

AN INTERVIEW WITH CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVIST ANTONIA HERNÁNDEZ

Antonia Hernández, a lifelong civil rights activist, visited Harvard Law School to mentor students considering careers in public interest. She generously took an evening to sit down with the Harvard Latino Law Review and La Alianza, reflecting on her over thirty years of experience as an attorney—two decades of which were spent as President and General Counsel of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF)—and sharing her thoughts on the state of Latinos in American society today. We include excerpts of the Latino Law Review’s personal interview with Ms. Hernández.

You are originally from Mexico and immigrated to the United States, where your father was a citizen. What was it like coming to the United States from Mexico?

My dad was born in Texas, and my grandmother and grandfather lived in the west part of Texas. During the Depression, a great many families were pushed back into Mexico. That’s how my father ended up going to Mexico and that’s where I was born. But he always knew he was a U.S. citizen, and as soon as he could, he would go back and forth . . . My parents are very political, but my dad especially so. He just loves politics, and he’s a proud lifelong Democrat, so he brought us up to be very much attuned to politics.

Did you participate in the Chicano movement with him?

I’ve been active for quite some time, and my dad would drive me to the demonstrations, drop me off at the beginning and then pick me up at the end of the demonstration. I was not discouraged from participating. I did boycott. I did march. I was a product of my times, and so I was very active in my college life and throughout my life.

Looking today at youth and protests, do you see a difference? How would you characterize it? I know a lot of people were surprised to see high school students participating in walkouts.¹

¹ See *Student Immigration Protests Continue, Thousands in California, Texas Skip Class for Immigration Rights Rallies*, ASSOC. PRESS, Mar. 28, 2006, available at <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/03/28/national/main1447009.shtml> (last visited Mar. 6, 2008); John Rogers, *Stay in School or March for Rights?: Some Student Ponder Whether Walking Out to Join Immigration Protests is a Good Thing, but Most Are United Behind a Cause*, CONTRA COSTA TIMES, Apr. 29, 2006, at F4.

It's a different generation. Younger people view the world very differently. We're all products of our environment, and I am a bit disappointed in the sense that people aren't as politically active as they were in my generation. I have children your age, and it's different. I would say that this generation is not as optimistic about the political process.

It's disappointing in a sense because there's a lot wrong with our political process, but there's also a lot right. Being involved in movements and public interest, you don't change things without nudging, without challenging, without forcing people to feel a bit uncomfortable. And it's only through social movements that things change. This generation is more tangible, one on one, touching and feeling. My generation was about the systemic change.

You're directing a big community organization that's doing projects in the L.A. community.² Do you think that community organizing is the new direction where things are headed?

I think that philanthropy is playing a different role. When I was active in college and high school, I was not aware of foundations or philanthropy. I think with the new world, you hear a lot more about philanthropy and entrepreneurial philanthropy. It's a new vehicle for involvement in your generation that wasn't there in my generation.

To me, the interesting thing about philanthropy is its evolving niche in society, and, if you look, philanthropy is like the risk capital of society. Whereas you have risk capital in the private sector, philanthropy is what I would call that type of capital for the nonprofit sector. It's where you get to experiment, to try new things, where you're allowed to make mistakes, but not needless mistakes. I think philanthropy is going to play an important role, though I will tell you that anybody who thinks that philanthropy is going to solve the problem of poverty is barking up the wrong tree.

Suppose you're a young lawyer coming out of law school and you have a choice of getting a Skadden Fellowship, Echoing Green, or starting at Community Legal Services. What do you think is better?

All three. What I tell students is find your passion first and foremost, then get the skills necessary to put your passion into operation, realizing that you're going to have to work really hard and be very entrepreneurial and creative. It's that passion.

I define passions very broadly. If you were to tell me, "I'm interested in public interest, but my passion is business," I would tell you go out and make a lot of money—do it honestly, without taking advantage of anyone,

² Ms. Hernández is President and CEO of the California Community Foundation. CCF focuses its philanthropic work in Los Angeles County. See California Community Foundation, <http://www.calfund.org> (last visited Apr. 1, 2008).

and then give back. There are different ways of helping society. I'm religious. It's finding the talents the Lord gave you. Develop those.

I'm passionate about what I do. I have that fire in the belly. I was at MALDEF for twenty-three years, and that was one vehicle for social change. The California Community Foundation is another vehicle for social change. Whereas MALDEF was at the macro, systemic change level, CCF is about the micro, one community, one county. . . . At CCF I am an enabler. I don't get to go out there and get my hand in it. At the same time, it's another vehicle. It allows me the opportunity to put into action my ideas of what an ideal society should be.

The skills, you learn them. You cannot learn passion. If you're really good at something, that's where you'll be most useful, so it's what really motivates you, and what gets you up in the morning. You need to feel good about what you want to do. You also have to have a good sense of what's at the end of the road. What is it that you want to accomplish? It's that thing at the end of the road, that you can keep looking at, whether it is changing the political face of the United States through voting rights litigation, changing the education system through public policy and litigation, immigration laws; you keep your eyes on the long term.

The other thing I tell students is that change is very slow. A lot of times, you take two steps forward and one back, one forward and three back. You have to keep the long view, otherwise you get very discouraged.

When I was at MALDEF, I had Skadden Fellows; I had Fried Frank fellows. It didn't matter how they got to MALDEF, they got there and that was their passion. Whether it's the Environmental Defense Fund, or the ACLU, or security issues, or animals—as long as you're not extreme on anything because, remember, you cannot be too much of a radical if you're a lawyer. You crossed that path many moons ago; when you chose to be a lawyer, you chose to work within the system. You bend it. You stretch it. You nudge it. But you don't break it because it's the only way you have got. You have to have a pretty good sense of what you want to substitute it with. In my view, the best radicals are good lawyers. The best public interest lawyers are very smart, very hard working.

I worked in a legal services organization this summer. We had one lawyer who was also a social worker. He was the hardest working person I have ever seen. He was never off. He spent his day being a lawyer and his nights being a social worker, even though he was only supposed to be a lawyer.

See, that's the other thing, you can just burn out. You've got to have a life outside of work. You've got to have balance. You have to love work, and be committed to work, but your career and work cannot define who you are, and that is the most important thing I say to students. When I was at MALDEF, I used to say, "Give me a good nine hours, and in a crisis give me fifteen hours, and then go out and get a life. Because if your life is

MALDEF, there's something wrong with you." It's the issue of balance, of family, of friends, of really sort of enjoying life. It shouldn't be a sacrifice. It should be something you love to do that at the end of the day is intellectually stimulating.

I tell my students who say they want to help poor people and say they want to take Landlord/Tenant classes, "Forget it. Poor people have the most complicated, complex problems in the universe. Take contracts. Take insurance. Take transactions. Know torts. Know the law in the most complex, intricate areas because those are the problems of poor people."

You have to focus. Look at the issue of subprime mortgages. If you look at most complex litigation, who do you go up against? They are your colleagues—Harvard graduates who go to firms. Firms have three associates, four paralegals. And you've got you, yourself, and your wits. You have to be smarter, cagier, more resourceful. You're practicing the same law, the same statutes. Go out there and be the best law student, the best lawyer.

Three years ago, when you were speaking at our conference,³ you mentioned it was important to think of new ways to address issues. What do you see as the new directions in Latino legal issues?

Let's talk about education. A good education is basically the only way out of poverty. And if you look at the studies, poor people are not getting the education that they've earned. For instance, let's pick Southern California. People are at Harvard Westlake in Westside L.A., where parents are paying \$25,000 a year. Most poor people in South Central don't earn \$25,000 a year.

The new data shows that you start unprepared at two or three years old. You start kindergarten behind. You're going to a mediocre school with over-taxed teachers, not having the resources, falling behind. By the third grade, if you don't know how to read and write, you're lost. Right now, the greatest crisis is the lack of high school graduation, particularly for minority African American and Latino males. You're basically caught in a cycle of poverty that you're never going to get out of.

I think that to a large degree, the diminishing of the middle class has really hurt American society. When I was MALDEF, in 1983, with two of my colleagues, Mike Bauer and John Huerta, we conceived of a strategy to sue all of the major grocery chains in the Southwest, all of them, Safeway's, Lucky's, Von's, because they were union, well-paying jobs which you only needed a high school education to get . . . but they were closed in. Your brother, your cousin got it. It was never opened up. In the grocery stores, the butcher was the top of the hierarchy. Most men worked there.

³ See *The Seventh Annual Harvard Latino Law, Business, and Public Policy Conference: Investing in Our Future*, 8 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 93, 124-135 (2005).

We succeeded in winning on every level, but what has happened to the economy since then? It has changed dramatically. There's been strike after strike. You have a two-tiered salary just like you have in the airline industry. People have lost their wage power. Those jobs that would allow you to work most of your life and have a comfortable middle class life, they're gone. All you needed was a high school diploma, and they're gone. Look at flight attendants and what's going on there. Look at pilots. Pilots were the cream of the crop. If you were a pilot, you were happy. Now they've lost wage power, and they're just another commodity.

Most of the jobs that are opening up are opening at the top end and the bottom end. What's happening is that we've lost a lot of the economic infrastructure that maintains a healthy middle class. We've created a lot of jobs that are not sustainable like waitressing and most of the construction and labor jobs. There's no way out of there because of the wages they're being paid. So what's a new strategy? A living wage.

I look at the law as a vehicle. It's a tool for changing society. You change it by making laws, by lobbying as to how to change laws, by litigating, or by educating and agitating. You look at the problem and say, "Which is the best vehicle?" Sometimes litigation is not the best vehicle. Sometimes organizing is the best vehicle. When I first started, the strategy was going to federal court. That changed in the mid-80s. Then we used to pick going to state court, if not in Texas then maybe in California. Then you say, the courts are not that great, so let's get ordinances and go through the political process of changing the laws and amending the laws. As a lawyer, how you face an issue depends on the circumstances and looking a little bit forward. People look to the past, and it's a good indicator, but if all you're solving is the past, and not the present or the future or what's coming, then if you prevail it will be only for the short term because the remedy won't be a remedy for the present and the future. You have to look at the vehicles for change and figure out which are the most appropriate.

In the education context, one of the big areas is early childhood education. How do you work within the legal structure to get early childhood education?

We're starting a program at CCF in partnership with the Packard Foundation. The Packard Foundation had for some years been investing a great deal in the passing of an initiative for universal early childhood education, Proposition 82. Everybody's for early childhood education because the facts are so clear. But who pays for it and from where?

It didn't pass. . . . It turns out that "universal" didn't make sense to some people because, "Why should we be paying for someone who makes \$100,000 a year and help them with child care?"

At the end of the rainbow we all want early childhood education, but in California, particularly with so many initiatives and bonds, you have to start with need-based programs. That's a political strategy. People thought, if

you make it universal, everybody will love it. But that's only to the degree that they don't have to pay for it. Once they started analyzing that this is going to cost a lot of money, they thought this isn't a good idea.

Packard came to us and said, "Help us with a strategy building consensus around the issue." In early childhood education, there's a lot of vested interests—Head Starts, and providers in the private sector—and then the majority of Latinos are taken care of by the neighbor, by the grandma. Our job is to get an understanding of all the different interests, to start working with parents and the community, and then to build up an educational campaign to go to the legislature for a legislative fix based on need.

We anticipate it will take us maybe into the next legislative session if it's the year of education; if health care and water don't get taken care of, it would push education further behind. You look long term. It'll be a three- to four-year effort, but if we're successful, the legislature will pass a bill that will mandate multiple approaches to providing early childhood education on a need-based basis. *That's* a solution. Incremental. It's got to be worth the effort.

Who does get it passed the first time? I think sometimes idealism gets in the way of pragmatism.

But it sounds like one of the risks is that you get my generation, which is marked by cynicism. How do move toward pragmatism and still have the idealism to keep that long-term focus?

A true idealist is first and foremost a pragmatist. Cynicism, to me, is an excuse not to do anything. We all have to make choices. Five to ten years ago, women would say, "We want it all: career, family, happiness . . ." You can have it all. Just not all at the same time. We have hard choices. I've been an idealist all my life. Once I got an award, and I said, "Thank you with my eyes open." You have to be practical, too.

Where do you see Latino influence in politics in the future?

A large part of our community is under age eighteen. We're a relatively young community. Then, you have to deal with the issue of citizenship, and those who are eligible for citizenship, and those who want to become legalized. So when you look at our community, you talk about mixed families. I'm not talking about mixed ethnically. I'm talking about a citizen, a legal resident, and an undocumented in the household. And so, those things have to work themselves out.

Political evolution will really depend on the involvement of the *citizens* in building up the citizens of a community, and it will be from the *local* up. That's what you're seeing, for the first time. Bill Richardson running for president, he won't get it the first time, but he would be a phenomenal senator, a phenomenal Secretary of State. You will begin to see that evolution.

Immigrants are a funny group. I'm often told, "Republicans think that Latinos should be Republicans, and Democrats think that Latinos should be Democrats." For Latinos, we're very communal, and people don't get that, meaning communal in the sense that you support your family and family could be cousin to the twentieth degree, the ranch you come from, the town you come from. It's large; it takes a village. [The right question is:] "How do you take advantage of that?" rather than, "How do you manipulate them?"

I wanted to get your take on some of the issues we're publishing about this year in the *Latino Law Review*. One article is on resegregation in North Carolina and the added element of the growing Latino population.⁴ Resegregation and the legacy of *Brown*⁵ is something you're well versed in at this point.

Latinos are the most segregated students in the United States. That's number one. The issue of desegregation has always been about housing patterns, which nobody wants to deal with, or change, or can't to a large degree.

In the 1990s, I started traveling a lot to the Southeast because we saw the demographic changes. MALDEF opened an office in 2001 in Atlanta, Georgia. I went to Raleigh and Durham, and Georgia I knew very well. And what was interesting about the Southeast is that several things are still evolving: as Latinos went in, it was becoming less black/white. When you were [a] small [population], they didn't know where to put you. When you start growing in numbers, then it starts getting complicated. As the demographics were changing, a lot of jobs were being created in the Southeast. Mercedes Benz opened; a lot of cars were going into production there, and they're always chasing a cheaper workforce. So at the same time Latinos were moving in . . . you had an expanding economy that could take in and absorb all those new workers, and so you sort of prolonged the social rubbing until later on. There's a Latino comedian who said, "They used to describe the demographic change in the Southeast like, in the 80s it was a drizzle, in the 90s it was a heavy rain, in the early 2000s it was a downright storm." People started to say, "What's going on?" And now the issue of immigration has just taken total hold.

We used to go into Dalton, Georgia, which is the carpet capital of the United States. Over fifty percent of the students there are Latino. If you go to Gainesville, Georgia, which is where they kill chickens, same thing. All of these little towns, and now the vast majority of students in these schools are Latino. They're struggling to figure out how to educate these people.

⁴ Marie C. Scott, *Resegregation, Language, and Education Opportunity: The Influx of Latino Students into North Carolina Public Schools*, 11 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 123 (2008).

⁵ *Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). See generally CHARLES J. OGLETREE, JR., ALL DELIBERATE SPEED: REFLECTION ON THE FIRST HALF CENTURY OF BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION (2004); JAMES T. PATTERSON, BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION: A CIVIL RIGHTS MILESTONE AND ITS TROUBLED LEGACY (2001).

They're different from their [categories] of black and white. Georgia, when it started having a large number of Latinos, started bringing in teachers from Mexico. They needed teachers to help them. There was some creativity going on because they weren't stuck with the old paradigms. They were just trying to deal with issues.

Today, the whole immigration debate has been taken by the demagogues, and it hasn't allowed for a rational debate and solutions to the immigration dilemma. People are coming for one primary reason: work, economics. If there weren't any jobs for these undocumented, they wouldn't come. They have no safety net, notwithstanding what the public gives. They have to work, and if the economy didn't absorb them, then just like they've been pulled here economically, they would be pushed back economically. The economy keeps bringing them in.

We had an article about that in our last issue, looking at the effects of NAFTA, and there was a lot of discussion about the push factors and the pull factors that were influencing it.⁶

We were just in Ireland. There are a lot of immigrants in Ireland. In fact, if you go into a hotel, you can't understand what they are saying because they're from Poland, Lithuania, throughout the E.U., and moving back and forth, going to where the jobs are. It's not a United States phenomenon. It's a worldwide phenomenon, and we can either choose to regulate it and deal with it, or get caught up in all of this societal polarization that isn't going to get us anywhere by not dealing with the issue.

What do you think is going to happen with *Plyler*,⁷ as communities start passing these anti-immigrant ordinances?

We're one vote away from losing *Plyler* at the Supreme Court, and we're one case away from fitting all of the criteria for the Supreme Court to take the case. The folks who want to overturn it know this, and they're pushing it. All these ordinances have been challenged, and one of them is going to percolate to the Supreme Court. You cannot think of a scenario in which the constitution of the current Supreme Court will uphold *Plyler*. It's much more fragile than *Roe v. Wade*. And it's just waiting.

Is that the end of choice? No, because medicine has caught up. What was in the 50s and 60s is not today. If *Plyler* is overturned it's not the end of the world because new public interest lawyers like you will be coming out and will see the world differently and will find an angle and take it back to the state courts, and then make it a state issue.

⁶ Ranko Shiraki Oliver, *In the Twelve Years of NAFTA, the Treaty Gave to Me . . . What, Exactly?;*, 10 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 53, 120-30 (2007).

⁷ *Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202 (1982) (striking down Texas statute denying public education to illegal immigrant children).

I think that's the other thing about being a public interest lawyer. You have to be scrappy, and you have to be entrepreneurial, and always optimistic. If they close one door, where's the window? Where's the back door? Where's the little sliver? It's never over.

Another article in this issue discusses how the Supreme Court has classified Latinos over the years.⁸ As you were saying in Georgia, black, white, and what? Where do think that's heading?

I think that the United States is a laboratory, and one moving in the direction in which race is becoming if not irrelevant, then silly. Latinos prior to the 50s were classified as white, legally, but treated black. It went to the Supreme Court in the case of *Hernandez*,⁹ to say, "Yeah, you classify us as white but you treat us as black. So, we need special protection because of the way you treat us."

We're coming full circle. In many ways, race is becoming academic. Look around L.A.; the biggest percentage of children are mixed race. It's Iranians, Mexicans, Armenians, mixed Mexican-Koreans, every mix whatever. I think that's wonderful. People say, "You're complicated," but life is complex and complicated, and I think that that is not helpful. We're a laboratory and we have something to show for it. As messy as we are, and though sometimes we think we're not making progress, we are. We clash, but think about it, every village, every tribe is represented in L.A. County. So I think that in the future, the whole issue of race and color is your generation's challenge, and that's what I think that every new generation brings to the table.

With my kids, when they say they're bringing over their friend Jennifer, I don't know what the heck Jennifer is. To them, it's not really an issue that it's not until Jennifer shows up that I know what Jennifer is. Your folks look at it differently. That's not to say that there are not tensions. Class and race are still very different and I'm making no illusions. I think that's the challenge of your generation, to look at the demographics of this country, which were very different in my generation, and try to make sense of them.

One of the articles we're publishing is on product liability and failure to warn.¹⁰ What you were saying earlier about studying torts and studying contracts was interesting because, to some extent, products liability is a tort issue.

But you also sign contracts. If you look at the issues of poor people, black, white, whatever, it's an issue of an imbalance of economic power.

⁸ Jamie Crook, *From Hernandez v. Texas to the Present: Doctrinal Shifts in the Supreme Court's Latina-o Jurisprudence*, 11 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 19 (2008).

⁹ *Hernandez v. Texas*, 347 U.S. 475 (1954).

¹⁰ Glenda Labadie-Jackson, *Warning: Silence Can Cause Severe Harm*, 11 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 85 (2008).

What public interest lawyers are trying to do is level the playing field economically and make it a fair playing field. Lawyers are tools which poor people can have access to. You are a tool; you are a vehicle; and you're providing these individuals with the skills to make sure that those who have more economic power do not take advantage of them. Health care, the whole thing, you always look at the balance of the relationship and if it's a balanced relationship.

That's what you're always looking at, constantly being pulled by those who have the political and economic power. It's human nature. What public interest lawyers do is try to pull it back. It's a constant battle, always. Sometimes, it's like a game. We can beat you at your game. It's part of the psyche. I've been doing it for thirty-five years. You have to be in the game and have that psyche to be in the game.

You mentioned subprime loans earlier, and we have an article on Spanish-language loan documents.¹¹ What's your take on that?

It's not going away because the mortgage loans set every eighteen months, and we just got the first set. It hasn't worked itself through. It's the second resetting. The challenge is dealing with a lot of greedy interests. You know the cliché, "It's okay to be a pig; pigs get fat and hogs get slaughtered"? That's a common cliché in the food industry. Some of these financial interests went from being fat pigs, to being hogs. The problem is that its impact will go [on for a long time] and it's quite complicated. As subprime lending was coming into play, the whole financial industry was changing too. Whereas before you went into a bank, you borrowed some money, and the bank held your note . . .

. . . Now it's securitized.

That's right. That's why they don't know where the end is. You don't know who holds these notes. Because the bank sold it, and when you're paying the bank, you're only paying them to process the payment. They don't make any money on the loan; they make money on the fees. Then you bundle those loans, and it goes to Citibank. Citibank bundles those loans, and it goes to hedge funds. You never thought Citibank was in subprime, or Goldman Sachs, or Merrill Lynch.

We at CCF are trying to help people in L.A. because L.A. County is going to be one of the hardest hit. How? Do you give to Bet Tzedek and MALDEF and Legal Aid to provide legal services? I'm not sure. What is there to litigate?

It might help save some people, to help them declare bankruptcy and save their homes.

¹¹ Jo Carrillo, *In Translation for the Latino Market Today: Acknowledging the Rights of Consumers in a Multilingual Housing Market*, 11 HARV. LATINO L. REV. 1 (2008).

Then what's happening in bankruptcy? Structurally, they'll get hit twice. A person needs maybe two payments. Is it cheaper to provide them the two payments, then help them catch up and help them restructure? If you want to help the poor homeowner, you want to help the people who got us into the mess to begin with, like the savings and loans. It's like an onion. You've got to peel it away one layer at a time, and you might be just one part of the peel, and there's another solution to the next part of the peel.

That's why the Federal Reserve doesn't know what to do. Even though they reduced the interest they paid on the over-the-counter money to the financial institutions, it didn't help. So you folks have to say, "Hey, let's be smart about it. How can we help? Who can we help?" The smart people are saying that forty percent of the people who got subprime loans had very good credit, so you just need to restructure them into a good, solid mortgage. Twenty percent were investors. Of the forty percent who should not have gotten loans, you have to figure out the ones you *cannot* help, and you cannot help everyone all the time.

I find that an interesting tension because one argument in support of subprime loans is that "this group would never get a loan otherwise." On the other hand, there's someone who could qualify for prime rates, but the types of solicitations that happen would never take her to a main bank, they'd take her to their subprime branch.

Bank of America might not have a branch in South Central L.A. You don't have access to the same type of credit. But there are some people who shouldn't be on those loans. You're putting them into a worse situation. The economics just don't work out. You're not doing them a favor by putting them in that position. That's really hard for do-gooders.

I experienced that when I would interview people who were facing foreclosure, and they would say things like, "We knew we couldn't afford it, but we just really wanted to buy a home." It's tough. People don't do the five-years-down-the-line calculus where their ARM has adjusted upward and they're now paying \$5000/month.

One of my rules of public interest is "First, do no harm." Poverty has its limitations. You've got to live within your means. And hoping and wishing that everyone should have this, isn't going to get them this. They should have good credit. They should look into getting good credit. Poor people save a heck of a lot of money, but they're getting poor people to assume a responsibility that they [cannot handle]. As a lawyer, think about "do no harm."

How do we convince a Latino professor that Harvard is someplace they should come?

You can't. You can't and you shouldn't. That Latino professor needs to see it in their self-interest to do it, and he/she needs to feel that they're making a contribution and that they're being considered as an equal to their colleagues. I had the same problem. I graduated from UCLA Law School, and I'm after my dean for a Latino professor, so he brings me someone from Argentina. And everybody is after Gerry.¹² Gerry is at Stanford, Berkeley, UCLA, Columbia, they're all after him. He's everywhere.

Yes, he's here in the winter.

I'm telling you, he's everywhere! My dean's telling me, "We're going to get Gerry." And I'm saying, "He's not the only one. Pick a young, brilliant lawyer."

So Harvard can steal them in about 10 or 15 years.

Exactly. I think that students need to continue to put pressure on the administration to bring them. That's your job. Continue to push for it. It's their job to find someone who thinks that they're being brought because of their talent and their skills, who is equal to their colleagues.

¹² Professor Gerald Torres, Bryant Smith Chair in Law, currently at the University of Texas, Austin.