From the Editors

This issue illustrates the wide range of concerns that define the *Journal of Legal Education*. The articles variously bring readers new insights on the phenomenon of the globalization of legal education, and its limits. They provide how-to tips for those seeking to become master professors, taking up the position of dean, or wishing to use the War on Terror as a unique teaching moment about the role and responsibilities of lawyers. One article provides the best possible case for tenuring clinical professors and the concluding article examines the benefits of empirical self-study for law school management and reform. Finally, we include two book reviews on altruistic activities—pro bono domestically, and clinical legal education abroad—the latter also echoing globalization themes.

The Japanese move to superimpose a newly created J.D. degree onto the long-standing system of undergraduate legal education was a self-conscious response to globalization. Reformers sought to expand the kind of skills and talents that individuals would bring to the law, better engage students, give them more practical skills, and prepare them for global practice. One part of the plan in particular has not worked out, as detailed in the article by Shigenori Matsui on "turbulence ahead" in legal education in Japan. The number of students allowed to pass the bar has remained quite low, and especially low for those who do not have undergraduate law degrees, suggesting that the appeal of the three year J.D. may not hold up.

Comparing the situation in Taiwan to that of Japan and South Korea, which moved toward the J.D. even more aggressively than Japan, Thomas Chih-hsiung Chen details why Taiwan did not follow the same path. While critical of the Taiwanese reforms, Chen suggests that it made sense in that national context not to follow Japan and South Korea. Other changes in Taiwan, moreover, accomplish some of the reform goals sought in Japan and Korea and, as a result, graduate legal education has in fact become more important in all three countries.

John Mitchell writes of a truly recharging sabbatical that focused on teaching rather than research. Looking to refurbish his teaching of Evidence, he sought out, visited, interviewed, and studied three professors he had reason to believe would offer new teaching insights and teaching tools. He found his project exhilarating and useful—and recommends this approach or some version of it for law professors generally.

We do not often publish checklists for improvement, but we thought that Michael Coper's "top ten tips for good deaning" was worth making an exception. The article offers helpful universals for deans as well as insights about the relationship between the legal world of Australia, where he serves, and law schools in other parts of the globe.

Clare Coleman takes the famous "torture memos" as a point of entry for many key issues in law and legal education, including professionalism and the exercise of judgment. Her suggested teaching agenda is especially compelling because of the signal role many ascribe to those memos in undermining the legitimacy of reasoned law.

Next, Bryan Adamson and his colleagues on the AALS's Task Force on the Status of Clinicians and the Legal Academy examine the role of clinical professors. Given the history of clinical legal education, the activities of clinical professors, and the challenges they face, Adamson and his coauthors argue that the most appropriate status for clinical professors is neither long-term contract nor a separate clinical professor tenure track, but rather the same tenure status as more traditional teachers and scholars enjoy. Their argument is a strong one, and even those who disagree with the conclusion will learn from the thoughtful reasoning and the data assembled by this group of clinicians.

In our final article, we share insights that the University of Toronto Faculty of Law obtained about its students, their engagement, and their academic programs from very sophisticated empirical research. As Cassandra Florio and Steven Hoffman suggest, the stand-alone survey tailored to one school, as compared to the more general Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), may lose the comparative dimension, but it does allow a concentrated analysis of the particulars of one institution.

The two books reviewed both focus on the public interest side of the legal profession. Mitchell Kamin, a long-time CEO of Bet Tzedek, a public interest organization with many pro bono volunteers serving its mission, reviews Robert Granfield and Lynn Mather's edited volume on "the evolving role of pro bono." While offering positive comments, he reminds us that academics and practitioners even in this field need to speak more to each other.

Finally, Sameer Ashar reviews an edited volume by Frank S. Bloch on the "global clinical movement" and its "social justice" mission. Again finding much to praise, Ashar reminds us of the lesson on globalization that the articles on Japan and Taiwan suggest. However much we believe in the virtues of our legal education system—for example, a graduate degree that allows individuals to bring all kinds of learning and experience to legal careers, and clinical education that nurtures idealism and serves the public interest—the process of export and import is far more complex than simply moving good ideas from one place to another.

As noted at the outset, this issue is diverse, but we hope that readers will find insights and analyses that provoke their interest. As always, we encourage comments and ideas for future issues of the JLE.

Bryant G. Garth
Gowri Ramachandran
Molly Selvin