

# PANEL II: CONSTITUTIONALISM AND ORIGINALISM

## INTRODUCTION

STEPHEN CHAPMAN\*

I am a columnist and editorial writer with the *Chicago Tribune*. You are probably wondering, as I did, why the Federalist Society asked a newspaper person to attend a conference and preside over a Panel of distinguished legal scholars performing constitutional analysis. It strikes me as much as if they had asked Woody Allen to be the bouncer. However, it has occurred to me that there is at least one similarity between journalism and constitutional analysis: you do not need a license for either one. In fact, you do not need any training whatsoever for either one.

As a journalist, I do constitutional analysis all the time, yet I have never before done constitutional analysis in front of several hundred students and scholars of the law, and I do not intend to do so now. And although I managed to avoid attending law school, I have not avoided a legal education—I have been educated in countless hours of telephonic discussion with law professors patient enough to explain things that would have been obvious to any law student in his second week of classes. In fact, I have told Dean Bennett that I do not understand how he can get students to pay for legal education when his professors are constantly giving it away for free.

In that vein, the following very distinguished Panel will discuss constitutionalism and originalism. We will begin with Professor Lillian BeVier of the University of Virginia, who likely will win the contest for the best metaphor of the weekend. Following Professor BeVier are Professor Lino Graglia from the University of Texas, Professor Jonathan Macey of Cornell, and Professor Cass Sunstein of the University of Chicago.

---

\* Columnist and editorial writer, *Chicago Tribune*.

