

subjects are taught and the law culture. Women's voices must be heard in legal education. Personal law school experiences and the works of Catherine MacKinnon, Carol Gilligan and Ann Scales reveal the "bitter, solitary anger" experienced by women. Women must come together to prevent the assault of legal education.

Ambivalence: The resilience of legal culture in the United States

J Resnik

45 *Stan L Rev* 6, July 1993, pp 1525-1546

The classroom is still invulnerable to radical commentaries such as critical legal studies, feminism and critical race theory. There are three reasons for the resilience of the classroom to these radical commentaries: (1) law professors tend to teach what they themselves have been taught; (2) the conservative power of the law and economics movement, which is heavily financed by conservative (in the political sense) foundations and; (3) law professors find it very difficult to stand before students and tell them of the failures of the discipline of law. Courtrooms are also displaying a similar resilience to radical commentaries.

Many task forces on women's issues have revealed that gender bias is

prevalent in the legal system, however these task forces have been predominantly directed by either men or white women. Investigations by task forces into the bias against women who belong to racial or social minorities is notably absent and in need. White women within power should be insisting on the inclusion of women from minority groups.

Missing questions: Feminist perspectives on legal education

D L Rhode

45 *Stan L Rev* 6, July 1993, pp 1547-1566

In legal education, feminists are now demanding that institutions change to accommodate women, unlike the early feminists who argued for equal opportunity. What feminists want from legal education is similar to what other critics have wanted - an overhaul of the values, skills and substantive concerns of legal education.

The questions that legal educators should be asking are: (1) Are legal educators effectively equipping students to address the needs of the client as the client perceives them? (2) Are legal educators strengthening commitments to ethical decision making and public service? and (3) Are legal educators serving faculty interests at the expense

of others in the way in which the educational experience at law school is structured? In response to these questions values more central to feminist analysis - care, collaboration and context - should become more central to legal education and practice.

The socratic method of teaching and the omnipotent nature of the lecturer perpetuate the authoritarian structure thereby suppressing alternative voices. Legal texts ignore the factual circumstances, the legal choices, the consequences for litigants and the social and historical context of cases. The contextual details are necessary if the interaction of life and law are to be understood. Finally, issues of professional ethics and responsibility are not addressed within courses as they arise, moreover, they are relegated to a single course which is perceived by students as being the 'dog of the law school'.

Legal education and the politics of exclusion

R A Epstein

[see Context, Criticism and Theory]

What we do, and why we do it

L Alexander

[see Context, Criticism and Theory]

The *Legal Education Digest* is published by the:
Centre for Legal Education, Level 4, 170 Phillip Street, Sydney
New South Wales, Australia

Telephone: (02) 221 3699

E-mail: centlged@sulaw.law.su.OZ.AU

Facsimile: (02) 221 6280

Director:
Administrator:
Research Assistant:

Christopher Roper
Lynne Singleton
Tim Marshall

The assistance of the Librarian and staff of the library of the Law Society of New South Wales is gratefully acknowledged.