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Ninety years! What an amazing accomplishment for *Temple Law Review* and each of you in this room. As the TLR@90 project ably demonstrates, *Temple Law Review* has enjoyed a rich history filled with significant moments and even more significant people.

For anyone unfamiliar with TLR@90, it’s a wonderful project in which past law review members and associated figures have offered their thoughts on the continuing role law reviews have to play in the evolving world of legal scholarship. Consider the breadth of talent and personality engaged in the project: our honoree, Marcel Pratt, about whom I’ll say more in a moment; the Honorable Tim Rice and the Honorable Mitch Goldberg; world-class litigator Catherine Recker; and our very own Professors Little, Green, Rieser, and Reinstein.

Of course, the moments have been significant, too, and *Temple Law Review* has had its part to play not just in legal scholarship but in national and even international affairs. The *Temple Law Review* began as the *Temple Law Quarterly*, and it was through the pages of the *Temple Law Quarterly* that the world was able to read the complete judgment and the dissenting opinion of the Nuremberg trials, thanks to the initiative of a legislative editor, Jim Marsh ’47, who went on to clerk for Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson.1

More recently, Professor Bob Reinstein’s scholarship on executive power, published in the *Temple Law Review*,2 was so influential on the question of whether the power to recognize a sovereign resides solely with the executive that

---

* Dean & Peter J. Liacouras Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law.
1. The Nuremberg opinions, along with a foreword by Justice Jackson, who served as the Chief Prosecutor for the United States at the Nuremberg trials, were reprinted in Volumes 19 and 20 of *Temple Law Quarterly*, over the years 1945 and 1946.
both the majority and the dissent cited it in Zivotofsky v. Kerry.3

But what TLR@90 really illuminates is that, like much of what’s best at Temple Law School, the best thing about Temple Law Review has always been its people. It’s impossible to look around this room, filled with former and current members of the Temple Law Review, and conclude otherwise.

One of the people who has enriched the Temple Law Review with his talent and personality is our honoree tonight, Marcel Pratt. Marcel has built an extraordinary career in the nine years since his graduation from Temple Law School. He first joined the Law Department for the City of Philadelphia as an attorney in the civil rights unit before moving to Ballard Spahr and building a complex commercial litigation practice.

Marcel returned to public service in 2016, assuming the role of Chair of the Litigation Group at the Law Department. You may be familiar with some of the work he’s done there: among many other high-stakes cases, Marcel is responsible for overseeing the so-far successful defense of Philadelphia’s Sweetened Beverage Tax, currently before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.4 On the strength of that work and more, Marcel has been appointed and, just a few weeks ago, confirmed as the City Solicitor of Philadelphia.

During both his public and private sector careers, Marcel has demonstrated an unfailing commitment to this city and to its bar. He has been a member of the Philadelphia Bar Association and an avid supporter of the Barristers’ Association of Philadelphia, having served on the Executive Board for several years. He has modeled the Barristers’ longstanding tradition of advocating for social justice and ensuring diversity in the legal profession and, in doing so, has strengthened the bridge to practice for future African American lawyers. He has also made Philadelphia stronger in the process.

In honoring Marcel tonight, I congratulate the Temple Law Review for a job well done, both this year and the past 90 years. And, I look forward to another fruitful 90 years!
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3. See 135 S. Ct. 2076, 2085, 2091, 2093 (2015); id. at 2114 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting).
4. Since the date of speech, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the tax. See Williams v. City of Philadelphia, 188 A.3d 421 (Pa. 2018).