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In 1957, Francis E. Lucey, the Jesuit Regent of Georgetown Law School and its leader, by then, for more than twenty years, wrote, “The history of a Law School is not a story of brick or mortar nor even of books,” but “is a story of expanding educational objectives and ideals, translated concretely into faculty, standards, methods and courses.” The history of a law school, he added, “reflects the vision and wisdom of its faculty and administrators.” More than fifty years after Lucey wrote his history, Georgetown Law now moves closer to commemorating the 150th anniversary of its founding in 2020. The Law Center will also pass landmark years for its graduate program. As the law school prepares for the future, it is a good time to reflect on its past. The school’s evolving educational objectives and ideals offer a window into the development of graduate education in law. At the same time, the course of graduate education at Georgetown is uniquely Georgetown’s: the University’s Jesuit heritage, its location in the nation’s capital, and its clinical fellowship program, in particular, defined the LL.M. program for much of its history.
From its founding through the first half of the 20th century, graduate legal education at Georgetown was influenced by the desire of its faculty and founders to promote jurisprudence that reconciled democratic values with its Catholic mission. But, as a law school in the nation’s capital, Georgetown also became an institution that promoted graduate education primarily as a means of specialization in fields important to increasingly sophisticated practice in Washington – patent law, at first, then the federal government and legislation during the New Deal, and, closer to the present, tax and international trade and yet more fields. An expanded view of the role of the law school in society was vital to defining graduate education at Georgetown. The launch, in the 1950s, of a graduate degree in advocacy, the first of its kind in the nation, established new boundaries for what graduate education in law could achieve. The history of graduate education at Georgetown Law is long and dynamic, continuously informed by changing visions of legal education.

Moreover, graduate education in law has long been fundamental to the law school’s aspirations, and the achievements of its leaders have helped define the school’s identity. This history provides an account of the idea of graduate education at Georgetown Law and how it has evolved. In doing so, it aims to assist in fulfilling one of the law school’s long-held objectives – to “keep abreast
Beginnings

Georgetown University's Law Department was eight-years old when it first began offering a Master of Law degree in 1878. Like many law schools at the time, Georgetown offered a two-year legal education leading to an LL.B. or Bachelor of Laws. An undergraduate degree was not required for admission. This was not unusual. College degrees were still rare in America. So were degrees in law. Many lawyers entered practice through apprenticeships and clerkships rather than through formal education. Rising bar admissions standards, though, began to demand that lawyers have three years of legal education rather than two. The sense that lawyers needed a longer education was shared by the new law school's faculty. Martin F. Morris, one of the law school's founders, wrote, "it is simply impossible under our circumstances for students to get any adequate knowledge of law in less than three years."
However, rather than extending the LL.B. course, the school announced the creation of a “Post Graduate Course” leading to the degree of Master of Law. The new program was launched, announced the school, “In pursuance of the intention of making the tuition more thorough.” It was, in the beginning, a practice-oriented program, “devoted especially to proficiency in Practice, and to advanced branches not usually touched upon in the regular two-years’ course.” Six students, mostly from the District of Columbia, graduated in the course’s inaugural year. Of these, the most prominent was Richard Nott Dyer, LL.M.’79. Dyer practiced in Chicago after graduation before moving to New York in 1881. He would eventually become Thomas Edison’s chief patent counsel, representing the inventor in patent disputes, among others, over the incandescent light-bulb, the gramophone, and the “Kinetoscope” – an early device for viewing moving pictures. He later took charge of patents for General Electric.

Georgetown was not the first law school in the United States to offer an advanced degree in law. That distinction goes to Columbia University, which offered an LL.M. degree in 1863. But Georgetown was one of the most committed to continuously offering and conferring the degree and one of the most successful in attracting students to pursue it. Columbia ceased conferring the LL.M. two years after the course was launched because of a lack of student interest – a difficulty the school continued to face after restarting its program later in 1892. Harvard similarly launched an advanced degree in law in 1873, but it was not until 1923 that it regularly conferred an LL.M. degree. By contrast, in 1883, Georgetown’s graduate course enrolled 35 postgraduates – a large number for the time. Even though attrition was high, the number of graduates with the degree was also still relatively high: nine in 1884, eleven in 1885, and eighteen in 1886. Keeping up with other local Washington schools may have been one reason for Georgetown’s persistence with its graduate course. In 1890, two
other law schools in the District offered advanced degrees – at a time when the total number of law schools in the United States doing so was only eight.\textsuperscript{12} Still, competition was not the sole reason. Records indicate that the faculty had what appears to be a genuine interest in the educational value of the course.

In 1883 the faculty decided that the “curriculum of the school should be made more practical” and that the course be made more prominent.\textsuperscript{13} The decision was reflected in the law school’s subsequent catalogs – the annual publications listing the school’s programs, courses, and its faculty. There, the school observed that its course had been attended even by those students “who propose to practice in jurisdictions where the requirements are less rigorous” and even by those “who have been previously admitted to the Bar.” This, the school described, had “been a source of no slight gratification to the Faculty, and a most favorable omen for the Bar of the future.”

A surviving examination from this period does reflect an emphasis on practice. An 1892 examination for the Post-Graduate Class in Pleading avoided questions that asked students to describe legal rules—like those asked to the senior LL.B. class—in favor of requiring examinees to draft pleas and replies. This also meant, of course, that the emphasis of the program at that early stage was not the production of original scholarship – a conceptualization that reflected the norms of legal education at that time. That said, a number of the law school’s early professors earned graduate degrees at Georgetown before returning to teach there. J. Nota McGill, lecturer on patent law for instance, earned his LL.M. at the school in 1888.\textsuperscript{14}
Moreover, there was another reason to keep the Jesuit school’s graduate course going: the school also took the year as an opportunity to train its students in natural law. As an 1892 syllabus on the course in Natural and Canon Law shows, students were expected to understand morality as “the foundation of human laws, the test of their validity” and the “source of their binding force.” When Martin Morris described his interest in the graduate program to the University’s Jesuit president in 1895, he speculated about teaching a course whose “predominant idea would be to show the influence of Religion and the Church” in the development of “Constitutional and Civil Liberty.”

But if an introduction to Catholic legal thought was part of the founders’ intentions for the Post-Graduate Course, the school nonetheless imposed limits on how Catholic its identity would be. The faculty rebelled against an 1894 proposal to transfer Georgetown’s Law Department to the planned Catholic University. George E. Hamilton, who would later serve as a dean of the law school, wrote angrily to the Francis Satolli, the Apostolic Delegate who had informed him of the wish that Georgetown’s law school be transferred from Georgetown and affiliated with Catholic University: “It is, in our opinion, impossible to establish or maintain successfully in this country a school of law in connection with a sectarian university, eo nomine, whether Catholic, Methodist, Protestant or Baptist. The transfer, therefore, is out of the question.” Should the Bishops attempt to push through with transferring the law school, the faculty, Hamilton threatened, “will at once proceed to carry out our own organization under the laws of the United States.”

The faculty’s opposition to the law school’s transfer, however, did not mean that they approached inculcating a belief in natural law in their students with subtlety. In a series of eight lectures to the Postgraduate Class in the 1895 and 1896 academic year, students were expected to understand morality as “the foundation of human laws, the test of their validity” and the “source of their binding force.”

Examination of Post-Graduate Class in Pleading
Friday, December 23, 1892

1. What are the necessary averments in declarations upon negotiable paper against parties primarily liable thereupon? What against parties secondarily liable?

2. On January 1, 1820, Samuel Smith, in London, England, was assaulted and beaten by John Jones. Prepare a proper declaration for Smith in King’s Bench.

3. On March 1, of the same year, at the same place, Thomas Robinson was sheriff; then and there he received as sheriff a capias from King’s Bench, directing him to arrest Henry Johnson, who, while resisting such arrest, was unnecessarily and excessively beaten by Robinson. You have filed a bill in King’s Bench for Johnson, to which Robinson has pleaded his authority and son assault demesne. Reply in such manner as to put in issue excess of battery.

4. On July 10, 1836, Frank Wheatley, doing business as a grocery merchant in the town of Carlisle, Cumberland County, England, was accosted by his enemy, George Janney, of the same place, with these words: “You cheat your customers with light weights.” Declare in case, in Common Pleas, for Wheatley and justify for Janney by a proper plea.

5. Prepare a declaration in Common Pleas upon a case of trespass quare clausum fregit, supplying your own facts; then interpose a plea of liberum tenementum.
years, Morris, then an associate justice of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, began: “There is a never-ending war
between good and evil, between man’s higher and man’s lower nature, between the agencies that would raise us to the stars and
those that would draw us down to hell.” Natural Law and Ethics would remain part of the graduate program’s curriculum well
into the start of the 20th century. The arrival of Jesuit regents as the school’s de facto leaders in the 1930s also meant a continuing
emphasis on natural law. Whether students absorbed the faculty’s interest in the subject, though, is unknown. Religion went largely
unmentioned in the students’ yearbooks, where students’ romantic interests, among others, were a more common theme.

“The Legal Lore”

The law school made the third year of law mandatory for the LL.B. degree in 1897. The postgraduate course was simply
turned into the third year with no change in its curriculum. In 1899, the school announced that it would launch a “Fourth Year or Post-
graduate Course” to be inaugurated in 1901. Notwithstanding its intent to launch the course, the faculty faced difficulty finding the
“right person” to lead it. Justice Morris said he was “deeply inter-
ested” in the course, planning to lecture on Comparative Law and Conflict of Laws, but was too ill to lead it himself. Still, his
hopes for the graduate course reflected the school’s aspirations. Morris wished that, “others more competent will be found to carry
it into effect, and to place our school on the high place on which it should stand.”

Fourth Year or Postgraduate Course:—For students, who have completed the foregoing three years’ course, and for holders of the Degree of Bachelor of Laws, a fourth year or Postgraduate course has been added, the successful completion of which will entitle students to the Degree of Master of Laws. Among the subjects included in this fourth year course are the following:

*History and Development of Law; Natural Law and Ethics; International Law; Admiralty; Civil Law and other Systems; Comparative Law; Conflict of Laws; Statutes and Constitutions, and Diplomacy.*

This course will be under the direct charge of Professor Charles C. Cole, late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, who will be assisted by lawyers of national reputation, selected on account of their peculiar fitness for the subjects enumerated.

Professor Cole will, in September next, issue a supplemental circular announcing the detailed arrangement of this course, and the professors associated with him in its conduct.

The fourth year LL.M. as announced in 1901
In 1900, Georgetown retained retired Associate Justice Charles C. Cole of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to take charge of the program, beginning in 1901. John Whitney, S.J., the University’s president, predicted that “the course would prove of the greatest value and most successful from the very start.” Lectures, he said, would be taught by “men of international prominence.” Cole, Whitney added, “was the right man to take charge.” Indeed, Cole assembled an impressive set of lecturers, each of whom was only assigned to the Postgraduate Course. The lecturers included Justices Morris and Seth Shepard, from the Court of Appeals; Conrad Holmes, a former U.S. Solicitor General; and Louis E. McComas, a former justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Professors from other universities were also retained as lecturers with several staying at Georgetown for several years. 1910 saw the addition of Hannis Taylor as lecturer on International Law and Foreign Relations of the United States and History of Constitutional Government. One of the most nationally prominent members of the faculty, Taylor was also its most controversial member. He had served as ambassador to Spain immediately before the Spanish-American War, was frequently consulted on American policy towards Cuba, and published well-received tomes on public international law and constitutional history. Documented accusations of plagiarism, however, hurt his reputation.

October 3. School opens. Students exchange greetings, and many new acquaintances are made. Everybody anticipates there will not be much work connected with the Post-Graduate Class. (They changed their minds about it later.)

October 7. Major Blitzing announces that he has been a member of the bar of his State for fifteen years, and has held the office of Assistant Attorney General.

October 12. Crowe almost lost his head by striking the transom.

October 24. Hennessy made himself heard. Good for you, old boy.

October 31. Royer rubs his eyes and asks whether the lecture has begun, and to his consternation finds that the class members were putting on their coats preparatory to leaving for home. Where have you been Royer?

November 8. Captain Rounds to his neighbor: “If I snore, let me know.”

November 14. Costello asks Professor Adkins where to find books on organization of the courts, and received the useful information to go the library.

December 12. Buckley was present in the class and gave an excellent statement in connection with the procedure in the U.S. Court of Claims. After that we have not seen Buckley. However, we look forward to our graduation day, when we expect to see him again.

January 2. Captain Rounds did not ask Professor any questions. Was this a New Year resolution?

January 5. We have heard again the voice of Major Blitzing.

Excerpted from _YE OLDE DOMESDAY BOOKE (1923)_.

Charles C. Cole
in 1909. The scandal over his alleged plagiarism did not go unremarked upon by students. David Wiener, LL.M. ‘13, wrote: “throughout the year we have had with us the Hon. Hannis Taylor and ‘his’ books on The History of Constitutional Government and International Law.”

Justice Cole passed away in 1905 soon after the Postgraduate Course was launched and had little time to leave his imprint on graduate education at the law school. Nonetheless, his curriculum and outlook on legal education shed light on part of the character of graduate education in law at the turn of the century. To Cole, graduate education was “practical and yet ornamental.” Despite the continuation of “practical training,” the course’s principal intention had become to “broaden the foundation of the lawyers.” The Postgraduate Course, the school, stated, would provide “real university postgraduate work in law.” Students would “round out the legal education received in the undergraduate course, by a fuller investigation of the fundamental principles of the Common Law, [and] the study of comparative jurisprudence.” Morris wrote of the school providing a “complete academic education.”

The curriculum of the early 1900s reflected an increased interest in improving the standards of legal education through the production of more educated lawyers. It was also in line with the view that lawyers needed to be educated to serve the public as part of the nation’s “governing mechanism.” In this period, graduates of the law school were exhorted to avoid narrowly serving single interests for fear of becoming unable to “to administer justice impartially.” They were urged to engage in more serious study of “legal principles in order that the development of the law might be uniform and consistent.” A student in the Class of 1911 wrote of traveling the “course of human history,” learning an “extensive range of legal lore.” He had some reason to be so bold. In addition to subjects like railway and comparative law, required subjects included Roman law and legal ethics — areas of study more associated with “general cultivation” and liberal education rather than legal training.

That said, the faculty also treated the Postgraduate Course as an opportunity to train students in a dizzying and ambitious array of subjects. In 1903, at a time when students did not choose their classes, Georgetown announced that the one year Postgraduate Course’s “principal subjects” also included legal history, constitutional law, civil law, admiralty, conflict of laws, family law, probate, patent law, insurance law, medical law, water law, federal judicial jurisdiction, special tort law and more. The next year, the faculty added even more elements to the course, announcing that it would establish “practical exer-
In our work we have traveled the whole course of human history and covered an extensive range of legal lore. We have gone to Athens and heard of the bloody code of Draco; we have sat with the students around the Roman lawyer and listened to his pronouncements on the law; we have wandered down the ages until the Fall of Rome and farther on until the Pope and Emperor both yielded their place upon the dual throne; to the wonderful book of Grotius and, more wonderful still, under Dr. Taylor’s magic, we have seen the state of France transformed into a book and “the Norman government become a little watch.”

A History of the Postgrad Class, YE OLDE DOMESDAY BOOK

cises in General Practice, Pleading and Evidence.” Students were required to draft pleadings in law and equity, motions, and “contracts, deeds, leases and other papers.”

The assortment of classes may have suited the students, who, notwithstanding faculty interest in their “general cultivation,” seemed to take the postgraduate course as a means of becoming legal specialists. The Class of 1923 described themselves as “trained to be specialists and authorities in different fields of practice.” At the same time, they described themselves as occupying positions of “exalted dignity.” Other classes were less dignified. Henry Gatling, LL.M.’17, who served as class historian in his year, wrote of his classmates: “Whether it was the voluntary desire to know more of the law before attempting to launch out upon the practice of the profession, or whether it was the failure to pass their home bar examinations that compelled them to return is a matter of conjecture.” But, he wrote, “Judging from the way some of us have answered the questions” asked by the professors, “it was probably the latter.”

Nonetheless, students were hardworking – even if they didn’t expect to be. Unlike their undergraduate counterparts, Fred J. Fees, LL.M.’20, observed, the postgraduate class was too “devoted” to their studies to engage early in the annual ritual of electing class officers. And “Social functions,” he plaintively noted, “were few in number” albeit “generally successful.” Fees may have been overstating the burden of being a graduate student insofar at least for himself. In addition to his graduate studies, Fees was class historian, president of the Patent Law Class, and a member of Georgetown’s basketball team. Participation in the university’s athletics was not unusual for law students in this period. As acting captain of the team in his graduate year, Fees was credited with piloting Georgetown’s basketball team to victories in 12 out of its 13 games.

For other students, the move to graduate work was more difficult. Lawrence Koenigsberger, LL.M.’14, described the transition for one student, Ed Davis, from the LL.B. to LL.M. at length. Davis, Koenigsberger wrote, was “changed, oh, so changed from the
Davis of the class of 1913. No longer did he appear before us in his formerly ever-present evening clothes. Instead, we nightly witnesses the spectacle of Ed hurriedly rushing off after class, not to charm some fair damsel, as he is capable of doing with less than no effort at all, but to bury his nose in some legal work, in preparation for an examination, or feverishly to pound a typewriter, engaged in creating a thesis or essay of more or less merit.” A like ethos of hard work may, however, have benefited Koenigsberger even if it discomforted Davis. Koenigsberger would later have a Supreme Court practice, and serve as a professor of law, sole member of the District Board of Tax Appeals, and President of the American Jewish Congress.  

Increasingly rigorous academic standards combined with what might have seemed a small time commitment may have played a role in students’ misconceptions of the increased difficulty associated with the fourth-year graduate degree. Instead of writing exams, students were required to write theses on their courses of study, with the aim of encouraging “a thorough investigation of each topic under consideration.” By 1925, LL.M. students were required to defend a 20,000-word thesis before a five-member panel. The rise in academic standards paralleled the law school's growing national reputation as the century progressed. Yet, when Hugh Fegan, the school’s assistant dean, wrote to LL.B. graduates to encourage them to take up the course, he told them that students would be free every day after an hour and a half’s work.

Another factor in prolonging the law school day for graduate students was their heavy involvement in the life of the school. Frederick Fees’s role as captain of Georgetown’s basketball team during his LL.M. year has already been mentioned. Less athletic students had a myriad of other activities...
at the law school that likewise kept them busy. LL.M. students joined the school’s burgeoning number of debating societies, the committees in charge of the yearbook, annual “smoker” (class dinner), the religious Law School Sodality, and academic clubs. Even the Georgetown Law Journal would find itself led by an LL.M. student, Frank Buckley, LL.M.’22. In Buckley’s final year as editor-in-chief, 7 out of the journal’s 25 staff were graduate students. And when Georgetown Law students faced students from the University of Wisconsin’s law school in a much-publicized debate in 1900—a debate that had come to be billed as a contest between Catholic and non-Catholic education—two of the three students that won the debate for Georgetown were graduate students—John J. Kirby, LL.M.’01, and Daniel W. O’Donoghue, LL.M.’01. At no other point in the history of the law school were graduate students, whatever their complaints about the burden of their studies, as deeply and broadly involved with the life of the school.

Early International Students

Citizens of other countries began making their way to Georgetown for postgraduate work in the late 19th century. Among the first known are Jean Felix des Garennes, LL.M.’97, Gerald Van Casteel, LL.M.’00, and Antonio Opisso, LL.M.’04. Des Garennes, born in France, earned both undergraduate and graduate degrees from the law school, practicing as an attorney for the French embassy before taking charge of the San Juan, Puerto Rico office of a New York law firm in 1905. Van Casteel took a longer and somewhat mysterious route to Georgetown. Born in Dublin to a Dutch father with an aristocratic title and a Welsh mother, he was orphaned at eight before working for the Education Department in London at sixteen. He worked as a journalist in Paris and New York before arriving at Georgetown in 1896.

In 1903, Antonio Opisso, from Manila, Philippines, enrolled in the LL.M. course—part of a trickle of students from the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico who arrived at Georgetown in the wake of America’s success in the Spanish-American War. Born in Manila to Spanish parents under Spanish colonial rule, Opisso came to the United States in 1901, three years after the United States formally acquired the Philippines, after having reportedly been imbued “with republican ideas” and a desire to become American. While enrolled in Georgetown’s LL.B. program, Opisso filed a petition for mandamus against the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, asking that he be allowed to declare his intention of becoming an American citizen. The case, the newspapers noted, appeared to require a decision on the unsettled citizenship status of Filipinos under American rule. Ultimately, the District’s Supreme Court would not decide that question, though it did allow Opisso to state his intention to naturalize. The same victory won Opisso a right to be admitted to the D.C. Bar. However, despite his efforts to remain in the United States, Opisso did not stay long. After completing his degree, he returned to the Philippines, where his practice eventually led him to two victories in the U.S. Supreme Court. Another LL.M. from the Philippines, Marcelo Nubla, LL.M.’23, would serve
as the first President of the “Philippine’s Law Club” – the first student organization to serve a student body from outside the continental United States. John Molloy, from San Juan, Puerto Rico, became the first graduate student from Puerto Rico, in 1908, and Manuel Prieto, Jr., LL.M.’16 was the first post-graduate student from Mexico.

How students from the Philippines and elsewhere in the world experienced Georgetown Law is difficult to discern. Georgetown attracted students from throughout the country but enrollment remained closed to women and African-Americans. Few students from abroad became members of the school’s many debate, academic, and extracurricular clubs and none were elected as class officers. American students, however, were respectful of their Filipino, Mexican, and Puerto Rican classmates in the school’s yearbooks, often writing of the high expectations for them. A student described Guillermo B. Guevara, LL.M.’16, from the Philippines, for instance, as a “man of unceasing ambition” that the class was glad to have “as a representative of the islands.” The class history of 1914 described each of the class’s “three antipodes” – “a reference to our three Filipinos” as “an example of what a good student should be.” Racism was hardly absent, however. One student wrote about Gabriel La’O in the LL.B. class of 1913: “No doubt, realizing that he was of another people, his association with class matters and fellow classmates has been more or less restricted.” Language barriers were also onerous for some. Of Pablo Rada, LL.M.’19, from Bolivia, a student wrote: “We do not hear much from him in class, due to the fact that he is unable to speak the English language as readily as his other colleagues.” For its part, the school’s administration was solicitous to the students from the Philippines, admitting students from the territory without tuition and encouraging the creation of a “Philippine’s Law Club” in 1922.
The hopes for great success for the school’s graduate students from abroad came true for some alumni. Manuel Prieto, Jr., LL.M.’16, became a prominent attorney in his home state of Chihuahua. Guillermo Guevara, LL.M.’16, was elected to the Philippine Court of First Instance before becoming a justice of the Philippine Supreme Court and, later, a law professor and businessman. He visited the Law Center in 1969, bringing a copy of a legal commentary he had written. Inscribed on the text was a dedication to the faculty of 1916. It said that the book had been given "as a humble memento of the happy days of intellectual camaraderie I spent with my mentors and fellow graduates of 52 years ago."
The Patent Law Course

America’s increasing prosperity presented new challenges to the law school as demand increased for lawyers capable of handling specialized work. In October 1910, Georgetown launched a new optional course aimed at students and graduates intending to pursue the practice of patent law. The field had become increasingly important. The start of the 20th century had brought with it a flood of new patent applications accompanied by what J. Nota McGill, LL.M.’88, lecturer in patent law, characterized as “bitterly-contested” litigation over who could claim a patent.47 Georgetown Law graduates found themselves competing with dedicated patent attorneys in what a student later branded an “age of specialists.”

The first specialized graduate degree offered by Georgetown, the Patent Course offered an LL.M. or a Master of Patent Law (M.P.L.) to students who completed one year of study. The first class of 30 graduated in June 1911. The Patent Law program

Patent Law Class of 1912. Professor J. Nota McGill, the course’s lecturer, is fifth from left in the bottom row.
emphasized what had long been the law school’s strengths in practical training. In addition to studying cases and federal jurisdiction, students were trained in filing complaints, injunctions, and pleadings, navigating the Patent Office’s recording system, and managing judgments and final dispositions. By 1916, students were handling actual cases of patent infringements, gathering the evidence serving as the basis for trial. Charles E. Morganston, Jr., Chairman of the Patent Law Class in 1916, commented favorably on the course: “we feel we enter upon our professional career fully equipped to face the practitioner of many years standing.” Morganston, it seems, had other reasons to be pleased. The handling of actual assignments, he wrote, made the study of patent law, “to say the least, profitable.” Students describe a program that fostered camaraderie. The Patent Law Class, small in its early years, and taught exclusively by Professor McGill and then his former assistant, Francis S. McGuire, produced “closer association and greater intimacy” among its students.

“A Great Laboratory for Political and Social Experimentation”

In 1932, Georgetown Law School’s LL.M. students declared that the school had fallen “in line with other departments in constituting a University of a truly national character.” By that time, the Law School had been offering courses leading to the LL.M. degree for more than 50 years. The continuity of the program was not, though, the source of the sole impulse behind the claim. Rather, the claim was founded in the increasing diversity of the Graduate School’s incoming students, representing law schools from across the nation, combined with profound changes in its graduate curriculum. In that decade, the law school announced a dramatic reorganization of its graduate course. Beginning in 1930, graduate studies would be “conducted chiefly as a study of Federal legislation and of the decisions of the United States Courts.” The reorganization of the graduate course in 1930 is surprising. First, the graduate program’s focus on federal legislation and of the federal courts anticipated rather than responded to the New Deal. When the program was reorganized in 1930, Franklin Roosevelt was Governor of New York and three years away from the presidency. Second, the reorganization was hardly incremental, taking place over the course of a year. The school first attributed the change to the rise of administrative law – the “legal machinery” of “each department of the Government,” and Congress’s “grinding out new laws.” Its appointment in 1930 of Frederic P. Lee as a specialist in legislation in statutory interpretation recognized this change. Lee was Legislative Counsel to the United States Senate and later one of the drafters of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 – a principal piece of New Deal legislation. The Graduate Course’s focus on federal courts and legislation demonstrated a considerable degree of foresight. But the reorganization also reflected other developments in jurisprudence and in views of legal

Rev. Thomas B. Chetwood, S.J. Chetwood served as regent from 1928 to 1931. Dramatic changes to the school’s Graduate Course began during his tenure.
education that had started to ferment even before the New Deal.

“During the past several years, American legal and political institutions have been subjected to far-reaching, critical scrutiny,” announced the school in early 1932. Law schools were no exception. In particular, Legal Realists challenged the underlying assumptions of Christopher Columbus Langdell’s case method – that fundamental legal rules and principles could be drawn from the study of case law and then applied to “new cases as they arise as merely new samples of preexisting cases.” The Realists emphasized the role of law as a means of achieving social ends as well as the importance of experience, data, and political and social views in legal thinking and judicial decision-making. This new way of thinking, the Realists said, called for new approaches to legal education that allowed students to examine how well laws actually worked in real life and how they could be improved.

Law schools, some Realists argued, needed to move away from preparing students solely for practice; rather, they needed to raise their academic standards and develop their capacity for research.

This approach informed Georgetown’s new graduate course – even if some of the school’s leadership in the period, especially the adherents to natural law, were hardly admirers of the Realists. For the first time, research and scholarship became principal goals of the graduate program. Thomas B. Chetwood, S.J., the Law School’s Regent, described the school’s goal as the elevation of “Graduate work at the Law School on a plane of high scholarship.” By 1931, practice classes had been discontinued. The school’s catalog declared that the “Nation’s Capital has become a great laboratory for political and social experimentation.”
Chetwood wrote, was “capable of great development” attractive to students from across the country. Students wrote dissertations on the scope of presidential power and federal jurisdiction. “Honors courses” in subjects like “Constitutional Aspects of Recovery Legislation” were established for graduate students who had entered with high rank in their prior academic work.

The school introduced both the degrees of Juris Doctor (J.D.) and Scientiae Juris Doctor (S.J.D.). Unlike today, the J.D. was originally a second law degree – conferred as an honor for exceptional graduate students, though it was discontinued as a second degree in law in 1938. When other law schools in the District of Columbia began conferring the J.D. as a first law degree, its value, the faculty began to feel, had been “depreciated.”

Early J.D. graduates made an impact as Georgetown Law professors: Aloysius Philip Kane, Walter H.E. Jaeger, and Francis Carol Nash. Jaeger served as a dissertation adviser to students in the graduate program, director of the graduate program, and as a faculty member at Georgetown for several years. Nash, a brilliant student and perhaps the youngest professor at Georgetown Law up to that time, returned to the school to teach after working at the Federal Alcohol Control Administration. Paul R. Dean, LL.M.’52 a student of the three who would later also serve as the Law Center’s Dean, remembered them fondly. Jaeger, he wrote, was “unforgettable,” “had a piercing tongue,” and “could spew out fantastic jokes, legal aphorisms, and profound insights with equal facility.” Nash, described Dean, was “a brilliant legal scholar, easily the most articulate member of the faculty.”

After the abolition of the J.D. as a second law degree, the S.J.D. or Doctor of Laws degree was introduced in 1937. “No law degree carries higher graduate standing or presupposes work of greater excellence,” Lucey, who had succeeded Chetwood as regent, announced. Like the new LL.M., the S.J.D. degree was directed towards the study of government. S.J.D. candidates, chosen under highly selective criteria, were offered seminars on administrative tribunals, the Federal Communications and the Securities and Exchange Commissions, and legislative drafting. They were required, as part of their program, to work regularly on the
Georgetown Law Journal, which would, in turn, “devote special attention to Federal legislation.” Fellowships, with the initial value of $700, were allocated to support their work, and the first S.J.Ds were conferred in the late 1930s. Elden S. Magaw, S.J.D.’39, also the first full-time faculty member of the Beasley School of Law at Temple University, was among the first S.J.D. graduates, and has been credited with much of that law school’s later progress.61
Academic and admission standards also increased. The ability of Georgetown Law’s graduate students was a source of pride for the faculty, although their increased numbers did pose challenges to the faculty’s wish to provide them as much individual attention as possible. Professors reported graduate classes gave them a break from their undergraduate lectures to sit with students who were “very much interested” in the discussion. Lucey reported to the University that the graduate course had begun to attract record numbers of students – 52 in 1935 from 31 in 1934 and 12 in 1933. Moreover, by 1935, the graduate class consisted of students from 20 law schools who produced dissertations of “exceptional quality.” Each dissertation, he reported, was “an exhaustive monograph on some important phase of the law.” Their achievements were enough for Lucey to suggest to the faculty that the school “make special efforts to increase the Graduate School to build up the prestige of Georgetown.”

The school celebrated the rising admissions standards for its graduate programs. The school had an excellence, Georgetown asserted, that was to be found in its “progressive spirit, the insistence upon higher standards of admission and graduation, and in the demand that its graduates be men of principle.” The entering qualifications for the LL.M. and S.J.D. programs, it pointed out, set the same high bar as “four other outstanding law schools in the United States.” Nevertheless, enrollment increased. In 1934, Georgetown boasted that the largest enrollment of graduate students of any other American law school. “The increasing importance of the federal government and its deeper penetration into our daily lives” was a fact that could not be denied, wrote members of the Class of 1935. In the midst of the New Deal, they described, the nature of Georgetown’s program had “led the young men of the nation to beat a track to our door to learn how better mousetraps are made.”

“The Laboratory, the Forum, and the Cultural Center of Legal Education and Research”

The onset of the Second World War led to a sharp decrease in enrollment. In 1943, only four students were recommended for the Master of Laws degree. With the end of the war, enrollment rebounded and increased. Seventy-three students enrolled in the graduate program in 1952, matching the largest graduate enrollment during the New Deal. By 1959, graduate enrollment had surpassed even that, reaching 230. Georgetown’s program became one of the largest in the country. The proportion of graduate to undergraduate students also increased, from less than 10 to close to 15 percent of the student body. But the end of the war did not mean a return to graduate education in law as it was before. In the postwar environment, both international and administrative law became required LL.M. courses. And in 1951, the law school began to offer a Doctor of Comparative Law (D.C.L.) degree for foreign lawyers. The degree was aimed at qualifying students to engage in comparative work by study of Anglo-American law. Most significantly, Georgetown developed the concept of a law center as opposed to a law school.

In 1953, the law school embarked on a new round of graduate curricular reform. The school began to move away from its singular focus on recent legislation and judicial decisions, eliminating the requirement that graduate students concentrate their work in that area by 1957. Nonetheless, with almost all the graduate students working full-time – the vast majority for the federal government, the school was challenged by the need to balance academic standards with the goals of the students and with its goals as an institution. This called for reevaluating graduate education at the school. In 1952, the faculty eliminated the LL.M. program's
long-held thesis requirement, substituting it with more credit for courses and a paper of law journal note length. More dramatic changes did not occur until 1959 when part-time students were required to spend two years at the school and to limit their studies when they were working full-time, and students began to be allowed to take examinations in most of their classes rather than write papers. Some decisions were contested, and called for the school to define its view of graduate education. Some faculty feared the consequences of removing the requirement that students write papers for each course they took, believing that it would make a graduate education much like an undergraduate one and would “reduce the level of graduate work.” Others disagreed. Both the Dean of the Graduate School, Frank Dugan and Lucey, defined the primary function of the graduate study of law as the production of specialists. Asked to describe the concept of “graduate law study,” Dugan replied, “it is really a fourth year of law school where specialization is encouraged.” Accordingly, the graduate program encouraged specialization by reorganizing its classes into clusters of related courses in fields like in fields like taxation, labor, antitrust, administrative law, and international law. In 1954, Georgetown announced that it was “pioneering in International Trade Regulation” by offering four courses in what was then a “relatively unexplored field of legal education.” Later in the same decade, Georgetown built on its tax courses to establish an LL.M. in Taxation – its first named LL.M.
Changing views of the role of the law school in society affected graduate education at Georgetown Law. At the initiative of Dean Paul R. Dean, the law school was reorganized as the Georgetown University Law Center in 1954. Both Dean and Lucey considered graduate education to be an integral part of the development of a “law center,” an institution that would train law students for the bar but would also serve as a venue for a broader range of professional and research activities. Georgetown’s graduate program was organized as its own separate institute—the Graduate School of Law—under its own associate dean. Frank Dugan, who had previously served as the director of the graduate program, was named the first associate dean that year.

Graduate education in law was itself a subject of much discussion during the 1950s and 1960s. More law schools had begun offering graduate degrees and the programs were attracting more practicing lawyers. Scholars debated what graduate legal education was and should be. Some suggested that too much emphasis had been placed on research, which, they argued, produced researchers proficient in narrow fields rather than effective law teachers. An American Association of Law Schools subcommittee proposed, among other ideas, emphasizing interdisciplinary academic work and severing graduate education in law completely from the law schools. By contrast, others emphasized that graduate education was “additional legal training” that was increasingly valuable for practicing lawyers who did not intend to teach. In that sense, graduate education, it was argued, could fulfill a duty to the bar by providing “advanced professional work,” and, simultaneously serve as “a valuable laboratory for experimentation in new courses and new techniques of instruction.”

Georgetown took a middle road, allowing room for research but devoting its graduate program primarily to the training of specialist lawyers in practice. The Law Center, Lucey wrote, would be an institution for research but also a site for continuing legal education and for the training of legal specialists. At the same time, the Law Center claimed that, “The Graduate School of a Law Center, is the laboratory, the forum and the cultural center of legal education and research.” Accordingly, even if training specialists was a primary purpose of the graduate school, the school also expanded its teaching and research fellowship programs, aiming for its students to produce scholarship “that will aid in the administration of justice.” Fellowships, named after former law school dean Hugh Fegan and the prolific Professor Charles Keigwin, became available to Georgetown Law graduates with the “most outstanding performance in areas of scholastic and research-oriented achievement” to undertake graduate studies. Acknowledging an expanded role for a law center, fellows were also given supervised teaching experience with the aim of improving teaching standards.

A German industrialist, Wilhelm Schulte zur Hausen, endowed an additional four fellowships. Two St. Peter Canisius Fellowships allowed graduates to study at the University of Frankfurt while two international trade regulation fellowships allowed for teaching and research in that field. The international trade fellowships allowed the school to expand its international trade offer-
nings early in the history of the field—a development on which the law school later capitalized in 1957 with the creation of the Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law under the direction of Professor Heinrich Kronstein, S.J.D.’40.

The foundation that he and other professors built in international trade established an early reputation for Georgetown in the subject. The relationship between law and religion was also a continuing object of study. A Church-State Law Institute, a base for research fellows and LL.M. graduates, and a Law and Morals Forum were established in the 1960s. In 1953, Lucey wrote that the provision of continuing legal education, the funding of fellowships, and the appointment of Dugan as dean of the graduate school meant that the “Graduate Department and the Law Center now provide for almost all the services possible or requisite to legal education and the legal order.”

Notable Georgetown alumni who made their mark in teaching included Robert F. Drinan, S.J., LL.M.’51, Charles Whelan, S.J., LL.M.’55, Richard Reeve Baxter, LL.M.’55, and Helen Steinbinder, LL.M.’56. Drinan served with distinction as Dean of Boston College Law School, and as a member of Congress, before returning to Georgetown Law to teach in 1981. His LL.M. dissertation, on religious education in public schools, presaged his later work on the relationship between church and state. Baxter became a professor at Harvard Law School and a judge on the International Court of Justice. Whelan, later a professor at Fordham Law School, became a leading First Amendment scholar. Steinbinder became the law school’s first full-time female faculty member in 1957. She was, Georgetown Professor Patricia King remembers, “one of the earliest women law professors in the nation.”

Steinbinder’s story epitomized the challenges facing women lawyers of her generation. She was one of the first eight women to enroll at Georgetown Law in 1951, and was one of three among the eight who graduated. Fortunately, the faculty were friendly. Frank Dugan, one graduate remembered, said upon seeing her in his labor law class, “this is new to me and new to you and we will learn together.” Steinbinder placed first in the afternoon class during the 1952-53 academic year and was one of the first women to become an editor of the *Georgetown Law Journal*. After graduating, she became the Law Center’s first female law librarian, and joined the faculty soon after. She faced challenges as a young professor, but...
was well respected by the women who joined the faculty after her. Steinbinder later recounted that she shocked another Georgetown professor, Peter Weidenbruch, LL.M. ’57, when she told him she didn’t need a microphone to speak to a class of more than 200 students. “I have a strong voice,” she recalled.

Steinbinder and Mabel Dole Haden became the first women to receive an LL.M. degree from Georgetown in 1956. Breaking other barriers, Dole Haden was also the first African-American woman to earn an LL.M. She received her first law degree in 1948 from Howard University, which she attended at night while working as a teacher, finding time to graduate as president of her class. But like many women who entered law school at the time, she could not find a position in practice. For black women, prospects were even dimmer. There were few black lawyers at all – either men or women. In 1950, there were only 1,450 black lawyers in the entire United States.

Haden returned to teaching high school students and then attended Georgetown – the only law student who was a black woman, she remembered. After graduating, she became among of the first African-American women to practice in the District, taking court-appointed work and referrals from teachers. In 1985, she became president of the Black Women’s Lawyer’s Association and was outspoken on the issue of racism in the legal profession – something that she had experienced regularly as a young lawyer. In the District of Columbia, she remembered, young lawyers “put their names on a court-sanctioned list in order to get business referrals from the court. All the black business went to black lawyers, and the more lucrative white business went to young whites.” She served as a mentor for students and lawyers, and her own advocacy for women in the legal profession crossed racial lines.

A 1963 report on Georgetown’s Graduate School by Walter Gellhorn, a professor at Columbia University, on behalf of the American Association of Law Schools’ Special Committee of Graduate Study, provides an independent view of graduate study at Georgetown midway into its history. Practical and skills courses were becoming less prominent as the balance of the graduate program moved towards “academic discipline” and away from being “a practical program of continuing legal education.” The school had become more selective in its graduate student body and the academic rigor of courses had increased as the school fully separated its graduate courses from its Continuing Legal Education Institute. What graduate instruction in law should be when its nature remained the subject of academic debate was of concern to the faculty. A faculty self-evaluation of the graduate program observed that, “The relationship between the curricular theories of the undergraduate and graduate schools has not yet been fully explored.”
and that, “deeper analysis of the respective objectives of the undergraduate and graduate schools” was required “to the end that their curricula be complementary.”

Gellhorn reported that the students in the graduate program in 1963 were a mix of students from “smaller law schools who have not had access to a broad curriculum” and those from larger schools seeking an education to match “the professional interests they later developed.” Most were studying tax, labor, or international law. Most were lawyers who had worked in Washington for one or two years after graduation. Much of the teaching was performed by specialist practitioners with a quarter of the courses taught by full-time professors. In most cases, classes were small, averaging slightly more than 20 students each. The graduate courses, Gellhorn decided, were “seriously considered and well administered” and Georgetown’s “present conception of graduate work” was “consonant with its justly mounting pride in the quality of its undergraduate program.” He recommended increasing the number of hours of course work for students – a recommendation adopted by the school soon after.

In the meantime, one of the most consequential developments at the Law Center was brewing – the creation of the E. Barrett Prettyman Fellowship program. In response to a call for law schools for the establishment of a “legal internship program” for law school graduates, Dugan began soliciting funding to launch a Master of Trial Advocacy Program in 1959, which the school intended to be “an integral part of our Graduate School of Law.” According to Kenneth A. Pye, the first director of the Fellowship Program, it was “Georgetown’s experiment in legal education” – the first program of its kind in the United States. Dugan was successful in obtaining funds, and the Prettyman Fellowship Program was inaugurated in 1960 with the aid of a grant from an anonymous donor. The law school began engaging law students to undertake graduate trial advocacy instruction in combination with the actual representation of clients in D.C. courts. At the end of their terms, Prettyman Fellows were awarded an LL.M. with a Certificate of Proficiency in Trial Advocacy – later shortened into an LL.M. in Advocacy. In its first twenty years, the Prettyman program produced six judges, twenty law professors, and numerous federal and state prosecutors, and other public interest attorneys. The Prettyman program became the foundation for Georgetown Law’s top-ranked clinical program, and thus continues to shape Georgetown Law’s identity. It has served as a model for other law schools.

Student interests changed over time, prompting further changes in the law school’s graduate curriculum. The Master of Patent Law degree attracted fewer and fewer students while other specialties became more popular. In 1969, one student graduated with an M.P.L., while 48 completed graduate degrees in taxation. Gellhorn reported in 1963 that the patent program had been kept out of “sentiment” rather than student interest. It would take the school until 1979 to stop offering it. The Doctor of Comparative Law degree was abandoned soon after in the 1980s, also because of low enrollment. In 1981, the school increased its graduate
offerings to eight programs, adding masters degrees for the first time in international and comparative law and in labor law. An LL.M. in Securities Regulation was introduced in 1983. Continuing through this period, most of the degrees were offered part-time and the school advised students that its programs were “geared particularly towards the young attorney who wants to further his legal education in the evening while working in government, business, or private practice during the day.” When full-time international students began arriving in larger numbers later on, some expressed bemusement at Georgetown’s part-time graduate students: “Now that you are graduating, the only problem is what to do with all your free time,” wrote two members of the Class of 1996, adding, “you might look into keeping your job as an attorney during the day and attending medical school at night.”

In the 1990s, Georgetown launched a Graduate Teaching Program for Future Law Professors. Leading to an LL.M., the program was “designed to attract candidates who can bring under-represented, minority, perspectives to the development of legal scholarship.” A precursor to the school’s Research Fellowships, the program provided opportunities to teach, develop a relationship with a faculty mentor, and complete a published research paper.

**Building a Global Law School**

Although Georgetown Law had welcomed a few students from abroad since its founding in 1870, a substantial percentage of its students from outside the 50 states came from countries and territories with strong historical links to the United States like the Philippines and Puerto Rico. With the introduction of the degree of Master of Comparative Law, students from more countries overseas began making what was, at first, a slow trek to Georgetown. Three students—from Mexico, France and Germany—graduated with the first Georgetown LL.M. strictly for foreign-trained students in 1964. Students from Australia, Canada, India, Africa, and elsewhere in Europe followed. As the law school expanded its degree programs in the 1980s, international enrollment began to rise. In 1983, students from Korea, Venezuela, Norway, Germany, Austria, France, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, and Zambia enrolled for the Master of Comparative Law degree. Globalization in the legal profession had seen American law firms go abroad, seeking new talent among attorneys overseas, and foreign lawyers sought credentials and education to serve cli-
ents engaged in international business transactions. The North American Free Trade Agreement also brought an increased number of students to the Law Center. In 1986, under the leadership of Professor Ed O’Brien, Georgetown launched a South African Lawyers’ Program to expose lawyers to American clinical education. Over its 17-year run, the program allowed more than 50 South African lawyers to earn LL.M. degrees at Georgetown.

The school’s growing international student body complemented the increased prominence of international and transnational law throughout the Law Center. International and comparative law had been part of the school’s curriculum long before international student enrollment rose in the late 20th century. A course in Comparative Law was part of the curriculum of the postgraduate course in 1900. International and Foreign Relations Law joined the curriculum in 1905. Exchanges with the University of Frankfurt, beginning in the late 1940s, and the establishment of an Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law in the 1950s further laid the groundwork for the expansion of international law at Georgetown. But developments were more rapid in the late 20th century and after. In 1993, a Leadership and Advocacy for Women in Africa fellowship program was founded after Professors Susan Deller Ross and Judy Wolf led a successful effort to obtain funding. The LAWA Program allows human rights lawyers from Africa to study at Georgetown to earn an LL.M. and work for six months on issues affecting women before returning to their home countries. More than 50 human rights lawyers have participated in the program since its inception.

The growth in the international student body required the school to address what had been a perennial concern regarding graduate study and international students at the Law Center since the 1960s – training in American legal discourse and in legal English. The first program to address that concern dates back to at least the 1970s when Professor John Wolff began teaching a course on the common law during the summer. The program was led by Professor Don Wallace. Wallace had succeeded Heinrich Kronstein as Director of the Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law. Under his leadership, the Institute broadened the scope of its work. The school’s graduate offerings in international law likewise grew. Wolff continued to teach the summer course for decades, earning a reputation as “scholar and a gentleman.” Dory Mayer, who began teaching and working with international students at Georgetown in 1982, remembers. Wolff, originally from Germany, had himself been an international student at an American law school in the 1930s – an experience that Mayer says gave him an understanding of the challenges faced by foreign students and lawyers studying a common law system for the first time. Wolff, Mayer recounts, “understood exactly what [international students] needed to know.” In 1988, Wolff began teaching a new course called U.S. Legal Methods – a course for which he himself developed the materials. As international enrollment rose, curricular changes continued. The summer course changed its focus. Renamed “Foundations of American Law and Legal Education,” the course changed its focus to introducing stu-
dents to American law in order to prepare them to undertake graduate study in the United States. The course had previously been open to lawyers who were not going to take an advanced degree. And it previously covered subjects like international business and tax.

Mayer taught the first course in 1995. More recently, under Associate Dean Wendy Perdue, the school launched a center to work with students on legal discourse and professional English skills and, in 2008, established an extended LL.M. program for foreign lawyers could benefit from a year of intensive training in legal English.

In 1986, an International Lawyers and Law Students Association was established with the aim of promoting "legal understanding by a comparative law approach through social, academic and professional integration." Reaching out to the J.D. student body was a priority for early international graduate students. Martin Frey, LL.M.’87, appreciated having an academically enriching and practice-oriented experience. “In Switzerland, there is more theoretical talk,” he said, but “during law school in the United States, you learn what Swiss lawyers learn after the mandatory two years of practice." He wished, though, for more interaction with
American students and for the experience of campus life. Space constraints contributed to a diminished student life. In 1986, the Law Center, where physical facilities then consisted only of the core of an increasingly cramped McDonough Hall, did not encourage a rich student life. A decades-long building campaign led to the expansion of the Law Center campus with the construction of the Edward Bennett Williams Law Library, the Gewirz Student Center, the East Wing of McDonough Hall, and a Sports and Fitness Center. The building campaign also reflected an increased focus on international and comparative law. The Eric B. Hotung International Law Building, which housed the John Wolff International and Comparative Law Library, was completed in 2004.

In addition, the growing number of international students created a critical mass of international students. In 1983, international graduate students numbered barely a dozen. By 1990, more than three times as many international graduate students graduated from the law school. At the turn of the 21st century, the number of international graduate students at Georgetown Law broke one hundred. The International Lawyers and Law Students Association turned into a socially and academically active Foreign Lawyers at Georgetown student group in 1991. In its first year, FLAG held events for students on human rights in Latin America and economic developments in the former Soviet Union, held a Christmas party, organized a conference on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, played basketball, and toured the Capitol. Foreign lawyers were, Professor Charles Gustafson wrote, “a growing source of energy at the Law Center.”

Into the 1990s and 2000s, international enrollment at Georgetown Law’s graduate programs continued to increase, dramatically changing the composition of Georgetown’s graduate student body. Today, approximately half of Georgetown’s incoming graduate classes come from abroad, and the presence of international lawyers identifies Georgetown as a leading center for the study of international law.

Professor Judy Areen, who served as Dean from 1989 to 2004, encouraged the school’s internationalization as well as outreach to its international alumni. Areen appointed the school’s first associate dean for international programs in 1995 and was the
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The International Lawyers and Law Students Association in 1989

Dean Judy Areen (right) receives book written by Dr. Chibli Mallat, LL.M. ’83, (right). International student enrollment increased greatly during Areen’s tenure.


Georgetown Law is enriched by and continues to benefit from the legacy of its LL.M. and S.J.D. programs. Historically, its graduate program has been a source for innovation in legal education, a means for the school to meet its responsibilities to the profession in the United States and beyond, and a gauge and driver of the school’s progress through most of its history. But in outlook, the school is turned decidedly towards the future. If the past is any guide, the Law Center’s graduate program will continue to evolve and adapt to the needs of its students and the times and to reflect Georgetown Law’s aspirations for the future.
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