are experimenting with other books or materials of their own. It is significant that
the publishers find that they can afford to have several public international law
course books competing with each other.

Now, a personal remark. I recommend to Professor O'Connell that she request
to serve on her law school's faculty appointments committee. Then, she should
endeavor to bring a colleague onto her faculty. No one who teaches international
law can survive in isolation. Regardless of the school, you need colleagues who
have an interest in the field.

Professor O'Connell, you should not try to recruit someone who will teach only
public international law. You will probably not be able to sell that to your faculty.
But you may find someone who can teach comparative constitutional law, interna-
tional economic law, European Community law, or international criminal law,
who might share with you the teaching of public international law. Among faculty
candidates who are of interest to the appointments committee, you will find some
persons who have superior law school records, outstanding clerkship or practice
experience, expertise in domestic law areas that need coverage, and who also have
strength in international law. International law teachers who serve on appointment
committees can have a beneficial influence on the development of their faculties.

COMMENTARY BY MICHAEL H. CARDOZO*

For my part, I wish to provide a commentary on the remarks of the other
panelists. My background is that I am an ex-everything. I am an ex-teacher, ex-
practitioner, and an ex-administrator. Most of those positions involved domestic
matters, and I wish to note, I never took a course in international law in law
school.

It is a pleasure to see Professor Myres McDougal here today. He is the Nestor
of teaching international law in this country, and it would be interesting to hear
his comments on the subject of our panel.

I want to emphasize that, whatever we teach, and that includes international
law, we are teaching students how to become lawyers. Of course, this approach
does not apply to teaching in a political science department. I am addressing my
remarks to the law school world.

It is not important to know what we are teaching. The real question is, Why do
we teach it? I was disturbed by Mr. Westin's remarks. He stated that the liberal
arts aspect of teaching international law has nothing to do with the practice of law.
He also stated that, although international law courses tend to attract students to
a law school, those students are not likely to take the courses. It reminds me of
what Thurmond Arnold used to say about jurisprudence courses: "Practitioners
tell their sons (they were always "sons" in those days) to attend a law school that
has a good jurisprudence course, but not to take the course. It's good for the
faculty to have a course like that." Is the same true about international law
courses? Given the view of practitioners today, perhaps it is.

I also heard the comment that many international law courses tend to be special-
ized rather than survey courses. The specialized courses cover the practical appli-
cations of international law. That is what the prospective practitioners want. I
have taught a survey course in public international law at various law schools. I
taught the course as a "bread and butter" course on the theory that anyone who
wants a legal education should know something about the international aspects of
the law. We should not complain about the specialized courses, because interna-
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tional law can be taught in any context. Law schools are supposed to be teaching the students how to be lawyers.

I return to my comment that I did not take a course in international law. In college, I never took a course in economics. Yet, I eventually served as Assistant Legal Advisor for Economic Affairs in the State Department. I was able to do that, because, in law school, I learned how to be a lawyer. The law student should learn how to be a lawyer, regardless of the context. One of those contexts may be international law, and of course it would help to have studied it in law school. More fundamentally, however, one learns in law school how to handle the problems that arise in the field of law as a whole.

Regarding the survey on international law teaching that we conducted about fifteen years ago, there was a response to the question on the relevance of international law as perceived by students and faculty. It revealed that relatively few felt that the relevance of the subject had increased in the minds of others. In those days, a total of 167 courses were being offered under the classification of international and transnational law in 117 out of about 150 law schools. So the condition of teaching international law in those days was very good and, I think, comparable to the current results and the results that Professor Edwards found in his 1963–1964 survey.

In my report, I quoted a law teacher who said: “International law should be taught as a value-embracing phase of international politics. . . . The rules . . . should be related to their value and interest foundations.” International law courses lie in the humanistic field. That leads me to quote something Edward Levi said about legal education in general, keeping in mind the idea that international law is a value-oriented subject. He said:

The esprit and spirit of the modern law school are the wonder of many graduate departments and other professional schools. . . . It is not, I think, sufficient for us to discuss only procedure and to leave the substance to some other unknown discipline to pick up. A dialogue of values—in addition to our humanistic appreciation of our artistic creations of logic is in fact within our tradition. It is one of the things which makes us uniquely valuable to the university community.

That, I think, states what we are trying to achieve with an international law course.

Finally, I would like to read an excerpt from an article by Professor Myres McDougal and Professor Michael Reisman on what they thought we should be trying to do in the law school world:

The scholar as well as a lawyer advising a client can do no more than: to explain what relevant decisions were made in the past and what relevant decisions are likely, under different conditions, to be made in the future; to aid in the clarification of goals; and then to devise strategy tools toward goal realization. We are thus concerned with sensitizing the student to the performance of five intellectual tasks which every decision specialist must discharge: (1) the clarification of goals; (2) the review of past decisions; (3) the identification of conditioning factors that accounted for those past decisions; (4) the projection, by a variety of means, of possible future courses of this decision; and finally, (5) the invention of techniques for intervening in a way to cause future decisions to promote the public order interest of one’s community or other clients.

COMMENTARY BY RONALD ST. J. MACDONALD*

On November 15, 1990, the Sixth Committee concluded its deliberations on the report of the Working Group on the UN Decade of International Law under
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