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REMARKS ON CHARLES H. KOCH, JR.

Paul R. Verkuil*

It is a memorable moment for me to be back in the historic Great Hall of the Wren Building, where James Blair, my first predecessor, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson dined and where Tara Verkuil celebrated her twenty-first birthday. (I won’t reveal her age now.) And of course, Charles and Denise were married just next door at the Wren Chapel in June of 1985.

While I have known Charles on a collegial basis since the early 1980s, I want to recall three interactions with him that reveal the breadth of his talents and the depth of his character. The first occurred in 1990 when, as Chair of the ABA section of Administrative Law, I asked him to accept the assignment as faculty editor of the Administrative Law Review. This is a largely thankless task that involved not only scholarly judgment, but managerial skills and lots of patience. He performed remarkably well and the Review flourished.

The second was a complicated research assignment I asked him to collaborate on in 1992. It was a report for the Administrative Conference (which I now Chair) entitled “The Federal Administrative Judiciary.” It was a contentious project involving better ways to appoint and monitor the performance of Administrative Law Judges and other deciders. Again, Charles’s knowledge of how the ALJ system worked, gleaned from his years at the Federal Trade Commission, provided invaluable insights to a project that still has relevance to the Conference’s work.

The third occasion was a sensitive issue of institutional politics at William & Mary. As President, I had always wanted us to have a Faculty Senate, but its creation had long been stymied by interschool rivalries at the College. Part of the problem was the Law School’s concern, well documented during the years of Dean William Spong, that the school would be outvoted in a forum dominated by the Arts & Sciences faculty. So Charles was again my collaborator, or maybe co-plotter. The challenge was to convince his colleagues that such an institution could succeed but not at their expense. My part of the assignment was getting Arts & Sciences to dilute its numerical advantage in voting (which happened by the way). Charles not only brought his school along, but served, if I’m not mistaken, as an early member and leader of the newly constituted Senate.

Now these are qualities of character and competence we can all admire. Before I close, however, I want to speak directly to Denise and Andrew. In the years I knew

him, before you came along, Charles had a slightly curmudgeonly quality, an affect perhaps acquired from his mentor, Kenneth Culp Davis, the grand curmudgeon. But after you arrived, his demeanor changed. In his later years, he exuded happiness and fulfillment—and his high spirits could fill a room—as they do this Great Hall tonight. Thank you.