

*(Text of letter sent to the Editor in Chief of every law review in the country)*

*October 29, 2007*

*To the Editor in Chief:*

*Enclosed is the text of a letter sent to the deans of accredited law schools along with three cartoons that have been designed to dramatize the Harvard and Yale law schools' de facto monopoly of the Supreme Court.*

*It is no secret that eight of the nine justices of the Supreme Court attended either Harvard or Yale Law School. But what is truly incomprehensible is that this de facto monopoly has not been critiqued or even discussed in any of the recent books on the Court, such as Toobin's *The Nine*, nor in any of the articles of weight, such as *Time* magazine's recent cover story on the Court, nor in any of the numerous articles from some of the most distinguished journalists who cover the Court, nor, to my knowledge, has it been discussed within the elevated levels of the legal community. It's as if this issue were "flying under radar," so to speak. Wouldn't such a discussion make it more likely that future Court nominees might be more broadly representative of the legal talent and experience that are so abundant in the country?*

*Defenders of this state of affairs might argue that this is nothing more than a 'tempest in a teapot,' and that there is nothing wrong here as long as those appointed to the Court are the most outstanding candidates available. If so, what does that say about the graduates of every other law school in the country? Wouldn't that imply that these two law schools so totally monopolize our country's legal wisdom as to make the graduates of every other law school somehow unsuitable or unworthy of Court appointment?*

*If there is any merit in the proposition that each law school is unique as to its ethos, culture and underlying values, then what is the propriety, the fairness and the wisdom of entrusting the future definition, interpretation and evolution of our nation's fundamental laws to a group that is from so narrow an institutional base? Perhaps the *Law Review* will consider this matter worthy of some attention.*

*Your comments will be most welcome.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Robert J Aragon*  
[rja825@aol.com](mailto:rja825@aol.com)  
*626 390 2159*

(Text of personalized letter sent to the Dean of every law school in the country)

October 19, 2007

Dear Dean

It is no secret that eight of the nine Supreme Court justices attended the Harvard (6) or Yale (2) law schools. What is hard to understand is why there has been so little discussion, if any at all, as to the propriety, the fairness, and the wisdom of entrusting the future definition, interpretation and evolution of our nations fundamental laws to a group that is from so narrow an institutional base. Wouldnt such a discussion increase the chances that future Court nominees might be more broadly representative of the legal talent and experience that are so abundant in our country? Or are we to conclude that these two institutions so totally monopolize our nations legal wisdom as to make the graduates of every other law school somehow unsuitable or unworthy of Court membership?

This cartoon has been inspired by the desire to call attention to this question.

The sole intention of the other two cartoons, **PACKING THE COURT** and **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** is simply to poke fun.

Sincerely yours,

Robert J Aragon  
rja825@aol.com  
seeaincourt.net