Thank you, President Samuelson, for that gracious introduction. Thank you, thank you for this undeserved but deeply appreciated honor you have paid me this evening. I feel humbled by the presence of so many in this audience who I esteem as treasured friends and role models, and I express my personal affection and appreciation for each of the persons on the stand this evening—each a treasured, personal friend.

The Beginning and the End

Of a Lawyer

By Elder Dallin H. Oaks
Thank you, President Samuelson, for that gracious introduction. Thank you, thank you for this undeserved but deeply appreciated honor you have paid me this evening. I feel humbled by the presence of so many in this audience who I esteem as treasured friends and role models, and I express my personal affection and appreciation for each of the persons on the stand this evening—each a treasured, personal friend.

THE BEGINNING AND THE END OF A LAWYER

BY ELDER DALLIN H. OAKS
In the beginning, every lawyer has some fathers or mothers in the law—persons whose teaching and example has a profound influence on their initial thinking and development in the profession. I have had many influential teachers and mentors in my life, but when it comes to my initial thinking and development in the legal profession, four men stand out above all the rest. I want to tell you about each of these fathers in the law and what I credit them with teaching me. I will mention them in the order in which they came into my life.

1. Dean Edward H. Levi

Most of you will remember Edward H. Levi as the United States attorney general whose stature and wisdom restored integrity to a Department of Justice badly bruised by the Watergate scandal.

Much earlier, Edward Levi was the dean of the University of Chicago Law School when I enrolled there in 1954. He was my teacher in various courses and circumstances. As dean he recruited me to the faculty in 1963. When he went to the university administration the following year, he appointed me acting dean of the law school and tutored me in those responsibilities. Still later he was the wise academic leader who spoke at my inauguration as president of Brigham Young University in 1971. The influence in my life of this great Jewish legal scholar and leader was prolonged and powerful.

In my first year Levi’s writings introduced me to the way of precedent and reasoning in the law (see Levi, Introduction to Legal Reasoning [1948]). As a teacher he was brilliant, thorough, and extremely rigorous. All of us remember being terrorized in classrooms by law teachers whose high expectations and threat of public humiliation drove us to exhaustive preparation and gave us the scar tissue and thick skin we would need to survive in an adversary profession. I will never forget the day Dean Levi called on me in his amicus course. He directed me to state a particular case and to explain how it differed from another case. Being poorly prepared that day, I hesitated slightly. Reading the circumstance and wanting to teach a lesson to me and everyone else, he cut me off with, “Oh, never mind, Mr. Oaks. You have to be good to do that.” Years later I could laugh about that put-down, but the scar tissue and the motivation for preparation have never left me.

Levi taught that the law is a learned profession, so law study should be much more than preparation for the practice of law. The law requires intellect as well as craftsmanship, and its obligations include improvement of the system of justice for the common good of mankind. “The problem for the lawyers,” he once said, “is not just to know the law, but how to create within it. It is a world of artistry and craftsmanship and change” (see Edward H. Levi, “An Approach to Law,” Occasional Papers, University of Chicago Law School, 13 [1976]; also see Edward H. Levi, A Talk on Legal Education, University of Chicago Law School [1972]).

President James E. Faust has said that his law school dean “constantly impressed upon us that his primary mission was not to teach us the law, for the law would change; rather, his primary mission was to teach us to think straight, based upon sound principles” (James E. Faust, “The Doctrine and Covenants and Modern Revelation,” The Doctrine and Covenants [Craig K. Manschill, ed. (2004)], 1). Dean Levi did the same for me.

Levi also gave his students assurance of the natural goodness of the law and the legal profession, showing how they are ideally founded on what is right and good and workable. The practice of law is not just a way to earn a living or to secure a position of power. Levi’s paramount interest was making the law what it ought to be for the good of the people and the country and teaching his students and associates to do the same. He never seemed to have any personal interests. I saw him as a man without self-promotion or concern with political correctness who was fundamentally grounded in what he believed to be right. To me his leadership and his wisdom illustrated our doctrinal teaching that “the Spirit of Christ is given to every man, that he may know good from evil” (Mor. 7:16).

When I was a new law teacher, Dean and President Levi taught me the workings
In the beginning, every lawyer has some fathers or mothers in the law—persons whose teaching and example has a profound influence on their initial thinking and development in the profession. I have had many influential teachers and mentors in my life, but when it comes to my initial thinking and development in the legal profession, four men stand out above all the rest. I want to tell you about each of these fathers in the law and what I credit them with teaching me. I will mention them in the order in which they came into my life.

Dean Edward H. Levi

Most of you will remember Edward H. Levi as the United States attorney general whose stature and wisdom restored integrity to a Department of Justice badly bruised by the Watergate scandal.

Much earlier, Edward Levi was the dean of the University of Chicago Law School when I enrolled there in 1954. He was my teacher in various courses and circumstances. As dean he recruited me to the faculty in 1966. When he went to the university administration the following year, he appointed me acting dean of the law school and tutored me in those responsibilities. Still later he was the wise academic leader who spoke at my inauguration as president of Brigham Young University in 1971. The influence in my life of this great Jewish legal scholar and leader was prolonged and powerful.

In my first year Levi’s writings introduced me to the way of precedent and reasoning in the law (see Levi, Introduction to Legal Reasoning [1948]). As a teacher he was brilliant, thorough, and extremely rigorous. All of us remember being terrorized in classrooms by law teachers whose high expectations and threat of public humiliation drove us to exhaustive preparation and gave us the snarled and thick skin we would need to survive in an adversary profession. I will never forget the day Dean Levi called on me in his antitrust course. He directed me to state a particular case and to explain how it differed from another case. Being poorly prepared that day, I hesitated slightly. Reading the circumstance and wanting to teach a lesson to me and everyone else, he cut me off with, “Oh, never mind, Mr. Oaks. You have to be good to do that.” Years later I could laugh about that put-down, but the scar tissue and the motivation for preparation have never left me.

Levi taught that the law is a learned profession, so law study should be much more than preparation for the practice of law. The law requires intellect as well as craftsmanship, and its obligations include improvement of the system of justice for the common good of mankind. “The problem for the lawyers,” he once said, “is not just to know the law, but how to create within it. It is a world of artistry and craftsmanship and change” (see Edward H. Levi, “An Approach to Law,” Occasional Papers, University of Chicago Law School, 13 [1976]; also see Edward H. Levi, A Talk on Legal Education, University of Chicago Law School [1952]).

President James E. Faust has said that his law school dean “constantly impressed upon us that his primary mission was not to teach us the law, for the law would change; rather, his primary mission was to teach us to think straight, based upon sound principles” (James E. Faust, “The Doctrine and Covenants and Modern Revelation,” The Doctrine and Covenants [Craig K. Manschill, ed. (2004)], 1). Dean Levi did the same for me.

Levi also gave his students assurance of the natural goodness of the law and the legal profession, showing how they are ideally founded on what President James E. Faust has called “the Spirit of Christ” (see Moro. 7:16).
The University has sought throughout this period to disperse the tension for which it stands... In a world of considerable violence, one in which violence begins to reign, for the University to avoid both the pressure to be a lawbreaker and the role of a lawgiver—and the unique response of faculty and students to make the possible—to handle its own affairs in a way consistent with its ideals. (Public statement, 14 February 1969).

Levi also taught me the meaning of a faculty member, as an acting dean, and much later as a university president. For example, Levi was a master at honoring a faculty member. The University had to be such a place that the faculty, at all times, could sit back and know, ‘We have this place, and we are valued, and we will be listened to.’ That respect for the faculty was an important aspect of the University. It was a way of life.

Levi gave me a brief but insightful send-off with this letter: “As I have told you, we are proud of you and sorry to lose you, but we bow, as we must, to this calling.” As usual, he had it right.

President John K. Edmunds was my stake president during my law studies, law practice, and early law teaching in Chicago. A giant in Church leadership, he served for over 10 years as president of the Chicago Stake. He was the only man I knew during my studies who was both an outstanding lawyer and an exemplary Latter-day Saint. I had no lawyers in my family and hardly any among my acquaintances as I was growing up.

President Edmunds had a powerful influence over my spiritual development. (See my tribute to him in Ch事先 News, 1 March 1979, 2.) The period of graduate education is an uncertain time when personal values and beliefs are challenged. This was especially true for me in my first two years at the University of Chicago Law School when I was the only Mormon in the law school. This was also my first experience outside the small towns of Utah and Idaho where I had grown up. I was surrounded by philosophies and influences quite alien to anything I had ever experienced.

President Edmunds was instrumental in helping me gain the spiritual nourishment and spiritual perspective I needed to handle these strains. He had a powerful testimony of the Lord Jesus Christ and of the Prophet Joseph Smith. He stressed the fundamental faith, repentance, love, theology, and the reality of a living prophet. Except in occasional interviews, I rarely had personal conversations with him. But as I sat in stake conferences and in priesthood leadership meetings, I always felt that he was speaking directly to me. He always impressed and inspired me with his use of the scriptures, his spirituality, and the power of his example. Under his influence I was able to keep my life in balance—spiritual, intellectual, and practical. As to the latter, I saw him adjust his professional life to serve the Lord in his calling—a model I would later follow in my own life.

After graduation and a year clerking in Washington, D.C., I returned to Chicago to become a professor of law at the University of Chicago. This proved to be a crucial decision in my life. Here I feel to men...
The University has sought throughout this period to fulfill the values for which it stands. In a world of considerable violence, and one in which violence begins violence, it has emphasized the principle of non-violence, and the principle of dialogue, to a calling that I have come to believe is a calling to its ideals. As it has sought—and the unique response of faculty and students has made possible—the ability to foster its own affairs in a way consistent with its ideals. [Public statement, 14 February 1969].

That is a great lesson for every organization, especially those involved in teaching. Do your own work, and don’t ask the law or other organizations to do it for you.

After two months of individual hearings on 510 students summoned to university discipline, our faculty committee concluded its assigned task and the university continued its work, all without outside intervention.

This was a time of great disruption on campuses throughout the country. When the political desire to punish student demonstrators produced proposals for federal legislation, I was asked to write my recommendations to Arthur F. Burns, a counselor to President Richard M. Nixon. I was merely following the teaching and leadership of Edwin and Levi when I wrote:

My advice is for the federal government and federal officials to stay out of this controversy. Spare us the spectacle of federal prosecutions of university students. . . . Let the university administrators and faculty look like federal policemen.

By all means stay off the campus, and don’t make federal officials to stay out of this controversy. Spare us the spectacle of federal prosecutions of university students. . . . Let the university administrators and faculty look like federal policemen. [Letter of 15 May 1969].

My advice is for the federal government and federal officials to stay out of this controversy. Spare us the spectacle of federal prosecutions of university students. . . . Let the university administrators and faculty look like federal policemen. [Letter of 15 May 1969].

Iam happy to recall that no federal legislation was enacted. As Levi was fond of saying, the law is a crude instrument. He taught that we should only use the law when we have to.
And so forth. I can still hear his voice speaking those words and sending them right into my heart as an inspiration and a challenge.

From his example I learned that people who are trusted and Church leaders single out a small number of key principles and emphasize them again and again, these few fundamentals are able to raise individual performance on a multitude of other subjects rarely mentioned. This is more effective than trying to push everything equally, like the proverbial river a mile wide and an inch deep that never achieves the concentration necessary to erode a mark on the landscape. Leadership requires selective concentration.

Knowing that I am speaking to many who have important positions of leadership in the Church, I voice the prayer and challenge that you are doing for your people.

In my lifetime I have known people, like the Chief, have the quality of treating everyone like a child of God.

Arthur V. Watkins of Utah. In contrast to my disagreements with him and his family in every sense of that word. We talked about family things many times. He had me bring my wife and our children to his home without cutting off the avenue to deal with true emergencies—at the office.

The Chief justice gave his three law clerks a farewell luncheon on July 3, 1958. I recorded these thoughts in my personal journal:

For this and other reasons my confident personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice's votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on by the Court. Many of these were very satisfying to me personally. Those cases in which I disagreed with the votes of the chief justice allowed me to learn a good lesson in professionalism. Regardless of your opinion of your client's choices, it is your professional duty to serve your client to the best of your ability—subject, of course, to the constraints of legality and legal ethics.

In contrast to my disagreements with the Chief's justice on some cases, I adopted the Chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as a wise and considerate employer. On his part, the Chief (as we always called him) frequently praised my work, we got along well in every circumstance, and after about nine months he asked me to stay another year. But, typical of his consideration for his clerks, he told me I should feel free to decline if I felt this was best for me and my family. I therefore acted on my urge to get back to Chicago to practice law.

Hoping that the Chief invited those who came to his office. He always came from behind his desk, shook hands, and ushered the visitor to a seat. He often did this even when lawn interchanges were Dean Acheson, the most impressive advocate I saw argue a case that year, and John F. Kennedy, a young junior senator from Massachusetts who was to be elected president less than three years later.

Chief Justice Earl Warren was an unlikely mentor and boss for a conservative lawyer like me. As you know, he and others on the so-called “Warren Court” are the authors of many opinions that represent and act like they serve that purpose now known as “Paradigm judicial activists. In my view this judicial activism has worked fair-reaching mischief in the law. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the outcome of these activist decisions, they are unfortunate precedents because the look’s matters that should be decided by elected lawmakers, not life-tenured federal judges.

For this and other reasons my confident personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice’s votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on by the Court. Many of these were very satisfying to me personally. Those cases in which I disagreed with the votes of the chief justice allowed me to learn a good lesson in professionalism. Regardless of your opinion of your client’s choices, it is your professional duty to serve your client to the best of your ability—subject, of course, to the constraints of legality and legal ethics.

In contrast to my disagreements with the Chief’s justice on some cases, I adopted the Chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as a wise and considerate employer. On his part, the Chief (as we always called him) frequently praised my work, we got along well in every circumstance, and after about nine months he asked me to stay another year. But, typical of his consideration for his clerks, he told me I should feel free to decline if I felt this was best for me and my family. I therefore acted on my urge to get back to Chicago to practice law.

Hoping that the Chief invited those who came to his office. He always came from behind his desk, shook hands, and ushered the visitor to a seat. He often did this even when lawn interchanges were Dean Acheson, the most impressive advocate I saw argue a case that year, and John F. Kennedy, a young junior senator from Massachusetts who was to be elected president less than three years later.

Chief Justice Earl Warren was an unlikely mentor and boss for a conservative lawyer like me. As you know, he and others on the so-called “Warren Court” are the authors of many opinions that represent and act like they serve that purpose now known as “Paradigm judicial activists. In my view this judicial activism has worked fair-reaching mischief in the law. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the outcome of these activist decisions, they are unfortunate precedents because the look’s matters that should be decided by elected lawmakers, not life-tenured federal judges.

For this and other reasons my confident personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice’s votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on by the Court. Many of these were very satisfying to me personally. Those cases in which I disagreed with the votes of the chief justice allowed me to learn a good lesson in professionalism. Regardless of your opinion of your client’s choices, it is your professional duty to serve your client to the best of your ability—subject, of course, to the constraints of legality and legal ethics.

In contrast to my disagreements with the Chief’s justice on some cases, I adopted the Chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as a wise and considerate employer. On his part, the Chief (as we always called him) frequently praised my work, we got along well in every circumstance, and after about nine months he asked me to stay another year. But, typical of his consideration for his clerks, he told me I should feel free to decline if I felt this was best for me and my family. I therefore acted on my urge to get back to Chicago to practice law.

Hoping that the Chief invited those who came to his office. He always came from behind his desk, shook hands, and ushered the visitor to a seat. He often did this even when lawn interchanges were Dean Acheson, the most impressive advocate I saw argue a case that year, and John F. Kennedy, a young junior senator from Massachusetts who was to be elected president less than three years later.

Chief Justice Earl Warren was an unlikely mentor and boss for a conservative lawyer like me. As you know, he and others on the so-called “Warren Court” are the authors of many opinions that represent and act like they serve that purpose now known as “Paradigm judicial activists. In my view this judicial activism has worked fair-reaching mischief in the law. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the outcome of these activist decisions, they are unfortunate precedents because the look’s matters that should be decided by elected lawmakers, not life-tenured federal judges.

For this and other reasons my confident personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice’s votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on by the Court. Many of these were very satisfying to me personally. Those cases in which I disagreed with the votes of the chief justice allowed me to learn a good lesson in professionalism. Regardless of your opinion of your client’s choices, it is your professional duty to serve your client to the best of your ability—subject, of course, to the constraints of legality and legal ethics.

In contrast to my disagreements with the Chief’s justice on some cases, I adopted the Chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as a wise and considerate employer. On his part, the Chief (as we always called him) frequently praised my work, we got along well in every circumstance, and after about nine months he asked me to stay another year. But, typical of his consideration for his clerks, he told me I should feel free to decline if I felt this was best for me and my family. I therefore acted on my urge to get back to Chicago to practice law.
Chief Justice Earl Warren

All of us know something about my third father in the law, Chief Justice Earl Warren. I served as one of his three law clerks for 1957–58. My law school sponsored and recommended me to another justice, but I was not chosen. I decided independently to apply to the chief justice. The law school had no connections with him and offered me no encouragement. I contacted President Ernest L. Wilkinson of BYU, who put me in touch with his law partner, Carl Hawkins, who had clerked for Warren’s predecessor and still had a contact in that office. Hawkins also secured a recommendation from Senator Arthur V. Watkins of Utah. In a child of God. This gave me freedom to speak with him about Church matters, and that led to a friendship.

I felt a keen loss at leaving him. Though these pages hold no axe to grind in regard to what I consider his faulty notion of how a judge should reach his votes on some cases, I adored the chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as an educator. For this and other reasons my confidential personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice’s votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on my docket. Most of these disagreements were unimportant. My year clerk for the chief justice was challenging, satisfying, and far-reaching. Beyond the obvious opening of doors for professional advancement, it was a remarkable educational experience. I was allowed to see and participate in the work of the nation’s highest court and to work side by side with the most future leaders of the bench, the bar, and the nation. Among the special guests of the chief justice were George F. Kennedy, a young junior senator from Massachusetts, who was to be elected president less than three years later.

Chief Justice Earl Warren was an unlikely mentor and boss for a conservative lawyer like me. As we all know, he and others on the so-called “Warren Court” are the authors of many opinions that represent and set forth what is now known as constitutional activism. In my view this judicial activism has worked far-reaching mischief in the law. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the outcome of these activist decisions, they are unfortunate precedents because they are matters that should be decided by elected lawmakers, not life-tenured federal judges.

For this and other reasons my confidential personal year-end tally shows that I disagreed with the chief justice’s votes on 40 percent of the cases decided on my docket during that year. The 40 percent in which I agreed with him were obviously more comfortable for me, especially in cases where he was writing the opinion for the Court. Many of these were very satisfying to me personally. These cases in which I disagreed with the votes of the chief justice allowed me to learn a good lesson in professionalism. Regardless of your opinion of your client’s choices, it is your professional duty to serve your client to the best of your ability—subject, of course, to the constraints of legality and legal ethics.

In contrast to my disagreements with his votes on some cases, I admired the chief justice as a person, and I admired him as an administrator of the Court and as a wise and considerate employer. On his part, the Chief (as we always called him) frequently praised my work, we got along well in every circumstance, and after about nine months he asked me to stay another year. But, typical of his consideration for his clerks, he told me I should feel free to decline if I felt this was best for me and my family. I therefore acted on my urge to get back to Chicago to practice law.

Horrified that the Chief treated those who came to his office. He always came from behind his desk, shook hands, and ushered the visitor to a seat. He often did that even though he had a hunch that he was about to lose litigation. He shared one example I have never forgotten. I was on the staff of the chief justice. He had been a candidate for the United States Senate in 1954. I was about to file suit against a senator, the member of Congress for the district where I lived. I thought I was about to lose the case, but I decided to take the risk, and I’m glad I did. I won the case.

I started as a clerk in the chief justice’s office on July 3, 1957. I recorded these thoughts in my personal journal: The chief justice was faithful to his wife and his family in every sense of that word. We talked about family things many times. He had me bring my wife and our two children to see and participate in the work of the nation’s highest court and to work side by side with lawyers who were the present and future leaders of the bar. I loved how the Chief treated those who came to his office. He always came from behind his desk, shook hands, and ushered the visitor to a seat. He often did that even though he had a hunch that he was about to lose litigation. He shared one example I have never forgotten. I was on the staff of the chief justice. He had been a candidate for the United States Senate in 1954. I was about to file suit against a senator, the member of Congress for the district where I lived. I thought I was about to lose the case, but I decided to take the risk, and I’m glad I did. I won the case.

The chief justice was always respectful of the opinions of the members of the Court. As I observed that some people, like the Chief, have the quality of treating everyone like a child of God even though they lack the doctrinal understanding that requires this. Others who have the doctrine sometimes fail to act on it.

The Chief also taught me about professional confidences. He shared everything with his clerks, and in return advised us that we expected absolute confidentiality about the work of the Court, forever. We should never talk or write about the confidential matters we had observed at the Court, since he was, as he said, “destructive of the free exchange of ideas among court members and of public confidence in the Court.” Since I was schooled in that way, you can imagine my disgust at some of the disclosures made by former confidants of political figures who get wealthy by betraying their confidences in so-called “kiss and tell” autobiographies.

The chief justice taught me about the quality of treating everyone like a child of God. In my lifetime I have observed that some people, like the Chief, have the quality of treating everyone like a child of God even though they lack the doctrinal understanding that requires this. Others who have the doctrine sometimes fail to act on it. The chief justice was always respectful of the opinions of the members of the Court. As I observed that some people, like the Chief, have the quality of treating everyone like a child of God even though they lack the doctrinal understanding that requires this. Others who have the doctrine sometimes fail to act on it.
decisions, I have developed a profound affection and respect for him. I believe he is completely honest, sincere, and utterly without guile. He has wonderful matters and judgment about many matters, and is the most kind and considerate employer one could ask for. I will miss him.

The Chief continued his interest in all his clerks. He urged me not to practice law in Chicago, which he considered a “crooked” place, but later he retracted when I told him I was leaving the practice to teach.

“Oh, that’s great,” he said. “You’ll be able to influence those young lawyers. That’s a wonderful thing to do.” (from my personal journal, quoted in Ed Gray, Chief Justice, p. 375, 1997?)

When the Chief justice reigned in 1956, while still in good health at age 80, he decided to resign and return to his alma mater. Despite this, besides wise and at the peak of his powers and effectiveness.

“I believe you have done that,” I wrote, then expressed my belief that this was “the right and proper course.” I continued, “That is what I would have wanted for you if you had been my father, and I feel the same way about you as one of a small group of men who are in a very real sense my fathers in the law.”

Lewis F. Powell

The fourth of my fathers in the law is Lewis F. Powell. You will remember him as the President of the United States Supreme Court. But I believe he is completely honest, sincere, and utterly without guile. He has wonderful matters and judgment about many matters, and is the most kind and considerate employer one could ask for. I will miss him.

Lewis F. Powell was an expert at defining the respective responsibilities of a board and a professional staff. He was also brilliant at analyzing how to present matters to a board to obtain fruitful discussions and clear decisions to guide the staff. Powell was very clear an organizational principle, he knew the contours of the men, and he knew the people who had to make and implement the decisions. All of those skills were needed because I was appointed to manage the University of Arizona at a time when the board was experiencing serious financial problems. The staff that its continued funding was in doubt. Differences had to be resolved, new policies had to be formulated, and confidence had to be restored. I described the results in my personal history.

One of the most valuable experiences was watching the lift off energy and broke over the New Law School Board. Our Board of Governors attended the opening ceremonies and we were honored to have the Board of Governors of the University of Arizona present at the ceremony dedicating the new Law School, and we were honored to have the organization moving forward within the limits of constitutional and charitable support.

Less than a month after this tutorial ended, I was meeting with the Board of Trustees of Brigham Young University. I had been one of the Board’s members and spent a great deal of time meeting with them from 1972 to 1973. I was appointed to manage the board, develop its policies and structure, and prepare it for the university’s future. The Board of Trustees supported the University’s development by providing a consistent and stable financial plan and by ensuring that the University’s resources were used efficiently and effectively.

In 1984, while happily serving on the Utah State Supreme Court, I was appointed to the University of Arizona to teach in the law school. I was one of the first members of the law school’s faculty, and I was very happy to be able to teach there. I continued to teach at the University of Arizona for many years, and I was very pleased with the results of my teaching there.

Lewis F. Powell

I flew to Richmond and met my friend and tutor, Professor Lewis Powell. He was a brilliant man, and he was an important figure in my life. He was known for his legal knowledge and his ability to use it effectively. He was also known for his kindness and his ability to listen. I was very fortunate to have had him as my tutor.

A few years later Justice Lewis F. Powell came to me in 1970 and said, “I have been offered the presidency of Brigham Young University. Will you come and help me?” I was very pleased to accept this offer, and I spent many hours with Justice Powell discussing the University’s future and the steps we could take to make it successful.

In 1977, I was appointed to the Board of Trustees of the University of Arizona. I was one of the first members of the Board and I was very pleased to be able to serve there. I continued to serve on the Board for many years, and I was very pleased with the results of my service there.

I have spoken of four men whom I call my fathers in the law, reviewing some of the things they taught me in my formative years in the legal profession. Each of these men has had a profound impact on my life and my career. I hope you have been as blessed through your mentors as I have been through mine.

The Chief continued his interest in all his clerks. He urged me not to practice law in Chicago, which he considered a “crooked” place, but later he retracted when I told him I was leaving the practice to teach.

“Oh, that’s great,” he said. “You’ll be able to influence those young lawyers. That’s a wonderful thing to do.” (from my personal journal, quoted in Ed Gray, Chief Justice, p. 375, 1997?)

When the Chief justice reigned in 1956, while still in good health at age 80, he decided to resign and return to his alma mater. Despite this, besides wise and at the peak of his powers and effectiveness.

“I believe you have done that,” I wrote, then expressed my belief that this was “the right and proper course.” I continued, “That is what I would have wanted for you if you had been my father, and I feel the same way about you as one of a small group of men who are in a very real sense my fathers in the law.”

Lewis F. Powell

The fourth of my fathers in the law is Lewis F. Powell. You will remember him as the President of the United States Supreme Court. But I believe he is completely honest, sincere, and utterly without guile. He has wonderful matters and judgment about many matters, and is the most kind and considerate employer one could ask for. I will miss him.

Lewis F. Powell

I flew to Richmond and met my friend and tutor, Professor Lewis Powell. He was a brilliant man, and he was an important figure in my life. He was known for his legal knowledge and his ability to use it effectively. He was also known for his kindness and his ability to listen. I was very fortunate to have had him as my tutor.

A few years later Justice Lewis F. Powell came to me in 1970 and said, “I have been offered the presidency of Brigham Young University. Will you come and help me?” I was very pleased to accept this offer, and I spent many hours with Justice Powell discussing the University’s future and the steps we could take to make it successful.

In 1977, I was appointed to the Board of Trustees of the University of Arizona. I was one of the first members of the Board and I was very pleased to serve there. I continued to serve on the Board for many years, and I was very pleased with the results of my service there.

I have spoken of four men whom I call my fathers in the law, reviewing some of the things they taught me in my formative years in the legal profession. Each of these men has had a profound impact on my life and my career. I hope you have been as blessed through your mentors as I have been through mine.
decisions, I have developed a profound affection and respect for him. I believe he is completely honest, sincere, and utterly without guile. He has wonderful matter-of-fact judgment about many matters, and I think he is the most kind and considerate employer one could ask for. I will miss him.

The Chief continued his interest in his clerks. He urged me not to practice law in Chicago, which he considered a “crooked” place, but he later respected when I told him I was leaving the practice to teach. “Oh, that’s great,” he said. “You’ll be able to influence these young lawyers. That’s a wonderful thing to do.” (from my personal journal, quoted in Ed Gray, Chief Justice, 377–9972).

When the chief justice retired in 1969, while still on good health at age 78, I wrote him a letter recognizing his resignation as a fulfillment of his intention—frequently voiced to his law clerks—besides the peak of his powers and effectiveness.

“I believe you have done that,” I wrote, “triumphed in your belief that this was ‘the right and proper course.’ I continued,” That is what I would have wanted for you if you had been my father, and I feel the same way about you as one of a small group of men who are in a very real sense my fathers in the law.”

Lewis F. Powell

The Board of my fathers in the law is Lewis F. Powell. You will remember him as a highly respected former president of the American Bar Association. He served as chairman of the board of the American Bar Foundation, the research arm of the American Bar Association. ABA, as we called it, was located next door to the University of Chicago Law School. In the summer of 1970 Powell arranged for me to have a year’s leave of absence and time from the law school to serve as the executive director of ABA. I was responsible to work with the board of directors and to direct the professional staff—the same task as the president of a corporation or the university. I had never served on a board or worked under the direction of a board, so this was an entirely new experience.

I had the pleasure of better teacher than Lewis Powell. He was an expert at defining the respective responsibilities of a board and a professional staff. He was also brilliant at analyzing how to present matters to a board to obtain fruitful discussions and clear decisions to guide the staff. Powell was very knowledgeable in an organizational principle, he knew the concerns of the members, and he knew the people who had to make a decision and the implications. All of these skills were needed because I was appointed to manage ABA at a time when its board was so dissatisfied with the work of the professional staff that its continued funding was in doubt. Differences had to be resolved, new policies had to be formulated, and confidence had to be restored.

I described the results in my personal history.

One of the most valuable experiences was watching the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which came to the end? Each of us will have our record of service to our clients, our profession, our communities, and our God. There will remain what we have become by that service. We will also have the eternal family responsibilities we treasure, as defined by the terms of our covenants and promised blessings and our fulfillment of the conditions on which they are based. All of this we can talk with as we have our last appearance before a judge. As we know from sacred writings, we must “stand at the bar of judgment seat of Christ” (Morm. 8:1), “that we will judge all men according to their works, according to the desire of their hearts” (Dallin Oaks, University of Chicago law student).

I have spoken of four men whom I call my fathers in the law, reviewing some of the things they taught me in my formative years in the legal profession. Each of them had a prodigious influence on my life, and it has been a fulfillment of my intention—frequently voiced to my law clerks—to resign while still at the peak of my powers and effectiveness.

Many times I have thanked a loving Heavenly Father for what I was privileged to learn from Lewis Powell. His teachings have been crucial in my life. He is the expert at defining the respective responsibilities of a board and a professional staff. He was also brilliant at analyzing how to present matters to a board to obtain fruitful discussions and clear decisions to guide the staff. Powell was very knowledgeable in an organizational principle, he knew the concerns of the members, and he knew the people who had to make and implement the decisions. All of these skills were needed because I was appointed to manage ABA at a time when its board was so dissatisfied with the work of the professional staff that its continued funding was in doubt. Differences had to be resolved, new policies had to be formulated, and confidence had to be restored.

I described the results in my personal history.

One of the most valuable experiences was watching the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which came to the end? Each of us will have our record of service to our clients, our profession, our communities, and our God. There will remain what we have become by that service. We will also have the eternal family responsibilities we treasure, as defined by the terms of our covenants and promised blessings and our fulfillment of the conditions on which they are based. All of this we can talk with as we have our last appearance before a judge. As we know from sacred writings, we must “stand at the bar of judgment seat of Christ” (Morm. 8:1), “that we will judge all men according to their works, according to the desire of their hearts” (Dallin Oaks, University of Chicago law student).