

**CLINICAL EDUCATION CHANGING THE WORLD AND
THE WORLD CHANGING CLINICAL EDUCATION:
THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE EDUCATION**

Clark D. Cunningham W. Lee Burge Professor of Law & Ethics,
Georgia State University College of Law
140 Decatur Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303 U.S.A Email: cdcunningham@gsu.edu
Home Page: <http://law.gsu.edu/ccunningham/>

Presented Thursday, July 14, 2005
at

***Flowers in the Desert: Clinical Legal Education,
Ethical Awareness and Community Service***
The Australian Clinical Education Association &
The International Journal of Clinical Legal Education

On September 4, 1996 21 law teachers, lawyers, and judges from 11 different countries met at the Centre for Legal Education in Sydney, Australia to discuss the creation of an international organization for “the advancement of socially relevant legal education.” As a result of that meeting, the Global Alliance for Justice Education (GAJE) was formed in 1997. This remarkable organization has now held three world conferences – in India (1999), South Africa (2001) and Poland (2004) – attended by law teachers, lawyers, judges, law students, and community activists committed to promoting justice through education. Fifty-three different countries – from every inhabited continent – have been represented at one or more of these conferences. GAJE provides a free “electronic bulletin board” through an email list serve, as well as a web site and bi-monthly electronic newsletter. Membership in GAJE is free and hundreds of people from countries in the developing world have received GAJE scholarships to cover all their costs to attend the world conferences. GAJE has accomplished all of this without any paid staff, any regular funding source, or even a physical office.

This paper is a small beginning to what I hope will become a project with many authors: to write the history of GAJE and document its contributions to the improvement of legal education and the promotion of justice. I begin with an historical account of the formation of GAJE using primarily previously unpublished documents and personal recollection. I then conclude with two examples of what I mean when I suggest in my title that through the work of GAJE clinical education is “changing the world” and also “the world” is changing clinical education.

The Birth of GAJE

Two Meetings Lay the Groundwork

Two international meetings of clinical law teachers that took place in the year preceding the gathering in Sydney helped create the momentum for that event. The first was a three-week course on clinical teaching that was organized by the National Law School of India under the direction of its founding Director, Dr. N.R. Madhava Menon in November 1995. The course was taken by about 25 law teachers and lawyers from south Asia and had an international faculty which included Marlene LeBrun (then a law teacher at Griffiths University in Australia, myself (then a clinical teacher at Washington University in the US),

Frank Bloch (then director of clinical education at Vanderbilt University in the US), Mizanur Rahman (then a law teacher at Dhaka University in Bangladesh), Jane Schukoske (then a clinical teacher at the University of Baltimore in the US, en route at the time to a Fulbright Teaching fellowship in Sri Lanka), Kenneth Gallant (then director of clinical education at the University of Idaho in the US, at the time a Fulbright Teaching fellow at the National Law School of India), and Roger Burrige (then a law teacher at Warwick University in England). Although this group of teachers collectively shared decades of experience in clinical education, we all agreed that the course at the National Law School was an exciting venture different than anything we had previously known in several respects:

- 1) The participants were neither entry-level law teachers hired specifically to do clinical teaching nor clinical specialists but were mostly conventional law teachers – generally senior members of law faculties, including a number of deans, who were eager to learn about this new mode of legal education. Some participants were not academics but rather senior members of the profession. For example, several members of the Bar Council of Bangladesh participated.
- 2) The course was a very serious study of clinical teaching methodology that lasted three weeks. By way of contrast, workshops on clinical pedagogy for new law teachers in the US typically are a day long and clinical education conferences in the US rarely last more than five days.
- 3) The course was an opportunity for experienced teachers from different countries to learn from each other and in turn to offer to participants information about clinical teaching that was broader than any one country's experience.

At the time of the course in India, I had already been appointed to the planning committee for the 1996 clinical education conference sponsored by the Association of American Law Schools (AALS). The title of the conference was “ Expanding the Frame: Crossing the Border to Other Countries and Disciplines,” and was described in AALS publications as follows:

“This is the 19th annual conference or workshop on clinical legal education sponsored by the AALS. Over the years the conferences have grown in popularity and complexity, and this Conference continues that trend. With this Conference, as the title suggests, we are expanding our frames of reference. For the first time we will have the opportunity to learn from and with a significant number of clinical law teachers from outside of North America as well as the opportunity to learn from people from disciplines other than law such as medicine and social work.”

Inspired by Dr. Menon's vision, both for legal education at the National Law School and on a global scale, I succeeded in arranging for him to be the keynote speaker at the AALS conference. I also secured a small grant from Ford Foundation-India for several of the participants in the course to attend the AALS conference and then visit a number of US law schools to observe American clinics in operation and to set up potential partner relationships between law schools in India and the US.

The AALS clinical conference, held in Miami, Florida in May 1996, had the largest attendance of any conference in the history of the AALS (apart from the annual AALS membership meetings). Over 15 law teachers from outside United States attended, leading a number of workshops.

Menon opened the conference at a plenary session address in which he described the innovative curriculum at the National Law School of India as fulfilling a mandate to provide

“a socially relevant scheme of legal education.” He also distributed a more detailed paper entitled: *In Defense of Socially Relevant Legal Education*. The paper concluded with these words:

“Many law teachers seem to think that these activities which the National Law School has taken up in the last five years do not fall within the domain of legal education and law schools generally are ill-equipped for these tasks. They are certainly right in their assessment of the equipment (and perhaps the commitment) of the average law school to discharge responsibly social justice programmes of wider import. But the tragedy of legal education is that without such involvement, law schools will remain isolated and alienated from the people and legal education will lose its potential to engineer social justice particularly through its consumers who are eventually to become the actors of the legal system. If the rule of law is to be part of democratic culture and if human rights are to be respected in governance, there is no alternative except to inform and illuminate legal education with social values drawn from the people for whom the laws are made. The days of lawyers being mere craftsmen, and judges only umpires in adjudication, are fast disappearing and systems of accountability are developing within the legal system and outside. The function of legal education is to enable people to respond to these challenges with a sense of commitment to the struggle for human rights and a feeling for suffering of people everywhere.”

Five of the international participants were from Australia. Les McCrimmon, clinical education director at the University of Sydney, organized an informal breakfast meeting between myself and the other Australian representatives at the conference -- Adrian Evans, Andrew Goldsmith, and Neville Carter. The consensus of this discussion was that the AALS conference showed the value and need for international meetings to promote information sharing and collaboration on issues relating to clinical education; This particular meeting also demonstrated the many problems with having such meetings hosted in a “usual suspect” location such as the United States or Western Europe: high costs of hotel and food, high registration fees, and the dominance of persons from affluent countries as both speakers and participants. We noted that the money spent to bring a participant from a less-affluent country to such a conference would have gone a long way to fund the start-up of a clinical program in that country. Symbolic of these concerns was the fact that our very meeting was taking place at the only place serving breakfast at the conference hotel and the minimum price for breakfast was \$13.

This informal breakfast discussion led to a follow-up lunch meeting as the AALS conference concluded that brought together persons interested in the concept of an international organization. Present at the follow-up meeting were Menon, McCrimmon, Evans, Bloch, Goldsmith, myself, as well as Neil Gold (then dean of the University of Windsor Law School in Canada—now Provost), Alan Treleaven (director of education and practice, Law Society of British Columbia, Canada), Martin Bohmer (founder of the clinical program at Palermo Law School in Argentina), and Iqbal Ishar (deputy director of the Global Law School program at New York University Law School, formerly on the law faculty of Delhi University). The Sydney working party meeting was a direct result of this discussion. Sydney was selected as the location to take advantage of the fact that a number of possible participants would be there the following September attending an international legal education conference sponsored by the Australasian Professional Legal

Education Council (APLEC). It was agreed that a top priority was to make the meeting as “global” as possible by including persons from less-affluent countries and to raise funds to subsidize their costs of coming to Sydney.

Obtaining Help from the Ford Foundation

Menon stayed in the US for two months after the AALS conference to co-teach a course on comparative constitutional law with me at Washington University. On June 12 a letter signed by Menon, Frank Bloch and myself was sent to Mary McClymont, senior director for Peace and Social Justice, at the headquarters of the Ford Foundation in New York City. Taking its inspiration from Menon’s speech to the AALS conference, the letter requested a meeting to discuss the formation of an ‘International Council for the Advancement of Socially Relevant Legal Education.’ In relevant part the letter explained:

“[T]he Ford Foundation played a key role in the development of clinical legal education in United States through its funding of the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR) in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s. CLEPR provided financial and other support for law school clinical programs around the country, usually on a matching basis over a period of years with a declining percentage share paid by CLEPR. Although they covered a wide range of program needs CLEPR grants were always aimed at encouraging law schools to provide serious professional responsibility education through permanent institutional support for clinical programs. CLEPR’s ambitions were not modest, and they have been achieved to a considerable extent in United States. Today clinical legal education needs the same type of support worldwide. ... [T]here is no organization currently in existence that is functioning on a truly international level to exchange information, coordinate programs, and provide funding for ways of reforming legal education that would include but also go beyond clinical teaching methods as developed in United States. A new Council for the Advancement of Socially Relevant Legal Education would support the goal of promoting socially relevant legal education in a number of different ways: as a clearinghouse and seed money source for cross-national projects; by funding and supporting new and innovative educational programs in countries where there is as yet little or no clinical legal education; and by sponsoring world congresses on legal education reform with human rights and social justice as a major focus.”

McClymont agreed to set up a meeting at the Ford Foundation on July 10 and we sent a follow-up letter on June 20 providing greater detail about plans to create an international organization.

“In the very short term we hope to organize a two-day meeting the first week of September in Sydney, Australia to bring together legal educators from around the world to comprise a working group for development of the International Council. ... We anticipate that educators from many Asian, African, and Latin American countries will not be able to afford the cost of travel to this meeting without financial assistance. We want to avoid the risk that the working group would be dominated by representatives from relatively affluent countries like the US, Australia, Canada and the UK. Therefore, one topic we want to

discuss with you is the availability of discretionary funds either at your central office or in country-based offices that could support attendance at this meeting. We also would appreciate the assistance of you and your program officers in identifying institutions and specific individuals to recruit for participation.”

On July 10 we had a productive meeting with McClymont and Gowher Rizvi, who directed the Asia Program at Ford. Although they were not willing to provide funding out of the Ford Foundation headquarters, McClymont encouraged us to write to a number of regional Ford offices for support, authorizing us to say that she had suggested we contact them. By July 19 a letter had been composed to be sent by Menon, myself and Les McCrimmon. The opening paragraph of this letter stated: “We are writing to you at the suggestion of Mary McClymont regarding a meeting of lawyers and legal educators in Sydney, Australia on September 3 to discuss ways to promote international cooperation for the reform of legal education. We hope this meeting will be an important step toward the creation of an International Council for the Advancement of Socially Relevant Legal Education.” The next few paragraphs were similar in content to the first letter sent to McClymont. The letter ended with these words:

“We hope that you can assist us in two ways. First, we would appreciate your sending us the names of one or two lawyers or legal educators in your country who might be the most appropriate representatives to attend meeting. Second, we hope that you might be able to provide financial support, if needed, to persons from your country interested in attending. The Law Foundation of New South Wales has approved a small grant to assist with costs of international travel to attend the September 3 meeting, but additional funding will be needed to assure that persons from less affluent institutions and countries are represented. We would like to finalize the list of participants by August 12; therefore we are asking persons interested in participating in the meeting to send Les McCrimmon a one-page biographical statement in a one-page memo briefly summarizing (1) the current state in their country of clinical legal education and other innovations toward socially relevant legal education, (2) the direction in which that person would like to see legal education development, and (3) what roles and international organization could serve in support of such developments.”

This letter was e-mailed and faxed to Ford Foundation officials around the world. One sample of resulting correspondence, with the Ford representative for the “Southern Cone” of South America, is described in detail below in the section on “Clinical Education Changing the World.” Ultimately Ford regional offices funded six persons to come to Sydney, from Argentina, Bangladesh, India, Nigeria, and South Africa. Most of the other persons who attended the meeting were also participating in the APLEC conference.

The Working Party Meeting in Sydney

21 people from 11 countries participated in the working party meeting. Two were judges, two were lawyers working at NGO’s, and the rest were law teachers.

There was considerable discussion of the phrase ‘socially relevant legal education.’ A number of participants expressed views that alternative phrases should be used in the title of the organization, but there was a general consensus that the themes of justice, social reform, and benefit to the society should be central to the goals of the organization.

Participants listed a wide variety of educational activities that they would like to see promoted by the international organization. The types of activities listed went well beyond traditional models of clinical education, both in types of education offered to law students and by including educational activities directed at other groups such as the lay public, practicing lawyers, NGO's, and judges.

Three different models for the possible structure of the organization were suggested: 1) regional representation with subcommittees to deal with specific topics; 2) an organization of national organizations; and 3) individual membership including both organizations and individuals. The majority of the participants favored an individual membership model with a flat structure and a widely inclusive membership open to groups other than law teachers such as law students, practitioners, judges, NGO's and interested non-lawyers. It was agreed that a conference to launch the organization should be a low-cost operation for the majority of the participants, and in particular for those from developing countries.

GAJE is Born

The participants agreed to share these discussions with colleagues when they returned home. Gary Blasi, a law professor from UCLA, volunteered to set up an e-mail listserve. After considerable discussion through various modes of communication, in April 1997 a memo was circulated by e-mail among those persons who had shown continuing interest in the formation of an international organization, and consensus was reached on the following points. GAJE, one of several possible names floated in Sydney, was selected as the name for the organization. The following mission statement was adopted:

“GAJE is GLOBAL, seeking to involve persons from as many countries in the world as possible, avoiding domination by any single country, and especially committed to meaningful participation from less affluent countries, institutions, and organizations. GAJE is an ALLIANCE of persons committed to achieving JUSTICE through legal education. Clinical education of law students is a key component of justice education, but this organization also works to advance other forms of socially relevant legal education, which includes education of practicing lawyers, judges, non-governmental organizations and the lay public.”

Three goals were articulated: (1) a global conference and a low-cost location (particularly for persons from developing countries) would be convened by the end of 1999; (2) GAJE would receive and administer funds to support the development of innovative justice education, especially less affluent countries; (3) the organization would serve as a clearinghouse of teaching methods and materials. Membership was established on an individual basis and was not limited to professional legal educators. No membership fee was required initially, and membership in GAJE continues to be free and open to anyone “interested in promoting justice education.” 11 people agreed to serve on a temporary steering committee with the understanding that a permanent steering committee would be elected at the first global conference.

The inaugural GAJE conference was indeed held before the end of 1999, taking place from December 8-17, 1999 in the city of Trivandrum in south India. It was a spectacular event, attended by 125 persons from 20 different countries. A majority of delegates were from the developing world and a majority were women. At a gala opening session, the delegates were welcomed by the Governor of the State of Kerala, by the president of the Bar Association of India, and by retired Indian Supreme Court Justice Krishna Iyer, revered throughout India for his courageous advocacy of human rights.

A detailed report on the inaugural GAJE conference is available on the GAJE web site. I end my brief history of GAJE at this point in the hope that the many others who have done so much to move GAJE forward since 1997 will contribute to completing this history. I conclude with two of what are many possible examples of how GAJE has been making a difference with few resources other than the dedication, energy and imagination of its members.

Clinical Education Changing the World: **Public Interest Clinics in Argentina**

On the fourth day of the 1996 AALS conference a session entitled “The Justice Mission of Law School Clinics: a Cross National Perspective” was organized by Frank Bloch, Martin Bohmer, and Iqbal Ishar. The central question to be addressed was “ Can a social justice agenda be integrated successfully into a skills and professionalism clinical curriculum?” In 1995 Bohmer and group of young lawyers at the University of Palermo founded Argentina’s first university legal clinic that actively sought out precedent-setting civil rights cases. In the written synopsis prepared for the AALS session, Bohmer provided the following description of the state of legal education in Argentina:

“Legal education in Argentina is framed by the nature of Argentina’s legal culture. ... Within Argentina’s civil law tradition .. the judiciary simply applies the law ... [T]he law is not to be adjudicated; to know the law is to know the code, by heart, if possible. Consistent with this model, law schools do not have full-time law professors or extensive law libraries, nor do they provide students opportunities to learn through discussion of ideas or principles. Students are simply taught the code; they read the codes and the professor’s handbook; they learn the law, no more no less. Public interest advocacy in Argentina is tied in a similar way to local political history. During Argentina’s pre-1983 dictatorship, the judiciary, with a few notable exceptions, was either aligned with or frightened of the military, and therefore was not the forum to approach for relief; the law was not a very useful tool to change the course of the Argentine nightmare. ... The judiciary is still regarded by many as an accomplice to the old order and change is not expected to come from the bench. Moreover, the profession has failed to take up the cause of law reform. During [the] dictatorship, the few courageous members of the bar who dared to represent the “disappeared” became themselves “disappeared”; they were seen almost as outcasts by most of their colleagues. The net result is that public interest advocacy through law barely exists in Argentina; a public interest commitment is alien to its dogmatic legal tradition and outside the current culture of the profession.”

It is important to keep this description in mind as a baseline to against which to measure the pace and extent of change in legal education in Argentina since 1996.

Following the July 10, 1996 meeting with Ford Foundation officials in New York described above, one of the letters requesting help in organizing the Sydney meeting was sent to Alexander Wilde, head of the Ford Foundation office for the “Southern Cone” of South America. On July 30 Alexander Wilde sent the following response by e-mail.

“Your proposal for a new Council for the Advancement of Socially Relevant Legal Education seems opportune. However, although this office of the Ford foundation supports work in Human Rights and in Democratic Governance, we do not have any program concerned with reform of legal education per se. ... [O]ur small office does not work with the legal profession as such in any of the countries of the Andean Area or Southern Cone. We do have an interest in one specific related matter cooperation between NGO’s and university based programs in advocacy and litigation. ...[I]f that subject would be addressed in your meeting agenda .. we might be able to consider modest support for travel for one or two participants from our region. ... Thank you for informing us about this promising undertaking.”

On July 31 I replied, indicating that encouraging law schools to develop relationships with NGO’s to develop new forms of legal services to low-income and oppressed groups would be a very high priority for the planned organization and mentioned that Bohmer was a member of our planning group. Wilde responded on August 2 saying that he had been in direct contact with Bohmer and that Ford would support his participation in the Sydney planning meeting. He went on to say that “ Bohmer will meet with interested individuals and institutions here in Chile and in Argentina upon his return, to convey the substance of the meeting and explore possible future collaboration in this field.”

Upon returning from Sydney, Bohmer submitted a positive report on the meeting to the Ford Foundation, and a few months later, in December 1996, Ford funded the creation of a network of eight university clinics on public interest law in Argentina, Chile and Peru. Law teachers from these clinics, as well as a significant number of students, met in Buenos Aires in December 1997 for the first of what has become an annual international meeting of these clinics. I attended the meeting and was particularly impressed by the student presentations about ambitious public interest cases that their clinics were currently litigating. It was thrilling to observe students from different countries brainstorming with each other about similar strategies to to address comparable problems.

While in Argentina for the conference, I visited Bohmer’s law school and observed a meeting of his clinic students. One of the students at that meeting was Mariela Puga, who later joined the staff of the Public Interest Law Clinic at Palermo, and attended the 2001 GAJE conference in South Africa as its representative. In September 2003 she went to the National University of Tucuman in northwest Argentina to found the first clinical course in Argentina officially sponsored by the law faculty of a national public university. On December 10, 2003 – the 10th anniversary of the restoration of democracy in Argentina – the clinic filed its first lawsuit, raising the issue of widespread infantile malnutrition in rural Argentina. The case was filed at 8 a.m. and by 5 p.m. the judge had issued an unprecedented mandatory injunction ordering the immediate treatment of an undernourished three-year-old girl. The case was widely reported in both the local and national media and became a leading precedent for the development of public interest law in Argentina. The Governor of the Province sent the Secretary of Human Rights to meet with the clinic and in February 2004 the provincial government launched a “Vital Plan” to address infantile malnutrition.

Most recently Puga has helped organize a committee comprised of law students, lawyers and human rights activists to submit a proposal to host the next worldwide GAJE conference in Córdoba in 2006. Cordoba is an important and prestigious center for education in Latin America. The National University of Cordoba is Argentina’s oldest university (and the second oldest in Latin America), and two out of the last four presidents of Argentina received their law degrees in Cordoba.

It appears that both legal education and legal culture in Argentina have changed significantly since Bohmer's description at the 1996 AALS conference. In a paper Bohmer presented in 2002, he provided this much more optimistic report.

"In Argentina's history, there have been many top-down approaches to legal reform which have emphasized improving legal certainty, efficiency, and transparency in the Judiciary. These attempts at reform have largely ignored Argentina's legal culture, choosing instead to rely on "trickle-down" theories which focus entirely on the government institutions which are the central actors responsible for the administration of justice.[T]he reforms which result from these incentive structures are either short-lived or cosmetic institutional alterations that only mask fundamental problems of corruption, patronage, and overall disregard for the rule of law.

Although the Palermo Group developed its access to justice initiative primarily as a means of giving impoverished and traditionally disadvantaged groups access to the legal system, their efforts produced significant systemic effects by:

- 1) creating a more proactive role for the legal profession in addressing Argentina's problems,
- 2) fostering transparency in the judicial process by increasing the ability of informal institutions to monitor and criticize the Judiciary,
- 3) structuring the demand for legal services so that the consumers of legal services have a stake in the system working well,
- 4) increasing government awareness and responsiveness to the concerns of the most impoverished and disadvantaged members of society, and
- 5) solidifying the rule of law among groups that have grown cynical towards the Judiciary.

These secondary effects can fundamentally alter the legal landscape that forms the context within which any top-down reforms of Argentina's institutions must take place."

The World Changing Clinical Education: Learning New Ideas from "Less Developed" Countries

The 1995 course on clinical teaching in India was not my first visit to the National Law School. In January 1994 I had visited at Menon's invitation to consult with the faculty on the clinical curriculum that was just then being developed. In reviewing my records from that visit, including a memo I wrote to Menon, I see that I was very focused on encouraging them to develop what at the time I considered "real clinical education," that is representation of individual clients by law students acting directly as their lawyers under faculty supervision. This kind of clinical education faced considerable obstacles in the Indian context. Not only was there nothing like a student practice rule in any Indian court but, for somewhat obscure reasons, full-time law teachers were prohibited from engaging in the practice of law themselves. In addition, India had no tradition of non-profit or government entities to provide free legal services to the indigent – e.g. legal aid offices and public defenders; indigent legal services were provided (if at all) by private attorneys

who received very modest reimbursements from the government. (Legal aid and public defender offices have generally provided the dominant models for law school clinic programs in the U.S. and many if not most American clinical teachers received their practice experience in such settings before moving to the academy.) My recommendations emphasized the need to implement student practice rules and amend the Advocates Act so that law teachers could then supervise students. I also urged that the National Law School support the creation of a legal aid type NGO whose staff attorneys could share student representation responsibilities or become adjunct faculty. In other words, I was recommending that Indian legal education become more like American legal education.

When I returned to the National Law School in 1995 I did not see my recommendations being implemented. Instead I observed and learned about student activities being called clinical education that I had never seen American law students do. For example, an entire cohort of students taking a basic criminal law course had, with the blessing of the local judges and jail authorities, gone into the huge city jail and interviewed EVERY inmate who was being held pending trial. The purpose was a combination of field education – learning about the criminal justice first hand and getting to know in person people incarcerated for suspected crimes – and pro bono legal assistance on an ambitious scale. The students focused on why each person was still in jail though not convicted. Was bail excessive? Did the inmate's family and friends know how to bond him or her out? Was trial of the case unduly delayed? In the course of these investigations, the students actually resolved a number of cases using procedures under Indian law where an accused in some cases can make restitution with the victim on his or own initiative and the victim can then cause criminal proceedings to end.

I also learned about the National Law Reform Competition initiated by the National Law School. This is an entirely voluntary extracurricular activity that in some ways resembles the familiar moot court competitions. But with what differences! To enter the Law Reform Competition, a law school puts together a sizeable team of students who must agree to spend a substantial period of time in a community that is affected by the issue which is the subject of that year's competition, e.g. gender justice, sustainable development, fair labor laws. The students' submission to the competition must show how their law reform proposal has grown out of this experience in the community and how their proposal, if adopted, would change that community for the better. The students involved in that year's competition all said that it was the highlight of their legal education. Most had never spent time in a village or other low-income community. They said the most important thing they learned was the irrelevance of the ideas they brought to the community for law reform – indeed the irrelevance of the legal categories themselves. They had expended enormous time and creative energy, without receiving any academic credit (though they had excellent faculty advising). And they had funded the modest expenses of their fieldwork themselves.

My initial approach and attitudes when I visited the National Law School in 1994 were, I think typical, of many of the American clinical teachers who have visited law schools in former Soviet republics, in Africa, and in Asia – often under the auspices of U.S. government funding. We had assumed that “clinical education” was not only a great thing for law schools everywhere, but that the best kind of clinical education was the kind practiced in the U.S. If law schools in other countries wanted to call other things “clinical education,” we were suspicious that either they did not really understand what was important about clinical education or were trying to do clinical education “on the cheap” because “real” clinics are so expensive.

I think I can speak for many Americans when I say that three GAJE conferences --- where

many of the most impressive presentations have described innovative forms of justice education that do not require a “legal aid” model of direct client representation by student lawyers --- have changed my mind. And now, a decade after that 1995 visit to the National Law School I have decided to experiment with a different form of justice education in my own teaching. For Fall 2005 I am replacing my Criminal Justice Clinic with a newly designed course I entitle: Criminal Justice Fieldwork and Law Reform. The course can be conceived as a combination of the two innovations I saw at work in the National Law School. I will spend the beginning of the semester with my students going into all the dark places of the metropolitan Atlanta criminal justice system – police stations, jails, traffic courts, misdemeanor courts, first appearance hearings: places that get very little attention in conventional legal education, places where the “law on the books” is frequently ignored. After that initial fieldwork, students will then pick law reform projects that interest them with the goal of completing some kind of work that has the potential of actually changing some aspect of the injustice they have observed.

From the earliest days of GAJE, a common refrain was that GAJE was emphatically not about what might be called an “export” model of international work --- exporting one country’s legal system and educational models to other “less developed” countries on the assumption that “we” are “helping them” by so doing. Rather GAJE is about learning from each other, inspired by the frequent experience that countries and institutions with limited financial and other material resources in fact may have some of the most exciting and thought-provoking innovations. In this way, the “world” is indeed changing clinical education.

APPENDIX

Current GAJE Steering Committee (By Region Represented)

Africa: Thulisile Mhlungu, George Mukundi

Australasia: Les McCrimmon, Vanessa Sweeney

East Asia: Mao Ling, Carlos Medina

Eastern Europe (including Russia): Filip Czernicki, Maria Kolikova

South and Central America (including Mexico): Roberto Hernandez, Eva Rodriguez

South and Central Asia (including the Mideast): Valentina Gelgorn, S. Sivakumar

North America: Frank Bloch, Catherine Klein

Western Europe: Joanne Coysh, Stephen Levett

At-large: David McQuoid-Mason, Ed Santow

COUNTRIES REPRESENTED AT ONE OR MORE GAJE CONFERENCES

Argentina

Armenia

Azerbaijan

Australia

Bangladesh

Belarus

Bosnia

Bulgaria

Cambodia

Cameroon

Canada
Chile
China
Czech Republic
El Salvador
Ethiopia
Gambia
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
Guinea
Hungary
India
Israel
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Latvia
Macedonia

Mexico
Moldova
Mongolia
Nepal
Nigeria
Pakistan
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Romania
Russia
Serbia/Montenegro
Sierra Leone
Slovakia
Spain
South Africa
Sri Lanka
Sweden
Turkey
Uganda
Ukraine
United Kingdom
United States of America
Uzbekistan
Zimbabwe

(53 countries)