

St. John's Law Review

Volume 74
Number 3 *Volume 74, Summer 2000, Number 3*

Article 12

March 2012

Panelists' and Deans' Roundtable Discussion

Rev. John J. Coughlin O.F.M.

Dean Howard Eisenberg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview>

Recommended Citation

Coughlin, Rev. John J. O.F.M. and Eisenberg, Dean Howard (2000) "Panelists' and Deans' Roundtable Discussion," *St. John's Law Review*: Vol. 74 : No. 3 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/lawreview/vol74/iss3/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in St. John's Law Review by an authorized editor of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact selbyc@stjohns.edu.

**THE THIRD NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
THE ASSOCIATION OF THE RELIGIOUSLY
AFFILIATED LAW SCHOOLS**

**PANELISTS' AND DEANS'
ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION**

July 10, 2000
St. John's University School of Law
Jamaica, New York

MODERATORS

Reverend John J. Coughlin, O.F.M.
St. John's University School of Law

Dean Howard Eisenberg, ARALS President,
Marquette University Law School

REVEREND COUGHLIN: Now what we'd like to do is to simply open up the floor for questions or comments, without further ado. They can be comments in general or directed to any of the panel participants or any of the Deans, for that matter.

PROFESSOR MARGULIES: I have a question for Ken Sprang. I guess we had sort of a friendly discussion about this outside. I'm Peter Margulies. At one point, Ken talked about how a lawyer who comes from a tradition of faith can't cross-examine a witness who the lawyer knows to be telling the truth. It's his responsibility and it's one of the hypos I extend to my students. On the one hand, there's a lot of compelling tradition behind the idea that lawyers should refrain from that kind of impeachment. On the other hand, we do also have a tradition that people who are accused need to have a zealous defense. People accused who are subject to the power of the State are among the least of those, and in that sense ought to be people, perhaps, who have the most protection. How would you reconcile those two commitments?

PROFESSOR SPRANG: I guess my sense is that in the tradition of zealous defense, there are ways to do that and it's not the question of truth. I'm troubled by the system. If you want to study justice, go to divinity school. Truth is what the jury or judge says it is. That troubles me. It seems to me that as a Catholic Christian, I can't compromise what I know to be true. If I know that the witness is right, then obviously you have to change the system because I recognize that under the Code of Professional Responsibility, I unequivocally have the right, and maybe the obligation, to discredit the witness. There are absolute truths, and I'd like to think that people of faith are looking for the truth, however that plays out, as idealistic as I can see that it is.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I am Ray Franklin, Law Secretary with a Supreme Court Judge in the Criminal Division. I think maybe one of the things that has to be changed is the emphasis in Professional Responsibility, when we often hear about how you represent the client at any cost, that being the popular conception. That's often what you hear at law school. I had the privilege of having both Professor Gregory and the Honorable Ed Re as professors and one of the things that Ed Re used to say was you have to always remember—and this is something that has to be emphasized—you are an Officer of the Court. I think that, within the Professional Canon, you have to find that middle ground when you have a client that's going up there to the stand and he's lying to the court, and to the judge, and you're examining him, and you know it. You have certain obligations as well, but I think there has been too much of an emphasis that you defend your client at all costs, you go up against the system. Basically, as a Law Secretary, you're adjudicating. You watch. Unfortunately, it is the case. One of the speakers made reference to winning or losing, the ego against the system. We've seen it with a couple of celebrated cases. Going back to the original point, I think there has to be a balance, with greater emphasis on telling attorneys that, in addition to representing their clients, they are also Officers of the Court.

DEAN BAHLS: My name is Steve Bahls. I'm Dean at Capital University Law School. I have a question, [Professor] Frank [Ravitch], for you. I enjoyed your presentation where you talked about the importance of law faculty and others considering the mission of the law school. My question to you

would be: To what extent should that dialogue include students? Should students be asked to think about what it means to be a student at a religiously affiliated school, particularly if that religious affiliation is different from theirs?

PROFESSOR RAVITCH: That's a great question. I think to a certain extent, if the faculty of all denominations and faiths are involved in at least the broader interpretation of the mission, then the students can become a part of that. I think certainly if you were a student at a school with a very sectarian religious mission, it's going to be hard to be part of the mission. Most missions have more than one prong and you certainly can be involved in other aspects of the mission. I'm speaking, really, about the Catholic institution that I've taught at, and the one that I was a student at. Basically, there's enough play there that you can come to your own understanding. As I said, I understand the religious dimension of Barry's mission differently than maybe some of my Catholic colleagues do. They may have both views of the mission, where mine is more the ethical commitment and helping of people in need. I think students can also take part in that. Part of the problem is that if the faculty doesn't take part, it's unlikely the students will ever see it. There may be a Mission Committee. One or two students may sit on it, but it's unlikely to be talked about. Basically, if the mission allows it—and most missions have the room for that play with the student and the mission, not just the faculty and the mission—the school can really carry it out with the students as well, but the students need to be aware that that's something that should be done and the school needs to create the infrastructure for that. I think in a school with a narrower mission, it will be harder for students with diverse backgrounds to be involved. I'll use Ave Maria for example. If you're going there and you're Jewish or an Evangelical Christian, you know where you're going. You know what it's about, and at some level, you must agree with that mission and I guess at that level you can carry it out, but you're probably not going to be part of the broader mission of the school. Under those circumstances, though, I don't think there's necessarily anything wrong with that. You made your choice. In most schools, though, the play will be there.

DEAN EISENBERG: I'm the Dean of the Marquette Law School, which is a Catholic and Jesuit law school in Milwaukee,

Wisconsin. It's 95 years old and I'm the first non-Catholic Dean in their history. Seventy percent of our students are not Catholic. The majority of our faculty is, and I say that to respond to Steve Bahls' question. I think the students are absolutely critical to the development of the mission. More than that, I think students have to be educated about the mission of the institution early on. I tell this story. In my first semester as Dean at Marquette, a student came into my office during orientation and told me he was concerned about something. I said, well, what is it? He pointed to the crucifix in my office. I have both a crucifix and a Mezuzah in the office, which is interesting, but he pointed to the crucifix and he said I'm concerned about that because I'm an Evangelical Christian. I said, well, you think Howard Eisenberg is trying to convert you to Catholicism? The irony escaped him entirely, but it gave me an opportunity to really talk about the mission of the institution. With that experience, I deal with that literally in the first hour of the students' orientation and talk about what it means and what it doesn't mean because I'm so tired of people viewing the teachings of the Catholic Church as limited to issues of reproductive rights and gender and the like. The greater problem—and this was just referred to—is to get the faculty to embrace the mission. Even when they have worked on the mission, even when it is their words that are in the mission, they don't think it really affects them in what they do, whether it's accessibility to students, whether it is a commitment to serving the community and other kinds of service or whether it is to really look at how our curriculum reflects our religious nature. I find, frankly, that sometimes you can get the students to lead the faculty. This is a matter that's too important to leave to the faculty, particularly when their self-interest may appear to work in a direction where adoption of the mission really is inconvenient for them.

DEAN DESTROW: My name is Bob Destrow. I'm the Interim Dean of Catholic University Law School in Washington. I wanted to follow up Howard's question and pick up on Frank's. The distinction was drawn between the mission broadly defined, and then to something that's more sectarian. Howard was talking in terms of how he views the faculty as the example of how the mission is lived out, in terms of meeting with the students, for example. What is that middle ground between how

the mission infuses and makes a religiously affiliated law school different in some meaningful way? Is it the way in which we teach our courses? The way we treat our students? I mean, what is it? Because, you know, we can talk about these different topics of the papers. They're all really very interesting but in the end I'm still wondering, how do we make our law school more religious? And that's the question. I wanted you to elaborate on that distinction first, if you don't mind.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm not sure that it's necessarily a distinction. I think in a sense—I mean, obviously helping the under-served and the other aspects of the mission are directly part of the Catholic mission of the school, but there is that part that is more sectarian; the Masses and so forth. I'm not sure that those two are as disjointed as I may have made it sound previously. The two go together. In terms of making the school more religious, in that sense, you have to go by the definition of what we mean by more religious. I guess it's a religious practice based question or whether it's sort of the broader mission, going out there into the world of the religious belief system and so forth and so on. I'm going to say you're kind of referring to both and I think that's obviously going to vary from school to school. But when you run into a mission statement which says, we are a Catholic university or a Presbyterian university, and our mission is to carry this belief or that belief into the community with a religious dimension—to ignore the faith that the university has when it carries it into the religious community, to say, well, we're just like any other school, going out there to help the under-served—probably would be a failure of fused horizons with the text. Our school is working with Catholic Charities and other things are being done in terms of keeping a real Catholic identity to that outreach. In terms of the practice base, and I think it's an excellent point and I think that's what Dean Eisenberg is referring to, a religious institution must be able to have its religious belief system recognized and if the faculty does not like that, it's a terrible market. If you're teaching in an institution that's religiously based, you know where you're at and you shouldn't be offended by a religious symbol or two as long as nobody is forcing you to do anything. In terms of the fusing of the horizons there, though, the reality is that if the school goes into the community and ignores the religious dimension, it simply says we're going to help poor people, we're

not going to do it in any way that necessarily ties it to the religious mission, that's a good thing, not a great thing, and it's not a fusion of the horizons of the mission.

DEAN LINK: I am Dave Link. I have been a long time Dean at Notre Dame, served as President of Notre Dame Australia, and I am now helping St. Thomas in Minnesota reopen their law school and St. Augustine start their new university down there, but I wanted to comment on this mission since I wrote the mission statement at Notre Dame before the faculty got hold of it. I wrote the one for Notre Dame in Australia, and I'm writing one now for St. Thomas and one for St. Augustine. It really is an interesting question. It's not just a mission statement. It really affects everything you do. I think the importance that distinguishes the mission statement of any faith-based university is, like it says in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, this whole idea of the joy of searching or discovering and communicating the truth and it's how we do that. I mean, every university does that. Every university is searching for the truth. As law schools, we're searching for the truth in the law and in legal systems and it's how we do that. It's a mixture of faith and reason and therefore, it involves the faculty. It involves the students and everything else and it doesn't matter what the faith persuasion. It's that mixture of faith and reason that's a part of it, inquiry into the truth that I think distinguishes us. I think as we detail our missions, as we go into goals, et cetera, we simply detail that in different ways, but I think it is that kind of mixture of faith and reason that distinguishes us from the secular school that simply tries to reason to what the value of law is. We have a faith basis and there's nothing wrong with that. I mean, every academic has some base from which they make assumptions, and we make an assumption that we do know where the ultimate truth is. It lies in God, and it is how we interpret that as we move from reasoning to a people of faith searching for understanding. St. Augustine, whose name I often use now when I'm in Africa, says, we believe so that we may understand and we understand so that we may believe—and I think that's what defines all of us at religiously affiliated schools.

PROFESSOR COCHRAN: I am Bob Cochran from Pepperdine Law School. I'd like to return to a question that Dean Eisenberg raised, which is how do you make sure that

faculty signs onto the mission. I really think that is a crucial question and I think it's crucial because if you look at this body, you probably see representatives from maybe 25% of the schools that originally were founded with religious missions. Probably the majority of law schools that were founded with religious missions don't really seriously address their religious mission today, and I think that's occurred over the years as the faculty in those schools have evolved and they have had faculties that really don't share the mission of the school. I think it might be good if we talked a little bit about the attempts that the different schools here have made to try to ensure that they maintain a school that supports its mission. I teach at Pepperdine and we do something that very few schools do in the hiring process. As part of the very initial application immediately after we receive a resume from someone, if it's someone that we want to go to the next step with, we send them an application form which states our mission and then we ask them to react to the mission of the school. I don't think it's enough to ask someone's denominational background, because that may or may not tell you something very much about how they would react to the mission of the school, but that signals to applicants the importance the school places in the mission. Then you have a lot of self-selection that goes on, but it also gives the university something on which to assess whether this person in the future is likely to support the mission.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I actually have a question. I am Gene Harper. I practice law in New York and I teach as an adjunct at Fordham.

REVEREND COUGHLIN: Please ask your question.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll ask my question to your incoming Dean. It's a question about the Catholic intellectual tradition. I'd like to ask the Dean of a Catholic law school is there such a thing? We are dealing constantly with the great utilitarian tradition that has shaped our private law in the economy for quite some time. We deal with the neo-Kantian tradition that has shaped our public law and constitutional adjudication. What is the substance, the constitutional elements of the Catholic intellectual tradition? How might we bring it to bear on the studies that are done at a Catholic law school?

JUDGE BELLACOSA: Well, I think it's in formation, as just about everything is. That would be my response. *Ex Corde*

Ecclesiae is going to be a very important evocation for the development of a deeper tradition. I think there is one, but it has been in its own way in Catholic higher education somewhat diffused. When John Courtney Murray, through what we were talking about earlier this morning, identified and helped to do away with some of the anti-intellectualism in Catholic tradition until the 1960s, we started, even in legal education, to see development of respect for the intellectual tradition in the professions as well as in scholarly studies. I think, therefore, we are still in the very, very early stage, certainly in the United States, in my sense and understanding of it, and that we are enormously helped by the *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* evocation.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess I had in mind the Aristotelian Thomistic tradition, which has been around for a long time and wondered whether or not, given the revival of that tradition at Notre Dame and other places in recent years, that would not provide an intellectual grist for the mill that would compete with utilitarian and neo-Kantian tradition.

JUDGE BELLACOSA: It certainly does, but I think what's happening in historical cycles, we have been very historically assimilative ourselves. We wanted to be part of that larger community. We—I sound like I'm speaking for the Catholic tradition. I'm not. I'm speaking for my own experience in it. I think that process, part of the immigration process or part of the process of our coming of age, it seems to me that assimilative trend and tendency and desire pretty much damped down what was the Aristotelian Thomistic tradition that was so great and generous which I think is now habit, a new awareness and development.

PROFESSOR GREGORY: Maybe to give a bit of a practical answer to your question, I'll put in a plug for the University of Notre Dame. From October 19 to 21, they are doing a three-day Maritain Conference. They have about 200 people coming in from all over the world to do a series of papers on the work of Jacques Maritain, the great Thomistic scholar. Jacques Maritain lived a holy life to the point where Pope Paul VI seriously contemplated making him a Cardinal of the Church. It promises to be a world-class conference. There are relatively few lawyers involved.

PROFESSOR COVERDALE: I am Professor John Coverdale from Seton Hall. It's co-curricular. We're inviting

students who want to come and talk about the recent Papal encyclicals and what they represent in terms of the law. There has been a fair degree of interest. One of the interesting things is that we have a good mix of faculty and students coming, so it was one of the rare places I think where faculty and students talked with each other rather than at each other in the classroom. It seems to me that what most distinguishes us Catholic or other religiously-related law schools is precisely the belief there is a truth out there. I'm not so sure, Dean Link, that I quite agree that all law schools are actually out there searching for the truth. I think a lot of law schools, a lot of the faculty, don't believe there's any truth to be found, a utilitarian approach or whatever. I was enormously pleased with Ken Sprang's statement that there's a truth out there and I'm not going to be trying to destroy it. I think much of the time we are sucked in by the legal culture and the way we were formed in law school into a positivistic exposition of the cases in terms of if the judge decides this way, what would you do to get the judge to decide another way, and it leaves the students with the impression that this is all purely manipulation. It seems to me at the deepest level what we need to be trying to do is to regain what I think John Paul II spoke about so well in *Faith and Reason*, the conviction that, yes, there are truths out there and they are accessible. They are not easily grasped, but accessible, and that has to influence how we see. Otherwise, I think as Father Araujo was saying, it's so bland—that's all very nice but who would be opposed to it. I think often times we may end up doing much of the same thing, that we have certain convictions but the technique we learned ourselves, and that we pass onto the students, really undermines it and we end up doing things that aren't really very different from what anyone from any other school would do. I think there's a lot of difference amongst us as to exactly where we come in. But I think that's our kind of bedrock: Do we in fact believe that there are accessible truths? We can build from there.

PROFESSOR SPRANG: In terms of the Dean's comment, it weaves into the tapestry. I'm a convert to Catholicism. It's interesting to have been a life-long Presbyterian and now being a Catholic and I couldn't be anything else. The reason I converted is that I fell in love with a woman who was a Catholic who said don't do this for me. She was quite willing to be a two-religion

family. She opened the door. For me, it's the feast of the senses. All of our rituals are important. That speaks to me. Quakers can speak to God in silence but for me, the ritual of Mass is a mystery. The Mystery of the Eucharist, that whole experience, is a transcendent moment. That's the only way I can talk about it, but I never would have gone through the door had I not met my wife because I had all the misconceptions about Catholicism, all the mythology Protestants have about Catholics, and Catholics have about Protestants too, to be sure. What if we did daily Mass? So many days I would have loved to have gone into a new Mass and I didn't have time. There was some debate about the religious symbolism. Some of us wanted more of it. Again, because that's part of our Catholic tradition. It is our identity. It is who we are. With other traditions there would be less of that because other traditions would not have embraced as much symbolism. It seems to me part of what we do to claim that identity and be more religious is to know who we are. I remember when I taught at Dayton. We had a marvelous Marianist priest who could tell jokes in Latin. It was the presence. There was something about the collar that reminded you of where you were, and I think that's an important piece and the other thing is the sense of spirituality, that quest for truth. Peter [Margulies] and I had a discussion, in the sense that we are all on this journey. God is the ultimate truth and we are all trying to figure it out. If any of us claims we know all the answers, they're probably smoking funny cigarettes. We are all struggling to understand that truth. It is a quest. It is a quest that we are called to do. It seems to me that's part of what we do. It's being who we are and embracing it. There was some debate amongst us at Barry Law School that at Christmas, for example, we decided to celebrate Kwanzaa, Hanukah, Ramadan, and Christmas, and some of us said—there was no Crèche, and some of us said, that isn't who we are. It isn't that we don't respect those traditions, but even my Jewish friends said it doesn't make sense. We didn't expect to see a Menorah here. It is a sense of this that is part of who we are, have a look. It seems to me that leads to these other broader issues of the search for truth and the law.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Professor Margaret Kniffin, from St. John's. This is addressed to the people who spoke about justice as being important as a goal. I remember being at the

American Association of Law Schools contracts meeting. Contracts is my field. Hearing people puzzle out loud: How can we keep the students' interest? Should we talk about law and economics? Should we talk about this and that? When I was finally brave enough to raise my hand—and I thought I was being simplistic—I said I found in what is now 25 years of teaching that they are intrigued and interested when we talk about justice as the goal. We come into law school expecting to learn about justice. I think this is part of what has called them to be lawyers. I find that in teaching, as I keep coming back to this theme throughout the year and throughout the whole first year, because contracts is a full year course here, I keep asking them, what would be fair? It could get quite complicated, as all of us know, because sometimes there will be cases in which the students will say, "but this decision is unfair." It's unjust, and if they see that the court has followed the precedent, has followed the common law, or has applied the statute—and this is my point I wanted to make now—I find it so useful, and I wondered if others agree, to point out to the students that the law, the common law, and statutes are designed to accomplish the largest amount of justice in the largest number of cases, but that they cannot always do justice for the individual. And then the students will say, "well, why don't they make a different decision in this case? Why don't they change the law?" And then I remind them that we need predictability. We need uniformity. We can't make a different decision for every case that comes up. I don't know if anyone has a response to this, but I do feel that justice is a theme that is useful and important to continue to emphasize.

DEAN DESTROW: I have a brief response. I think the students really appreciate that. I teach, among other things, Professional Responsibility. I have found that, in teaching, it's much easier to start from a Jewish law perspective, which focuses on the nature of obligation than it is to start from an American law perspective of what's the right of the client. The first time that I actually did that, I had one of my Jewish students come up after class and say, "I want to congratulate you. This is the first time in law school that anybody ever remotely said anything that resonates with anything my rabbi said. I'm going home this weekend and I'm going to tell him that." So I think that in some respects, not only are the students

looking for justice, they're looking for ways to connect those notions of justice with what they learned as they were growing up. Otherwise, law school and justice simply become, what's best for the many and too bad for the small guy.

FATHER ARAUJO: I'd like to follow up on [Professor Mararet Kniffin's] question, being one of those speakers who addressed the issue of justice. I will go with contracts. Peggy and I had a brief discussion during the break. I made a second confession today, being that I just taught contracts for the first time this year. People are always intrigued: What do I teach? I always respond: Whatever they want me to! Well, I had an interest because this idea of the law of promise intrigued me, but we also had a need. We needed a teacher. We've all heard in our own legal education, I'm sure at some point, when we're looking for what does the law say, what's the rule, and how do I tell my client that he or she is going to win or lose? Well, why? Perhaps in some instances the judge or the Appellate Bench is looking at the contract issue very formally, and following rules very precisely, and not doing much more than that. That says we can now expect what the result is and understand it. There's also the functional approach. What's the law about?—reconciling a dispute, resolving a dispute, solving a bad relationship between two people, hopefully in a civilized way. So there's the functional approach. I guess we as teachers try to bring some closure to this response about where is justice in the nuts and bolts courses we teach, just to keep in mind for ourselves that indeed we have seen a variety of judges, smart people, ethical people, decent human beings going in several ways. How do we help ourselves as well as our students chart a course through this? I think by keeping in mind that indeed if we're looking for something other than simply a formalistic solution, we can go to that next step and say: What's the right thing? Not just for these two people but, as several of our colleagues have said today, there are others involved. There are others involved, and do we keep these others in mind? And I think that's when we do get closer to the true solution, meaning what's right for the people involved, not simply looking for the formal solution but perhaps something of the function.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know we're getting close to the conclusion and this is a comment on what we're talking about, another comment of appreciation for all of you for being here

today for this conference at which I've learned a great deal at as one of the new kids on the block. One of the things that strikes me in so many of the questions that have been posed and answers is the recognition of how much we don't know when we're striving for a particular virtue or ideal like justice. And the participants and the adjudicators, how much they don't know and the fallibility of the individual agents and of the process is something that we have to come to deal with in accepting that as a limitation on what we would like to have as the ultimate justice in any given case or in any kind of a generality or proposition that we might advance. I think that understanding helps us, not only in teaching the students that there will be variations and cases on both sides, but helps us in providing that instruction to appreciate the limitations that are there, though they do not deter us from striving for the ideal in the achievement of a virtue as wonderful and as grand and as important as justice.

PROFESSOR McMORROW: I am Judy McMorrow from Boston College. It strikes me that what these comments suggest is that the mission statement, like the Constitution itself, is a performance document, and only comes to life in the way in which it is enacted in our day-to-day lives. One of the challenges is how much we talk about it, for example, having teaching seminars for our faculty to talk about how to bring our faculty on board. You don't do it by e-mailing them a copy of the mission statement. People have to resonate with the mission statement. That means we have to talk to our faculty and to each other in terms that they will accept, that will resonate with them. In the end, I keep coming back to a vision that inevitably, I think, the more ecumenical implementation is better for our Catholic law schools, which leaves me to feel uncomfortable with a really aggressive affirmative hiring for Catholic faculty because I feel like we're only exercising our left arm. Perhaps it will not bring as broad a vision of this performance document as I think it needs to have, but I might be wrong, so I have that sense. I don't know if others are in that place.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Ray Franklin again. Just for the Deans, I guess we've talked about the mission, when it's completed, the faculties. Somebody had brought up the students. I'm just wondering how beneficial would it be for law schools, as I see more and more universities—instead of just

asking that bland question, "what did you do this summer?," asking instead, "what did you do that was meaningful in your life?" I've seen more and more universities take their mission statement, put it into the context of the essay that is part of the admission process and say, "what is your comment on this? This is the mission." They select parts of the mission and say, "what do you think about this? How do you think you would fit in?" Do you see that as applicable in a law school setting as well as a regular university setting, particularly in light of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*? In reference to the Honorable Joseph Bellacosa's comments, the point is made very succinctly about the assimilation process. I sometimes think—and some of the comments I've heard here even today, although the overall view has been a refreshing one—that it is a self-consciousness, a fear that we're going to be labeled and typed intellectual Catholicism. I think there's a tendency at times to bend over backwards to say we're Catholic but we're Catholic with a small "c;" we're really not going to ram this down your throat, instead of saying, as many of the speakers say, we're a Catholic institution, this is what we stand for, this is our belief system, you are welcome to join us with that understanding that this is the mission and the basis of this university.

REVEREND COUGHLIN: Now we're going to have some closing remarks from our President.

DEAN EISENBERG: The Association of the Religiously Affiliated Law Schools is not much of an association, I must tell you. I inherited the presidency from my predecessor, who was Dean of the Marquette Law School, apparently because he and our then academic vice president decided there was a need for this organization, essentially to defend ourselves from the American Bar Association. I think they were correct. As it's turned out, the American Bar Association has had some bigger enemies to deal with, such as the Government of the United States and others, although we will take credit for getting them off of our back. But having said that, if anyone else would like to be President, you are welcome to it.

My only accomplishment as President has been seeing that we have met the last two times. First in Virginia Beach at Regent in 1998 and now here at St. John's. At the Regent meeting, Professor [David] Gregory volunteered St. John's for this meeting and he actually even decided then exactly on this

date because it was between the ABA meeting in New York and the ABA meeting in London. David has been able to pull this together and really produce an extraordinary conference, and I hope you'll all join me in thanking David. I know the Interim Dean of the Law School, Vince Alexander, has been very gracious with his time and his staff. We appreciate that, Vince. Judge Bellacosa could still be called judge for a while, and then the faculty will start calling you other things. We welcome you to the ranks of Dean and I have a whole list of things they will call you that you haven't seen—you thought it was bad as a judge. Just wait until you get back to the new reality of being a law school Dean. This year, we have the tradition of, number one, deciding where we are going to meet at our next conference, so you can all plan and, number two, alternating between a Catholic and non-Catholic school.

You may wonder how an association that really doesn't exist can decide so quickly how and where to meet. That's really an advantage of not having any membership or Board of Directors, although we've elected them from time to time. I never communicate with them, so it makes it easier, but in any event, we are going to have to struggle in 2002 to go to Big Sur because the host of our next meeting in the fall of 2002 will be Pepperdine Law School. That not only will give us a religious diversity; it will also give us geographical diversity: Milwaukee, Virginia Beach, New York, and now we will go out to the West Coast.

