derless world, crucial problems that challenge humankind cannot be solved solely by individual states. Instead, the growing trend towards internationalisation requires an ever-greater degree of international cooperation. These developments highlight the emergence of a new world reality - and a new legal reality. What will be the effect of these changes on legal education? What challenges do we as legal educators face as we try to prepare our students and our institutions to confront this changing world?

The academic reliance on the Socratic method was consistent with the 'scientific approach' to legal education where professors could direct students to analyse actual decisions in terms of doctrinal logic. This also meant that a whole array of other intangible issues relevant to practising law in an international, multicultural environment - such as the interplay of culture and nationality in legal decision making - were conspicuously absent from the academic agenda. Lawyers interacting with individuals in and from other nations must understand the interplay of culture and nationality with legal decision-making. Implicit in this is also the necessity for an understanding of the relationship between gender and the law, since concepts of gender are intricately linked to culture.

This is not to advocate a position of cultural relativism, which allows societies to make their own rules, based on culture, with respect to the rights afforded to individuals. The human dignity of men and women must be respected in every culture, but culture must be respected and understood in order to allow lawyers to communicate effectively with clients and with each other.

US law schools have long focused on a concept of diversity that is domestic in nature - ensuring that there is a more balanced representation of various minority groups found in the US population. But now there is a need for a more multinational concept of diversity. Law schools must anticipate in their own composition the composition of the world that their graduates will interact with - a world that is multinational and pluralistic.

Globalisation has created new social problems - such as increased international crime and environmental degradation from increased economic activity related to trade. It has also brought the effects of problems that were once 'far away' closer to home. For example, increased interaction among nations means that a domestic financial crisis in one country can now more easily spread to another country.

How do we address these challenges? How do we move away from a self-centred approach to legal education? How do we promote a new, international concept of diversity in our law schools? And how do we instil in our students both the ethical convictions and the means to address the social problems of our globalised world? There are differing schools of thought on these questions but none are sufficient to produce the type of fundamental changes that are necessary. Below are outlined briefly some of the strategies that may lead to such a fundamental change in legal education. These strategies are being proposed and implemented at the Washington College of Law (WCL) and other schools around the country.

The first involves creating linkages between the study of domestic and international law. We need to create such linkages because in our new global reality even 'domestic' lawyers will at some point in their careers have to address issues of international law. At WCL we have made revisions to the first year curriculum to incorporate international law issues into traditional first year 'domestic' law courses. Teaching methodologies, such as moot court competitions, which have been traditionally used to develop advocacy skills in the domestic sphere, are now being used to expose students to the interplay between domestic and international law and to promote advocacy skills in international fora. The creative use of simulations involving a combination of domestic and international law issues is also important. Providing opportunities for experiential learning - clinics and externships - in settings that provide hands-on experience in cases that involve both domestic and international issues is also essential to preparing students for the reality of an interconnected world.

Law schools must offer courses in comparative law and international conflicts of laws in order to give students an understanding of types of legal traditions other than common law - civil law, religious law, customary law, and mixed systems. We must also recognise the limitations of the case method in teaching other legal traditions and use a variety of teaching methods, including simulations and experiential learning. We need to allow our students the opportunity to study abroad in countries with different legal systems.

Including cultural and gender issues in the academic agenda can be done by adding courses to the curriculum that address these issues. Another component of promoting cultural understanding is providing students opportunities to develop their foreign language skills as lawyers. Including the perspectives of other academic disciplines in the study of the law is also important. The primary way to do this is through joint degree programs. This can also be achieved through faculty exchanges.

Social change and international awareness can also be promoted through purpose-oriented programs outside the curriculum. Law schools can be vehicles for meaningful social change in the international sphere, while at the same time providing valuable experience for their students.

We, as lawyers, have the opportunity to shape the legal institutions that will govern the future. As legal educators, we have the responsibility of preparing students to continue this process. We do not yet know the end result. We simply know that participating in this process is essential to solving the global problems facing today's world. What is needed is a profoundly different approach: one that advocates a qualitative rather than a quantitative change in legal education.

Emerging worldwide strategies in internationalising legal education
L F Del Duca
18 *Dick. J. Int'l L* 3, 2000, pp 411-428

There are a number of fundamental trends that cause or encourage internationalising

of United States legal education. They suggest a very strong and continuing phenomena that will be one of the most important in United States legal education for the next generation or two.

The first trend is the pattern of growth of law and legal education in the United States in the post-World War II period. For about forty years there was a tremendous growth of law, legal education, and the number of lawyers in the United States. During this period two areas of life - economic and social - became subject to massive regulation that did not previously exist in the areas of environment, health, telecommunications, the Internet, new forms of intellectual property, etc. This spilled over into law school curricula. The number of American Bar Association approved law schools increased greatly with a substantial increase in the number of applicants and enrolled students. This growth was followed in the past half dozen years by a decline in law school applications and applicants.

The second trend is the pattern of growth of law and legal education in the rest of the world in sharp contrast to recent developments in the United States. In many parts of the rest of the world the situation is beginning to resemble the United States growth in legal education and law of about thirty years ago. For example, fifteen or twenty years ago in China, there were virtually none, or only a handful of law schools. Reports indicate there are currently 300. The need for a minimally effective rule of law in order to have economic growth and proper relations with other economies and politics is recognised in China. This spills over into the demand for lawyers and legal education.

There is also a great increase in foreign student enrolment, a great upsurge in global legal activity, and a great interest in studying American law in the United States.

The trend towards internationalisation is so strong and deep that it will not be able to be met by the half dozen to a dozen law schools that already have a very strong set of international activities. Rather, it will have to be met jointly along with many other law schools in the United States.

Many problems exist in reacting creatively and effectively to the challenge of implementing internationalisation of legal education in the United States. The embarrassment of a lack of effective resources is perhaps the most general problem. If a school is not already positioned with vast resources and contacts abroad, it is wise to develop focused strategies. In developing new programs schools are well advised to utilise existing strengths and contacts to achieve carefully selected goals. Schools should look at hiring good international and comparative law faculty interested in developing quality new programs. Provide them with resources and time to visit other countries and take up opportunities abroad. Utilise strengths that already exist on your faculty. Build on networks you already have abroad in the form of alumni or other contacts.

There is growing recognition that crucial problems that challenge the human race cannot be solved only by individual states. International cooperation is required. There are two schools of thought responding to the implications of global changes and discussing their effect on legal education. The 'translators' school asserts that modification of legal education is unnecessary because the global issue merely involves establishing communication to translate rules of law when foreign nationals become part of an otherwise domestic transaction. The 'modernisers' school believes that mere translation is insufficient. The proper approach to legal education for them is to increase global exposure by adding courses, international faculty, more international academic programs and global research centres, and augmenting the number of formal international linkages. Both of these groups' responses are inadequate because what is needed is qualitative as well as quantitative change in legal education.

Today, development of new skills and teaching methodologies are required in legal education, as exemplified by the development of practical and experiential training methodologies. Today's law school graduates must have the skills to play the role of facilitators in international transactions. They must also be able to act as liaisons for communications between and among formally-organised legal systems with differing national histories, customs and experiences.

In addition to simply 'modernising' its curriculum in quantitative terms, the American University Washington College of Law and other schools around the country are adopting a qualitative, process-oriented approach which sets into motion the dynamics necessary to transform domestically-oriented legal training into training that is interconnected with the world. This is the context for discussion of 'global' law school approaches. One approach is to emphasise accentuation of international law, public and private, human rights, etc. Another is to recognise the obvious globalisation of the practice and thinking about law. A third way is to emphasise development of some 'Esperanto of law' - that is some ideal system. A fourth way is to develop an attitude or perspective of humility and wisdom, looking not only to our system but also outside of our system for solutions and criteria in evaluating legal institutions.

The range of methods of how one could structure the achievement of these various goals is broad. One could structure modest programs or alternatively, programs that might be almost revenue neutral in exchanging students or faculty for example. Conversely, one could invest very substantial sums in providing for student and faculty involvement in international experiences.

Expanding faculty and curriculum is another method of internationalising legal education. Team-teaching by domestic faculty in the presence of international faculty with expertise in the same area of the law inevitably produces a different qualitative course than would be the case when it is taught singly by domestic faculty. The range of costs involved in implementing faculty expansion and curriculum expansion, of course, can be from modest amounts to very heavy investments. Accordingly, resources available

in various schools become a factor in the extent to which this technique can be utilised.

Another methodology is the complete integration of the comparative and international approach for the entire curriculum of the sort that was discussed regarding the first year curriculum. There is a need for development of a community ethos. It is important that domestic and foreign students be integrated into a common cultural, social and educational experience which will facilitate communication and appreciation of cultural similarities and differences.

The emerging global economic village generates discussion of the concept of global law schools. United States law schools are trailing far behind United States business schools and many law schools around the world in thinking about globalisation.

A well-trained global faculty and interested alumni are the two most important resources in developing internationalised legal education. The relationships can be important in attracting visiting faculty as well as partnering with other institutions for larger projects.

The United States legal culture has profoundly affected a wide range of foreign and international legal regimes by providing models for international legal regimes, acting as an example for foreign countries, and assisting in the evolution of public international law through vertical linkages. Effective participation by lawyers in the world of international law requires, not only efforts of organisations like the American Society of International Law, the International Law Association, American Bar Association, etc., but also earlier preparation of such lawyers in the law schools. There has been an increase in law school classes which assist students to enter fields of international and comparative law. This shows a flexibility and willingness of law schools to enter fields that may be beyond their traditional curriculum.

Teaching law by design: how learning theory and instructional design can inform and reform law teaching

M H Schwartz

38 *San Diego L Rev* 2, 2000, pp 347-462

Although law teachers generally have salutary educational goals and some individual law teachers have developed insightful experimental instruction, law school instruction as a whole remains locked in an instructional methodology of dubious merit. That method, characterised here as the Vicarious Learning/Self-Teaching Model, has persisted since Langdell's tenure at Harvard Law School in the 1870s. It has persisted even in the face of the explosive evolution of learning theory throughout the twentieth century and the rise, in the second half of the century, of the field of instructional design, a field devoted to the systematic and reflective creation of instruction.

The MacCrate Report spawned a national discussion on the skills and values law school graduates should possess. Although this discussion of what law students should learn is necessary, it addresses, at most, one-half of the equation. Good learning goals mean nothing if the instruction does not succeed in producing learners who have achieved those goals. In other words, what is missing is an educationally sound body of law school androgogy scholarship, a body of scholarship that applies twentieth century developments in the fields of learning theory and instructional design to the design of law school instruction.

Two aspects of law teaching epitomise how law professors teach law. First, law teaching requires students to learn vicariously. Second, law teaching requires law students to teach themselves. This article classifies the approach as vicarious because law professors structure classroom interactions as one-on-one, professor-on-student dialogues. Professors expect that the other students in the classes will learn by watching these interactions. Vicarious instruction assumes some sort of rebound learning effect. Somehow the professor's comments, questions, and corrections of the selected student not only will help the selected student, but also will rub off on all the students in the class. This method also presupposes that the non-selected students know to play along, answering the queries in their heads and learning to think like lawyers by experiencing vicariously what the speaking student actually experiences.

Moreover, while most professors critique the selected students' classroom attempts to perform legal analysis, law professors fail to state explicitly what students need to know or to explain how to spot legal issues or to perform legal analysis. In fact, law professors devote considerable classroom time to critiquing students' case reading and case evaluation skills even though, ironically (or, perhaps, perversely), law professors seldom test case reading skills explicitly. The classroom discussions certainly cannot be considered adequate tests of these skills. Such discussions are not really tests at all.

Law teaching methodologies, of course, are not uniform. Individual instructors have tinkered with the traditional methodology by creating experimental courses and by experimenting with different teaching methods in their classrooms. These professors report improved learning outcomes. Nevertheless, on the whole, law teachers are 'anti-intellectual' about their teaching, and law school teaching methodologies have remained mired in a Langdellian tar since the 1870s. While these deficiencies run across the entire spectrum of American law schools and law students, the deficiencies are particularly problematic for all but the very best law students. In other words, for better students, their legal education is irrelevant. These students possess the skills and have developed the learning strategies with which to develop the legal reasoning skills they need as lawyers no matter how they are taught in law school. On the other hand, students who enter law school with lesser skills and less developed learning strategies depend on their instruction to succeed in law school, on the bar exam and in practice. What they get is the Vicarious Learning/Self-Teaching Model of instruction.

Vicarious Learning/Self-Teaching Model is sufficient to teach most law stu-