緬懷孔傑榮教授
《中研院法學期刊》第 39 期
頁 13-32（2026 年 9 月）

Celebrating Jerry Cohen:

A Life of Purpose and Principle

Keynote address as edited for the memorial issue

*Margaret K. Lewis**

Thank you to the Institute of Law at Academia Sinica, Professor Herbert Han-Pao Ma's Foundation, and National Taiwan University College of Law's Public Law Center for bringing us together. Distinguished guests, colleagues, students, and friends, it is a privilege to be with you today to celebrate Jerome A. Cohen.

I can hear his voice in my head saying, "Maggie, you know that I insist that everyone call me Jerry." So, for the rest of my remarks, I will. It means so much to be here in Taiwan celebrating his life. He loved Taiwan. He had deep respect for how the Taiwanese people—including many in this room—fought so hard for democracy and human rights.

We lost Jerry last year, but it is still hard for me to talk about him in the past tense. Jerry was a titan in the field of East Asian law. He met Zhou Enlai. He was pivotal in opening the study of Chinese law to American legal academia. He brought Senator Ted Kennedy to China. He helped countless dissidents and political prisoners. He mentored generations of people across Asia, Europe, and the United States.

---

* Professor of Law, Seton Hall University.
Online: https://publication.iias.sinica.edu.tw/11305162.pdf.

But I, and I know others here, will miss him most in the countless less-storied moments. I think of him at conferences. We would be in a far-flung region of China, surrounded by high-ranking officials, and Jerry would make sure to find the basic-level judge from the most local court in the room. He would ask how things really worked on the ground, then keep the conversation going over dinner and, ideally, a cold beer. Jet lag be damned.

I think of him in classrooms. In every class he taught—and he taught thousands—he showed up with his expansive knowledge and his wit. He fully saw and listened to every student. You were someone with experiences and ideas that deserved his full attention.

I think of him in airports. He far surpassed a million miles in the air, which is a feat of endurance few mortals can match. But I appreciated the quiet times when the pause before boarding gave a chance to plan for the trip ahead, reflect on whatever adventures we just had, or talk about some random topic that had caught his interest.

Jerry always had a newspaper with him—a real paper newspaper—because his intellect was vast and his appetite for knowledge voracious. For those of you who did not have the honor and joy of knowing Jerry, it is hard to convey how much he was an extrovert. He could almost be in the dictionary as the definition of an extrovert. He derived energy from being with other people, and he gave that energy back many times over.

Jerry was always curious, always listening, always ready to introduce one person to another because he sensed that some good might come of it. And he always had a twinkle in his eye, and a bow tie with his suit.

Today's title, "A Life of Purpose and Principle," invites us to celebrate Jerry as someone who lived with conviction. He strove, tirelessly, to make the world a better place, and he succeeded in many ways large and small.

I want to build my remarks around those two words: purpose and principle.

Let me begin with purpose.

Much of our focus today will rightly be on Jerry's work with Taiwan. But I also find myself thinking about his 2018 honor from the Japanese government, the Order of the Rising Sun, awarded for his outstanding contributions in promoting interactions among Japanese and U.S. legal professionals and enhancing the understanding of Japan in the US.

As one of the people in the United States whom Jerry helped to understand so many things, his life's work showed me a shining example of the Japanese concept of ikigai. Ikigai captures the essence of having a purpose in life: not in a narrow, individualistic way, but a purpose outside yourself, oriented toward the people around you. It is often translated as a reason for being, or a reason to get up in the morning. It suggests aligning one's talents, commitments, relationships, and service to the world.

Jerry had a career of tremendous service and astonishing accomplishment. That does not mean he knew exactly where he was going from the beginning. One of the moving aspects of his life is that he built his purpose step by step. He did not inherit a field called "Chinese legal studies" in the United States. He was central in creating it over many decades.

Jerry liked to quote Confucius. In particular, he often mentioned a passage from the Analects about the arc of a person's life:

At fifteen, my heart was set upon learning; at thirty, I had become established; at forty, I was no longer perplexed; at fifty, I knew what is ordained by Heaven; at sixty, my ear was attuned; at seventy, I could follow my heart's desires without transgressing the line.

In modern language, Confucius was essentially saying:

At fifteen, he threw himself into learning; at thirty, he found his footing; at forty, he was no longer confused about his path; at fifty, he had a sense of a larger calling; at sixty, he could listen deeply and discern what mattered; and at seventy, he could trust his heart without crossing the boundaries of right.

Jerry, whose Chinese name 孔傑榮 included the Confucian surname 孔, would have been quick to reject any claim that he was a sage. He would probably have said something funny and self-deprecating, then immediately shifted the conversation to the person next to him.

But this passage captures something about his life: a devotion to lifelong learning and a pursuit of humaneness, 仁, sometimes also translated as benevolence or human-heartedness.

These Confucian life-stages are apt markers as loose chapters for Jerry's story.

Jerry's heart was set on learning even before fifteen. He was an eager student in his home state of New Jersey, which I am happy to now call home. Even in high school he looked beyond his backyard: he

represented his school in New Jersey's first student model United Nations conference. He went on to Yale University, a tremendous feat given that his modest family background was far from the profile of most Yale students at the time. After graduation, he embarked on a Fulbright scholarship in France and then returned to Yale for his law degree.

After law school, Jerry accomplished something truly extraordinary. He clerked first for Chief Justice Earl Warren on the United States Supreme Court. The following year, he clerked for a second Justice, Felix Frankfurter. That combination of clerkships was—and remains—remarkable.

He then went into practice as a lawyer. But his heart was set on learning and on teaching. By 1958, he wrote in his memoirs, he was restless at the law firm and "was starting to focus on teaching."

At thirty, to borrow Confucius's phrase, he took his stand. He turned to teaching at the University of California at Berkeley and began establishing himself not only as a Chinese language learner but as a pioneer of Chinese legal studies in the United States.

In 1960, when Jerry was a young professor at Berkeley, the idea of devoting oneself to the legal system of the People's Republic of China sounded, to many, absurd. The United States and the PRC had no diplomatic relations. Access was limited. Suspicion was high.

From the outside, the PRC's legal system did not look like a promising subject for a young American lawyer. Jerry recalled in his memoirs that one of his professors advised him: "Don't throw away your career on China."

With his stellar credentials, Jerry could have taken a safer path in a standard field of American legal academia. Instead, he took on an unfamiliar language and a little-understood legal system. He wrote letters to PRC leaders with no reason to assume they would answer. He interviewed people who had left the PRC. He searched for ways in.

There is a Chinese idiom: 不入虎穴，焉得虎子, without entering the tiger's den, how can one obtain the tiger cub? Jerry entered the tiger's den with his optimistic attitude and characteristic vigor, and he never looked back.

But he was not reckless. His purpose was never adventure for its own sake. He believed that law could be a window into society, and that understanding another legal system required listening not only to leaders and elites but also to the people who experienced the system in everyday life. This habit never left him.

Decades later, when I traveled with Jerry for meetings on criminal justice reform, he was still listening for details others might miss. He wanted to know how police used their powers, what judges did when pressure was present, how lawyers navigated political constraints, and how reforms that looked impressive on paper functioned in the courthouse, the police station, and the prison.

Jerry liked to warn against the worst kind of comparative law: the apples-and-oranges comparison. It is intellectually lazy, he would say, to compare our ideals with someone else's practice. Serious comparisons are between practice and practice, or ideals and ideals. He carried deep convictions—his ideals—and did the work to understand how those ideals translated into practice. He was clear-eyed and rigorous.

That methodological point was also an ethical point. It required humility and self-criticism. It required asking whether one's own system lived up to its professed values before lecturing others. Jerry's purpose was never simply to explain China, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, or any other place to outsiders. It was to make law more humane by building understanding across systems while insisting that human dignity was not negotiable.

By the time Jerry turned forty in 1970, he was no longer "perplexed" about his career path. He had become a professor at Harvard Law School and was firmly committed to Chinese law. But he remained uncertain about how best to get a foothold in the PRC.

Normalization of relations on January 1, 1979, opened new opportunities for extended visits, but he had already found creative ways to engage with the PRC: interviewing anyone he could find who had lived there, reading voraciously, and finagling short-term visits.

By that time, he was familiar with Taiwan and had spent a year in Hong Kong. He first visited Taiwan in 1961 on his way to give a lecture in Hong Kong. His work on criminal justice in China had roots in a much longer visit to Hong Kong. In 1963, he spent a year there interviewing refugees for what became pathbreaking work on the PRC's criminal process.

His adventurous spirit drew him to a Kowloon neighborhood with few foreigners and a long trek from Hong Kong Island. It was a vivid introduction to everyday life, but not an easy place to live with three young children in tow. I have particular admiration for Jerry's wife, Joan, who fully embraced that adventure but later told me that it was the last

time Jerry made a unilateral decision about where they would live. Their more-than-seventy-year partnership is itself a remarkable story.

At fifty, Confucius said he knew what was ordained by Heaven. Jerry would never claim to know any mandate of Heaven. But by 1980, it was clear he was playing a central role in the United States' relationships with East Asian countries. He approached that role with his characteristic energy and acumen, structuring early joint ventures with large companies while also teaching and mentoring future generations of law scholars and practitioners with an interest in Chinese law.

By sixty, Confucius said his ear was attuned: 耳順. One translation is that at sixty he could listen deeply and align himself with a larger moral purpose. Jerry in the 1990s increasingly focused on human rights and, in particular, China's criminal justice system. This was in ways a return to his original Hong Kong work, but this concern for how the government exercises its power against its citizens had never left him.

Human rights had concerned him throughout his years in corporate practice. He became personally engaged in cases, including those involving U.S. citizens detained in China. After joining the faculty of New York University School of Law (NYU Law), human rights moved to center stage. He refused to be cowed by tacit or explicit pressure to avoid sensitive cases.

At seventy, Confucius said he could follow his heart's desires without transgressing the line. By 2000, Jerry had combined teaching at NYU Law with hands-on projects that brought a stream of foreign legal academics and practitioners to East Asia for close interaction with their counterparts. When the PRC began to consider major reforms to death

penalty procedures, for example, he spearheaded a project introducing American capital case practice.

I first met Jerry in 1998, when I was a prospective law student. I came to the East Coast from Beijing, where I was working as a paralegal at Coudert Brothers law firm. I visited several law schools, but the choice was clear the moment I met Jerry. He had a tremendous ability to connect with people and help them find their own purpose. He really saw people.

That is one reason his mentorship did not feel transactional. He did not help people because they were useful to him. He helped them because he saw possibility in them, sometimes before they saw it in themselves.

That brings me to my own life and to Taiwan. In 2005, when I was finishing a judicial clerkship, I wrote to Jerry. The conventional path would have been to return to a law firm, accept the clerkship bonus money, and continue on a predictable track. But I wanted to work on legal reform in China, closer to the questions that had brought me to law school in the first place.

Jerry's reply was succinct: "Come work with me. I'll find money." If almost anyone else had said that I might have taken the safer route. But this was Jerry. So, in late summer 2005, I packed up, drove from San Diego to New York City, and began a project that eventually became our book, CHALLENGE TO CHINA: HOW TAIWAN ABOLISHED ITS VERSION OF RE-EDUCATION THROUGH LABOR—the punishment then used in China called 勞動教養.

I first came to Taiwan on that project, twenty years ago now. That was before some of the students in this room were born. I mention that not to make myself feel old, though it does, but to underscore how directly Jerry formed my relationship with Taiwan. I had already worked closely with him as a student at NYU Law, but our Taiwan project cemented a professional partnership that continues to shape my life.

But for Jerry, I do not know when—or even whether—I would have come to Taiwan. I certainly would not be here today. I would not have all the friendships I have developed here, or the appreciation I have gained for what an extraordinary country this is. Also, but for Jerry, my children would not know the beauty of Alishan or the joy of a Taiwanese mango. Nor would we have our beloved family dog, a Taiwanese Mountain Dog who was born on the streets of Hsinchu.

I have come to think of this as the "Jerry effect." This was not a butterfly effect, where tiny changes produce remote, unintended consequences. It was more direct. It came from his ingenuity, generosity, persistence, and willingness to intervene at key moments in people's lives. He did not just build his own purpose. He helped other people find theirs. His purpose was not solitary; it radiated outward.

Jerry was not content to be a pioneer if the path closed behind him. He wanted others to walk it, widen it, and go beyond him. He founded programs. He created institutions. He wrote books and articles. He practiced law. He advised governments. He saved dissidents. He taught students. He asked questions. He showed up—and he kept showing up.

At seventy-five, Jerry was helping build the U.S.-Asia Law Institute at NYU, where some people here today have spent time as visiting scholars and practitioners. Most people are retired at 75, but Jerry had

more work to do. He was overflowing with reasons to get up in the morning. And he kept going until the end. And through it all, Jerry's pursuit of a purpose-driven life was anchored in deep-rooted principles.

So let me turn to principle.

In his later years, as the human rights situation in China and then Hong Kong deteriorated, Jerry's voice remained a clear reminder of what was right to do. He used his public platform to reinforce the boundaries of right. For him, principle began with a simple idea he returned to again and again: all people seek and deserve to be treated with dignity.

He once recalled an early trip to a still largely closed-off China. He was being whisked through immigration while PRC citizens faced long lines. One of them called out, 不公平, unfair. Jerry saw something important in that moment. People do not need a legal treatise to understand unfairness. They know when they are treated as less worthy than others.

That conviction animated his human rights work and his commitment to a rich exploration of comparative law. Law, for Jerry, was not merely a technical system of rules. Law was a set of promises about how human beings should be treated by power. Arbitrary detention had to be challenged. Power had to be accountable.

That brings us back to Taiwan. When Jerry first visited Taiwan in the early 1960s, the democratic transformation was still decades away. Political power was concentrated in the party-state, the military, and security organs. There was no freedom of speech or assembly. Challenging the government carried tremendous personal risk.

His engagement with Taiwan in that period deserves special attention, not least because we are gathered in Taipei among people who know that Taiwan's democracy was neither inevitable nor easily won. When the Taiwan government awarded Jerry the Order of the Brilliant Star with Grand Cordon in 2020, then Ambassador Lily Hsu of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in New York noted that he had "not only witnessed the entire transformation of Taiwan into the full-fledged democracy that it is today, but also played no small role in the process."

Jerry also witnessed Taiwan as a dictatorship. Even in those dark days, he looked for ways to support people on the ground here. One story that has stayed with me comes from the Grand Hotel. Jerry recounted meeting Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Madame Chiang there in 1968. When asked what could be done to improve the Republic of China, he did not say everything he might have wanted to say about ending dictatorship. Instead, he suggested that the legal historian Chang Wejen establish a legal history project at Academia Sinica.

The idea became reality. Professor Chang and his team went on to collect, preserve, and analyze historical legal documents that might otherwise have been lost. Many people in this room have benefited from that work.

This story reveals several things about Jerry. First, he cared about institutions. He knew that law depends on records, archives, research, and the patient reconstruction of legal history. Second, he understood the art of saying something useful in a constrained setting. He did not confuse principle with performative bluntness. He looked for openings.

Third, he thought long term. A documentation project may not sound dramatic but preserving legal history matters; it gives a society

tools to understand itself. His work with Taiwan also included far more confrontational moments.

In the 1980s, after the murder of Henry Liu, Jerry represented Liu's widow, Helen Liu. Henry Liu, a Chinese American writer who had criticized the Chiang family, was assassinated in California in 1984 by gangsters linked to Taiwan's military intelligence apparatus. Jerry took the case *pro bono*, pressing for accountability in a matter that cut to the heart of authoritarian impunity.

The case was about one man's murder, one widow's pursuit of justice, and one regime's attempt to contain the truth. It was also about something larger: whether state power could reach across the Pacific to silence criticism and then hide behind sovereignty, secrecy, and intimidation. Jerry understood that principle sometimes requires public reckoning.

Others here can speak personally about Taiwan's martial law era in ways that I cannot. My role is not to retell stories that belong most deeply to those who lived them. But I can say this: Jerry's Taiwan work mattered in part because he did not treat Taiwan as an abstraction. He knew people who were imprisoned, threatened, silenced, watched, and constrained. He also knew people inside government, courts, universities, and civil society who were trying to push Taiwan toward something better. He believed that people mattered. And he believed that systems could change.

That belief shaped our work on 流氓 (*liumang*). For over six decades, police in Taiwan could lock up people deemed *liumang*, often translated as hooligans, hoodlums, or gangsters. The concept was elastic. It could describe gang behavior, but it could also be used more broadly

against people treated as threats to order, including people who peacefully questioned the dictatorship.

During the martial law period, Taiwan's legal framework gave police extraordinary authority. Even after democratization, the system lingered as a post-martial-law remnant, increasingly out of step with Taiwan's evolving constitutional democracy and criminal procedure reforms. By the time Jerry and I worked on the project, Taiwan had already changed dramatically, yet police-dominated punishment remained embedded in law. People could still be subjected to serious deprivation of liberty through procedures that did not resemble an ordinary criminal trial.

On one visit, we toured a facility genteelly called a 技能訓練所, a technical training institute. Jerry immediately saw through the euphemism. This "institute" was literally attached to a prison and, aside from perhaps slightly enhanced access to some skills training, indistinguishable. Moreover, the process by which someone ended up there, he observed, reminded him of martial-law-era practices that, in theory, had been cast off years earlier.

The *liumang* project was not only about Taiwan. It was also about the PRC's system of re-education through labor, 勞動教養, a police-imposed punishment allowing detention without ordinary criminal trial. Jerry had encountered this decades earlier while interviewing refugees in Hong Kong for his work on the criminal process in the PRC. He never lost his concern about arbitrary detention, whatever name a state gave it.

But Taiwan's story was not simply a cautionary tale. It was also an achievement. Taiwan's path toward abolition of the 檢肅流氓條例, the Act to Eliminate *Liumang*, was winding and complex. It involved judges,

lawyers, civic groups, academics, officials, legislators, and people directly affected by the system. The Constitutional Court played an essential role by gradually reining in police power. The executive and legislative branches eventually recognized that the system could not be justified as compatible with post-martial-law democratic values.

In 2009, *liumang* who had no concurrent criminal sentences were released. That achievement did not mean Taiwan's system was now perfect. But it was a real transformation. The title of our book was CHALLENGE TO CHINA. The point was not to hold Taiwan up as flawless or to suggest that reform could be mechanically transplanted across the Strait. The point was to say: here is a Chinese-speaking society, shaped by its own history, that confronted a system of police-imposed detention and ultimately abolished it. Here is a story of legal change in East Asia that complicates claims that due process, human rights, and constitutional accountability are somehow foreign to this region.

Jerry rejected the argument that democracy and rule of law are Western values unsuitable for Chinese people or East Asian societies. Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea mattered deeply to him in part because each, in its own way, refuted that claim. And there were moments when the stakes were very high.

His work with Korea was, in one instance, literally a matter of life and death, as he helped mobilize international pressure in the case of Kim Dae-jung, who would later become president and a Nobel Peace Prize laureate. But for Jerry's intervention, Kim would have been the victim of an extrajudicial killing. Jerry and I certainly claim no causal significance, but we were heartened to see that, shortly after Taiwan

removed 流氓 offenses, China ended its practice of reeducation through labor.

Of course, that was a qualified victory: arbitrary detention continues in China today under various names and sometimes just as disappearances without even a fig-leaf of a legal justification. But even with the political chill that took hold as Xi Jinping solidified his power, Jerry refused to give up on engagement. This is one of the hardest parts of Jerry's legacy to carry forward today.

We live in a time when the human rights climate in the PRC is deeply troubling, when Hong Kong's freedoms have been dramatically curtailed, when cross-Strait tensions are acute, when U.S.-China relations are strained, and when democratic institutions in many countries, including my own, face serious pressure. In his memoir, EASTWARD, WESTWARD: A LIFE IN LAW, Jerry confronted the painful question of whether his decades of engagement with the PRC had been mistaken. Had helping rebuild legal institutions after the Cultural Revolution only enabled a more powerful authoritarian state? Had seeds of legal reform been planted, or buried?

These questions go to the heart of how scholars, lawyers, and citizens should act when the political environment darkens. Jerry did not respond with easy optimism. He was optimistic, but his optimism was not a refusal to see reality. He saw the intensifying suppression of political and civil rights. He saw the suffering of victims. He saw the limits of what engagement had achieved. And still, he refused to conclude that efforts to promote law and rights had been meaningless.

Jerry believed that ideas could survive underground. He believed that people inside systems could remain committed to legality and

dignity even when temporarily silenced. He believed that history moves in pendulum-like fashion, and that periods of repression can be followed by openings. He knew there were no guarantees, and that brave people can suffer for a long time.

But he also knew that if we act only when success is assured, we will never act when action matters most. Principle, for Jerry, meant doing what one could in the circumstances one faced. It meant speaking clearly without giving up the possibility of conversation. It meant being respectful without being deferential to injustice. It meant maintaining contact without becoming complicit. And it meant criticizing one's own country as well as others.

This is one of the lessons I hope students in the room will take from his life. Principle does not spare us from compromise, ambiguity, or hard judgment calls. But it does require drawing an ultimate line that you are not willing to cross. And it requires knowing deep down what you are trying to protect. Jerry was trying to protect human dignity.

In his final years, Jerry became increasingly concerned about protecting human dignity not only abroad but also at home. He rightly worried about assaults on democratic institutions and liberal principles in his own country. He did not see human rights as a one-way conversation from the United States outward. He knew the United States often fails to meet its own ideals. He knew American law can be unjust, American politics can be dangerous, and American power can be abused. That self-critical stance was part of his credibility. Again: apples to apples. Ideals to ideals. Practice to practice.

Jerry's example asks us to resist two temptations. The first is despair: the world is too hard, the abuses too severe, the institutions too weak, the

politics too ugly. Why try? Jerry's answer was to try anyway. The second temptation is self-congratulations: our side is democratic, our rhetoric is rights-protective, our institutions are legitimate, so we are safe from the abuses we criticize elsewhere. Jerry's answer was to look harder.

The rule of law is not a possession. It is a practice. Democracy is not an inheritance. It is a discipline. As retired Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor cautioned: "The practice of democracy is not passed down through the gene pool. It must be taught and learned by each new generation." Jerry gave generations of people younger than him tools to support human rights, but now it is up to us to continue the work.

Finally, before I close, I want to say something about a third word that starts with the letter "P": play. I do not want those of you who did not know Jerry to imagine him as a dour person who emanated only weighty seriousness. He also brought a sense of joyfulness to the world. And he quite literally liked to play. He loved skiing, swimming, and tennis. I expect there are people here who know more than I do about Jerry on the tennis court. I will simply say that he brought to tennis what he brought to many things: competitiveness, delight, stamina, and probably a strong view about the previous point.

To be sure, he could be solemn when solemnity was required. He knew the stakes of his work. He had seen too much suffering to be glib. Yet he also knew that people cannot live by solemnity alone. The jokes mattered. The slightly puckish grin mattered. The fashionable bow ties mattered. So did the breakfasts.

As a morning person, I always appreciated Jerry's embrace of breakfast meetings. In our travels, he almost always had someone to see

in the morning: an old friend, a new contact, a scholar whose work he had read, a student who needed encouragement. Those breakfasts were not separate from the work; they were a delightful part of it.

Jerry understood that law reform is not only built in formal sessions with microphones and nameplates. It is built where people lower their guard, tell stories, ask questions, and discover that someone else is really listening.

My time is nearly up, and Jerry would have furrowed his brow at me if I went on so long that I took time away from discussion. But I have one more thing to do before I close: to leave us with a task. We are gathered today to remember a remarkable man. But if all we do is admire Jerry, we will have missed something essential about him. He was never content with passive admiration. He wanted movement. He wanted people to meet, talk, argue, learn, and then do something.

Conveniently, a tea break follows these remarks. So here is my challenge: during the break, meet at least one new person. Yes, it is wonderful to catch up with old friends—you can do that too if you have time—but your charge is to have at least one conversation, even if brief, with someone you do not know.

Ask what brought them here today. Ask what they are working on. Ask what their favorite sport is. If you are a senior scholar, find a student. If you are a student, introduce yourself to someone whose work you admire. I am confident that if Jerry were here, he would already have met several new people before we all sat down to start this symposium.

There is poignancy in gathering without him. Those of us who loved him feel the absence of his voice, his questions, his emails, his

laughter, and his ability to make the next conversation seem urgently necessary. There is also gratitude. Gratitude for a life of purpose. Gratitude for a life of principle. Gratitude for a life that made room for play. Gratitude for the Jerry effect, which continues in the lives of people he taught, mentored, challenged, protected, and inspired.

Jerry helped us see that law is not only a set of institutions. It is a way of asking how power should treat people. He helped us see that engagement without principle is empty, but principle without human connection is brittle. He helped us see that Taiwan's democratic transformation matters not only for Taiwan, but for anyone who rejects the claim that human rights and rule of law are culturally bounded aspirations. He helped us see that one person can make a difference, especially when that person spends a lifetime helping others find their own purpose.

In his memory, let us go forward with purpose and principle, with courage and humility, and with enough play to do all of this with a smile.