsales for- mations, which they believe separate the best advocates from less ad- vocates. Judge Griffith praised the competitors for not relying on the same examples, even when they were difficult and outside the scope of the prob- lem. Judge Judge also explained that the best advocates treat argu- ments as a dialogue with the judges instead of simply presenting a list of arguments. He explained that the best advocates treat the judges as colleagues and respect each other’s opinions. In the end, the judges praised the advocates for their creativity and ability to think outside the box. They commended the advocates for their ability to present their arguments in a clear and concise manner. The advocates were then given a round of applause for their hard work and dedication. The advocates were then given a round of applause for their hard work and dedication.

---

thkim@virginia.edu
Response to “Untangling the Immigration Debate”

Max Wagner’s piece on immigration is misleading, false, and xenophobic. Under the guise of the Minority Rights Coalition at North Carolina State University, an educational series, Wagner makes unsubstantiated claims that only serve to promote hate and(pun intended) conflate illiteracy with xenophobia.

The Minority Rights Coalition and the below-signed affinity groups are deeply disappointed by Mr. Wagner’s attempts to mislead the readers by conflating illiteracy and lack of English proficiency. A focus on English language skills and literacy is thinly veiled racism;casting language as a proxy for xenophobia from non-English-speaking countries. But it is important to note that the immigrants from predominantly English speaking countries, too.

FURTHERMORE, NOT speaking English does not preclude people from being productive members of society. As history demonstrates, English-only laws and literacy tests have often been used to single out racial minorities. It is simply impossible to confute illiteracy without speaking English.

Third, Mr. Wagner’s account of “chain(ed) migration” fails to clarify anything. We reject the term “chain(ed) migration” not for the reasons Mr. Wagner claims, but rather because the term is an inaccurate characterization of the complex process of immigration. The term has recently been used to fearmonger about an uncontrollable influx of immigrants. However, the claim that “once immigrants are in the system, they tend to bring members of their extended family over” is grossly inaccurate.

Furthermore, green card holders only apply for绿卡 for their unmarried children and spouses, while limited by the annual cap. Notably, they cannot petition for their parents or their siblings. For U.S. citizens, even this is subject to applications for their children and parents, applications for legal status to the same annual cap.1 The application process is restrictive and time-consuming. The term “chain” migration is excessively misleading.

Finally, Mr. Wagner should do his research—and learn that you cannot back up a factual assertion with an opinion column. He fails to clarify the existing immigration debate and may actually confuse readers with his limited knowledge of the issues.

For minority students at UVA Law, this is not the first time, nor will it be the last, that our peers feel justified when their opinions and facts are actually ignored and lies. Surely everyone is entitled to their opinions, but the problem surfaces when one presents misconceptions and false premises as statements of facts. From blatantly racist and xenophobic comments in class, to passive-aggressive dominating behaviors at firm events, to repeated use of the phrase “no radicals, where are you from?” until the minority is forced to voice a foreign country as an answer. While we are often enraged and hurt, we cannot say we are ever surprised. This was a daunting reminder that many of our colleagues hold similar views and facts are actually ignored and lies.

My experience is common for Jewish students in the University of California system. In recent years, swastikas have been spray-painted around town and on UC Davis, swastikas were even painted around the Jewish fraternity house. At UCSD, at a pro-Israel event, we had to seek a restraining order. A Jewish student was called a “terrorist” and swastikas were even painted around town. Another student was slashed in the dormitory one night.

My experience is common for Jewish students in the University of California system. In recent years, swastikas have been spray-painted around town and on UC Davis, swastikas were even painted around the Jewish fraternity house. At UCSD, at a pro-Israel event, we had to seek a restraining order. A Jewish student was called a “terrorist” and swastikas were even painted around town. Another student was slashed in the dormitory one night.

In no hurry to remove them. The Daily Californian, UC Berkeley’s student newspaper, published anti-Semitic op-eds and cartoons on multiple occasions. A Jewish student was rammed in the back with a shopping cart during an anti-Israel event and subsequently had to seek a restraining order. As bills to boycott the Mid-East’s only democracy, Israel, were debated by UC Berkeley’s student government, hundreds of Jewish students called Jewish students while the panel of Israeli Defense Force reservists were to share their personal stories and answer questions from students. The objective was to humanize the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, offer students a chance to learn about Israeli society, and create a dialogue about peace-making.

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

It was still more disturbing to see the underground Minority Rights Coalition deny the Jewish Leadership Council of Virginia the right to participate in the Jewish state often predicts violence, intimidation, and even violent felonies.

Second, Mr. Wagner attacks perception that others cannot engage with false data and premises. Con-
Welcome Admitted Students!

Do you remember the moment when you knew you were ready to accept your acceptance to UVa Law?

Admitted Students Open House

and the feelings that came to you at that moment? A combination of joy, relief, fear, and determination led you to choose Charlottesville as your home for the next three years and believe it or not, you have almost completed another large step in your journey at UVa Law. Now it is time to pave the way and welcome the Class of 2021!

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

This weekend is likely to be one of the most exciting for most of the students arrive, and we will kick off the afternoon with a BBQ here at the law school, building from our Virginia Law Ambassadors. There will be plenty of new faces wandering the halls, so please feel free to help someone look for their group and need help with directions—andystem.

Debating Abortion

This year, I have been extraordinarily privileged to serve on the board of Advocates for Life at UVa Law.

As the word “debate” implies, the event will involve two speakers, each presenting their views in their respective minds the strongest arguments for or against the legal status of the categories of abortion.

Nadine Strossen, a political scientist, will lead the discussion about the legal status of abortion. Her research focuses on free speech. Through her long involvement with the ACLU—she served as president from 1990 to 2008—she has also gained intimate familiarity with other American constitutional issues, including abortion-related issues.

Speaking for the other side of the argument, Strossen and Stephanie Gray, a Canadian who is the founder of the pro-life outreach group Love Unleashes Life and a co-founder and executive director of the Canadian Cen- tre for Bio-Ethical Reform, will come to the debate with an argument that abortion is a human right. Strossen and Gray have participated in numerous debates on abortion, but they will debate each other for the first time this Sunday.

Both women have agreed to address ethical, moral or philosoph- ical arguments and not legal arguments, about which many of us have not been fully informed through reading cases or treaties. The sole goal of the debate, according to a current analysis of what Strossen, like Strossen, is a sound analysis of the issue.

Both speakers are exceptionally qualified, and I am deeply grate- ful to each for her willingness to come to this point in her careers. Gray is currently a professor at New York Law School. Her scholarship and teaching have been focused on free speech. Through her long involvement with the ACLU, she is well known for her work from 1990 to 2008—she has also gained intimate familiarity with other American constitutional issues, including abortion-related issues.

Strossen Gray, a Canadian who is the founder of the pro-life outreach group Love Unleashes Life and a co-founder and executive director of the Canadian Cen- tre for Bio-Ethical Reform, will come to the debate with an argument that abortion is a human right. Gray and Strossen have participated in numerous debates on abortion, but they will debate each other for the first time this Sunday.

Both women have agreed to address ethical, moral or philosoph- ical arguments and not legal arguments, about which many of us have not been fully informed through reading cases or treaties. The sole goal of the debate, according to a current analysis of what Strossen, like Strossen, is a sound analysis of the issue.

Both speakers are exceptionally qualified, and I am deeply grate- ful to each for her willingness to come to this point in her careers. Gray is currently a professor at New York Law School. Her scholarship and teaching have been focused on free speech. Through her long involvement with the ACLU, she is well known for her work from 1990 to 2008—she has also gained intimate familiarity with other American constitutional issues, including abortion-related issues.
different forms of hate on the community hanging a noose outside their window for Halloween. It was not a coincidence — targeting of other groups as well. It was entirely unsurprising it was.

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

I didn’t spend months working on this problem to give up now. I prepped for the first round, went in, and did my best. We went back to our hotel and prepped for the second day. We got up, got ready, and went out to wait for the shuttle to the competition. While we waited, I looked at my phone, and again, GroupMe was blowing up. Apparently, someone had written an incredibly biased, hate-filled article about immigrants in the Lau Weekly. Questions and comments were raised as people discussed how We (not a typo, meant to be a capital We), the people of color at UVa, should respond.

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

I didn’t spend months working on this problem to give up now. I prepped for the first round, went in, and did my best. We went back to our hotel and prepped for the second day. We got up, got ready, and went out to wait for the shuttle to the competition. While we waited, I looked at my phone, and again, GroupMe was blowing up. Instead, I turned to my journal, which was on hand. I opened it and found a quote from Martin Luther King: ‘We shall overcome.’

We were defeated, but not by the competition. We were defeated by the need to do nothing. We needed to do nothing to win.

I was defeated by the need to do nothing. I was defeated by the need to do nothing to win.

When All You Want to Do Is Moot

My team had just finished the first round of a national moot court competition. The competition was to try to drive a wedge between Jews and other minorities, suggesting that Jews are a separate minority group in need of special protection.
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