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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Law and Government Regulation</th>
<th>Clinical Education</th>
<th>Constitutional Law</th>
<th>Corporate Law and Securities Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheryll D. Cashin</td>
<td>Hope M. Babcock</td>
<td>Charles E. Abernathy</td>
<td>Jeffrey D. Bauman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Heinzerling</td>
<td>(Environmental Justice Clinic)</td>
<td>T. Alexander Aleinikoff</td>
<td>Richard Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pittsky</td>
<td>Angela J. Campbell</td>
<td>Susan Low Bloch</td>
<td>Viet D. Dinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy A. Schotland</td>
<td>(Institute for Public Representation)</td>
<td>J. Peter Byrne</td>
<td>James V. Feinerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girardeau A. Spann</td>
<td>John M. Copacino</td>
<td>David D. Cole</td>
<td>Martin D. Ginsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Criminal Justice Clinic)</td>
<td>Viet D. Dinh</td>
<td>Robert J. Haft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Epstein</td>
<td>Robert F. Drinan, S.J.</td>
<td>Donald C. Langevoort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Domestic Violence Clinic)</td>
<td>Peter B. Edelman</td>
<td>Lynn A. Stout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chai Feldblum</td>
<td>Chai Feldblum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>(Federal Legislation Clinic)</td>
<td>Steven Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow</td>
<td>Steven H. Goldblatt</td>
<td>Steven Goldblatt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Holmes Norton</td>
<td>(Appellate Litigation Clinic)</td>
<td>Lawrence Gostin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James C. Oldham</td>
<td>David A. Koplow</td>
<td>Michael H. Gottesman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Center for Applied Legal Studies)</td>
<td>Vicki C. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust</td>
<td>Laura Macklin</td>
<td>Neal K. Katyal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry F. Carter</td>
<td>(Family Opportunity Clinic)</td>
<td>Charles R. Lawrence, III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pittsky</td>
<td>Wallace J. Mlyniec</td>
<td>Mark J. Matsuda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven C. Salop</td>
<td>(Juvenile Justice Clinic)</td>
<td>John G. Murphy, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>David L. Parker</td>
<td>Gary Peller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Abernathy</td>
<td>(Institute for Public Representation)</td>
<td>Cornelia Pillard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman L. Cohn</td>
<td>Richard L. Roe</td>
<td>Paul F. Rothstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki C. Jackson</td>
<td>(DC Street Law)</td>
<td>Roy A. Schotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow</td>
<td>Susan Deller Ross</td>
<td>Louis Michael Seidman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Mezey</td>
<td>(International Women's Human Rights Clinic)</td>
<td>Girardeau A. Spann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas L. Parker</td>
<td>Philip Schrag</td>
<td>Jane E. Stromseth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Perdue</td>
<td>(Center for Applied Legal Studies)</td>
<td>Mark V. Tushnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Pillard</td>
<td>Abbe Smith</td>
<td>Carlos Manuel Vázquez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Schrag</td>
<td>(Criminal Justice Clinic)</td>
<td>Robin L. West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>Robert K. Stumberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Abernathy</td>
<td>(Harrow Institute for Public Law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony E. Cook</td>
<td>Emma Coleman Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles R. Lawrence, III</td>
<td>John G. Murphy, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari J. Matsuda</td>
<td>Elizabeth Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Peller</td>
<td>William T. Vukowich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>Communications Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Abernathy</td>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>Conflict of Laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman L. Cohn</td>
<td>Susan Low Bloch</td>
<td>Lizbeth Patterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki C. Jackson</td>
<td>Angela J. Campbell</td>
<td>Wendy Perdue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Law</td>
<td>Robert Haft</td>
<td>Carlos Manuel Vázquez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles F. Abernathy</td>
<td>Vicki C. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony E. Cook</td>
<td>Mark V. Tushnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles R. Lawrence, III</td>
<td>Comparative Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari J. Matsuda</td>
<td>James V. Feinerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Peller</td>
<td>Robert Haft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Pillard</td>
<td>Vicki C. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Mark V. Tushnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rothstein</td>
<td>(International Women's Human Rights Clinic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter W. Tague</td>
<td>Communications Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote Woolsey Wales</td>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Wasserstrom</td>
<td>Corporate Law and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securities Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Law and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Election Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family Law
Judith Arsen
Richard H. Chused
Deborah Epstein
Patricia King
Laura Macklin
Wallace J. Mlynice
Milton C. Regan, Jr.
Wendy Webster Williams

International and Trade Law
Barry E. Carter
Richard Diamond
Viet D. Dinh
Charles H. Gustafson
John H. Jackson
Jane E. Stromseth
Robert K. Stumberg
Carlos Manuel Vázquez
Don Wallace, Jr.
Edith Brown Weiss

Steven Goldberg
(Science)
Donald C. Langevoort
(Psychology)
David Luban
(Philosophy)
Naomi Mezey
(Culture)
Steven G. Salop
(Economics)
Warren F. Schwartz
(Economics)
Lynn A. Stout
(Economics)
Heathcote Woolsey Wales
(Psychology)
Edith Brown Weiss
(Political Science)

Professional Responsibility
Jeffrey D. Bauman
Sherman L. Cohn
Samuel Dash
Robert F. Drinan, S.J.
David Luban
Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow
Douglas L. Parker
Milton C. Regan, Jr.
Abbe Smith
Peter W. Tigue

Property
J. Peter Byrne
Sherylle D. Cashin
Richard H. Chused
Daniel R. Ernst

Taxation
Stephen B. Cohen
Martin D. Ginsburg
Charles H. Gustafson
Ronald Pearlman
Clarissa Potter
Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr.

Torts
Heidi Li Feldman
Robert J. Haft
Emma Coleman Jordan
Patricia King
Richard Lazarus
Mari J. Matsuda
James C. Oldham
Joseph A. Page
Gary Peller
Paul E. Rothstein
Warren F. Schwartz
Girardeau A. Spann

Trusts and Estates
Kevin P. Quinn, S.J.
Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr.

Federal Courts
Susan Low Bloch
David D. Cole
Vicki Jackson
Mark V. Tushnet
Carlos Manuel Vázquez

Feminist Legal Theory
Mari J. Matsuda
Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow
Robin L. West
Wendy Webster Williams

Health Law and Bioethics
Judith Arsen
M. Gregg Bloche
Lawrence Gostin
Patricia King
Kevin P. Quinn, S.J.

Immigration Law
T. Alexander Aleinikoff
Philip Schrag

Intellectual Property
Richard H. Chused
Julie E. Cohen
Robert Oakley

International Human Rights
M. Gregg Bloche
Stephen B. Cohen
Robert F. Drinan, S.J.
Lawrence Gostin
Susan Deller Ross
Carlos Manuel Vázquez

Legal History
Richard H. Chused
Daniel R. Ernst
Mari J. Matsuda
James C. Oldham
Mark V. Tushnet
Wendy Webster Williams

Jurisprudence
Anthony E. Cook
Heidi Li Feldman
David Luban
Mari J. Matsuda
Gary Peller
Robin L. West

Legal Research and Writing
Frances DeLaurence
Diana Roberto Donahoe
Craig Hoffman
Jill J. Ramsfield
Kristen Robbins
Julie Ross

Labor and Employment Law
Chai Feldblum
Michael H. Gottesman
Eleanor Holmes Norton
Cornelia Pillard
Susan Deller Ross

Legislation
Chai Feldblum
Naomi Mezey
Robert Stumberg

Library
Robert Oakley

National Security Law
David A. Koplow
Jane E. Stromseth
Don Wallace, Jr.

Law and Other Disciplines
Norman Birnbaum
(Social Sciences)
Sherylle D. Cashin
(Urban Affairs)
Peter B. Edelman
(Poverty)
Heidi Li Feldman
(Philosophy)
Charles Abernathy

Charles Fuzell Abernathy is a wonderful teacher, a clear expositor, a gifted writer, an academic of high integrity. In many ways, Chuck’s life is one of themes in balance. Even in high school in Nashville he showed classic balance: first in his class and valedictorian, a member of the varsity football and varsity state champion basketball teams, student body president. An outstanding student at Harvard College, Professor Abernathy wrote his high honors thesis on the British poor laws.

Chuck Abernathy’s twin interests in civil rights and international issues were already evident at Harvard Law School, where he was editor-in-chief of the Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, even while serving briefly on the staff of the Harvard International Law Journal. Earlier Chuck was an intern at the United Nations headquarters in Geneva and also a student delegate to the President’s Commission on Human Rights.

During the summer of 1970, long before graduating from law school, Professor Abernathy served as a summer law clerk to Judge Frank M. Johnson Jr., one of the great federal judges committed to the desegregation of the South. Chuck’s equally great commitment to that cause began during his student years at Harvard Law School and continued for several years thereafter at the Southern Poverty Law Center in Alabama, of which he was a co-founder, and where he was a trial and appellate constitutional litigator in the federal courts. Chuck has maintained these interests ever since; his Cases and Materials on Civil Rights, published by West in 1980, with a second edition in 1991, was the first modern casebook of federal civil rights legislation and litigation.

There is also a strong international theme in his life. In 1977, Chuck prepared the United States position defending and evaluating American compliance with the Helsinki accords on human rights, with the resulting document published by the State Department for distribution to our diplomats. In 1982-83, he was the first ever Fulbright professor of law in Egypt, teaching constitutional law and studying aspects of the Egyptian legal system. For years Chuck lectured on comparative law at the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, to consular officers about to go abroad, even as he would lecture to visiting foreigners on our constitutional law. In 1996 he produced a casebook on Law in the United States, which is already used in many American LL.M. programs for foreigners and in foreign law schools as well.

The book follows 20 years of teaching and directing the orientation program in American law, first at Georgetown and then at the International Law Institute, to which hundreds of foreign law students and lawyers come each summer. Since 1987, Professor Abernathy has directed our summer programs abroad in Florence and Heidelberg. Much like a Shakespearean actor-director, he performs and he leads.

As a law professor in Washington, he has the inevitable opportunities of public service, advising the Senate Judiciary Committee on legislation and court nominations, testifying before Congress, and doing studies for the executive branch. But there are other themes on which I would like to close: character and service, balance and integrity. Chuck is a warm colleague, a professor and advisor of whom students are fond, the father of the admirable Chip (Georgetown Law Center ’99) and the budding Julia (born 1995), and the husband of Kathleen, former president of the Federal Communications Bar Association. Chuck Abernathy’s character is constant, even as the world, Georgetown, and Abernathy’s interests all evolve.

By Don Wallace, Jr.
T. ALEXANDER ALEINIKOFF, BETTER KNOWN AS ALEX, IS WIDELY REGARDED AS ONE OF THE LEADING IMMIGRATION LAW scholars in the country. Indeed, he is often credited with establishing the discipline we now recognize as “immigration law.” His 1985 publication of Immigration Process and Policy, with co-author Professor David Martin, defined the field of immigration law as an academic endeavor suitable for serious scholarship. Thus, Alex is one of the “founding fathers” of immigration law.

The Law Center is proud to have attracted Alex to Georgetown. He had taught at the University of Michigan Law School since 1981, first as an assistant professor until 1984, then as associate professor to 1986, and since then as professor of law. In 1994, he took a leave of absence from the University of Michigan when he joined the Clinton Administration as general counsel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the U.S. Department of Justice. From 1995 to 1997, Alex served as the executive associate commissioner of programs for the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). While at the INS, Alex taught refugee law at the Law Center as an adjunct professor. In November of 1996, Alex left the INS and has since been a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Not surprisingly, this stellar career had an appropriately impressive beginning. Born in 1952, Alex graduated from Swarthmore College in 1974, summa cum laude, and from Yale Law School in 1987 after serving as note editor of the Yale Law Journal. After clerking for Judge Edward Weinfeld and serving as attorney advisor in the Office of Legal Counsel, United States Department of Justice, Alex began his teaching career at the University of Michigan Law School. There he became a nationally recognized scholar in the field of immigration law, constitutional law, and statutory interpretation. In addition to writing the leading casebook in immigration law, Professor Aleinikoff has written seminal articles in both constitutional law, including “Constitutional Law in the Age of Balancing,” in the Yale Law Journal in 1987 and “A Case for Race Consciousness,” in the Columbia Law Review in 1991; and in the field of statutory interpretation, including “Updating Statutory Interpretation” in the 1998 Michigan Law Review.

Alex is married to Rachel Cohen, a clinical psychologist, and has three children, Shoshana (13 years old), Sam (9), and Eli (6). Alex teaches immigration and refugee law, a seminar on citizenship, and constitutional law. He also serves as director of the Comparative Citizenship Project, sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment’s International Migration Policy Program.

By Susan Low Blum
EVERY AREA OF THE LAW EXPRESSES IMPLICIT SOCIAL VALUES AND IDEAS ABOUT HUMAN BEHAVIOR. IN DEAN AND PROFESSOR JUDY AREEN'S PRINCIPAL SPECIALTIES OF FAMILY LAW AND BIOETHICS, SUCH CONCERNS ARE ESPECIALLY CLOSE TO THE SURFACE. THESE SUBJECTS DEAL WITH FUNDAMENTAL EXPERIENCES THAT FORCE US TO CONFRONT WHO WE ARE AND WHAT WE HOLD IMPORTANT. THE LAW'S ENGAGEMENT WITH THESE ISSUES DEMANDS BOTH A DEEP APPRECIATION OF THE TEXTURE OF EVERYDAY LIFE AND A WILLINGNESS TO ADDRESS QUESTIONS OF ULTIMATE MEANING.

IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT DEAN AREEN HAS BEEN COMMITTED TO INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO LAW FROM HER EARLIEST DAYS AT YALE LAW SCHOOL. THAT CONVICTION WAS INSTILLED ESPECIALLY IN CLASSES WITH PROFESSORS JOSEPH GOLSTEIN AND JAY KATZ. THEIR COURSES ON FAMILY LAW AND LAW AND PSYCHIATRY DREW UPON THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE HUMANITIES, INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ANNA FREUD, WHO JOINED THEM FOR A SEMESTER.

PROFESSOR AREEN'S FIRST JOBS AFTER GRADUATION FROM LAW SCHOOL COMBINED LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY CONCERNS. SHE WORKED AS A PROGRAM PLANNER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE BUDGET BUREAU OF THE NEW YORK CITY MAYOR'S OFFICE, AND THEN AS A FELLOW AND EVENTUAL DIRECTOR OF THE EDUCATION VOUCHER STUDY FOR THE CENTER OF PUBLIC POLICY IN CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS. HER WORK ON EDUCATION ISSUES PROMPTED AN INTEREST IN TEACHING. IN 1972, SHE ACCEPTED AN OFFER TO BECOME THE SECOND WOMAN TO JOIN THE FACULTY AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER.

PROFESSOR AREEN SOON DISCOVERED THAT EXISTING FAMILY LAW CASEBOOKS NEGLECTED MANY IMPORTANT ISSUES. SHE SUPPLEMENTED THE TEXT WITH HER OWN MATERIAL, WHICH EVENTUALLY BECAME THE FIRST EDITION OF CASES AND MATERIALS ON FAMILY LAW. THE BOOK WAS NOTABLE FOR ITS INCLUSION OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, THE TRANSCRIPT OF AN ACTUAL CHILD CUSTODY HEARING, AND MATERIAL ON WHAT HAPPENED TO PARTIES AFTER THEIR LITIGATION ENDED.

PROFESSOR AREEN'S WORK ON FAMILY LAW WAS ENHANCED BY A FELLOWSHIP AT THE WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS IN 1988-1989, WHERE SHE EXPLORED THE INFLUENCE OF JOHN LOCKE ON WESTERN CULTURE'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE FAMILY. JAY KATZ'S WRITINGS SPARKED PROFESSOR AREEN'S INTEREST IN BIOETHICS. SHE ALSO SERVED FOR NINE YEARS AS PROFESSOR OF COMMUNITY AND FAMILY MEDICINE, IN ADDITION TO HER POSITION ON THE LAW FACULTY. THIS LED ULTIMATELY TO THE CASEBOOK LEO, SCIENCE, AND MEDICINE. HER OTHER WRITING IN THIS AREA REFLECTS A WIDE RANGE OF CONCERNS, SUCH AS HUMAN GENE THERAPY, ORGAN DONATION, THE LEGAL ISSUES SURROUNDING THE AIDS EPIDEMIC, AND CONSENT TO WITHHOLD OR WITHDRAW MEDICAL TREATMENT.

FINALLY, DEAN AREEN'S ONGOING INTEREST IN ETHICAL DELIBERATION HAS LED HER TO DEVELOP WITH CARYL BERNSTEIN A SEMINAR ON JUDGMENT AND DECISIONMAKING. THE COURSE INCLUDES CASE STUDIES OF DIFFICULT DILEMMAS THAT CONFRONT LAWYERS, AS WELL AS WORKS OF LITERATURE THAT SEEK TO CAPTURE THE NUANCES INVOLVED IN MAKING CHOICES IN COMPLEX SITUATIONS.

DEAN AREEN DESCRIBES THE TRADITION AT GEORGETOWN AS ONE IN WHICH THE DEAN COMES FROM AND RETURNS TO THE FACULTY, TAKING ON RESPONSIBILITY ADEQUATE TO A "MAJOR COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT." SHE REGARDS THE COLLABORATION AND ACCESSIBILITY INTRINSIC TO SUCH A CONCEPTION AS ESPECIALLY VALUABLE AT THIS TIME, WHEN A MAJOR ELEMENT OF THE DEAN'S ROLE IS TO SUPPORT THE SchOLARSHIP AND TEACHING OF A NATIONALY RECOGNIZED FACULTY. JUDY AREEN'S COMMITMENT TO SCHOLARSHIP THAT DRAWNS ON THE INSIGHTS OF MANY DISCIPLINES HAS BEEN AN IMPORTANT ASSET IN HELPING HER FULFILL THAT ROLE WITH DISTINCTION.

—By Milton Regan
Hope Babcock

When Professor Hope Babcock graduated from Yale Law School in 1966, she faced the array of employment barriers that women law school graduates faced at that time. The question was not what she wanted to do but, rather, what would she be allowed to do. Things only became worse when, a few years later, she took part-time status at her law firm to devote more time to caring for Matthew, her then three-year-old son.

As a female part-timer, she was given some of the less desirable tasks. One day, however, she fortuitously received a responsibility that redirected her career. She was given the job of helping the firm’s utility clients deal with the technical reporting requirements of a new statute that Congress had passed. The act was the groundbreaking National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and, as Professor Babcock became familiar with it and with the issues at stake, she found her specialty.

Professor Babcock wanted to practice environmental law in the public interest to help address the devastating effects of industrialization and governmental neglect. She fulfilled her goals and then some. She has practiced environmental law from a number of vantage points, including high-level government policymaking, private practice, and at the National Audubon Society—ultimately becoming its general counsel. Professor Babcock has also served on the boards and committees and was a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Environmental Law. In those varied positions she has helped shape environmental law policy. She participated in some of the most important environmental cases of the past 25 years, including the Exxon-Valdez litigation and the Supreme Court Takings Clause decision in Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council.

As we entered the 1990s, however, Professor Babcock was restless. She left the National Audubon Society and came to Georgetown specifically to fulfill three goals. Teaching would give her time to write about her experiences in the early days of environmental law and allow her to train the next generation of environmental lawyers. Professor Babcock also wanted to explore a new idea—developing legal strategies to help local communities protect their environment. Professor Babcock particularly wanted to tackle local issues in the District of Columbia, her home. She came to Georgetown because it uniquely provided strong support for these goals, particularly in its commitment to have her establish an entirely new clinical program dedicated to teaching students environmental law practice.

After nine short years at the Law Center, Professor Babcock has accomplished all of her goals, and Georgetown has the benefit of an environmental justice clinic regarded as a model for the nation—as well as a colleague who contributes widely to the quality of student and faculty life. While at Georgetown, Professor Babcock helped develop a new concept, environmental justice—the recognition that poorer communities had become environmental dumping grounds because they lacked economic and political strength. For seven years, she and dozens of students broke new ground fighting the first citizens’ suit filed in federal bankruptcy court seeking to prevent a company from avoiding responsibility for environmental damage. In another case, the first brought under the District of Columbia’s Environmental Protection Act, Professor Babcock and the clinic secured a permanent injunction.

The clinic’s interests are eclectic. One client is the Mattaponi Indian Tribe, whom Professor Babcock represents in an effort to protect land and water rights secured under a 1677 Crown Treaty. The clinic also has a more traditional regulatory docket, which ensures that students are exposed to all aspects of public-interest environmental lawyering.

One can only wonder where Professor Babcock intends to go to reflect on what she has done at Georgetown, because her work is, if anything, more on the cutting edge than ever before. Fortunately, she is much too busy to even think about that for some time to come. In her spare time, she is an avid tennis player and runner. In the interest of full disclosure she confesses to being less successful as a cook and gardener and warns that she sings off-key and loudly.

By Steven Goldblatt
Jeffrey Bauman

I can think of no better way to begin an essay about Jeffrey Bauman than to say how deeply he cares about his students and colleagues. When I picture Jeff in my mind’s eye, the image is intensely personal. He is teaching a student, worrying about how best to communicate with his students, or helping a friend at a difficult time in his or her life. I do not picture him as the lonely scholar poring over learned books or lengthy judicial opinions or, more accurately these days, staring intently at his computer screen. Jeff does plenty of this. But it is as a means to an end. What motivates Jeff is his desire to educate, to inspire, and to make happier the people around him.

The subject upon which his teaching and scholarship have been focused is the corporation. As Jeff conceives of the corporation, it is primarily an instrument through which people who have savings that they wish to invest and people with diverse skills and interests can cooperate to achieve their goals and provide goods and services which are desired by the purchasers of their products. It is, then, very much a story about cooperation and the role of the law in providing the requisite foundation for the cooperative endeavor.

So there is no surprise in Jeff’s choice of subject matter. Moreover, Jeff’s choice of the type of scholarship in which he has principally engaged is equally unsurprising. His vehicle of choice is the casebook. His objective is to provide the means for a teacher to communicate to students the fascinating story of the corporation as a device for human cooperation.

Jeff’s contribution to the Georgetown University Law Center community is not, however, limited to teaching students about corporations and providing a means for others to teach about corporations. He has devoted much of his energy to finding ways to make the teaching at the Law Center as good as it can possibly be. As chairman of the teaching committee, he has organized valuable discussions of how we might improve our pedagogy. As a member of the library committee, he has been vigilant in seeking to it that no opportunity to utilize cutting-edge technology to better communicate with our students has gone unrealized.

Jeff’s concern for our students manifests itself in his extraordinary willingness to provide a sympathetic ear for their descriptions of the uncertainties they face as they try to decide what kind of life they wish to have after leaving law school. He does much good by simply communicating to them that he understands the difficulty of the questions they are facing and wishes them well in resolving them. But he does much more. He offers valuable advice and assistance in the students’ efforts to secure appropriate employment opportunities. Most dramatically, he actually conducts a great many mock interviews in which he plays the interviewer. I regret that there are no tapes of these interviews. I would be delighted to see how Jeff portrays the peculiarity of the people sent forth by their firms to find people whom, in all relevant senses, will “fit in.”

I have left the most important point for last. Jeff is a caring and loyal friend. Once again he has been a good teacher. And his teaching has been of the most powerful kind. He has shown us by example how a member of a faculty should behave toward his colleagues. As a beneficiary of his understanding and his kindness, it seems entirely appropriate to conclude by thanking Jeff for being who he is.

By Warren Schwartz.
PROFESSOR NORMAN BIRNBAUM IS GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER'S RESIDENT "MAN OF LETTERS," A SCHOLAR IN the traditional sense whose intellectual curiosity has yet to be sated. He is extraordinarily well-educated, having earned his degree from Williams College and his doctorate in sociology from Harvard. He is equally well-accomplished as an academic, an author, and a consultant in U.S. and European political arenas. He speaks with such a wealth of knowledge and wisdom, he is like an oracle. You listen, you believe, you learn.

Professor Birnbaum came to Georgetown in 1979 at the request of then University president, Father Healy, who hoped he could "humanize the teaching of law" by giving students a broader historical and philosophical perspective. Professor Birnbaum was teaching at Amherst at the time, and being a New York City native, believed himself to be "suffering from too much chlorophyll" in rural Massachusetts. He readily accepted Father Healy's invitation to visit at Georgetown, and two years later he was named a University Professor.

Having had a schoolteacher for a father, the academic life always made sense to Professor Birnbaum. He was a voracious reader as a child and grew up in New York during the 1930s and 1940s, enveloped and engrossed in the social issues of that tumultuous period. He still remembers the thrill of reading authors such as Thomas Mann and John Dos Passos for the first time. He remembers the respect and admiration he held for his professors at Williams. The joinder of a teaching career and his interest in social issues was a natural combination.

Professor Birnbaum also has taught at the London School of Economics and Political Science, Oxford University, and the University of Strasbourg. He introduced sociology to the undergraduate curricula at Oxford and Amherst. He has held research appointments at the Gianni Agnelli Foundation (Torino), The Institute for Advanced Study, the Wissenschaftszentrum and Wissenschaftskolleg (Berlin), the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, and the Fondazione DeGasperi. He was Distinguished Fulbright Professor at the University of Bologna and was a visitor at the London School of Economics in 1998.

In addition to his scholarly books and journals, Professor Birnbaum contributes frequently to the press in the U.S. and Europe. He is fluent in German, French, and Italian. His books include The Crisis of Industrial Society (1969), Toward A Critical Sociology (1971), The Radical Renewal: the Politics of Ideas in Modern America (1988), and Searching for the Light, Essays in Thought and Culture (1993).

By Kristen Robbins
Susan Low Bloch

IT IS NOT UNUSUAL TO FIND INDIVIDUALS WITH A DEEP CONCERN FOR PEOPLE TEACHING CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AT GEORGETOWN University Law Center or serving on the Ethics Committee of the D.C. Bar Association. However, the path that Professor Susan Low Bloch has taken to get to these positions is anything but ordinary and offers an interesting lesson for students who think it essential to plan their careers years in advance.

Professor Bloch's adventure began in 1962 when she entered Smith College. Although her first interest was Latin American studies, Professor Bloch decided instead to major in math. In hindsight she realized that her switch was probably motivated by her great admiration for her math teacher, the first and only female professor Sue had. Alice Dickerson was an outstanding role model who showed that it was possible to combine professionalism with marriage and a family. "I thought she had it all," Sue says. Professor Bloch switched her major to mathematics, concentrating in the new field of computer science. Sue graduated in 1966 among the top 10 students in her class, and went on to earn advanced degrees in math and in computer and communication sciences.

While Sue has remained fascinated by the intersection of computer science and human behavior, she realized after a few years that practical applications in this field would take decades. Seeking a career that would more directly help people, she entered the University of Michigan Law School. Sue's journey through the law school was a tour de force. She served as an editor of the Michigan Law Review, and graduated summa cum laude, with the highest grade point average in the history of the Michigan Law School.

After law school, Sue clerked first for Spottswood Robinson on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, and then for Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. She was particularly struck by Justice Marshall's passionate dissent in cases involving downtrodden individuals whom, he believed, were being denied their constitutional rights. She became personally close to Justice Marshall; when he died in 1993, Sue served as one of the pallbearers.

Sue followed her clerkships with four years of law practice at Wilmer, Cutner & Pickering. Finally, in 1982, the Law Center succeeded in bringing Sue aboard. Her career here has shown all the intensity, diversity, and quality that her record promised. Sue has concentrated her scholarship and teaching on constitutional law; in particular, on questions relating to the structure of government. When the House of Representatives sought advice from constitutional scholars during the recent impeachment proceeding, Sue was one of 19 professors (and the only woman) asked to testify.

In her teaching, Sue is most proud of the Supreme Court seminar she offers every year, a course in which she can take full advantage of being in Washington. Sue has also played a key role in developing Georgetown's new Supreme Court Institute.

As part of her public service, Sue has helped the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia plan a number of judicial conferences. She has served the D.C. Bar on issues of professional responsibility. Recently, she was chosen as a member of the city's Judicial Nominating Commission, which recommends individuals to the president for appointment to the D.C. courts. Noted for her expertise in constitutional law, Sue appears frequently on national television and is often quoted in the press.

A scholar who publishes in diverse fields, a teacher, a devotee of public service, a devoted mother and wife, a wonderful colleague. Perhaps, the best way for me to describe Sue is to return to her description of her favorite Smith math professor, "She has it all."

By Richard Diamond
M. Gregg Bloche

CAN OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM BECOME EFFICIENT WITHOUT NEGLECTING THE FEARS, HOPES, AND DIGNITY OF SICK people, especially the least advantaged among us? This question animates Gregg Bloche's teaching and writing about the law of health care provision.

With the support of a three-year investigator award in health policy research from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Professor Bloche is now at work on a series of articles and a book on the legal and regulatory governance of the managed care revolution. He is challenging policymakers' reliance on prevailing models that he contends direct courts and regulators toward the fruitless pursuit of singular, "rational" answers to issues presented by the market-driven transformation of American medicine. Prevailing conceptions of rationality—and personal autonomy—are highly indeterminate, he argues, and thus too often of no help to legal decisionmakers when the perspectives of health care providers, payers, and patients conflict. At the Institute of Medicine, he is helping to plan a new "law-medicine interface" program, and he has advised the Federal Judicial Center, state regulators, and others.

His interest in the limitations of institutions and people took flight during his college years as a reporter and editor for Columbia's daily newspaper, where he wrote a series of exposés on the university's budgeting process, the hiring and firing of deans, and the fight over coeducation. After graduating, he spent a year as an economics reporter for the Dallas Times Herald, covering the airline and energy industries.

Bloche then entered Yale Medical School, more interested, he admits, in public policy questions than in hanging out a shingle someday. Following his first year, he traveled through China, financing the trip with a syndicated series for the Washington Post and other newspapers on public health policy after Mao. Turning down an offer to join the Washington Post, Bloche returned to Yale, where his interest in public policy led to a decision to pursue a joint degree with the law school. After completing a residency in psychiatry, he joined the Law Center's faculty—"a disappointment for my mother, who still had her hopes up for the shingle, but a fabulous opportunity to think about hard questions, influence the lives of young people, and perhaps come up with some ideas for reducing the sum total of human misery."

The design of institutions has also been a focus of Professor Bloche's pro bono work at the interface between health and international human rights. He has advised South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission on restructuring the country's post-apartheid health sector, consulted to the World Health Organization on development of a global human rights program, investigated physician complicity in torture and other abuses in Uruguay and the former Soviet Union, and written widely and lectured internationally on medical complicity in human rights abuse. As a member of the board of directors of Physicians for Human Rights (which shared the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for the campaign to ban landmines), he has also helped to shepherd investigations into the Taliban's abuse of women and into war crimes in Bosnia, Rwanda, and Kosovo.

As a teacher, "Doc Bloche," as he is affectionately known, aspires "to get students to think independently and skeptically about things they have never wondered about before." For Bloche, the law's underlying values and vision are heavily layered and require the patience of an archeologist to penetrate and understand. As rules and understandings are always shifting, it is habits of thinking and questioning that must be mastered, rather than answers.

By Healthcare Wales
Peter Byrne

THE OUTSTANDING LAW PROFESSOR IS MOST OFTEN THE FACULTY MEMBER WHO MERGES EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND scholarship. For some, it is pathbreaking legal scholarship that enlivens the classroom. For others, the creative spark is realized first through curricular innovation that triggers original legal scholarship. For Associate Dean and Professor Peter Byrne, however, the objective during the past 15 years at the Georgetown University Law Center has been far more ambitious. He has worked towards fostering an entire law school community where faculty and students are intellectually engaged and thriving in classroom learning, scholarly activity, and public service.

Rarely does one hear a faculty member speak enthusiastically of work on faculty committees or on law school administrative matters. But Peter Byrne does. He sees some of his most important work on the faculty as his work as a member and frequent chair of the faculty appointments committee, likely the most demanding of all faculty committee assignments. He has sought through the identification, evaluation, and appointment of entry-level and lateral faculty hires to combine the law school’s already prestigious faculty with new hires. This work has helped Georgetown create the very best faculty of law scholars and teachers in the nation. And, now, as associate dean for the J.D. Program, Peter has focused his sights on a major revamping of the upperclass curriculum to emphasize more engaged and active learning by students.

For his faculty colleagues, students in his classroom, and the professional staff, Professor Byrne’s laugh is likely his most distinguishing personal characteristic. It is infectious and disarming and it sends a clear message throughout the law school community of support, respect, and good cheer. But it is also misleading. It provides little hint that Peter is a product of “The Bronx.” Nor does it suggest the full extent of his extraordinary professional accomplishments—a law student graduating first in his class at the University of Virginia, a Supreme Court clerk with Justice Lewis Powell, and a distinguished legal scholar on wide ranging issues of academic freedom and property law. Just behind that laugh lies both a gourmet chef and an exceedingly rigorous thinker whose critical analysis has greatly benefited his Georgetown students and faculty colleagues alike.

It is not surprising that Professor Byrne describes himself as “a crazy person for higher education.” He is “thrilled to be in it” because he views it as a “place where serious intellectual inquiry informs personal development.” When he joined the Georgetown law faculty in 1985, however, he did so without any firm sense that he would remain on the faculty for so long. He and his wife, Karen, were then just beginning their family (they now have three children), and were not yet committed to Washington, D.C. But Peter has come to love Georgetown and especially its commitment to scholarship, to justice, to collegiality, and to the Jesuit tradition of educating the “whole person.”

Professor Peter Byrne’s strong commitment to the establishment of a nurturing, supportive community at Georgetown as well as in his neighborhood and church on Capitol Hill binds together his professional and personal lives. It plainly influences his teaching of property law, which he perceives to be an important vehicle for community building. And it is a dominant theme in much of his scholarship, particularly in his work on legal issues raised in the unique academic community present in institutions for higher learning. But his most outstanding contribution here at Georgetown remains his success in fostering an intellectual community of the highest caliber.

By Richard Lazarus
Angela Campbell

“MEDIA IS OUR INFRASTRUCTURE; COMMUNICATIONS LAW IS SO IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT AFFECTS EVERYTHING ELSE,” SAYS Professor Angela Campbell, the director of the communications law project of the Institute for Public Representation. Professor Campbell’s keen interest in communications began at Hampshire College. There she was not only directly involved in television production work but she was also involved with cable franchising, combining her interest in communication with public interest work. At UCLA School of Law, her interest continued as she was editor-in-chief of the Federal Communications Law Journal and was involved in a conference on the future of network television.

After law school, Campbell channeled her interests in communications and public representation as a graduate fellow in the Institute for Public Representation here at Georgetown. As a fellow in IPR, she worked on a variety of projects involving communications law and policy. She continued to flourish in her field as an associate at Fischer, Weyland, Cooper & Leader and then as a trial attorney with the Communications and Finance Section at the Department of Justice. Campbell’s move from the Justice Department to Georgetown as an associate professor at the Institute of Public Representation was a natural progression: As an expert in communications law, Campbell could now use her knowledge to teach students to represent citizens’ groups in Federal Communications Commission and court proceedings relating to communications policy.

IPR is a perfect fit for Campbell. It allows her to combine interests in communications law and public interest and teach them to second- and third-year and graduate law students. She enjoys teaching skills that will serve students well when they practice law. She teaches seminars but says the students do most of their intensive learning in small group meetings. The students seem to thoroughly appreciate her efforts, especially the one-on-one attention they receive as they discuss the issues, interact with Campbell and clients, and receive feedback. As a result of Campbell’s dedication and talents, the students can see her enthusiasm and say she is a “dynamic resource.”

Professor Campbell is planning to teach a new seminar, comparative media law. In this writing seminar, students will be able to choose a communications issue and compare the law in different countries. Campbell herself has traveled abroad, most recently to Australia, to research and compare communications policy and to give speeches on her expertise. She also teaches a seminar on comparative media law and technology at Oxford University.

When Campbell is not immersed in communications law or teaching students, she spends time playing the violin. Both of her children play and they often practice together as a trio.

By Diana Donahoe
Barry Carter

Professor Barry Carter is hardly the only practitioner of that inside-the-beltway phenomenon known as the “revolving door” between government service and the private sector, but he is surely one of the most successful at building a career that combines the best of public policy activism and academic reflection.

Recently returning to Georgetown after being a senior official in the U.S. government, Barry has resumed his responsibilities as a teacher, as a scholar and the co-author of the best-selling international law casebook, and as a key contributor to the Law Center’s growth as a world-class center of international law activities.

Barry’s personal odyssey began in California—and he still shows signs of being a native son. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Stanford University in 1964, but the East Coast soon began its insidious pull on him. He earned a master’s degree in economics and public policy from Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School in 1966, and his J.D. from Yale in 1969, where he was Projects Editor of the Yale Law Journal.

After graduation, he made an early foray into government service. Starting as an Army lieutenant, he was a program analyst in the Pentagon and then served on Dr. Henry Kissinger’s National Security Council staff, working on NATO and arms control. Barry followed that with a fellowship at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, several years in trial and appellate practice in law firms, and a year with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities.

Professor Carter joined the Georgetown faculty in 1979, but also kept involved in public policy—participating in the 1984 Mondale–Ferraro campaign, serving as Executive Director of the American Society of International Law (ASIL), and working in the 1992 Clinton–Gore campaign on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The call to full-time public service came again in July 1993. Barry became the acting Under Secretary and then Deputy Under Secretary of the Commerce Department in the bureau that administers and enforces several trade laws. During his three years there, Professor Carter helped streamline U.S. export controls—a task he was uniquely well-qualified for, since he had literally “written the book” on the subject. His International Economic Sanctions: Improving the Haphazard U.S. Legal Regime (1988) had won the annual ASIL award for the outstanding new book in international law.

Barry takes special pride in also serving during this time as U.S. vice chair to Secretary of Defense William Perry on bilateral defense conversion committees with Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Belarus, Uzbekistan, and China. He worked to help convince these countries that the carrot of Western commercial engagement, often including joint ventures with U.S. companies, was worth the price of converting their defense industries to civilian production.

At Georgetown, Barry teaches both international law and antitrust law. His teaching international law is facilitated by having written the casebook: International Law (3d ed. 1999), which has been adopted by professors in over 70 law schools. Barry is now hard at work on a new casebook on International Business Transactions (forthcoming in 2001). Barry’s teaching and many publications reflect his overriding objective to make international law fascinating and relevant. His students have found him to be accessible, committed, and caring.

Barry is married to Kathleen Ambrose, the vice president for international affairs for a major trade association. They have two children: Gregory, 12 (a budding baseball star and serious student) and Meghan, 9 (an enthusiastic horseback rider and soccer player who has also reintroduced her parents to the whole animal kingdom). When Barry isn’t helping out with the children’s activities, he is an avid tennis player, describing himself as “California average.”

By David Koplow
Sheryll Cashin

When you walk into Sheryll Cashin's office, you will immediately see photographs and works of art that give you hints about the person who works there. One of the first photos you will see is of a little girl, no more than 7 years old, at the front of what is clearly a civil rights march. That photo of Sheryll, surrounded by her parents and brothers, walking to commemorate the anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King and to support voting rights in Alabama, is emblematic of her early years and tells us much about her journey since then. Sheryll's mother was the deputy director of a community action agency, providing services to poor Alabamians for over 20 years. Her father, Dr. John Cashin, the greatest influence in her life, was a dentist and founder of the National Democratic Party of Alabama—an alternative party active in the 1960s and 1970s. Sheryll's childhood was one of political rallies, stump speeches, and trips through the state of Alabama on behalf of NDP. Her father would eventually run for governor against George Wallace, spearheading the election of scores of African-Americans to local offices throughout the state. Working for the disenfranchised was full-time work for the Cashin family and Sheryll never lost her zeal for it. It also spurred a lifelong interest in policy work that would lead her first into politics and then to Georgetown.

Other influences from her early life continue to reverberate through her work. Because she grew up in Huntsville, Alabama, home of the Redstone space arsenal, she was surrounded by the children of engineers and attended a high school that stressed science and math. Sheryll attended Vanderbilt University on an honor scholarship, graduating summa cum laude in electrical engineering. While the lure of politics and the influences of her activist upbringing soon displaced engineering, the habits of mind acquired from her scientific training are still present in her work.

As with many college graduates, the desire to have an impact on national policy led Sheryll first to Oxford as a Marshall Scholar and then to Harvard Law School where she graduated cum laude. First came a clerkship with Abner Mikva, a judge on the D.C. Circuit. After that followed a Supreme Court clerkship with the venerable Thurgood Marshall, where the traits of perseverance, humor, and service, all learned long ago in Alabama, were reinforced on a daily basis by this great justice. After practicing law in Alabama for a year, Sheryll came to Washington in 1992 to work with the Presidential Transition Office, then went to the National Economic Council in the White House and finally to the Office of the Vice President before coming to Georgetown in 1996.

Photographic mementos of all of these milestones line the walls of her office. But equally prominent is a large painting of a jazzman, a little-known saxophone player, over her desk. In the corner of the painting is the artist's name, Sheryll Cashin. Sheryll's work at Georgetown is the convergence of all of these influences—political activist, policy specialist, servant of the people, scientist, artist, and scholar. Sheryll begins her articles like an artist, first creating the under-painting, next drawing the outlines of the pieces and tracing the whole form before beginning to add the detail. Then comes the political analysis of theory, drawing not just on legal sources, but also on economic and political science literature, relying heavily on the quantitative analysis and empirical data so important to a scientist. In a recent work on decentralizing political power in the context of welfare reform, Sheryll tests conventional theories of federalism, looking to other disciplines and to political realities to debunk accepted conventional wisdom. She offers an alternative vision for decentralizing welfare authority that she believes better fits the empirical realities of state and national politics.

Sheryll believes that her life as a Georgetown professor fulfills her ambitions to serve the disenfranchised poor and to affect policy. She believes policy advocacy can benefit from intellectual rigor and that the legal academy can benefit from closer attention to empirical facts. While she has not discarded the possibility of returning to public life from time to time, she sees her academic career as but another means to an end for which she has been preparing all her life.

By Wallace Mlyniec
Richard Chused

PROFESSOR RICHARD CHUSED PURSES STRONG INTERESTS WITH PASSION AND CREATIVITY. AS A TEACHER AND SCHOLAR, he combines erudition and commitment with an abiding curiosity. His interests reflect both his evolution and his distinct identity.

A 1968 graduate of the University of Chicago Law School, Professor Chused began teaching immediately at Rutgers in that fateful year. Early clinical work in landlord-tenant law and housing discrimination kindled an interest in the changing face of property law and prepared him to accept an offer from Georgetown to teach property in 1973. The transition to Washington was eased by his lawyer wife, Elizabeth Langer, securing a position as an aide to Congresswoman Bella Abzug.

Professor Chused's approach to property has been shaped by his clinical experience, his commitment to law reform, and his blooming expertise in legal history. His teaching materials on property, first published in 1978, uniquely emphasize the context from which property rules evolve. Early editions focused on the litigation process (including, for example, trial court documents), but later editions (the current edition has just been published) have also considered the broader historical and social contexts which give rise to legal rules and institutions.

This emphasis on social context is not surprising in a teacher who is a nationally recognized scholar in the history of gender and the law. This historical interest was stimulated by conversations with colleague and friend Professor Wendy Williams, and curiosity about the origins of those legal practices struck down by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional sex discrimination. These conversations and subsequent research developed into a now legendary co-taught seminar on gender and legal history and numerous articles that have helped shape the field. Such collegiality and success at mastering interdisciplinary materials captures something both characteristic and admirable about the Georgetown faculty.

Professor Chused has played many roles within the faculty, but two require mention here. First, he has been the clear leader on the faculty in adapting new technology to teaching and research. This dates back to the early 1980s, when he was the first faculty member to revise an article on a word processor (having to first type his draft into the system in a photocopy room). More recently he has been helping faculty design and use course Web pages, so as to enhance student-faculty discussion of issues raised in class. Characteristically, he encouraged Georgetown to develop its own software to support such pages, helping the school become a national leader in implementing Web technology to enhance the classroom learning experience. Second, he has put his avocation in architecture to crucial institutional ends, by playing key roles on the faculty committees that chose architects and oversaw the highly successful planning for the Williams Library, Gewirz Student Center, and the expansion of McDonough Hall.

In recent years, Professor Chused and Elizabeth have taken a new interest in their Jewish heritage. Growing from a son's interest in reading for his bar-mitzvah, they have become serious students of Hebrew and active participants in the life of a conservative congregation in Washington. Professor Chused proudly chanted Torah in the synagogue for his 25th wedding anniversary. The Chused family has also hosted Law Center students in their home for Shabbat.

From what has been written, it is easy to conclude that Professor Chused's career to date has exemplified what makes the Georgetown faculty unique. But the real point is stronger. In his concern for social justice, his creativity and collegiality, and his interdisciplinary focus, Professor Chused has helped create the collective identity for which the faculty is widely admired in legal academia.

By Peter Byrne
Julie Cohen

DEGREES
A.B. 1986
Harvard-Radcliffe
J.D. 1993
Harvard

EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS
Law Clerk, Hon. Stephen Reinhardt,
U.S. Court of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit
Associate, McCutchen, Doyle,
Brown & Enersen
Assistant Professor, University
of Pittsburgh School of Law
Visiting Assistant Professor,
Georgetown University Law Center
Visiting Assistant Professor,
University of Michigan Law School

COURSES
Copyright, Cyberspace and the Law
Se minar, Trademark and Unfair
Competition Law

REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS
WIFO Copyright: Treaty Implementation
in the United States: Will Fair Use
Rev. 256 (1999)
Lohr in Cyberspace:
The New Economic Orthodoxy
of “Rights Management,”
Copyright and the
Jurisprudence of Self-Help,
23 Berkeley Tech.
L.J. 1089 (1995)
A Right to Read Anonymously:
A Closer Look at “Copyright
Management” in Cyberspace,
28 Const. L. Rev. 981 (1996)

As a result of her undergraduate studies at Harvard-Radcliffe in the history of science and technology, Professor Julie Cohen developed an enduring fascination with the ways in which cultural factors and the trajectory of technological development interact. She went to law school—also at Harvard—to broaden her understanding of the dynamic relationships between science, culture, and government. Although Professor Cohen initially intended to focus her academic career on medical and biotechnology policy, she became interested in the policy implications of digital technologies after taking a class in copyright law. Her fate was sealed when, as a federal judicial clerk, she participated in one of the most important software copyright cases of the decade. The amicus briefs filed by legal academics in that case convinced her that the study of law often could illuminate the issues in real disputes.

Professor Cohen is one of a small group of bright, young scholars integrating their technological expertise with a deep understanding of intellectual property law. Her current work focuses on intellectual property rights in computer software and digital works, and on the intersection of copyright, privacy, and the First Amendment in cyberspace. She has become a nationally recognized expert on the conflicts between the public’s need for access to intellectual property and the preferences of many copyright owners to control access to their property by use of contracts and technological fencing devices. Her recent seminal articles on the right of World Wide Web surfers to read and browse anonymously and the difficulties of preserving copyright fair use rules in the face of calls for freedom of contract on the Internet brought her to the attention of the Law Center faculty, which she joined in 1999.

Despite her recent arrival at Georgetown, Professor Cohen’s presence has had an enormous impact on the Law Center. Her technical expertise and knowledge of the Internet has led the school to extensively revise its policies on faculty use of the Law Center’s Web site and on external access to the quickly growing list of Law Center course and seminar Web pages. In her teaching, Professor Cohen is demonstrating to her faculty colleagues how to better integrate technology and education. She regularly seeks to combine the strengths of traditional law school pedagogy with newer techniques utilizing group-based learning and network technology. She believes that a humanized Socratic method is an important technique for preparing students to meet the performance-oriented demands of law practice. At the same time, however, she uses role-playing activities and a variety of technological tools, such as threaded discussion lists and online information resources, to broaden the opportunities for student participation both within and outside the classroom.

Professor Cohen expressed great delight when she joined the Georgetown family. She is excited by the faculty’s strong tradition of involvement in policymaking and public service and the Law Center’s location in Washington, D.C. The combination creates the perfect environment for her to study and influence the development of intellectual property law and technology policy. The Law Center is thrilled with the new strengths she brings to the faculty.

By Richard Chused
LIKE EVERY DISTINGUISHED LAW SCHOOL, GEORGETOWN LAW CENTER CULTIVATES—DESPITE ALL THE CHANGES IN
the legal profession and our society—one great tradition. The law is a discipline in which everything can be questioned,
in which Socrates reborn would find himself entirely at home. Each of our colleagues (and I write as a non-lawyer who
has learned a great deal from all of them) embodies that tradition in her or his way. No one strikes me as a more
self-conscious bearer of it than Stephen Cohen. His intellectual and moral relentlessness may at times make some
uneasy—but they end the better for it.

Professor Cohen entered academic life immediately after leaving law school, but a call to public service
in the Carter Administration has had large consequences for his work. Serving first on the Policy Planning Staff at the
State Department, he later became an assistant secretary of state for human rights. He was involved, then, in the
very early formulation of a human rights diplomacy at the center, rather than the periphery, of our foreign policy.

Upon leaving the government, Stephen Cohen joined our faculty. There followed a set of activities which he has pursued to the present. As a frequent contributor to publications like The Nation, The New Yorker, and the great
daily newspapers, Professor Cohen has carried his convictions and knowledge in the sphere of human rights into the
public forum. He is at present a member of the Academic Advisory Board of the International Human Rights Law Group.

Having returned to academic life, Professor Cohen has not limited himself to advocacy. At the State
Department, South Africa (then struggling in apartheid) was one of the first of his work. He now is a very active board
member of the South Africa Enterprise Development Fund, which finances new businesses in southern Africa, with
an emphasis on job creation.

Professor Cohen’s expertise in this matter is, clearly, connected to his wide-ranging work as an authority
on taxes. At first sight, the jurisprudence of human rights and work on tax law seem incongruent. Second sight shows
that they are not. Professor Cohen is interested in tax systems as concrete expressions of a society’s real conceptions of
justice, that is, the ideas it is prepared to pay for. He has worked on the tax status,
for instance, of organizations practicing discrimination or disseminating hate.
He has examined the ways tax systems can facilitate a citizenry’s accession to
equality of opportunity.

His teaching reflects all these concerns, and he is especially attached to
his seminars on human rights.

By Norman Birnbaum
SHERMAN LOUIS COHN IS A PATHBREAKING PIONEER. EARLY IN SHERM’S CAREER, HIS COLLEAGUES REALIZED THAT IF THEY wanted someone to initiate and champion a new valuable cause, Sherm was the man to call. Whether it was continuing legal education, American Inns of Court, or promoting acupuncture, Sherm was there to explore and then, if he thought it valuable, promote the cause.

Professor Cohn is a Georgetown three-timer—or four-timer depending how one counts being a member of the law faculty. Sherm graduated from Georgetown’s School of Foreign Service, summa cum laude, in 1952. He then received his Juris Doctor from the Georgetown Law Center in 1957, where he served as managing editor of the Law Journal. After graduation, he served as a law clerk for Judge Charles Fahy on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from 1957 to 1958. He then fought for justice in the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice from 1958 until 1965, arguing many interesting cases in virtually every circuit in the country as well as the Supreme Court. During all this, he managed to complete his LL.M. from the Law Center in 1960. All those Georgetown degrees earned him the triple crown. When he joined the law faculty in 1965, he was legitimately awarded the quadruple crown.

It did not take long for those around Sherm to discover that if you want to get something worthwhile done, Sherm is the person to call. When Dean David McCarthy wanted to establish a continuing legal education program at Georgetown, he asked Sherm to lead the effort. Sherm’s efforts were so successful, he eventually had to be replaced by a full-time administrator.

When Chief Justice Warren Burger wanted help in developing the new program called American Inns of Court, he called on Sherm. Not surprisingly, Sherm quickly became a key player. In 1983, he brought the program to Georgetown, establishing the first Inn in the District of Columbia and only the fifth in the United States. In 1985, he became the first national president of American Inns of Court Foundation; at the time there were only eight Inns in the country. When he left the office of president 11 years later in 1996, there were more than 300 Inns nationwide. The Inns advocated the need for civility long before the profession realized what a serious problem the lack of civility was causing.

Not surprisingly, Sherm was also pioneering in his teaching experience. In conjunction with Rabbi David Saperstein, he was one of the first law professors in the country to create and teach a seminar in Jewish law. Since 1978, he has been teaching this seminar, exploring and emphasizing the unique perspective that Jewish law can contribute to our understanding of jurisprudence.

As the foregoing reveals, Professor Cohn is a uniquely valuable member of both the profession and the academy. The secret is out—when there is a worthwhile new endeavor that needs championing and husbanding, Sherm Cohn is the man to enlist. Sherm asks only two questions: “Is the cause valuable? Can I help?” If the answer to those two preliminary questions is yes, the response is totally predictable: “Yes, I will do it with 100 percent of my energy.” And fortunately for all of us, 100 percent of Sherm’s energy is always more than necessary to accomplish the task. With Sherm aboard, success is assured.

Notwithstanding all these demanding leadership positions, Sherm always has time for his family—his wife, five children, and seven grandchildren. The greatest joy of having grandchildren, says Sherm, is “to watch your children be parents.” And that joy is similar to the joy of teaching generally—trying to impart values and knowledge to the younger generations and then seeing them employ those skills and pass on those values. And Sherm is a natural—and successful—teacher in all dimensions.

By Susan Low Bloch
David Cole

A RESTLESS ANGER AT INJUSTICE AND GOVERNMENTAL RESTRICTION IS AT THE HEART OF PROFESSOR DAVID COLE’S persona. The son of an English professor and a grade-school teacher, he started to fight against the forces of repression as a young staff attorney at the Center for Constitutional Rights, a public interest advocacy group in New York City. After six years at the Center, he joined the faculty at Georgetown in 1990, where he teaches a variety of constitutional law courses and continues as an active public interest litigator.

Professor Cole has litigated six cases in the Supreme Court, most notably Texas v. Johnson, in which the Supreme Court reversed Johnson’s criminal conviction in Texas for burning a United States flag. In a book on the Rehnquist Court, New York Law School Professor James Simon singled out Professor Cole’s brief for its “lean, muscular narrative.” As Simon puts it, “there was no scent of rhetoric, no trace of ideology.” The arguments used there were incorporated into Professor Cole’s brief in U.S. v. Eichman, where the Supreme Court invalidated the federal law criminalizing flag burning that was enacted in reaction to Texas v. Johnson.

In addition to flagburners, Cole has represented performance artists denied funding by the National Endowment for the Arts because of the controversial content of their work; immigrants targeted for deportation because of their political advocacy and associations; documentary filmmakers denied customs benefits because their films did not reflect positively on the United States; and non-citizens detained as alleged “terrorists” on the basis of secret evidence that they have not been able to confront.

Professor Cole is a major advocate and an influential litigator in the struggle to protect and expand those precious privileges guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. He is an advocate, a defender of the downtrodden, a theoretician of the law, and a tactician in important litigation. He embodies in a special way the motto of Georgetown Law Center, carved on the portals of the Edward Bennett Williams library: “Law is but the means, justice is the end.”


Professor Cole is married to Professor Nina Pillard, and they have two young children, Aidan and Sarah. Professors Cole and Pillard both swim with a U.S. Masters swim team, and have competed in various marathons and triathlons.

By Robert Drinan
Anthony Cook

WHEN ANTHONY COOK STARTS TALKING ABOUT RELIGION, ETHICS, AND LAW, LISTENING IS LIKE HEARING A SYMPHONY orchestra at its best.

Professor Cook teaches in the areas of jurisprudence, corporations, and race relations. The combination may seem odd, but it is brought together by Cook's overriding concern with normative ethics. He cares not only about the law but about how lawyers ought to conduct themselves.

At Georgetown Law Center, with its Journal of Legal Ethics and Jesuit heritage, Cook is adding to a strong tradition. His contribution includes a full-scale engagement with the modern intellectual trends loosely grouped under the heading of postmodernism. As Cook has written, "For many, the very suggestion of a postmodern ethics is oxymoronic...But understood as a commitment to a way of living and not merely as a way of thinking about how to live, a postmodern ethics is not only possible but eminently desirable."

Professor Cook began his studies at Princeton, where he combined academic work with appearance as an actor on stage. After graduating from Yale Law School, he practiced in New Orleans and then joined the faculty at the University of Florida. He spent a year in the Program on Ethics and the Professions at Harvard's Kennedy School before joining the Georgetown faculty in 1991.

Being the kind of professor who combines teaching and writing with speaking engagements around the country is time-consuming, but Anthony and his wife Traci are kept equally busy by their four young boys, Brian, Braxton, Bryndon, and Broderick. Cook is also a big fan of jazz music. An important focal point for the family's life is the Unity Center of Light, a non-denominational Christian church near their home in Lanham, Maryland.

Professor Cook's scholarship has often sought points of contact between religion and law. In an influential Harvard Law Review article, he suggested that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s conception of the Beloved Community could move the search for ethics relevant to law beyond the abstractions of critical legal studies. In later works, he has, among other things, critiqued the writings of John Dewey and argued that a Christian conception of God based on the work of Walter Rauschenbusch can provide one route to an improved understanding of the common good.

Cook continues to write on the intersection of religion, spirituality, and jurisprudence. During the 1994-95 academic year, Cook divided his time between the Law Center and Harvard University's Divinity School Center for the Study of Values in Public Life. There he taught a course called, African-American Hermeneutics: Visions of Community in Law, Religion and Literature, and another called Culture, Class and the Corporate Enterprise.

But academic audiences are not the only ones that matter to him. He is particularly excited about teaching the course in legal justice to first-year students in Georgetown's innovative Curriculum "B." Law students are going to be lawyers someday, and Anthony Cook wants them to realize that their need for a strong moral compass will never go away.

By Steven Goldberg
PROFESSOR JOHN COPACINO HAS LIVED LIFE. AFTER GRADUATING FROM DUKE UNIVERSITY WITH BACHELOR'S AND
master's degrees, he taught English for two years in an inner-city high school. He then left teaching, bought a
motorcycle, and rode from Minneapolis to Georgia, Georgia to Texas, and Texas to New Mexico, where he ran out of
money. In New Mexico, Professor Copacino pursued a series of odd jobs (roofer, waiter, construction worker, and
substitute teacher) to make ends meet. From there, his bike took him down to the mountains of Guatemala, where he
built water systems.

Somehow one of his friends lured him to Maryland, promising him that he could make a decent living as
a crabber—the deal was that he would catch crabs in the morning and read to his heart's content all afternoon
and evening. But there just weren't enough crabs to be caught, and he spent his days looking at his empty crab buckets and
thinking about what he could do with the rest of his life. He decided that the only thing he really loved was baseball,
and told his brother that he was going down to Florida to play for the minor leagues. The response: “Brother, you are
too old, and not good enough.” Professor Copacino—who did not know a single lawyer at that point—then decided to
enroll in law school because he thought lawyers could effect social change.

Perhaps it is his desire to bring about social change, as well as his zest for life, that led him to a career as
a professor of law in one of Georgetown's award-winning clinics. He knew while he was in law school that he did not want
to join a law firm. He had spent a summer at the National Juvenile Law Center, and liked the public interest world and
the range of policy work. And so, following his graduation, he joined Georgetown Law Center's juvenile clinic as a fellow.

For two years, Professor Copacino then defended juvenile criminals in court. He had never practiced
criminal law before, but found himself loving the work. After his fellowship was over, he spent the next five
years continuing his work at Antioch School of Law, where he was the director of the Juvenile Law Clinic. In 1987,
Georgetown lured him back to become a visiting professor, and he was then named, over the next six years, assistant
professor, associate professor, and then professor of law.

Professor Copacino is currently the director of the Law Center's Criminal Justice Clinic. The Clinic
instructs third-year students as well as graduate fellows in the representation of defendants in court. Georgetown
students regularly appear in court and run their own cases, from start to finish. The cases
students try cover a range of matters: drug possession, theft, shoplifting, prostitution,
drug sales, assault, and the like. As the director, Professor Copacino spends his days
supervising five first-year graduate fellows in the practice of criminal law (the same
job he had taken at Georgetown 20 years ago). And he supervises five second-year
fellows in the teaching and supervision of third-year law students.

Professor Copacino is married to Diana Blitz, who teaches at Edmund
Burke High School, and has three stepchildren. He continues his love for baseball
by playing in an “Over-48” fast pitch baseball league.

By Neal Katyal
Samuel Dash

Samuel Dash, recently profiled as a legend in the law, has had a career that is the stuff of (lawyer) dreams. Most obviously, he has been center stage in the investigation of the two most politically and constitutionally important criminal cases of our times—Watergate and Whitewater. He has also served the causes of criminal justice and professional responsibility from almost every angle—among them as a prosecutor, defense lawyer, advisor to legislatures, consultant to bar organizations, and gifted teacher. In addition to his extraordinarily broad experiences and interests, Professor Dash brings to the classroom a deep commitment to promoting integrity in the legal process and in the professional lives of his students.

Professor Dash is best known nationally for his service as chief counsel of the Senate Watergate Committee. He continued his work in major inquiries by serving in 1976 as special investigator for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to look into the firing of the special prosecutor appointed to investigate police corruption in Philadelphia. Professor Dash served as chief counsel to the Alaska Senate in 1986 and as special counsel to the president of the Senate of Puerto Rico from 1983 to 1992 in an investigation of the political murders at Cerro Maravilla. In October 1994, he was appointed ethics counsel to the independent counsel in the Whitewater investigation, and served in that role until he resigned in 1998. At Georgetown, he teaches one of the only seminars in the nation on congressional investigations.

Throughout his legal career, Professor Dash has taken seriously the obligation of a lawyer to promote justice. While still a law student at Harvard, he helped found and served as first president of the Harvard Voluntary Defenders, a pioneering student clinic providing legal services for indigent criminal defendants. In 1951, he conducted an undercover investigation of corruption in the Municipal Court of Chicago. The published report of his investigation, entitled Cracks in the Foundation of Criminal Justice, is now viewed as a classic study of corruption in the legal system. As district attorney of Philadelphia, Professor Dash took the virtually unprecedented step of requesting evidence on behalf of a convicted murderer. He believed that critical evidence helpful to the defense had been deliberately concealed by his predecessors. And in 1957 he conducted the first nationwide investigation of wiretapping. His book, The Eavesdroppers, helped change the law on wiretapping.

Professor Dash's work for justice has not been limited to the United States. He is on the board of directors of the International League for Human Rights and has served on special human rights missions to Northern Ireland, the Soviet Union, and Chile. As a result of his work in Northern Ireland, he published an important and influential report on the Bloody Sunday incident. In 1985, Professor Dash was the first American permitted by the South African government to visit Nelson Mandela in prison. He subsequently participated in mediation with the South African government that resulted in Mr. Mandela's release from prison.

Professor Dash brings to the classroom the same energy and commitment he has brought to all aspects of his professional life. He is passionate in his view that integrity must form the core of a lawyer's professional and personal life. For all his years of public service and work in the public eye, Professor Dash has remained at heart a teacher, committed to educating the next generation of lawyers.

By Wendy Perdue
Richard Diamond

It is said that all God's angels come to us disguised. Mine came to me in the terrestrial form of an avuncular, self-effacing colleague named Richard Diamond. It was my second day on the faculty of the Law Center. Professor Diamond peeked into my office and announced, “Hi, I’m your angel.” “Excuse me?” “I am your angel,” he repeated. As he went on to explain the faculty angel program, where a senior professor takes a novice faculty member under his wings for professional guidance, I kept reminding myself of Thomas Hobbes’s observation that “it is not their shape, but their use, that makes them angels.”

Truth indeed, Richard, as he has done for so many others over the years, led me with a firm hand through the whirlwind of my first years in academia. He gently nudge me in this direction or that, gave honest and critical comments on my research, and provided wise counsel on the intricacies of professional and institutional interaction. From mundane details—how properly to conduct oneself in an academic profession—to important matters of teaching and research, Richard was always ready with an answer, invariably delivered with a subtle combination of wisdom and wit.

His is a wit that delights with a purpose. Among his colleagues, Richard’s sense of humor facilitates discussions and rounds the edges of intellectual disputes. In the classroom, Richard uses humor to spark interest and enliven doctrine. Students in his wildly popular corporations class regularly note in their evaluations that they took the course braced for boredom, a preparation that they quickly discover was not at all needed. The same sentiments are echoed in evaluations for his other classes, international law and the international trade seminar. Perhaps it is true that angels can fly because they take themselves lightly; Chesterton would find ample proof for his observation in the many times Richard deprecates himself to stimulate his colleagues and students.

When it comes to academics, however, there is nothing light about Richard’s contribution to the fields of trade law and international business regulation. Having established himself as the authority on countervailing duty law, through a series of well-received articles, Richard has directed his considerable analytical powers to broader questions of international business regulation and the management of an international trade regime.

He describes the problem as attempting to achieve international integration without sacrificing national and regional sovereignty and identity. Despite the seeming inevitability of global economic integration, the trade law regime remains by and large “incoherent.” The pressures of domestic politics and calls for unilateral protectionism make difficult the achievement of a rational set of multilateral rules, rules which Richard considers to be an essential foundation for efficient international commerce. Richard’s academic endeavors—in areas ranging from countervailing duty laws and antitrust enforcement to regulation of natural resources and the WTO’s dispute settlement procedures—all contribute to an attempt to find a balance between international institutions and national politics.

When not focused on international realpolitik, Richard turns his attention to a lovely family. He and his wife of 19 years, Law Center professor Wendy Williams, have two children, Luke, 18, and Ethan, 12.

By Viet Dinh
Viet Dinh

AS A MEMBER OF GEORGETOWN’S INTERNATIONAL FACULTY, PROFESSOR VIET DINH BRINGS BOTH PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AND professional expertise to his classroom. He is passionately interested in Southeast Asia and the transition from socialist to market economies. “I hope to establish a theoretical basis for the promotion of sound economic policy and business law,” he says, noting that Vietnam’s continuing experience with its economic renovation (doi moi) program has offered some challenges. “The business world is important and should not be ignored as we analyze emerging economies in international law,” he says. The energy sparkles from his eyes. “I am Vietnamese and I am American,” he says. “I came here as an adolescent and that experience has defined who I am.” It is hard to remain detached as he tells his story.

His own international odyssey began when he was 10 and fled Vietnam with his family and 85 others aboard a boat headed for Malaysia. His mother, and six siblings sailed for 12 days, the last five without provisions. The engine failed and the boat drifted. Some Taiwanese fishermen offered food and directions to Malaysia, but when the boat came within range of shore, it was fired at and forced back to sea. Finally, at dusk, the refugees floated to within 50 feet of the Malaysian shore, sank the boat, and swam to the beach. After the United Nations processed Dinh’s family, they were admitted to the United States with $200 among them. The family worked for 35 a night cleaning restaurants in Portland, Oregon. In the summers, they worked from 4 a.m. until late afternoon picking berries. Money went to his father, who had escaped from a reeducation camp for former government officials. He joined his family in 1983 after 25 unsuccessful escape attempts.

Dinh worked at “practically every menial job there is” before landing at Harvard University and then Harvard Law School, and graduating magna cum laude from both. As a visiting student at the London School of Economics, he further developed his interest in economics, law, and policy. At Harvard Law School, he was the Bluebook editor of the Law Review, a semifinalist in the Ames Moot Court Competition, a John M. Ohlin Research Fellow in Law and Economics, and class marshal. After law school, Dinh clerked for Judge Laurence H. Silberman at the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and then for Justice Sandra Day O’Connor at the Supreme Court.

From these personal and professional experiences, he has developed what he calls an intellectually “mixed perspective,” one that he hopes will allow him to establish some theoretical bases for sound economic policy and business law in developing countries. In a recent piece, “Financial Reform and Economic Development in Vietnam,” Professor Dinh focuses on policy strategies for improving capital formation in Vietnam. He was a consultant to the U.S. Agency for International Development in a project to help redraft Vietnam’s Company Law, recently enacted by the National Assembly. His previous publications, including “Asylum and the Law,” “Multiracial Affirmative Action,” and “Executive Privilege,” a book review, indicate his diverse interests, which, he says, “taps into my American side.”

To Viet Dinh, “teaching is the best thing in the world.” He laughs as he recalls Justice O’Connor asking him during the clerkship interview if he could work hard. “Work hard? I don’t think this is work,” he told her.

“For me,” he says now, “teaching is a dream job. I have freedom to pursue my own interests. To sit at a desk and read and write is a pleasure.” His students benefit from his tirelessness, too.

By Jill Ramsfield
IT IS HARD TO GET ROBERT DRINAN TO TALK ABOUT HIMSELF. IT IS NOT HARD TO GET HIM TO TALK, JUST HARD TO MAKE Bob Drinan the subject of the conversation.

But there are things we know: his passion for justice, his faith, his energy, his activism, his devotion to his students, his prolific writing, his public service, and more.

So one asks, why? Where did all of this come from? “It goes back to Catholic training,” he says, “to Vatican II. Faith and justice go together. They are linked. You can’t love God without loving other people. It’s all very simple.”

“Don’t make this too autobiographical,” he says. I get it.

So now I’ll say what I know. I know that there must be two or three Bob Drinans. Because one of them is at the Law Center at all hours, always available to his students or any student and former students, too; in on weekends to work on his continuing outpouring of wonderful writing (I see him any weekend when I come to catch up on things in my office); advising the Journal on Legal Ethics; and doing dozens of things vitally important to the health of this University that no one will ever know he did. He has no posted office hours, because his door is always open. He invites students to call or e-mail him, too. And the students ask him questions on a wide array of subjects—he is a priest, after all. So he teaches, he counsels, he advises, he reminisces, he is totally accessible.

But all of that is only one of the Bob Drinans. Because I constantly meet people who just heard him speak in San Francisco or just saw him on television. His resume is printed in the smallest type available on the computer in order to fit in all of the bar and other committees he chairs and all of the boards on which he sits. There has to be a second or a third to do all of that.

What are his interests outside of his work? “People,” he says. He is more faithful than anyone I know at attending the weddings and bar mitzvahs and first communications of the children of his current and foreign colleagues and students and legions of friends, and of course his own family. You can see he still likes to work a room, and he is good at it. When Father Drinan says, “Thank you for all you do,” you definitely feel blessed.

Such a productive man, such a productive life. He has written nine books ("Which is your favorite?" I ask. "I can’t answer that," he says. "Who can say which is their favorite child?"). hundreds of articles (he has lost count), and contributes currently on a regular basis to numerous Catholic periodicals. He spent 10 years in Congress and 15 years at Boston College Law School as professor and dean, in addition to his nearly two decades at Georgetown. He is an internationally renowned expert in human rights and legal ethics. But he also has time to be a personal clipping service for my family. Whenever he sees something about my wife or me in any periodical anywhere, it is in my mailbox the next day with a little note.

So much energy, so much humanity, so much intelligence, so much courage. Robert Drinan touches students and colleagues one by one, day in and day out, and reaches people all over the world by the thousands with the message of his written word. He is truly an inspiration.

By Peter Edelman
NOT MANY LAW PROFESSORS IN THE UNITED STATES CAN CLAIM TO HAVE WORKED FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE IN ALL THREE branches of government—the judicial, the legislative, and the executive (and at both national and state levels), but Peter Edelman can, and his students are the beneficiaries of his wide-ranging experience and natural talents. Professor Edelman's distinguished career has been affected and shaped by some of the most important political figures of the 20th century.

Professor Edelman always knew he would be a lawyer. His father was a well-known litigator in Minneapolis, called on to solve the most complex problems. But like all children, Peter wanted to do something different from his role-model parent. After college (magna cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa) and law school (magna cum laude, treasurer, law review) at Harvard and a Supreme Court clerkship with Justice Arthur Goldberg, he thought he would head to the bright lights of New York law firm practice.

The turbulent 1960s changed all that. Edelman was supposed to clerk for Justice Felix Frankfurter, who had a stroke and retired from the Court. "If I had done what Justice Frankfurter advised me to, I would have gone home, as the Justice told all his clerks to do, to make a contribution in their home communities." Instead, Justice Goldberg advised young Edelman to work for the new Kennedy administration in Washington, and he became a special assistant to Assistant Attorney General John Douglas in the civil division of the Justice Department. He then became a legislative assistant to Senator Robert Kennedy and found his lifelong mission in legal, political, and policy work on poverty, health, welfare, civil rights, children, education, employment, and other programs designed to make ours a more just society.

As a legislative assistant, and then as issues director for Robert Kennedy's 1968 presidential campaign (a job he performed for Senator Edward Kennedy's 1980 presidential campaign as well), Edelman traveled the country and met many politically committed people, including César Chavez and Marian Wright, the first black woman lawyer working in Mississippi. Wright, herself a leader in the civil rights and war on poverty movements, founded the Children's Defense Fund in 1973. When Peter and Marian married in 1968, the headline in the New York Times read, "Aides to Robert Kennedy and Dr. King Are Married," but as the paper reported, Justice Goldberg (paraphrasing Dickens) noted, "It was the best of times and the worst of times." Both Kennedy and Dr. King had been assassinated less than six months before the wedding.

In 1971, Peter Edelman began his association with the fourth branch of government—aidee—by serving as vice president for planning and policy at the University of Massachusetts. He served in the 1970s as director of the New York State Division of Youth and returned to Washington in 1979 to practice law.

By the early 1980s Peter Edelman decided it was time to share his knowledge and begin teaching. Georgetown has been the beneficiary of his wisdom, judgment, and commitment ever since. He served as associate dean for several years in the late 1980s and, in addition to teaching such important standard courses as constitutional law, civil procedure, and administrative law, he has been the innovative creator of several new courses and clinics that express his commitment to and insights about social welfare policy and public interest lawyering, broadly defined. Among them are a multi-disciplinary practice clinic (Family Poverty Clinic), two policy and internship courses (social welfare law and policy and public interest lawyering in the District of Columbia) and a first-year elective in public interest law, which introduces students to the many varieties of public interest law and policy work.

Professor Edelman took a leave of absence to serve in the Clinton Administration, initially as head of the transition team for the Justice Department, then as counselor to Secretary Donna Shalala in the Department of Health and Human Services, and finally as assistant secretary for planning and education. In 1996, in an act of great personal and political integrity and courage, he resigned his post when President Clinton signed the welfare reform bill that gravely damaged America's social safety net for millions of poor children and their parents.

In addition to writing, speaking, and serving on numerous national and local boards on issues of poverty, welfare, children, equality, and human rights, Edelman and his family—he and Marian have three grown sons—have time for each other, good friends, their community in Washington, and world-wide travel.

By Carrie Menkel-Meadow
DEBORAH EPSTEIN HAS BEEN HELPING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SINCE THE DAYS BEFORE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE had a name. In college, she worked for a shelter and hotline for battered women. She noticed that many of the problems these women faced were legal problems, and so she went to law school. During her first year at New York University, Deborah noticed that no organization in all of New York City was dedicated to providing legal services to the victims of domestic violence. And so, along with another first-year law student, Deborah started the Project for Battered Women, through which law students and pro bono attorneys came together to provide legal assistance to victims of domestic violence. The project was one of the first of its kind in the country.

When she came to Washington, Deborah again perceived gaps in the services and protection afforded victims of domestic violence and again proceeded to fill them. When Congress, through the Violence Against Women Act, made federal funds available, Deborah and others saw an opportunity to correct some of the shortcomings of the law's response to domestic violence. She co-chaired the successful effort to create a separate domestic violence court in the District of Columbia.

The results have been impressive. In its first year, the Domestic Violence Unit witnessed a 55 percent increase in the number of civil protection orders filed. Similar progress has occurred on the criminal side. In 1989, out of 19,000 calls to police reporting domestic violence, only 25 misdemeanor convictions were handed down. In 1998, there were 8,000 such convictions—an increase of more than 300 times.

Here at Georgetown, Deborah directs the Domestic Violence Clinic, which provides legal services to indigent victims of domestic violence who seek civil protection orders. Partly because of the contentious nature of the cases, the Domestic Violence Clinic has the highest trial rate of all of Georgetown's clinics. In fact, almost all of Deborah's students participate in at least one trial during a semester in the clinic.

Deborah also somehow finds time to direct the Emergency Domestic Relations Project, a small non-profit organization dedicated to providing legal assistance to victims of domestic violence. Not surprisingly, Deborah observes, victims of domestic violence do much better in court when they are represented by lawyers than when they are not.

Deborah has also managed to compile a publication record most non-clinical professors would envy. Appropriately, some of Deborah's writings provide crucial guidance for navigating, and litigating in, the domestic violence justice system. Others take on the complex subject of sexual harassment and workplace speech. Throughout her writing, indeed throughout her professional life, though, runs a common theme: perceiving, targeting, and then setting out to eliminate the violent and abusive practices women still face, at work and at home, in their daily lives.

Deborah and her husband are the proud parents of Adam, born in 1998.

*By Lisa Heinzerling*
Daniel Ernst

DEGREES
A.B. 1980
Dartmouth
J.D. 1983
University of Chicago
LL.M. 1988
University of Wisconsin
Ph.D. 1989
Princeton

EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS
Jack & Margaret Sweet Visiting Professor of History,
Michigan State University
Fulbright Scholar, New Zealand
Member, Editorial Board. Labor History
Member, Board of Directors,
American Society for Legal History

COURSES
Property, American Legal History

REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS
Willard Hurst and the Administrative State: From Williams to Wisconsin,
Law and American Political Development, 1897-1938, 26 Rev.
"In Short He Is a Stupid Man":
The Judges and the Arbitration Court, 1893-1938, 97 Tumbull Libr. Rev.
59-70 (1990)
Lawyers Against Labor: From Individual Rights to Corporate Liberalism,
University of Illinois Press (1995)
Common Laborers? Industrial Pluralists, Legal Realists, and the Law of
Industrial Disputes, 1915-1945, 31
Law & Hist. Rev. 59-106 (Spring 1993)

JUST AS THE RESPECTFUL MOUNTAINEER TREADS CAREFULLY INTO THE BACK COUNTRY, DANIEL ERNST, THE RESPECTFUL historian, treads carefully upon the past. In a well-regarded essay in the Yale Law Journal, Ernst wrote: "The historian finds that much of what the past has to say is of little or no immediate use. The past, like a person with whom we converse, has other things on its mind, events transpiring well before we arrived on the scene."

Ernst is a leading legal historian, specializing in the history of the legal profession. His writing is marked by empathy, understatement, attention to detail, and judiciousness. The work is not unlike the man, a sober Midwesterner with a wry sense of humor that the careless listener might miss if, like history, she has other things on her mind. At first glance, Ernst's humble persona might appear dull, but it belies one of the central facts related about Dan Ernst by Georgetown law students: He is a passionately engaged teacher, considered among the best of a very strong teaching faculty. Students, simply put, fell in love with him. "He really cared about us. He made a speech on the last day that had us all in tears, and I think he was crying too," said one radical feminist who found herself in Ernst's property class.

The Georgetown Law Center has long recognized the importance of interdisciplinary study of law. Ernst studied history at Dartmouth as an undergraduate and pursued a J.D. at Chicago with the intent of studying legal history. He went on to complete a Ph.D. at Princeton and an LL.M. at the University of Wisconsin, the birthplace of modern American legal historiography. When asked to name his heroes, Ernst chooses not historical figures, but historians, including Willard Hurst, the path-breaking Wisconsin legal historian who devoted a lifetime of study to the minutiae of state administrative records. Hurst's willingness to pursue a path that others saw little value in, his persistence in plumbing primary sources, his careful exegesis of non-glamour subjects like the lumber industry, and his insistence that law be understood in the context of the social and the local, all add up to the kind of heroism Dan Ernst appreciates. It is not flashy, it is fiercely independent, and it is smart.

Dan Ernst's work shows the influence of this kind of heroism. He writes with great care, never overstating a case and never imposing his own ends upon the material. He pays attention to detail, and is not averse to digging deep in the archives of the day-to-day stuff of the law. He recalls an idyllic time on research leave in New Hampshire. He was spending long hours reading local administrative records that no one else cared about. His school-aged children were successfully negotiating a foreign school system; his wife studied the country's child protection system. At the end of the day the family joined at the dinner table and reported on the bits of information they had gleaned about the remarkable place they found themselves in. The spirit of shared adventure and quiet joy in tasks created "a moment in time I just wanted to freeze forever," he says.

What does Dan Ernst do for fun? He is a Cub Scout den leader, and says his job as an involved father is the "most satisfying part of my life." Other than family, his passion is his work. His teaching is inspired by a belief that understanding how social forces shape the law will make his students better, more thoughtful lawyers.

By Mari Matsuda
James Feinerman

**DEGREES**
- Ph.D. 1979
- Yale
- J.D. 1979
- Harvard

**EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS**
- Associate, Davis Polk & Wardwell
- Lecturer on Law, Peiping University
- Law Department
- Administrative Director and Fellow, East Asian Legal Studies Program, Harvard Law School
- Fulbright Visiting Researcher, Faculty of Law, Kyusho University
- Director, Committee on Scholarly Communication with China

**COURSES**
- Chinese Law, Japanese Law,
- Comparative Law, Corporate Law

**REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS**
- Chinese Participation in the International Legal Order
- Roger Ehri and Team Flayos, China Q., Vol. 141 (March 1995)
- The History and Development of China's Dispute Resolution System, in Dispute Resolution in the PRC (1995)

James Feinerman is James M. Morita Professor of Asian Legal Studies at Georgetown University Law Center and a specialist in Chinese law. A longtime student of China, Dr. Feinerman earned his B.A. in Chinese Studies at Yale University, as well as a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Literature at Yale University and a J.D. from the Harvard Law School, where he specialized in East Asian Legal Studies.

Feinerman’s interest in China and East Asia began with high-school study of Chinese language at Loyola Academy, a Jesuit school in the suburbs of Chicago. Later, from 1971 to 1973, Dr. Feinerman spent two years teaching and studying in Hong Kong as a Yale-in-China Teaching Fellow at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Following normalization of relations with China, he was a participant in the first national student exchange program sponsored by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People’s Republic of China. And from 1982 to 1983, he returned to China to teach as Fulbright Lecturer on Law at Peking University.

Between his two stints in China, Feinerman practiced law as an associate in the New York City law firm of Davis Polk & Wardwell. While at Davis Polk, he specialized in banking, securities, and corporate law and transactions, working with a wide range of domestic and international clients of the firm.

Upon his return to the United States in the fall of 1983, Feinerman became administrative director of the East Asian Legal Studies Program at Harvard Law School, holding that position until 1985. While at Harvard, he taught Chinese Law and initiated—with Professor Oliver Oldman—the Pacific Community Legal Research Program there. In 1985, he came to Georgetown for a one-year visit, which turned into a long-term teaching career at the Law Center. He has also taught as a visitor at both Harvard and Yale Law Schools, giving courses on Chinese, Japanese, and Asian law and legal systems.

From 1986 to 1999, he has been serving as editor-in-chief of the American Bar Association’s *China Law Reporter*. In 1991, he became the chair of the Asian Law Forum of the Association for Asian Studies. During the 1992 to 1993 academic year, he received a fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., to write a book focusing on international law in China in the post-Mao era. From July 1, 1993, until June 30, 1995, he served as the director of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with China (CSCC), the national organization located at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C., sponsoring official exchange programs between the United States and the People’s Republic of China. From 1993 to 1996, he also served as the third chair of the Committee on Legal Education Exchange with China. On April 25, 1997, he was named the first occupant of the James M. Morita chair in Asian Legal Studies.

Along with Professor Viet Dinh, who acts as associate director, Professor Feinerman directs the Asian Law and Policy Studies (ALPS) program at Georgetown University Law Center. ALPS is a newly established forum for structured dialogue among academics, policy experts, and government leaders concerning law and policy harmonization in the Asia-Pacific region. The forum’s agenda includes issues such as the legal framework for Pacific trade, the proposed APEC investment code, and harmonization of trade and competition laws in the Pacific region. Participants include visiting fellows from Asia, American specialists, and members of the Washington policy community. Through this unique forum, the Law Center contributes to the development of U.S. relations with Asian countries. Dr. Feinerman also serves on the boards of the Lingnan Foundation and the Yale-China Association, non-profit organizations promoting educational exchanges with China.

*By Charles Abernathy*
Chai Feldblum

"I wanted to be the first woman Talmudic scholar," Chai Feldblum explains. She still holds a passion for the "intellectual challenge of focusing on the text, seeing how every word has meaning." But after college, she found herself drawn away from religious studies into the world of legislation. There, her mastery of text fulfilled an even deeper passion—the pursuit of justice. The injustice that raises Chai is a society that forecloses opportunity for women, people of color, gay people, or people with disabilities.

Professor Feldblum's attraction to both academic and activist commitments is revealed in a series of chess-like career moves that have kept both options in play. First, her academic education (Barnard, summa cum laude; Harvard Law, magna cum laude) led her to clerkships in the highest courts (clerk to Frank M. Coffin, Federal Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun). But her next move was to recapture her activist ground in pursuit of civil rights. She created her own role as a legislative lawyer at the AIDS Action Council and later at the ACLU, where she served as the lead lawyer responsible for drafting and negotiating the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

After teaching as a visiting professor at Georgetown for two years following passage of the ADA, Chai felt she would have to choose between teaching and a return to activism. She was able to combine them at Georgetown by creating and directing the Federal Legislation Clinic. Professor Feldblum's clinic is the only one in the nation that focuses on federal legislation, providing students with the opportunity to work with congressional legislators. Chai interprets the role of the "legislative lawyer" as an individual who combines a sophisticated knowledge of law with a keen sense of politics in order to research, draft, and negotiate legislation and regulations.

Her most personal contribution to clinical teaching is to create a "work family" for teaching justice within the often cynical environment of the nation's capital. "I compared the abuse of personal power I saw on the Hill to the personal relationships I saw at the Court. I learned from Harry Blackmun and Frank Coffin how to create a work family based on respect for everyone in the hierarchy."

"Students come with talent: you don't create that," explains Feldblum. "But many students have talent that is untapped. The clinic gives them an opportunity to be creative, a goal they can achieve by combining the abilities they come in with and what we teach them."

Apart from her work in the clinic, Professor Feldblum engages in both scholarship and activism in the area of gay rights. As a consultant to various national gay political groups, Chai has been the lead lawyer drafting and promoting the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would establish employment protection for individuals discriminated against on the basis of sexual orientation. In her scholarly work on gay rights, Chai has challenged the efficacy of resting on traditional liberal arguments of equality, and has argued instead that the love between gay people is morally equivalent to the love expressed by heterosexual couples, and that government has an obligation to support both of these moral goods.

Professor Feldblum has resolved the dilemma between scholarship and activism by engaging in both arenas with integrity and high-voltage energy. She calls herself "a pragmatist with passion," and that passion is evident in her teaching, her writing, and her doing. The beneficiaries of her passion are her students, her clients, and the causes of justice.

By Robert Stumberg
“IT’S RIDICULOUS TO THINK THAT A PHILOSOPHER CAN TELL YOU WHAT’S RIGHT AND WHAT’S WRONG,” SAYS HEIDI LI Feldman, who holds a Ph.D. in moral philosophy along with her law degree. “Philosophers don’t know that better than anyone else does. What philosophy can help you do is think more clearly about right and wrong. Thinking clearly helps you draw your own conclusions.”

Feldman is an unabashed intellectual, in love with ideas and completely at home in the world of theory. Outspoken and high-spirited, she is well-known to her students for an intensely demanding “stand and deliver” classroom style that wins her high praise from her torts classes. Her colleagues know her for the penetrating, often intricate, questions she poses to speakers at research workshops.

Feldman is a prominent member of an exciting new generation of tort theorists. Currently, she is delving into evolutionary theory and cognitive psychology to learn what light they might shed on the legal concept of the “reasonable person,” the cornerstone of negligence law, about which she is writing a book.

Why tort theory? “I wanted to teach torts because I’ve always been fascinated by an area of law governing the relationships of total strangers,” Feldman replies. “It’s the way that civilization expands to take in more and more people.”

More recently, Feldman has added legal ethics to her repertoire. She has authored a well-known paper arguing that legal ethics has more to do with old-fashioned virtue than it does with rules of professional conduct (“old-fashioned,” be it noted, as in Aristotle, not as in grandma and grandpa). Her seminar on ethics, codes, and virtues is an amazing mix of the philosophical and the practical. For weeks, her students immerse themselves in contemporary moral theory; then they put what they have learned to work analyzing a series of videotapes of real-world dilemmas lawyers face. Finally, each student interviews a practitioner about the ethical side of his or her practice and examines the responses to learn whether philosophy sheds light on them.

Heidi Li Feldman (“make sure you include my middle name—it’s important!”) knew that she wanted to pursue philosophy from the moment she interrupted her undergraduate education at Brown to spend a year at Cambridge University. At Cambridge she had the chance to study with the celebrated philosopher Bernard Williams. Studying with Williams and the political theorist Quentin Skinner convinced Feldman to abandon her plan to become a journalist and led her instead to graduate school and law school. Feldman was interested in the way that ethics intersects political and social institutions, and law seemed like the precise point of intersection. She worked on her law degree and her Ph.D. concurrently, and became an articles editor of the Michigan Law Review. She taught at the Michigan Law School for five years before coming to Georgetown.

What does she like about Georgetown? The faculty, the students, and the location. The faculty: “A smart, collegial group, who encourage their colleagues and see their successes as a cause for celebration and not envy.” The students: “Terrific! Sometimes they need to be prodded to get them to show how impressive they really are—but they respond wonderfully to the prodding.” The location: “Washington is a great place for legal studies, a place where you encounter all kinds of law practice at a very high level.” Does philosophy belong in a town renowned above all for its anti-theoretical pragmatism? “Really, philosophy at the deepest level helps you think with subtlety about difficult problems—and that is what lawyers have to do when they solve problems for clients.”

By David Luban
Martin Ginsburg


At the Law Center, Professor Ginsburg is known for his prolific scholarship, his rigorous courses, and his marvelous sense of humor. His three-volume work on Mergers, Acquisitions, and Buyouts (with Jack S. Levin) is published semi-annually. At last count he had written over 50 articles on a wide variety of federal taxation issues. In his teaching, he covers the core Law Center federal tax courses and seminars in business planning and the tax legislative process. His course on structuring venture capital and entrepreneurial transactions is a must for the student with an interest in this field.

Outside the classroom, Professor Ginsburg influences federal tax policy. Both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means ask for his advice year after year. He testifies repeatedly on subjects ranging from Subchapter S corporations to the tax policy aspects of mergers and acquisitions. Federal administrators such as the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Tax Division of the U.S. Justice Department turn to him to serve on advisory groups. Elected to the prestigious American Law Institute in 1974, he served for years as a consultant to its Federal Income Tax Project on corporate, partnership, and corporate-shareholder integration issues.

To get a true sense of this man's range, however, you have to know that his fans include both H. Ross Perot and the National Women's Political Caucus. He is undoubtedly the only person on this planet to have been honored by both. Mr. Perot gave his reasons at the faculty dinner in 1986 where he announced his $1-million gift to establish the Law Center's Martin D. Ginsburg Chair in Taxation—empty to this day because the honoree refuses to sit in it. As Mr. Perot explained, Marty Ginsburg solved Perot's most complex tax problem in hours, where others had frivolously spent days, and refused payment for his time as well. Or as Perot also put it, "For he's a jolly good fellow." As for the NWPC, it gave Professor Ginsburg its Martin Abzug Memorial "Good Guy" Award in 1993. Marty professes astonishment, saying "History reveals no prior instance of a tax lawyer held to be a 'Good Guy' or even a 'Decent Sort.'"" Hints as to what lay behind this award may be gleaned from some of his early work. Take, for instance, his chapter on the Internal Revenue Code in the 1975 Report to the United States Commission on Civil Rights on the Legal Status of Women. Or consider this recollection by a woman lawyer: Marty Ginsburg, companion to his wife at a program on women's rights, freeing the lawyer to deliver her talk by walking her infant son up and down the halls in a stroller. And then there's the fact that Professor Ginsburg left his job teaching at Columbia Law School to follow his wife to Washington, D.C., where, as he explained, "she got a really good job."

Last, but by no means least: Marty Ginsburg is also known among his friends as a man who wields a wicked golf club on the links. All in all, he's someone you'll want to know.

By Susan Deller Ross
Steven Goldberg

A chapter that Professor Steven Goldberg wrote for the text Law, Science and Medicine begins with an
account of the reasoning process that Albert Einstein used in developing the special theory of relativity. The text then
asks the reader to compare Einstein's reasoning to the reasoning that appellate judges use to decide cases. In teaching
this material in his law and science seminar, Professor Goldberg strives to ensure that class discussion extends
to a comparison of the ultimate value systems used by lawyers and scientists.

The intersection of law, science, and values has shaped Professor Goldberg's intellectual life and
professional career. Because his father headed a government research laboratory, Professor Goldberg saw first hand
that science involved not only empirical testing, but questions of government funding and policy as well. During his
undergraduate years at Harvard, Professor Goldberg combined the study of mathematics with the history of science.
At Yale Law School, as a research assistant to Professor Joseph Goldstein, he helped shape an early course on law and
science. After a clerkship with Justice Brennan, Professor Goldberg chose to work at a then-new federal agency—the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission—where science, law, and policy intersect every day.

In his years of teaching at Georgetown, Professor Goldberg's interests have expanded to include explicit
consideration of morality in addition to scientific research and legal process. These concerns have led him to teach
a seminar in law and religion, where students consider not only the legal relationship between church and state, but
also the appropriate role of moral and religious decision-making in the lives of lawyers.

Professor Goldberg's books reflect his intellectual concerns. In Culture Clash: Law and Science
in America, he contrasts the process orientation of law with the love of progress that is at the heart of science. He
maintains that in supporting basic research, our society defers to the scientific point of view. However, in regulating
the technology that results from that research, we shift gears and demand an extraordinary attention to process. The
result is a regulatory gap in which the promise of science is not fully realized.

In Seduced By Science: How American Religion Has Lost Its Way, Professor Goldberg argues that
religious leaders sometimes reflexively adopt the scientific perspective. This is particularly ironic because of the
constitutional protections that our legal system extends to religious leaders in the
hope that they will speak candidly about matters of ultimate values. Professor
Goldberg illustrates this thesis by noting how clergy have been too quick to say
that genetic research tells us something vital about what it is to be human, that prayer is important for its medical benefits, and that scientific research can validate the Bible. In the end, Professor Goldberg reflects on a number of
factors, including personal experiences with his father and his rabbi, in an effort
to make sense of the proper relation of science to religion in our legal culture.

Professor Goldberg's scholarly concerns remain close to the
interests that he first developed in his youth. He has remained close to his youth
in geographic terms as well. Professor Goldberg was born in Washington, D.C. He
and his wife, Miriam, live in Maryland just a few miles from where they
grew up and from the high school where they first met. Their
children, Joseph and Rebecca, attended some of the same
schools Professor Goldberg and his wife attended. Professor
Goldberg regards himself as remarkably lucky to have had
the opportunity to teach at an outstanding national law
school located right here in his own home town.

*By Girardeau Spann*
STEVEN GOLDBLATT KNEW IN HIGH SCHOOL THAT HE WANTED TO BE A LAWYER. EVEN THEN, HIS INTEREST WAS NOT to become rich in private practice, but to make a contribution to the law and society. When Steve graduated from Georgetown University Law Center in 1970, his desire to contribute to public law through criminal law led him to join the Philadelphia district attorney's office, where he served three elected district attorneys over an 11-year period, ultimately serving as deputy district attorney heading the Law Division.

As chief of the Appeals Division, Steve argued thousands of criminal appeals for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and won the respect of the Pennsylvania bar and bench for his skillful and scholarly briefs and his clear and persuasive oral arguments. Steve won a major ear search case for the prosecution in the United States Supreme Court on the basis of his brief alone. He also argued a case before the Supreme Court involving the impact of a defense lawyer's conflicts of interests on effective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment. Both cases are important inclusions in leading casebooks on criminal procedure and professional responsibility.

It was natural, then, for Steve to be sought by Georgetown's clinical program. He joined the faculty of the Law Center in 1981 as co-director of the Appellate Litigation Clinic and in 1983 became director, a position he still holds. In the 18 years he has served on the faculty, Steve has piled up a record of superb teaching and student excellence in appellate litigation in the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. and Fourth Circuits, the D.C. Court of Appeals, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. Steve brings to his clinic students a wealth of appellate advocacy experience. He has participated in 11 cases before the Supreme Court, four of which he has personally argued.

Steve demands hard work and rigor from his students. He emphasizes the ethics of client representation and aims to impress on his students the necessity of independent integrity to the facts and the law. Steve strives to demonstrate to his students that good appellate advocacy is not simply based on skill, but also on the creative application of the law. The students are inspired to realize that the appellate process in which they are engaged truly does make "law."

The American Bar Association demonstrated its respect for Steve's research and writing abilities by appointing him reporter for three major national ABA committees. Attorney General Janet Reno, who served on two of these with Steve, has acknowledged him to be among the very best legal writers in the country. Wally Mlyniec, dean of the Law Center's clinical program, has only accolades for Steve. "Steve has been my soundest and wisest advisor in helping me administer the clinics program," Wally says. "Not only has he been indispensable to me, he has added to my enjoyment of my work through his constant good will and collegiality."

When Steve is not working around the clock in his clinic office at the Law Center, he is equally intensive in his love for and attention to his wife, Rene, who works in the Justice Department, and his two daughters, Sarah and Elizabeth. "They make what I do and what I am all worthwhile," he says. If you press him, however, Steve will admit that for many years his hobby has been growing orchids. His many selections of these exotic flowers are thriving in a temperature- and light-controlled portion of his basement.

By Samuel Dash
Richard Gordon

IN THE CLASSICAL TRADITION, LEARNING IS NEVER SIMPLY A MATTER OF IMPARTING INFORMATION, AND THE ARTS ARE never simply the occasion for a few hours' pleasure. Both perform a higher function. They help us know the good, the true, and the just. Since 1961, thousands of Georgetown students have learned contracts, entertainment law, jurisprudence, torts, and other legal subjects from Richard Alan Gordon. They have been entertained by his often-theatrical teaching style—so much so, in fact, that one class once had him in the original performance of what became the Law Center's Gilbert & Sullivan Society. Gordon's students have sometimes been daunted by his insistence that they speak fearlessly and with as much precision as the English language affords, but they have also found him, as one put it, "the most accessible teacher" at the Law Center. Above all they have been impressed by his warning that even so elegant a body of knowledge as the law of contracts has no intrinsic morality and that its masters had collaborated in some of history's worst atrocities.

Doubtless encounters with the ratio studiorum at a Jesuit high school, Georgetown College, and the Law Center have been an important source of Gordon's views. As a law student, he was a member of Georgetown's championship team in the country's most eminent moot court competition. The victory was a triumph both for the Law Center and for Gordon, who was named best advocate.

After graduation, Gordon served as a staff judge advocate in the U.S. Air Force, including a three-year stint in Paris. Back at the Law Center, however, Gordon's old debate coach, Paul Dean, was working to win effective governance of the school for the faculty. When Dean succeeded in 1961, he needed an able and trustworthy lieutenant. Gordon answered the call, and over the next six years he carried a heavy teaching load and an even heavier administrative one, single-handedly assuming responsibilities that whole offices now perform.

Not content with making his contracts course a Georgetown institution, Gordon responded to a student request that he teach a seminar on entertainment law, only the fourth such course to be taught at the nation's law schools. Some colleagues thought the course a "frill," but Gordon knew better. He had had something of an epiphany when his close friend William Blatty asked him to read a movie option contract for The Exorcist. Fascinated with the often-arcane practices of the entertainment industry, Gordon projected an almost limitless growth of multifaceted and rewarding work in the field. In 1995, grateful alumni showed their appreciation by endowing Gordon's professorship. He is now Alumni Professor of Entertainment and New Media Law.

Gordon's devout Roman Catholicism provides the moral sense he brings to all his teaching. Not infrequently his faith has led him to take controversial stands, as when he filed a canon lawsuit on behalf of 1,000 alumni, students, and professors to block the recognition of a pro-choice group on main campus. Yet no professor has articulated his understanding of the Law Center's place in a Catholic university with greater integrity, civility, and intelligence.

Gordon's views may strike today's students as conservative. They are better understood as liberal, in the sense in which Congress used the word when it chartered Georgetown College in 1815. The charter gave Georgetown the right to instruct students in the liberal professions—that is, occupations "worthy of a free man." Today Gordon would unhesitatingly add, "or woman." Otherwise, Georgetown's original mission is still his own.

By Daniel Ernst
IN HIS PROFESSIONAL LIFE, PROFESSOR LARRY GOSTIN HAS PLAYED MANY ROLES—ACTIVIST, LITIGATOR, POLICY MAKER, teacher, and scholar—and has been involved in a range of substantive areas of medicine and health policy. His quest to improve the lives of the unfortunate is captured best by Larry’s paraphrase of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, “a life is not what you get, a life is what you give.”

His participation in a study of North Carolina mental hospitals, while attending Duke University Law School, was a life-forming event. Larry spent approximately six weeks in a mental hospital as a pseudo-patient—a sane person pretending to be mentally ill. He encountered many dangerous patients but learned that the staff could be even more dangerous. He participated in litigation against the state that eventually led to reform of the mental health system. His appetite whetted, he applied for and received a Fulbright to study law and psychiatry for two years at Oxford University. He stayed on as a litigator, policy maker, and activist in Britain. Larry was aggressive in promoting the interests of the mentally ill and mentally disabled and served as the legal director of the National Association for Mental Health in the United Kingdom from 1975 to 1982.

After what became a decade in England, Larry and his wife, Jean, and his children, Bryn and Kieran, packed their belongings in four suitcases and returned to the United States. He was itching to teach and to write so he joined the Harvard School of Public Health as a member of the faculty. In 1986, he took on the additional responsibility of serving as the executive director of the American Society of Law, Medicine, and Ethics.

Over time, Larry’s interest in the individual’s relationship to government deepened and broadened to include concerns “about the health of communities and the rights of communities.” Formulating and articulating a theory of affirmative governmental obligations in the context of public health issues, he discovered, is a much tougher task than helping to keep government at a distance. His latest book, American Public Health Law, provides a systematic theory and definition of the field.

Larry was attracted to Georgetown because the Law Center has a joint degree program with Johns Hopkins University’s School of Hygiene and Public Health, one of the best, if not the best, public health schools in the nation. The combination of Georgetown Law and Johns Hopkins was “irresistible,” he said.

Larry’s presence has been strongly felt at both Johns Hopkins and the Law Center since his arrival. He was instrumental in obtaining a grant from the Greenwall Foundation to establish a fellowship program that will allow post-doctoral students trained as lawyers, physicians, and social scientists to pursue their studies in law, public health, bioethics, and health policy. The program is the first of its kind in the country. He also received a $1.5 million grant on genomics and the law from the National Institutes of Health.

In addition, Larry has become a vital presence in the University and has helped to solidify relationships with other parts of Georgetown concerned with health and medical matters. They include the Institute for Health Care Research and Policy, where he serves on the steering committee; the Medical School; and the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, where he is a fellow.

Larry has changed his location, but in all important respects his life remains the same. He is a prolific writer and scholar. He teaches. He helps shape public policy. By any measure, Larry Gostin has lived his life in accordance with his view that one should give back to one’s society and contribute to protecting the interests of the less well off and the most vulnerable.

By Patricia King
Michael Gottesman

RICHARD EPSTEIN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL ONCE DESCRIBED PROFESSOR MIKE GOTTMESMAN AS "FOREVER CURIOUS," BECAUSE HE HAS AN UNQUEENABLE INTELLECTUAL FORности.

We, Mike Gottesman's colleagues, know this to be true. Often he has amazed us by teaching a course mainly in order to learn it. How can it be that a labor law practitioner-turned-academic is teaching courses in insurance law, international trade law, not to mention conflicts of law, or the combined torts and contracts course (bargain, exchange, and liability) in our optional first-year curriculum? Not only that, how can he get rave reviews from his students in all these courses? Also, how does he manage to spin off law review articles in these subjects just because he gets curious about them—while at the same time writing steadily and influentially in his mainstream area of interest, employment law?

Mike Gottesman is an enormously popular teacher. His classroom style is deceptively relaxed—deceptive in that, despite the informality and easy-going atmosphere, every class has been thought through thoroughly in advance and is equipped with prescribed goals that are both announced and accomplished. Both in and outside the classroom, it is palpably clear that Professor Gottesman cares deeply about his students. For example, each year he schedules small-group lunches so that he can spend casual, social time with all 125 students in his first-year section. He spends much time coaching moot court teams, organizing events to raise money for student charities, or simply discussing the job market.

Mike Gottesman joined our faculty after 28 years of law practice in Washington with Bredhoff & Kaiser, one of the best known and most respected labor law firms in the country. He has continued to argue Supreme Court cases since joining our faculty, and has won 13 of the 18 cases he's argued.

Many of Mike Gottesman's courtroom successes involved high-profile cases that received extensive press coverage. For example, he successfully represented the estate of Karen Silkwood before the Supreme Court, arguing that nuclear power companies should pay punitive damages in cases of controllable radiation exposure. His greatest personal satisfactions were the victory before the Supreme Court in Steelworkers v. Weber, in which private affirmative action to offset past discrimination in employment was upheld; the successful class action against Northwest Airlines, resulting in a $60 million punitive damages award for flight attendants who were the victims of sex discrimination; and, most recently, the Supreme Court's decision in Ominstead v. L.C., recognizing the right of mental patients to treatment in the community, where appropriate, rather than in institutions.

Those of us who have spent most of our professional lives as law teachers know how rare and how hard it is for a practitioner to make a successful mid- or late-career shift from practice to academia. The problem usually does not lie in the classroom, but in the demand made by the law teaching profession for serious-minded scholarship. Yet here, Professor Gottesman confounded every skeptic. His writings since he came to Georgetown as a full-time faculty member have been described variously by leading labor law academics as brilliant, masterly, thorough, important, persuasive, profound. Who could hope for better adjectives?

Probably enough has been said to get across the basic message—that Georgetown Law Center benefits enormously from Mike Gottesman's presence on its faculty—and by his continuing, with us, to "have a good time doing what he does."

By James Oldham
Charles Gustafson

Charles Gustafson joined the Law Center faculty in 1972, after what he characterizes as a “checkered career” during the decade after his graduation from the University of Chicago Law School. The square in that “checkered career” included several years as a member of the initial Faculty of Law of Ahmadu Bello University in northern Nigeria, practice with firms in New York (Shearman & Sterling) and Washington (Surrey & Morse), and a stint with the Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

Gustafson’s principal academic interests are in tax law and policy, international law, and law and development. He is the co-author of three casebooks on aspects of federal taxation, including Taxation of International Transactions, which currently is the most widely used casebook in the field. He was the principal tax consultant to the Privacy Protection Study Commission and the draftsman of its report on taxpayer confidentiality, which led to the adoption of the privacy provisions now found in Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code. He was also the principal rapporteur for an American Law Institute study, Federal Income Tax Simplification, which he characterizes as “a great idea whose time may never come.” Citing the extraordinary strength of the Law Center in his two principal fields, Gustafson often observes that “there could be no better place for me than Georgetown and Washington.”

Gustafson says that, despite the number of years that he has been doing it, teaching is still the most satisfying aspect of his time at Georgetown. He particularly enjoys teaching a course such as basic income taxation, which many students approach with considerable reluctance and very modest expectations. However, many discover with some surprise that the examination of the economic, social, and political consequences of the income tax system provides a remarkable vehicle for examining at least some aspects of governance in this country. There are a number of tax experts who have declared that their career path was substantially affected by Gustafson’s basic course. Declining to embrace the “international law as theology” school, his approach to the course includes a sharp focus on the tasks that “international lawyers” are called upon to undertake. He says that his seminar on law in developing countries should be subtitled “Life in 80 percent of the world for two credit hours.”

During recent years, Gustafson’s responsibilities at the Law Center have expanded. He has served since 1995 as the first associate dean for international programs, and since 1997 as the associate dean for graduate programs as well. During that period, the international elements of the Law Center have been strengthened and expanded, programs for foreign lawyers have been offered in several other countries by Georgetown faculty, and additional opportunities have been created to enhance the academic opportunities available for graduate students in each of the various programs.

In addition to his work at the Law Center, Dean Gustafson has been active in bar organizations, has consulted for government agencies and international organizations, and serves periodically as an arbitrator in commercial and investment disputes. He is often invited to lecture in countries around the world and, in fact, has lectured at universities in every inhabited continent.

Gustafson contends that his sanity, “such as it is,” is maintained in part by cherished hours on the tennis court (albeit diminished by the frustrations of occasional rounds of golf). Asked by friends whether teaching has become routine, he responds that “teaching is a process of constant renewal. The joys of the classroom and of meeting former students embarked upon successful careers are the true compensation of this job and this life.”

By James Feinerman
BOB HAFT PRACTICED WHAT HE TEACHES. BEFORE COMING TO THE LAW CENTER, HE WAS ONE OF THE LEADING securities lawyers in the world, overseeing international corporate financial transactions. His clients include many of the world's largest investment and merchant banks. He was the principal lawyer for Bernard Cornfeld's Investors Overseas Services and its "Fund of Funds," then the world's largest mutual fund. Haft's office was a townhouse on Manhattan's upper East Side. His Wall Street clients arrived in their limousines for conferences over lunch served in the Haft firm's backyard. When not at the office, Haft was likely on one of his innumerable one-day trips to Europe.

Haft's clients weren't exclusively multinational corporations. There was also Timothy Leary, the celebrated Harvard professor and counter-culture iconoclast. Leary's first visit to the Haft firm caused a sensation. Some Wall Street clients were leaving as a shaggy, long-bearded figure with tassels and beads entered the townhouse. Encased in their limousine, the Wall Streeters called Haft on their car phone to report a prowler. "That was no prowler, that was my client," was Haft's quick reply.

Haft represented Leary in the Supreme Court, seeking to overturn his criminal conviction. The case was paired with another that raised the same issue: whether, consistent with the privilege against self-incrimination, the government may prosecute persons who fail to report and pay tax on the marijuana they possess. Haft's argument must have been good. As he was leaving the podium, the lawyer for the defendant in the companion case asked if Haft would argue his case, too. Haft proceeded to argue his second Supreme Court case of the day. As he left the podium the second time, his former law school professor, Milton Handler, approached the bench to argue the next case. "I suppose you'd like to argue my case, too," whispered Handler. Haft scored a rare double-header, arguing and winning two cases on the same day.

In 1977, Haft became special counsel to the Securities and Exchange Commission. His first mission was to investigate New York City's default on $100 million in bonds. Armed with a 100-person support team, Haft conducted a massive investigation and prepared a report concluding that New York's mayor, Abe Beame, had known that false statements were made in issuing the bonds. Beame was then running for reelection, and was locked in a close primary battle with Ed Koch and Mario Cuomo. Beame lost the primary to Koch by a narrow margin, and blamed his defeat on the Haft report. A New York Post front-page headline read: "Haft Who?"

Georgetown's good fortune began with Haft's assumption of his SEC duties. He began teaching securities law as an adjunct professor and a year later accepted an offer of a full-time academic position. Haft has become a fixture at the Law Center, teaching securities and corporate law courses, as well as torts, to chuck-full classes of adoring students. He recently created a course in comparative corporate law, comparing American corporate law to that of other major industrial nations.

While fully ensconced as an academic, Haft has kept a toe in the real world. For several years, he continued to serve as consultant to the SEC. More recently, he has become a highly sought-after expert witness in high-stakes securities cases. He authors a number of annual publications that are a staple for the securities bar and frequently speaks at conferences of securities lawyers.

By Michael Gottesman
Lisa Heinzerling

LISA HEINZERLING GOES HER OWN WAY. A CAREFUL THINKER, WITH A GENTLE VOICE, SHE PURSUES IDEAS TENACIOUSLY AND FORGES FRESH, INDEPENDENT ANALYSES. SHE HAS BROUGHT THE WELCOME PERSPECTIVE OF A YOUNGER GENERATION TO HER WORK AT GEOGETOWN IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW.

Lisa’s independence of mind has stood her in good stead. She served as the first female editor-in-chief of the University of Chicago Law Review, and clerked happily for both Judge Richard Posner, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Brennan. After clerking and a public interest fellowship in Chicago sponsored by Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, she eschewed the usual paths for three years of environmental litigation with the Massachusetts attorney general’s office.

When Georgetown sought to add a professor in environmental law, Lisa stood out both for her intelligence and for her freedom from academia and policy wonk orthodoxy. At a time when “regulatory reform” has been seen triumphant, she has carefully criticized administrative reliance on cost-benefit devices and urged a more favorable evaluation of command and control mechanisms.

Lisa’s first scholarly article deflated claims by leading scholars that “pollution trading” schemes, such as the creation of a market for tradable sulfur dioxide permits in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, would enhance political deliberation by clarifying the issues at stake. She also has drawn on her background in environmental law to develop criticisms of one of the Supreme Court’s most widely accepted doctrines. The Court has regularly said that state laws discriminating against interstate commerce are unconstitutional. Examining several recent Court decisions involving efforts by local governments to control the generation and disposal of solid wastes, Lisa suggested that the Court may be employing its doctrine in the service of ideas of economic due process that have been largely discredited when seen openly presented.

During the summer of 1994, Lisa advised the Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination of Stephen Breyer to the Supreme Court. Her involvement with Breyer’s published scholarship stimulated her to write a review of Breyer’s much discussed book, Breaking the Vicious Circle, about administrative law. Her review, entitled “Political Science,” trenchantly criticizes Breyer for displacing democratic, political decision-making in favor of decision-making by scientific elites. Since then, Lisa has also published articles on risk and regulation in the Yale Law Journal, the Georgetown Law Journal, the Fordham Environmental Law Journal, and the Land and Water Law Review. Her 1998 article in the Yale Law Journal was named one of the 10 best environmental or land use articles of 1998 by a panel of experts in the field. She has also testified before Congress and presented her views on risk and regulation to a federal work group on children’s health. In 1997, Professor Heinzerling was a visiting professor at the Yale Law School. In the winter of 2001, she will visit at Harvard Law School.

Thankfully, Lisa’s tough mindedness does not result in ferocity of demeanor. Rather, she is a solicitous and witty colleague with whom it is a thorough delight to work or chat. Lisa lives in Bethesda (admittedly a lapse into conventionality) with her husband, Bob Lechleider and two young children, Mariah and Lucas.

By Peter Byrne
John Jackson

John Jackson is no stranger to anyone anywhere involved in trade law. To international economic law aficionados, John's work is legendary. His work on the Trade Act of 1974 and the dispute settlement aspects of the World Trade Organization have won him special acclaim. He is widely credited with creating the intellectual framework for the new WTO dispute settlement procedures providing for binding panel decisions and an appellate body. His first book, *World Trade and the Law of GATT*, launched his career in international economic law. The book has been referred to as "the Bible" for trade law and policy specialists, including diplomats and government officials.

John received his A.B. from Princeton in 1954, graduating from the Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. After two years in the U.S. Army, he went to the University of Michigan Law School, where he received his J.D. in 1959 and won the Coblenz Award for the best law review work. After two years of law practice in Milwaukee, he joined the faculty of the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. But his mid-Western roots lured him back to Michigan, and in 1966, he left Berkeley to become a faculty member at Michigan, where, in 1983, he became the Hess E. Yamada Professor of Law. During 1988-89, he served as the associate vice president for academic affairs (international studies) at the University. In 1998, John accepted a position at the Georgetown University Law Center as a University Professor. He remains a member of the University of Michigan law faculty with emeritus status.

During his more than 38 years of teaching law, John has produced 10 books and many dozens of articles, chapters in books, and reports. His casebook on *Legal Problems of International Economic Relations* (with Davey and Sykes) is in its third edition and is widely used in courses across the country. His treatise on *The World Trading System* is in its second edition and is an indispensable guide to understanding trade law. Most recently, he published *The Jurisprudence of GATT and WTO*.

From 1973-1974, John served as a general counsel for the U.S. Office of the Special Trade Representative, (now the office of the U.S. Trade Representative), and subsequently, in 1974, as the acting deputy special representative for trade. His legacy was the Trade Act of 1974, which introduced the famous section 301, which John recalled was originally a diplomatic protection concept.

John's work has garnered many honors. He served as vice president of the American Society of International Law from 1990-92 and has been honorary vice president since 1996. He serves on the editorial advisory boards of many journals and is editor-in-chief and founding editor of a new journal started in 1998, the *Journal of International Economic Law*. He is a member of the American Law Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations. John's influence is multiplied by the many students throughout the world whose lives he has touched.

In 1992, he was given the Wolfgang Friedmann Memorial Award for lifelong contribution to international law.

He shares his life with his wife, Joan Leland, and their three daughters, Lee Ann, Jeannette, and Michelle, and three grandchildren. When he is not researching, teaching, or providing advice to governments or private clients, he may be swimming or biking or, during sojourns to Japan, securing the side streets of Tokyo for modern Japanese prints or older woodblock prints.

*By Edith Brown Weiss*
VICKI JACKSON'S INTERESTS IN LAW GO BACK A LONG WAY. HER TRIPS WITH HER FATHER TO THE LAW LIBRARY OF
the Association of the Bar of the City of New York introduced her to the mysteries—and occasional joys—of legal
research. After law school she completed a hat trick of clerkships with distinguished federal judges in the Second Circuit
(Murray Gurfein), the Southern District of New York (Morris Lasker), and the Supreme Court (Thurgood Marshall)—a
feat that may be unique in the past few decades.

She was a litigator with a Washington law firm for eight years, longer than she had expected. But she
decided to go into law teaching because, like litigation, it presented her with new challenges every year: "You are
frequently faced with a high learning curve and don't do the same thing over and over," as she puts it. And, although
she loved litigation, an academic career made it easier for her to devote the time she wanted to her family.

As a teacher and scholar, Vicki Jackson has drawn on her earlier experience. She remembers the
generosity of the late Yale Law School professor Robert Cover in giving her and another classmate a two-person tutorial
in federal jurisdiction, simply because they were unable to take the course at the regularly scheduled time. After having
taught at Georgetown since 1985, Professor Jackson now knows how extraordinary a gift of time and attention that was.

She gives the same depth of attention and care to her own courses. While serving as co-chair of the special
committee on gender of the D.C. Circuit's Task Force on Gender, Race, and Ethnicity Bias, she developed a course in
which students engaged in empirical research on gender issues in the federal courts, which resulted in a number of
published articles. And her more recent work on comparative constitutional law was deepened by the contributions
made by Georgetown students with a wide range of backgrounds and experience with other legal systems.

Professor Jackson has made her name as a scholar as one of the nation's premier students of federalism. Her interest in the subject goes back to her clerkships.
She recalls one case in the district court in which she found the law of the Eleventh Amendment so peculiar that she was driven to grapple with the
complex issues raised by the Supreme Court's decision. She has continued
to do so in her meticulous articles on that amendment.

While she was working for Thurgood Marshall, the Justice was
assigned the opinion for the Court in an intriguing case involving a challenge
under a federal statute to a practice by a Native American tribe that amounted
to gender discrimination. The case prodded Professor Jackson to think
about how to deal with questions about the relation between national
law and historically subordinated groups. She sees federalism as
offering an answer to such questions, and yet understands that
it raises new and sometimes equally difficult questions.
Professor Jackson's subtle analysis of federalism has allowed her
to develop acute criticisms of the modern Supreme Court's less supple approaches to these issues.

By Mark Tushnet
Emma Coleman Jordan

"I'VE ALWAYS HAD THE ROMANTIC IDEA THAT THE LAW EXISTED TO PROTECT PEOPLE." WITH THOSE WORDS AS HER GUIDE, Emma Jordan has built a career on helping people.

Jordan gained national prominence as one of Anita Hill's attorneys during the 1991 Senate hearings on the nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court. But she also worked for free on a series of California cases in the 1980s that helped reform the way financial institutions treat consumers. "I entered law because I've always been a risk-taker," Jordan says. "I've never been hesitant to challenge authority and speak up when I see something wrong."

Jordan has been working to explore and challenge various injustices in our society as a scholar, a teacher, and as an individual active in legal education. She started out as a pioneer in her own legal education: In 1973, she graduated first in her class from Howard University Law School in Washington, D.C., at a time when women were not well represented in law schools. She taught for over 10 years at the University of California, Davis; spent an intense year as a White House Fellow in 1980 working as a special assistant to Attorney General William French Smith (and working closely with Ken Starr, then chief of staff); and came to Georgetown University Law Center in 1987.

Throughout her career, Jordan has focused on two issues: civil rights and consumer protection. While she was teaching at University of California, Davis, Jordan helped write briefs and draft legislation that would support affirmative action. Following her representation of Anita Hill, Jordan helped organize a symposium and co-edited a book with Hill entitled Race, Gender, and Power in America. Most recently, she has been working on a book entitled Lynching: The Dark Metaphor of American Law, which explores why the metaphor of lynching (used by Clarence Thomas in his hearing) still resonates so strongly in the African-American community.

Jordan's other passion has been consumer rights. In the early 1980s, Jordan became aware of problems consumers were facing in gaining access to checks that had been deposited in their accounts. At the heart of the problem was the inefficient method used by banks to determine if checks coming in to accounts were fraudulent or backed by insufficient funds. Jordan attacked the problem from all directions. She helped draft the California Delayed Availability Act, which proposed a comprehensive state law approach to the problem, helped coordinate a consumer response, and wrote a law review article in Hastings Law Journal, "Ending the Floating Check Game: The Policy Arguments for Delayed Availability Reform."

A major focus for Jordan's passion for economic justice and civil rights has come in the arena of legal education. Emma has contributed her time and energy to making the world of legal education as fair, diverse, and successful as possible. She has been an active member of the Association of American Law Schools since 1987, and served as the association's first African-American president in 1992.

For the future, Jordan plans to concentrate on economic justice issues. Jordan puts it best herself: "The conventional economic arrangements in this country make it very difficult for African-Americans to progress. This society still harbors racial bias in health care, public schools, and housing. Some of us have made progress, but for others it's as bad as it ever was. The only way things will change is through changes in the conventional market rationales for distributing the basic necessities of life. That's why I'll concentrate on the financial side of the law."

Wherever Emma concentrates, good things will happen. Our society as a whole, and Georgetown University Law Center in particular, benefit from her passion, her commitment, and her intelligence.

By Chai Feldblum
When Professor David Cole introduced Neal Katyal to the Georgetown community, he remarked that Professor Katyal is “returning to his Jesuit roots.” While this may seem a strange description for one who is of the Hindu faith, Professor Katyal was indeed returning to the fold of his Jesuit education. Professor Katyal’s parents, who had emigrated from the Punjab region of India and settled in Chicago, enrolled him in the Loyola Academy (alma mater to two other Law Center professors, James V. Feinerman and Peter P. Weidenbruch Jr.).

It was a wise decision, for Professor Katyal relied upon the firm foundation of his early education to build a very successful academic career. He was graduated from Dartmouth College with highest honors and went on to excel at Yale Law School, where he was the symposium editor of the Yale Law Journal and a member of the Yale Journal of Law and Feminism. While in law school, Professor Katyal published articles in Harvard Law Review, University of Chicago Law Review, UCLA Law Review, and Yale Law Journal. At Yale, Professor Katyal’s passion for writing took root, and he received a number of writing prizes and co-authored several articles with professors Bruce Ackerman and Akhil Amar. After receiving his J.D., Professor Katyal served clerkships with Judge Guido Calabresi of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer.

Professor Katyal’s broad academic interests run the gamut of constitutional and criminal law issues. He has written on, among other subjects, the ways in which Supreme Court justices provide advice to legislatures and states in constitutional opinions, the relevance of the Thirteenth Amendment to prostitution, and the boundaries of the use of deterrence as a rationale for criminal punishment. His articles have appeared in places such as the Stanford Law Review, Michigan Law Review, Criminal Law Bulletin, and The New Republic. He has also written extensively about education law policy. In a New York Times article he pointed out that “even before we had a Constitution, this nation had begun forging a Federal role for education to insulate that our children have some semblance of equality in education.” Tracing the historical evolution of his observation, Professor Katyal argued that “Article IV of the Constitution, which calls for a republican form of government, was widely viewed until the turn of the century as a Federal guarantee of education.”

Professor Katyal recently finished serving as national security adviser to the deputy attorney general, U.S. Department of Justice. His work at the Justice Department focused on war powers (particularly Kosovo), the Independent Counsel Act, drug and immigration policy towards Mexico, sales of military aircraft, affirmative action, and the implementation of sanctions against India and Pakistan for detonation of nuclear devices. In 1999, President Clinton also commissioned Professor Katyal to write a report on ways in which to improve the quality and quantity of pro bono service by lawyers across the country, and ways in which to enhance the diversity of the legal profession.

When he is not busy imparting knowledge or providing counsel, Professor Katyal relaxes in the traditional manner—through his appreciation for fine wine and good music.

By Viet Dinh
FOR MANY OF HER COLLEAGUES, PAT KING, GEORGETOWN’S CARMACK WATERHOUSE PROFESSOR OF LAW, MEDICINE, ETHICS, AND PUBLIC POLICY, IS SOMETHING OF AN INSTITUTION WITHIN THE INSTITUTION. SHE HAS SPENT THE LAST 25 YEARS TEACHING AND WRITING ABOUT LAW AND BIOETHICS AT THE LAW CENTER. SHE WOULD ACKNOWLEDGE, WITH CHARACTERISTIC MODESTY, THAT DURING THAT TIME SHE HAS SEEN GEORGETOWN GROW INTO A PREEMINENT LAW SCHOOL AND HER FIELD OF EXPERTISE BECOME AN INCREASINGLY CENTRAL AND CONTENTIOUS ISSUE OF LAW AND POLICY. THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT KING HAS NOT BEEN A MERE WITNESS BUT A VITAL PARTICIPANT IN THE TRANSFORMATIONS OF BOTH THE LAW CENTER AND THE LEGAL FIELD THAT IS THE PRIMARY SUBJECT OF HER SCHOLARSHIP.

As with many such intellectual unions, serendipity brought King to the nascent field of law and medical ethics in the early 1970s. After graduating from Harvard Law School in 1969, she spent five years working for the federal government. During a year’s leave of absence to teach at Georgetown, King answered a request from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to sit on a national commission to study and protect human subjects of medical research. King recalls the appointment as a moment when “life takes one of those strange turns.” The four-year commission marked the beginning of the fledgling field of bioethics. Not only did King’s one-year visit become a 25-year commitment to Georgetown, but she has sat on every federal commission directed to study fetuses and embryos since then. “It has been wonderful,” says King, “to be at the beginning of a field and grow up with it.”

The cultural sensitivity King brings to her professional life, as well as the warmth, moral guidance, and dignity she brings to the life of the Law Center, are traceable to the trajectory her personal life has taken from a childhood in a segregated southern city to Harvard Law School. King and her sister were raised by their mother in Norfolk, Virginia. They lived in segregated housing and attended segregated public schools. A high school teacher helped her prepare for and gain entrance to Wheaton College; when King traveled to Massachusetts in 1959 to attend the women’s college, she moved from an all-black world to an all-white one. Despite “culture shock,” King is convinced that the four years she spent at Wheaton altered the course of her life. “It was, and still is, an institution that nurtures its students. For every barrier, obstacle, and encounter with racism, there was a fellow student or teacher who offered support, opportunity, or challenge.”

If Wheaton was an education in navigating white culture, Harvard, one of the last law schools to admit women, was an education in gender inequalities. Women law students were told they were taking the places of men, and “ladies days” were those designated days when women were called on in class.

King has come full circle, bringing the best and most difficult lessons learned in her own courageous travels to bear on both her current scholarship and the Law Center as it comes of age. Her most recent articles use critical race theory and feminism to add dimension and particularity to the current debates within bioethics. King has also brought the wisdom of her experience to the ongoing task of defining Georgetown Law Center. She knows from her own education that being encouraged to flourish as a person is no small thing, and this is one of the gifts she continues to contribute to the Law Center and its students. “If you are interested, you can grow and blossom as a human being here. It is no accident that we have a woman dean or a Catholic tradition that values human dignity and justice. You can explore and become what you want to be and Georgetown will help you to do that. Not just in terms of race or gender, but in so many ways. Not many institutions do that. Not many institutions enjoy being modern.”

By Naomi Mezey
PROFESSOR DAVID KOPLOW IS A RENAISSANCE MAN OF THE LAW. DURING HIS EIGHTEEN-YEAR CAREER AT GEORGETOWN, Dave has displayed uncommon versatility, virtuosity and balance in clinical and academic teaching, in legal practice and research, and in work and family.

When Dave arrived at the Law Center in 1981 from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with Phil Schrag, with whom he still teaches, they inherited the Administrative Advocacy Clinic and "changed everything about it," from its name—now the Center for Applied Legal Studies, or CALS—to its subject matter and methodology. As a clinic, Dave was looking for cases students could handle from start to finish in a semester, that were fact intensive as opposed to law intensive, that served unmet community needs, and that were important enough for students and clients to genuinely care about them. Dealing with political asylum cases, he and Phil developed a clinical methodology that starts with the concept of student responsibility, both for case development and for the priorities of their own educational growth, and is characterized by emphasis on personal growth in addition to conventional legal training.

The international focus of Dave's academic courses and scholarly research, where he moves "from small claims court to the International Court of Justice," contrasts sharply with his CALS clinic, although they share similar practical concerns. In his approach to introductory international law, Dave connects the more abstract principles of international law with events of the real world. "Instead of a course book, you could almost have students subscribe to the New York Times or Washington Post" to study current crises around the world, he notes. His specialty is arms control and international security, where his work has evolved with the times. His arms control seminar is structured to dovetail with his scholarly pursuits. He maintains a student-centered focus in his academic teaching. When asked to comment on the remarkable fact that for two consecutive years participants in his arms control seminar have won the award for best student paper at the Law Center, he deferred to them, saying it was "satisfying to help students develop and then realize genuine scholarly ambitions."

During 1997-99, Dave took leave of absence to engage in the practical application of his interests at the Department of Defense, where he served as deputy general counsel for international affairs. There, he was "responsible for the legal aspects of everything the Pentagon did that touched another country." In those two years, Dave grappled with domestic and international legal issues regarding Iraq and Yugoslavia. He dealt with such matters, often not in the headlines, as ongoing negotiation and implementation of arms control treaties. This experience enriches his teaching. One of his strongest impressions is "how hard-working, dedicated, insightful, and smart my Pentagon colleagues are."

On the home front, Dave is an active parent of three boys, one a junior at Georgetown and two in high school. His qualities as a teacher are reflected in his view that out of all his experiences, personal and professional, the most exciting things he has ever done were "helping my youngest son learn to hit a curve ball, helping my oldest son to keep his elbow in while shooting a basketball, and being my middle son's cub scout den leader."

Dave's wife Karen is his high-school sweetheart from Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Dave recognizes how personal issues can help or hinder the group process and how people interact with each other. "Terrific lawyers bring the full range of personal and interpersonal experience to their work. What lawyers really do demands that full range of insights."

By Rick Roe
DONALD LANGEVOORT IS FASCINATED BY GRAND THEMES: POWER, WEAKNESS, HONOR, CORRUPTION, DESIRE. THAT’S WHY he enjoys teaching and writing about corporate law and securities regulation.

“Corporate and securities law is extraordinarily rich in human drama,” says Don. This view may help explain how a man who majored in religion and social philosophy at the University of Virginia has gone on to establish himself as one of the nation’s leading experts in business law. Cataloging Don’s honors and achievements is a humbling task. In addition to his many scholarly articles, he has published a treatise on insider trading and is co-author of one of the leading textbooks in securities regulation. He has testified before the U.S. Congress on numerous occasions, he serves on the legal advisory board of the New York Stock Exchange, and he is the editor-in-chief of West Publishing’s Securities Law Review. Perhaps the best example of Don’s preeminence may be a series of phone calls he received back in 1995. At the time, Congress was considering legislation that would make it significantly more difficult for investors to sue corporations for securities fraud. President Clinton, in turn, was considering whether he should sign or veto such a bill. To whom did the White House turn for advice? Don Langevoort, of course.

All this from a man who decided to go to law school “by default,” because “none of the obvious alternatives was all that appealing.” Don’s decision to devote his career to the study of the business world stemmed from a surprising discovery he made soon after he arrived at Harvard Law School and took a course in corporate law. Like social philosophy, business law was about power, authority, and human relationships.

To learn more about the corporate world, after graduating in 1976, Don accepted a position with the Washington, D.C., law firm of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering. Then moved to a position as special counsel at the Securities and Exchange Commission. But teaching and scholarship were always at the back of Don’s mind. In 1981, he left the SEC to join the faculty at Vanderbilt Law School. In the years that have followed, he has produced a blizzard of scholarly articles on virtually every corporate and securities topic imaginable. These include takeovers, insider trading, managerial behavior, securities fraud damages, the bureaucratic functioning of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the effects of information technology on the securities markets (to name a few).

Yet Don has never lost sight of the human element of corporate law that he finds so fascinating. As Don puts it, “I love to think about why people behave the way they do.” Don’s eye for the human side of business may help explain why he is such an effective and popular teacher. During his years at Vanderbilt, Don won the Hartmann Award for Excellence in Teaching not once but four times.

Although Don has only recently arrived at Georgetown, his students here have been similarly enthusiastic. As one of Don’s Georgetown students puts it, Don is “awesome!” Awesome indeed. We are delighted to welcome Don Langevoort and his family — wife Joni, daughter Kate, and son Jackson — to Georgetown.

By Lynn Stout
Charles Lawrence

THE LETTER ON THE WALL ABOVE PROFESSOR CHARLES LAWRENCE'S DESK IS DATED JUNE 3, 1943. "MY DEAR SIR," IT reads. "May I congratulate you upon your advent into this astonishing world and hope that you may be able to do something toward straightening it out. Very sincerely yours, W.E.B. DuBois." Charles Lawrence was one-month old when he received the letter from the renowned scholar/activist. Charles's father was a graduate student at Atlanta University and DuBois was his teacher. Twenty-five years later, when Lawrence graduated from law school, he framed it together with a drawing of the great man. "It's hung in my office ever since," he says.

Several years ago, when Charles Lawrence, then a tenured professor at Stanford, joined the Georgetown faculty, I asked him why he left one prestigious law school and the beautiful weather of Palo Alto, to join another. He replied that he was attracted by the racial diversity at Georgetown. Here his voice would be his own—he could assert his views as one among many minority legal scholars. There would be no expectation that he speak for all African-Americans.

That does not mean that Charles Lawrence has lost the fire in his belly for the things in which he believes. Professor Lawrence, whose course offerings include constitutional law, race discrimination law, education law, and law and religion, has never been content with teaching his students legal doctrine and theory. He grew up walking with his parents in demonstrations and on picket lines. Before he became a law teacher, he was a community organizer, the principal of a community school, and a civil rights lawyer. He still sees himself first and foremost as a civil rights advocate. "As a teacher my primary weapon in the struggle for justice is my students," he says. "I want them to be activist, to take responsibility for helping shape and define our identity as a community." In his classes Lawrence encourages students to talk with one another about the issues that most deeply divide them—racism, sexism, homophobia, poverty.

"Professor Lawrence doesn't hide behind the role of the detached objective scholar," says one student. "He brings himself to class. He says, 'This is who I am and what I stand for.' And he invites you to do the same."

Chuck Lawrence is proud of his influence upon individual students. One of these, Federal District Court Judge Martin Jenkins, tells the story of stopping by Lawrence's office at the end of his first year. Jenkins had done well, but he felt alienated and was thinking of leaving school. At the end of a 45-minute conversation, Professor Lawrence said two things: One, "Congratulations for doing so well." And two, "Do you think you could help more people by staying than leaving?"

Charles Lawrence's students know him primarily as a gifted teacher, but he is also one of the Law Center's most influential scholars. He is a prominent voice in the emergent genre of critical race theory and one of the nation's leading authorities on affirmative action. His books on hate speech and affirmative action, co-authored with Georgetown Law Center professor Mari Matsuda, have won awards for "outstanding work contributing to public understanding of intolerance," and author Jonathan Kozol has called their most recent book, We Won't Go Back: Making the Case for Affirmative Action, "a moral essay in the tradition of DuBois and Dewey...in the very best sense a transcendent work."

Charles Lawrence describes his own work in more modest terms. "I'm just trying to do something toward straightening this world out."

By Sherman Cohn
Richard Lazarus

CITIZEN-SCHOLAR PAR EXCELLENCE, RICHARD LAZARUS HAS A WELL-DESERVED NATIONAL REPUTATION FOR SCHOLARLY writings that often identify problems others have not yet noticed or that challenge conventional wisdom in the environmental law community. After receiving his B.A. in economics and his B.S. in chemistry from the University of Illinois in 1976, and his J.D. from Harvard in 1979, Lazarus served as an attorney in the Land and Natural Resources Division of the U.S. Justice Department and later as an assistant to the solicitor general. After several years of law teaching at Washington University in St. Louis, Lazarus came to Georgetown in 1995.

Richard Lazarus grew up in an academic family in Urbana, Illinois, where his father was a widely admired professor of physics. The only lawyer whom Richard really knew growing up was Lou Pollak, a family friend (then a law professor, now a federal judge). So it was perhaps only natural that Lazarus knew from an early age that he, too, wanted to be a professor. Lazarus was also precocious in his determination to become an environmental lawyer. At the age of 17, he took a semester off from college and traveled through Europe, largely on his own. In Venice, viewing the decay to historically important buildings caused by industrial pollution from nearby cities, he decided to become an environmental lawyer. In this way, he felt he could combine his strong background in math and science with his love of public policy and politics. It was with this determination in mind that he created for himself a double-degree program at Illinois (including a semester taking economics courses at M.I.T. and Harvard) to prepare himself for a specialty (in environmental law) that was only then coming into existence. His scholarship situates problems in environmental or natural resources law in broader political and institutional frameworks and seeks to advance constructive and better understandings of how courts, legislatures, and administrators should behave. Known for his “jeweler’s eye” in identifying important issues that need to be addressed, Lazarus speaks at scholarly conferences around the world on environmental issues. He is willing to take on any issue and any institution, as witnessed by a recent paper criticizing Harvard Law School’s contributions to environmental scholarship.

In the academic year 1999-2000, Lazarus will be a Woodrow Wilson Center Fellow, writing a 30-year retrospective book on environmental law in the United States, focused on the E.P.A. Not all of his other written work is in the law reviews; Lazarus is a regular columnist for the Environmental Law Institute’s Environmental Forum magazine, for which he writes short, provocative essays. Among other activities, he has continued to be active in the litigation of environmental cases, especially in the Supreme Court, and more generally, in facilitating Supreme Court practices in a variety of areas by arranging moot courts. He recently became director of the Law Center’s Supreme Court Institute.

In addition to his scholarly work and his continuing involvement in litigation of environmental issues, Lazarus receives rave reviews from students both here and at the other law schools where he has taught. Not only is he a superb classroom teacher, he is generous in devoting time to out-of-class activities. Perhaps most indicative of his dedication was a visit he led, during a blizzard, for 15 seminar students to see a Supreme Court argument in an environmental case and meet with the lawyers thereafter. Lazarus has worked with students to reinvigorate the Environmental Law Forum, regularly invites his students to moots of actual upcoming cases, and demonstrates his athletic talents through regular participation in the “free throw” event at the annual “Home Court” basketball game.

By Vicki Jackson
David Luban
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Professor David Luban is funny, warm, engaging, and generous. And he is also unquestionably one of the most prominent legal philosophers of our time. By the virtually universal judgement of his peers, he is the intellectual leader in the field of legal ethics. He firmly believes and persuasively argues that lawyers, as professionals, should be committed to justice, and that this central commitment should define the lawyer's role, including the role-morality that structures lawyers' relationships with their clients. David has worked steadfastly over the last 16 years to lay bare the implications of that conviction for our understanding of law, legal institutions, and of legal ethics. By doing so, his work has immeasurably improved our understanding of law, justice, and the relation between them, and of the lawyer's potential for and contribution to both.

David received his B.A. from the University of Chicago in 1970, where he studied, "ideas and methods," with a concentration in mathematics. After graduating with honors, he went on to Yale, where he earned an M.A. and Ph.D. in philosophy, graduating in 1974.

Professor Luban joined the Law Center in 1995 as the Frederick Haas Professor of Law and Philosophy. He has authored or edited five books, including a widely used casebook on professional responsibility, and over 50 articles on issues of ethics, justice, and jurisprudence. His 1988 book, Lawyers and Justice, argues for a lessening of the distance between professional ethics and ethics per se, and shows how closing the gap would improve the quality of justice lawyers are required to uphold. The book has become a classic in the field and for good reason. It is a joy to read. The arguments are clear and the prose straightforward. The book is full of refreshing insights and rewards careful reading and re-reading.

To my mind, the most distinctive and unifying features of Professor Luban's work is that he is so clearly comfortable grappling with fundamental issues, wherever they are raised and in whatever form, whether in philosophical and literary classics, biographies and histories of lawyers and judges, television shows such as L.A. Law, or codes, legal opinion, and treaties. Thus, Professor Luban has written extensively on the Nuremberg trials; on Hannah Arendt's moral philosophy; on the problem of Just Wars; on the nature of justice and law in Aeschylus's classic trilogy, The Oresteia; on Holmes's conception of law, lawyering, and legal ethics; and on any number of jurisprudential or philosophical issues raised by cases or by his colleagues in traditional academic legal writing.

David Luban is praised in the highest terms by everyone even passingly familiar with his work. Legal academics in his fields at Stanford, Yale, and Harvard have called his work "spectacular," "phenomenal," "engaging," "beautifully written," "wonderful," "entertaining," "always interesting, subtle, and a joy to read." Professor Luban's interests also include the real-world issues of practicing lawyers. He has co-taught in the Center for Applied Legal Studies (CALS), the Law Center's political asylum clinic, and, as a result of that work, developed a distinctive legal ethics course for clinical students.

By Robin West
Laura Macklin

POOR FAMILIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS ELSEWHERE, FACE A MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS, MANY, IF NOT MOST, OF which derive from their poverty. Professor Laura Macklin has devoted the past several years to addressing issues related to the education and welfare of poor children with special needs; she does so through the vehicle of the Law Center's Family Opportunity Clinic, of which she is the director.

Macklin came to the Law Center in 1981. Prior to joining the Law Center faculty, she had been an associate with the Washington, D.C., firm of Covington & Burling and then a staff attorney in the Law Reform Unit of the D.C. Neighborhood Legal Services Program (NLSP). It was actually while working for Covington & Burling that Professor Macklin, as she put it, "had the opportunity to learn in a direct and close-up way that she loved legal services work" and wanted to do it for as long as she could. She learned this through her participation in a Covington program whereby a firm lawyer, accompanied by a secretary and a paralegal, could spend six to eight months in a Neighborhood Legal Services office.

A glance at a typical week in the clinic for Laura Macklin reveals the breadth of her responsibilities. In the course of such a week, she would: (1) co-teach two, two-hour classes with Kenneth Anderson, the graduate teaching fellow in the clinic; (2) along with Ken Anderson, meet one hour or more with each of the student teams of two (six teams in all) in the clinic; (3) meet informally with each team individually, several times a week, for 10-20 minutes, as events unfold and issues and challenges arise; (4) visit at least one if not two schools, community organizations, education specialists, or health-care providers as a means of increasing the resources available to serve clinic clients or establishing relationships with people who might refer clients to the clinic; (5) spend two to three hours meeting with other advocates for poor families in the areas of special education, family law, child services, or government entitlements; (6) work with teaching assistants, who are law students who formerly participated in the clinic; and (7) co-teach, with Ken Anderson, a two-credit course entitled Community-Based Lawyering: Theory and Practice. She might also speak at a brown-bag luncheon or other program sponsored by the Women's Legal Alliance or Women in Law as a Second Career, or the new Children's Advocacy group.

Professor Macklin cherishes her time with her husband, Eric Richard, and their two sons, Drew and Brennan. At the time her son Brennan was old enough for day care, the Law Center had opened its child care center, and this provided her with one of the greatest joys of her life: the opportunity to spend precious moments in the car with him during the commute to and from school. Priceless as well were the peace of mind of having him close by and the ability to introduce him to the Law Center community. When she can find a spare moment, Professor Macklin loves to take long walks, jog, swim, play soccer, read books, and see friends.

By Elizabeth Patterson
FROM HER EARLIEST ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS, THE PROLIFIC PROFESSOR MATSUDA HAS SPEAKEN FROM THE PERSPECTIVE and increasingly used the method that has come to be known as critical race theory. She is not only one of its most powerful practitioners, but is among legal scholars who can be most credited with its development.

Her first article, "Liberal Jurisprudence and Abstracted Visions of Human Nature," published in 1986, boldly—albeit respectfully—took on liberal legal philosopher John Rawls' theory of justice and in doing so announced her own philosophical orientation. Matsuda concludes her piece with an idea that informs much of her work in subsequent years: "There is, as Rawls suggests, a place called Justice, and it will take many voices to get there." The voices she has in mind are the voices that have been left out, "outsider" voices speaking as individuals and as members of their communities of origin, voices of subordinate peoples. Voices from the bottom, Matsuda believes—and critical race theory postulates—have the power to open up new legal concepts of even constitutional dimension. Paradoxically, bringing in the voices of outsiders has helped to make Matsuda's work central to the legal canon. A Yale Law School librarian ranked three of her publications as among the "top 10 most cited law review articles" for their year of publication. In addition, judges and scholars regularly quote her work.

Mari Matsuda is also known as a teacher. Her elective courses are typically over-subscribed, she has lectured at every major university, and she is much in demand as a public speaker. Judges in countries as diverse as Micronesia and South Africa have invited her to conduct judicial training, and other law professors count her as a significant influence on their own work. Harvard professor Lani Guinier says "Mari Matsuda taught me that I have a voice. I did not have to become a female gentleman, a social mile. Nor should I strive to become someone else in order to be heard." And social critic Catherine MacKinnon says of Matsuda's book, Where Is Your Body? Essays on Race, Gender, and the Law, "Her writing shines, her politics illuminate, her passion shines and reveals...Community grows in her hands. Read her. We need this."

For Matsuda, community is linked to teaching and scholarship. She serves on national advisory boards of social justice organizations, including the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Asian Pacific Legal Consortium, and Ms. magazine. By court appointment, she is a member of the Texaco Task Force on Equality and Fairness, assisting in implementation of the largest employment discrimination settlement in U.S. history. "Every one of the publications that I am known for came out of some kind of pro bono community work I was working on," she says. Her Yale Law Journal article on accent discrimination, for example, came out of her representation of Manual Fragaite, immigrant and Vietman veteran. Although he placed first of 700 applicants on a civil service test for the job of clerk in the Hawaii Department of Motor Vehicles, Fragaite was passed over because of his accent. For her work on such cases, A Magazine recognized her in 1999 as one of the 100 most influential Asian Americans.

Judge Richard Posner, in his quantitative analysis of scholarly influence, lists Mari Matsuda as among scholars most likely to have lasting influence. Yet in other venues, he has criticized the narrative methods of critical race theory. This paradox of criticism combined with recognition perhaps best characterizes reaction to Matsuda's work. People, in her optimistic words, "learn and grow through interaction with difference, not by reproducing what they already know." A faith in law's potential for reconstruction to create a more inclusive democracy illuminates all of Mari Matsuda's work.

By Wendy Williams
Carrie Menkel-Meadow
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Quinnipiac College of Law
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Women’s Ways of Knowing Law:
Feminist Legal Epistemology, Pedagogy
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Carrie Menkel-Meadow has spent most of her professional life looking for and finding common denominators. She began her career as a clinical teacher who soon recognized that both classroom teaching and clinical teaching required clear, rigorous approaches to understanding the theory and practice of law. As a young law teacher, she soon recognized that the "we-they" dichotomy in legal education had created counter-productive hierarchies between clinicians and traditional teachers.

By entering law teaching from practice she hoped to combine levels of analysis—dealing with decisions about real people in legal, policy, and sociological terms. Her search for better solutions for human and legal problems led to her interest in the field of alternative dispute resolution. Although she identified with clinical teachers, as a woman, she realized that the "maeoh" culture of litigation was antithetical to her own deeper preference for collaborative problem solving.

Professor Menkel-Meadow’s search for the most appropriate form of dispute resolution led to the establishment of a new field. She is a nationally known pioneer in the field of conflict resolution, negotiation, and mediation. Professor Menkel-Meadow’s passion for justice and conflict resolution can be traced to the lessons she learned from her parents, both Holocaust survivors. Menkel-Meadow says that "my parents’ experiences caused me to recognize that although the world may be a place where there can be cruelty and unfairness, I could make a contribution by supplementing my work as a litigator in a culture that rewarded polarized, confrontational tactics with more humane and interest-satisfying approaches. I made the transition to mediation, and became one of the founders of conflict resolution in legal education, as a way to achieve justice and make the world a better place through talk and empathy rather than only lawsuits."

Menkel-Meadow, like a true bridge-builder, understands the value of a good old-fashioned lawsuit nevertheless. She says, "There are times when even I say ‘to hell with this ADR stuff.’ There are limits to mediation and settlement. Every once in a while I return to my roots of being a civil rights lawyer where rights, rather than interests, have to be vindicated.” Georgetown students have appreciated her eclectic and pluralistic approach to alternative dispute resolution and civil procedure. This comment is representative: "It was in the hope of learning from professors like Professor Menkel-Meadow that I chose Georgetown... [she has] a gift for teaching. It’s a privilege to study with her.” Her colleagues, too, have appreciated her generosity in leading an interdisciplinary research workshop for faculty with presentations from the leading scholars in law and society issues.

Our success in bringing Professor Menkel-Meadow to Georgetown, after her 20 years at UCLA Law School, has been amply rewarded with Carrie's presence as a respected and influential leader on alternative dispute resolution, legal ethics, and feminism. Her scholarly activities include drafting and writing about ethical rules for lawyers in conflict resolution roles.

By Emma Coleman Jordan
Naomi Mezey

Despite impressive credentials, Naomi Mezey sees herself as very much a work in progress. "My dreams are still coming true," says the Georgetown law professor, who waxes enthusiastic about her job and the intellectual community among faculty and students at the Law Center.

Mezey graduated with distinction from Stanford Law School in 1995 where she held a public interest fellowship, was an articles editor of the Stanford Law Review, and was the star student in the legislation class I conducted as a visitor there. She began publishing while still in law school, beginning with an article entitled, "Legal Radicals in Madonna's Closet: The Influence of Identity Politics, Popular Culture and a New Generation on Critical Legal Studies." No one will ever call her a cloistered academic.

It comes as no surprise that Mezey came to law school with an M.A. in American Studies, earned at the University of Minnesota. In fact, it was at Minnesota that the urge to go to law school took hold. According to Mezey, "I love ideas, and I love writing, but my prior experience in politics made it especially important to me to work with ideas that I felt mattered, that had a tangible relationship to the world we live in. Graduate school didn't seem to be offering that." And so she left Minneapolis for Palo Alto. Mezey found the intellectual challenges of law school, as well as the change in climate, "enormously satisfying." Since then, Mezey says, her scholarship has been an attempt to integrate the insights of two disciplines: cultural studies and law. After law school Mezey remained in the Bay area to clerk for two years for Judge Marilyn Hall Patel of the Northern District of California. Mezey credits Judge Patel, whom she found "very dynamic, very smart, an inclusive and yet creative legal thinker," with giving her a great practical education that had been missing from law school.

Mezey credits her family and childhood with the development of her abiding interest in culture and politics. The young Naomi Mezey lived a nomadic existence because her parents "were hippies with wanderlust." Childhood peregrinations took the family to Spain, rural California, and Utah until the family settled in Claremont, California. Thanks to Mezey's father, a poet, there were always writers visiting the house when she was growing up. Mezey came east to attend college at Wesleyan University, where she graduated with high honors. It was her inherited "love of the literary" that helped Mezey secure, after graduation from Wesleyan, a Watson Fellowship that took her to Spain, where she wrote poetry, researched the Spanish Civil War, and translated for the New York Times.

The following year she came to Capitol Hill, where she spent two years working for Senator Cranston as a legislative aide for environmental and natural resources issues. A decade later Mezey is back in the nation's capital, putting her experience in politics to use in teaching Georgetown's popular course in legislation. In her own writing, Mezey attempts to make some systematic sense of the relationship between law and culture by "using theory to understand how legal rules may change when placed in the context of the way people live and how they understand themselves. People might follow the rules, or they may contest them. Other times they may redefine the rule, and then sometimes they are redefined by the rule itself. All of those possibilities, particularly the last, I find fascinating."

When not teaching and writing, Mezey—and her husband, Matthew Paul—enjoy life in Washington with their young son, Jacob, born in the summer of 1999.

By William Eskridge, Jr.
DEAN AND PROFESSOR WALLACE J. MLYNIEC IS THE CONSUMMATE CLINICAL LAWYER AND TEACHER. FOR MORE THAN 25 YEARS, he has defended the rights of juveniles accused of committing crimes, while shaping the hearts and minds of young lawyers enrolled in his clinical program. And he has simultaneously redefined Georgetown University Law Center, by expanding its vision of education to include experience as well as theory and by deepening its commitment to public service.

In 1972, Mlyniec became the first director of the Juvenile Justice Clinic and an early champion of clinical legal education. One of Mlyniec’s early successes was a class action suit that prevented the District of Columbia from placing nearly 500 abused and neglected children, who had been labeled “handicapped,” into institutional placements where they would remain for the rest of their lives. The Juvenile Justice Clinic, together with the Children’s Defense Fund, obtained a consent order mandating the creation of new, individualized education plans and alternative foster and adoptive homes for all 500 children. Today, none of the 500 remains in a large institutional facility, several have gone on to college, and many more are highly productive adults. Mlyniec remains passionate about the belief that drew him to this litigation. We can never allow the government to give up on our children.

Mlyniec is also a prolific scholar on juvenile justice issues, exploring the impact of laws affecting the lives of children and their families. His students represent indigent adolescents in the criminal justice system, integrate their understanding of classroom theory with the practical problems facing real-life clients, and graduate with a commitment to improving our flawed juvenile justice system. One former student honored her long-time mentor by endowing the Mary E. Lupo and Edward M. Riezi Professorship of Clinical Legal Studies, and recommending that Mlyniec be its first occupant.

For the past 10 years, Mlyniec has served as associate dean of clinical education and public service, responsible for the largest law school clinical program in America. Under his leadership, seven new clinics (enlarging the total to 14) as well as a clinically focused course in professional responsibility have been created, with opportunities for students to learn trial and appellate skills, legislative lawyering, transactional, and international work. Mlyniec secured the integration of classroom and clinical faculty into a single tenure track, long before most other law schools were even ready to broach the subject, and year after year he has ensured that Georgetown is ranked number one in U.S. clinical legal education. Colleagues across the country and even around the world consistently look to him for guidance in creating new programs and pushing the boundaries of clinical pedagogy. His work has been recognized through numerous awards, including the Stuart Stuller Memorial Award, which honors “outstanding lifetime integration of humanity and professional excellence.” and the Association of American Law Schools’ William Finnek Award for “outstanding contribution to clinical legal education.”

Mlyniec also played an instrumental role in creating the Law Center’s Office of Public Interest and Community Service. Its mission is to foster a commitment to public service in all Georgetown students. Its staff actively promotes student pro bono activities and advises students and alumni seeking to pursue public interest careers.

Mlyniec’s 25-year mission to re-conceptualize legal education has been enormously successful. The impact of his work is reflected in the countless accused juveniles who receive the best possible legal representation; the hundreds of students who enroll in a clinic and devote themselves to serving disenfranchised clients and promoting the public good; the numerous graduates who choose a public interest career, and in Georgetown’s national prominence as a leader in clinical education. He is truly an institutional treasure.

By Deborah Epstein
Jack Murphy

JACK MURPHY, A GEORGETOWN LAW ALUMNUS AND LAW REVIEW EDITOR, JOINED THE GEORGETOWN FACULTY IN 1985 AFTER a five-year frolic and detour at the prestigious corporate law firm of Covington and Burling. During his 34 years at Georgetown, he has been a master teacher, protean public interest lawyer, and probably the most inspiring, eloquent, and funny speaker I have ever encountered.

Jack’s courses have formidable titles—commercial law, secured transactions, payment systems, negotiable instruments. These are regarded as highly technical, soporific, impenetrable subjects, approached by law students with the same enthusiasm that precedes reserve for organic chemistry. Yet students consistently rate Jack’s classes as “the very best in law school,” made “not just bearable, but enjoyable.” They describe Jack as “pleasant, caring, congenial, hospitable, nurturing, respectful, animated, and hilariously funny.”

When he arrived at Georgetown, Jack also began work for the Office of Economic Opportunity, where he helped design the Legal Services Program, which provides free legal counsel for the poor. In the wake of the Watergate scandal, Congress created the Federal Election Commission to oversee campaign finance reforms, and Jack became its first general counsel.

Among his other pro bono activities, Jack has: co-chaired the National Conference on Law and Poverty sponsored by the Justice Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity; headed the Communication Workers of America Public Review Board; been a consultant to the National Governors Association Project on Emergency Preparedness; served on the District of Columbia Commission on Interest Rates and Consumer Credit; co-authored a Model Rental Agreement protecting tenants’ rights; written on the breakdown of policing following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; and analyzed for public television the congressional hearings on Watergate.

Jack has also been a major force in governance of the entire University community. As vice-president of the Faculty Senate and chairman of the Senate’s Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for over 20 years, he has co-authored most of Georgetown’s rules and policies affecting the faculty and been a staunch defender of academic freedom.

Given his success both as teacher and lawyer, it is no surprise that Jack has been invited to visit at a number of foreign law schools, including the National University of Lebanon, Guadalajara University in Mexico, Palackoy University in Czechoslovakia, and Xiamen University in southern China. Jack explains his role at these foreign law schools, “All my experiences abroad share the following characteristics: The teachers are grossly underpaid. The libraries are all but nonexistent. The students are submissive and are almost never asked to write anything, perhaps in part because the research resources that exist, principally in the library, are useless. Students are required to take an incredible number of class hours a week, perhaps 28-30, and appear to work from notes rather than from books. The visiting professor’s role is to quietly observe, to avoid pointed and alienating criticism, but by indirection, wheedling, ingratiating, and cajoling to attempt to promote the perception that it might be worth looking at alternative ways of doing things. The students offer the most promise in this regard. Because what you do (e.g., personalized attention, exam feedback, talk of student organization, identifying how the school might better serve students) might touch some few, who in coming years will remember fondly and say, ‘Hey, I have an idea.’ I think of the work as analogous to that of a single ray of sunshine on a speck of a glacier after a massive and protracted ice storm. You hope for a little melting and that the next freeze won’t undo your achievement.”

Ancient Athens had Pericles. Georgetown Law Center has Jack Murphy.

By Stephen Cohen
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON IS THE COMPLETE PUBLIC INTEREST LAWYER. SHE HAS BEEN A LEADING CIVIL LIBERTIES ATTORNEY, chair of two government agencies committed to equal rights, a law professor, a public commentator on issues of equal justice, and, for the past decade, a representative of the people of the District of Columbia in a none-too-friendly Congress. At each stage, she has taken on seemingly impossible battles, and has usually won.

Professor Norton’s toughest challenge and greatest accomplishment is no doubt her current job as D.C. delegate to the House of Representatives (congresswoman). 1999 was not an auspicious time to enter District of Columbia politics. During this decade the District experienced its worst financial crisis in this century. Undaunted, Professor Norton, in her first elected office, introduced landmark bills that led to the city’s recovery. Now in her fifth term, she has transformed the post into a powerful force for the people of the District.

Most remarkably, she did it all without a full vote, because the people of the District are without complete representation in Congress. (Delegates have full votes in committees, however.) She actually won the right to vote on the House floor from her colleagues in 1993. But when the Republicans gained the majority in 1995, they rescinded that right. That has not stopped her, however, as she has consistently been one of the most productive and well respected members of the House. Only 13 representatives have had more bills enacted than she in the 105th Congress.

Even in the worst periods for the District, Professor Norton has managed to maintain a bridge between the city’s people and Congress, and to earn the respect of both parties despite a deeply adversarial city relationship. She is one of the key architects of an historic bipartisan bill that is making higher education in U.S. public colleges and universities available at in-state rates to D.C. residents, who lack the usual array of higher education institutions.

The District of Columbia and a Republican Congress are not the only tough challenges that Professor Norton has taken on. A graduate of the last segregated class of Washington, D.C.’s Dunbar High School, she went to Antioch College in rural Ohio, where she picketed local businesses that refused to serve blacks. As a law student at Yale, she traveled to the Mississippi Delta to work in the freedom summers of the civil rights movement.

As a young attorney for the ACLU, she defended the right of segregationist George Wallace to speak in New York City’s Shea Stadium, and won a unanimous First Amendment victory for a white supremacist organization in the Supreme Court. And in the 1970s and 1980s she transformed two bureaucracies known for their backlogs—New York City’s Human Rights Commission and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—into prompt and effective agencies for the protection of equal rights.

Despite holding down one of the toughest jobs in Washington, Professor Norton has maintained her ties to the Law Center, teaching a class on legislation every year. Professor Norton says that the class “gives my brain the exercise a lawyer needs, and my Georgetown students always offer the challenges a congresswoman should have.”

By David Cole
Robert Oakley

Professor Robert Oakley directs the library of the largest law school in the country. He supervises a permanent staff of 65 and administers a budget of almost $7.5 million dollars. Under his leadership, the library has grown from a collection housed on two floors of McDonough Hall to a collection that abides in a beautifully designed 144,000-square-foot library across from McDonough Hall. He has built the library into one of the best in the country, and the world. One often hears the comments in Europe or Asia that the international collection is among the best anywhere.

Bob Oakley has been drawn to libraries since his youth. He worked in his high school library and at Cornell University's library during his college days. After graduating from Cornell in 1968, he worked in the law library at Cornell under the tutelage of Harry Bitner, one of the deans of law libraries and co-author of the major book on legal resources at the time. At Bitner's urging, he decided to go to library school at Syracuse University and earned his M.S.L.S. in 1972. After considering a move to Cornell's Graduate Research Library, he pondered his future and decided that it lay with law libraries. So he took the LSAT and earned his law degree from Cornell University in 1976. He was admitted to practice in New York the next year. Thereafter he became associate law librarian at Cornell Law School, and then director of the law library and associate professor of law at Boston University School of Law, before joining Georgetown University Law Center in 1982 as director of the law library and professor of law.

At Georgetown, Bob has planned and implemented an automated library system, designed and built a library site on the World Wide Web, and played a key role in the design and construction of the Edward Bennett Williams Law Library. He has managed the transition from a wholly book-based library to one that is much more electronically based. As we approach the next century, Bob is skillfully guiding the law library in balancing the collection between print and electronic form.

Bob is fascinated by information technology. He is a ham radio operator and has long been interested in computers. Years ago he put the Law Center's library on the map by taking the lead in adopting new technologies for storing, retrieving, and using library resources.

According to Bob, the Law Center has been a wonderful home. Being in Washington, D.C., has let him be involved in important policy issues. He has been especially concerned with two issues: providing greater access to information (especially government information) and promoting competition among providers of information services. While Bob may be too modest to discuss his effectiveness publicly, he was instrumental in congressional action relating to copyright, and his work on competition is reflected in a recent judicial decision, *Matthes Bender and Hyperlaw v. West Publishing Co.*, decided in the second circuit.

Not surprisingly, Bob has received several honors for his work. In 1998, he received the David J. McCarthy Award for Excellence in Administration and Service at the Law Center. In 1999, in recognition of his national leadership as a law librarian, he was elected vice president and president elect of the American Association of Law Libraries.

Bob enjoys family life and is devoted to his two children, Esther (21 years) and Daniel (13 years). For hobbies, Bob enjoys amateur radio and Balkan dancing. He relishes the Balkan music and its intricate dance steps. And he relishes his time at Georgetown University Law Center. "It's perfect for me," he says. And he is perfect for us!

*By Edith Brown Weiss*
James Oldham

WHEN HE WAS GROWING UP IN NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS, PROFESSOR JAMES OLDHAM NEVER DREAMED THAT HE WOULD become a lawyer or a law professor, or that he would write a major book on one of the giants of legal history, or that one day, he would find himself in Indonesia, amidst the chaos and danger of a revolution. But Professor Oldham has done all of these things and more as he leads a self-described academic double-life.

After graduating from Stanford Law School, and practicing labor and general business law in Denver for a few years, Oldham realized that he did not want to become a partner. Having already written two law review articles, he felt that he might have an inclination toward the academic life, and he decided to see what opportunities were available. He turned down an assistant deanship at Stanford, and despite an admonition from the Stanford dean not to go to Georgetown, Oldham accepted the position here of assistant dean and associate professor, beginning in the spring of 1970. Those were turbulent years in higher education and a period of massive expansion for the Law Center. Among other things he did during those years, Oldham was a principal draftsman of the Law Center's first five-year plan, which laid the groundwork for increased financial aid, a larger appropriation for the library, and an expanded law faculty.

Although Professor Oldham had practiced labor law, he did not expect to teach it when he came to Georgetown. As events unfolded, however, he was able to take over the subject, and it quickly became a major part of his academic and intellectual life. His interest in labor law led him to become a labor arbitrator. Among other things, he has chaired the Foreign Service Grievance Board for the last five years. In 1998, Professor Oldham traveled to Indonesia on behalf of the public interest arm of the AFL-CIO to train a group of Indonesians to become labor arbitrators. As it turned out, he was there in the middle of the coup that overthrew President Suharto. Oldham's group was in danger just driving across town, with fires ablaze in the streets and no certainty about whom to believe or which direction to go. In the end, they made it to their destination, and eventually, out of the country.

Despite his involvement in labor law, Professor Oldham's real passion is English legal history. Always a latent Anglophile, Oldham used his first sabbatical to go to England to study the work of Lord Mansfield, one of England's greatest jurists and chief justice of the King's Bench of Great Britain from 1756 to 1788. From this experience, his life's work emerged. Mansfield's trial notes had been discovered a short time before, and Oldham was astonished to get access to them.

Oldham worked diligently for years to organize and transcribe the trial notes. Not content, however, simply to collect and reproduce the manuscripts, he did extensive research in contemporary sources to understand the social and legal context of the times. In 1992, he published a two-volume collection of the manuscripts, supplemented with photographs and a series of introductory essays to each chapter. The introductory essays make a separate major contribution to the scholarly literature. One reviewer said: "This book is a tour de force ... the result of great learning, thorough research and industry. It ... will be an essential tool and book of reference for all legal historians of the common law in the eighteenth century."

Oldham's work is held in such high regard that the essays will be published as a separate work. In addition, Oxford University Press has persuaded Professor Oldham to write a volume on the reign of George III in its prestigious 14-volume Oxford History of the Laws of England.

Oldham loves music and used to appear regularly in the chorus for the Law Center's Gilbert and Sullivan productions. He also is a dogged marathon runner and enjoys international travel. He still spends a lot of research time in London and particularly enjoys the London theater.

By Robert Oakley
Julie Rose O’Sullivan

ANYONE WHO SPENDS AN HOUR IN ONE OF PROFESSOR O’SULLIVAN’S CLASSES WILL UNDERSTAND NOT ONLY WHY SHE WAS awarded the 1998 Frank F. Flegel Teaching Award, but also why she was such a successful trial attorney. She is funny, relaxed, and engaging, but always in complete command of the material and the class.

After graduating from Cornell Law School, she clerked for Chief Judge Levin Campbell of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and then for Justice Sandra Day O’Connor of the United States Supreme Court. She spent five years with Davis Polk & Wardwell in New York, where she worked on mergers and acquisitions litigation as well as white-collar criminal cases. That experience at Davis Polk included work on U.S. v. REI, a lengthy and complex public corruption case, and the BCCI case, where she worked with Robert Fiske to defend Clark Clifford and Robert Altman.

In 1991, Professor O’Sullivan sought to broaden her experience as a litigator by moving from Davis Polk to the Criminal Division of the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York where she first prosecuted so-called “general crimes”—mostly drug cases—and then moved on to prosecute major white-collar crimes. She capped her three-year career in the U.S. Attorney’s Office with the successful prosecution of what was then the largest bank fraud case in the country and the first to be brought under the financialkingpinstatute. Professor O’Sullivan was all set to move to Georgetown and begin teaching in the fall of 1994. But she had to put her teaching debut on hold, temporarily, when Robert Fiske, her former colleague at Davis Polk and the newly appointed independent counsel for the Whitewater investigation, asked her to join his staff in Little Rock, Arkansas, as associate counsel. She eventually joined the faculty in 1995.

Professor O’Sullivan is one of 11 faculty members at the Law Center who have argued cases before the United States Supreme Court. In 1995, she was appointed by the Supreme Court to brief and argue a case on behalf of an indigent petitioner in a case pending before that Court. She is completing a casebook on white-collar crime and is a recognized expert on both the federal sentencing guidelines and the independent counsel statute.

Professor O’Sullivan brings to her teaching not only her enormous experience but also a passion about the importance of criminal law and a deep conviction about the awesome power and responsibility of prosecutors. In all her teaching, she pushes her students to understand the ethical and other real-life consequences that their actions as lawyers will have.

By Wendy Perdue
Joseph Page

A TEACHER AND SCHOLAR OF TORT LAW, A CONSUMERS RIGHTS ADVOCATE. LAW JOURNAL EDITOR, AUTHOR OF A
best-seller about Juan Perón. A public figure in Argentina. Expert on Brazilian culture. Professor Joe Page
defies easy summary, and he knows it. When asked how his diverse accomplishments fit together, he responds in
typically wry yet cheery fashion: "That's a good question. I haven't the vaguest idea."

Joe arrived at Georgetown University Law Center in 1968, following a brief stint at the University of
Denver College of Law. At Denver, he got his start as a torts professor after an extended sojourn in South America
with Harvard classmate Ralph Nader. He then spent three years in an editorial position at NACCA Law Journal
(NACCA—National Association of Claimants' Compensation Attorneys—was the predecessor to the Association of
Trial Lawyers of America). He returned to Harvard for an LLM (to prepare for a career as a legal scholar).

Each of these threads continues to run through Joe's work. For example, a few years ago, Joe published a
book about Brazil. He also currently serves as a director of the public-interest group Public Citizen. He not only
writes regularly for law reviews about issues in tort law, but he is also one of the directors of the American Museum
of Tort Law, which is in its formative stage.

In 1959, Joe travelled to Spain. Upon his return to the United States, he decided to study Spanish, and it
was from one of his teachers that he first learned details about the former Argentine leader Juan Perón. "It was an
advanced conversation class," Joe explains, "and I was the only student. The professor was an old Colombian
who liked to talk. One day he decided to tell me the story of Perón's arrest. I thought to myself, one day I'd like to write
this story." In 1983, he did.

Perón: A Biography received warm reviews. Writing in The New York Review of Books, Robert Coxe said,
"Mr. Page did his fieldwork in Argentina at a time when more than one hundred journalists and writers were
liquidated. It took some courage for Mr. Page to tramp the sinister streets of Buenos Aires with notebook and tape recorder. The
result is a remarkable book." Marta Gil-Montero, Joe's Argentine wife, translated the book into Spanish, and it became a bestseller in Argentina. The couple spent six weeks there promoting the book.

After the flood of attention paid to his work on Perón, Joe wanted to avoid being pigeon-holed as a Perón
scholar. He switched his attention to Brazil, returning to the country he had originally encountered in his travels with
Nader. An earlier trip had landed Page in a jail in Recife, Brazil—an episode he recounts in The
Revolution That Never Was: Northeast Brazil: 1955-1964. His more than a dozen other trips to Brazil provided the material for his book, The Brazilians.

Currently, at the invitation of Foundation Press, Joe is writing a primer for students on proximate causation, one of the more vexed areas of torts. This will
give students across the country the chance to benefit from Joe's experienced teaching. Recently, one Georgetown alum recounted Joe delivering a "riff" on torts and baseball.
When asked about this, Joe chuckles and says, "He must be thinking of what I call
'The Wide World of Torts.' It is a sort of a stream-of-consciousness thing in
which I explain to my students that whenever a case involving baseball comes before the court, judges lose
all restraint."

By Heidi Li Feldman
DOUG PARKER CAME TO GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER IN 1975 BECAUSE HE WANTED TO PRACTICE PUBLIC interest law. As an associate at a Washington, D.C. law firm, Hogan & Hartson, Parker had taken a pro bono case representing workers at the U.S. Government Printing Office in a race discrimination suit. When Parker started this case, he never imagined that it would take 15 years to resolve. But ultimately, Parker, by this time at Georgetown, won the case and obtained extensive monetary and injunctive relief for his clients.

After graduating from Harvard Law School, serving in the Air Force, and practicing law at Hogan & Hartson, Parker realized that he wanted to spend the majority of his time doing public interest work. So he applied to the Law Center’s Institute for Public Representation (IPR). At that time, IPR, then called INSPIRE, was a relatively new clinical program. Parker worked on a wide variety of cases in such diverse areas as the Freedom of Information Act, environmental law, and housing discrimination. After a while, Parker began to concentrate on cases involving disability rights. Parker is probably responsible for bringing more cases under the Air Carrier Access Act than anyone else in the country. This Act prohibits discrimination by airlines against passengers with disabilities. For his important work in this area, the Paralyzed Veterans of America awarded Professor Parker the Harry A. Scheiker Jr. Disability Awareness Award in 1993.

Parker finds his work on behalf of disabled clients very fulfilling. Unfortunately, disabled individuals still face discrimination in many aspects of daily life, and not enough lawyers are available to represent them. In addition to his series of airline access cases, Professor Parker was lead counsel in litigation before the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Court of Appeals, and U.S. District Court concerning Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. He also has represented several deaf clients in actions against hospitals for failing to provide interpreters as required by law. Students and graduate fellows at IPR work closely with Professor Parker on these cases. Parker is known for his accessibility to students and the delight he takes in working through a particularly knotty legal issue in a collegial manner.

Since 1981, Professor Parker has been the director of IPR. In this capacity, he has focused on strengthening the educational experience of the students who take the clinic. He is particularly concerned that students get a chance to do significant writing (and rewriting) and that they consider the ethical issues raised in their cases. In addition to teaching at IPR, Professor Parker occasionally teaches a professional responsibility course and instructs in the summer program in Florence, Italy.

Professor Parker’s interest in Italian culture (and cuisine) dates back to his Stanford undergraduate years, when he spent a semester in Florence. He has since taken both of his sabbaticals in Italy and has published articles (in both English and Italian) comparing standing law in Italy and the U.S. He also enjoys golf, fishing, and along with his wife Betsy, growing vegetables. Stop by his office in the springtime and you might even see some seedlings on the window sill.

By Angela Campbell
Elizabeth Patterson

IN HER TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND RELATED WORK, PROFESSOR ELIZABETH HAYES PATTERSON BUILDS BRIDGES THAT span generations, intellectual disciplines, continents, and divides between people. When she first decided to study law, in 1968, Elizabeth Patterson was a Ph.D. student in French language and literature at Stanford University. Public events, including the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., led her to reflect and talk with family members and friends about whether the study of law might prove more useful to the struggles of black people and poor people.

When she completed Catholic University's law school in 1973, Patterson accepted an appellate clerkship with Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. From 1974 to 1977, she practiced with the law firm of Hogan & Hartson, and then from 1977 to 1980 served on the D.C. Public Service Commission, first as a member and then as chairperson.

Patterson has always had a special affinity for teaching. After gaining experience in private practice and government service, she agreed to join the Georgetown Law faculty in 1980. She started by teaching the courses in contracts and conflict of laws, having found these courses challenging and rewarding when she was a law student. Soon, she added courses in commercial law and secured transactions to her repertoire. Her research and scholarly work also lie in the areas of commercial law and constitutional law.

In 1989, Professor Patterson created and taught Georgetown's first course in race and American law. This course uses history, literature, sociological studies, and a range of legal materials and analytical tools to examine the intersection of race and law in contexts including slavery, education, housing, employment, voting rights, and gender. Patterson designed the course as one she would have liked to take. "Derrick Bell had pioneered the course at Harvard, and Chuck Lawrence was teaching a similar course at Stanford," Patterson explains. Both of these colleagues were very generous with their materials and ideas.

Although all of Patterson's upper division courses are in frequent demand, she also finds time to teach regularly in the first-year curriculum. "I like the enthusiasm, inquisitiveness, and energy first-year students bring to the classroom," she notes. "And I also find that the students I meet in their first year tend to come back and talk with me about their courses, employment, and related choices. The wonderful thing about teaching in the first year is that these students see me as a resource person, and as someone with whom they want to share information about their lives."

Serving as associate dean for the Juris Doctor and Graduate programs from 1993 to 1997, Patterson shared responsibility for much of the recent innovation and leadership at the Law Center. During her tenure as associate dean, spring semester electives, medium-sized classes, and the experimental "Curriculum B" became ongoing parts of the first-year curriculum, and the Gewirz Center opened as both a residential facility and an integral part of law student life. In the wider Washington, D.C., community, she serves on the boards of Family and Child Services of Washington, the Florence Crittenden Mission Foundation, and the Child Welfare League of America.

Professor Patterson's husband, Jerome Patterson, is a 1972 graduate of the Law Center. Their daughter, Sela, has taught English in Benin, West Africa, and in Rome, Italy. Their son, Malcolm, graduated from Morehouse College in 1999, majoring in business and French.

By Laura Macklin
PROFESSOR RONALD PEARLMAN RECALLS THE DISAPPOINTING REACTION WHEN HE ANNOUNCED HE WOULD JOIN THE Internal Revenue Service after law school. At the St. Louis firm where Pearlman had clerked, the managing partner urged him to rethink the plan. “Just compare,” Pearlman recalls him saying, “the kind of lawyer you will be after four years at the IRS with the kind of lawyer you would be after four years at this firm.”

Looking back, Pearlman smiles. “He had the right question, just the wrong time frame.” Pearlman says there is no question the years with the IRS made him a better lawyer in the long run—it sparked his interest in tax policy and gave him a sense of the public responsibilities of private tax practitioners.

Ultimately, his experience at the IRS led Pearlman back to the Treasury Department. In 1984, President Reagan appointed him to be assistant secretary of the Treasury for tax policy. There, Pearlman produced what he believes is his most important work: the 1984 Treasury Department Tax Reform Study. Over the years, the study has become a classic of the tax policy literature, and is so familiar to tax professionals that it is commonly referred to simply as “Treasury I.”

During the early 1980s there was a growing sense that tax reform was needed: The system was rife with loopholes and giveaways, but beneficiaries were not anxious to loose them. “As George Bernard Shaw once said” comments Pearlman, “a government that robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul.”

Pearlman successfully used Treasury I to set an agenda for broad tax reform. The study formed the foundation for the Tax Reform Act of 1986, the most sweeping tax law change in a generation. For his contribution, Pearlman was awarded the Alexander Hamilton Medal, the highest honor the Treasury Department bestows. He also won a place in the lore that surrounds tax reform legislation, and is profiled in the book *Shoeless at Gucci Gulch: Lawmakers, Lobbyists, and the Unlikely Triumph of Tax Reform*, by Jeffrey H. Birnbaum and Alan S. Murray.

In 1988, Pearlman was again tapped for an important post: chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, the group that advises Congress on tax policy. With this appointment, he became only the second person to have held both of the highest tax policy positions in the federal government.

Notwithstanding his stellar public career, however, Pearlman has spent most of his professional life as a tax practitioner, advising business clients. He cites this work, especially during his early days of building a practice, as perhaps the most enjoyable. “It is very satisfying to participate in a transaction that is a transforming event for a client,” he says.

As a professor, Pearlman aims to make tax law issues exciting and accessible to his students. “I want my students to experience the fun of dealing with tax issues in a simulated real-world law practice setting,” he says. Along the way, he exposes them to ethical and professional issues they may confront. “I try to encourage my students to develop a philosophy of tax practice at the outset of their careers,” he adds, “so they are better prepared when a difficult ethical issue arises in their work.”

Professor Pearlman is married to Hedy Pearlman, who is a pre-school administrator, and has two grown children, Leslie and Steve. Professor and Mrs. Pearlman enjoy outdoor activities, including hiking and biking (although not the Everest/Hillary variety, he quips), and are avid fans of the arts.

*By Clarissa Potter*
GARY PELLER IS A LAW PROFESSOR, A SOCIAL CRITIC, AN ACTIVIST, A LAWYER, A THEORETICIAN, AND A SOLDIER IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE. HIS REMARKABLE CAREER STANDS AS A REPROACH TO THOSE WHO CLAIM THAT THOUGHTFUL SCHOLARSHIP IS AT WAR WITH POLITICAL COMMITMENT.


WHEN ONE LOOKS BEHIND THE SURFACE, HOWEVER, PELLER'S CAREER HAS BEEN ANYTHING BUT CONVENTIONAL. HIS WORK IN AND OUT OF THE CLASSROOM HAS BEEN DOMINATED BY A SINGLE GOAL: THE UNMASKING OF THE SUPPOSED NEUTRALITY AND OBJECTIVITY OF LEGAL AND OTHER "RATIONAL" DISCOURSES THAT ENTRAP AN UNJUST SOCIAL ORDER. PELLER HAS PURSUED THIS GOAL WITH SINGULAR INTELLIGENCE, ENERGY, AND COURAGE. THESE EFFORTS ARE ALL THE MORE REMARKABLE BECAUSE THEY HAVE WON THE RELUCTANT ACCEPTANCE OF THE VERY ESTABLISHMENT THAT HE HAS ATTACKED.

WHILE STILL A STUDENT AT HARVARD, HE TRIGGERED A MAJOR CONTROVERSY WHEN HIS LAW REVIEW NOTE EXPOSED SURPRISING WEAKNESSES IN A FAMOUS ARTICLE BY A SENIOR PROFESSOR. AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, HE WAS AWARDED TENURE LARGELY ON THE BASIS OF AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE METAPHYSICS OF AMERICAN LAW," WHICH QUICKLY BECAME A MAJOR TEXT FOR THE EMERGING CRITICAL LEGAL STUDIES MOVEMENT. SINCE COMING TO GEORGETOWN, PELLER HAS TURNED HIS ATTENTION TO CRITICAL RACE THEORY. MUCH OF THIS WORK REVIVES THE BLACK NATIONALIST TRADITION, LONG DENIGRATED BY INTEGRATIONISTS, WHO CLAIMED THAT INTEGRATION WAS NEUTRAL, RATIONAL, AND UNCONTROVERSIAL.

OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM, PELLER HAS ORGANIZED POOR COMMUNITIES TO DEMAND LEGAL CHANGE AND FILED LAWSUITS THAT CHALLENGE ESTABLISHMENT INSTITUTIONS. HE HAS REPRESENTED MUNIA ABU-JAMAL, A BLACK JOURNALIST ON DEATH ROW WHO ASSERTED THAT HIS FREE SPEECH RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED WHEN NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO CAVED IN TO POLITICAL PRESSURE BY CANCELLING HIS RADIO COMMENTARIES. HE HAS ALSO REPRESENTED DEAF FACULTY AT GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY WHO REJECT THAT INSTITUTION'S ASSIMILATIONIST ORIENTATION. BUT PERHAPS HIS MOST NOTEWORTHY LEGAL EFFORTS CAME WHEN HE TOOK ON THE CORPORATE GIANT, AMERICAN FAMILY PUBLISHERS, ON BEHALF OF THE THOUSANDS OF ELDERLY AMERICANS DUPED BY ITS FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING CAMPAIGNS.

PELLER IS A DYNAMIC AND CONTROVERSIAL CLASSROOM TEACHER WHO REGULARLY INSPIRES, CHALLENGES, AND OUTRAGES HIS STUDENTS. EVEN THOSE WHO ARE OUTRAGED CANNOT DENY HIS INTELLIGENCE OR HIS WILLINGNESS TO TAKE SERIOUSLY IDEAS HE OPPOSES. FOR EXAMPLE, HE IS A CAREFUL STUDENT OF THE LAW AND ECONOMICS MOVEMENT. ALTHOUGH HE OPPOSES ITS PRINCIPLES, HE HAS TAKEN THE TIME TO LEARN MORE ABOUT NEOCLASSICAL ECONOMIC THEORY THAN SOME OF THE MOVEMENT'S MOST FERVENT ADVOCATES.

A THORN IN THE SIDE OF DEANS, ADMINISTRATORS, BUREAUCRATS, AND STUFFED SHIRTS EVERYWHERE, GARY PELLER BELIEVES THAT A TRUE DEMOCRACY BEGINS WITH THE WAY WE INTERACT WITH EACH OTHER, AT WORK, AT HOME, AND ON THE STREETS. HIS OWN CAREER AND DAILY CONDUCT EMODY THE VALUES HE BELIEVES IN, AND HIS EXAMPLE HAS LEFT FEW WHO KNOW HIM UNTOUCHED.

By Louis Michael Seidman
PROFESSOR PERDUE IS FONDLY REFERRED TO BY HER STUDENTS AS "THE DAVID LETTERMAN" OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, A moniker that becomes clearer when you enter her office and are greeted by a flock of pink flamingoes. The flock, started by her mother as a joke some years ago, has now grown to the point where flamingoes perch throughout Professor Perdue's office on piles of papers and books, as well as on her desk, window sill, and file cabinets. Her favorite is a pink flamingo hat, the wings of which flap when you pull on the strings, which she gleefully demonstrates to the random visitor.

Professor Perdue's passion is civil procedure. She has taught a first-year course in civil procedure every year but one since coming to the Law Center in 1982. She also has taught conflicts (which she sees as a spin-off of civil procedure), a seminar in commodity trading, and antitrust classes. But it is civil procedure that she loves, and which has had the most influence on her life: "Civil procedure is all about how things are done and about figuring out solutions to problems." Professor Perdue's passion for the topic led her to co-author a very popular civil procedure casebook (now in its second printing), which she designed specifically to make the field more accessible to students. She also recently co-authored a casebook on conflict of laws as well as a number of law review articles. Her best known article, "Sin, Scandal, and Substantive Due Process: Personal Jurisdiction and Pennoyer Reconsidered," examines the colorful facts behind one of the bedrock cases in civil procedure. Her research revealed a fascinating story involving a corrupt, philandering senator from Oregon, a disgruntled governor, and an illiterate, but persistent homesteader. "There is always more going on in a lawsuit than the court opinion reveals. I love bringing the cases to life by showing the human story behind the law," Professor Perdue explained.

In addition to her work in civil procedure, Perdue is active in local government. She serves on the five-member Montgomery County Planning Commission which regulates land use, transportation, and parks. Her contribution, she feels, is to get people to think systematically about problems and their solutions—"what are we trying to accomplish here, where are we trying to get to?" She loves the work and the idea of being in a totally new, self-contained world with its own language and real-life problems to solve. Her experience on the Commission and her 12-year stint as an activist on development issues in her home town of Silver Spring, Maryland, have led her to urge students to become involved in their communities. "The personal learning from these experiences cannot be duplicated anywhere else." Asked how she finds the time to spend an entire day a week serving on the Commission, she confesses she does a lot of reading "watching" her two sons Ben, age 11, and Bill, 14, play baseball.

As if Professor Perdue's life was not full enough, she has served on all but two law school committees, most recently as chair of the Self Study and Long Range Planning Committee. And her life is about to fill up even more with her recent appointment as associate dean for research. She has also served on Duke Law School's Board of Visitors, taught Sunday School, and has been an active member of the American Association of Law Schools, serving on planning committees for various workshops. Through it all, Professor Perdue appears to be having great fun. Her father gave her some advice long ago she has forever tried to adhere to—"if you're not having fun, you're not doing it right." That seems to be true not only for the professor, but also for her students.

By Hope Babcock
Cornelia Pillard

When Cornelia (Nina, to her many friends) Pillard graduated from high school, becoming a legal scholar was not high on her agenda. In fact, her primary question was whether to even attend college. She spent the next year sorting things out while doing economic development work in a rural community in India. Conversations in India critical of American race relations pointed her toward a legal career where she could try to improve conditions at home. Now, after extensive service as a public interest lawyer, including several years at the Office of the Solicitor General—where she wrote more than 20 briefs for Supreme Court cases and argued six—Pillard has joined the Law Center faculty.

When she did attend college, she chose Yale and graduated magna cum laude, then returned to China, where she had earlier studied Mandarin. There she taught English and American culture at a school sponsored by the Chinese Ministry of Culture while keeping tabs on stories occurring throughout Asia as a research assistant at the Newsday Asian Bureau.

Pillard then returned to her hometown, Cambridge, Massachusetts, for law school, graduating magna cum laude from Harvard in 1987, where she served as an editor at the Harvard Women’s Law Journal and the Harvard Law Review. Next she went to Philadelphia to clerk for U.S. District Court Judge Louis H. Pollak, who first taught at Yale before eventually serving as law school dean there and at the University of Pennsylvania. The following year was spent as a Marvin M. Karpatkin Fellow with the American Civil Liberties Union in New York. In 1989, she moved to the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, where she spent much of her time on employment discrimination cases.

When Drew Days, another NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund veteran, was named solicitor general early in the Clinton Administration, Pillard’s interest in government service grew. The solicitor general’s office afforded Pillard a broader and more reflective view of the law, but it involved lots of intellectual sprints, as compared to the in-depth thinking that legal academia supports. Among other her projects, Pillard wrote the brief arguing that the Virginia Military Academy be required to admit women.

As a government lawyer, Pillard sometimes found herself arguing against what others within the government favored: “I learned how to disagree with people and continue to communicate my respect for them,” she says. She suggests that disagreement provides an important sense of perspective for any lawyer to acquire, irrespective of personal politics.

But Pillard stresses the importance of expressing one’s core values through work. “To some extent, you become what you do,” she says, adding, “It’s important to keep your ideals intact.” “Students should expect moral fulfillment from their legal careers,” she concludes. Legal academia gives her the opportunity to call things as she sees them, unconstrained by client concerns. All the same, the lure of public service drew Pillard back to the Justice Department for a two-year stint as deputy assistant attorney general in the Office of Legal Counsel through the summer of 2000.

Along the way, in 1991, Pillard wed Georgetown Law Center Professor David Cole. They have two children, Aidan and Sarah, and they juggle schedules to maximize their time with them. Recalling her expectations when she completed high school, Nina says marriage and motherhood are no less unanticipated than teaching law. And at least equally satisfying.

Her career trajectory has included more than a few surprises and her life has taken some unpredictable turns that proved to be unexpectedly satisfying. All in all, she brings an impressive background to our law community.

By Hope Babcock
DURING HIS LONG AND PRODUCTIVE CAREER, ROBERT PITOFFSKY HAS BEEN AN ANTITRUST MASTER. HE HAS TRAINED THOUSANDS of students in antitrust, having taught at New York University, Harvard, and Georgetown and co-authored the leading antitrust casebook. He has provided leadership at the Federal Trade Commission on three separate occasions, capping it as chairman for the past four years. Not to mention being dean of the Law Center for six years and raising a family. He has done it all with a relaxed disposition and enjoyment that itself provides guidance on how to live.

After a year at the Justice Department's Civil Appellate Division, Bob started private practice at Dewey Ballantine in New York. In his first case, he represented Lilly and other pharmaceutical companies in a major criminal antitrust suit concerning alleged price-fixing. Lilly won and Robert Pitofsky was an antitrust lawyer for life.

In 1963 Bob began his teaching career at NYU Law School, where he taught antitrust and federal courts law. In 1969, he joined the Kirkpatrick Commission's study of the Federal Trade Commission. Then Miles Kirkpatrick became FTC Chairman and appointed Bob director of the Bureau of Consumer Protection. After a distinguished tenure, Bob joined the Law Center faculty, where he wrote seminal articles on the antitrust treatment of joint ventures, market definition, and consumer protection. In 1978, Bob left the Law Center and was appointed to be a commissioner at the FTC, where he was the intellectual leader, guiding the commission into a number of key antitrust cases.

Bob rejoined the faculty in 1980 and became dean in 1983. For those at the Law Center now, it is hard to even understand how approximately the same number of students could have attended school solely in McDonough Hall, let alone without the addition of the new wing and with the library taking up the entire second and third floors. This sardine-like existence began to relax during those years. He oversaw the building of the library and the acquisition of the land for the residence hall.

Bob became FTC Chairman in 1995. He has convened hearings designed to update antitrust for the 21st century, which has led to revisions in the merger guidelines and new guidelines for joint ventures. The FTC also has brought and won a number of path-breaking antitrust cases and has become active in policing consumer deception and privacy on the Internet.

During all of this, Bob and his wife Sally have raised a family, including one child immortalized in a children's poem by Judith Viorst (who managed to rhyme the name Pitofsky!). Bob was not an absentee, workaholic parent either. He has been part of a father-child softball league for almost 30 years and remains an active tennis partner to his children. Nor have his professional colleagues suffered from his hard work. Bob has carried out all of his professional activities intensely, but while maintaining a relaxed and positive disposition. He is never too busy to deal with others' needs. He takes the time to mentor his clerks, students, and younger colleagues. He returns his phone calls.

I asked Bob what he would do when he left the FTC this time, whether he would retire. "Maybe get a Ph.D. in astronomy or English," he mused. It was clear that he remains intellectually vital, excited about work and life, and not about to give any of it up.

By Steven Salop
Clarissa Potter

While at Yale Law School, Professor Potter never would have predicted that she would have a career focused on tax policy and the social welfare implications of financial markets. "I thought I was the oddball, taking corporate finance, securities regulation, and partnership taxation," she says, "while my friends were taking classes on education policy and environmental policy and so forth." When she joined Sullivan & Cromwell in 1989 as a tax associate with a special interest in financial products, she thought she would spend her entire legal career working in private practice. She soon found out, however, that "policy" was where her real interests lay.

In 1993 a friend lured Professor Potter from New York to Washington to work for the Joint Committee on Taxation. While she knew his description of the glamorous life of a congressional staffer was an exaggeration, she could not pass up the opportunity to shape laws she often found reason to criticize. Somewhat to her surprise, she was immediately hooked on the excitement of government work. She soon moved to the Office of Tax Policy at the Treasury Department, where she quickly advanced from drafting regulations and specific legislative provisions to developing the administration's overall tax policy plans. In 1997 she won the Treasury Secretary's Award for her outstanding work on the Clinton administration's education tax incentives. In her final year at Treasury, she served as acting tax legislative counsel, one of the top tax law positions in the government, and directly advised former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, Secretary Lawrence Summers, and the White House on tax matters.

As a government attorney, Professor Potter undertook diverse projects, from drafting detailed regulations on new financial products to consulting on the Line Item Veto Act and the subsequent Supreme Court case. But she found her work on so-called "tax shelters" to be some of the most satisfying. In one case she led a team that structured the government response to a scheme that, if allowed to proceed, could have cost the public tens of billions of tax dollars just within its first six weeks of operation. Some Wall Street tax experts began to report a "Potter effect": gossip among tax shelter experts about the latest tax shelter would be swiftly followed by anxious rumors that Treasury was about to announce a "fix." Indeed, there was a mixed reaction in the Wall Street community when The Wall Street Journal reported in early 1998 that Professor Potter would be leaving Treasury to join the Georgetown University faculty.

Although private practice might have beckoned after years of government service, teaching at Georgetown University Law Center presented another opportunity that Professor Potter could not pass up. "I was so excited by the prospect of teaching at Georgetown," she says. "It's a chance both to immerse myself in a subject I love and to share it with others who are eager to learn." The wide range and depth of scholarly interests among the Law Center faculty is one thing that drew Professor Potter to the school. Professor Potter also was drawn by the caliber of the students and enjoys sharing her enthusiasm for tax law and policy with them. "Students often expect tax to be a dry subject," she says. "They're surprised when it turns out to be full of great stories of human greed and folly, with Dickensian twists and lost and found fortunes." Moreover, she notes, "the tax law highlights some of the most basic questions we have to confront as a society—what are our responsibilities as citizens, how much should we ask from our affluent, and how do we treat our poor?"

In her spare time, Professor Potter is a homebody who enjoys cooking, walking in the park, and putting around her D.C. home with her husband, Jim Wilson, and their one-year-old son, Ennis. She plans to get back to other hobbies, like sewing, horseback riding and skiing, some time in the next ten years.

By Julie Cohen
KEVIN QUINN

DEGREES
A.B. 1979
Fordham
M. Div. 1985
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
J.D. 1988
University of California at Berkeley
S.T.L. 1990
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
Ph.D. 1993
University of California at Berkeley

EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS
Instructor in social studies, philosophy, and theology,
Regis High School, New York
Visiting Lecturer in criminal law,
Santa Clara University School of Law
Law Clerk, Hon. Joseph M. McLaughlin,
United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Senior Research Fellow,
Kennedy Institute of Ethics,
Georgetown University
Consultant, Ethical Consultant,
Service, Georgetown University
Consultant

COURSES
Civil Procedure; Decedents’ Estates; Jurisprudence; Law; Medicine and Ethics

REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS
Proceed with Caution: Genomic Information and the Future of American Health Care,
Human Cloning After Dolly: What Sort of Creatures Might We Become?
38 Jurimetrics J. 91 (1997)
Assisted Suicide and Equal Protection: In Defense of the Distinction Between Killing and Letting Die,
Sandel’s Communitarianism and Public Deliberations Over Health Care Policy,
85 Geo. L.J. 2361 (1997)

Professor Kevin Quinn is also Father Kevin Quinn, a Jesuit priest since 1985. Indeed, to sit down in conversation with Professor Quinn is to learn that he has devoted the greater part of his life to training for educational ministry. “We revel in our training,” Quinn says of the Jesuits. His vows to “poverty, chastity, and obedience” are deeply felt.

Professor Kevin Quinn was born in Queens, New York. He grew up on Long Island, where he attended Catholic grammar and high schools. By the time he was 17, Quinn was pretty sure he wanted to join the Jesuits. Immediately after high school graduation in 1973, he moved to Syracuse to enter the Jesuit Novitiate of the New York Province. Quinn flourished as a novice in the Jesuit “boot camp” that culminated in a traditional 30-day retreat based on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola.

Professor Quinn’s novitiate was only the beginning of what the Jesuits call his “formation.” Still in training, Quinn enrolled in Fordham University for college. Quinn developed a passion for philosophy while at Fordham, where he was encouraged to think hard about social ethics, a field of study he has never abandoned. After college, Quinn continued his Jesuit formation by teaching at Regis High School in New York City. He then went on to earn a Master of Divinity degree and a Licentiate in Sacred Theology from the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley.

Education is the predominant ministry of the Jesuit Order. Few Jesuits elect to become lawyers. Quinn links his decision to become a law teacher to the study of social ethics at Fordham. The discipline of social ethics includes the study of moral and legal aspects of public policy. Quinn believed a legal training would better enable him to grapple with the legal dimensions of public policy.

By then a young priest, Professor Quinn earned a law degree and a doctoral degree in jurisprudence and social policy from the University of California at Berkeley. Quinn went on to clerk for Judge Joseph M. McLaughlin of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In 1994, Quinn joined the Georgetown faculty as an associate professor of law and senior research fellow at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics.

Today Professor Quinn’s goal is to educate future lawyers about the values that inform law and legal practice. His courses are courses about health and legal philosophy. As a Catholic priest, teaching students of varied religious backgrounds about the legal system of a democratic society, Professor Quinn labors self-consciously always to teach with an open mind, and to avoid even the appearance of “towing a party line.”

Accordingly, he has designed an updated jurisprudence course that surveys current economic and critical theories, as well as traditional natural law and positivist theories. His seminar on law, medicine, and ethics introduces students to issues raised by fetal tissue and human embryo research, the Human Genome Project, abortion, health finance, and the “right to die.” In addition to being a focus of his teaching, health law is currently the focus of Quinn’s scholarship. Recent articles on human cloning, assisted suicide, and regulatory ideals relevant to health policy attest to this interest.

The liberal educational tradition of Georgetown University seems to suit Professor Quinn perfectly. Indeed, he says he was overjoyed by the offer he received from Georgetown, where now he not only teaches, but also lives as a chaplain-in-residence to undergraduates on the main campus. Still one of the youngest of about 70 resident Jesuits, Professor Quinn likes to remind his colleagues that he professes at Georgetown ad maiorem Dei gloriam.

By Anita Allen

By Anita Allen
JILL RAMSFIELD BEGINS EACH DAY IN THE YOGA ROOM OF THE SOOTHINGLY ELEGANT HOME SHE SHARES WITH HER husband, Gene. After completing her daily ritual meditation, Jill readies herself for another day of challenges in her twin realms of academics and law practice.

Jill’s academic mission can be summed up in three words: students come first. Jill developed her intense dedication to teaching students as a choral master in a public high school in Wisconsin. Reflecting on her Midwestern roots, Jill attributes her “students first” teaching style to the practical and egalitarian atmosphere in Wisconsin that shaped her worldview. As director of the Legal Research and Writing Program, Jill has put her focus on students by designing a writing curriculum at the Law Center that responds directly to the diverse needs of the Georgetown student body. Jill has been a tireless advocate for strengthening the number and scope of writing opportunities for students across the Law Center’s curriculum.

Jill has become one of the most respected thinkers in the field of legal writing through a consistent drive for innovation in teaching and scholarship. Drawing from fields as diverse as music theory, architecture, linguistics, and formal logic, she has infused her writing pedagogy with both intellectual rigor and a sense of real-world legal practice. Jill’s extensive research in learning theory constantly reinforces her belief that the process of writing greatly enriches a student’s learning of the law. Beyond the walls of the Law Center, Jill has become a much-sought-after teacher in law firms, federal agencies, and courts—lawyers, administrators, and judges can be students too.

Jill’s unique approach to teaching writing has received broad acceptance and acclaim both at the Law Center and around the world. Building on her scholarship intended for U.S. lawyers and law students, Jill has undertaken the challenge of developing a pedagogy for foreign lawyers who often struggle in the U.S. legal discourse community. In her groundbreaking article, “Is Logic Culturally Based? A Contrastive, International Approach to the U. S. Law Classroom,” she identifies some of the specific problems that foreign lawyers face in acculturating to U.S. legal discourse, and she explores the implications of her thesis that writing is culturally based. Again integrating scholarship and practice to reach specific students, Jill has brought her writing expertise to South Africa, where she has worked with South African law schools to address writing issues in their unique discourse community.

Jill Ramsfield ends each day in the yoga room where it began.

Another day of teaching is complete; another day of learning awaits.

By Craig Hoffman
Milton Regan

PROFESSOR MILTON (MITT) C. REGAN’S BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND PRESENTATIONS HAVE EXPLORED THE WAYS IN WHICH LAW
both reflects and shapes concepts of ourselves as distinct individuals who simultaneously are within a social context.
His writings ask whether the individual can make decisions autonomously and independently of preexisting
commitments or must take them into account in an effort to achieve a concrete identity. Different approaches to this
question in turn produce distinctive conceptions of identity, rationality, agency, and morality.

Professor Regan is particularly interested in tracing the influence of what he describes as “market
orientation” in his two predominant areas of teaching and scholarship: family law and legal ethics. He regards such an
orientation as not simply economically inspired behavior, but as a broader perspective that treats individual cost-benefit
analysis as a fundamental human preoccupation. This approach emphasizes the values of choice and rational justification
and is skeptical of claims of obligation not rooted in individual consent. Professor Regan suggests that a market
orientation has become more prominent in family life in a figurative sense, while it has become more literally pervasive
in legal practice. He maintains that we must resist the urge to condemn or applaud such developments without
qualification. The challenge is to arrive at a richer conception of these social institutions that takes into account
the complex effects of this shift in sentiments and attitudes.

Professor Regan’s books Alone Together: Law and the Meanings of Marriage and Family Law and the
Pursuit of Intimacy explore these themes. Alone Together examines the tension in our commitments to the ideas that
spouses are both separate individuals with their own distinct interests and members of a shared community who have
special obligations to promote its welfare. It continues the work begun in Family Law and the Pursuit of Intimacy,
which analyzes the cultural shift from relational to more individualistic conceptions of the self within the family.
Professor Regan traces the demise of the relational self, first through a modern vision of intimacy as the search for an
“acontextual self” who stands apart from relationships (a “consumer” in a personal relations “market” seeking to
aggrandize this atomized self) and then through the postmodern construction of intimacy as self defined by multiple
aspects “uncoordinated by a single ego.” The book argues that family law should not move completely
from status to contract. “Ultimately,” Professor Regan suggests, “family law should seek
a dynamic balance between status and contract as a way to accommodate desire for both
intimate connection and individual independence.”

Professor Regan’s courses on the American legal profession (first-year elective) and professional responsibility and the legal profession (upper division) focus both on legal ethics and broader issues regarding trends in the practice of law.
The first part provides an overview of the historical development of the profession, different models of the lawyer’s role, and case studies of different types of modern
law practice. The second part exposes students to ethical theories and then to
particularly ethical issues that tend to arise in practice. Its focus is on
ethical rules, common law sources of attorney liability, and
moral and practical considerations that should inform
lawyers’ deliberations. During the summer of 1999,
Professor Regan taught a course on professional
responsibility and the international legal profession
in Florence. He is now working on a course for
the regular Law Center curriculum that will
focus on ethical issues that arise in
international practice.

By David McCarthy
Rick Roe

Rick Roe teaches what is probably the Law Center's most unusual course. In Street Law, his students learn to teach law to students in District of Columbia high schools. Under Roe's guidance, they hold classes in their assigned public schools several times a week, using interactive exercises to teach the basic principles of criminal law and procedure, torts, family law, and individual rights. At the end of the year, the law students coach their classes in a citywide mock trial competition.

Fictional trials are nothing new to Roe, who was motivated to become a lawyer by watching the television lawyer Perry Mason. "Mason combined the ideas of power, justice, and overcoming adversity," he says. "He was always on the defensive by Hamilton Barger, his adversary, but he always discovered the truth."

Midway through his college experience at Yale, Roe took a year off to study in Bogota, Columbia, where he also taught English and history to fourth-graders. This experience—and a subsequent one teaching in an impoverished community on the New Jersey shore—sparked a lifelong interest in literacy education. Law school—at the University of Maine—provided many enriching experiences, and one sad one. After the last examination of his first semester, Roe noticed that a classmate hadn't come to school for the test. The student, he later learned, had committed suicide. Roe realized that even a close-knit and supportive law school could generate terrible pressures. Roe keeps his office door open and encourages students to express their feelings about the law school experience itself.

In 1977, his final year at Maine, Roe responded to a New York Times advertisement to teach law to the public, particularly in high schools. This turned out to be the Street Law Program, which Professor Jason Newman had founded at Georgetown five years earlier. Currently, Roe not only directs Georgetown's Street Law Clinic but also works with law students and other volunteers whom he brings to a prison to teach inmates how to read interactively with their children. The idea is to build literacy and positive legal values. "By helping prisoners to enjoy reading children's books with their families, we shift the family dynamic toward greater respect and expression, where parents give children a voice and opportunity to be heard," Roe said. "We encourage them to talk about the books, which helps them in turn to have open discussions with their children." Since they were five years old, Roe's three boys have often gone to the prisons with him and read with prisoners whose families can't attend the special family visits.

Many of the ideas Roe developed in family literacy have found expression in the literacy and law course he developed jointly with Professor John Hirsh, who teaches English at Georgetown University. The course explores connections between emergent literacy and the development of legal understandings and includes a practicum, in which participants read one hour each week with emergent readers in a local public housing project.

Roe's guiding principle is that justice emerges not only from constitutions and laws but also from the crucible of daily experience. "I don't try to legislate reform in the schools or prisons in which my Georgetown students teach and volunteer," he says. "Instead, I try to help classes and families to become models of due process, respect, fairness, and openness."

By Philip Schrag
Susan Deller Ross

THROUGHOUT HER LEGAL CAREER, PROFESSOR ROSS HAS BEEN AN INNOVATOR AND PIONEER IN THE FIELD OF GENDER equality. Shortly after graduating from law school, Professor Ross began work on one of the first law school casebooks to focus on gender issues. That book, Sex Discrimination and the Law, has become a mainstay in the field and was completely revised and reissued in 1996. Professor Ross was co-chair of the Campaign to End Discrimination Against Pregnant Workers, a broad-based coalition that spearheaded enactment of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978. Later, she was one of the architects of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

Professor Ross joined the faculty in 1983, as director of the then recently created Sex Discrimination Clinic. She built the clinic into a nationally recognized program, first focusing on employment discrimination and then concentrating on domestic violence. Students in the clinic represented women employees in lawsuits raising such issues as sexual harassment, pregnancy discrimination, male-only job rules, pay inequity, and the glass ceiling. They helped women who were victims of domestic violence seek civil protective orders and, if necessary, enforcement of the orders by filing motions for criminal contempt. The experience of working in a clinic is both intense and immensely rewarding. "The clinical setting is one of the best ways for students to grapple with fundamental issues of justice and equality," Professor Ross has explained. "Clinics offer students a unique opportunity both to see the law in practice and also to step back from practice and reflect on deeper issues and implications."

In recent years, Professor Ross has expanded her expertise beyond United States boundaries and has become a recognized expert on international and comparative law concerning the rights and status of women. She has lectured and served as an advisor on improving women's legal status in countries as diverse as Mongolia, India, and Lithuania. She is currently director of Georgetown's International Women's Human Rights Clinic. This unique clinic links Georgetown students with lawyers in Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, assisting in legislative reform, test-case litigation, and reports concerning national, regional, and international human rights law. Professor Ross also regularly teaches a course on International and Comparative Law on the Rights of Women.

Professor Ross sees her new international focus as a natural outgrowth of her focus on women's equality: "Women everywhere are struggling for greater equality in the workplace, for protection from domestic violence, for wider participation in political life, for physical and economic security for themselves and their families. These are fundamental issues of human rights, which have been decisively recognized at the international and regional level in the 1980s and 90s. The challenge for the future is to achieve enforcement of those rights for women in domestic legal systems around the globe." Her interest was also stimulated by the increasingly international student body at Georgetown: "I have taught students from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe. Their presence has pushed me to make comparisons among legal systems and to explore how successful efforts at legal reform in one context might be useful to other cultures."

By Wendy Perdue
Paul Rothstein

WITH EXPERIENCE AS A LITIGATOR IN A LEADING WASHINGTON LAW FIRM, PAUL ROTHSTEIN CAME TO THE LAW CENTER AT A PROSPEROUS TIME IN LIGHT OF HIS INTERESTS. THE FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE WERE BEING DRAFTED, AND PAUL SEIZED THE OPPORTUNITY TO SHAPE AND EXPLAIN THE EMERGING CODE. INDEED, IN ADDITION TO TESTIFYING ABOUT THE RULES IN BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS, HE IS CREDITED WITH WRITING THE FIRST BOOK ON THE NEW RULES. THAT BOOK, A SERIES OF NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL ARTICLES HE WROTE OVER A SIX-YEAR PERIOD, AND MANY CONFERENCES HE ORGANIZED ACROSS THE COUNTRY, HELPED TO PREPARE JUDGES AND LAWYERS FOR THE SHIFTS FROM THE COMMON LAW TO A CODE.

PAUL HAS WRITTEN A LEADING TREATISE ON EVIDENCE AS WELL AS EVIDENCE IN A NUTSHELL (ALSO KNOWN AS A TREATISE). OF HIS 100 OR SO ARTICLES, MANY HAVE CONCERNED EVIDENCE ISSUES. FOR SIX YEARS HE WAS ALSO THE CHAIR OF AN ABA COMMITTEE REVIEWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FEDERAL RULES, AN EFFORT THAT CONTRIBUTED TO VARIOUS CHANGES. MOST RECENTLY, HE WROTE AN AMICUS BRIEF (ONE OF SEVERAL HE HAS PENNED) IN WHAT HAS BECOME THE LEADING SUPREME COURT CASE ON EXPERT TESTIMONY (DAUBERT).

HE HAS HELPED CONGRESS IN OTHER IMPORTANT WAYS: IN THE ENACTMENT OF THE FEDERAL CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION ACT (AFTER WRITING AN INFLUENTIAL ARTICLE ABOUT THIS TOPIC); IN ATTEMPTING TO REFORM THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW; AND, MOST RECENTLY, IN DISCUSSING PRESIDENT CLINTON'S IMPEACHMENT WITH VARIOUS CAUCUSES. HE HAS NOT FORGOTTEN THE STATES, HELPING SEVERAL TO ADOPT VICTIMS' COMPENSATION LAWS, AND CONTRIBUTING TO THE UNIFORM RULES OF EVIDENCE.


OF ALL HIS ACHIEVEMENTS, WHAT HAS PERHAPS MOST SPREAD PAUL'S REPUTATION IS HIS COMMENTARY ABOUT LEGAL ISSUES. BEGINNING WITH HIS TELEVISION ANALYSIS OF THE PROSECUTIONS OF OLIVER NORTH AND ADMIRAL PRINEDEXTER, PAUL, WITH HIS DISTINCTIVE RED BEARD, COVERED ALL OF THE CELEBRATED TRIALS OF THE LAST DECADE FOR CNN, ABC, CBS, AND NBC. CURRENTLY HE IS AT WORK ON A BOOK SEEKING A LINK BETWEEN THOSE CASES INVOLVING GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION. HE HAS APPEARED COUNTLESS TIMES ON TELEVISION (NEWSLINE, RIVERA, COURT-TV, MACNEE-LERHER, C-Span, TO NAME A FEW) AND ON RADIO (NPR). FOR SEVERAL YEARS HE HAS ALSO PROVIDED THE FIRST TELEvised EXPLANATION OF THE SUPREME COURT'S NEW DECISIONS, FROM THE STEPS OF THE COURT, ON BEHALF OF CNN AND CBS. IN THE PANtheon OF TOP COMMENTATORS, HE WAS DESCRIBED BY PEOPLE MAGAZINE IN THIS FASHION: "THE AUTHOR OF A HANDFUL OF SCHOLARY LAW BOOKS ON EVIDENCE, STYLISTIC, DIGNIFIED ... ROTHSTEIN WAS AN UNLIKELY CANDIDATE FOR THE TALK-SHOW WAR ZONE ... HE HAS A TOP MEDIA ANALYST ... AND SHOWS A TALENT FOR DESCRIBING LEGAL COMPLEXITIES IN LAYPERSON'S TERMS."

FOR ALL HIS CONTRIBUTIONS DOMESTICALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY, PAUL NONETHLESS MAINTAINS THAT NOTHING PLEASIES HIM MORE THAN TEACHING. HE IS ESPECIALLY SATISFIED BY TEACHING THE SMALL SECTION OF TORTS IN THE FIRST YEAR. HE REGULARLY INVITES THE MEMBERS OF THAT CLASS FOR REUNIONS, TO SHEPHERD EACH PERSON'S DEVELOPMENT.

PAUL IS ONE OF THE FEW FACULTY MEMBERS WHOSE OBSERVATIONS, IF SIGNED, MIGHT BE EVEN MORE PLEASING THAN WHEN SPOKEN. HIS LOVE OF SINGING LED HIM TO HELP TO FOUNDED THE LAW CENTER'S GILBERT & SULLIVAN SOCIETY. OVER MANY YEARS HE SPECIALIZED, WITH HIS FINE TENOR VOICE, AS THE PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL IN TRIAL BY JURY.

By Peter Tague
Steven Salop

Professor Steven C. Salop represents a major and successful commitment by the Law Center to ensure that economic reasoning is a vital part of U.S. law. Although many Law Center faculty have graduate degrees in non-law fields, Salop was the first non-lawyer economist to receive an appointment to the faculty here—or to the faculty of any major U.S. law school.

A world-class economist, Salop graduated summa cum laude from the University of Pennsylvania and received his Ph.D. in economics from Yale University. Before coming to Georgetown, Salop had been an economist with the Federal Reserve Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Trade Commission, rising to the position of associate director in the FTC's Bureau of Economics. Steve was invited in 1981 to the Law Center for a two-year visit by a faculty bent on better understanding economic reasoning. In his first year, Salop developed and taught a well-attended, active workshop for faculty members on economic reasoning and the law. Salop and the workshop were such a success that he received tenure after the first year.

That first year was just a harbinger of future innovation. The faculty workshop continued for more than another year and was the seedbed for other faculty workshops and seminars in law and economics, as well as in other fields. Drawing upon the workshop materials and experience, Salop also began to teach a course for law students on economic reasoning and the law, which has recently become one of the electives for the first year.

Salop also developed for students a year-long, five-credit workshop on law and economics, which invites outside speakers for lively discussions with the students and faculty. His experience helped increase the use of outside speakers in other seminars at the Law Center. Salop also teaches a four-credit antitrust economics and law course, which combines the statutes and cases with a healthy dose of economics.

Even as he continues his innovative teaching efforts, Steve has managed an impressive level of scholarship and other scholarly activities outside the Law Center. He publishes frequently and widely in both law reviews and economics journals—e.g., with articles in the Yale Law Journal, the George Washington Law Journal, the Antitrust Law Journal, and the American Economic Review. He was a visiting professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in spring 1996 and a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution in 1990-91. He has testified before Congress and the FTC, and he is often invited elsewhere to lecture. He has served as an associate editor of the Review of Industrial Organization, Journal of Industrial Economics, and the Journal of Industrial Organization.

Building on his economics background, FTC experience, and teaching, Salop has become one of the leading experts in the world on competition and antitrust law and policy. He has published considerable scholarship on joint ventures and mergers. His work on the potential for entrenched firms to take steps to raise competitors' costs as a means of exclusionary conduct helped lead to an important Supreme Court decision in 1992. Salop is now active in writing about and consulting with high-tech and telecommunications firms on antitrust issues. His other scholarship includes decision theory approaches to legal procedure and analyses of appellate court voting rules.

In spite of his busy teaching, writing, and consulting activities, Salop devotes much time to his family, including his three young children. He is also an avid skier and a summer beachcomber and snorkeler.

By Barry Carter
Roy Schotland's 35 years of teaching, scholarship, and service have been inspired by an impassioned commitment to pragmatism. As an academic and an activist, he has taken on a series of hard questions central to the future of our democracy and to the financial security of older Americans. On such matters as campaign finance reform, insulation of state courts from political influence, and the design of investment programs for retirees, he has challenged the wisdom of conventional thinking and has defied the odds.

Schotland's scholarly output has been prodigious. In addition to co-editing the leading casebook on administrative law, he has authored dozens of articles and several books on election law, administrative government, and the management of retirement programs, and conflict of interest on Wall Street. The power and relevance of his writings have regularly led to public service. Millions of Americans employed by non-profit institutions that participate in TIAA-CREF, the nation's largest private pension fund, are indebted to Schotland for leading the nationwide effort to keep their retirement savings more flexible.

More recently, Schotland has turned his attention—and unconventional wisdom—to campaign finance. "If you believe in an accountable democratic system," he warns, "you have to make sure that there's a reasonable likelihood of challenges to incumbents." Thus "the crucial problem in campaign finance is the incumbent/challenger gap," which he notes has increased dramatically since the post-Watergate campaign finance reforms of the 1970s. Schotland chides advocates of McCain-Feingold and other proposals to regulate so-called "soft money" for failing to take account of both constitutional constraints and the ability of political fundraisers to find and exploit loopholes. He argues instead for targeted public support for challengers' campaigns—e.g., free mailings to voters.

He has become especially concerned about the impact of campaign contributions and partisanship upon the disinterestedness of state judges, 87 percent of whom face elections. Here again, Schotland's commitment to pragmatism shows: The pervasiveness of judicial elections, despite nearly 100 years of efforts by leaders of the bar to eliminate them, leads him to focus his attention on development of norms of conduct for judicial elections.

Schotland's concerns about the integrity of the political process go back to his professional roots as a fresh Columbia College graduate who trekked to Oregon in 1954 to manage Richard Neuberger's longshot campaign for the U.S. Senate. Neuberger became the first Oregon Democrat in 40 years to be elected to the Senate, and the 21-year-old Schotland came to Washington in 1955 as Senator Neuberger's legislative assistant.

Next, after two years of army service, he went to Harvard Law School with the help of the GI Bill, intent on a life of public service. Before joining the Georgetown faculty, he clerked for U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Brennan, worked for the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Reserve Board, and became a professor at University of Virginia Law School.

He came to the Law Center in 1970 as associate dean, and during his two years' service, the Law Center's enrollment doubled. It also hired 17 new faculty, including the school's second female professor, Judith Areen. Schotland recalls: "The sign of those three years back then—and about this school—that we couldn't get enough votes for her the first year we tried, but won on the second try."

His personal interests include travel and art, especially impressionist, Asian, early Italian, and Flemish. He founded the nation's largest chess center, here in Washington, aimed at teaching the game to urban youth.

By M. Gregg Bloche
Philip Schrag

Phil Schrag beams as he describes how it feels to watch two of his students make their final arguments to a federal immigration judge. The students are representing a refugee in an asylum case and this hearing is the culmination of a semester's work in the Center for Applied Legal Studies (CALS) International Human Rights Project. Each semester, six second- and third-year Georgetown students assume direct responsibility for all aspects of the representation of refugees seeking asylum in the United States. Professor Schrag is a co-director of the CALS Asylum Project and one of two professors who supervise students in the clinic. "These are very hard cases, and often they are capital cases because our clients may very well be killed if they are deported to the country they have fled. Our students take the case all the way from the initial client interview to this final hearing before the judge and they win a great majority of their cases," says Schrag with undisguised pride.

Professor Schrag is also the director of the Law Center's Public Interest Law Scholars Program, a program designed to train and encourage students who are committed to careers in practicing public interest law. He is an unabashed booster of the program. "Public interest lawyers have the best jobs that lawyers can have," he says. "They have the most fun and do the most good." From his first job at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, where he directed the fund's consumer protection litigation, to the most recent of his 10 books, a treatise on the congressional battle to save political asylum, Schrag has worked in public interest law as an advocate, teacher, and scholar.

Two lessons are at the center of Schrag's teaching and scholarship. "Procedure is central to how lawyers make a difference," he says. "It is a prerequisite to effective legal advocacy. But students and lawyers must also understand interpersonal relationships—how individuals feel, how they interact with one another as people, and how they can affect the behavior of the organizations and institutions of which they are a part." At first these lessons may seem in opposition to one another—the hard-nosed lawyer's focus on formal rules and the human concern for feeling and relationship—but Professor Schrag sees them as necessary and complementary parts of a skilled lawyer's tools and training. Likewise, a central theme in his many books and articles is a deep description of how non-governmental organizations can and do influence public policy. Schrag looks at the role that lawyers can play in this work, not just through the formal procedures of litigation but in the interpersonal relationships of negotiation, legislation, lobbying, and the shaping of administrative law.

When Phil Schrag graduated from Yale Law School in 1967, he was part of a generation of students who believed they could change the world. He says that the hardest part of teaching is that many students no longer feel this way. "As a community we have become cynical about our ability to achieve change, and it is not surprising that we see this reflected in our students." He says the most rewarding part of teaching is "to see students learn how they can be a powerful force for change and to watch them learn that they can make a difference." The two Georgetown students who have just won their case in the immigration court may have saved their client's life. Certainly they have learned that as lawyers they can make a difference. That is why Phil Schrag is beaming.

By Charles Lawrence
SOME PEOPLE ARE BORN TO BE TEACHERS; SOME ARE BORN TO BE SCHOLARS; SOME ARE BORN TO BE GADFLIES. Professor Warren Schwartz is one of those rare people who was born to be all three.

A brief look at Professor Schwartz's academic record suggests the range of his experience. A professor at Virginia and Texas Law Schools before coming to Georgetown in 1979. A visiting professor at law schools throughout the world. Director of the John M. Olin Program in Law and Economics at Georgetown. A public servant who has consulted and done research for the Federal Trade Commission, the International Trade Commission, the Administrative Conference of the United States, and other public bodies. The author of four books and numerous articles. In short, a man for all intellectual seasons.

Professor Schwartz's career has been marked by an unflinching and ever-systematic thought from his students, his colleagues, and—equally—himself. His insistence, at times, has made us uncomfortable when faced with difficult decisions, but it has led us to make better choices than had he remained silent. And we are poorer when, faced with complex issues, he is not able to be present to keep us honest and to force us to examine those things that we would rather not consider.

As a teacher, Professor Schwartz has been single-minded in his pursuit of what he believes should be taught in the classroom, whether or not that belief will be popular with his students. Facing a new class of skeptical students each year, he inevitably concludes by winning them over to a different way of analyzing material, even if he cannot always convince them that his world-view is correct.

Professor Schwartz has displayed his erudition and scholarship in the fields of antitrust and international trade. But in no other field has he left his mark more on Georgetown than in law and economics. With a wit not always associated with serious law and economics scholars, he has carried the Law Center into that world, despite its best efforts to resist. Now, as director of the Olin Program, he has brought distinction to the Law Center through the quality of the scholars he has gathered under its roof and the publications that his conferences and workshops have engendered.

Last, but perhaps most important, Professor Schwartz's capacity for deep friendship and his zest for life have enriched the lives of his colleagues here and his friends throughout the world. Those of us who have shared a glass of old Bordeaux or listened to chamber music or simply spent an evening talking with him come away enriched and rejuvenated. He is a magnet who continues to draw us to him, to our unending pleasure.

By Jeffrey Bauman
Michael Seidman has been at Georgetown Law Center a good long while now, and it shows: he has given Georgetown many gifts. Over his 25-year tenure at Georgetown, Mike has produced several books, many articles, and a leading, widely acclaimed e-book on various topics in contemporary constitutional law. For very good reason, Mike’s views on contemporary constitutional law issues are routinely sought out, not only by the national constitutional law community, but also by our more thoughtful legislators and any number of concerned citizens who care about good government. Mike is a true architect, teacher, and scholar of American constitutionalism. His passion for his subject and his tremendous scholarly accomplishments in this fundamental field of law have benefited both Georgetown and the nation hugely.

Just as noteworthy have been Mike’s tireless efforts on behalf of the scholarship of others. Mike Seidman has generously midwifed or mentored the scholarly work of countless numbers of junior colleagues, peers, and students, not only in constitutional law but in virtually all fields. He keeps faculty workshops lively and sharp (as well as organized and on time). He has freely ventured comments and friendly criticisms on the work of any and every colleague who asks. He happily participates in debates, symposia, and panels on all sorts of current constitutional topics sponsored by various student groups. For as long as he has been here, Mike Seidman has been at the heart—he has been the heart—of our scholarly community.

Seidman has also given a decade’s worth of entering classes at Georgetown a fresh, ambitious, audacious, challenging, and smart “alternative” first-year curriculum of legal studies. About 10 years ago, after devoting a year to designing a curriculum, and substantial time convincing colleagues to join in the effort, he launched “curriculum B.” The students in Georgetown’s fabled section three—the quarter of the first-year class that every year has opted to absorb the alternative curriculum—have been the primary beneficiaries of this awesome project. But all of us at Georgetown have benefited.

Mike has given to Georgetown over the last two decades a model for how to successfully combine extraordinary teaching and scholarship with selfless service. He has chaired and served on committees too numerous to name, and by informal survey, he still holds the record for most-years-without-a-substitution.

Mike Seidman has given Georgetown the example of his own remarkable moral character. Constitutionally, and whether or not by conviction, he is a true Kantian. He acts on the basis of moral principle. He takes no moral shortcuts, and he does not shy away from moral conflict. In faculty and committee meetings, he will tell his friends, colleagues, and dean, gently and firmly, when we are acting—well—badly.

Mike Seidman keeps this place honest, and much more.

Most importantly, Mike has given Georgetown the gift of kindness. Mike Seidman is, at heart, a truly kind man. He will lighten your load, seemingly effortlessly and always with a funny touch. As a student, scholar, lawyer, and teacher, Mike has been there, and can sympathize. He’ll let you know if you’re in the wrong, but he will also get you past your self-created demons by showing you how flimsy they are, and he’ll help you laugh at yourself for being frightened by them. That is an extraordinary gift.

Georgetown is always at its best when it is being Seidmanesque. We can be—and even have been at times—principled rather than expedient. As institutions go, it is a kind place as well, and quite good at dispelling demons. We could do a lot worse than to aim to “Be Like Mike.” Michael Seidman gives this place wit, moral backbone, and soul.

By Robin West
Abbe Smith didn't love law school. She did, however, love being a public defender. She found it stimulating, intellectually challenging, and "creative." It is perhaps a bit ironic that Abbe should become one of the country's foremost clinical education teachers and scholars.

Abbe knew that she was going to be a criminal defense lawyer ever since she read To Kill a Mockingbird in elementary school. There was something about the dignity and passion that Atticus Finch brought to his representation of Tom Robinson, something about fighting for the underdog and standing up for racial justice that captivated her. "In addition," she says with a chuckle, "it was one of the few jobs I knew of where you could get paid for talking."

After law school at New York University, Abbe fulfilled her lifelong desire when she took a job with the Philadelphia Public Defender. During her seven years in the office, she tried hundreds of cases, ranging from misdemeanors to the most serious felonies. When Abbe left the Public Defender to teach at City University of New York law school, it was not because she was burned out or disenchanted with public defender work. She loved being a lawyer, and she thought that teaching the progressive and practice-oriented C.U.N.Y. would give her the opportunity to translate that love into teaching.

After two years at C.U.N.Y., Abbe had the opportunity to work with Professor Charles Ogletree to help create the Criminal Justice Institute at Harvard Law School, which included the school's first Criminal Defense Clinic. "It was a good opportunity at a high-profile place to talk about the importance of good lawyering for the poor," she notes. The Institute combined direct representation of clients with scholarly and policy work. Abbe takes great satisfaction in having helped create the Institute and in raising the profile of indigent defense at Harvard and nationally.

When Georgetown's Criminal Justice Clinic was looking for a visiting professor for a three-year visit, the search led them straight to Abbe Smith's door. The chance to work with the Prettyman Fellows, 10 dedicated young lawyers who spend two years at the Law Center before moving on to practice criminal law, was an opportunity she couldn't pass up. "Given my interests and passions, this was a great place for me to end up. I feel lucky to be here," Abbe says. Three years later, when the Law Center created a permanent tenure-track faculty position in the clinic, Abbe Smith's name was the only one forwarded to the faculty by the search committee.

Abbe Smith loves to write, fueled by a love of the stories and issues that come from criminal law practice. Her articles cover a wide range of criminal defense and clinical education topics, with a specialty in defense ethics. Her recent writings include a stirring argument in support of the defense lawyer's duty to represent clients who do "terrible things." Abbe recently delivered this paper at the Howard Lichtenstein Legal Ethics Lecture at Hofstra University School of Law.

Abbe Smith is an inspiring teacher who pushes her students to explore the difficult issues in criminal justice. She often uses film and television clips that focus on timely issues to provoke student interest. Her teaching always gains the highest evaluations by her students, who comment on her dedication to criminal defense, passion for social justice, skill as a trial lawyer, and her interest in larger issues in the criminal justice system and society.

By John Copacino
Girardeau Spann

DURING HIS FIRST YEAR OF LAW SCHOOL, GIRARDEAU A. SPANN DECIDED THAT HE EVENTUALLY WANTED TO BECOME a law professor. He recalls, “My teachers seemed to be analytical magicians. With verbal sleight of hand, they could turn black into white, good into bad, and even right into wrong. The process was breathtaking to watch, although the implications were a little unnerving to consider. But teaching looked like so much fun that I knew I wanted to try it.” However, Professor Spann was not prepared to begin teaching immediately.

Like so many students who came of age during the Vietnam War, Professor Spann felt some obligation to use his legal training “to help save the world.” Accordingly, after graduating from law school, he became a staff attorney with Ralph Nader’s Public Citizen’s Litigation Group, where he engaged in test-case litigation against corporate and governmental defendants concerning constitutional and administrative law issues. After five years, however, Professor Spann had become discontent with practice, and he was ready to begin teaching. “I don’t think the legal system works very well,” he says, “and students should be exposed to that view while they are still in law school—while they still have time to reflect on the implications of what they will be doing with their lives.”

Professor Spann finds both the classroom and writing component of teaching to be very challenging. In the classroom, he wants his students to understand how vastly indeterminate legal doctrine is. He believes that the best way to get students to appreciate this is to teach them how to manipulate doctrine themselves. Once students master this skill, Professor Spann finds that two important things happen. First, students come to understand the meaning of “practicing law,” as opposed to collecting case holdings like a clerk. Second, they realize the degree to which legal decisions rest on the normative preferences of the judges who render them, rather than on the abstract legal principles that judges invoke in their opinions. Professor Spann hopes to impress upon his students the need for them to take responsibility for their own actions, and hopes that his students will not be “tricked” into doing bad things in the mistaken belief that they are required to do so by some legal principle. Professor Spann tries to teach his students that their values matter, and that they cannot escape responsibility for their judgments by hiding behind legal doctrine.

In his writing, Professor Spann seeks to expand upon the views that he introduces in the classroom. His recent books and articles have concerned the manner in which the Supreme Court has treated the interests of racial minorities. Professor Spann believes—contrary to common understanding—that, historically, the social function of the Supreme Court has been to perpetuate the subordination of racial minorities rather than to protect racial minority rights. He believes that the Supreme Court continues to serve this function today. By invoking disputable assumptions about racial neutrality, the Court channels societal resources away from racial minorities and towards the white majority. This serves to preserve white superiority in contemporary culture. Professor Spann views this judicial role as more inevitable than conspiratorial. This is because the doctrinal principles on which we rely to counteract the predictable majoritarian preferences of individual justices simply lack sufficient content to provide any meaningful constraint.

Professor Spann enjoys teaching, and he appreciates the many benefits that teaching at Georgetown has given him over the years. In return, he tries to stay out of trouble, meet his deadlines, and keep his office clean.

By Steven Goldberg

83
ONE OF THE JOYS OF HAVING PRACTICED, TAUGHT, AND WRITTEN ABOUT CORPORATE AND SECURITIES LAW FOR 30 YEARS is to have a younger colleague who is thinking new and exciting thoughts about subjects that I wouldn't dream of tackling at this point in my career. In so doing, my colleague and friend, Lynn Stout, has brought an added dimension both to the Law Center and to me as a teacher and scholar.

Professor Stout's principal scholarly interest is in economic theory and the gap that she perceives between theory and the ways in which businesses and markets actually work. Thus, in a recent major article, "A Team Production Theory of Corporate Law," Lynn argued that the prevailing view that corporate directors should manage firms to maximize shareholder wealth is not, in fact, economically efficient. She based this conclusion on an alternative economic model of the corporation she calls the "team production" model, which emphasizes the importance of managing corporations to serve not just shareholders' interests, but also those of managers, rank-and-file employees, and other groups that make firm-specific investments of financial or human capital.

Given her love of theory, it is interesting that Professor Stout quite consciously does not emphasize it in her basic courses. She believes strongly that students need to understand the law well before attempting to critique it or put it in theoretical framework. She also believes that it can be dangerously tempting to apply theories that rely on simplifying but unrealistic assumptions to complex, real-world problems. Thus her courses stress an in-depth mastery of substance and doctrine, while her seminars are reserved for a full examination of current theory.

Coming from a small public school in upstate New York, Lynn Stout received a B.A. summa cum laude from Princeton in 1979, an M.P.A. from the Woodrow Wilson School of Princeton, and a J.D. from Yale Law School in 1982. Following a clerkship with Judge Gerhard Gesell of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Professor Stout practiced law at the Washington, D.C., law firm of Williams & Connolly for three years before beginning her teaching career at George Washington National Law Center in 1986. She moved to Georgetown in 1990 and has been here since, with occasional visits elsewhere.

What does someone as busy as Lynn Stout do when she is not thinking deep thoughts? She indulges her long-standing interests in baseball (her license plate is "Those O's"), opera, and, particularly absorbing, chasing her young sons around the playground. And, for the last six years, Lynn has spent approximately two hours a week as a volunteer at the Manassas National Park clearing walking trails and working on other safety-related projects.

What will Lynn Stout be doing in five years? She laughed when I asked the question. She will be doing exactly what she is doing now: teaching, writing, and talking about ideas with anyone who will engage her. She wonders, though, whether changing technology will soon make today's classroom, in which one teacher talks to relatively small groups of students, seem primitive. Indeed, she worries whether in 20 years "I will be obsolete." As one who has watched Lynn Stout devote her professional career to using theory to help shape the future, I am not worried. The one-and-a-half-year-old at the bottom of the slide may be her grandson rather than her son, the Orioles may still be one pitcher away from a pennant, but Lynn will be as active as she is today. If Lynn has become obsolete, we are all in trouble.

By Jeffrey Rauman
Jane Stromseth

Jane Stromseth's scholarly interests span large but unresolved questions of the post-Cold War world—how can military force, in an era of seemingly intractable conflicts and civil strife, be directed for good? How can international norms and institutions help to guide the use of force for legitimate ends? And how does the deeply human impulse to seek retributive justice inform multilateral approaches to resolving disputes and the historical grievances that underlie them?

"For me, the contrasts of life always stood out," says Stromseth, reflecting on her formative experiences. As a teenager, during the early 1970s, she lived in Thailand and traveled throughout Asia with her family. There, they witnessed the social and political extremes that characterized that turbulent era—repression and revolution, wealth and poverty, contemplation and ignorance. Making sense of the extremes, and their collision, was the beginning of an insight gained while Stromseth lived with a Thai Buddhist family. "For Buddhists," observes Stromseth, "the right path is the 'middle way'—a tranquil point of equilibrium between the extremes of life. At some level, this has affected me."

Raised in Minnesota, Stromseth continued her intellectual journey at Swarthmore College, where she studied economics, politics, and religion. She spent summers in Washington working for former Senator and Vice President Walter F. Mondale. Awarded a Rhodes Scholarship to Oxford University, she completed a doctorate in international relations. At Yale Law School, Stromseth served as articles editor of the Yale Law Journal and student director of the Lowenstein International Human Rights Law Clinic.

Stromseth has welcomed subsequent opportunities to blend government service with scholarly reflection. She served as a law clerk for Judge Louis F. Oberdorfer of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor of the U.S. Supreme Court. Stromseth then joined the Office of the Legal Adviser at the Department of State, where she worked on legal and policy issues raised by extraterritorial law enforcement.

Eager to teach and write, Professor Stromseth joined the Georgetown faculty in 1991. Continuing her focus on law and foreign affairs, Stromseth teaches constitutional law, international law, and a seminar on the use of force and conflict resolution. She has become a recognized expert on the constitutional war powers of Congress and the president, and has written thoughtfully about U.S. participation in multilateral military operations, including peace operations authorized by the United Nations and humanitarian interventions to stop atrocities.

Consistent with her lifelong interest in striking a balance between reflection and action, Professor Stromseth served on the National Security Council staff as director for multilateral and humanitarian affairs from 1999 through January 2000. Her responsibilities included United Nations political issues, war crimes and international tribunals, and a range of human rights issues. Among other things, she worked on U.S. support to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and on the international response in East Timor. Her NSC experience gave her a greater sense of both the possibilities and challenges of melding strategic and human rights concerns in the conduct of foreign policy.

Professor Stromseth's family life is also a search for balance—between the demands of professional life and the joys of raising two children, Sarah and Jonathan—together with her husband, Jim Sehear, deputy assistant secretary of defense for peacekeeping and humanitarian affairs. Their kids can tell you their thoughts about Kosovo and East Timor—and about their pet hamster—and are happiest when mom and dad are home playing piano or basketball or just puttering around the house.

By Wendy Perdue
Robert Stumberg showed all the kids back in St. Charles, Missouri, that a nice boy, the son of a country lawyer who grew up along the banks of the Mississippi River, armed with his own law degree, could address Ralph Nader's complaint that "this country has more problems than it should tolerate and more solutions than it uses." After early political commitments to conservative political causes (he worked for Nixon's reelection in 1972), Professor Stumberg began the grass roots activism that would become the hallmark of his professional life.

Resisting the establishment began for Stumberg at Macalester College in Minnesota, where he was the president of the student body. He succeeded in defunding the student yearbook and then using that money to fund antiwar activities. He then consciously responded to Ralph Nader's call to students to match their idealism with their professionalism, helping to establish the first student Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) in the nation, MPIRG—which immediately sued U.S. Steel over clear-cutting timber practices.

Flush from his college activism and convinced that legal action, deployed strategically, could be a powerful weapon in the struggle for social change, Stumberg enrolled in Georgetown University Law Center—and he has been here, in one capacity or another, ever since. After graduating in 1975, he served as a graduate teaching fellow for two years and then became deputy director of the D.C. Project—the institutional forerunner of the Harrison Institute for Public Law that he now directs. Throughout his tenure at Georgetown, Stumberg has played Boswell to Nader's Johnson, taking his predecessor's ability to harness the power of grass roots mobilization to effect social change and making that vision accessible to hundreds of law students.

Stumberg's vision, that creative legislative policymaking and astute political strategizing are necessary complements to the blunt instrument of litigation, has guided the Harrison Institute's projects over the years. During the first years of D.C. home rule, Stumberg, his colleagues, and students drafted the entire body of progressive landlord/tenant law that remains a national model for housing justice—including rent control, eviction restrictions, and various tenant ownership opportunities. Today, the same commitment to participatory democracy is manifest in the institute's new projects, including not only community economic development and support for state and local governments, but also the impact of international trade agreements on popular sovereignty, local economic development, and the environment.

Explaining what has motivated him in his career, Stumberg says, simply and directly, "I met real people who were smart and hardworking, and yet who couldn't get ahead." All Stumberg's professional work has been dedicated to changing that fact about American society, with an abiding faith that "it doesn't take more than 200 or so dedicated people to change the world."

By Gary Peller
Peter Tague

DEGREES
A.B. 1965
Harvard
J.D. 1969
University of Michigan

EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS
Scholar in Residence, Kibbs College, London, England
Visiting Professor, University of Melbourne, New York University Law School, San Diego Law School's Summer Law Programs in Oxford, Dublin, and Paris, GULC's Summer Law Program in Florence
Lawyer, Public Defender's Office, Alameda County, California
Law Clerk, J. Walter Mansfield, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
Chair and Vice-Chair, various ABA committees

COURSES
Criminal Justice, Advanced
Criminal Procedure, Evidence, Professional Responsibility

REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS
Effective Advocacy for the Criminal Defendant: The Barrister vs. Lawyer (1996)
The Fifth Amendment: An Aid to the Guilty Defendant, an Impediment to the Innocent One. 70 Geo. L.J. 1 (1981)

"AWASH WITH SARTORIAL SPLENDOR!" LAW STUDENTS OBSERVE WELL AND GEORGETOWN STUDENTS GOT PETER TAGUE right. Resplendent with bow tie, flamboyant mustache, and favored with a deep voice, Peter looks and sounds the part of a criminal law professor at Georgetown. "Bred in the bone" to be a trial lawyer, Peter absorbed the profession from a father who was a prosecuting attorney and then a judge in a small Ohio county. He often brought his work home, to Peter's delight.

After undergraduate studies at Harvard and one year teaching English in exotic Beirut, Peter attended Michigan Law, where he excelled. Then he clerked for federal district court Judge J. Walter Mansfield. Trial court experience just confirmed his lifelong ambition to be a trial lawyer.

Peter practiced corporate law in San Francisco after clerking, but found antitrust and business litigation boring. Anyone who knows Peter cannot imagine him happy in a dank Bay Area warehouse searching for documents. Trial lawyer that he wanted to be, Peter soon found his place as a public defender in Oakland. To practice law was suddenly exhilarating. Peter tried to verdict over 40 jury trials and pursued numerous appeals, often in cases involving police brutality against students and minorities, in the California of the early 1970s. Yet for Peter, something was missing.

Questions unasked, much less unanswered, in the crush of public defender work troubled him. In particular, Peter began to question how well the American judicial system served the criminal defendant—an issue that he continues to believe is the most important question in the law. Where better to reflect on pressing legal issues than at a law school, and so Peter, finding himself in the nation's capital in 1976, joined Georgetown's faculty.

The new law professor glided comfortably into teaching criminal law and evidence, and writing about critical issues confronting lawyers in criminal cases. His special concern was how best to defend indigents accused of crimes. Peter's passion was clear to his students, and his droll sense of humor and frequent references to movies and real cases didn't hurt in the classroom, either. Yet the funny man had something bigger up his sleeve.

Peter is an inveterate traveler—particularly to European spots. His resume lists more than a few visiting professorships in European law programs. Not surprisingly, then, Peter's major scholarship to date is a book about the practice of criminal law by barristers in England. What an engaging mix of interests—criminal law with things European. Yet the question addressed is distinctly contemporary and American: how best to defend criminal defendants. And Peter's answer is arresting.

Americans have much to learn from barristers and solicitors practicing criminal law in England and from a system that pays criminal lawyers, even for the poor, well.

Not only does Peter study Italian Renaissance art, but he excels in cooking Italian food (and other cuisine, too). He travels widely, yet often prefers to describe local backpacking or hiking adventures. And Peter's students can't forget his classroom promotion of and references to the arts and various District of Columbia neighborhoods and gardens.

A final word on teaching. Peter recounts that on the last class day students often arrive wearing all forms of bow ties, including leaves stapled together. Leaves stapled together, blending the old and the new, may describe Peter better than he might concede.

By Kevin Quinn, S.J.
Mark Tushnet

DEGREES
B.A. 1967
Harvard
J.D., M.A. 1971
Yale

EXPERIENCE AND AFFILIATIONS
Law Clerk, Judge George Edwards, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
Law Clerk, Justice Thurgood Marshall, U.S. Supreme Court
Faculty, University of Wisconsin Law School
Faculty, Georgetown University Law Center
Visiting Professor, law schools of the University of Texas, University of Southern California, University of Chicago, Columbia University

COURSES
Government Processes, Comparative Constitutional Law

REPRESENTATIVE PUBLICATIONS
Taking the Constitution Away from the Courts, Princeton (1990)
Comparative Constitutional Law, Foundation (1999)

QUESTION: WHY IS MARK TUSHNET SO PROLIFIC?

ANSWER: IT MAKES IT EASIER FOR HIM TO ACCOMPLISH HIS GOAL OF READING EVERYTHING THAT'S EVER BEEN WRITTEN. That's the "B" answer. The "A" answer is that Professor Tushnet has a lot to say—and for more than 25 years, the legal community has been listening and learning. Tushnet is one of the nation's leading constitutional lawyers. His articles, which have appeared in virtually every leading law journal, have been widely influential. Says a colleague at Georgetown: "A generation of constitutional scholars have been Mark Tushnet's students, even though they have never taken a class with him."

Tushnet attended Harvard College and the Yale Law School, where he was an editor of the Yale Law Journal. After clerkships with Court of Appeals Judge George Edwards and Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, Tushnet began his academic career at the Wisconsin Law School as an assistant professor in 1973. He came to Georgetown in 1981 as a visiting professor and joined the faculty a year later. He is now Carmack Waterhouse Professor of Constitutional Law.

At Georgetown, Professor Tushnet has taught a variety of courses on constitutional law and civil procedure. His most recent interest is comparative constitutional law. In 1999, he and Georgetown colleague Professor Vicki Jackson published Comparative Constitutional Law.

Mark Tushnet's intellectual journey has had an enormous impact on legal scholarship. As a founder and guiding light of the "critical legal studies" movement, he has challenged academics, students, and practitioners to confront the ways in which our legal system, despite its pretensions of fairness and neutrality, in fact works to the advantage of those with power. He has authored two widely respected books on Justice Thurgood Marshall, published scores of articles, and delivered lectures at law schools around the country—most recently, the David C. Baum Lecture on Civil Liberties and Civil Rights at the University of Illinois Law School and the William B. Lockhart Lecture at the University of Minnesota Law School. For a number of years, Tushnet has sponsored a national conference on constitutional law at Georgetown, which brings together young scholars and established figures in the field.

Professor Tushnet's most recent work is Taking the Constitution Away from the Courts. In the book, he argues that Americans should take greater responsibility for enforcing constitutional rights and that reducing the role of the courts would be helpful in that endeavor.

Tushnet lives among lawyers. His wife, Elizabeth Alexander, is director of the National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union. He has two daughters. Rebecca is a graduate of the Yale Law School and clerk to Supreme Court Justice David Souter during the Court's 1999-2000 term. She is married to Zachary Schrag, the son of Georgetown faculty member Phil Schrag. Younger daughter Laura is a senior at Yale College.

By T. Alexander Aleinikoff
Carlos Vázquez

The wisdom of age is, no doubt, often exaggerated—but its pleasures are sometimes overlooked. One of the delights of seniority at the Law Center is the opportunity to know younger colleagues like Professor Carlos Manuel Vázquez.

Vázquez came to the Law Center in 1990 as a visiting associate professor and became an associate professor on tenure track in 1991. A graduate of a Jesuit secondary school in Miami, he studied at Yale and took his J.D. at Columbia Law School in 1983. He was then a clerk to the distinguished appellate court judge, Stephen Reinhardt, in Los Angeles. In 1985, he joined Covington & Burling and remained there for five years, and it is to that eminent firm’s credit that they did not hesitate to employ him even when he declared at the outset that he intended to move to an academic career.

One understands why: Professor Vázquez is self-possessed, even quiet—but conveys a large inner authority stemming from his Cuban heritage. In Cuba, his father was an opponent of Batista and an early supporter of Castro. When el líder, alas, turned to neo-Stalinism, the elder Vázquez (also Carlos) became a dissident. The rest of the family had permission to leave, but Señor Vázquez was held back. Anticipating arrest for counter-revolutionary activity, he and a group of friends presented themselves at the residence of the Brazilian Ambassador. After some months in the Embassy, the group was allowed to depart for Brazil and from there travel to the United States. Señor Vázquez settled with the family in Massachusetts, worked in a shoe factory, but educated himself about computers and now has a consulting business in Miami.

Carlos Manuel Vázquez has clearly integrated his heritage in any number of ways. He is deeply concerned with issues of human rights in their international context, he has done much in the law of immigration, and his scholarly work on the Constitution attests to a great concern for the continuity of the rule of law in a democratic and plural society.

Professor Vázquez’s daily routine at the Law Center demonstrates how broadly our younger faculty interpret their pedagogic tasks. He has taught constitutional law; federal courts and the federal system; international law; conflict of laws; and two seminars in the international and international litigation and an international human rights workshop.

Professor Vázquez has also been exceedingly active in the larger professional sphere, giving seminars at the Department of State, teaching on extradition to federal judges in a series on international law in U.S. courts, and participating in panels at meetings of both the International Law Association and the American Society of International Law. He was one of the reporters for a project of the American Branch of the International Law Association, and he wrote the portion on the place of international treaties in U.S. law. Professor Vázquez has profited from his own life history and contemporary sensibility to make the internationalization of national societies, and thereupon of the very structure and vocation of law, his central intellectual theme.

In a set of articles replete with Constitutional scholarship, Carlos has argued that groups and persons within our border do have rights under treaties by virtue of the Supremacy doctrine intrinsic to our Constitution, and these rights are not hortatory alone. In other words, the internationalization of American jurisprudence was provided by the nation’s founders. The international sensibility of the 18th century anticipated, in a remarkable triumph of early American cosmopolitanism, the realities of our own existence. That is not a point of interest to lawyers only, and Professor Vázquez may be credited quite fairly with a serious contribution to contemporary political thought.

By Norman Birnbaum
William Vukovich

SOME FACULTY OFFICES AT GEORGETOWN SEEM RATHER IMPERSONAL, IN SOME CASES BECAUSE ANY CLUES TO THE occupant's personality are so buried under stacks of articles, books, and manuscripts that only a skilled archaeologist could unearth any ideas about the real person who works there. Professor Bill Vukovich's office does not fit that model. One wall is, not surprisingly, lined with shelves filled with books on topics ranging from contracts, bankruptcy, and the Uniform Commercial Code to legal philosophy. But the other wall features Professor Vukovich's own photographs of the seashore (especially Cape Cod), gardens, and Russian churches and palaces. A student or faculty colleague meeting in this office gets an idea not only of a serious legal scholar and teacher, but also of a man with broad outside interests and with skills that transcend the world of law.

Bill Vukovich is originally a Hoosier, graduating from Indiana University with a degree in math. He then attended law school at Berkeley in the late 1960s, during the most turbulent period in the school's history. Seeking (as he describes it) tranquility, he taught at Willamette University in Oregon and then (again as he puts it) weary of solitude, left to pursue a J.S.D. degree at Columbia as a Ford Urban Law Fellow. He joined the faculty at Georgetown in 1971.

At Georgetown, Professor Vukovich teaches commercial law, consumer law, bankruptcy, and contracts. His scholarship has focussed on issues of debtor/creditor relationships, and he has written extensively in those areas in addition to serving on the advisory board of the American Bankruptcy Institute Law Review. While the uninitiated might initially think these subjects are technical or even dry, Professor Vukovich sees them differently and is able to convey to his students why he remains fascinated with issues of bankruptcy and debtor/creditor relations. "How a society treats its citizens who become debtors tells us a great deal about that society and about the values it places on families, for example," he says. "Similarly, the rules governing bankruptcies, such as those relating to the kinds and amount of property that should be discharged, reflect complex social policies." Professor Vukovich also finds the interplay between the federal and state laws and policies that underlie the bankruptcy system particularly interesting.

When not teaching and writing, Professor Vukovich finds time to pursue his interests in photography, the Caps and the Orioles, gardening, and cycling (he is the long-time co-sponsor of the popular orientation bike ride for incoming first-year students).

Most recently, Professor Vukovich has taken a new pedagogical challenge: teaching European students about the American legal system. In the fall of 1999, he taught Italian and other European students at Rome's prestigious Libera Universita Internazionale degli Studi Sociali. That course discussed not only how commercial relations are established and regulated in the United States, but explored the nature and sources of American law and the issues of U.S. constitutional law and federalism. Similar issues are currently at the heart of debates in Italy and the broader European community. In the spring of 2000, he teaches a course in comparative consumer protection law in the Law Center's joint program with the University of Heidelberg. While in Europe, Professor Vukovich is researching the European Union's laws and policies on consumer protection.

By Douglas Parker
ONE WAY TO BEGIN A PROFILE OF HEATHCOTE WOOLSEY WALES WOULD BE TO SATISFY THE INEVITABLE CURIOSITY ABOUT the mellifluous moniker he bears. Immediately after his birth during World War II, his father was shipped overseas on military assignment, and his mother had to christen her newborn son. She opted for her father's given name. When Wales père returned home, he expressed dissent, traceable to his own childhood experience with an unusual first name (Wellington) that didn't suit him, by dubbing his young son Pete, and the nickname stuck.

Of course there is much more to be said about Heathcote Woolsey Wales. In addition to his pool-playing prowess (on display every summer at the Cowboy Bar in Jackson Hole, Wyoming), his unerring jump shot (on display every spring during the Home Court charity basketball game between the Georgetown Law faculty and members of Congress), and his thespian and singing talents (on display in occasional productions of the Law Center's Gilbert & Sullivan Society), Pete Wales is an innovative teacher and scholar in the fields of criminal law and law and psychiatry.

One of Pete's central aims is to bring real-world concerns into his classes and his research. "Every rule of law enables one set of actors to exercise power over another set of actors," is the way he puts it. "To understand the law, one must understand something about those actors, their incentives for action, what makes them tick."

Pete's law-in-action bent may have originated in the circumstances that brought him into academia, directly after his graduation from the University of Chicago Law School in 1968. Committed to the cause of civil rights, he jumped at an offer to teach at the University of Mississippi School of Law. In addition to his classroom duties, Pete served on the board of directors of Northern Mississippi Rural Legal Services. "It was half Peace Corps work; half law teaching," he recalls. "I liked teaching so much," he explains, "that I stayed with it." This decision eventually brought him to Georgetown in 1971.

Pete's current scholarly project, on the meaning of the "impartial" criminal jury, focusses on the inherent contradiction between permitting jurors to bring their personal experience to bear upon decision-making, and aspiring for verdicts that are free from the taint of prejudice. He has been closely examining four areas that highlight the tension between these two goals: the process of jury selection, the rules of evidence that govern what a jury sees and hears, the instructions that jurors receive from the trial judge, and aspects of a case that the jury gets to decide.

In his popular law and psychiatry course, Pete concentrates on civil commitment. "I try to show students how the law actually works so that they can have an accurate appreciation of how much difference any modification in the law will actually make," he observes. "It's amazing how bureaucratic attitudes, budgets, and popular perceptions actually bring about more significant alterations than changes in the wording of statutes." To help illustrate the point, Pete has his students visit St. Elizabeth's Hospital, where they observe patient interviews with psychiatrists and talk to members of the staff.

On one of these visits, the class found itself inadvertently locked in an empty ward. According to Pete, "Some of the students got a little anxious." The experience may well have conveyed more about commitment than any readings on the subject would have conveyed, but Pete has not made it a permanent part of his repertoire, despite his down-to-earth approach to teaching.

By Joseph Page
Don Wallace, Jr.

Don Wallace Jr. is the most senior member of the International Law faculty and it is due, in no small part, to his efforts that Georgetown has come to have an international law program that is consistently rated among the top five in the nation.

Wallace attended Yale College and Harvard Law School. After law school he practiced trusts and estates law in New York. Wallace went on to a job with the Agency for International Development (AID), initially in its Africa bureau. For two of his four years at the Agency, he was stationed in Ankara, Turkey, as regional legal advisor responsible for the Middle East. In his spare time, he managed to co-write a book on Turkish law (the fourth edition of which has just recently been published).

Wallace came to Georgetown in 1966 and quickly set about to strengthen its international and public law programs. He founded and was the first chair of the International Programs Committee. A year-long study coordinated by Wallace led to the founding of the Law Center’s second law journal, Law and Policy in International Business. In 1970, Wallace was named the second director of Georgetown’s International Law Institute, succeeding the institute’s founder, Georgetown Professor Heinrich Kronstein. Under Wallace’s leadership, the institute expanded its focus to international law generally. Wallace’s work with the institute contributed significantly to a great expansion and strengthening of Georgetown’s graduate offerings in international law over the past several decades.

Wallace has authored, co-written, edited, or co-edited more than 20 books on various aspects of international economic law, including casebooks on international economic law and international procurement law. During the past three years, he has co-taught a well-received seminar called “Conservatism in Law and Politics in America.” The Federalist Society will also shortly launch a journal examining the same themes as does the seminar.

Professor Wallace was chairman of the American Bar Association’s Section of International Law and Practice from 1978 to 1979, and he is currently chairman of the ABA’s Private International Law Coordinating Committee. He is also a member of the American Law Institute and of the Secretary of State’s Advisory Committee on Private International Law; he is a U.S. Delegate to UNCITRAL; he is on the roster of panelists of the World Trade Organization’s Dispute Settlement Body; and is the presiding officer of the UNIDROIT Foundation of Rome. He has been chairman of the Advisory Committee on Technology and World Trade of the U.S. Congress’ Office of Technology Assessment. He was a member of the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. Conference on State Succession in Respect of Treaties. He has been a visiting professor at the People’s University of Beijing. He was awarded the Harry L. Jones Award for outstanding achievement in foreign and international law in 1992.

He is currently a member of the Board of Governors of the Republican National Lawyers Association and was national chairman of Law Professors for Bush and Quayle in 1988 and 1992 and national co-chairman of Law Professors for Dole and Kemp in 1996.

Wallace has also done considerable pro bono work over the years, including the case of Sidney Jaffe, a resident of Canada who was abducted from his home by U.S. bounty hunters to stand trial for land fraud. With Wallace’s help, Jaffe has long been challenging his abduction as a violation of international law. Currently he advises on an action against the U.S., brought by Canadian interests under the investor protection chapter of NAFTA, challenging the grossly excessive award of punitive and other damages by a Mississippi jury.

By Carlos Vázquez
Silas Wasserstrom

For someone destined for life in the academy, Silas Wasserstrom is an irreverent academic. Although he is the author of important articles on criminal procedure and constitutional theory, Professor Wasserstrom has come to believe that most legal scholarship is “a lot of sound and fury signifying nothing.” He prefers to spend his time teaching. “I am an academic in the sense that I like to think about things and get my students to think about things,” he says.

Professor Wasserstrom’s irreverence animates his teaching. He regards himself as an “agnostic,” with no “real point of view.” He is wary of preconceptions and skeptical of doctrinaire thinking from both the right and the left. His strength as a teacher lies in his ability to challenge students—to get them to think critically about their most cherished beliefs. He wants students to realize that there are no easy answers to questions that truly matter.

Professor Wasserstrom’s legal career was something of an accident. He majored in philosophy at Amherst and intended to go to graduate school. However, when he married during college, he felt he “needed to do something responsible.” On advice from his brother, he went to Yale Law School and discovered a passion for law and legal argument.

After law school, Professor Wasserstrom clerked for Judge J. Skelly Wright of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart. He worked for the antitrust division of the Justice Department and a Senate committee focusing on civil rights before joining a law firm specializing in tax.

Professor Wasserstrom was feeling bored and unchallenged by private practice when he ran into a friend who was working at the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia. The friend was so enthusiastic that Professor Wasserstrom called PDS, arranged an interview, and was hired in a matter of days. He had found the work that would consume him for the next decade.

The 1970s were heady times to be a public defender. The Warren Court’s legacy was still in force, the country was undergoing massive social change, and representing the indigent accused was regarded as “fighting the good fight.” Professor Wasserstrom looks back on those years with affection. “In those days, PDS was a very exciting place,” he says. “The work was interesting, there was a lot of variety, and I got to work with some of the best people I know.” Professor Wasserstrom moved up through the ranks very quickly and became head of appeals, arguing three cases before the Supreme Court.

The most memorable case Professor Wasserstrom argued was Jones v. United States, which addressed the constitutionality of mandatory commitments upon a finding of not guilty by reason of insanity. The defendant, who had a history of schizophrenia, had been charged with shoplifting, acquitted by reason of insanity, and immediately sent to the state mental hospital. There had never been a determination of the defendant’s current mental illness and dangerousness, prerequisites to an involuntary civil commitment. Unfortunately, this case was argued six months after John Hinckley was prosecuted for shooting President Reagan and had successfully raised an insanity defense. Although Professor Wasserstrom lost the case 5-4, his client—who is still at the state hospital even though he long ago completed the maximum sentence for shoplifting—still calls him “recesses” a week.

Professor Wasserstrom enjoys sports, especially golf. He spends his free time either on the golf course or with family and friends. He is married to a lawyer and has five children and three grandchildren.

By Abbe Smith
PETER P. WEIDENBRUCH HAS BEEN DAZZLING STUDENTS OF FEDERAL TAXATION SINCE HE JOINED THE FACULTY IN 1965. Although it is well known that the complexities of the tax world do not necessarily appeal to all students, Peter regularly carries one of the largest teaching loads on the faculty and usually has more students signed up for his courses than any other member of the faculty. As one student put it: "Everyone feels like they have to take tax at Georgetown. It's like eating your vegetables. Taxes are the vegetables of the law school...Weidenbruch does a good job of serving them up, spicing them up." Many students who may have assumed that the study of taxation was a kind of obligation were induced by the Weidenbruch classroom to pursue career paths in the field. U.S. Tax Court Judge Laurence Whalen, for example, has written that "Professor Peter Weidenbruch was an inspiration to me and to a lot of people."

Not only is Peter one of the senior members of the faculty, he is among its most active. Since 1975 he has held the Ralph H. Dwan Chair of Taxation. He was instrumental in persuading the Tax Section of the American Bar Association to select Georgetown law students to produce its esteemed journal, The Tax Lawyer and he has served as the chair of the Law Center's Committee on Professional Responsibility for more than a decade.

Peter has practiced tax law with a top law firm and a major corporation. He has written and spoken on tax matters in many different forums in almost every part of the country and has presented papers at most of the nation’s major tax institutes and conferences. They include the annual NYU Tax Institute, the Southern Federal Tax Conference, the Tulane Tax Institute, and several ABA tax programs, all directed toward the continuing legal education of tax attorneys and accountants. Additionally Peter has held a number of positions in the Tax Section of the ABA and served as an associate commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service in the 1970s. Several generations of Georgetown alumni, particularly those engaged in tax law, stay in regular contact with him—which is appropriate because Peter earned two law degrees (including a master's in taxation) from the Law Center and has served as an ex-officio member of the Law Center's National Law Alumni Board.

Among Peter's many other passions, in addition to teaching, are baseball, tennis, and golf. He is a regular at Camden Yards and served as a member of the board of directors of the Baltimore Orioles for 10 years. It is well known, however, that Peter's greatest passions are his family and his friends. He and Barbara, a Trinity College graduate and former elementary school teacher, have been married for 42 years. Photos of their children (two of whom have been graduated from the Law Center) and the enlarging tribe of Weidenbruch grandchildren are prominently displayed in Peter's office.

Peter has won many awards that together reflect the warmth and respect that he has engendered within the Law Center community. He received an honorary doctorate from Georgetown in 1986. Several years ago he was selected as the Faculty Member of the Year by the staff of the Law Center. In the spring of 1999, his colleagues awarded him the Frank Riegel Award as the Outstanding Teacher of the Year. But perhaps the greatest tribute to his intellect and pedagogical skills occurs twice annually at registration time when more students seek his class than there are seats in his classroom.

By Charles Gustafson
Edith Brown Weiss

ASK SCHOLARS AROUND THE WORLD TODAY WHO HAS CONTRIBUTED MOST TO THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, and Professor Edith Brown Weiss would be at the top of virtually everyone’s list. For more than two decades, Professor Brown Weiss has combined a focus on protecting the environment with an exceptional ability to draw upon different disciplines and bridge diverse scholarly communities. A path-blazing scholar, she has translated her ideas into practice as a U.S. government official and participant in United Nations legal programs. In recognition of her outstanding contributions—as scholar, teacher, colleague, public servant, and world citizen—Edith Brown Weiss was named the Francis Cabell Brown Professor of International Law in May 1996.

Professor Brown Weiss’s concern for the global environment and her interest in inter-disciplinary scholarship have deep roots. She grew up in Oregon, where she learned to love the beauty of the great outdoors. She holds a J.D. from Stanford University, an LL.B. from Harvard Law School, and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of California at Berkeley. She was on Princeton University’s faculty before coming to Georgetown.

After Edith Brown Weiss joined the faculty of Georgetown University Law Center in 1978, she developed and launched the concept of “intergenerational equity” as a principle of international law in the environmental field and more generally. Her book, In Fairness to Future Generations: International Law, Common Patrimony, and Intergenerational Equity, set forth an argument for this concept. In part because of this book, she won, in 1990, the Certificate of Merit Award from the American Society of International Law for making the most significant contribution to international law. Though novel at the time, her idea has now been expressly incorporated in various international environmental agreements and United Nations declarations, used in national court cases in other countries, and cited by the International Court of Justice.

Professor Brown Weiss’s scholarly contributions extend into international law. Among the most notable are her writings on the International Court of Justice, including her empirical analysis of the Court’s practice. Recently, she was the co-leader of an international team of scholars conducting interdisciplinary research on strengthening national compliance with international agreements. This work led to another path-breaking book, Engaging Countries: Strengthening Compliance with International Environmental Accords. Professor Brown Weiss continues to work at the cutting edge of international law with her research on changes in the international legal system. She also has held many very important positions. From 1994-96, she served as president of the American Society of International Law. In 1990, she was associate general counsel at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and set up a new division for international and comparative environment law.

In recognition of her vital contribution to international law, Professor Brown Weiss has received numerous honors and awards, including the prestigious Elizabeth Haub prize in Belgium in 1995, for contributions to international environmental law. That same year, she was one of 24 scholars internationally chosen to address the U.N. Congress on public international law, held at the United Nations General Assembly as part of the U.N. Decade of International Law. She is a member of the editorial boards for eight scholarly journals and/or book publishers. A committed public servant, Professor Brown Weiss has fostered links among scholars in law, social science, and science, serving, for example, on the U.S. National Academy of Science’s Commission on Geosciences, Environment, and Natural Resources, the Academy’s highest body. She is a member of the American Law Institute and the Council on Foreign Relations.

Here at Georgetown, Professor Brown Weiss serves as founding faculty advisor to the Georgetown International Environmental Law Review. She is a devoted teacher and a wonderful mentor to students and colleagues alike. She, her husband, and her two children have traveled the world together, sharing interests in international affairs, art, and music.

By Jane Stromseth
Robin West

By all accounts, Robin West is one of the most influential and widely admired legal scholars of her time. The bare facts tell a part of the story. In 18 years, she has written three widely acclaimed books and more than 70 law review articles in the fields of jurisprudence, feminist legal theory, law and literature, and constitutional theory.

She has held visiting positions at both the University of Chicago and Stanford Law Schools. She has presented papers at over 50 conferences, including law faculty workshops at New York University Law School, the University of Chicago School of Law, and Yale Law School. She has given endowed lectures at two universities, and was invited to write the prestigious foreword to the *Harvard Law Review* Supreme Court issue.

Yet none of these external markers of success really captures what is truly unusual and inspiring about Professor West’s career. The simple if remarkable fact is that her work and her life have served as a model for a whole generation of students and aspiring academics.

The reasons for this extraordinary impact are multifaceted. In part, they relate to the originality of her scholarship. It is not simply that Professor West is widely read in numerous disciplines. She has brought her knowledge to bear on legal problems in ways that are wholly unique. For example, only Professor West could have imagined that the works of Richard Posner might profitably be compared to the works of Franz Kafka and that important insights into the law and economics movement and, indeed, into the nature of free choice, might be derived from the comparison.

The reasons also relate to the unusual fusion of abstract rigor with strikingly honest and apt personal insights drawn from Professor West’s own experiences. Mediation between the personal and the professional—between abstraction and specificity—is one of the central problems addressed by modern feminism. Professor West’s scholarship is unusually successful not merely in discussing this mediation, but in actually accomplishing it.

Most of all, Professor West’s influence derives from the fact that her ideas form a coherent part of her life story. Indeed, her career itself encapsulates the successful melding of the professional and the personal. Professor West did not attend a fancy law school and holds no graduate degrees outside of the field of law. She did not serve in a prestigious clerkship or work as an associate in a high-priced Wall Street firm. In an environment where success is increasingly built upon influence and credentials, she has made her career without either. Instead she has gained respect the old fashioned way—through persistence, creativity, and the sheer force of her ideas.

On a personal level, Robin West is quiet, modest, even a shade retiring. Yet when Professor West does begin to speak she immediately commands attention. Her thoughts are invariably perfectly organized, lucid, powerfully expressed, and carefully constructed. There is no one who can get to the heart of the matter—no one who can express what is really at stake—more directly and forcefully.

In short, Professor West’s very career embodies the ideals of empathy, creativity, and anti-subordination that are the subject matter of her work. Her work and her life demonstrate how powerful those ideals can be.

*By Louis Michael Seidman*
Wendy Williams

WHEN SHE WAS A LITTLE GIRL, HER MOTHER PUT NOTES UNDER HER PILLOW TELLING HER THAT WOMEN COULD BE anything they desired. She was the eldest of seven children in a rural mountain community in northern California and, during those days, young girls were not supposed to grow up to have intellectual lives, filled with commitment, influence, and manifest contributions to society. But that is exactly how Wendy Webster Williams did grow up, and she has become one of the nation's greatest thinkers, teachers, and advocates on the equality of women and the role of the family.

As a young law student at the University of California at Berkeley in the early 1960s, she never forgot her mother's message. This was a time of deep social unrest, a time of the civil rights movement, protest against the Vietnam War, and student deaths at Kent State University; and Professor Williams recalls that she was always at student protests and that is probably when she developed her ideas for social change.

When she entered law school (at Berkeley's Boalt Hall) only about one-tenth of her class were women. Herma Kay, then a young law professor and now Boalt Hall's dean, became Wendy's mentor. Kay called women students together to discuss their status. "Changes need to be made," Kay said. "Barriers need to be dismantled." Wendy helped form the Boalt Hall Women's Association and sought interviews for law firms known for refusing to hire women. Professor Williams recalls one such interview, during which a partner was so furious he shook his fist at her. After that experience, she brought an EEOC claim of discrimination. The case was settled, and the law firm agreed to hire women.

Professor Williams went on to clerk for Justice Peters on the California Supreme Court. There, she heard that the Justices were planning not to hear what she regarded as an important case involving a state statute that prohibited the hiring of women as bartenders. She wrote a memorandum for her judge that ultimately convinced the Court to hear the case. In the opinion that resulted, the California Supreme Court became the first court to hold that sex, like race, was a suspect classification. A few months later, in Reed v. Reed, 404 U.S. 71 (1971), the U.S. Supreme Court for the first time invalidated a gender classification.

When Professor Williams finished her clerkship for Justice Peters, she became a Reginald Heber Smith Poverty Law Fellow. This program was part of Lyndon Johnson's plan to train an elite corps of attorneys to work on behalf of the nation's poor by pursuing law reform litigation. After her fellowship, she co-founded and practiced law with Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest law firm dedicated to women's rights and gender equality. ERA recently celebrated its 25th anniversary. During her years in practice, Professor Williams became very interested in gender discrimination based on pregnancy. As a professor at Georgetown University Law Center, she helped draft both the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, which defined sex discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act to include pregnancy, and the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Over the years, Professor Williams' scholarship has reflected her deep interest in issues of gender equality, especially those involving pregnancy and parenthood of employed parents. She is a co-author of a casebook, Sex Discrimination and the Law: History, Practice, and Theory, with Barbara Babcock (1996). De l'Exclusion à l'intégration: législation proactive et affirmative action, in Difference Sexes at Protection Social, Leona Auslander et Michelle Zancarini-Fournel, eds. (1996).

By Lawrence Gossin
Frances DeLaurentis

PROFESSOR DELAURENTIS STUDENTS SAY THAT SHE IS A TOUGH, FAIR, AND CONSISTENT PROFESSOR. ONE STUDENT COMPARED her to college basketball coach Bobby Knight (intended as a complimentary comparison, for those readers who might not be Hoosier fans), who has been described as “his own man, one who represents high principles, expectations, and demands, for his players, his coaching staff, and, most of all, himself.” Professor DeLaurentis sets similarly high expectations for her students, her law fellows, and herself in connection with her first-year legal research and writing class at the Law Center. She demonstrates a genuine compassion for her students and is truly interested in what they have to say, both in class and in their written projects.

Before joining the world of academia in 1996, Professor DeLaurentis spent 10 years with the Washington, D.C., firm of Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson & Hand, representing clients in a variety of commercial litigation matters. Recognized by her colleagues for her strong research and writing abilities as well as for her diligence and thoroughness, DeLaurentis gained a breadth of experience in all aspects of litigation and corporate investigations. She served on Verner, Liipfert’s hiring committee and acted as co-chair of the firm’s summer associate program, setting up training and mentoring programs for junior associates. She also was appointed as the firm’s sexual harassment ombudsman, running a collaborative educational program designed to raise awareness of and prevent sexual harassment in the workplace.

When she was named a partner at Verner, Liipfert in 1994, the news of her accomplishment was met with tears from her eldest daughter. Apparently, the partner with whom Professor DeLaurentis had worked for several years was a balding gentleman, and DeLaurentis’s daughter was convinced that DeLaurentis would lose all of her hair once she too became a partner. (Happily, her daughter’s fears were unwarranted.)

After two years as a partner at the firm, Professor DeLaurentis decided to pursue her interest in teaching, which had developed over her years of working with junior attorneys in practice. Teaching legal research and writing appealed to her desire to combine her interest in the law with the challenge of introducing first-year law students to the field of legal discourse. Professor DeLaurentis joined the faculty of the lawyering skills program at the Catholic University School of Law in 1996, and became an associate professor of legal research and writing at Georgetown in July of 1999.

Professor DeLaurentis has expressed great excitement about the opportunities and challenges presented by the legal research and writing program, stating, “It’s such a pleasure to be working with Georgetown’s talented students and outstanding faculty.” She is also looking forward to pursuing her interest in scholarly writing as a member of the Law Center faculty.

Professor DeLaurentis’s goal for both herself and her students is to continually seek improvement as professionals and as individuals. She strives to instill in her students the concept that being a good lawyer means more than simply demonstrating competence in one’s ability to research, analyze, and write about the law; one must also act ethically and civilly both within the profession and in one’s personal life. “If you’re going to do something,” she says, “do it right.” Sounds like something Bobby Knight might say, doesn’t it?

By Jill Ramsfield
Diana Donahoe

Professor Donahoe had an early introduction to the law. Her father has been a state court judge in New York since she was in high school and, prior to that, served as a district attorney. Her father's work as a prosecutor sparked Professor Donahoe's interest in criminal law, however, she was drawn to defense work. She asserts that criminal defense work, more than any other discipline, forces lawyers to confront real world realities and differences. She especially liked the idea of helping people who often grew up under very different circumstances than she did.

She attended law school at Georgetown where she graduated magna cum laude. After law school she assumed she would become a public defender. But a stint working as a Prettyman Fellow for the Criminal Justice Clinic made her realize that she loved teaching more than court experience. When opening an office on the Georgetown Legal Research and Writing faculty came to her attention, she eagerly applied.

Professor Donahoe has found working with students extremely satisfying. She especially appreciates the ability to emphasize her specialty in criminal law while teaching students the intricacies of legal research and writing. Her appellate brief writing exercise always focuses on a criminal case. And she attempts to bring the realities of criminal law to her classroom. She frequently presents her students with live "clients"—student actors she has recruited—whom her students can interview in preparation for a writing project. She also attempts to give her students as much exposure as she can to the kind of work they will be called upon to do in legal practice, often providing them with samples of professional legal writing.

Apparently these techniques are paying off. Professor Donahoe consistently receives very high praise from her students. A colleague describes her as "so organized and aware of what students want—they simply love her." Her work as a consultant to D.C. area law firms is a testament to her reputation as an excellent legal writing teacher. She is often called upon by local law firms to teach young associates how to improve their writing skills.

Professor Donahoe has brought her interest in criminal defense to bear in her legal scholarship. In a 1997 article for the American Criminal Law Review—"Could Have, Would Have," What the Supreme Court Should Have Done in Whren v. United States—she argued for an alternative test for evaluating pretextual stops of criminal suspects and recommended that most "pretext" crimes that are infrequently enforced be eliminated from criminal statutes.

In an upcoming article, Professor Donahoe takes a respite from criminal law to research the role of technology in legal research and writing pedagogy. In particular, she examines the legal research resources available on the Internet and assesses the impact they should have on pedagogy. She expects to conclude that technology-based search tools and resources should have more impact in advanced legal writing courses.

Professor Donahoe clearly enjoys teaching and writing at Georgetown and is quite successful at it. Her two young children compete for her time, as does a keen interest in hiking and rugby. During her days playing rugby at Williams College, she was the "hooker"—the typically small person who is hoisted by other players in a "scrum down" to hook the ball for her team. At Georgetown, she is an integral member of our team.

By Sherryll Gasbin
Craig Hoffman

Craig Hoffman, with a doctorate in linguistics and postdoctoral work at Texas, followed by a fellowship at Texas's Graduate School of Business and then law school, was launched into legal writing by his outside work while a law student at Texas. Like the Georgetown students who benefit from opportunities to work with federal agencies, Craig was able to work for two years with the Texas attorney general's office. There, under four lawyers responsible for writing the opinions of the attorney general, Craig learned rafts of Texas law but more, "that's where I learned to write." Whether or not he was helped by his doctorate on "Prepositional Phrases in English," the challenge of that job, the example of what his "bosses" were turning out, and the remarkable teacher-student ratio of 4:1, made him a writer and a person dedicated to teaching others to be the best lawyers they can be, by being the best legal writers they can be. He's been at Georgetown since 1994, after practice here and in Austin. In addition to his Texas law degree, he holds a Ph.D. from Connecticut and an A.B. from the College of William & Mary.

Of course, Hoffman hopes that his students, by writing better and appreciating better writing, will not stop with law. The natural assumption about a person involved with writing is that literature is their passion.

Craig, for all he does in literature, is passionate about Asian art. Because he was so conscious of what he calls the "Western knowledge gap," he started into Asian art at our Sackler and Freer Galleries; he now chairs their membership committee. That interest has led to travel in Thailand, Cambodia, India, and Iran. Craig's steadily growing knowledge of the diversity of Asian art has led to deeper understanding and best of all, to fuller appreciation of the beauty of the art and of the cultures that produced it.

That appreciation of diversity in art coincides with his appreciation of the diversity among Georgetown students. While he always applauded diversity, he has been surprised at how much he finds it adds to his own and his students' growth. He has been struck by how well people of all types work together here, and how often he sees ways in which our students enjoy an intangible, indispensable strength that will serve them wherever they go next.

By Roy Schotland
Kristen Robbins

LURED FROM THE COURTROOM TO THE CLASSROOM BY THE EXCITEMENT OF THE ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT AND THE THRILL of being with students, Professor Kristen Robbins has earned a reputation as a demanding, but fair, teacher. She challenges her students to master the fundamental disciplines of legal research, writing, and analysis. A litigator in practice, Robbins approaches each class as she did each case: with methodical preparation, meticulous organization, and courtroom demeanor. In fact, she describes her teaching style as that of a litigator in a classroom. She is formal, attentive, and responsive; she demonstrates a mastery of her subject and an ability to impart her knowledge to others. She is a good listener and students appreciate how well she responds to their questions. Students quickly realize that the intense classroom professor is very approachable and engaging outside of the classroom.

Prior to joining the faculty at the Law Center in 1994, Robbins was a litigator at Kirkland & Ellis in Washington, D.C., for seven years. Her practice encompassed diverse areas of commercial litigation, including product liability and copyright infringement. While practicing, she was an adjunct professor of legal research and writing at George Washington University National Law Center. It was her experience as an adjunct that led her to pursue teaching as a career.

Robbins describes her classroom as very practically oriented. Yet, she values the theoretical underpinnings of legal writing and analysis. Her interest in both the theoretical basis and practical usage of law is demonstrated by her ongoing scholarship. Professor Robbins is working on two publications which address legal writing and analysis from the perspective of the federal judiciary and through the lens of classical rhetoric. The first article addresses the question of audience in the legal discourse community. Using a questionnaire sent to the federal judiciary asking judges to evaluate different aspects of persuasive writing, Professor Robbins intends to provide students and scholars with a deeper understanding of how one audience views legal writing. She wants to provide practical, empirical data to support the methods employed in teaching legal writing.

In her other article, Robbins evaluates recurring problems in student writing in classical rhetorical terms. She attributes much of the poor quality of legal writing to ineffective reasoning and analysis. Too often students make arguments without an understanding of the elements of argument. She believes that an understanding of the elements of classical rhetoric will enable students to reason more effectively and draft more persuasive documents. Through her scholarship, Professor Robbins hopes to demonstrate that one can improve one’s legal writing and analysis through an appreciation of the practical needs of audience and an understanding of the theoretical basis for argument.

When not challenging her students, Professor Robbins is challenging herself. Now a brown belt in Tae Kwon Do, Professor Robbins is aiming for her black belt. When not cracking the books, Professor Robbins is cracking wood with her bare feet. While students need not fear her classroom demeanor, her lethal kicks are another matter.

By Frances DeLaurentis
Julie Ross

From Hollywood to Georgetown, Julie Ross has starred in numerous roles throughout the country. To each role, she has brought a keen intellect, a dynamic personality, and a caring heart. As a professor of legal research and writing, she challenges her first-year students to strive for the highest quality work and professionalism—goals that Professor Ross attained in her legal practice and which continue to guide her in academia.

Before entering the world of academia in 1998, Professor Ross spent nine years as a member of the Los Angeles law firm of Gibson, Hoffman & Pancione, representing high-profile clients from within the entertainment industry. Her first court appearance, a mere two months after joining the firm, was representing Chevy Chase. She went on to represent other stars such as Frank Sinatra and Nancy Sinatra, media entities such as The Los Vegas Sun and UPN, and film companies including the producers of “Natural Born Killers” and the distributor of “The Blair Witch Project.” Experienced in all aspects of litigation, Professor Ross flourished in the role of appellate litigator. She wrote a successful petition for Certiorari and brief on the merits before the United States Supreme Court in a copyright dispute between her client, the lead singer for Creedence Clearwater Revival, and his former record company. She became a partner in 1995 and, in recognition of her strong leadership abilities, was elected to serve on the firm’s management committee, where she helped direct the future growth and development of the firm.

As a Los Angeles litigator in the 1990s, it seems only fitting that Professor Ross had a role, albeit small, in the O.J. Simpson trial. She made a court appearance during the trial and has a protective order signed by Judge Ito. Johnny Cochran, and Julie Ross.

A 1996 move back to the East Coast cast Professor Ross in a novel and innovative role: a coast-to-coast telecommuting lawyer. From Maryland, Julie continued to craft persuasive arguments, draft appellate briefs, and counsel clients on the West Coast. What began as a transition developed into a successful telework relationship.

Professor Ross continues to straddle the worlds of private practice and academia as of-counsel to Gibson, Hoffman & Pancione. It is easy to see why her class is a delicate mix of theoretical basis and practical application. Professor Ross believes it is important that her students understand the theory behind what they are learning and the future application of such material in their professional lives. A collaborative, approachable teacher, Professor Ross wants her students to leave her class with an understanding of the conventions of legal research and writing, the confidence to tackle independently any legal problem, and a respect for other members of the legal profession.

As a litigator in Los Angeles and a law clerk to the Honorable H. Lee Sarokin, United States District Judge, Newark, New Jersey, Professor Ross had the opportunity to see a wide range of competence and professionalism among attorneys. As a teacher, she values her role in educating and inspiring a future generation of lawyers to be more competent, professional, and civil to one another. The lines of students outside her door and the enthusiastic reception Professor Ross receives from her returning students are telltale signs that students value her role, her competence, her professionalism, and her civility.

By Frances DeLaurentis
Graduates of the Law Center class of 1999 assemble for the processional outside Healy Hall on Georgetown University's Main Campus.
The Law Center is located near Union Station and Capitol Hill at 600 New Jersey Avenue, NW.

**By Metro:**
The Law Center is easily accessible by Metro, the subway system of the Washington area. Take the Red Line to Union Station and exit onto Massachusetts Avenue. Turn right on Massachusetts Avenue and walk two blocks to the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and New Jersey Avenue. Turn left on New Jersey Avenue. The Law Center will be on your right. To reach the Gewirz Student Center, make your first right onto F Street. You may also take the Metro to Judiciary Square and walk two blocks on E Street to 2nd Street.

**By Car:**
From northern and eastern Maryland: take the Beltway (I-95/95) to the Baltimore Washington Parkway. Exit south onto the Parkway towards Washington. The Parkway will split at Rt. 295. Follow the signs that say Downtown, not Rt. 295 (you will bear right). The Parkway will end on New York Avenue. Take New York Avenue for approximately 2 miles. Turn left onto North Capitol Street. Follow North Capitol for approximately 4 blocks and turn right on H Street, NW. At your first stop light, turn left onto New Jersey Avenue. The Law Center will be on the block ahead on your right.

**From Montgomery County and all points west:** take the Beltway (I-495) to the George Washington Memorial Parkway towards Washington, DC. Follow the Parkway for approximately 9 miles. Exit onto I-395 North and follow the directions below.

**From Virginia:** take I-395 (Shirley Highway) north towards Washington. Cross over the 14th Street Bridge. Bear right at the end of the bridge and continue on 395. Take the exit for D Street/ U.S. Senate (you will go into a tunnel). Make your first right in the tunnel to the D Street exit. The exit ramp will lead you onto 2nd St. NW. Proceed two blocks. The Law Center will be on your right.

**Parking:**
Parking is available in outdoor lots next to the Law Center. The cost is approximately $7 for the day. Limited metered parking is also available on the streets surrounding the Law Center at $0.25 per 20-30 minutes.

**Accommodations:**
There are several hotels within walking distance of the Law Center, such as the Phoenix Park Hotel at 520 North Capitol Street, NW. Please call the hotel directly for rates and room availability.
Just three blocks from the U.S. Capitol, Georgetown University Law Center includes three buildings: (right to left) Edward Bennett Williams Law Library, one of the nation's foremost law libraries; Bernard Patrick McDonough Hall with modern classrooms, faculty offices, and administrative offices; and the Bernard and Sarah Gewirz Student Center, a residence hall housing 290 first-year students, a fitness center, and a child-care center.