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LAWYERS FOR THE ACCUSED: AN
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Abbe Smith

Ilene Seidman

I. INTRODUCTION

We tend to despise each other. Lawyers for the abused\(^1\) would rather spend time with the most vicious abusers than

\* Abbe Smith is an Associate Professor of Law and Associate Director of the Criminal Justice Clinic and E. Barrett Prettyman Fellowship Program at the Georgetown University Law Center, and an experienced criminal defense lawyer who has represented many alleged batterers.

\** Ilene Seidman is a clinical instructor at Harvard Law School and an experienced poverty lawyer who has represented many battered women.

We thank Jane Aiken, Deborah Epstein, Lois Kanter, and Catherine Klein for their thoughtful consultation. We thank Sarah Josephson and Yvette Missri for excellent research assistance.

1. When we refer to lawyers for the abused, we mean lawyers in a variety of legal settings who represent women who have been abused by spouses or partners. We include lawyers who practice in family court, housing court, criminal court (when they appear on behalf of complainants or witnesses), before administrative agencies, and in general civil trial court. In the context of the criminal justice system, we will refer to those who claim to have been battered or abused as either "alleged victims" or "complainants." In the civil setting, we will refer to those who claim to have been battered or abused as "victims of domestic violence" or "battered women," as the prevailing reality of domestic violence is that women tend to be victims and men perpetrators. See Evan Stark & Anne Flitcraft, Spouse Abuse, in PUBLIC HEALTH & PREVENTIVE MEDICINE 1040 (J.M. Last & R.B. Wallace eds., 1992). For a discussion of the complex, perplexing and ultimately unsatisfying vocabulary of domestic violence, see ANN JONES, NEXT TIME, SHE'LL BE DEAD: BATTERING & HOW TO STOP IT 82–87 (1994) (criticizing the term "domestic violence" as a "euphemistic abstraction" and "battered woman" as deceptive and restrictive); ELIZABETH SCHNEIDER, BATTERED WOMEN AND FEMINIST LAW MAKING 60–68 (2000) (critically examining the terms that have been used to describe the concept of battering and noting the interrelationship between definition and strategy); Elizabeth M. Schneider, Particularity and Generality: Challenges of Feminist
someone who regularly represents them. Lawyers for the accused would rather convene with a crowd of alleged victims of abuse than their lawyers. When we do meet up, it is seldom pretty. We try to hold our tongues—especially when it is in our clients’ interest to do so—but invariably contempt leaks out. At best there is a kind of wry jousting.

Let us be clear. This is no “Adam’s Rib” relationship: Opposing counsel are not Katherine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy; they do not spar during the day and dine together at night; there is no romance here. The testiness—if not outright hostility—between lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused is not limited to the courtroom; neither is terribly glad to see the other even in the neutral setting of a professional conference.

Perhaps this hostility is not surprising. Lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused are adversaries in a system that is based on competition. Rivalry and conflict are an inevitable part of advocacy. There is often tension between opposing

---

2. When we refer to lawyers for the accused, we mean criminal defense lawyers, the vast majority of whom are public defenders or court-appointed counsel in this context.

3. ADAM’S RIB (Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer 1949). In the film, Spencer Tracy is a district attorney prosecuting a woman for attempting to kill her philandering husband. Katherine Hepburn is the lawyer for the accused, whom she portrays as an abused woman.

4. At clinical teaching conferences, those who teach in clinics representing alleged victims and those who teach in clinics representing alleged perpetrators tend to attend separate workshops when they are defined by practice area. Lawyers who represent battered women are in “domestic violence” small group discussions, and criminal defense lawyers are in “criminal justice” small group discussions. Of course, not every domestic violence clinician is hostile to every criminal defense clinician, and vice versa, as the co-authorship here demonstrates.


parties, as well as tension between either or both of the parties and the judge. Otherwise congenial, pleasant people can sometimes become contentious and unruly in an adversarial setting.

But the rivalry here seems to go further than most. Perhaps this is because lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused are groomed in very different cultures of practice and, as a con-

WASH. L. REV. 477, 514 (1990) [hereinafter Advocacy and Contempt, Part One] (stating that "some level of emotional reaction, some degree of temporary animosity, and a measure of turmoil, are part of the natural processes of trial advocacy"); Taylor v. United States, 412 F.2d 1095, 1096 (D.C. Cir. 1969) ("a criminal trial is not a minuet"). See also MARVIN FRANKEL, PARTISAN JUSTICE 11 (Hill & Wong eds., 1980) (describing the adversary system as a "battlefield" on which lawyers "marshal the[ir] forces" for a "grimly combative" fight).

7. As Monroe Freedman has noted:
The problem is, in part, one of perspective. Along with a great deal of mutual respect between judges and the lawyers who appear before them, there is also a considerable amount of tension between them. One probable reason for that tension is the fact that the judge and the advocates have different functions. The lawyers are committed to seek justice as defined by the interests of their clients, while the judge is dedicated to doing justice between the parties. From the perspective of the judge, therefore, at least one lawyer in each case is attempting to achieve something to which her client is not entitled. From the perspective of the lawyer, however, the judge is always poised to deprive her client of something to which the client is entitled.

FREEDMAN, supra note 5, at 73.


He sprang from his chair screaming, grabbed opposing counsel by the throat and began to choke him. The judge and the law clerk tried to separate the two men who were now locked in combat, and at one point all four persons—the judge, his law clerk and the two attorneys—were rolling on the floor. The judge suffered minor injuries before the two combatants could be separated.

In re McAlevy, 354 A.2d at 290. Although the above conduct is clearly over the top—it is unsurprising that the New Jersey Supreme Court issued a strong reprimand—what may sometimes appear to be "undignified, discourteous, or degrading" behavior by a lawyer may be "essential to . . . effective representation." FREEDMAN, supra note 5, at 73; see also Monroe H. Freedman, The Ethical Danger of "Civility" and "Professionalism," 6 N.Y. ST. B.A. CRIM. JUST. J. 17 (1998) (noting that the call for civility, courtesy and professionalism among lawyers often masks a serious attack on the ethic of zeal).

9. The intense rivalry between defenders and prosecutors may be comparable. See generally Abbe Smith, Can You Be a Good Person and a Good Prosecutor?, 14 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 355 (2001).

10. For an exploration of the culture of practice for public defenders, see generally LESLIE ABRAMSON, THE DEFENSE IS READY: LIFE IN THE TRENCHES OF CRIMINAL LAW 61–133 (1997); LISA MCINTYRE, THE PUBLIC DEFENDER: THE PRACTICE OF LAW IN THE SHADOWS OF REPUTE (1987); JAMES KUNEN, HOW CAN YOU DEFEND THOSE PEOPLE?: THE MAKING OF A CRIMINAL LAWYER (1983); SEYMOUR WISHMAN, CONFESSIONS OF A CRIMINAL LAWYER (1981). The culture of lawyers who represent battered women might fairly be said to be an amalgam of the cultures of the women's movement, see ROBIN MORGAN, SISTERHOOD IS
sequence, seem to speak a different language.\footnote{See generally John Gray, Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting What You Want in Your Relationships (1992); Carol Gilligan, In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development (1982). Citing these two books suggests that the cultural differences between victims' lawyers and criminal defenders may be “gendered,” irrespective of the gender of the individual lawyer. Although there is some truth to this stereotype, in fact the cultures are not so rigid. See generally Rand Jack & Dana C. Jack, Moral Vision and Professional Decisions: The Changing Values of Women and Men Lawyers (1989).} They certainly seem to have markedly different sensibilities. At their worst, victims’ lawyers revel in their clients' victimhood, connecting it to a deep sense of their own victimhood.\footnote{See generally Wendy Kaminer, I'm Dysfunctional, You're Dysfunctional: The Recovery Movement and Other Self-Help Fashions (1992) (examining the recovery movement's obsession with victimhood); Wendy Kaminer, It's All the Rage: Crime and Culture 1–90 (1995) (examining the criminal justice system's obsession with victimhood).} At their worst, defense lawyers make fun of everything, lampooning even the most tragic human events.\footnote{For example, a couple of years ago, the Georgetown Criminal Justice Clinic represented a young man accused of shooting a ten-year-old girl in the chest in the course of a gang-related incident. The little girl—a classic innocent bystander who was standing on her own porch when gunfire erupted—was the chief government witness. In the course of preparing for trial, lawyers in the clinic began to poke fun at the little girl—calling her a young hussy, a chronic liar, and a poor student who wasn't contributing much to the world anyway. Distasteful though it may sound, this is the kind of conduct defenders engage in to cope with the anxiety of handling such a serious case and of facing such a sympathetic witness. There is a reason public defenders prefer the term “complainant” or “complaining witness” to “victim” or even “alleged victim.” It creates some distance. The term “complainant” implies that these people are not true victims, worthy of sympathy. Rather, they appear as complainers. Their testimony will consist of complaining: they will complain, complain, complain.} Antagonism toward the opposition is built into the culture of practice for both sets of lawyers. To lawyers for the abused, defenders are amoral, insensitive cowboys who enjoy humiliating victims and never consider the secondary social consequences of their client's violent conduct, like the effect of spousal abuse on children.\footnote{See generally George W. Holden et al., Children Exposed to Marital Violence: Theory, Research, and Applied Issues (1998); see also Jones, supra note 1, at 84–85 (noting that studies suggest that children who witness battering may suffer long-term conse-}

happened, they routinely lie, cheat, and engage in other nefarious practices in order to get their clients off, and are just not nice people.

To lawyers for the accused, so-called "victims' lawyers"—if they are lawyers at all, and not the peculiar subspecies "victim/witness advocate"—are shrill fanatics obsessed with their cause. Victims' lawyers make no connection between criminal defendants and complainants, though they can sometimes be interchangeable and certainly have more in common than anyone

quences such as anxiety, depression, or aggressiveness); Gerald T. Hotaling & David B. Sugarman, An Analysis of Risk Markers in Husband to Wife Violence: The Current State of Knowledge, 1 VIOLENCE & VICTIMS 101–24 (1986) (reviewing psychological studies of batterers and concluding that many witnessed the battery of their mothers when they were boys); Dorothy O. Lewis et al., Violent Juvenile Delinquents: Psychiatric, Neurological, Psychological, and Abuse Factors, 137 AM. J. PSYCHIATRY 1211–16 (1980) (finding that nearly four-fifths of seriously violent youth in a delinquency institution in Connecticut had witnessed extreme family violence). The Lewis study found that the single most important factor distinguishing families of violent children from other families is the father's severe violence against the mother. See id.

15. Others share this concern. See, e.g., FRANKEL, supra note 6, at 73–86 (arguing that the unchecked partisanship in the adversary system undermines the search for truth and justice); Marvin E. Frankel, The Search for Truth: An Umpireal View, 123 U. PA. L. REV. 1031, 1032 (1975) (arguing that the adversary system "rates truth too low among the values that institutions of justice are meant to serve"); William Simon, The Ethics of Criminal Defense, 91 MICH. L. REV. 1703, 1704 (1993) (noting that defense lawyers routinely subvert the truth by presenting perjured testimony, impeaching truthful witnesses, and arguing evidence that supports inferences they know to be false); Harry I. Subin, The Criminal Lawyer's "Different Mission": Reflections on the "Right" to Present a False Case, 1 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 125, 126–227 (1987) (arguing that criminal defense lawyers should be prohibited from putting on evidence to accredit a false theory or impeaching truthful government witnesses); Van Kessel, supra note 5, at 435–45 (arguing that criminal trial advocacy routinely includes deceptive and frivolous claims).

16. This view has been articulated by many outside the context of domestic violence. See, e.g., HAROLD J. ROTHWAX, GUILTY: THE COLLAPSE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 222–38 (1996) (criticizing the defense lawyering in the O.J. Simpson case); Simon, supra note 15, at 1704–05 (criticizing defense tactics such as drawing out and delaying cases, subverting truth, and threatening to disclose information that will embarrass witnesses and discourage the prosecution from going forward); Subin, supra note 15, at 153 (noting that much of the public regards criminal defense lawyers as "not to be trusted," "truth manipulators or worse" and "little more than the alter ego, if not alter id, of his or her client").

17. Defenders protest that they are nice to some people. See Mary Halloran, An Ode to a Criminal Defense Lawyer, CALIFORNIA LAWYER, June 1998, at 96 (noting that criminal defense lawyers "cry in public if the subject has to do with justice or the death penalty ... [and] oddly . . . make loving parents").

18. As those of us who practice in the trenches of criminal court will attest, today's complainants are often tomorrow's defendants and vice versa.
else in the criminal justice system. They believe everything their clients say, because battered women never lie. They seek only harsh punishment—preferably castration, but at the very least imprisonment—for criminal defendants. They believe all batterers are monsters.

The authors of this article have generally avoided this hostile dynamic. It probably helps that we have never opposed each other in court and have never even practiced in the same court, even when we lived in the same city. No doubt it helps that we are friends. But, our lack of hostility is not merely the result of professional avoidance or personal friendship—or even our joint tendency to resist fitting into the usual mold. Notwithstanding our different adversarial roles, we find that we have a shared vision.

Our shared vision may be a reflection of the similar paths we have taken to the work we do. Both of us began our careers as poverty lawyers—one as a legal services lawyer and the other as a public defender. Both of us became clinical law teachers out of a desire to continue doing the work we were doing, but also to draw


Victims and defendants often have more in common with one another than either does with the representatives of the State. Victims and defendants often know one another, live in the same neighborhood, and are of the same educational, racial, or class background. Most importantly, they are both relatively powerless.

This similarity often has been ignored by those in the forefront of the victim’s rights movement who focus attention on the antipathy between victims and defendants.

*Id.* at 143.

20. See *id.* at 144 (noting that the victim’s rights movement has played a role in diminishing defendants’ rights at bail and sentencing, and that those in the forefront of the victim’s rights movement often call for more prisons and greater punishment).


22. Ilene Seidman could be described as a plucky—and occasionally pushy—poverty lawyer. Abbe Smith likes to think of herself as a relatively sensitive, feminist criminal defense lawyer.
students to the work and give them the skills, understanding, and judgment to do it well. Although one of us teaches students and represents clients (often victims) in a civil clinic, and the other teaches students and represents clients (often perpetrators) in a criminal clinic, we both see ourselves as representing poor people in trouble.

There is a shared sensibility, as well. We both like being lawyers who represent individual clients in the lowest courts in the land. We like fighting the good fight on behalf of an underdog, no matter the odds. We believe in the adversary system, no matter its many shortcomings. We also share a particular interest in issues concerning gender, race, poverty, and violence.

In this article, we will explore what unites lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused. In Part II, we will discuss our connection as poverty lawyers concerned about the dignity of individual clients. In Part III, we will discuss our shared commitment to the adversarial system, legal process, and access to justice. In Part IV, we will address the challenge of teaching students who represent victims or perpetrators to be zealous and devoted advocates—but also to care about social and legal injustice on both sides.

II. Poverty Lawyers Representing Individual Clients

By and large, lawyers who represent battered women and criminal defendants—especially in a clinical setting—are poverty lawyers. We represent the aggrieved and afflicted, the forgotten and shunned. We represent those for whom extreme poverty has

---


24. See generally ANTHONY LEWIS, GIDEON’S TRUMPET 5–6 (Vintage Books 1989) (1964). Gideon was a fifty-one-year-old white man who had been in and out of prisons much of his life. He had served time for four previous felonies, and he bore the
persisted for generations,\textsuperscript{25} is an intermittent condition constantly struggled against,\textsuperscript{26} or is a relatively new state of being, the result of a crisis.\textsuperscript{27} We spend our time in the trenches of poor peoples' courts where the need is great and deliverance doubtful.\textsuperscript{28}

We work in settings familiar to the poor and their advocates. Criminal defenders and lawyers for battered women meet with our clients in hallways and holding cells, in hospital rooms and

\begin{quote}
physical marks of a destitute life: a wrinkled, prematurely aged face, a voice and hands that trembled, a frail body, white hair. He had never been a professional criminal or a man of violence; he just could not seem to settle down to work, and so he had made his way by gambling and occasional thefts. Those who had known him, even the men who had arrested him and those who were his own jailers, considered Gideon a perfectly harmless human being, rather likeable, but one tossed aside by life. Anyone meeting him for the first time would be likely to regard him as the most wretched of men.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{26} See \textit{Jencks, supra note 25, at 72–79 (discussing the poverty rate); see also Randy Albelda et al., \textit{The War on the Poor: A Defense Manual} 12 (1996) (noting that when asked by a Gallup poll what amount of income they would use as a poverty line for a family of four, the average person’s response was twenty–four percent higher than the official poverty line).

\textsuperscript{27} See, e.g., \textit{Christopher Jencks, The Homeless} (1994) (documenting the rise in homelessness in the 1980s and examining the causes); \textit{Peter H. Rossi, Down and Out in America: The Origins of Homelessness} 143–79 (1989) (discussing the vulnerability to homelessness of the mentally and physically ill, those with substance abuse problems, those with criminal convictions, those with severed ties to friends and family).

\textsuperscript{28} See \textit{Smith & Montross, supra note 24, at 457 (footnotes omitted) (noting that “[i]ndigent criminal defense lawyers labor in the lowest courts of the land, where the air is thick with worry and fear, and the halls are lined with the aggrieved and the adamant. This is clearly a gathering place for poor people; it has the smell and feel of so many places to which they are shunted.”).
half-way houses. We wander through our clients’ crumbling neighborhoods\textsuperscript{29} to track down witnesses and family members. In a time of widening inequality,\textsuperscript{30} we meet with overburdened social workers, case workers, mental health workers, and probation and parole officers—those who minister to the poor in the dreary, crowded waiting rooms and make-shift offices to which our clients seem forever resigned.\textsuperscript{31}

By calling ourselves poverty lawyers, we do not mean to suggest that crime and domestic violence happen only to the poor; to the contrary, crime and domestic violence know no social or economic bounds.\textsuperscript{32} Nor are we suggesting that most poor people are victims or perpetrators of abuse; most poor people lead peaceful,
law–abiding lives. Still, there is a strong correlation between economic deprivation and inequality and criminal violence in this country. Moreover, while our clients may not start out poor, they are often poor by the time they come to us. Women who flee abusive partners who were their primary source of financial support are often impoverished as a result. Likewise, there are very


[There are] subcultures of violence whose members legitimate, even encourage, physical aggression as a response to conflict. An examination of homicide data in Philadelphia gave rise to the idea of such a subculture existing in certain urban neighborhoods among people below the poverty level. Homicides in these neighborhoods seemed to result from trivial disputes. Trapped in an underclass of social isolation, these people face not only economic stress but the social stresses of illness, drugs, poor schools, crumbling buildings, and an environment where no one feels safe. In this oppressive environment tempers flare easily, aggression becomes common, and the whole social system begins to spiral upward to a crescendo of violence. Violence becomes normalized as a routine part of everyday life, and this normalization forms a subculture of violence.

Id.

35. See JEFFREY REIMAN, ... AND THE POOR GET PRISON 48–49, 104–07 (1996) (noting that the majority of those accused and convicted of crime are poor); JONES, supra note 1, at 200–01:

Many [abused women] flee one problem—battering—only to become part of another: the “feminization of poverty.” Today 65 percent of black children live in a family headed by a single mother, and 45 percent of all American families headed by a single mother live in poverty. . . . We can attribute this [family] “disintegration” in part to violence, just as we can attribute the “feminization of poverty” in part to woman and child abuse, a cause economists and politicians never cite. Today, experts name battery as a “major cause” of homelessness; large numbers of the nation’s growing band of homeless are women on their own with children—women and children who, despite the social and economic obstacles, ran from male violence at home.

36. See JONES, supra note 1, at 201; see also LENORE WALKER, THE BATTERED WOMAN SYNDROME 28 (1984) (reporting that one study found that twenty–seven percent of battered women had no access to cash, thirty–four percent had no access to a checking account, fifty–one percent had no access to charge accounts, and twenty–two percent had no access to a car); Martha F. Davis & Susan J. Kraham, Protecting Women’s Welfare in the Face of Vio-
An Interfaith Marriage

few wealthy people in jail or prison. In our experience, the majority of criminal defendants and battered women who appear in court are poor.

Although some lawyers who represent battered women consider themselves women's rights lawyers, and some lawyers who defend clients accused of domestic violence regard themselves simply as criminal lawyers, lawyering in domestic violence court
is—and must be—poverty lawyering. The immediate problem that has drawn our clients to court may have to do with domestic violence, but they also face other vexing problems.41 Hence, thoughtful lawyers doing domestic violence work will approach clients and cases from the broad, contextual, interdisciplinary perspective of a poverty lawyer.42

activists); see also Fredric Dannen, Defending the Mafia, New Yorker, Feb. 21, 1994, at 64 (examining the professional life of Gerald Shargel, a prominent criminal defense lawyer who represents alleged members of organized crime). Still, most lawyers who represent criminal defendants are either public defenders or court-appointed counsel. See Steven K. Smith & Carol J. DeFrances, U.S. Dep't of Justice, Indigent Defense (1996). In 1992, eighty-one percent of felony defendants in the nation's seventy-five largest counties had a public defender or court-appointed counsel at trial. Id. at 4 tbl.8. In 1991, seventy-six percent of state prison inmates and fifty-four percent of federal prison inmates had court-appointed lawyers representing them for the offenses for which they were incarcerated. Id. at 3 tbl.3. In 1989, seventy-eight percent of inmates in local jails had court-appointed counsel. Id.

41. See, e.g., Paula Galowitz, Collaboration Between Lawyers and Social Workers: Re-examining the Nature and Potential of the Relationship, 67 Fordham L. Rev. 2123, 2126–27 (1999) (describing a client who was referred to a civil legal services clinic because of a housing problem, but who turned out to have additional problems relating to his inability to pay his phone bill and the threatened loss of food stamps); Paul Tremblay, Acting "A Very Moral Type of God": Triage Among Poor Clients, 67 Fordham L. Rev. 2475, 2519–21 (1999) (describing a woman who comes to a legal services office with a host of problems in addition to being battered). The prospective client in Professor Tremblay's article discloses the following: She has lived with her boyfriend for six years and has a three-year-old daughter with him; her boyfriend has a serious drug and alcohol problem, which has worsened since the boyfriend was laid-off from his job; the previous night, the boyfriend brutally beat the woman with his fists and then left the house in a rage; when he left, he took the daughter with him; the woman believes her boyfriend may have gone to his parents' home in a neighboring state. See id. Although the prospective client focuses on her desire for a restraining order to keep her boyfriend from abusing her, and a custody order to keep him from taking the daughter again, there may also be problems relating to how she will support herself and where she will live now that her boyfriend and child are gone. See id. at 2519. Looming in the background are the boyfriend's need for employment or job training, drug and alcohol treatment, and, no doubt, counseling—as, irrespective of what happens between the woman and her boyfriend, he is the father of her child. See Naomi Cahn & Joan Meier, New Approaches to Poverty Law, Teaching, and Practice: Domestic Violence and Feminist Jurisprudence: Towards a New Agenda, 4 B.U. Pub. Int. L.J. 339, 344 n.16 (1995). For two vivid portraits of the complex needs of poor families in contemporary urban America, see generally Kozol, Amazing Grace, supra note 29; Alex Kotlowitz, There Are No Children Here: The Story of Two Boys Growing Up in the Other America (1991); Nicholas Lemann, The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America (1991); Wilson, supra note 29.

A recognition of the importance of social context is an important aspect of effective lawyering on behalf of the poor abused and accused. The complex social context—which implicates questions of individual and social responsibility—should be reflected both in case theory and evidentiary arguments at trial.

the connection between poverty, welfare, and domestic violence; see also Lucie E. White, No Exit: Rethinking “Welfare Dependency” from a Different Ground, 81 GEO. L.J. 1961, 1989 (1993).

Whenever I listen intently to poor women talk about their lives, I hear stories of violence: the violence of racism and class bias that they remember—and expect—from school; the violence of industrial hazards, braindeadening routines, repressive discipline, and sexual harassment that they face in the few available jobs; and the violence inherent in the bargain when they seek to secure their children’s futures through a man.

Id.


44. See Smith, supra note 43, at 457–58. In a previous article, one of the authors contemplates individual responsibility and social responsibility in the context of poverty and violence:

When a child is abused and then becomes an abused or abusive adult, is that person acting out of free will as we know it? What is the nature of individual responsibility when there is less and less freedom? What is the social cost when we lay the blame for crime on individuals who often themselves have been victims of crime, and what is the individual cost when we lay the blame for crime on society?

I think choice lies on a spectrum, and criminal and moral responsibility should reflect where a person falls on that spectrum. It is wrong to evaluate responsibility—criminal, moral, and social—from the point of view of either free will or determinism, as if they are incompatible and as if the free will/determinism calculus sufficiently answers the responsibility question.

Id. at 458 (emphasis added) (footnote omitted). Cf. SCHNEIDER BATTERED WOMEN AND FEMINIST LAWMAKING, supra note 1, at 147.

Because this work argues for affirmative recognition of the significance of social context, and of the necessary interrelationship between individual action, social context, and social responsibility, it challenges fundamental assumptions about “free will” in the criminal law, and triggers considerable resistance for some criminal law scholars. All these aspects of resistance are forms of resistance to equality. The legal problems of battered women who kill demonstrate the devastating impact of social failure to link violence to equality.

Id.

A poverty lawyer’s approach to domestic violence recognizes the importance of counsel,\(^4\) of making a meaningful connection with a client, no matter his or her life circumstances,\(^5\) and of providing clients with a voice in court and beyond.\(^6\)


47. See Margulies, supra note 42, at 1091–93 (discussing access as a key element of lawyering on behalf of victims of domestic violence); Abbe Smith, For Tom Joad and Tom Robinson: The Moral Obligation to Defend the Poor, 1997 ANN. SURV. AM. L. 869 (1997) (arguing the importance of defending the poor accused). For one of the most powerful accounts of the importance of counsel, see generally Lewis, supra note 24 (recounting the story behind Gideon v. Wainwright).

48. See Margulies, supra note 42, at 1093–97 (discussing connection as a key element in lawyering on behalf of victims of domestic violence); Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Narrowing the Gap by Narrowing the Field: What’s Missing from the MacCrate Report—Of Skills, Legal Science and Being a Human Being, 69 WASH. L. REV. 593, 619–20 (1994) (stating that “lawyers must learn how to ‘feel with’ others . . . to truly apprehend the reality of the other . . . not just to understand instrumentally how to move, persuade or affect that person, but to understand what meaning the interaction has for that person in a caring and existential sense”); Charles J. Ogletree, Beyond Justifications: Seeking Motivations to Sustain Public Defenders, 106 HARV. L. REV. 1239, 1272 (1993) (characterizing the relationship between lawyer and indigent criminal defendant as “a true friendship”); Smith & Montross, supra note 24, at 515–19 (discussing connection to client as the central virtue for criminal defense lawyering); see also Rosellen Brown, Before and After 249 (1992) (stating that “[a] defense lawyer, you know, is not just a prosecutor turned inside out. He tends, by practice and maybe by temperament, toward a little compassion for his felon.”).

49. See Anthony Alfieri, Reconstructive Poverty Law Practice: Learning Lessons of Client Narrative, 100 YALE L.J. 2107, 2132 (1991) (examining the importance of client narratives in poverty law practice); Gerald P. Lopez, Reconceiving Civil Rights Practice: Seven Weeks in the Life of a Rebellious Collaboration, 77 GEO. L.J. 1603, 1613 (1989) (arguing that client voice should be at the center of lawyering strategies); Binny Miller, Give Them Back Their Lives: Recognizing Client Narrative in Case Theory, 93 MICH. L. REV. 485 (1994); see also Martha Minow, Political Lawyering: An Introduction, 31 HARV. C.R.–C.L. L. REV. 287, 292–93 (1996) (noting that poor peoples’ voices are seldom heard because of their lack of political clout). For a discussion of the importance of providing a voice to victims of domestic violence, see Schneider, battered women and feminist lawmaking, supra note 1, at 101–02 (noting that “[s]torytelling—using the ‘stories’ of clients as the essential factual matrix of the case—has always been an essential part of good lawyering, and narrative accounts of battered women’s experience have historically been incorporated into feminist lawmaking”); Margulies, supra note 42, at 1097–1100 (discussing the importance of providing a voice to victims of domestic violence, including “finding a way of stopping the war on women in poverty”). For a discussion of the importance of providing a voice to criminal defendants, see John B. Mitchell, Narrative and Client–Centered Representation: What Is a True Believer to Do When His Two Favorite Theories Collide, 6 CLINICAL L. REV. 85, 98–101 (1999) (illustrating criminal defense lawyer arguing the importance of “culling
This question of client “voice” can be complicated, however, and dovetails into the question of client autonomy. Discerning what a client is saying and what a client wants can sometimes be a difficult undertaking. Determining what it means to uphold a client’s “autonomy” and “dignity” can be even harder.50 This is challenging for all poverty lawyers51—the reality is that poor clients are often different from their lawyers—and may be especially so for lawyers representing the accused and the abused.52

much fuller stories from my clients and actively involving them in strategy and decision making”). Professor Mitchell now “cringes” as he recalls his early lawyering days, when he saw his clients as little more than an impediment to winning “his” case.

By casting my clients as powerless and dependent, with my legal story as the only one that counted, I set myself above them, enjoyed my superiority, and stole their voice—or at least made them self-edit that voice to give me what they knew I was seeking—and, in the process, to an extent I hurt them. I took their dignity, if only for the brief term of our interaction.

That has changed, though undoubtedly imperfectly. I now seek and teach my students to seek, the full person—a unique person, in part defined by culture, gender, race, sexual preference, and the political world, but ultimately unique. I do so, not just because I believe it is the right thing to do, but because it makes me (and my students) better lawyers. I know who I’m dealing with and can work in a relationship of mutual respect. And in truly hearing the client’s story, the client and I (and/or the students) can make a range of strategic decisions which otherwise would not be possible.

Mitchell, supra, at 100–01.


51. At least this is so at the time of the representation. Of course, some lawyers grew up in poverty too.

52. What defender in the course of representing clients—juveniles, non–English speakers, the illiterate, those who are mentally retarded or cognitively impaired, those who are suffering from mental illness, those who are addicted to drugs or alcohol, the abused and discarded, and those without any resources at all—has not wondered about whether she truly understands her client’s wishes in the short and long term? What battered women’s lawyer in the course of representing clients who fall into the same categories has not wondered the same thing? Even when our clients clearly and forcefully express their interests, who among us has not wondered whether they are being fully autonomous—not to mention wise—in doing
A poverty lawyer's approach also recognizes that clients are not perfect people, do not always (or even often) embody the lofty causes to which we mean to contribute, and sometimes are downright exasperating.

By and large, poverty lawyers are social justice lawyers one case at a time. We are not in it for the glamour or prestige—so? Defenders grapple with a variety of dilemmas: helping a client get back on the street where he or she may reoffend, helping a client get back on the street where he or she may be rearrested, acceding to the wishes of a client who needs but declines services or treatment, acceding to the wishes of a client who is acting to protect someone else. Battered women's lawyers have their dilemmas too: what to do about clients who initially seek and then withdraw from the criminal prosecution of abusers, clients who return to their abusers in spite of the danger, clients who need but decline services or treatment, clients who are acting to protect someone else.

53. Battered women's lawyers often see themselves as part of the struggle to end violence against women, see generally Susan Schecter, Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement (1982), while many criminal defenders see themselves as part of the struggle for social and racial justice. See Barbara Babcock, Defending the Guilty, 32 CLEV. ST. L. REV. 175, 178 (1983-84) (describing the "political activist" motivation for criminal defense work); Smith & Montross, supra note 24, at 453 (describing the authors' identification with social justice activism). For a discussion of social justice lawyering generally, see Carrie Menkel-Meadow, The Causes of Cause Lawyering: Toward an Understanding of the Motivation and Commitment of Social Justice Lawyers, in CAUSE LAWYERING: POLITICAL COMMITMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES 31-68 (Austin Sarat & Stuart Scheingold eds., 1998).

54. See generally Dash, supra note 25. Rosalee, the central character in Leon Dash's memorable portrait of urban underclass life, was abused as a child, periodically abused by husbands and boyfriends, and in and out of jail for prostitution, drugs, and shoplifting. Id. Though she is by no means a "typical poor client," she is a good example of an exasperating one. Id. She is alternately charming, humble, generous, and loving—and then manipulative, deceitful, exploitive, and generally loathsome. See Kunen, supra note 10, at 60-61:

The word for Cheryl Lee Harris was formidable. She was only fifteen, but looked much older. Intelligent, sophisticated, and self-possessed, she could look you in the eye and lie, and you'd never suspect a thing. She had the delicate wrists and elegant hands of an artist, and an artist's eye for clothes, and a face.... She had presence: you wanted her to like you, and she did—she was a real sweetheart, very friendly. Of course, she was quite pretty, and I am inclined to ascribe all good qualities to pretty girls, but everybody liked her. The detective liked her. The FBI men liked her. Even the teller she robbed at the bank liked her, as much as could be expected.

55. See John Kilwein, Still Trying: Cause Lawyering for the Poor and Disadvantaged in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in CAUSE LAWYERING: POLITICAL COMMITMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES 183-84 (Austin Sarat & Stuart Scheingold eds., 1998). At the heart of Anglo-American legal practice is the notion that a professional attorney has a basic professional responsibility to focus on the legal needs and interests of her or his individual clients. Given this tradition, it was only natural when the legal community began to take an interest in the legal needs of the disadvantaged that the effort would be based on individual client lawyering. The basic
because there is not much of either in the work. We do what we can to ease our clients' burdens and pain, and sometimes we make a difference.

When we see that our clients come from the same impoverished communities, have more in common with each other than

goal of this style of lawyering is to provide service to individual clients who would otherwise go unrepresented. The reason for this is simple. As a result of their financial situation, the poor have little or no independent access to the civil justice system. Anyone seeking to improve the legal status of the poor must, at some level, deal with the individual, microlevel legal problems of poor clients. Thus, client lawyering for the poor is made up of all of the activities associated with lawyering in general, including counseling clients on their legal situation, negotiating with societal actors on behalf of clients, drafting legal documents for clients, and litigating on behalf of clients before judicial and administrative tribunals.

Kilwein, supra, at 183–84. See also SCHNEIDER, BATTERED WOMEN AND FEMINIST LAW-MAKING, supra note 1, at 220 (noting that students in a clinical seminar on battered women and the law found that working on behalf of individual battered women “could be a practical vehicle for social change”). For other depictions of lawyering on behalf of individual poor clients, see MILNER BALL, THE WORD AND THE LAW 60–72 (1993); Jane M. Spinak, Reflections on a Case (of Motherhood), 95 COLUM. L. REV. 1990 (1995).

Of course, in both civil poverty work and criminal defense, lawyers sometimes engage in other than individual client representation. Among the strategies civil and criminal poverty lawyers employ are impact litigation, organizing or mobilizing clients, and what has been called “client voice lawyering.” See Kilwein, supra, at 184–86.

56. See Ogletree, supra note 48, at 1278 (stating that “the luster soon fades as the defender confronts the practical realities of the job—the daily drudgery of paperwork and the less-than-glamorous settings of the public defender’s office, the criminal court, and the jail”); Robert Rader, Confessions of Guilt, 1 CLINICAL L. REV. 299 (1994) (noting a student in criminal defense clinic stating, “Contrary to my imagination, criminal defense work was not glamorous. It was not heroic.”).


I do not know exactly what advocates for the poor might accomplish in the long term, but I know for certain that an effective lawyer can reduce felt pain for real people. Perhaps I should choose a different verb—perhaps I should be saying that lawyers can defer pain, or postpone pain. But either way the pain is diminished.

... [T]here is a real immediacy to alleviating the suffering that comes from a lack of money, the worry about having to live in a shelter, the fear of domestic violence, or of losing custody of a daughter, even if only for a short while.

Id. (emphasis added).

58. See, e.g., MELISSA F. GREENE, PRAYING FOR SHEETROCK (1991) (recounting the political awakening of a small, isolated African American community in Georgia in the 1970s and the successful collaboration of community members and legal services lawyers in the struggle); see also Tigran W. Elgren & Thomas Schoenberr, The Lawyer’s Duty of Public Service: More Than Charity, 96 W. VA. L. REV. 367, 373 (1993) (noting that, in New York City Housing Court, eighty to ninety percent of landlords have lawyers, while tenants have counsel no more than fifteen percent of the time, and reporting that eviction rarely occurs when tenants are represented).
any of the institutional actors they encounter, and could well be in the shoes of the opposing party, we should recognize that we are doing the same basic work with many of the same goals.

III. THE ADVERSARIAL SYSTEM, LEGAL PROCESS, AND ACCESS TO JUSTICE

In addition to being poverty lawyers, lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused share a similar approach to legal advocacy. We believe in the adversary system and in zealous adver-

59. See John O. Calmore, A Call to Context: The Professional Challenges of Cause Lawyering at the Intersection of Race, Space, and Poverty, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 1927, 1936–37 (1999) (noting that while “community” is a difficult concept, in the context of poverty lawyering it is “not a romantic abstraction, but rather the site of material deprivation and relations that are formed to cope with oppressive circumstances”); John O. Calmore, Racialized Space and the Culture of Segregation: “Hewing a Stone of Hope from a Mountain of Despair,” 143 U. PA. L. REV. 1233, 1271 (1995) (stating that “[w]hen there is nowhere to run and nowhere to hide, people must make a stand in place, at one’s home base. For many of the inner–city poor, this is their predicament.”); cf. Regina Austin, “The Black Community, Its Lawbreakers, and a Politics of Identification, 65 S. CAL. L. REV. 1769, 1817 (1992) (stating that “[t]hough the ubiquitous experience of racism provides the basis for group solidarity, differences of gender, class, geography, and political affiliations keep blacks apart. These differences may be the best evidence that a single black community no longer exists.”). 60. See Yaroshefsky, supra note 19, at 143.

61. Many people accused of crime—especially those accused of violent crime—have themselves been victims of abuse. See generally JAMES GILLIGAN, VIOLENCE (1996); see also ANGELA BROWNE, WHEN BATTERED WOMEN KILL 23 (1987) (reporting that seventy-one percent of battered women who committed homicide described physical violence in their childhood homes, and ninety-one percent believed that there was physical violence in the man’s childhood home); CAMPBELL, supra note 34, at 105 (stating that “[o]ne of the strongest predictors of wife beating by men is whether they were exposed to violence in the home as children”); G.T. Hotaling & D.B. Sugarman, An Analysis of Risk Markers in Husband to Wife Violence: The Current State of Knowledge, in 1 VIOLENCE AND VICTIMS 101–24 (1986) (finding that a boy who witnesses his father’s violence is three times more likely to beat his own wife when he marries); D.S. Kalmus, The Intergenerational Transmission of Family Aggression, 46 J. MARRIAGE & THE FAM. 11–19 (1984) (documenting the connection between experiencing or witnessing violence as a child and later battering). Of course, battered women sometimes become criminal defendants. See generally BROWNE, supra (examining the circumstances under which battered women commit homicide); KATHLEEN DALY, GENDER, CRIME, AND PUNISHMENT 46–48 (1994) (noting the significant percentage of women accused of felonies in New Haven, Connecticut, who had experienced physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, and battering); ANN JONES, WOMEN WHO KILL 281–95 (1980) (describing the battered woman’s self-defense cases of Francine Hughes and Jennifer Patri); SCHNEIDER, BATTERED WOMEN AND FEMINIST LAWMAKING, supra note 1, at 112–47 (discussing battered women who kill).
sarial advocacy as the best way to protect our clients' rights.\textsuperscript{62} We believe in a system in which lawyers on both sides fight hard and with sufficient resources to uphold clients' rights and pursue clients' rights and interests.\textsuperscript{63}

Unfortunately, there are regular efforts to shunt poor people out of the adversary system and into other systems of "dispute resolution."\textsuperscript{64} There are also problematic efforts to encourage women to resolve their legal problems in less formal settings.\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{62} See generally Freedman, supra note 5, at 13-42; see also Barnhizer, supra note 5, at 377-80 (arguing that "strong advocates are a critical balance against entrenched power"). There are, of course, critics both within and without the legal profession of the notion that adversarial advocacy is the best means of resolving disputes. See, e.g., Deborah Tannen, The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue (1998); see also Anne Strick, Injustice for All: How Our Legal System Betrays Us (1996); Carrie Menkel-Meadow, New Roles: The Lawyer as Problem Solver and Third-Party Neutral: Creativity and Non-Partisanship in Lawyering, 72 Temp. L. Rev. 785, 788-92 (1999) [hereinafter Menkel-Meadow, The Lawyer as Problem Solver].

\textsuperscript{63} See Freedman, supra note 5, at 13-42; Barnhizer, supra note 5, at 376. I argue that it is our failure to honor this duty [of zealous advocacy]—rather than the reverse as many suggest—that is at the center of many of the most intractable conditions in American society. This means there are reasons to seek a clarification and a strengthening of the adversary system and the role of the advocate in our society, rather than the weakening that seems to be the prevailing view. A legal profession without a strong sense of duty to its clients is not entitled to any special privileges or status in our society. Too frequently, however, claims of service to society are only masks for privilege.

Barnhizer, supra note 5, at 376.

\textsuperscript{64} See Richard Delgado et al., Fairness and Formality: Minimizing the Risk of Prejudice in Alternative Dispute Resolution, 1985 Wis. L. Rev. 1359, 1379 (arguing that alternative dispute resolution disadvantages minority disputants); Laura Nader, Controlling Processes in the Practice of Law: Hierarchy and Pacification in the Movement to Re-Form Dispute Ideology, 9 Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol. 1, 3 (1993) (critically examining the emphasis on "harmony" values over "justice" values in alternative dispute resolution to the detriment of poor people).

\textsuperscript{65} See generally Karla Fischer et al., The Culture of Battering and the Role of Mediation in Domestic Violence Cases, 46 SMU L. Rev. 2117 (1993); Trina Grillo, The Mediation Alternative: Process Dangers for Women, 100 Yale L.J. 1545 (1991); see also Penelope E. Bryan, Killing Us Softly: Divorce Mediation and the Politics of Power, 40 Buff. L. Rev. 441, 447 (1992); Lisa G. Lerman, Mediation of Wife Abuse Cases: The Adverse Impact of Informal Dispute Resolution on Women, 7 Harv. Women's L.J. 57 (1984). But see Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Whose Dispute Is It Anyway?: A Philosophical and Democratic Defense of Settlement (In Some Cases), 83 Geo. L.J. 2663, 2664 (1995) (defending "settlement" in some cases and characterizing the criticism of alternative dispute resolution as "simplistic" and "adversarial"); Menkel-Meadow, The Lawyer as Problem Solver, supra note 62 (arguing that "the traditional conception of the role of lawyer as an advocate of his client and as someone else's adversary is a crabbed and incomplete conception of the lawyer's role"); Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Ethics in Alternative Dispute Resolution: New Issues, No Answers from
Although some proponents of alternative dispute resolution claim that ADR has the potential to provide greater access to justice, we are skeptical.

For battered women in civil cases and defendants in criminal court, the power differential between the parties, and the enormity of what is at stake, necessitate the strongest adversarial


66. See Menkel-Meadow, Whose Dispute Is It Anyway?, supra note 65, at 2691 ([T]hese new processes offer the potential of making more, rather than less, justice available, both in terms of processes available and the variety of outcomes that may be achieved.).

67. See Jennifer F. Maxwell, Mandatory Mediation of Custody in the Face of Domestic Violence: Suggestions for Courts and Mediators, 37 Fam. & Conciliation Cts. Rev. 335, 337–38 (1995) (stating that "[i]f a relative equality of power cannot be achieved, mediation is an inappropriate method of dispute resolution for the situation. . . . The very nature of an abusive relationship makes a fair, safe, or mutually acceptable settlement an impossibility."). Maxwell relies on findings by the Academy of Family Mediators and the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts, 1995, the American Bar Association Family Law Section Task Force, 1997, and the American Arbitration Association, 1994. For a discussion of the power difference between battered women and their abusers, see generally Jones, supra note 1, at 129–66 (examining why battered women “do not leave”); Campbell, supra note 34, at 104–09 (examining men, intimacy, and control); Lenore Walker, Terrifying Love: Why Battered Women Kill and How Society Responds 42–45 (1985). See also Fischer et al., supra note 65, at 2171–74. Although the battered women and alleged batterers whom we represent tend to both be impoverished—so that the balance of economic power is relatively equal—the overall balance of power within the relationship is not. Fear can be terribly disempowering. See id. See also Anna Quindlen, Black and Blue (1997) (depicting the terrified flight of a battered woman from her abusive husband). In Anna Quindlen’s vivid portrait of domestic abuse, the central character is an educated woman who, as a registered nurse, makes more money than her police officer husband. See id. Still, the economic and social equality between the two means nothing in the face of the husband’s rage and violence. See id. There is no question in the context of criminal prosecution that the government has enormous power in comparison to an individual accused. See generally Lawrence M. Friedman, Crime and Punishment in American History 61–82 (1993) (examining the “mechanics of power” in the creation of the American legal system after the Revolution). As Professor Friedman notes, “about half the text of the Bill of Rights . . . is concerned with criminal justice. . . . The nightmare image was King George III, a despot sitting on a faraway throne. . . . On these shores, a castle wall of law would guard citizens from abuse, and prevent the central state from oppressing its subjects.” Id. at 72.

68. For both battered women and criminal defendants, the stakes might well be a matter of life or death. See, e.g., Jones, supra note 1, at 82; Stephen Bright, Counsel for the Poor: The Death Sentence Not for the Worst Crime, but for the Worst Lawyer, 103 Yale L.J. 1835 (1994) (discussing the pervasiveness of incompetent representation of indigent defendants in capital cases). Or, at the very least, there is loss of liberty and dignity. See Jones, supra note 1, at 87–100 (describing the physical injury, isolation, and degradation experienced by battered women); Wilbert Rideau & Ron Wikberg, Life Sentences: Rage and Survival Behind Bars (1992) (depicting the physical injury, isolation, and degradation of prison life); see also Linda Kelly, Republican Mothers, Bastards’ Fathers, and Good Victims: Discard-
advocacy. For these clients, the vigorous assertion of legal rights is the best means of self-preservation against a fierce adversary in a hostile institutional setting.\textsuperscript{69} Even critics of “binary,” winner–take–all advocacy\textsuperscript{70} concede that spirited adversarial advocacy is needed in these circumstances.\textsuperscript{71}

Moreover, informality has seldom been helpful to the poor or powerless.\textsuperscript{72} Informal settings, in which subordinated people have
to rely to some degree on the understanding or generosity of those with power instead of being able to invoke rights, tend to replicate power imbalances.  

Our strong preference for formal, adversarial process—indeed, our demand for it—suggests what one commentator has mocked as "litigation romanticism." But, we are not naive romantics about litigation. Lawyering cannot fix all the problems associated with poverty and inequality, and litigation is certainly no panacea. Sometimes we lose. However, no matter the out-

Control: The Talk of Trial Judges, 25 LAW & SOC. INQUIRY 227, 243 (2000) (suggesting that power is obscured when legal discourse is informal).
73. See Margulies, supra note 72; Richard Delgado, Rodrigo's Eleventh Chronicle: Empathy and False Empathy, 84 CAL. L. REV. 61, 85 (1996); see also Fischer et al., supra note 65, at 2153 (citing an empirical study that found that battered women were more likely to be abused after separation if they went through mediation instead of a formal adversarial process in which they were represented by counsel).
75. See SAUL ALinsky, REVEILLE FOR RADICALS 14 (Vintage 1969) (1946) (stating that "the radical has the job of organizing people so that they will have the power and opportunity to best meet each unforeseeable future crisis as they move ahead to realize those values of equality, justice, freedom"); SANFORD D. HORwitt, LET THEM CALL ME REBEL: SAUL ALinsky—His Life and Legacy (1989) (chronicling the life of Saul Alinsky, social justice activist and grass-roots organizer); see also Stephen Wexler, Practicing Law for Poor People, 79 YALE L.J. 1049, 1053 (1970) (stating that "[i]f all the lawyers in the country worked full time, they could not deal with even the articulated legal problems of the poor. . . . In this setting the object of practicing poverty law must be to organize poor people, rather than to solve their legal problems.").
76. See Barnhizer, supra note 5, at 407. "The adversary system is many things—including preserver of power and privilege, occasional righter of wrongs, a mechanism through which we can pretend that justice is done, a callous processor of people who have offended the law, a pressure release valve, and a resolver of disputes through the application of latent societal force." Id. For a discussion of litigation on behalf of individual poor people as opposed to other strategies, see JACK KATZ, POOR PEOPLE'S LAWYERS IN TRANSITION (1982) (discussing the perceived dichotomy between representing individual poor people and engaging in systemic legal work); Marc Feldman, Political Lessons: Legal Services for the Poor, 83 GEO. L.J. 1529, 1537 (1995) (arguing that many legal services lawyers accept the dichotomy of "service" versus "impact" approaches to poverty lawyering). For a masterful depiction of the complexities and frustrations of class action litigation by the weak against the mighty, see JONATHAN HARR, A CIVIL ACTION (1995) (recounting the efforts of a working-class community badly harmed by chemical dumping to hold corporate polluters accountable).
77. See Harr, supra note 76. This seems to happen more and more frequently in criminal defense—especially in some settings. See Associated Press, Federal Crime Data Show a High Conviction Rate, N.Y. TIMES, June 1, 2000, at A21 (reporting that eighty-seven percent of defendants charged in federal court were convicted in 1998, and seventy-one percent of those convicted were sentenced to prison).
Lawyers for the abused and the accused believe in formal legal process for our clients, and in the fundamental right to due process of law. Lawyers for the abused and the accused are vigilant about our clients’ procedural rights, because the less formal the process the likelier it is our clients will be disadvantaged. We also believe that a formal, rights-based system enhances the dignity and autonomy of our clients.

We have both witnessed poor people—our clients and others—at the mercy of informal, slapdash, perfunctory process. We have often seen—and sometimes exploited—backroom conferences that resolve matters based on expediency over fairness. We deplore the trend away from procedural rights, such as the call for nonunanimous jury verdicts, smaller juries, restrictions on the

79. See, e.g., Barnhizer, supra note 5, at 450 (“Although they are in an impossible situation, responsible criminal defense lawyers have my eternal respect. They are on the front lines of the conflict between state power, community indignation, and ensuring governmental power is held to some standard of accountability.”). Lawyers for battered women ensure the same sort of accountability from police, prosecutors, and sometimes even batterers. See Jones, supra note 1, at 219–20 (noting the important role of lawyers for battered women as a check on the system).
81. Consider, for example, individuals on probation or parole—most of whom do not have counsel or clout. Prior to the early 1970s, probation and parole officers could basically do as they wished when they believed their supervisees had misbehaved. See Morrissey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471, 489 (1972) (holding that due process requires that a state provide basic rights of fair treatment when revoking parole—including written notice of the claimed violations, disclosure of evidence against the parolee, opportunity to be heard and to present witnesses and evidence, right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses, a neutral hearing body, and a written statement by the fact finders as to the reasons for its decision); Gagnon v. Scarpelli, 411 U.S. 778, 782–83, 790 (1973) (extending due process rights to revocation of probation).
83. See Johnson v. Louisiana, 406 U.S. 356, 362–63 (1972) (upholding Louisiana statute permitting a nine-to-three verdict in a criminal case); Apodaca v. Oregon, 406 U.S. 404,
right to a jury generally,85 and the trend toward resolving some civil matters in a non-evidentiary forum.86

Lawyers for the abused and the accused believe in the cardinal importance of access to justice, and of lawyers in ensuring access to justice.87 We believe in lawyers.88 We believe that without

413-14 (1972) (upholding a ten-to-two verdict). However, the unanimity requirement still exists in federal criminal trials. See Johnson, 406 U.S. at 369 (Powell, J., concurring) ("Unanimity is one of the indispensable features of the federal jury trial"). Although only two states permit nonunanimous verdicts in criminal cases, there is a recurring call to expand this practice to other states. See, e.g., Jeffrey Rosen, After "One Angry Woman," 1998 U. Chi. LEGAL F. 179, 193-95 (reiterating his tentative endorsement of nonunanimous verdicts as a reform for instances where jury holdouts have "unreasonable doubts"). The call generally picks up steam after a controversial verdict. See Paul Butler, (Color) Blind Faith: The Tragedy of Race, Crime and the Law, 111 HARV. L. REV. 1270, 1283 (1998) (book review) (pointing to California legislators' and prosecutors' efforts to allow nonunanimous verdicts in the aftermath of the O.J. Simpson case).

84. See Williams v. Florida, 399 U.S. 78, 102 (1970) (holding that a jury of six persons in a non–capital felony trial is constitutional); but see Ballew v. Georgia, 435 U.S. 223, 239-44 (1978) (rejecting a five-person jury on the ground that a jury smaller than six persons would hinder meaningful deliberation and diminish minority representation); Burch v. Louisiana, 441 U.S. 130, 139 (1979) (striking down a five-to-one jury verdict).

85. See Lewis v. United States, 518 U.S. 322, 329-30 (1996) (holding that a criminal defendant may be convicted of innumerable petty offenses in one proceeding and sentenced to any number of years' imprisonment without a jury trial). In 1995, the District of Columbia reduced the maximum sentence in most misdemeanors to 180 days, so that there are almost no jury trials for misdemeanors. See D.C. CODE ANN. § 16-705 (1998) (limiting the right to a jury to cases punishable by more than 180 days); Burgess v. United States, 681 A.2d 1090, 1094-95 (1996) (finding that defendant is not entitled to trial by jury on misdemeanor assault and destruction of property charges in view of statutory amendments).

86. For example, in family court in Massachusetts, serious substantive issues such as custody, visitation, and even allegations of child abuse are often addressed in motion hearings, which are considered non–evidentiary. In the District of Columbia, especially before some trial commissioners, it is hard to characterize proceedings relating to civil protection orders as formal legal proceedings at all. Often neither petitioners nor respondents may have their "day in court."

87. See generally Lewis, supra note 24 (discussing the importance of counsel to indigent criminal defendants); see also Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45, 58-62 (1932) (holding there is a right to counsel in capital offenses); Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 342-47 (1963) (holding there is a right to counsel in criminal proceedings); Argersinger v. Hamlin, 407 U.S. 25, 36-38 (1972) (holding there is a right to counsel for criminal defendants facing loss of liberty even if charged with a petty offense). For battered women in civil court, as for the accused in criminal court, procedural due process would have little effect if it did not include the right to counsel.

The right to be heard would be, in many cases, of little avail if it did not comprehend the right to be heard by counsel. Even the intelligent and educated layman has small and sometimes no skill in the science of law.... He is unfamiliar with the rules of evidence.... He lacks both the skill and knowledge adequately to pre-
lawyers, our clients are effectively locked out of the adversary sys­
tem, they have no means of enforcing important procedural safe­
guards, and they have no access to justice.89

It has become increasingly clear that, just as lawyers are vi­
tal to access to justice for the poor,90 lawyers are essential to bat­
tered women obtaining meaningful access to the legal remedies
available to them.91 For many victims of domestic violence, the
right to be heard requires a lawyer.92
The connection between effective lawyers and access to justice for the accused has long been recognized. The courts alone—no matter the jurisdiction, no matter the law at issue, no matter how qualified or well-intentioned the judge or prosecutor—can never ensure justice. Able lawyers with adequate resources are an essential prerequisite to criminal justice.

The sad truth is that “able lawyers with adequate resources” does not reflect the reality of criminal practice in this country. As time has gone by, the promise of Gideon v. Wainwright, which ensured the right to counsel in criminal cases, has become increasingly empty. This is so in the most serious, high profile cases, as well as in more mundane ones.


93. See Attorney for the Damned, supra note 37, at 12 (quoting Clarence Darrow’s remarks to the inmates of the Cook County Jail in 1902: “If the courts were organized to promote justice, the people would elect somebody to defend all these criminals, somebody as smart as the prosecutor—and give him as many detectives and as many assistants to help, and pay as much money to defend you as to prosecute you.”).

94. See Kunes, supra note 10, at 265.

The courts cannot reduce crime or establish justice. They are just a sorting mechanism between the front end of the system—the police—and the back end—the prisons. To the extent that the public supports adequate judicial resources and effective representation for the accused, the sorting can be done in a just and equitable manner.

Id.

95. See Alan Dershowitz, The Best Defense 410 (1982) (referring to the “world full of underzealous, lazy, and incompetent defense lawyers”); Babcock, supra note 53, at 182 (referring to “[o]verburdened defense lawyers [who], without investigation or preparation, arrange for the going rates on cases, and trade one off against the other”); David Luban, Are Criminal Defenders Different?, 91 Mich. L. Rev. 1729, 1762 (1993) (referring to the “world of lawyers for whom . . . advocacy is rare and defense investigation virtually nonexistent; a world where lawyers spend minutes, rather than hours, with their clients”). A New York Times editorial on the thirtieth anniversary of Gideon v. Wainwright described the reality of indigent criminal defense: “In courts across the land, judges must beg the private bar to step up and take on criminal cases for which many lawyers are poorly equipped and grossly undercompensated. Public-defense systems are soft targets for budget cutters, state and Federal. Congress, which must pay for counsel appointed in the Federal courts, is perennially guilty of late and inadequate funding.” Editorial, Gideon’s Promise, Still Unkept, N.Y. Times, Mar. 18, 1993, at A22.


In the Gideon case, the Supreme Court held that every poor person charged with a serious crime was constitutionally entitled to a lawyer provided by the state. The Court later extended that rule to all criminal trials.
Lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused share a belief in the fundamental importance of available, adequately funded, well-trained lawyers. We have seen too many people caught up in the court system suffer from the alternative. Finally, lawyers for the abused and accused are committed to holding the government to the fire to do what they should as a matter of law and justice. Of course, this is the basic function of a criminal defense lawyer: to put the government to its burden of

The Gideon decision is a solid precedent, hailed from all corners of legal philosophy. The current Supreme Court, even while narrowing other rights of criminal defendants, has described the right to counsel as fundamental. There is just one trouble. In the real world, the promise of Gideon is not being kept. Poor men and women in large numbers go to trial in this country with lawyers who are so incompetent, drunk, inexperienced or uninterested that the defendant's right to counsel is a bad joke.

Lewis, supra, at A23. See also Nat Hentoff, A Disgrace to the Law, WASH. POST, Jan. 23, 1993, at A19 (writing that on the thirtieth anniversary of Gideon v. Wainwright the system of indigent representation is by and large a failure).

98. See generally Bright, supra note 68 (discussing the pervasiveness of deficient representation of indigent defendants in capital cases).

99. See Luban, supra note 95, at 1762 (noting the tendency in indigent criminal defense toward "indifferent mass-processing of interchangeable defendants"); see also Christopher Johns, "Slaughterhouse Justice": Crushing Workloads, Underfunded Public Defenders Shortchange Indigent Clients, ARIZ. REPUBLIC, May 23, 1993, at C1 (documenting the underfunding of indigent criminal defense across the nation and in the state of Arizona thirty years after Gideon); Ruth Marcus, Public Defender Systems Tired by Budget Problems, WASH. POST, Mar. 8, 1992, at A1 (reporting about overburdened and underfunded public defenders in New Orleans).

100. See generally Vanessa Merton, What Do You Do When You Meet a "Walking Violation of the Sixth Amendment," If You're Trying to Put That Lawyer's Client in Jail?, 69 FORDHAM L. REV. 997 (2000) (vividly describing an incompetent, ineffectual defense lawyer). Professor Merton offers up a memorable portrait of a bad lawyer, in the best tradition of Charles Dickens—or perhaps Tom Wolfe:

All along, he had been leaning against a wall, scribbling with a pencil on a stack of files. He had no briefcase or satchel or backpack to hold a handy CPL or Penal Law. He was, to put it politely, unkempt: flushed, perspiring, uncombed, unshaven, shirt-tails hanging out of his trousers. My first thought was he must be unusually dedicated to come to court when he was so obviously sick with the flu.

As it developed, that didn't seem to be the problem. . . . "Okay, here it is—Sanchez, yeah, another car thief. Probably young, though, you know? Maybe not such a bad kid—maybe he does it to support his dear mother. (Head thrown back, a gleeful guffaw over his own wit.) What are you looking for? These guys don't care if they get a conviction as long as there's no jail. How 'bout a fine? He can always steal another car to pay it." (Another raucous guffaw that descended into a giggle. Then he started working on something in his ear.)

Id. at 1007–08.
proof. Although lawyers for the abused may have an interest in maintaining a kind of partnership with prosecuting agencies, this is not always possible. Lawyers for the abused, like those for the accused, have an ethical responsibility to pursue their clients' interests, which is not always consistent with the government's interest. Like lawyers for the accused, lawyers for the abused must sometimes push and prod prosecutors to do the right thing.

IV. TEACHING ABOUT JUSTICE

Much has been written about the MacCrate Report's exhortation that lawyers "strive to promote justice, fairness and morality," and the role of law schools in carrying out this charge.

101. See generally Freedman, supra note 5, at 65-86 (examining the notion of zealous representation); see also Model Rules of Prof'l Conduct Preamble [2] (1999) ("As advocate, a lawyer zealously asserts the client's position under the rules of the adversary system."); Id. R 1.2 ("A lawyer shall abide by a client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation."); ABA Model Code of Prof'l Responsibility Canon 7 (1988) ("A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Zealously Within the Bounds of the Law"); id. DR 7-101 ("A lawyer shall not intentionally . . . fail to seek the lawful objectives of his client through reasonably available means permitted by law.").


103. The MacCrate Report specifically states:

Striving to Promote Justice, Fairness, and Morality

As a member of a profession that bears "special responsibilit[ies] for the quality of justice," a lawyer should be committed to the values of:

2.1 Promoting Justice, Fairness, and Morality in One's Own Daily Practice, including:

(a) To the extent required or permitted by the ethical rules of the profession, acting in conformance with considerations of justice, fairness, and morality when making decisions or acting on behalf of a client . . . ;

(b) To the extent required or permitted by the ethical rules of the profession, counseling clients to take considerations of justice, fairness and morality into account when the client makes decisions or engages in conduct that may have an adverse effect on other individuals or on society . . . ;

(c) Treating other people (including clients, other attorneys, and support personnel) with dignity and respect;

2.2 Contributing to the Profession's Fulfillment of Its Responsibilities to Ensure that Adequate Legal Services Are Provided to Those Who Cannot Afford to Pay for Them;

2.3 Contributing to the Profession's Fulfillment of Its Responsibilities to Enhance the Capacity of Law and Legal Institutions to Do Justice.

Id. at 213.
The MacCrate Report acknowledges that law teachers, both clinical and nonclinical, play a critical role in the development of law students who care about doing good and not just doing well.\(^\text{105}\) They do so by teaching about issues relating to justice, fairness, and morality in the classroom and clinic, and by modeling their own commitment to these values in their law practice.\(^\text{106}\)

Law school clinics provide the best opportunity to examine our system of justice from the perspective of those with little power but much at stake.\(^\text{107}\) In a clinical setting, students routinely experience the chasm between the idea of justice and the reality of justice.\(^\text{108}\) The question of justice occupies a central place in clinical work and pedagogy.\(^\text{109}\)

---


\(^{105}\) See MacCrate Report, *supra* note 102.


\(^{107}\) See Aiken, *supra* note 104, at 8 n.23 (stating that “[c]linical legal education is one place in the law school curriculum where those skills [of recognizing privilege and exercising judgment] are learned”); see also Norman Redlich, *Challenging Injustice: A Dedication to Bob McKay,* 40 CLEV. ST. L. REV. 347, 350 (1992) (noting that “idealistic young men and women [are] leaving law school, intently anxious to deal with problems of poverty, discrimination, homelessness, or an inadequate education system, and [do] not possess the widest possible range of tools to make one's legal education effective”).

We are referring here to “live client” clinics and not clinical programs that rely on simulations. We believe that the presence of a client gives students the richest opportunity to learn about the quality of justice in this country for the poor, and the day-to-day indignities, inequities, and unfairness that poor people encounter. See Aiken, *supra* note 104, at 30-46 (discussing teaching about justice in a general poverty clinic representing people with HIV); see also Fernando M. Pinguolo, *The Struggle Between Legal Theory and Practice: One Law Student's Effort to Maintain the "Proper" Balance,* BYU EDUC. & L.J. 173 (1998) (describing a clinical law student recounting experience working with indigent clients as a process from “romantic or utilitarian” theories to the practical realities of lawyering on behalf of real clients).

\(^{108}\) See David Hall, *Giving Birth to a Racially Just Society in the 21st Century,* 21 U. ARK. LITTLE ROCK L. REV. 927, 931 (1999) (“If lawyers are not trained with a deep appreciation for the value and calling of social justice, then they will only perpetuate the racial sins of..."
As lawyers and teachers, we share the concern expressed by Jane Aiken in her thoughtful article, Striving to Teach "Justice, Fairness, and Morality," that law schools have failed to teach about the "social consequences of a lawyer's acts and decisions not to act." Although our main interest is to teach our students to be excellent lawyers, representing clients with utmost devotion and zeal, we have another interest as well. We would like to instill a sense of justice in our students—an ability to regard the system not only from their client's perspective, but also from the perspective of justice. As Professor Aiken notes, to do less may serve to perpetuate injustice:

If all I can do in law school is to teach students skills ungrounded in a sense of justice then at best there is no meaning to my work, and, at worst, I am contributing to the distress in the world. I am sending more people into the community armed with legal training but without a sense of responsibility for others or for the delivery of justice in our society.114

The first step is to teach students to be zealous and devoted lawyers on behalf of poor, uncelebrated clients: We believe that this kind of lawyering furthers justice. But, in the end, we rec-
ognize that this is not enough. Although we want students and young lawyers to fight hard for—and believe in—their side, we also want them to see beyond their side when it comes to justice.

There is some natural resistance. How can teachers who have their hands full with the central challenge of clinical legal education—simultaneously providing students with high quality education and clients with high quality representation—take on yet another mission? How can students who have their hands full with their new role—and who ought to be chiefly absorbed in the pursuit of their clients' interests—contemplate larger issues?

Of course, the concept of justice—individual justice, social justice, criminal justice—is complicated and elusive. It becomes even more so when a lawyer or student lawyer takes on a particular case with the requisite passion. Interestingly, students in domestic violence clinics and criminal defense clinics often start out with very different perceptions of the justness of their cause.

To students representing victims of domestic violence, the question of justice can appear crystal clear—especially in the der when a mob tried to drive him and his family out of a white neighborhood in Detroit; IRVING STONE, CLARENCE DARROW FOR THE DEFENSE 476-83 (1941) (discussing the Sweet case). Darrow tried the Sweet case before a jury of all white men. His argument makes plain the enormity of a small murder case:

The Sweets spent their first night in their new home afraid to go to bed. . . . The next night they spent in jail. Now the state wants them to spend the rest of their lives in the penitentiary. There are persons in the North and the South who say a black man is inferior to the white and should be controlled by the whites. There are those who recognize his rights and say he should enjoy them. To me this case is a cross section of human history. It involves the future and the hope of some of us that the future shall be better than the past.

STONE, supra, at 483. The jury was out for three days and nights before declaring themselves hung. See id.

116. See Martha Minow, Introduction: Seeking Justice, in OUTSIDE THE LAW: NARRATIVES ON JUSTICE IN AMERICA 3–4 (Susan R. Shreve & Porter Shreve eds., 1997) [hereinafter Minow, Seeking Justice] (noting how hard it is to define justice or come to a consensus about the goals and values of justice). Professor Minow concludes: "Perhaps it is easier to know what injustice is." Id. at 4.

117. In the Georgetown Criminal Justice Clinic, we refer to the increasingly passionate belief in one's case as trial approaches as "trial psychosis." We call this same sort of wholesale belief in one's sentencing advocacy "sentencing psychosis." At these moments of "psychosis"—when the lawyer is so convinced of the rightness of his or her position that any other view is inconceivable—it is nearly impossible to think about abstract notions of justice.
These students are squarely on the side of the weak and downtrodden against the mighty and tyrannical; they are soldiers in the battle against the ultimate expression of gender oppression. They have the righteousness of poverty lawyers on a moral and political crusade—with a heightened sense of urgency. Their clients’ very lives are at stake. Justice is whatever it takes for their clients to prevail—even if it means that others will go to jail.

To students representing alleged perpetrators of domestic violence and other alleged criminals, the question of justice is often more difficult. Many students come to criminal defense work with reservations about the “rightness” of representing clients accused of domestic violence and mixed feelings about whether they will be able to represent these clients with the requisite zeal. One of the initial challenges for clinical teachers in a criminal defense clinic is working through these issues.

118. We note that students evolve throughout the course of their clinical experience, and their ideas about domestic violence—and crime and violence generally—evolve as well. It has been our experience that students in both domestic violence and criminal defense clinics come to the work with a variety of myths and misperceptions about victims and perpetrators and come away from the work with a more textured understanding. For example, students in domestic violence clinics are often surprised to find that they do not always like their clients, or the choices they make. Students in criminal defense clinics are often surprised to find that they often like their clients and feel less judgmental than they thought they would about the choices their clients make.

119. See Cahn & Meier, supra note 21, at 344 (“In feminist litigation ... a lawyer often chooses to represent a client precisely because the lawyer affirmatively endorses that client’s goals.”).

120. See Minow, Seeking Justice, supra note 116, at 1–13 (“If the system calls for adversary advocacy, lawyers may justify zealous work on behalf of venal, guilty clients. If those clients prevail, justice in the particular case may be defeated, but the system itself is protected.”).

121. In a misdemeanor clinic, domestic violence cases present the biggest personal and/or ideological challenge for many students. During the week-long orientation program for students in the Georgetown Criminal Justice Clinic, there is a session in which students voice questions and concerns about doing criminal defense work. Every year, students say they are worried about representing alleged sex offenders, perpetrators of domestic violence, and perpetrators of hate crimes. See Abbe Smith, When Ideology and Duty Conflict, in ETHICAL PROBLEMS FACING THE CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYER 19–20 (Rodney J. Uphoff ed., 1995) (noting that many defenders and prospective defenders are ambivalent about defending “rapists” and “racists,” and acknowledging that “[t]hese are the hard cases”).

122. See Phyllis Crocker, Feminism and Defending Men on Death Row, 29 St. Mary’s L.J. 981, 981 (1998) (exploring the relationship between being a feminist and representing men
In order to do the work, criminal defense students must learn that, as a matter of professional ethics—and day-to-day reality—they have "nothing to do with justice." Sometimes, they feel bad about this. Then, suddenly, after a case or two, the student does on death row. Professor Crocker talks about reconciling feelings of compassion for the victim and for the perpetrator in the context of domestic violence:

When a man kills a woman as part of a history of abuse, we are all outraged and saddened by her death. The woman's death is tragic on a personal level, but it also speaks directly to hearts of feminists on a political level because it exemplifies a broader reality about the violence that women suffer in our culture. A woman's death at the hands of her husband confirms our fears about the full extent of harm women face from men who beat them and it demonstrates the legal and social service systems' inability to deal effectively with the persistent problem of abuse until it is too late.

These same impulses resonate in the hearts and minds of those of us who represent the man who killed the woman. We understand the personal anguish of the victim's family, but we also see the individual tragedy of the man who committed the murder.

Crocker, supra, at 1001. See also Cookie Ridolfi, Statement on Representing Rape Defendants, in LEGAL ETHICS 304-05 (Deborah L. Rhode & David Luban eds., 1995) (discussing her "growing discomfort" representing defendants accused of rape); Abbe Smith, Rosie O'Neill Goes to Law School: The Clinical Education of the Sensitive New Age Public Defender, 28 HARV. C.R.-C.L. L. REV. 1, 45-50 (1993) (examining how defenders represent people who "hurt other people").

123. See Mills, I Have Nothing to Do with Justice, LIFE, Mar. 12, 1991, at 56 (recounting the life and work of Martin Erdmann, former Attorney-in-Chief of the Criminal Defense Division of the Legal Aid Society of the City of New York); see also Merton, supra note 100, at 998 n.4 (describing Erdmann as a "redoubtable character"). For the defense lawyer's obligation to pursue the client's interest and not justice, see ABA STANDARDS ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, THE DEFENSE FUNCTION, Standard 4-1.2(b) (providing that "[t]he basic duty defense counsel owes to the administration of justice and as an officer of the court is to serve as the accused's counselor and advocate with courage and devotion and to render effective, quality representation"); see also Charles Curtis, The Ethics of Advocacy, 4 STAN. L. REV. 3, 3 (1951) (stating that "[t]he lawyer's official duty, required of him indeed by the court, is to devote himself to the client"). As Curtis notes, the better a lawyer, the worse a citizen. . . . A lawyer . . . has lower standards of conduct toward outsiders than he has toward his clients or his beneficiaries or his patrons against the outsiders. He is required to treat outsiders as if they were barbarians and enemies. The more good faith and devotion the lawyer owes to his client, the less he owes to others.

Id. at 5-6.

124. See Smith, supra note 122, at 49 (quoting from a student journal: "How can I communicate that I'm on my client's side and still retain my sense of humanity and compassion. . . . Do I park my humanity at the courthouse door?"). The student was wrestling with the morality of defending guilty violent criminals who "will likely go out tomorrow and do something equally bad." Id. at 48. The student had just seen the film Criminal Justice (Home Box Office 1990), a powerful depiction of the aftermath of a violent urban crime. In the film, a lawyer whose client is accused of slashing a woman across the face in the course of a robbery, requiring sixty-three stitches and causing permanent disfigurement, tells his client that he only cares about the client and doesn't give a f*** about [the victim]. Id. at 49.
an about-face. Whether prompted by the student getting to know a flesh-and-blood client, or the student embracing professional role, the student no longer has any doubts about his or her cause. The student will do anything and everything within the bounds of the law to get the client off. For the student, the best result, the right result, the just result is getting the client out of the clutches of the system even if it means bringing the complainant down.

On the one hand, the students’ strong commitment to their clients’ cause is a good thing. We applaud it. This is what clinical teachers try hard to instill in students. In order for poor people to have meaningful access to justice, they must be represented by skilled and dedicated lawyers.

On the other hand, the students’ embrace of client may make it difficult for them to contemplate broader issues of justice. The stronger the attachment, the greater the righteousness, the harder it is to notice anything else. It sometimes seems that students simply cannot do both; they cannot take on a client’s cause body and soul, while keeping an eye on justice, fairness, and equality.

We believe this is a challenge that teachers in both settings—civil clinics representing battered women and criminal defense clinics—ought to take on. Although students who choose zeal on behalf of a client over a broader commitment to justice are doing exactly what they should for the client—and may be comporting with the clinic’s goals and standards—the reality is that few of these students are going to continue to practice law on be-

---

The student was shocked by this, and wondered about the role of criminal defenders: “Is it true that as Jesse Williams’ lawyer, I can’t care about Denise Moore’s cuts and her 63 stitches? It kind of makes sense that I shouldn’t care—my job is to give [my client] legal representation, not hop on the [victim’s] sympathy train. . . . But is that right?” Smith, supra note 122, at 49.

125. See generally Smith, supra note 78.
126. Of course, these students would also be comporting with ethical rules. See supra note 101 and accompanying text.
127. In both of the clinics in which we teach, the prevailing ethos is client-centered, zealous advocacy. This is conveyed both explicitly, through curricular materials, and implicitly in the way we relate to clients, prepare the cases, and conduct ourselves in court. We want our students to experience “moments of pride and wonderment that I was managing to function and even derive considerable satisfaction from the devotion of every molecule of my being to this enterprise.” Merton, supra note 100, at 1048.
half of the abused or accused. Most students will go into some other type of law practice and would benefit from a broad view of justice. Moreover, we believe that even those students who pursue careers representing the abused or accused will be better lawyers and better people if they develop a broad, critical perspective of our legal system and are concerned about justice.\[128\\]

We believe we should teach students to recognize and care about the quality of justice our clients experience, and recognize and care about the quality of justice encountered by our opponents. But, how to teach this? How might clinical teachers teach young lawyers to be both zealous and enlightened advocates? How might we teach students enough about justice, broadly construed, so that as the MacCrater Report directs, they will promote it in their daily lives as lawyers?

We have several ideas, which follow.

128. At the very least, we are looking for a recognition of the complexity of justice, and an experience of lawyering that regularly includes both “bliss and agony.” See Merton, supra note 100, at 1099. Professor Vanessa Merton, a former public defender who currently directs a prosecution clinic at Pace University offers one of the best descriptions we have seen of the moral ambiguity of lawyering for the poor accused:

As a defense lawyer . . . my [e]very reaction had provoked not just an equal and opposite reaction, but a cascade of multiple chain reactions in all different directions. Delight mingled with disgust when I bamboozled an ignorant judge or charmed a sexist one into letting out of jail a client who was undoubtedly guilty—but who just as surely did not belong in jail. Winning an acquittal brought rapture and ecstasy, only to be deflated almost immediately by the grim prognosis for my client as he emerged from jail after twenty-two months without a home, a friend, or a future that could be imagined. Near–homicidal fury possessed me when a miserable, lonely, mentally impaired man or woman accused, and generally guilty, of some petty crime was treated with casual, callous, unnecessary cruelty by police officers and court officers and corrections officers and probation officers and, not infrequently, judges and prosecutors—and other defenders. I learned that legally, there was really nothing I could do to stop the abuse, nor to puncture the lazy, uncaring, unprofessional, shallow and benighted attitudes that fostered it. That fury would quickly reverse field into a less intense but still debilitating anger when clients “got themselves” re-arrested after I had knocked myself out getting them released, or when they wanted to plead guilty but balked at accepting a short jail sentence because a diabolically clever judge was dangling five years of probation in front of them, or when they did any of a number of other self–destructive things.

Id. at 1047–48.
A. Supervision

Consider the following two stories from our clinical experience: 129

A Victory for a Battered Woman

A student returns from family court, flush with victory. In court, the student did very little, but came away with everything she had sought: an abuse prevention order against her client’s husband, and custody, visitation, and support orders. Although she was well-prepared for a full hearing—she had police reports and hospital records to corroborate her client’s testimony of abuse, a detailed direct examination of her client demonstrating a history of long-standing physical and emotional abuse, and her client’s present state of fear of her husband—all she had to do was utter a three-sentence response to the judge’s query about the nature of the case and the judge granted the restraining order. After that, everything else—custody, visitation, and child support—fell into place in her client’s favor. The student is exuberant. She is happy for her client, who received the protection she was seeking, and is relieved that she did not even have to testify. She is happy for herself—the whole thing was a “great experience”—and is relieved that she did not have to offer any of the documents she brought, which contained a lot of hearsay and may not have been admissible. She hardly notes that the husband, who was not represented, barely said a word during the “hearing.”

A Victory for an Alleged Perpetrator

A student returns from an investigative trip, thrilled with the results. The student reports that she and her investigative partner managed to get a lengthy, nearly fifteen-page statement from a complainant in a domestic violence case. Even though the students introduced themselves, showed business cards, and made clear that they represented the complainant’s boyfriend, the complainant allowed them into her home and into her confidence.

129. Both of these stories are true and are far from novel. These are fairly typical experiences in civil advocacy on behalf of battered women and pretrial advocacy on behalf of criminal defendants.
The complainant gave the students a detailed account of her relationship with the accused, and about the incident which resulted in his arrest. In the course of the statement, which the complainant signed after making and initialing minor corrections, she acknowledged using illegal drugs and consuming a large quantity of alcohol on the date of the incident, having feelings of anger and jealousy over the accused's infidelity, and having told the accused that she would do anything to keep the accused away from his new girlfriend. The student reports without any apparent mixed feelings that the complainant seemed happy to talk to her—and probably would have been happy to talk to anyone. She seemed starved for conversation. The complainant had two small children, ages two and four, who were asleep in the next room during the interview (although the student reports that she and her partner played with the four-year-old for a couple of minutes before the child went off to bed). The accused is the father of the two-year-old. From time to time the complainant would get up and check on the kids, because they were just getting over the flu. The complainant told the students that she had barely been out of the house all week and it was nice to have some company.

It is tempting to simply congratulate the students in the above stories. Both students pursued their client's interest and achieved good results for the client. There is nothing wrong with the student deriving satisfaction from the result of the family court proceeding or the criminal investigation, and nothing wrong with the teacher sharing or encouraging that feeling of satisfaction. Depending on the student, unmitigated exuberance at victories of this sort might be a positive step in the assumption of professional role.

Still, there would be a lesson lost if the student celebrated the client victory without contemplating the broader questions concerning the other institutional players. But how to do it?

First, in contemplating the supervision session, the teacher should probably not assume anything about the student's experience. Many, if not most, students would feel that something complicated and disturbing happened in both stories. The teacher might best initiate this conversation in an open-ended way, asking the student what they thought about what had occurred. If the student doesn't get to the question of justice, the teacher...
might want to be more direct: What was wrong with that picture—with the way the alleged domestic violence perpetrator was treated during the civil proceeding, or with the ease with which a damaging statement was obtained from a domestic violence complainant during a criminal investigation?

If the above approaches fail—if the students are so seeped in their adversarial role that they cannot see beyond it—an easy, familiar alternative would be to have the students consider what happened from the perspective of the opposing side. Clinicians recognize that good practice—sound strategic thinking about a case—requires developing a case theory that in some way reflects and addresses the opponent's theory. Developing "both sides" of a case is standard clinical pedagogy. Furthermore, in many cases demonizing—or ignoring—the opponent works to the client's disadvantage. The student representing the battered woman should contemplate what happened in court from the perspective of the alleged perpetrator, and the student representing the accused should contemplate what happened during the investigation from the perspective of the complainant.

The point is not to make students feel bad or guilty about serving their clients well. We want to mobilize, not paralyze them. But, we also want them to be thoughtful. To this end, there is nothing wrong with a little "shame and contrition"130 if the situation merits it. There is a "teaching moment"131 here that begs a discussion of the big picture. We want students to consider the vagaries of law, the unpredictability of the application of law, the arbitrary exercise of institutional authority, the question of power and powerlessness in general.

130. See Merton, supra note 100, at 1050 (referring to her feeling that she and her prosecution clinic students took unfair advantage of an alleged batterer who was represented by an incompetent defense lawyer).
131. See Aiken, supra note 104, at 24–30 (discussing the notion of a "disorienting moment"); Fran Quigley, Seizing the Disorienting Moment, 2 CLINICAL L. REV. 37, 51 (1995) (coining the phrase "disorienting moment" and defining it as the instant "when the learner confronts an experience that is disorienting or . . . disturbing because the experience cannot be easily explained by reference to the learner's prior understanding—referred to in learning theory as 'meaning schemes'—of how the world works").
discussing similarly complex depictions of domestic violence in fiction and nonfiction. 134

An alternative is to have the teacher in the domestic violence clinic conduct a session on domestic violence for the criminal defense clinic, and the criminal defense teacher conduct one on criminal defense for the domestic violence clinic. It is our feeling that it is not wise for either teacher to teach the "other side’s stuff," for three reasons: first, we don’t know enough about the other side to be good teachers; second, we are primarily—and rightly—concerned with teaching students to care about our own clients and to win; and third, there is an important lesson in seeing another teacher/lawyer who genuinely cares about the other side and voices another perspective.

V. CONCLUSION

There may always be a certain amount of hostility between lawyers for the abused and lawyers for the accused. Given what is at stake for each of our clients, how could there not be? Still, because lawyers for the abused and accused are essentially poverty lawyers who share the same basic approach to advocacy—an approach rooted in a deep commitment to access to justice—it seems a shame for there to be such outright loathing.

In addition to having these things in common, each of us has much to offer the other. Criminal defenders owe thanks to the

(Avalon/Fine Line 1994) (New Zealand film powerfully depicting a Maori family coping with abuse, alcoholism, and poverty); SLEEPING WITH THE ENEMY (20th Century Fox 1991) (depicting a battered woman who manages to flee her abusive husband, revealing how difficult it is to simply “leave”); STRAIGHT OUT OF BROOKLYN (Samuel Goldwyn 1991) (telling the story of a teenager’s attempt to get out of his impoverished neighborhood and violent home and providing a complex portrait of his abusive father and abused mother); WHAT’S LOVE GOT TO DO WITH IT (Touchstone Pictures 1993) (recounting Ike Turner’s abusive relationship with Tina Turner).

134. See, e.g., QUINDLEN, supra note 67 (portraying a woman’s escape from an abusive marriage); MARY KARR, LIAR’S CLUB (1996) (memoir about growing up in an abusive household); DOROTHY ALISON, BASTARD OUT OF CAROLINA (1992) (coming-of-age novel about child abuse); Susan Glaspell, A Jury of Her Peers, in THE BEST AMERICAN SHORT STORIES OF THE CENTURY 18 (John Updike ed., 1999) (depicting a battered woman who is accused of killing her husband and suggesting the many forms abuse can take and how abuse is compounded by isolation); MIKAL GILMORE, SHOT IN THE HEART (1994) (memoir by the brother of Gary Gilmore on the relationship between family violence and criminality).
B. Classroom Teaching

We have several ideas about teaching about justice in the clinical classroom. Our first suggestion is that there be a joint class with students from the domestic violence clinic and the criminal defense clinic. The chief goal of such a class would be to expose students in one clinic to the viewpoint and experience of students in another. In so doing, we would hope to expose students to the perspective of the opposing party, get students to consider the professional role in the representation of the abused or accused, and get students to consider how the goal of winning might co-exist with a quest for justice.

The centerpiece of the joint class should be a “double role-play” in which a student from the domestic violence clinic, acting as a criminal defense lawyer, conducts a counseling session with an alleged perpetrator, and a student from the criminal defense clinic, acting as a civil attorney, conducts such a session with a battered woman. We believe that when the students step into the other side’s “shoes”—even in a simulated client interview in class—they will come away with a different understanding.

The reading for the class should include materials that examine or describe role assumption in lawyering. The class might also include viewing a feature film or documentary that accurately portrays domestic violence, depicting both the victim and perpetrator as complex, multi-faceted people, or reading and

132. See, e.g., Abbe Smith, On Representing a Victim of Crime, in LAW STORIES 149 (Gary Bellow & Martha Minow eds., 1996) (recounting a defense lawyer’s representation of the victim of a brutal hate crime and her struggles with the change of sides and role). We also recommend interdisciplinary teaching materials on matters that are common to both sets of clients—e.g., the effects of witnessing or experiencing violence as children, the efficacy of treatment programs for perpetrators and victims of domestic violence, and the role of substance abuse in family violence.

133. See, e.g., THE ACCUSED (Paramount Pictures 1988) (a fictionalized account of a New Bedford, Massachusetts gang rape, focusing on the relationship between the prosecutor and victim); DEFENDING OUR LIVES (Cambridge Documentary Films 1993) (documentary about the Framingham 8, a group of women prisoners in Massachusetts who killed abusive spouses); EAST IS EAST (Assassin Films/BBC 1999) (English film depicting the alternately abusive and loving marriage of a Pakistani man and his English wife); HE GOT GAME (40 Acres & A Mule/Touchstone 1998) (Denzel Washington portraying an abusive husband who, upon being released from prison, attempts to be a father to his estranged son); LADYBIRD LADYBIRD (Channel Four/Parallax 1994) (English movie about a working–class abused woman’s fight to regain custody of her children from social services); ONCE WERE WARRIORS
battered women's movement for important insights into the cycle of family violence (useful at sentencing), and for furthering the consideration of social and individual context in crime and violence (useful at both trial and sentencing). Of course, battered women's advocates appreciate the particular skills and insights of criminal defenders whenever a battered woman assaults or kills her abusive partner and becomes the accused.

Although the chief obligation of students representing the abused and the accused is to zealously pursue their clients' interests, they ought to also consider broader questions of institutional power and social justice. Clinical teachers should do what they can to foster this consideration.