why bother learning anything that isn't going to be directly relevant to the business of law? The fact is that we live in a multicultural society where people of differing culture, gender, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation or level of ability can and do seek legal information. Ignoring this is fine as far as it goes, until a gay or lesbian seeks legal services from a lawyer ill equipped to provide adequate legal advice. As law lecturers, we are in a position to contribute to a better-informed legal profession by raising awareness of these issues in the first place. Even if most of our students do not go on to practise law, we will at least have validated the experience of those who would otherwise have remained invisible and exposed others to some ideas and issues they might otherwise not have considered. Information is made available for students to decide for themselves whether to accept all of it, some of it or none of it, but at least the choice is there to be made on an informed basis.

To make legal education more inclusive and reflective of society as a whole, much work needs to be done. To begin with, we can consistently integrate differing perspectives within the learning materials – whether lectures or tutorial questions – as part of the course delivery. We can include a variety of social contexts within our case studies, problems and questions. In doing so we challenge other students' tendencies to generalise and assume a common interpretation of legal issues. Moreover, it is important that we take the initiative here in order to include those who might be reluctant to speak out themselves or who do speak out but do so at tremendous personal cost.

Not only must differing perspectives and social contexts be integrated into the curriculum; they must be integrated across the curriculum. A much larger project in creating a cross-cultural and experiential law curriculum consists of rethinking and re-designing the curriculum from a critical perspective that draws on wide and varied sources.

GENDER ISSUES

Women in the law school curriculum: equity is about more than just access

R Field

10 *Legal Educ Rev* 1, 2000, pp 141-162

Equality of access to law schools for women has not levelled the law school playing field. The temptation to see women who have made it to law school as 'successful' and to consider that equity concerns are better focused elsewhere must be resisted. This is because, despite the apparent equality of access for women students of law, the reality of women's experience of learning at law school continues to be unequal to that of men. That is, women do not yet have equity of participation in tertiary legal education.

One of the most important reasons why women's experience of tertiary legal education is inequitable relates to the content of the law school curriculum. It is only since the mid-1980s that the inclusion of women's perspectives in the law school curriculum has been considered a serious issue. But debate has been sporadic and seemingly confined to discussions amongst those who understand the importance of the inclusion of gendered perspectives in the curricula. In terms of the broader legal academy, this issue has remained relatively low on the list of priorities.

Traditionally, the law school curriculum has ignored the specific perspectives of women, because, according to well-established liberal legal ideological approaches to understanding the law, the law is something which is objective, neutral and value-free. Although feminist legal theory has questioned the claim of the law to be rational, objective and neutral, it has not yet foiled the perpetuation of male biases in the law and the law school curriculum. Of particular concern have been the silencing, alienation and marginalisation of women at law school as a result of the designation of women's issues and perspectives as irrelevant.

Not only do law schools play a critical role in shaping and socialising our attitudes toward the law, the legal profession generally, and appropriate styles of lawyering, but also the content of Australian undergraduate law courses satisfies the academic requirements for admission to practice. Legal education is the foundation of every lawyer's function and performance in the legal system. To the extent that the law school curriculum ignores gender issues, it legitimises and perpetuates the existing biases in the legal system and the practice of law.

In terms of the general calibre of lawyers who graduate from our law schools every year, the equity-based content of the law school curriculum is extremely important if they are to be able to serve women as well as men. Lawyers need their legal education to include content relevant to women.

Since the recommendation was made that feminist legal theory be offered in separate elective subjects or in elective subjects that deal with legal theory, how many of Australia's law schools have introduced feminist legal theory units into the elective curriculum? A study of the elective curriculum subject lists of all 27 of Australia's law schools revealed that currently only eight universities offer a specific elective entitled 'feminist legal theory'.

The introduction of a gender and the law unit in the elective curriculum is no panacea for women students of law, nor for women consumers of legal services. Indeed a number of problems have been identified with this strategy for equity-based curriculum reform. For example, it is a danger that law faculties will substitute offering a feminist law elective for dealing with these issues in the core curriculum.

The development of feminist electives in the law curricula of a relatively small number of Australia's law schools is not sufficient progress for gender equity in the law school. It is too little spread too thin. The real answer is to integrate the experiences of women into the content of courses throughout the entire curriculum. The process of attempting to integrate women's issues into the traditionally androcentric core law curriculum is, however, one which is extremely challenging and confronting for legal academics. This is be-

cause integration would require all legal academics to rethink the structure, content and process of their course. The potential excuses for avoiding integration are many. Some believe that making materials compulsory that have a strong ideological perspective is inappropriate. Others consider that inclusion of feminist perspectives in the core curriculum will perpetuate and entrench gender differences. It is for this reason that diligence is required in assessing the progress and approaches of law schools on this issue.

There is no shortage of material available for use in core curriculum units which would assist with the integration of women's perspectives and these need to be more widely promoted and disseminated. There are also numerous articles regarding the integration of women's perspectives into core curriculum subjects. Helping academics with the content of materials that integrate women's perspectives into the core curriculum is important. But legal academics may also need assistance and encouragement with process. Programs for integrating feminist perspectives into the core law school curriculum need to be developed.

INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS/ AREAS OF LAW

Simulating multilateral treaty making in the teaching of international law

T McCormack & G Simpson

10 *Legal Educ Rev* 1, 2000, pp 61-82

The general course in Public International Law has not traditionally been considered a 'black letter law' subject along the lines of the legislation and case law based domestic law subjects in most Australian law school curricula. Despite the general acceptance among international law educators that international law is much more than simply a set of rules, teaching methods in the subject have rarely focused on the actual practices of international law making. A clinical international legal education program has yet to be developed anywhere in Australia.

This lack of attention to teaching about the making of international law poses a particular problem in the area of multilateral treaty making. Treaties are one of the four major formal sources of international law and, increasingly, are seen as the most significant component of the international legal order. An understanding of the principles of treaty law is fundamental to any analysis of the substantive provisions of an individual treaty and therefore indispensable to any student of international law. Yet, the methods and processes by which treaties emerge remains relatively unexplored in the discipline. This can be contrasted with scholarly activity in domestic law where emergence studies into national legislation is a thriving field.

The use of simulations offers at least one means by which this over-emphasis on doctrine at the expense of practice can be remedied. Through simulations students can understand that process is vital to an adequate comprehension of the political context in which international law operates and the legal forms which international law adopts and utilises. We have drawn on previous efforts to devise a simulation exercise aimed at redressing the lack of emphasis on process and negotiation in the teaching of international law and organisations.

The doctrinal focus of much international law teaching can be explained partly by the difficulties inherent in any attempt to teach process and negotiation. Communicating information about legal rules and principles is, on the whole, more straightforward than engaging students in the simulated practice of international law.

A successful simulation exercise on the negotiation of a draft multilateral treaty requires a substantial time commitment on the part of both teachers and students. Teachers need to identify an appropriate subject for negotiation – either from an existing multilateral negotiation process or by creating a hypothetical subject and process. In addition, the amount of time the actual exercise consumes is a factor for consideration. If the exercise occurs during normal class time, a teacher would need to allocate a substantial proportion of the lecture/seminar time allocated to the subject.

Possible deterrents include the suspicion that students may not be sufficiently motivated to make the simulation work and the sense that such events are rather unpredictable. The teacher concerned with getting through a mass of material in a course will find simulations an unappealing way to teach international law. Students teach themselves more slowly than we can teach them. But they teach themselves more effectively.

We have found it helpful to provide one or two lectures as background preparation for the simulation exercise. The lectures have helped students participating in the simulation exercise to gain a greater sense of familiarity and, as a consequence, confidence with the substantive issues. In the explanatory session we also attempt to describe some of the principles of how multilateral negotiations work – both in terms of procedure and conventional forms of negotiation, as well as in terms of the pursuit of national objectives and priorities.

Students usually have relatively little background in either multilateral negotiations or the history and politics of the State they are purporting to represent. This can lead either to a lack of confidence on the part of students or a tendency to enter the realm of the fantastic in adopting debating positions. To avoid this, teachers must provide adequate briefing papers in good time for students to absorb these papers and develop positions.

Either during or after a simulation, students will come to realise that they do not possess the answers or that the process is highly procedural, frustratingly slow, surprisingly informal and inelegant. These are, of course, insights but it will not always be clear to students that these are valuable conclusions. It is important that teachers engage in a serious debriefing at the conclusion of the simulation.

One has to accept from the outset that a simulation cannot entirely replicate actual negotiation and drafting. There are severe time constraints that do not exist to the same extent in reality; there are no sec-