

**Transcription of the Oral History Interview with
Joseph Harbaugh
March 5, 2001**

Johnson: This is the oral history project taping and we are very fortunate this afternoon to have Dean Joseph Harbaugh here. Dean Harbaugh, your experiences with Bill Pincus or/and any recollections of the CLEPR or sponsored conferences, or any other starting point?

0:01:00

Harbaugh: I first met Bill Pincus when I came to Connecticut in 1965-66. He was the Ford Foundation officer that funded a grant to the Circuit Court of Connecticut supporting the creation of the office that I held as chief public defender for the state of Connecticut. He was also supporting New Haven Legal Assistance with a grant from the Ford Foundation. So I met him in that context. As a Ford Foundation officer, I found him to be congenial person, somebody that was very bright and clearly somebody who was very interested in the concept of equal justice and access to justice as a Ford Foundation officer.

0:02:00

I next came in contact with him after I joined the faculty at the University of Connecticut Law School. I was hired to develop the first legal clinic at UConn. I was introduced to him by Howard Sacks, who was my dean at Connecticut and who had been the executive director of the predecessor of CLEPR, which was the Ford Foundation program that supported professionalism in legal education. Bill left Ford – a very dangerous move because he was a well-experienced Ford Foundation

executive – to take over the Council on Legal Education Opportunity – whatever – Professional Responsibility – the CLEPR acronym, supported. He had a commitment of ten to twelve million dollars over a ten-year period to foster clinical legal education. And he went about it in an almost ruthless but missionary way. His goal was to make sure that every school in the United States had a C-grant. His theory of philanthropy was not the trickle-down effect that was in place then; that is, you give it to the elite schools and it will finally sift down to the lesser-known schools. His view was you cut across all schools and get them all involved. One of the very early grants that CLEPR made was to my clinic at the University of Connecticut. In fact, the very first CLEPR clinical teachers meeting held at the CLEPR offices on Park Avenue in New York, I attended along with Harry Subine from NYU – Gary Bellow was there at that time, and one or two other people – at a time when we were kind of inventing what we thought clinical education was. And Bill was always at the core of it, pushing us as individual clinicians, pushing the legal education establishment which resisted him, incredibly – incredible resistance on the part of many traditional academics who saw him as an interloper, someone who was dangling a little bit of money and trying to disrupt the entire educational process.

Johnson: Would you take a few minutes to explore what the social context of your time was as you began clinical legal education?

Harbaugh: We're talking about the '60s. We're talking about a time when the civil rights

0:05:00

movement was at its most important crossroads. We're talking about a time when the Vietnam War was growing more and more important and more of an issue that would capture attention and divide the nation. We're talking about a time when the Supreme Court of the United States, would issues opinions every Monday, many of which would expand the rights of individuals, particularly those accused of crime.

0:06:00

We're talking about a time of significant social adjustment and unrest. It was at that time that the rebirth – and I say the rebirth of clinical education because it had existed earlier, but it had really died out – this was a time of exciting rebirth. It was also a time when the young people who were coming to law school had mission on their mind and vision in their eyes. They wanted to change society. They were brought up in this milieu of the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement and the like. So we brought in concepts of equal justice and training law students to be lawyers who represented the poor. All of our clinics focused on the civil or the criminal side – on people who didn't have enough resources to have access to justice. It wasn't difficult to find students to sign up for the clinic. The issue was how are you going to channel this incredible interest and excitement to make sure true

0:07:00

education occurred – not just learning, but a programmed, thoughtful planned education for the rest of their professional lives. Of course this environment created incredible opportunities to take on impact cases. But also at the same time the day-to-day cases in our civil and criminal courts were almost themselves momentous events, because we were arguing issues and policies that in many respects were just emerging in the time and in the legal times.

Johnson: In contrast to the times you are describing now, what was your initial exposure to clinical legal education?

Harbaugh: I was very, very lucky. I graduated from law school in 1964, and had offers for some
0:08:00 very interesting traditional legal jobs in Pennsylvania, particularly in the Pittsburgh area or back home in Reading. But there was a notice on the board at school for this thing called the Prettyman Fellowship at Georgetown. It totally intrigued me that you would spend a year – as it was at that time, a year – and you would get trained to be a trial lawyer with some of the best teachers you could find in the country. At the same time you would do some studying and get your LLM. Well, litigation was where I thought I wanted to spend the rest of my life, so I applied. And as Bill Greenhalgh, who was then the director of the Prettyman Program, said, “You were lucky, Harbaugh, that there were very few people applying from the Third Circuit,
0:09:00 because if there had been any more you probably wouldn’t have gotten the position as a Prettyman Fellow.”

Well, going there was one of the most exciting years that anybody could have.

Everyday you worked under the tutelage of Bill Greenhalgh, who had a vision about what it meant to be a trial attorney and what clinical education ought to be. Although at that time he only focused on the graduate level, I got totally indoctrinated into the concept that you needed to be truly trained in something as sophisticated as being a litigator before you could be turned loose on the public. And that on the graduate

level I was lucky enough to change, or to redirect – had the opportunity to – to the JD
0:10:00 level shortly thereafter, first of all by just employing some Yale students in my office
in Connecticut, and seeing what really could be done, even in an informal way, and
then moving from there into a clinical setting at the University of Connecticut. Now
I obviously took with me to UConn much of what I had been exposed to as a
Prettyman Fellow at Georgetown. So the early stages of my clinical education as a
teacher were dramatically influenced by what I had learned as a Prettyman Fellow at
Georgetown.

Johnson: Can you give us any idea of what the significant milestones in clinical education are
in your view? CLEPR funding? Title IX funding? The Key Biscayne Conference?
Bellow and Moulton book? Anything else that strikes you as a critical juncture?

0:11:00

Harbaugh: Well, all of those events were so very important. CLEPR's predecessor, the
organization that was directed by Howard Sacks, was important because it planted
the seeds. There were a few seeds planted then by Bill Pincus in the minds of the
folks at the Ford Foundation that the investment of ten million dollars – which in
those days was a hell of a lot of money – would have a dramatic impact on legal
education. And I think Bill must smile over and over again to think what his ten
million dollars has wrought in American legal education. So CLEPR was very, very
important. OEO Legal Services, Legal Services Corporation's predecessor, was very
0:12:00 important because it funded legal aid projects in many of the urban centers, and that

allowed for a partnership very often between the law school embryonic clinics and existing legal services providers. And that gave us a context in which to function. Title IX came much later. Title IX was very useful because it raised the ante for legal education; that is, there were many more dollars available per school from Title IX than we could ever squeeze out of CLEPR. My original grant, one of the early CLEPR grants, I believe was \$21,000 a year to run a clinical program and to do an analysis of its impact. I mean, we can look back now and say that was peanuts. But in those days it was significant because there had to be matching funds from the school. Title IX just ramped that up. Even when Title IX disappeared, by that time clinical education had become so much a part of legal education and was accepted much more broadly than it was in those early days, the clock couldn't be turned back. The investment had to stay.

0:13:00

Gary and Bea's book was very, very important for us as clinical educators because it gave us some credibility in the academy. Gary and Bea put together a book that is still turned to by clinical educators who say, "Wow!" That's pretty damn significant that they put into context the skills, values, approaches and pedagogy. When I came to clinical education, the establishment said it couldn't be done, there wasn't anything there, there wasn't anything that had a conceptual framework or academic legitimacy, and Gary and Bea made it clear that there was that foundation. From that sprung an enormous amount of scholarship that is now permeating legal education. Clinical educators also have influenced our more traditional brothers and sisters

0:14:00

whose scholarship reaches into areas that 25 years ago would have been declared off-limits for a legal academic.

0:15:00

There was the Key Biscayne group, the KBG, which was a watershed event because it was only then that those of us who formed that group grew up politically. We had been waging a political war within the academy to have recognition and it was at that point – which as I recall was Bill Pincus’ farewell conference – the last of the funding of CLEPR as CLEPR wound down its business, was to bring the group together, a much larger group. And those of us who stayed behind, and are now known as the KBG, were there saying this is the end of CLEPR, what we have to be conscious of is that this can’t be the end of clinical legal education. We then

0:16:00

mounted what became a political battle inside of legal education that led to the Battle of New Orleans. The Battle of New Orleans was an August meeting of the American Bar Association in New Orleans – I can’t remember the year, but I certainly remember the event. We were prepared to put a slate up, to challenge the already-designated new officers of the section on legal education and admission to the bar. As good lawyers, we’d figured out we could mount a campaign and do it on the floor. We could go to other members of the ABA, get them to sign up at that moment for their 15 bucks and become members of the section, pack the hall and throw the rascals out – throw out the old guard. I remember as if it were yesterday

0:17:00

when we finally won the battle and that battle was the beginning of winning the war with the ABA. We still had to restrain Bill Greenhalgh, who wanted to go in and just

beat the bastards where they were and take over the section. Luckily, I think for us, calmer heads prevailed. Roy Stuckey was there, Elliott Milstein was there – who else was there? – a bunch of folks who were part of the KBG. We had to hold Bill back so that we didn't confront the ABA, but we probably could have beaten them. We probably in the long run lost the war, however, that we eventually won for status for clinical legal educators.

0:18:00 I guess the other big part of it was winning the battle on Standard 405 we got ABA to adopt as a standard – this was the battle of “should” versus “shall.” The issue was the status of clinical legal educators and how to equate them with the more traditional faculty in terms of salary, benefits, status, security. The battle was with ABA and AALS on should the standard read “should” or “shall.” We lost the battle for “shall,” but won the battle for “should,” which in effect really meant “shall” for almost every school. At that time I was on the – no, I had been on the executive committee of AALS – I think I was the first clinical faculty member elected to a seat on the AALS group executive committee. I then went off the executive committee, but I was representing the AALS in the House of Delegates. I was the AALS rep to the House and facing a very difficult situation because I was trying to get a compromise on this “should” versus “shall” battle, as were others. And what I faced was the prospect that if it wasn't something that was acceptable to clinical legal

0:19:00

0:20:00 educators, I would either have to go on the floor of the House of Delegates and argue against my brothers and sisters who were clinical educators, or I was going to have to

resign my position at the AALS. And I was really torn by this whole process, and Lord knows we worked hours and days and right up to the very last moment as to which way it was going to go. There was a meeting in the suite of the president of AALS that I attended with the leadership group from the ABA and the AALS. At the very last minute, when the compromise was hammered out, I was literally I think an hour away from being forced into that choice. Thank goodness I didn't have to make that choice.

Johnson: Well, Dean Harbaugh, you've given us a little bit of a background and the political
0:21:00 tone of the times. Methodology or movement? What would be the term you'd use to describe clinical legal education?

Harbaugh: Methodology or movement? Both.

Johnson: Both?

Harbaugh: Clearly it's a pedagogy. In fact, I argued that position at the clinical conference at
Southern Cal, one of the very early clinical teachers conferences. In fact, I argued it
so vociferously that Bill Pincus pulled me aside and called me a traitor because he
really thought it was a movement. I argued pedagogy because we were teaching
0:22:00 fundamental lawyering skills in a very different way, from a very different
perspective from those who were teaching it in the traditional Socratic/lecture

environment. But we were still teaching, at its core, those incredibly important analytical skills that lawyers must have if they are going to serve their clients. We just put them in context. We put those skills in context and expanded what we were teaching. We were teaching people at the cognitive level, but we were also teaching people, law students, at the affective and active levels of learning. So it is a classical pedagogy. We were teaching a conceptual framework. We were also teaching people how to act and feel like lawyers. We were teaching all those values issues that confront lawyers all the time. So it was a pedagogy.

0:23:00

It also clearly was a movement. It grew out of the people who were attracted to the academy. At the beginning of clinical education almost every single one of those people was involved as an activist, a lawyer activist, in public defender work, which at that time was in the very early stages. It wasn't accepted the way it is today. It was legal aid lawyers fighting housing battles on behalf of tenants or anti-war protesters who were standing up to the establishment on every First Amendment issue that you could think of. They were drawn into the academy as clinical legal educators, and we started these clinics to serve those social justice purposes. We saw ourselves as part of a movement too. So it was both. It was both.

0:24:00

I think we are less of a movement now and more of a pedagogy. Not surprisingly, we've matured. We are much more sophisticated. I look back at the things that we did in the early stages of clinical education and just shake my head that we were able

to produce some lawyers who are actually pretty good. We were not all that good at figuring out what it was we were doing and how we were doing it. We were making it up as we went along. And the clinical legal educators today are such a sophisticated, talented group of people to take this teaching and learning to a much higher level than we ever had, or than I ever had – I'm not going to speak for my colleagues, but I will speak for myself – to a much higher level than I ever achieved.

0:25:00

Johnson: Can you take a few minutes to give us an idea of the cases or clients that have been most significant to you personally in this development of clinical legal education?

Harbaugh: Clients? Wow, let me think about that. Let me come back to that. Ask me something else now, because I know Ogilvy and these guys are going to edit this so they just snip together what they really want to do. Some of them I'm not sure I can talk about.

Well, wait a minute, maybe I can. There was somebody who was really very important to me and my understanding of myself as a lawyer and what I was going to teach, this fellow by the name of Willie Akins. And Willie was a revolving-door criminal defendant. He had spent – he was in his 30s – he had spent more than half of his adult life in jail. And Willie never went in for anything big – a small B&E, disturbing the peace, minor offenses. But Willie would go into jail, serve his 60 or 90 days, maybe sometimes a little bit more, and come out, and within a short time

0:26:00

Willie was back in again. No education – African American with virtually no hope or opportunity. We had Willie as a client, originally charged with aggravated assault and battery. And he had been living at a place for several months, and there was a woman there that he and another fellow in this lodging house got in a fight over. And there was a cutting. And the cops came. The other guy had been cut, so they took – this was typical in those days, they never inquired about anything, the guy who was cut went to old New Haven Hospital and Willie went to jail. Well, they got two people and one is cut. One becomes the victim and the other is the criminal. Now Willie told me that the other guy came after him with the knife – it was only the two of them – and that Willie got the knife away from him, and in the process of doing that the guy got cut. Willie could barely speak English and he had the hardest time speaking. And I got Willie’s record and it was I think nine pages of the old FBI sheets. I went to the prosecutor, and the prosecutor said, “If you plead Willie to disturbing the peace, I drop the felony charge, he does 90 days and walks.” That’s it. Other than that, they were going to charge him with aggravated A&B, and he is going to be facing – with his record, he is going to be facing three to five years. I went to Willie, and Willie said, “I didn’t do it.” I knew in my heart of hearts that if Willie got up there and testified, the way he spoke, the way he looked, everything about him, he – we weren’t going to win this case. And what I did was I leveraged Willie into accepting that plea. We pleaded guilty in the morning. There was the luncheon break and the sentencing was going to be in the afternoon. We knew what the sentencing was going to be. And Willie went off. And at 2:00, reconvening of court

came around, and Willie's not there. I go out in the street. I'm looking up and down the street. The next thing that they are going to do is they are going to issue a warrant for Willie's arrest. I see Willie coming down the street, walking toward me. He's carrying a small brown paper bag. And he comes up and we go in. And he is sentenced to his 90 days. And just before he goes off – "Willie, take care; you'll be out shortly. Don't worry about it." – Willie told me two things. First thing he told me was that the reason he didn't want to plead guilty was he was going to lose his address. He had an address in this rooming house. He got mail, junk mail, but he got mail at this address. And that was the most important thing to him, that he was going to lose his address. The second thing was what was in his bag, three or four packs of cigarettes, his razor and some shaving cream. That's all Willie had. That taught me a lesson about counseling. Willie pleaded that he hadn't done it, and he wanted to go to trial. And I used my power to leverage Willie into taking 90 days, which was something Willie could do standing on his head spitting wooden nickels, given his record, rather than face the three to five years that I knew he was going to get. I imposed my value judgement on Willie. That had an incredibly powerful impact on me when it comes to counseling clients, which I hope comes through in the book Bob Bastress and I wrote about making sure you empower the client to make the decision and not make the decisions for the clients. That to me – that had more impact on me than any other case I've ever had.

0:30:00

0:31:00

Johnson: Well, that kind of leads us to the discussion of the teaching materials that you've

developed along the growth of clinical legal education.

Harbaugh: Well, it's interesting. I began, I suppose, where most of us in those early days of clinical education began. I began by teaching trial skills. The big focus was to prepare litigators, because what we did for the clients we represented is we went to court with them in both civil and criminal cases. But I learned as a clinical – as an educator I guess – I didn't realize it when I was practicing – that most of the things that my students were doing didn't involve going to court. They were interviewing clients and witnesses. They were counseling clients about the choices that the clients had, and the opportunities and the obstacles. And then we negotiated on their behalf to achieve their goals. So in 1974-75, I went to my dean, who was then at Temple – went to my dean, Peter Liacouras, and said I want to teach interviewing, counseling and negotiating. And Peter said, "You can't teach those things. You just got to learn those. There is nothing there to teach." And I finally convinced them to let me put together a course on ICN. And that was the beginning of trying to develop materials in those skills and particularly in the area of negotiation.

And that was preceded by the fact when I left Connecticut and went to Duke I negotiated a semester-long sabbatical to go to Harvard. Ken Pye, who was my friend and had been the associate dean at Georgetown when I was a Prettyman fellow, and was the former then dean of Duke and really pulled me to Duke, negotiated so that I could have a semester at Harvard as a university research scholar, which was a great

0:34:00 title that allowed me to do anything I wanted to do and gave me an office. And I went to Gary Bellow's classes, but I primarily spent my time in the graduate school of education and the graduate school of psychology researching simulation as a teaching technique, as a pedagogical technique. And that semester of research on simulation, plus the interest in interviewing, counseling and negotiating, led to the development of a series of simulations, the PLI videotapes on interviewing and negotiation, and then the PLI problem materials and video. It also got me a title at one of the very first clinical teachers conferences out in Snowmass. I think that was the one that I was the conference chair on. I can remember coming into the bar after our first day of sessions, and as I came into the crowded bar, there was my mentor

0:35:00 Bill Greenhalgh across the bar, and he looked up and he saw me. He said, "Here comes the simulator!" Not the "clinical teacher" – the "simulator" – because Greenhalgh was always on my back because I was pushing simulation as a way to prepare students for the real-life encounters. And he said that pretty soon we would abandon all of clinical education and real clients and just have "simulated" clients. Now if Greenhalgh were alive today and began to look in at some of the stuff we are trying to do with computers and training, he'd certainly totally freak out and do more than just call me a "simulator."

0:36:00 But the pedagogy, from my perspective, was one that kept on evolving. What's exciting for me as basically a former clinician, because I don't have time to do it as a dean now, and I envy my brother Milstein, who has returned to the clinical education

trenches – I look out and see what clinicians are doing today and marvel that those of us who were around at the beginning had any real influence on the pedagogy that we see flourishing today.

Johnson: Well, Dean Harbaugh, I know you are very willing to make some predictions of what is in the future for clinical legal education. Would you give us an idea of clinical legal education's future, where you see it going?

Harbaugh: Well, I think that it's terrific. I think the future for clinical legal education is even brighter than in our past. I sense a greater and greater recognition on the part of the legal academy to accept clinicians as important colleagues in the legal academy – the bench and bar pushing even more. The McCrate report, another milestone that I hadn't even mentioned, another milestone in the development of clinical legal education, has helped focus the attention of the bench and the bar on the need to prepare within the JD program more students to handle the skill tasks and the value issues that are out there. Clinicians have developed a solid base of scholarship that makes it easier to be accepted in the academy. And much of that scholarship is viewed as useful by practitioners in comparison to some of the scholarship of our more traditional colleagues, scholarship that is viewed as not nearly as useful to the profession. The issues in front of and confronting clinical educators will more and more be focused on, I think, on cost. We are at a time where resources are going to be very tight, and our students are assuming debt that is staggering – particularly

0:39:00 those of us who are in private legal education. Our graduates are leaving with enormous debt. Clinical education is very labor-intensive and has been marked by very low student-faculty ratios. The challenge is to make sure we spread clinical education to reach as many people, as many students as we can, and yet contain costs. So the issues that we faced 20 years ago – how to take something that we could teach a group of eight or ten and now teach 40 or 50, will be multiplied as we try to reach everyone in the JD program, or as many as we can reach with a significant amount of clinical pedagogy and the movement part of it, the equal justice values, the type of thing that Elliott Milstein as AALS president tried to refocus the attention of the academy on.

0:40:00 So I think we have great opportunities. The challenges will be managing costs. Clinicians have been doing this from the very beginning. We spend an enormous amount of our time as administrators. That's why, for example, we have a number of former clinicians who are now deans, because we were administrators in running our programs. And more and more clinicians I think will move into decanal positions and then confront, as I have, some of those issues about how to expand the clinical education base with a quality educational program but containing costs and how do we involve more of the faculty in the spread of the pedagogy so that more members of the faculty assume some of the responsibilities that the clinical faculty has held exclusively in the past. Those are some of the challenges and incredible opportunities.

0:41:00

Johnson: In summary, do you have any thoughts regarding the political climate now for clinical legal education versus the start of clinical legal education?

Harbaugh: What we don't have is we don't have the external movement. We don't have the ferment and excitement, the social justice excitement that was outside of the law school, to spur us on. We built on that. We built on the fact that we knew what we were doing was right and we had an enormous amount of support and interest. And now we have to create it ourselves. I'm heartened by the fact that I believe the people who are coming from law school today are more focused on principles of

0:42:00

equal justice and reaching out in a pro bono way than we were, say, in the decade of the '80s, where I thought we had lost the heart and soul of many law students. That heart and soul is back in a substantial number of the students that I am seeing, and that is exciting, so that you have a climate perhaps now where inside the law school itself there's enough momentum building that will be another spurt for the growth for clinical legal education.

0:43:00

Johnson: Dean Harbaugh, you had an early interference by politicians during your start of your career in clinical legal education. Could you give us a little background and information on that?

0:44:00

Harbaugh: It was 1971. And you'll recall that it was a political time when the Vietnam War dominated the political consciousness and attention of the United States. The clinic

at the University of Connecticut that I directed took on as clients a lot of causes, many of them surrounding the Vietnam War. And they were almost all First Amendment cases where the state was interfering with the free expression of anti-war protesters. So on a regular basis I would say we were petitioning that great institution which has died away, a three-judge federal court to decide important constitutional questions. And we on a regular basis marched down to Chief Judge Joe Blumenfeld's chambers to file for another three-judge hearing. We had a series of cases on Vietnam and the red flag statute. We had the red flag statute in Connecticut declared unconstitutional. We represented the anti-war conspiracy, which was a Vietnam War protest group that was denied the opportunity to have a license permit to hold a rally across from the state capitol. We represented an individual who wanted to wear an American flag on the seat of his pants. We represented a whole series of individuals who really caused the political leaders of the state and local government to go nuts. Tom Meskill ran for governor as a conservative candidate for governor supported by Richard Nixon, and one of the things that he was most annoyed about was a time when he brought the president, President Nixon, in to his rally and parade. We had just had the red flag statute declared unconstitutional. So the streets were lined with our clients who were waving VC flags. It drove him nuts. When he got elected on an austerity budget plan he went before the general assembly for his first major speech to the general assembly after inauguration and said he was going to slash the budget of the state. And he gave three examples of where he was going to slash the budget of the state,

and the very first example he gave was he was going to cut the funding for my clinic
0:47:00 which he described as “nothing more than an agency designed to destroy our
government and its institutions.” And from that moment on he went on the attack to
close down the clinic. I got to tell you, in the scheme of things, our clinic probably
cost about \$40,000 most. So in a state budget of – I can’t remember what it was –
but it had no impact on the budget. It was clearly a political statement. We had
gotten under his skin and he was going to get us out. He went to the president of the
university and told the president to close down the clinic. The president called the
dean of the law school, Howard Sacks, and said, “Control that guy Harbaugh,
0:48:00 because if not we are going to have our funding for the university slashed.” The dean
proposed that they screen my cases, that they would get a committee of “lawyers,”
himself and a couple of other members of the faculty, and they would review the
cases before we accepted them so they could weed out the controversial cases. I told
them that they couldn’t do that, that that would be unethical for me and that as
lawyers it would be unethical for them. I went to the American Bar Association
Ethics Committee and asked them for an opinion on whether others, including
lawyers, could screen my cases. I also called for a special faculty meeting to review
my draft letter of resignation – not my letter of resignation, but the draft letter of
0:49:00 resignation in which, because I didn’t want to go into that – as a negotiator, that
ultimate step of making it the final threat, to review what I would be saying if I
resigned, and to make it public. This process had taken about six or seven months,
during which I was debating the governor on radio and on television as well. The

ABA came down with Informal Opinion 1208, issued February 9, 1972, entitled, “Limitations on the Operation of a Legal Clinic by a College of Law.” And in that – I was so proud of the ABA – they made it absolutely clear that no one could come in as a third party, even though that third party was providing my salary, and have oversight on our cases, particularly where the goal was to limit the cases to avoid controversy. And it pointed out that among the highest ideals of a lawyer is to represent unpopular causes that the establishment, including the government, thought were inappropriate positions. And that led the law school, the dean, the faculty, to back off and leave us alone. But it truly was the end of my being able to be a truly positive force within the law school – and it hastened my departure to Duke, knowing that if I stayed it would probably in the long run hurt the clinic because the focus would be on me as a renegade, if you will, rather than on the value of the clinic.

0:50:00

0:51:00

Johnson: Any advice for aspiring clinical educators of the moment?

Harbaugh: Just follow those great ideas and wonderful goals that mark clinical legal educators. Keeping justice squarely in front of one, and understanding the power that you have as a clinical educator. One of the things I learned – in fact, it attracted me to legal education – I was chief public defender of Connecticut when I left to go into legal education, and I left because of the multiplier effect. I figured I had another 30 years or 40 years to give to the equal justice movement if I stayed where I was and

0:52:00 continued what I thoroughly enjoyed, but that if I came into legal education, and each year I could influence two people to give two years of their lives for the same values and goals, I had taken my 30 years and made that 120 years. And the power that clinical educators have is as a role model to influence the bright, talented new lawyers to invest in the values that we as clinical educators have embraced. That's the real excitement.

Johnson: Thank you.

Harbaugh: Thank you.

Transcription of audio taken from video -- By: Mia Faber