

Report on the Inaugural Conference and Workshops of the Global Alliance for Justice Education¹

Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

8-17th December 1999

Introduction

The inaugural conference of the Global Alliance for Justice Education (GAJE) took place in Kerala, India from 8-17th December. This report outlines the content of the plenary, breakout and workshop sessions and summarises the themes that emerged and the decisions that were taken.

It is perhaps worth pointing out at this stage that the events described in this report happened without a formal institution, paid staff, or operational funding. All work on the conference was done by volunteers and decisionmaking took place by consensus. Indeed to date GAJE has not yet adopted a constitution nor imposed conditions or fees for membership, although as reported below (pp. 12-16) committees formed at the conference are in the process of giving permanent structure to GAJE. The unifying characteristics of the informal alliance that organised the conference are: an internationally shared commitment to introducing and sustaining an overtly 'justice' agenda in legal education, the wonders of new technology (especially e-mail) and a personal aptitude, on the part of many, to hard work!

To make sense of what GAJE stands for and the significance of what has been achieved so far, a little must be said of its history.

History of GAJE

An informal meeting in early 1996 at an American Association Law Schools' conference in Miami, USA led to a gathering of lawyers, teachers, judges and activists in Sydney, Australia, in September 1996. At the Sydney meeting there was general consensus that reform movements in legal education taking place around the world made possible the creation of an international organisation for the promotion of socially relevant legal education. It was agreed that an internationally active network should be created with a view to exchanging information and ideas on justice education. A conference at which such issues could be discussed was identified as an important goal. This was to be held in a location that best enabled attendance by delegates from 'developing' countries. The conference was linked to a training workshop so that theory and good practice could be

¹ This report was prepared by Richard Grimes with contributions from Frank Bloch, Hugh Brayne, Kim Connolly, Clark Cunningham, Nigel Duncan, Ken Gallant, Bob Golton, Beth Lyon, Les McCrimmon, David McQuoid-Mason, Peggy Maisel, Ed O'Brien, Edwin Rekosh, Jane Schukoske

shared. Central to the discussions was the recognition that justice education concerned both form and content – about what is taught and learnt and how that education is delivered. Hands-on or clinical methods were seen to be a vital component in the justice education context.

The participants at the Sydney meeting did not meet again, face to face, until the conference itself took place. Volunteers allocated themselves to a variety of groups to work on different organisational issues. Between September 1996 and December 1999 plans were made, tasks were allocated, and the work was done. After lively discussion by email the name Global Alliance for Justice Education (GAJE) was adopted, to communicate the organisation's primary character – an international alliance of those committed to achieving justice through education.

A list serve was created and a web site organised (details can now be found at: www.gaje.org) The Southern Indian State of Kerala was chosen as the conference venue. A steering committee, with international representation, was established and a local organising committee was formed. Modest (but gratefully received) funding was secured from a range of organisations (donors are listed in the appendix to this report) to subsidise the cost of conference attendance where appropriate. A conference programme was formulated aimed at providing the maximum opportunity for discussion and participation. We were ready to go.

Conference - organisation and participation

The conference was attended by 125 delegates from 20 countries, representing every inhabited continent. A partial list of delegate addresses can be found at page 21. Both the common and civil law worlds were represented. Although proceedings were conducted in English, a large number of delegates came from countries where the official language is not English. Delegates included teachers, judges, trainers, activists, and practitioners. Students from local law schools also attended and contributed. The conference was preceded by a one-day workshop and followed by a 5-day training event with 75 attending the former and 50 latter. The details are as follows:

Pre-conference workshop – 8th December

Victoria Jubilee Town Hall

Transforming Legal Education into Justice Education

The purpose behind this one day workshop was twofold: first to set the stage for the main conference by encouraging cross-cultural interaction between the participants and secondly to address the practical as well as theoretical issues of how a justice dimension to legal education can be practically achieved. After introductions delegates were allocated to groups each of which was charged with the task of designing an institution or structure that would advance justice education in a global context. For the purposes of the

exercise it was given that a generous budget was potentially available for the project. Each group had to discuss and formulate a proposal and then had to make a presentation to the supposed funding body. A decision then had to be taken by the funders as to which proposal(s) would be supported. The panel who organised the workshop formed the funding committee.

The objective of getting people from a variety of backgrounds and cultures working together was a success. Half a day passed almost unnoticed as participants grappled with complexities such as programme outcomes, curriculum design and cultural applicability.

A variety of proposals were presented by the end of the day, falling generally into one of two categories. One type of proposal took as its starting point the desirability of a new law school that would have 'justice' as its central theme. Courses on justice would be offered. Ethics and professional responsibility would form a pervasive part of the curriculum. The institution would offer a facility for teaching and student exchange, enabling colleagues from all over the world to spend time in the law school exploring justice issues and sharing knowledge and experiences. Through such interactive ventures participants would hopefully return to their countries better equipped to continue to develop justice education. In each of the models proposed the active involvement of students in their studies, through the use of clinical methods, was recommended.

The other approach concentrated on the global concept without, necessarily, having a defined institutional base. Such proposals focused on a number of specific projects in different parts of the world, including an environmental clinic in Eastern Europe, a programme addressing domestic violence in India and a law reform project in Africa. The venues chosen were taken from the suggestions made by delegates from the countries or regions specified. The work on each project would be monitored through a virtual office. Site visits and outcomes would be shared globally amongst those interested.

The judging panels reported back on the presentations and funds were 'awarded' in principle, if not in kind.

Prize winners apart the exercise had several benefits. It raised at the outset of the conference the concept of justice. There were several different views on what this meant and how any programme might introduce and develop a justice agenda. It provided a real icebreaker – not just in terms of getting to know each other but more substantially – helping participants to take on board the cultural and political dimensions involved on the global stage. Judging by the reluctance of some to finish their discussions it inspired constructive debate.

This workshop was attended by 75 delegates.

The inaugural conference

Conference session 1 – 9th December

A Global Perspective on Justice Education

The first day of the inaugural conference was devoted to introductions and welcomes.

Welcome plenary – Victoria Jubilee Town Hall

N R Madhava Menon, formerly of the National Law School of India (Bangalore) and member of India's Law Reform Commission (and chair of the local organising committee) gave the initial plenary address. He stressed the importance of siting legal education in a justice context – justice for students, clients, and society at large. 'Justice' could not be achieved without making this a central feature of the law school curriculum.

To this end, in his new position as Vice-Chancellor of the National University of Juridical Science (Calcutta) he invited comments on a paper contained in the conference programme which proposed a radically different law school in which multi-disciplinary study was seen as a cornerstone for promoting justice education. The proposal would see a range of programmes established with human rights, good governance, sustainability, professionalism and active learning as central tenets. This concrete proposal followed usefully from the practical exercises of the pre-conference workshop and gave both context and reality to the previous day's proceedings. With this exciting venture unveiled the conference was launched.

Opening session – Nishagandhi Auditorium

In keeping with the cultural traditions of the country (India) and state (Kerala) the conference was then formally opened in a colourful and interesting ceremony at a local open-air auditorium. Delegates entered in formal procession accompanied by drummers and treading on a carpet of petals. Each delegate was presented with a garland of jasmine flowers and a *bindi* of sandalwood. The opening event consisted of addresses by several distinguished guests including Frank Bloch (on behalf of GAJE), Madhava Menon, Mr Fali Nariman, Senior Advocate and President of the Bar Association of India and Justice Sukhdev Singh Kang (retired), Governor of Kerala. Each in turn stressed the timeliness of the conference in both a local, national and international setting. Reference was made on several occasions to the role of lawyers in ensuring social justice and the need for lawyers at all levels to practice ethically and to be accountable to those who they serve. The law school's position in this scenario is of crucial importance and educating lawyers in ethics and professional responsibility should begin at the very earliest stages of their education and feature throughout their studies.

Justice V R Krishna Iyer (retired) then made a presentation to two Indian law students who were the winners of the National Client Interviewing and Counseling Competition and who would represent India in the International Client Counseling Competition. The preliminary and final rounds of the competition were scheduled to take place in

Thiruvananthapuram in conjunction with the GAJE conference and GAJE delegates experienced in the International Client Counseling Competition assisted in judging.

The audience was then treated to a presentation, through music, dance and poetry, to a *Keraleeyam*. This elaborate presentation depicted the history and culture of, what is now, the Indian State of Kerala . As well as being enormously enjoyable as a spectacle, the display served as a powerful reminder of the importance of culture and tradition (in whatever country or locality). Justice must, if it is to mean anything in practice, be seen and applied against such a backdrop.

The dancers, musicians, poets and presenters made this a memorable occasion – one for which the participants and local organising committee must be thanked. The event was not only enjoyed by the conference delegates but by a large gathering of local residents.

The first of two conference dinners was then held providing the opportunity for old friendships to be rekindled and new acquaintances to be made.

**Conference session 2 –
10th December – morning**

Victoria Jubilee Town Hall

Law, Development and Social Justice

In order to facilitate maximum levels of delegate participation and to share as much information as possible the conference sessions were organised into two component parts – plenary meetings at which short (10 minute) presentations on chosen themes were given and breakout groups on identified topics within the theme areas. The first of these sessions concerned law, development and social justice.

Presentations were given on:

*Community-Based Justice Education
Advancing Women's Rights*

The role of legal education in the community and equality issues, particularly from gender and cultural perspectives, were raised here (and subsequently throughout the conference). Delegates were informed about a range of projects in Africa, India and the USA in which community initiatives and women's rights were advanced with input from law schools and NGO's.

The gathering was also addressed by Justice Krishna Iyer (retired). His comments were frank and hard-hitting. Justice Iyer made it very clear that professional standards and attitudes were, in his experience, often unsatisfactory and that law schools, the profession

and the wider public had the right and responsibility to make greater demands of all concerned. He also made reference to the role of the judiciary saying:

A person who cannot weep at the sight of suffering should not be considered for appointment as a judge

His contribution made a profound impact on all who heard it.

Hotel South Park

Three breakout sessions were then held under the titles:

- Taking Sides: Whose interests and what Issues to Advocate?*
- Working with NGO's: Legal Interventions and Community Development*
- Integrating Gender into Justice Education*

The *Taking sides* discussion looked in detail at the role of lawyers in the community and the potential conflicts that can emerge when such professional involvement arises. After introductions and a brief overview of the topic from session facilitators, delegates split into smaller groups for detailed discussion. Interesting debates ensued in which the contrasting positions of the lawyer as hired gun and the lawyer as guardian of the public interest were examined. There was a widely held view in the group that the involvement of professionals, such as lawyers, raised issues of use of power. The potential for lawyers to empower clients, students and the wider public was recognised. For legal educators this had particular resonance in the community context and clinical education was seen as an actual or potentially important contributor in the empowerment stakes. Interesting concerns were raised about the possibility of involving the community in the workings of the law school especially in terms of service provision and curriculum development.

The session devoted to *Gender integration* explored the status of women and gender-focused curricular content in the 26 participants' home institutions. The spectrum of experiences brought to the meeting ranged from places where women faculty members have no restroom facilities to a university where 6 of the 7 tenured members are women and where the directors are anxious to integrate gender issues into the curriculum. One participant observed that the workshop was an important opportunity to discuss such matters as she had up until now felt isolated. There was a commonly held view that there was a need for a support network on gender issues for teachers and administrators and that, particularly in the South Asian context materials advancing gender integration could be shared. The breakout group then engaged in a brainstorming sessions designed to support women's full participation in GAJE governance. The decisions of delegates at the final conference session (see page 11-12 of this report) perhaps bears witness to the success of this strategy.

Conference session 3 – 10th December - afternoon

Victoria Jubilee Town Hall

Legal Services and Access to Justice

Held appropriately on International Human Rights day, this session was devoted to promoting and achieving human rights, by improving access to law and legal services. The same format as used in the first session was followed – short presentations and breakout discussion groups. During lunch an icebreaker had been used in which pairs of delegates utilising their artistic skills drew pictures of the human body and then labelling various parts of the anatomy with appropriate human rights facets. Few parts had been left untouched! The range and depth of human rights issues revealed led usefully into the plenary session.

The plenary presentations covered:

Teaching Legal Skills and Social Justice Through Street Law Law Clinics in Developing Countries: Doing More with Less

Through some visually energetic direction and timekeeping, contributions from 8 delegates were presented, each focusing on how legal education can amount to justice education in a legal service context. The Street Law session started with more interaction followed by a description of Street Law programmes used in the USA, and South Africa. Here legal literacy classes are provided – for schools, prisons and community groups – with the teaching being led by law students. The students of course had worked with the law teachers in the preparation of the material used. The content covered a wide range of substantive issues including concepts of justice, civil and political rights, housing, employment, social welfare, education and consumer law. In some of the programmes, notably in South Africa, students were exposed to this hands-on education approach at a very early stage in their own education – from first year undergraduates through to post graduate students.

Projects on using experiential teaching methods and on using students in a supervised legal service capacity were then described in a number of different jurisdictions including Bangladesh, China, Poland and Slovakia.

Breakout sessions then followed on:

Street Law Projects as Justice Education Legal Clinics as a Resource for Service Delivery

The *Street Law Projects as Justice Education* discussion group witnessed GAJE becoming ENGAGE. Participants became actively engaged in learning and teaching methods that could be used in their own working environments and in the street law context.

Two demonstrations of Street Law as active learning were then given. The first involved a newspaper article on a contemporary justice issue before the Indian parliament. Three volunteers were used. The first described the content of the article to the second, who then relayed this to the third, who reported back to the group. Each time the story was retold it became shorter in length and detail. Apparently the exercise had been devised to demonstrate the common law principles of hearsay evidence but it served here as a clear example of how much can be lost between hearing information for the first time (for example in a lecture) and recalling the important details. Street Law programmes bring home to tutors and students the limitations implicit in the lecture format and the importance of maximising participatory techniques.

The second example, also based on a newspaper report, looked at the comments of a city mayor who described the actions of an environmental pressure group in highly derogatory language. Group members were asked to look at the law (in this instance a section of a civil code) and place themselves in a line indicating (from one extreme to the other) what point on that line they stood on the issues involved. Was the mayor right? Was the pressure group wronged? Was there something to say in favour of both? Individuals were then asked for reasons for their positions. The session produced a great deal of interaction. It addressed some fundamental issues of justice (free speech, social, political and legal accountability and the role of law as regulator). It showed the value of active rather than passive learning. The group expressed the common view that learning can also go beyond engaging in the activity and can provide an opportunity for students to teach each other about law and justice issues thereby reinforcing their own learning.

The session concluded with guidance on setting up Street Law programmes. A written guide, containing details, can be obtained by emailing eobrien@streetlaw.org.

The breakout group on *Legal Clinics as a Resource for Service Delivery* focused on both financial and human resource needs for legal services delivery in different parts of the world. For the most part, legal clinics, and law schools generally, are not realistic sources of funds for service delivery outside of the specific mission of the school. Although law schools in some countries include legal services delivery in their mission, this is relatively rare. Moreover, law-school based legal aid clinics operate typically with minimal funding. On the other hand, in many countries legal clinics can be a tremendous source of human resources – including large numbers of law students and a smaller number of faculty members. The sense of the meeting was that law schools and legal clinics should stress the importance of these human resources when applying to universities, governments, and private sources for funding – by highlighting the value of the student and faculty time available for clinical and *pro bono* projects. There was also some discussion of the dangers inherent in relying too heavily on student work, and especially unsupervised student work, for the delivery of legal services.

In the evening a further opportunity for delegates to enjoy indigenous culture, this time in local homes. This was a very special occasion; one which allowed guests to become better acquainted with their hosts and families not to mention the culinary delights that

were produced. The host families and local organising committee must be thanked for their kindness and hard work

**Conference session 4 –
11th December – morning**

Victoria Jubilee Town hall

International Collaboration in Promoting Justice Education

The third day of the conference began with a plenary session looking at working together across national and regional divides. The collaboration between lawyers, institutions, organisations and governments is a central concern to GAJE members maximising the impact of effort and resources in pursuit of the justice goals.

Presentations were on 3 themes:

*Working Together: Collaborations between Law teachers and
Activists
Collaborative Research and Justice Education
Using Technology for Cross-National Collaboration*

The session began with a description of various forms of cross-national collaboration in justice education, based in part on a recent survey of lawyers and law teachers in the field. This was followed 2 presentations on collaboration aimed at improving teacher/student communication through the use of new technology including the internet and video-conferencing. Delegates were told of: work in Ghana and Uganda with women's groups; collaborative work between US law schools and programmes in Africa and Eastern Europe (The Soros Foundation and Colombia Law School's public interest law initiative have helped fund and support the development of 40 clinical programmes in the former eastern-bloc); a pilot programme in Australia using the internet on remote external placement sites; and, an international research project which originated in Australia and was now expanding to include countries in North and South America, Africa and Western Europe. The research is on ethics and professional practice and, in particular, on values held by lawyers at different stages of their education and careers.

Hotel South Park

Breakout sessions followed on the following topics:

*Developing Model Teaching Materials and Teaching
Methods for use in Multiple Countries
Expanding Opportunities for Collaboration in Justice
Education*

The *Developing Materials and Methods* group was heavily subscribed indicating perhaps the perceived need for concrete assistance in providing tried and tested material and programmes. The cultural applicability of such aids to effective teaching and learning was discussed at length but the generally agreed position was that these developments should be shared and the decision about use and adaptability made by the utiliser. GAJE was seen as an ideal vehicle for the collation and dissemination of teaching material and methods. Many participants wanted information on how clinical programmes could be established. The issues raised in this session fed usefully into the training workshop planned for the following week.

In the *Expanding Opportunities for Collaboration* session the discussion began with participants being asked to identify themselves and briefly describe how they saw themselves working towards collaborative efforts for justice education in their own countries and institutions. Projects described included: the collaboration between the Law and Advocacy Project for Women in Ghana and Georgetown University Law School in the United States; collaborations between six clinical program in Australia and the challenge of moving the justice education mission into the general law school curricula; and a SOROS-funded project bringing street law and the use of interactive methods of teaching to 18 Eastern European countries.

Discussion of the concept of justice education then followed because there was a sense that assumptions may have been made about the term that varied depending on culture and experience. Discussion of a working definition concluded that:

*Justice education is education to achieve human rights for all citizens in society.
The term 'human rights' is one that all could relate to based on the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**.*

The pursuit of happiness was also identified as an important element.

The group concluded that GAJE should debate and produce a generally applicable definition.

The discussion then turned to expanding opportunities for collaboration in justice education. Opportunities for regional and global collaboration were explored. Concrete suggestions were made and included:

1. Use the concept of shaming as a way to promote justice. Utilising available resources, particularly computer based technology GAJE, UNIFEM and other organisations could be used to publicise unjust actions by countries and communities within them.

2. Expand the whole law school approach to promote justice education by publishing, for example on websites, programmes, materials and methods that would highlight justice issues.

3. Use the website as a means of promoting the use of laws to achieve justice

**Conference session 5 –
11th December – afternoon**

District Court premises, Thiruvananthapuram

Site visit to *Lok Adalats*

The afternoon of day 3 was devoted to a visit to the Lok Adalats, or People's Court, in Thiruvananthapuram. Delegates were briefed before the visit and the programme contained a detailed explanation of the history and role of these tribunals. Essentially the Lok Adalat is the result of an attempt to create (and indeed in part to revive) a means of resolving disputes without recourse to the rigour and expense of the courts. They have been operative since the mid 1970's. The Lok Adalats are now regulated by statute and aim to resolve disputes in an appropriate, efficient, timely and just manner. A panel consisting of a judicial officer (often retired), a lawyer and a social worker meets with the parties in dispute and, under its own adopted procedures, assists the parties to reach a resolution of their dispute. Although few studies seem to have been carried out on the workings of the Lok Adalats academics and practitioners at the conference suggested that they were popular with the parties using them and did reach settlements that appeared to be workable. They effectively removed the delay and expense associated with formal court proceedings and were a significant contribution to meeting otherwise neglected legal need.

The visits were facilitated by the Kerala State Legal Services Authority who were extremely helpful to delegates – ensuring that each could witness a Lok Adalat in action and in engaging in discussion afterwards. A question and answer session followed between delegates and members of the Legal Services Commission. Some concern was expressed that as valuable as the Lok Adalats were reliance on them might lead to a two-tier justice system with the 'cheaper' version for the poor.

Delegate reaction to the visit was interesting. All who attended were fascinated by seeing 'justice' in action in such a specific cultural setting. Our physical presence in the rooms where the hearings were taken place was potentially (and perhaps actually) intrusive - although no objection seemed to be raised by anyone directly involved in the hearing. For those from other jurisdictions, notably the US, the UK and Australia, the proceedings were seen to be very similar to a court hearing other than the latter would normally be more formally conducted. It was somewhat different from a mediation model as understood in the West. To unfamiliar eyes it seemed to retain an adversarial feel. As a means of addressing disputes that the parties may otherwise never have had the opportunity to discuss and possibly resolve however it appears to be a success. Delegates were privileged to have the opportunity to see and talk about the experience and thanks must go to the Legal Services Authority, the panel members and disputants. Thanks must also go to local law students who acted as guides and translators.

In the evening an open forum on human rights issues was held. This event was organised by Professor Jayakumar, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Kerala and, although not part of the formal conference programme, took advantage of the wide range of countries represented there. The forum was addressed by delegates from Europe, Africa, the Indian sub continent and the Americas. Each person who spoke described the human rights position as perceived in his or her own country. Particular attention was focused on child labour, capital punishment, torture and due process. Contributions were then made from the floor.

This was a significant gathering. Not only were those who attended familiarised with the human rights situation in the countries and regions represented, but it was an opportunity to discuss the extent to which countries (including former colonial powers) were indirectly implicated in human rights abuses – largely through their involvement in the arms trade and other commercial activities. Sharing such information can only help in the collaborative effort to secure human rights for all.

Conference session 6 – 12th December - morning

Where to from here?

Hotel South Park

From the very inception of the conference GAJE activists had struggled with what the role of the organisation should be. Having had 4 days of absorbing and challenging work the question had to be addressed – where to from here?

For a couple of days before the final conference sessions a notice had been placed in the conference hotel asking delegates what they wanted to flow from the event? Was there a need for a formally constituted body? If so what form should it take? What would its functions be? In the space allocated on the notice for responses various suggestions were made. A session was arranged on the morning of 12th December to talk this through and, hopefully, agree a course of action.

About 90 people gathered, despite the early hour and it being a Sunday, with virtually every GAJE delegate still in Thiruvananthapuram coming to the meeting. The meeting was opened by sharing a summary of the main topics for discussion that had been in circulation during the GAJE conference. These topics were:

- Steering Committee
 - ⇒ Balance (both gender-wise and region-wise)
 - ⇒ Steering Committee election/selection process
 - ⇒ Size?
- GAJE structure
 - ⇒ Constitution and its drafting

- ⇒ Membership
- The Future
 - ⇒ Next conference
 - ⇒ What to do between now and then

The first order of business was seeking views as to whether it was appropriate to engage in a discussion regarding GAJE's future. There was immediate and unanimous consensus that the work of GAJE should continue and a future conference should be scheduled. Based on that agreement, a brainstorming session ensued regarding what GAJE should do between December 1999 and the next conference. Following an early suggestion that national or regional groups meet once a year, the group determined it appropriate to agree as to what GAJE's regions should be for the foreseeable future. After input from a number of delegates, the following eight regions were identified: Africa, South Asia, Australasia, Southeast and East Asia, North America, South America, West Europe, and East Europe. (Delegates recognised that these eight regions should be considered temporary, allowing for possible further subdivision in the future as well as addition of new regions, such as the Middle East.) On the subject of regional meetings, several delegates suggested attending/supporting existing regional meetings, and/or providing trainers for such conferences, rather than holding separate GAJE meetings.

Concern expressed regarding over-emphasis on "regionalization," and one suggestion that a way to avoid some problems in this area might be to have "at-large" members of the Steering Committee. Other delegates suggested that it might be appropriate to appoint another Temporary Steering Committee, and leave any decisions with respect to a permanent structure to a later time when, perhaps, a constitution might be in place. That led to a discussion of whether there should be a constitution committee, and then a more general discussion of whether creation of multiple committees might be an effective way to ensure that meaningful work got done before the next full conference.

Seven committees were eventually agreed to: (1) Next GAJE Conference; (2) Constitution; (3) Subject Matter; (4) Membership; (5) Regional Training; (6) Communication; (7) Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum) Conference Report. Then followed discussion about options that would be within the purview of such committees, in part acknowledging the importance of ensuring that people not at the conference had a chance to get fully involved in the work of GAJE. It was agreed that each committee should be empowered to decide independently how to organize and administer itself within this general framework. Tentative tasks and "convenors" for the initial GAJE committees were identified as follows:

1. Next GAJE Conference – a committee to plan for the next conference, anticipated to be held in 2001 in Durban, South Africa (convenors: Asha Ramgobin, ramgobina@mtb.und.ac.za and Lillian Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza, lawdean@imul.com);
2. Constitution – a committee to draft a proposed constitution for GAJE (convenor: Clark Cunningham, cunningc@law.wustl.edu);

3. Subject Matter – a committee to share information and ideas regarding different subjects related to justice education (convenor: Ved Kumari, vedk@satyam.net.in);
4. Membership – a committee to solicit members and consider ways of including more people in the work of GAJE (convenor: Monika Platek, platek@atos.warman.com.pl);
5. Regional Training – a committee to co-ordinate with training opportunities in the various regions around the world (convenor: Marlene LeBrun, m.lebrun@mailbox.gu.edu.au);
6. Communication – a committee to work with the GAJE web site, listserv, etc. (convenor: Frank Bloch, frank.bloch@law.vanderbilt.edu);
7. Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum) Conference Report – a committee to put together a report on the December 1999 conference (convenor: Richard Grimes, richard.g@virgin.net)

Participants then selected a geographically-balanced nominating committee to nominate the next Temporary Steering Committee. It can be inferred from various conversations over the course of the Where Do We Go From Here gathering that many delegates expected the Temporary Steering Committee to be limited in number and balanced along regional and gender lines, though a detailed discussion of this matter did not occur during the process of actually identifying members of the nominating committee.

The nominating committee members were agreed as follows:

- Africa - Dora Byamukama, dorabyam@infocom.co.ug
- South Asia - Nagaraj, V., nagarajv@nls.ernet.in
- Australasia - Judith Dickson, j.dickson@latrobe.edu.au
- Southeast and East Asia - Titi Liu, titi_liu@yahoo.com
- North America - Ken Gallant, ksgallant@ualr.edu
- South America - Martin Bohmer, bohmer@giga.com.ar
- West Europe - Hugh Brayne, hugh.brayne@sunderland.ac.uk
- East Europe - Katerina Shugrina, kat@alt.ru

In addition to the discussions leading to the decisions set out above, during portions of the meeting the topics listed below were brought up by one or more delegates. The discussion in Thiruvananthapuram was dynamic and fluid. For purposes of this report however comments or issues have sometimes artificially combined. No attempt however has been made to “organize” the report of that meeting into topic areas, because this might detract from the sense of how the conversation developed. Further, many comments could be important to the work of more than one committee, and imposing categories might impact on whether topics were to be explored by all appropriate committees. Note that, in most cases, detailed or lengthy discussion and decisions of anything mentioned below were deferred either to an appropriate committee or to a later time. GAJE and its committees have plenty of work to do! The issues raised were:

- Does justice education mean (or require) institutional change?
- How can concepts of education about justice be translated into meaningful training for teachers as to how best to communicate justice concepts with students? Is there any realistic way to do this other than regionally (based on cost, cultural barriers, etc. limits)?
- What is GAJE's responsibility to the "next generation" (students in law school, young practitioners and activists)? Is there a way to honour the work of the students in law school in Thiruvananthapuram and to create a more concrete method to empower students at future conferences?
- Should and, if yes, how can GAJE connect with others in other parts of the world focusing on similar issues?
- How can those interested in justice education other than law teachers be included? It was a stated goal of the conference to include lawyers, judges and social activists, and there were delegates from all three categories, although the majority of delegates were law teachers. In particular to what extent should para-legals or students be included? Is such a broad membership realistic? Might it be appropriate for involved parties to differ by region? Is it too much too soon? What about including judges?
- The evolution of clinical legal education in the U.S. may be an appropriate subject for justice education, since while clinics are widespread around U.S. law schools, they are often not well integrated into legal education as a whole.
- Is it important to develop a dynamic web site? If yes, probably need funding (grant for full-time person?). What should the web site's purpose(s) be (e.g. exchange curricular material? not just limited to legal education? use for "shaming" schools and communities demonstrating injustice?) If resources are put into a web site, a reliable alternate distribution system for communities without direct access must be created and maintained.
- What should happen to the report on the Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum) conference. Should GAJE seek to get it published? How and where? What is the purpose(s) of such a report? To concretise achievements, create/enhance publicity, and/or increase sense of accomplishment? Are there tensions between community-centered publicity and "academic" report?
- A separate, concise report for potential funders (such as the World Bank) is probably important.
- Demonstrated post-conference/workshop follow-up may be key to securing funding from many sources for interim work and future conferences. How is that best achieved?
- How can all justice "stakeholders" get access to information about and through GAJE?
- Should one of GAJE's focuses be on bringing advocates into law schools and increasing cross-fertilization between successful activists and clinical legal education?
- Language barriers: is there a need to translate all reports as well as other significant communications? How can we access translators? What languages should be targeted?

- Delegates from nations in the ‘developing’ world shared some aims from their perspective:
 - ⇒ need to get help advocating for clinical legal education world-wide, and for seeing that such advocacy includes a sustainability focus so that programs are long-term (may counsel for regionally-based strategies). GAJE may be able to play a role in creating a newsletter, sharing materials, holding workshops, and recognising/supporting innovative programs.
 - ⇒ increase access for activists and educators in developing world to hear “success stories” in justice education from those of a shared or similar gender, cultural, class background.
 - ⇒ support efforts to have developing-world law students “practice” through clinical education rather than serve in a “paralegal”-type capacity.
- Should and how can efforts extend appreciably beyond countries with legal systems based in common-law?
- Should and how can GAJE offer meaningful exchange of research in related areas?
- Should a major component of the next GAJE conference be “skills sharing” – discussion of how particular, potentially shared issues have been dealt with by other members?
- What is the personal responsibility of delegates, once home from Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum), to publicise GAJE?

If possible, delegates appeared to leave the GAJE – *Where Do We Go From Here?* meeting with even more enthusiasm about the conference and the work of this new endeavour.

Post-Conference Workshop – 12th - 17th December

Training Trainers for Justice Education

As indicated above it was always the intention to link the inaugural conference with a training event that would provide the opportunity for imparting ideas and sharing experiences, with a view to capacity building in countries across the world. The workshop was designed to provide a flexible framework in which such an exchange of knowledge and experience could take place. Inevitably, in dealing with such diversity of experience as represented by the workshop delegates, an on-going review of both form and content of the workshop was needed. The workshop committee did sterling work in keeping the agenda responsive to need.

Opening session – 12th December – afternoon

British Council Library

Representatives from the GAJE workshop committee on Training the Trainers (Clark Cunningham, Neil Gold and Marlene LeBrun) introduced the concept of the workshop. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan, Chief Justice of the State of Tamil Nadu formally opened proceedings emphasising the importance of education and training and the need for training to become a permanent and on-going feature, to ensure continued development. As this was a Sunday delegates were then excused for the rest of the day (part of an afternoon and the evening!) to discover more Keralan cultural delights.

Day 1 – 13th December

Putting training in a justice context

Around 50 participants stayed for the training workshop. Again a wide spread of countries and regions were represented. Through the use of brief introductory comments, practical exercises and plenary feedback sessions, participants worked through a suggested number of topics beginning with the broad issue of training and justice.

The first exercise required discussion, in pairs, on what the main conference had achieved on the justice front. This was a lead in to the main task of the workshop – the design of a training programme to improve teaching and learning at delegate's own institution having, as its central focus, issues of justice – either in terms of substantive law (for example: human rights; anti-discrimination provisions) and/or in the method and basis of delivery (for example: justice for students; clients; the public at large). From what was said, delegates clearly found the conference stimulating and valuable but were now enthused about trying to put 'justice' in action.

As in all good teaching practice a variety of methods were used to present ideas and foster discussion. On the first full day of the workshop a video was shown illustrating how training methods might incorporate audio-visual facilities – in this instance using a recording of interviews with clients. Considerable debate followed on the cultural suitability of such material (the videos used were from an international interviewing competition) and on the level of complexity (or controversy) necessary or appropriate to achieve the learning outcomes anticipated.

Day 2 – 14th December

YMCA

Justice and learning – theory and practice

Bearing in mind that the outcome for the whole workshop was a training model that could be used in the delegates' own institutions day 2 was devoted to some theoretical and practical perspectives. Participants were asked - in brainstorming fashion - to identify words that encapsulated justice and learning. These included: fairness, equality, inclusiveness, accountability, respect, accepting, caring, sharing, pervasiveness, clarity, expectations, evaluation, transferability, transparency, and resourcing.

Bloom's taxonomy was then discussed to illustrate the stages of learning and understanding. Reference to Kolb and Schon followed.

How did this relate to the training task in hand? The point was made that unless objectives are understood or at least identified at the outset - in the sense of being clear about what you really want the learner to be able to do at the end - it is difficult, not only to structure an effective programme but to evaluate whether those objectives have been reached.

Through the use of a series of practical exercises the delegates, in small groups, began to formulate the broad aims of their justice-training project.

Having looked at concepts of justice and training and with a theoretical framework to work with, participants then began to discuss teaching and learning techniques – how to deliver what was being planned. The virtues, difficulties and challenges of a variety of techniques was examined ranging from lectures (widely and sometimes exclusively used as the base for teacher/student contact) to smaller group work (seminars and tutorials). The use of highly interactive forms of learning such as real-client clinics was also considered. The use of video ('eyes memory'), simulation and demonstration were all discussed. Although lectures are widely and traditionally used as a means of teaching (and often presumed to be learning and cost effective) the workshop quickly identified that lectures often did little to involve, excite or empower students. However, recognising their traditional place in the classroom, techniques were then discussed on how to use lectures more creatively.

A presentation was then given by Professor Kumar, a psychiatrist and academic from the teaching hospital in Thiruvananthapuram. Professor Kumar drew parallels between medical and legal education, including the ethical dimension in both, and gave the workshop further food for thought.

The day's sessions finished with 2 presentations both of which addressed feedback. The first looked at what makes a good teacher. A feedback session was given following a presentation and delegates had to give feedback on the feedback. This resulted in the initial presenter getting critiqued (in the nicest and most constructive possible way) and by the critiquer receiving similarly constructive feedback from the delegates as a whole. This exchange produced a large number of comments on the problems of giving feedback, especially if that process identifies areas for improvement. Suggestions were shared as to how the feedback process can be made a positive learning experience. All contributors emerged unscathed and wiser.

The second consisted of video taped student interviews with a 'client' in a suspected theft case. The group was asked to provide feedback on those performances. It was useful for delegates to see material actually used in teaching in a particular institution and to have a staff member from that College present to discuss context and content. Delegates were quick to identify strengths and weaknesses in the student performances and agreed that the use of video taping as a means of reflective learning was valuable.

Day 3 – 15th December

YMCA

Teaching and learning strategies

Bolstered by discussion of further principles of teaching and learning - in particular the need for clearly established learning outcomes and the linking of those outcomes to assessment criteria and evaluation strategies - the workshop moved on to more practical exercises. All were designed to assist participants in producing their own training plans.

The first asked fundamental questions about assessment and evaluation and asked participants to create their own assessment criteria in the context of the training project they were working on. In addition, how would they establish whether the criteria had been met and evaluate whether the assessment has been a success in learning terms. One highlight of the day was the involvement, in this exercise, of two students from the local law school. They conducted the brainstorming part of the exercise. If ever a demonstration of student power was effective it was here. Many thanks to Julie and Lina and best wishes to them in their own now justice oriented careers!

The workshop then moved on to the hard work – designing the training programme for their own needs

Day 4 – 16th December

YMCA

Moving towards a training model

Delegates were allocated a day in which to work on and produce their specific training schemes. In each case they had to identify the group they were going to be working with (colleagues, students, community) and the learning outcomes that were to be achieved in that programme. Then teaching and learning methods had to be selected that

would be suitable to the targeted group and local circumstances. This necessarily involved a consideration of materials that might be used and resources that would be available. Each plan had to then address assessment in terms of both means and criteria. Finally each programme has to indicate the evaluative scheme that would be used to determine the level of success.

The proof of the pudding!

Late that day, with preparations complete, delegates moved on to begin their presentations. Projects were presented in turn to the whole group. As might be expected the schemes were diverse and included:

- A course in basis law and procedure for para-legals
- A clinical programme in a University with several thousand law students and no permanent, full-time, staff
- A short course for judges on the sensitivity of dealing with children in judicial and related proceedings

Day 5 – 17th December

YMCA

Day 5 saw the completion of the presentations. The learning was a two way process. Non-presenting participants had the opportunity to witness the presentations complete with explanations of why and how each scheme was designed and structured. The presenters were able to field questions and reconsider their plans in the light of constructive criticism. The presenters and their audience were also able to take turns to put into practice much of the content of the previous 4 day's work.

A general discussion followed on the implementation of justice education projects focusing on obstacles that either had arisen or were likely to arise for particular participants, together with strategies for addressing them.

The workshop concluded with a final round of thanks to the organisers and local team who supplied so much support. Everyone left determined to maintain contact and to tell each other how the projects, which had been designed at the workshop, were actually working out on the ground.

Two memorable features of the last day stay in the mind – the first, a description of participants as JETS (Justice Education Trainers) and the second a tuneful rendition from West Side Story!

Conclusions

The GAJE conference and workshops were extraordinary in many senses. The whole event happened: with relatively few resources and with virtually no face to face contact (other than at a local level). It brought together colleagues from all over the globe and from both common and civil law jurisdictions. We met, worked and co-existed for 10 days all leaving very much enriched by the experience and hopefully taking with us knowledge, experience, ideas and enthusiasm with which to take legal education forward into the new millennium. Most of all, it might just be that the cause of justice was furthered.

Of course there is much that can be learnt and improved upon – in terms of structure and content if not climate and hospitality. One matter that colleagues might care to deliberate on is how we can be more inclusive of students at any future event.

As the old saying goes ‘so much is owed by so many’. Perhaps what is owed is not just ‘to so few’ - although there are those, notably Madhava Menon and Frank Bloch who merit particular mention, without whom the conference may not have taken place at all. The local organising committee, with the highly efficient input of Dr Sivakumar, must also be thanked. All delegates contributed to the success of the conference and workshops. The strength in GAJE is its democratic and open nature. Justice of course begins at home! A partial list of participating delegates is set out below.

Partial Delegate List (not including on-site registration)

Adjetey, Fitnat

Law and Advocacy for Women
P.O. Box 3451
Accra
GHANA
233-21-776518 or 233-24-367050
(phone)
233-21-228887 (fax)
fitnata@ghana.com or
fitnata@yahoo.com

Bajpai, Asha

Tata Institute of Social Sciences
Sion-Trombay Road
Deonar, MUMBAI
INDIA 400 088

Balachandran M K

Director
AMITY Law School
E-27, Defence Colony
New Delhi
INDIA 110 024

Barry, Margaret Martin

The Catholic University of America
Columbus School of Law
3600 John McCormack Rd., N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20064
USA
202-319-6787 (phone)
202-319-4459 (fax)

barry@law.cua.edu

Bentch, Sue

Riga Graduate School of Law
Alberta iela 13
Riga, LV-1010
LATVIA
371-701-5828
371-733-6024

sue@rgsl.edu.lv

Bloch, Frank

Vanderbilt University Law School
312 1st Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37203-1181
USA

615-322-4964 (phone)
615-343-6562 (fax)

frank.bloch@law.vanderbilt.edu

Bohmer, Martin

Universidad de Palermo
Mario Bravo 1302
Buenos Aires (I 175)
ARGENTINA
54-1-963-1560 (fax)

bohmer@giga.com.ar

Bond, Johanna

Georgetown University Law Center
International Women's
Human Rights Clinic
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.,
DC 20003
USA

202-662-9698 (phone)
202-662-9539 (fax)

bondje@law.georgetown.edu

Boytsova, Raissa

St. Petersburg Institute of Law
34, Malypr V-0.
St. Petersburg, 119178
RUSSIA

7-812-323-7823 (phone)
7-812-328-7144 (fax)

Brayne, Hugh

Sunderland University
Sunderland Business School
St. Peter's Way
Sunderland SR6 ODD
UK
00-44-91-515-23 10 (phone)
00-44-91-515-2308 (fax)
hugh.brayne@sunderland.ac.uk

Brooks, Susan
Vanderbilt University Law School
131 21st Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37203-1181
USA
615-322-4964 (phone)
615-343-6562 (fax)
susan.brooks@law.vanderbilt.edu

Burrell, Michelle
Kingsford Legal Centre
AUSTRALIA
612-9-397-6366 (phone)
612-9-399-6615 (phone)
mburrell@unsw.edu.au

Buruiana, Mihail
State University of Moldova
Drumul Viiilor 40-53
Chisinau MD - 2008
MOLDOVA
373-2-249454 (phone)
373-2-723152 (fax)

Byamukama, Dora C.K.
Law and Advocacy for Women
1032, Kampala
UGANDA
348449 or 077-507047(w) 285800(h)
(phones)
256-041-345-605 (fax)
dorabyam@infocom.co.ug

Chauhan, Asok K
President
AMITY Law School
E-27, Defence Colony
New Delhi
INDIA 110 024

Connolly, Kim Diana
University of South Carolina
Main & Greene Streets

Columbia, SC 29205

USA

803-777-6880 (phone)

803-777-3401 (fax)

connolly@law.sc.edu

Cooper, Elizabeth B.

Fordham Law School

33 West 60th Street, 3rd Floor

New York, NY 10023

USA

212-636-6934 (phone)

212-636-6923 (fax)

ecooper@mail.lawnet.fordham.edu

Cooper, Jeremy

Southampton Institute of Higher

Education

East Park Terrace

Southampton SO 14 OYN

UK

00-44-1703-319501 (phone)

00-44-1703-235948 (fax)

jeremy.cooper@solent.ac.uk

Cunningham, Clark

Washington University School of Law

Campus Box 1120

One Brookings Drive

St. Louis, MO

USA

314-935-6413 (phone)

314-935-6493 (fax)

cunningc@law.wustl.edu

Dickson, Judith

La Trobe University

School of Law and Legal Studies

Bundoora, Victoria

AUSTRALIA

613-9479-2284 (phone)

613-9479-1607 (fax)

j.dickson@latrobe.edu.au

Duncan, Nigel

Inns of Court School of Law

4, Gray's Inn Place

London WC 1 R 5DX

UK

00-44-171-400-3629 (phone)

00-44-171-831-4188 (fax)

n.j.duncan@icsl.ac.uk

Evans, Adrian

Monash University

Faculty of Law
Clayton, Victoria
AUSTRALIA
613-9562-3144 (phone)
613-9562-4534 (fax)
adrian.e@ans@law.monash.edu.au

Gallant, Ken
University of Arkansas @ Little Rock
School of Law
1201 McA]mont
Little Rock, AR 72202-5142
USA
501-324-9442 (phone)
501-324-9433 (fax)
ksgallant@ualr.edu

Galstyan, Kristina
Integrated Support to Sustainable Human
Development
(United Nations) ISSHD Project
20/1 M. Saryan Street, Apt. I
375002 Yerevan
ARMENIA
3742-583419 (phone)
3742-151-452 (fax)
kristgal@freenet.am

Gold, Neil
University of Windsor
Room 503, Chrysler Hall Tower
401 Sunset
Windsor, ON N9B 3P4
CANADA
519-253-3000 X2001 (phone)
519-561-1400 (fax)
ngold@uwindsor.ca

Golten, Bob
Denver University
Institute of International Human Rights
2200 S. Josephine Avenue
Denver, CO 80208
USA
303-871-7784 (phone)
303-871-4910 (fax)
bgolten@du.edu or
bgolten@aol.com

Gonzalez, Felipe
Universidad Diego Portales
Avda. Republica 105
Santiago
CHILE
562-697-1089 (phone)
562-676-2625 (fax)

felipe.gonzalez@jur.udp.cl

Grimes, Richard

Education Services Ltd.
Legal Education Consultant
39 Steade Road
Sheffield, S7 IDS
UK
44-0-114-255-1308 (phone)
44-0-114-258-9436 (fax)
richard.g@virgin.net

Hortsch, Diana

New York University School of Law
35 Orance Street, #IG
New York, NY 100 1 2
USA
212-998-6428 (phone)
212-995-4767 (fax)
hortschd@juris.law.nyu.edu

Hossain, Zakir

University of Chittagong
Department of Law
BANGLADESH
isk@ctqu.edu

Hrubala, Jan

Center for Environmental Public
Advocacy
Ponicka Huta 65, 976 33 Poniky
SLOVAK REPUBLIC
421-88-415-4102 (phone)
421-88-415-4102 (fax)
hrubala@changenet.sk

Iya, Philip F.

University of Fort Hare
Private Bag XI 314, Alice 5700
Province of the Eastern Cape
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
27-40-602-2236 (phone)
27-40-602-2618 (fax)

Jayakumar, N K

Dept. of Law
University of Kerala
Karyavattom
Thiruvananthapuram
INDIA 695 581
091-471-438624 (phone)

Jhunjhunwala, R N

Khaitan & Co., Advocates & Notaries
9, Old Post Office Street, 7th Floors
Calcutta

INDIA 700 001

Jivan, Vedna

Kingsford Legal Centre
University of New South Wales
11 Rainbow Street
Kingsford NSW
AUSTRALIA
00 1 1-612-9398-6366 (phone)
0011-612-9399-6683 (fax)
vjivan@unsw.edu.au

John, C P

Indian Society of Interdisciplinary Studies
H. No. 41 Kuklia Lane, Thycaud P O
Trivandrum
INDIA 695 014
091-471-330865 (phone)

Kay, Susan L.

Vanderbilt University Law School
13 1 21st Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37203-1181
USA
615-322-4964 (phone)
615-343-6562 (fax)
susan.kay@law.vanderbilt.edu

Klein, Catherine

The Catholic University of America
Columbus School of Law
Washington, D.C. 20064
USA
202-319-5679 (phone)
202-319-6780 (fax)
klein@law.cua.edu

Kotkin, Minna

Brooklyn Law School
1 Boerum Place
Brooklyn, NY 11201
USA
718-780-7994 (phone)
718-780-0367 (fax)
mkotkin@brooklaw.edu

Kumari, Ved

University of Delhi
Faculty of Law
Delhi - 10007
INDIA
00-91-11-7233035 (phone)
vedk@satyam.net.in

Land, April

University of New Mexico Law School
11 17 Stanford NE
Albuquerque, NM 87131
USA
505-277-5265 (phone)
505-277-4367 (fax)
land@law.unm.edu

Le Brun, Marlene
Griffith University
Faculty of Law
PMB 50
Gold Coast Mail Centre
Queensland 9276
AUSTRALIA
617-5594-8527 (phone)
617-5594-8667 (fax)
m.lebrun@mailbox.gu.edu.au

Liu, Mina Titi
Fudan University
E. China Institute of Law and Politics
Yongkang Lu, Lane 142, No. 2
CHINA
86-21-6473-6848 (phone)
titi-liu@yahoo.com

Lyon, Beth
American University
Washington College of Law
4801 Mass. Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016
USA
202-274-4146 (phone)
202-274-0659 (fax)
blyon@wcl.american.edu

Mahern, Kate
Creighton Legal Clinic
2120 Cass Street
Omaha, NE 68178
USA
402-280-3068 (phone)
402-280-5708 (fax)
mahern@culaw.creighton.edu

Maisel, Peggy
University of Natal, Durban
Private Bag X/O
Dalbridge 4014
Durban

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
27-031-260-2605 (phone)
27-031-260-2559 (fax)
maiselp@law.und.ac.za

Mariarnma, A K

Lecturer
Government Law College
Calicut
INDIA 673 012
091-495-373658 (phone)

McCrimmon, Les

University of Sydney
Faculty of Law
173-175 Phillip Street
Sydney, NSW 2000
AUSTRALIA
612-9351-0209 (phone)
612-9351-0200 (fax)
lesm@law.usyd.edu.au

McQuoid-Mason, David J.

Howard College School of Law
University of Natal
Durban 4041
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
27-31-260-2189 (phone)
27-31-260-2559 (fax)
mcquoidm@law.und.ac.za

Menon, N. R. Madhava

Vice-Chancellor
National University of Juridical Sciences (NUJS)
Aranya Bhavan, 10A LA Block, Salt Lake City
CALCUTTA - 700 091
91-33-335-7379 (phone)
91-33-335-7422 (fax)
nujs@cal3.vsnl.net.in

Meyer, Schalk

Potchefstroom University
Community Law Centre
PO. Box 1447
Potchefstroom 2520
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
018-293-0045 (phone)
018-297-7425 (fax)
pukrhpot@improtech.co.za

Minkah-Premo, Sheila

Leadership and Advocacy for Women
GHANA

233-21-224878 or 233-27-554-424

(phones)

233-21-232-296 (fax)

gyimash@ghana.com

Mitra, N.L.

National Law School of India University
Nagarbhavi, Post Bag No. 7201

Bangalore

INDIA 560 072

080-3211303/3213160 (phone)

080-3217858 (fax)

mitranl@nls.ernet.in

Mohiuddin Khaled

Department of Law
University of Chittagong
BANGLADESH

vc-cu@spnetetg.com

Morshed Mahmud Khan

Department of Law
University of Chittagong
BANGLADESH

vc-cu@spnetetg.com

Mulei, Christopher

University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197

Nairobi

KENYA

254-2-215319 (phone)

254-2-241092 (fax)

virmanet@nbnet.co.ke or

docusol@net2000ke.com

Murthy, Ramesh N. S.

National Law School of India University
Post Bag 7201, Naaarbhavi

BANGALORE

INDIA 560 072

Nagaraj, V.

National Law School of India University
Nagarbhavi, Post Bag No. 7201

Bangalore

INDIA 560 072

91-080-321-1303 or 321-3160 (phones)

91-080-321-7858 (fax)

registrar@nls.ernet.in

Nair, G. Rajasekharan
Government Law College
Trivandrum
INDIA 695 033

Nair, N Narayanan

Kerala Law Academy Law College
Peroorkada, Trivandrum
INDIA 695 005

Nair, S. Somasekharan
Kerala Law Academy Law College
Peroorkada, Trivandrum
INDIA 695 005

Nair, Sheeba
University Of Kerala
Dept. of Law, Trivandrum
INDIA 695 581

Namoradze, Zaza
Constitutional and Legal Policy Institute
OSI Budapest
Nador Str. II
Budapest 1051, HUNGARY
361-327-3102 (phone)
361-327-3103 (fax)
namoradz@osi.hu

Narayanikutty, K. V.
Principal
Government Law College
Thrissur
INDIA 680 003

Nelli, Romanova
Siberian Institute of Law
UL Baikalskaya, 291
Office 22 1, Irkutsk
RUSSIA
7-3852-3526-58 (phone)
7-3852-3526-58 (fax)
epra@irk.ru

O'Brien, Edward L.
Street Law, Inc.
1600 K Street, N.W., Suite 602
Washington, D.C. 20006-2801
USA
202-293-0088, ext. 235 (phone)
202-293-0089 (fax)
eobrien@streetlaw.org

Peters, Don

University of Florida
Levin College of Law
105G Bruton Geer Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611
USA
352-392-0412 (phone)
352-392-0414 (fax)
petersdon@law.ufl.edu

Pinheiro, M

V M Salgoacar College of Law
Miramar, Caranzalem - P 0
Ilhas, GOA
INDIA

Platek, Monika

Warsaw University & Polish Association
of Legal Education
Krakowskie Przedmiescie 26/28
00-927 Warszawa
POLAND
48-22-651-5897 or 48-22-827-7878
(phones)
48-22-651-5897 or 48-22-828-4698
(faxes)
platek@atos.warman.com.pl

Potti, Madhavan, M. M.

Government Law College
Trivandrum
INDIA 695 033

Puri, Poonam

Osgoode Hal I Law School
York University
4700 Keele Street
Toronto, Ontario M3J IP3
CANADA
416-736-5542 (phone)
416-736-5736 (fax)
puripoonam@hotmail.com

Rahman, Mizanur

University of Dhaka
Department of Law
Dhaka-1000
BANGLADESH
880-2-865583 (fax)
koli@citechco.net or
dumail@du.bangla.net

Rajeev, S S

Advocate
Indian Society of Interdisciplinary Studies
No 9, Victory Buildings., Mallore Road
Vanchiyoor P 0

Trivandrum
INDIA 695 035
091-471-493418(phone)

Ramgobin, Asha
University of Natal, Durban
Campus Law Clinic
Dalbridge 4014
Durban
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
031-260-2446 (phone)
031-260-2741 (fax)
ramgobina@mtb.und.ac.za

Rebbapragada, Ravi
Samata-Centre for Advocacy and Support
Plot. 301, Kamalapuri Colony
Phase II, Hyderabad
Andhra Pradesh
INDIA
91-40-354-8024 (phone)
91-40-354-8024 (fax)
samatha@satyam.net.in

Rekhi, V S
Director
National Law Institute University
Bhadbhada Road
Bhopal
INDIA

Rekosh, Edwin
Columbia Law School
Public Interest Initiative in Transitional
Societies
435 West 116th Street
New York, NY 10027
USA
212-851-1061 (phone)
212-851-1064 (fax)
erekosh@law.columbia.edu

Ross, Susan Deller
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Ave., N.W., Room 562
Washington, D.C. 20001
USA
202-662-9640 (phone)
202-662-9539 (fax)
ross@law.georgetown.edu

Sankaran, Kamala
Jamia Millia Islamia University
211 Deshbandhu Apartments
Kalkaji, New Delhi - 110019
INDIA
91-11-648-5696 (phone)

91-11-621-5908 (fax)

kamala-sankaran@hotmail.com

Schukoske, Jane E.

University of Baltimore
School of Law
1420 N. Charles, Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
USA

410-837-5650 (phone)

410-333-3053 (fax)

jschukoske@ubmail.ubalt.edu

Seielstad, Andrea M.

University of Idaho College of Law
Moscow, ID 83843-2322
USA

208-885-6110 (phone)

208-885-4628 (fax)

andreas@uidaho.edu

seielsta@udayton.edu

Semakula, Maria Nassaii

Law Development Center Legal Aid
Clinic
Makerere Hill
P.O. Box 7117
Kampala
UGANDA

256-41-540127/9 (phone)

256-41-540172 (fax)

eacodev@infocom.co.ug

Shabelnikov, Dima

Ford Foundation
103009, Tverskaya 16/2
Moscow
RUSSIA

095-935-7051 (phone)

095-935-7052 (fax)

d.shabelnikov@fordfound.org

Shugrina, Ekaterina Sergeevna

Altay Academy of Economy and Law
656038, Barnaul
Komsomoksky Ave., 86, AAEL
Siberia
RUSSIA

7-3852-364730 (phone)

7-3852-244808 (fax)

kat@alt.ru

Silva, H.J.F.

Principal, Sri Lanka Law College
244, Hulftsdrop Street
Colombo - 12
SRI LANKA
94-1-436040 (phone)
94-1-436040 (fax)
locwal@slt.lk

Singh, Ranbir
NALSAR
University of Law
3-4-761, Barkatpura
HYDERABAD
INDIA 500 027

Sivakumar, S.
Kerala Law Academy Law College
Peroorkada, Trivandrum - 695 005
Kerala
INDIA
091-471-343859 (phone)
sivku98@hotmail.com

Smith, Brenda
American University
Washington College of Law
4801 Mass. Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016
USA
202-274-4261 (phone)
202-274-0659 (fax)
bvsmith@wcl.american.edu

Sreenath, Lalitha
SK University
6/420-B- I-A, Kovur Nagar
Ananthpur
A.P.
INDIA

Sripati, Vijayashri
NALSAR, University of Law
3-4-761, Barkatpura
Hyderabad
INDIA 500 027

Subramoni, T K
Librarian, The British Library
Trivandrum
INDIA
Tk.subramoni@in.britishcouncil.org

Sunder, Madhavi
University of California, Davis
School of Law

King Hall
Davis, CA 95616
USA
530-752-2896 (phone)
530-752-4074 (fax)
msunder@ucdavis.edu

Sutherland, Peter
Director, Softlaw Community Projects
Supervising Solicitor,
Student Internship Program
P.O. Box 5425
Kingston ACT 604
AUSTRALIA
612-6270-3200 (phone)
612-6270-3299 (fax)
peter.sutherlandC@softlaw.com.au

Thilakanandan, C.
Lecturer, Government Law College
Calicut
INDIA 673 012

Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza, Lillian
Makerere University
Associate Dean
Faculty of Law
UGANDA
Ltibatwemwa@muklaw.bushnet.net

Tokarz, Karen
Washington University Law School
Director of Clinical Education
I Brookings Drive
St. Louis, MO 63130
USA
314-935-6414 (phone)
314-935-5356 (fax)
tokarz@wulaw.wustl.edu

Varma, N. Prabha
Press Secretary, C.M.'s Office
Secretariat
Trivandrum
INDIA

Varghese, Jose
National Law School of India University
Nagarbhavi, Post Bag No. 7201
Bangalore - 560 072
INDIA

080-321-1303 or 321-3160 (phones)
080-338-7858 (fax)
registrar@nls.ernet.in

Vijayabalan, N.

Member, Kerala Public Service
Commission
Pattom P O
Trivandrum
INDIA 695 004

Wakabi, Kulsum

Law and Advocacy for Women in Uganda
Raja Chambers
Plot 3, Parliament Avenue
P.O. Box 25324
Kampala
UGANDA
256-41-23544 (phone)
256-41-341245 (fax)
kwakabi@infocom.co.ug

Theodora Bitature Webale

Law Development Centre Legal Aid
Clinic
P.O. Box 7117
Kampala
UGANDA
256-41-540-127/8/9 (phone)
256-41-540-172 (fax)
lac@infocom.co.ug

Williams, Andrew

School of Law
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL
UK
1203-524-954
pgandrew@themis.law.warwick.ac.uk

Wortham, Leah

The Catholic University of America
Columbus School of Law
Washington, D.C. 20064
USA
202-319-5008 (phone)
202-319-4498 (fax)
wortham@law.cua.edu

Zielinska, Eleonora

Warsaw University School of Law

Krakowskie Warsaw
Przedmiescie 26/28
POLAND
(4822) 826-9886 or (4822) 842-2242
(phones)
(4822) 858-8332 or (4822) 8621-6475
(faxes
zielinse@uni-freiburg.de or
klinika@wpia.uw.edu.pl

Zoll, Fryderyk
Jagiellonian University Legal Clinic
Ul Olslewsuiego 2
31-007 Krakow
POLAND
48-12-4221033 (phone)
48-12-4221033 (fax)
fzoll@cicero.law.uj.edu.pl
fzoll@hotmail.com

Zvezdina, Julia
Tver State University
58, Lomonosova St.
5/2 UL Proshina, Apt. 15
Tver
RUSSIA
7-0822-3194-22 (phone)
7-0822-5581-57 (fax)
law@tversu.ru

Zykina, Tatiana)
Pomor State University
Arkhangelsk, 163006
RUSSIA
81-82-460-117 (phone)
81-82-618-910 (fax)
tzykina@atnet.ru

Conference donors and sponsors

The following individuals and institutions contributed towards the travel stipend fund which enabled many teachers to attend the conference and enrich the proceedings. The GAJE Steering Committee is thankful to each and every one of them. There may be many more not mentioned in the list. The Committee thanks them too and seeks to be pardoned for any such omissions.

Clinical Legal Education Association University of Baltimore

Sue Bentsch
Frank Bloch
Roger Burr ridge
Kim Diana Connolly
Clark Cunningham
Neil Franklin
Ken Gallant

Don Peters
James Rowan
Jane Schekoske
Ellen Scully
Stephen Shapiro
Karen Tokarz
Michael H. Wolf
Leah Wortham
Martin Geer
Robert Golten
Peter Joy
John Levy
Jenny Lyman
Holly Maguigan
Kate Mahern
Michael Meltsner

The following organizations have extended funding support to several teachers to enable them to participate in the Conference. The GAJE Steering Committee wishes to record thanks to them:

Association of University Legal Aid Institutions Trust, S.A.
Batory Foundation
British Council
Central and Eastern Europe Law Initiative of the
American Bar Association
Ford Foundation
Social Sciences & Humanities Council of Canada
Soros Foundations Network

The following organizations have contributed substantial in-kind service,.

Washington University Law School
University of Sydney Law School
Vanderbilt Law School
British Council Library, Thiruvananthapuram
Government Law College, Thiruvananthapuram
Department of Law, University of Kerala
Kerala Law Academy Law College
Kerala State Legal Services Authority
Kerala State Women's Commission

