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Making a Difference

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CLINIC

Student Perspective: Supporting the Transnational Fight to Protect Workers’ Rights

Via the International Human Rights Clinic—By Lily Axelrod, J.D. ’15

One January afternoon in 2012, two hundred men and women gathered at the Captain Morgan Bar in the sunny, Mexican coastal town of Topolobampo, Sinaloa. Their spirits were strong; recruiters had arrived to sign up workers for temporary H-2 visas to the United States. In a region where unemployment is high and the minimum wage is less than $5 a day, the recruiters brought hope. Applicants handed over deposits of several hundred dollars, representing years of savings or serious debt.

Weeks went by, and then months, as recruiters promised the Sinaloans that the visas were “almost ready.” But there were no jobs, and no H-2 visas. By April, it became clear: hundreds of applicants had been defrauded.

This summer, I had the opportunity to support the Sinaloan workers as a fellow with Proyecto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales (ProDESC), a human rights organization based in Mexico City. Having lived in Mexico and studied social movements there, I was drawn to ProDESC’s model, which balances a broad international vision with a focus on meaningful participation and leadership from local, marginalized communities. I contributed this summer to the organization’s Transnational Justice for Migrant Workers project, which seeks to promote humane, legal migration by protecting migrant workers’ human rights.

My work focused specifically on the H-2 temporary worker visa program, one of the few avenues for Mexicans to work legally in the United States without advanced degrees or immediate family members with status. ProDESC has been tackling abuses related to the program since 2007. Due to fear of reporting and lack of oversight, it is impossible to know how many applicants were promised visas and never received them, but ProDESC believes the problem is widespread. Even when job offers are legitimate, workers often go into debt to pay illegal “recruitment fees,” and fear blacklisting or violent retaliation if they speak up about their rights.

For years, both the Mexican and American governments turned a blind eye to these abuses, leaving workers vulnerable to exploitation, human trafficking, and forced labor. But ProDESC and the Sinaloan workers have been collaborating to change the status quo. In 2013, with support from ProDESC’s community organizers and attorneys, the workers formed a coalition and brought a groundbreaking collective criminal complaint against the fraudulent recruiter operating in Sinaloa. That coalition, in turn, strengthened ProDESC’s domestic and international policy advocacy to prevent abuse in the H-2 visa program overall.

Together, their activism captured the attention of both the Mexican government, which recently issued new regulations targeting recruiters, and the U.S. Departments of Labor and State, which have committed to cooperate with their Mexican counterparts and with NGOs to educate migrant workers about their rights.

With attention turning now to implementation of Mexico’s new recruitment regulations, I worked under the guidance of ProDESC Director Alejandra Ancheta (Harvard Wasserstein Fellow 2012-13) this summer to draft a policy memorandum requested by Mexico’s Secretary for Labor and Social Welfare. The memo, now published in English and Spanish, was co-authored with undergraduate intern Mica Pacheco Ceballos (Harvard ’16) and with support from Fordham Law Professor Jennifer Gordon, JD ’92.

I also conducted research on creative legal strategies to hold American companies accountable for their recruiters’ human rights violations. ProDESC’s attorneys consistently challenged me to think outside the box and draw from diverse fields, from international human rights law to contracts and negotiation.

In my last week at ProDESC, the mood at the office was jubilant: the Mexican government had considered the Sinaloan case, and imposed a substantial fine on the fraudulent recruiting agency for violations of the Federal Labor Law and related regulations. Still, it will take significant additional work to ensure that the rights of other workers seeking H-2 visas are truly protected. Now that the Mexican and American governments have committed to taking this issue seriously, ProDESC and its allies are pushing for both governments to work together to hold U.S. companies accountable for abuses in recruitment.

Lily S. Axelrod, J.D. ’15, is Co-President of the Harvard Immigration Project and Review Editor of the Harvard Latino Law Review. After graduation, she plans to practice immigration law.
In July 2012, Eskinder Nega was sentenced to 18 years in prison. In June 2011, Reeyot Alemu was arrested and convicted to 14 years of imprisonment, reduced to five on appeal.

Their crimes? Practicing journalism in Ethiopia.

Nega and Alemu are award-winning journalists who shared the prestigious Human Rights Watch Hellman-Hammett Award in 2012. For Nega, whose first child was born while he and his wife were in custody for treason, the arrest came days after publishing a column that criticized the Ethiopian government’s detention of journalists as suspected terrorists. For Alemu, a former high school English teacher, the arrest came days after she critiqued the ruling political party in an independent newspaper later shut down by the government.

The basis for the charges against these journalists is Ethiopia’s 2009 Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, which contains overly vague provisions that have been used by the government to silence its critics. Since the Proclamation was adopted, more than 30 journalists have been convicted on terrorism-related charges.

Earlier this summer, I had the privilege of working on behalf of Nega and Alemu as a fellow with the Media Legal Defence Initiative (MLDI). The small London-based non-profit works directly with journalists and bloggers who have been prosecuted for exercising their protected right to freedom of expression. With the help of partner organizations, MLDI’s staff are currently working on 107 cases in 41 countries; the organization’s success rate in receiving favorable decisions hovers around 70 percent.

Because I studied journalism before coming to law school, I know the range of challenges American journalists face, from accessing information to protecting sources to the threat of civil liability. Still, it was always clear to me that the First Amendment by itself will not ensure journalists are protected from the threat of criminal liability, and physical threat, among others.

For example, on my very first day, I worked on a petition to the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention concerning the case of Le Quoc Quan, a Vietnamese human rights lawyer and blogger who was wrongfully prosecuted on trumped up charges of tax evasion. Throughout my internship, I also researched case law from regional courts on freedom of expression, helped with an amicus curiae submission before the High Court of South Africa in a case about criminal defamation, and worked on a case in defense of a blogger in Singapore who is being sued by Lee Hsien Loong, the country’s prime minister.

When Nani Jansen, MLDI’s legal director, filed a submission to the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights on behalf of Nega and Alemu, I had the opportunity to do preparatory work for the submission. I also helped in the filing of submissions to international and regional courts on behalf of Nega and Alemu.

At this point, their chances for release are still unknown, but the situation remains dire. In a New York Times Op-Ed, “Letter from Ethiopia’s Gulag,” Nega wrote about gruesome prison conditions, including three toilets for about 1,000 prisoners. Alemu’s health continues to deteriorate: After receiving an operation to remove a lump in her breast—without the use of anesthesia—she was immediately sent back to the prison without proper recovery time, and she has since been denied further treatment.

The African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights remains one of the last options for these two journalists. When the Commission convenes its next session on October 22nd, I am hopeful it will recognize their case is admissible and that the Ethiopian government has used the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to systematically violate the right to freedom of expression. Even if the Commission decides the case is admissible, a decision on the merits is far away. While the ruling on admissibility will not immediately free Nega and Alemu, together with more international pressure, the Commission may eventually persuade Ethiopia that the cost of jailing journalists is too high.

Lindsay Church, J.D. ’16, will join the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy at the University of Oxford this January as a visiting research fellow. While there, she will work on a paper she began this summer, “International Influence on Freedom of Expression in Ethiopia: An Analysis of the Impact of Ethiopia’s Relations with the United States and China.”
Joey Michalakes Reflects on Experience at HIRC

By Joey Michalakes, J.D. ’16

This past summer, I had the enormous honor of working as the Cleary Gottlieb Summer Fellow at the Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinic (HIRC). Over the course of a very busy but thrilling three months, my work at HIRC provided a comprehensive introduction to the world of immigration legal services. Under the supervision of HIRC’s fantastic clinical faculty, including Professor Deborah Anker, Sabi Ardalan, Phil Torrey, Emily Leung, and Maggie Morgan, I represented clients seeking a variety of forms of immigration relief and was able to hone an important array of legal skills at different stages of the litigation process.

I loved coming to work at HIRC because each day was fast-paced and presented new challenges, many of which I will remember for the rest of my life. A mere three weeks into the internship, I was already sitting before an immigration judge in downtown Boston, arguing motions at a pretrial conference for our clients seeking cancellation of removal for certain nonpermanent residents. In that same case, I was asked to draft and then meticulously revise a pretrial brief laying out my client’s claims, knowing that the time I spent crafting legal arguments and telling my client’s story could make all the difference in her case. Another morning, I proceeded directly from leading our weekly case meeting with an asylum seeker fleeing gang violence in Central America to sitting in on an intake interview with a family of Middle Eastern political dissidents and playing with their children. I also got the chance to manage an I-730 relative petition for an East African woman seeking to bring her children to the United States after almost four years apart.

The legal training I got at HIRC this summer was invaluable. Debbie, Sabi, Phil, Emily, and Maggie never hesitated to answer any questions, no matter how trivial, and were quick to provide comprehensive feedback on my written work. More importantly, they were excellent role models—the passion they have for their clients, and for just and humane immigration laws, is evident in their work and how they treat all visitors to the office. Watching them work helped me learn how to effectively, but compassionately, interview clients and witnesses, especially those suffering from the kinds of trauma characteristic of many asylum seekers. My experience as the Cleary Fellow will stay with me for the rest of my legal career. I am extremely grateful to have spent my first law school summer in such a warm, welcoming, and mission-driven place. Thanks very much to the entire HIRC staff for everything!

FOOD LAW AND POLICY CLINIC

Food Law and Policy Clinic Works with Dean Minow to Launch i-Lab Deans’ Food System Challenge

By Ona Balkus, Clinical Fellow, Food Law and Policy Clinic of the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation

Have you ever considered working for a start-up or pursuing your own innovative business idea? Are you creative and do you like brainstorming with others about how to solve social problems? Are you concerned with the negative impacts of our current food system?

This school year, students will have the exciting opportunity to participate in the i-Lab Deans’ Food System Challenge, which invites creative and entrepreneurial students to develop innovative ideas to improve the health, social, and environmental outcomes of the food system in the United States and around the world.

Each year the Harvard Innovation Lab (i-Lab), a cross-University resource serving Harvard students interested in innovation and entrepreneurship, organizes a series of Dean’s Challenges that encourage students from across the university to develop innovative solutions to pressing social issues. This will be the first Dean’s Challenge sponsored by Dean Martha Minow, who is co-sponsoring the Challenge with Dean Julio Frenk of Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health. Attorneys and students from the Food Law and Policy Clinic (FLPC) and the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation have been thrilled to work with Dean Minow to develop and plan this Challenge.

Why is the Food System Challenge timely and important? Our current methods of producing, distributing, and consuming food are damaging both for human health and for the planet. Rates of diet-related disease, such as heart disease and type 2 diabetes, are rising in both developed and developing countries, and the fertilizers, chemicals and fuel used to produce and transport food are causing devastating pollution and contributing to global climate change. Further, the food system does not meet the basic social justice goals of ensuring access to food for all or supporting fair-paying, safe jobs for those working in the agricultural or food service sector.

Students will be able to submit proposals for ideas in the following four topic areas: (1) Producing Sustainable, Nutritious Food, (2) Innovating in Food Distribution and Markets, (3) Improving Our Diet, and (4) Reducing Food Waste.
What are the guidelines and timeline for the Challenge?
On October 27th, the official Kickoff event for the Challenge will feature Dean Minow and keynote speaker Ayr Muir, founder and chief executive of Clover Food Lab. All students and faculty interested in learning more about the Challenge are invited to attend. In early February, teams will submit their proposals. Teams must include at least one current Harvard student in order to participate in the challenge. Teams are encouraged to be interdisciplinary, with members from at least two disciplines. In early spring, several teams will be selected as finalists and given $5,000 and a mentor to incubate their ideas. At the end of the year, the winning team and two runners-up will receive larger cash prizes.

How can law students get involved in the Challenge?
Law students can participate in several key ways in the Deans’ Food System Challenge. First, students can start or join a team of students to develop a proposal for the Challenge. Law students can make many unique contributions to Challenge teams, including analyzing the relevant legal and policy frameworks and helping to develop the business plan. Second, students can participate on the Challenge’s crowdsourcing website, where students, faculty, and others engaged in the food system can have an open dialogue about pressing food system problems and promising solutions, and provide real-time feedback on Challenge contestants’ ideas. Students can meet other potential teammates on this website, or brainstorm and give feedback without joining a team.

EMMETT ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY CLINIC
Green Infrastructure (GI) Certification Report Released by Clinic

The Emmett Environmental Law and Policy Clinic and the Environmental Policy Initiative released a new report, Certifications for Green Infrastructure Professionals – The Current State, Recommended Best Practices, and What Governments Can Do to Help. The report surveys the current state of Green Infrastructure (GI) professional certification programs, discusses obstacles to the development of widely accepted certifications, recommends best practices for certification program design, and suggests measures that governments can take to promote certification programs. The report was written for various GI stakeholders, including regulators, certifying bodies, customers (e.g., municipalities and private property owners), employers and contractors, and community development and environmental groups.

This report is part of the Clinic and Policy Initiative’s ongoing green infrastructure pilot partnership with EPA, and was authored by Clinic Director Wendy B. Jacobs and Policy Initiative Director Kate Konschnik, with significant contributions from clinic student Ryland Li, J.D.’15.
Clinic students Sarah Peterson (J.D. ’15) and Albert Teng (J.D. ’15) started their academic year seeing the real world impact of their work. First, they attended oral arguments in the case of United States Department of the Interior v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission before the First Circuit Court of Appeals (No. 13-2439). Second, the Clinic team traveled to Lowell, Massachusetts to visit the dam that was the subject of the case. Last semester, working with Clinic Director Wendy Jacobs and Clinical Instructor Aladdine Joroff, Sarah and Albert submitted an amicus brief in the case on behalf of nonprofit organizations regarding historic preservation issues relating to a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) decision to amend the license for a hydroelectric project that impacts the Pawtucket Dam in the Lowell National Historical Park. Lowell’s history as the first large-scale planned industrial city in the United States, powered by its hydropower system, is protected by the Lowell National Historical Park Act (the “Lowell Act”). In its brief, the Clinic argued that the project approved by FERC would adversely affect the Pawtucket Dam, a historic resource of the Park, in a manner that contravenes the Lowell Act’s prohibition of adverse effects on the Park’s resources.

Barron Fellows Reflect On Their Work With the Environmental Law and Policy Clinic

This summer, the Environmental Law Program announced its 2014 Barron Fellows, all of whom ventured out to different cities across the United States to work on environmental issues involving advocacy, litigation, and legal research. In addition to their passion for environmental justice, the Barron Fellows also discussed the Emmett Environmental Law and Policy Clinic. You can read their comments below.

Cecilia Segal, J.D. ’15
“The clinic was a great experience for me. I had an offsite placement with the Clean Air Task Force in Boston. It gave me the opportunity to participate in huge developments in environmental law as it was happening. The projects I worked on were so relevant and fascinating; I helped prepare comments on EPA’s new power plant rules, and also provided research for the environmentalists’ brief in the UARG case, which was recently decided by the Supreme Court. Both projects gave me invaluable hands on experience and exposure to environmental lawyers, litigation, and policy work. The whole experience really solidified my goal of pursuing environmental law as a career.”

Seth Hoedl, J.D. ’15
“The Environmental Law Clinic has been a fantastic experience that has greatly enriched my time at HLS. I learn just as much, if not more, in the clinic than in formal classes and I feel that my work in the clinic has had just as much, if not more, impact on real-world issues as my summer positions. The clinic staff makes a real effort to match each student with projects that fit their interests. For me, it has become a true home at HLS and I look forward to continuing to work with the clinic during my 3L year.”

Sean Lyness, J.D. ’15
“The Environmental Law and Policy Clinic has provided me with the support to seek out opportunities based on how passionate I am about them, not how lucrative they are. Some of the best, most important legal work out there does not come with a summer paycheck. The clinic has allowed me to pursue that work and thrive while doing it.”

Samantha Caravello, J.D. ’15
“The Environmental Law and Policy Clinic helped me secure an externship placement with a nonprofit organization defending EPA’s greenhouse gas rules before the Supreme Court. I was able to work on what I feel is the defining issue of my generation while learning from some of the country’s most talented environmental attorneys, an experience for which I am very grateful.”
VETERANS LAW AND DISABILITY BENEFITS CLINIC

Legal Services Center Staffs Legal Assistance Tent at Stand Down Event for Homeless Veterans

Via the WilmerHale Legal Services Center

On August 22, 2014, the Legal Services Center participated in Massachusetts Stand Down 2014—the Commonwealth’s largest one-day event for homeless and at-risk veterans to connect with service providers. The event was held in the parking lot of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 103 in Dorchester and attracted over 700 veterans in need of assistance. A vast array of service providers set up in barracks-style tents—erected by the Massachusetts National Guard—to meet with veterans during this one-day event. Available services included health screenings, clothing, employment counseling, housing assistance, and information about benefits available to veterans. Veterans also received hot meals during the event.

LSC staffed the legal assistance tent for half of the day and provided pro bono legal consultations to over 50 homeless or at-risk veterans. Several of the legal consultations have since led to full representation cases. A total of eight LSC attorneys and three student volunteers from across LSC’s clinics and practice areas participated in the event, advising veterans in the areas of VA and disability benefits, financial and healthcare planning, housing law, family law, and consumer law. Additionally, LSC also recruited volunteer attorneys from the Fair Employment Project, the Massachusetts Committee for Public Counsel Services, and Harvard’s Criminal Justice Institute to provide advice on employment law and criminal law matters.

According to Daniel Nagin, Faculty Director of the Legal Services Center, “Stand Down is a powerful model for ensuring homeless and at-risk veterans receive needed resources. Legal assistance is just one area of need—but it is an important area as we work with others to remove barriers that prevent low-income veterans from achieving independence, stability, and dignity.”

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CLINIC

Human Rights Program Celebrates 30 Years of Advocacy

Via the Harvard Crimson

Harvard Law School’s Human Rights Program celebrated on Friday afternoon the increased awareness surrounding issues of human rights since its founding three decades ago and detailed the next steps for activists in the field.

The afternoon program included two panels—“Human Rights Advocacy Across Generations” and “The Next Stage in United Nations Treaty Bodies”—and a keynote address by former Yale Law School Dean Harold Hongju Koh ’75. “It is wonderful to look back at the graduates we’ve had go on to have distinguished careers, the scholarship we have produced, and the engagement we’ve had in projects,” said Gerald L. Nemser ’73, director of the Human Rights Program. “We are looking back but also forward to the problems of the day.”

After the luncheon and keynote address by Koh, which focused on the future direction of human rights advocacy, attendees listened to the two panels before a reception closed out the celebration. For Law School Dean Martha L. Minow, who served as an adviser to the program at its inception, the celebration displayed the success of activists in bringing human rights issues to the forefront of public discourse.

“Human rights once upon a time was just a phrase, then it became a movement, then it became law, then it became something we talk about at dinner tables,” Minow said at the ceremony.

The program, which was founded in 1984 by law professor emeritus Henry J. Steiner ’51, was created as a center for human rights scholarship, but now includes an international human rights clinic, a visiting fellows program, and partnerships with other human rights groups on campus.

The Human Rights Program provides an experience for both theoretical research and practical advocacy, according to Philippa Greer, who graduated from the Law School’s LL.M. program last spring after writing for the Human Rights Review.

“The program here is quite collaborative, and it’s a good chance to explore ethical advocacy issues but also do practical work,” Greer said. “It’s important to have a community on campus that puts forward that career path.”

With seven members of the Law School faculty and six full-time clinical instructors, the program’s human rights clinic instructs about 40 students each semester.

Katherine A. Soltis, a third-year student at the Law School, said the clinic provided an opportunity to go to Brazil and work firsthand on a project.

“It really gives you a reason for being in law school,” said Soltis, who said she will pursue a career in public interest law, foregoing the corporate law path.

Additionally, the Human Rights Program is home to seven visiting fellows, who will be conducting research throughout the fall.
Cluster Munitions Ban: National Laws Needed

Via the International Human Rights Clinic

(San Jose, Costa Rica, September 3, 2014) – Countries around the world should enact strong laws to implement the treaty banning cluster munitions, Human Rights Watch said in a report released today at an international meeting of nations party to the treaty.

The 81-page report, “Staying Strong: Key Components and Positive Precedent for Convention on Cluster Munitions Legislation,” urges countries to pass robust national legislation as soon as possible to carry out the provisions of the treaty. The report describes the elements of a comprehensive law and highlights exemplary provisions in existing laws. The report was jointly published by Human Rights Watch and Harvard Law School’s International Human Rights Clinic.

“To maximize the global cluster munition treaty’s impact, all countries should adopt national laws that apply its high standards at home,” said Bonnie Docherty, senior researcher in the arms division at Human Rights Watch and lead author of the report. “Prohibitions that can be enforced in domestic courts can help ensure that these deadly weapons don’t harm civilians.”

Cluster munitions are large weapons that disperse dozens or hundreds of submunitions. They cause civilian casualties during attacks, especially in populated areas, because they blanket a broad area with submunitions. In addition, many of the submunitions do not explode on impact and thus linger, like de facto landmines, killing or injuring civilians long after the initial attack.

Representatives from governments, UN agencies, and the Cluster Munition Coalition (CMC) are convening in San Jose, Costa Rica, from September 2 through 5, 2014, for the Fifth Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. They will discuss a range of matters relating to the status of the convention, including national legislation.

The 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions obliges states parties to enact national laws that penalize violations of its absolute prohibition on cluster munitions with imprisonment or fines. The treaty also requires destruction of stocks, clearance of remnants, and victim assistance. As of August 2014, 84 countries were full parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and another 29 countries had signed it.

According to “Cluster Munition Monitor 2014,” an annual report on the status of the treaty, 22 states parties have enacted national legislation dedicated to implementing the convention, while another 19 are in the process of drafting, considering, or adopting national legislation. Twenty-six states parties view other, more general national laws as sufficient to enforce the convention’s provisions.

While no single law represents best practice, Human Rights Watch and the Harvard Clinic highlighted provisions of existing implementation statutes that offer support for each essential element of legislation. National legislation should incorporate both the prohibitions and the positive obligations to minimize the humanitarian harm caused by cluster munitions, the groups said.

Legislation should ban use, production, development, and stockpiling of cluster munitions and make assisting any of these activities an offense.

The laws should also specify that it is unlawful for a country to be the host for stockpiles from other countries, to allow transit of cluster munitions across national territory, or to invest in production of cluster munitions.

“The legislative process is an opportunity to help resolve debates concerning interpretation of the convention and its scope,” said Docherty, who is also a lecturer on law in the Harvard Clinic. “National laws should make clear that countries are forbidden from assisting with the use of cluster munitions, even when operating with allied forces that might use them.”

National legislation should also set deadlines for destroying stockpiles and clearing land contaminated by cluster munition remnants. It should lay the groundwork for a national program to assist victims. Finally, implementation legislation should be broad enough to impose liability on both individuals and corporations with legal ties to the country, even if they commit offenses outside of the country.

While there have been no reports or allegations of states parties violating the convention’s prohibitions, according to “Cluster Munition Monitor 2014,” Syrian government forces have used cluster munitions since mid-2012, resulting in many hundreds of civilian casualties. Reports have also emerged of cluster munition attacks in 2014 in South Sudan and Ukraine, but it is unclear which armed forces participating in those conflicts are responsible. None of these three governments have joined the treaty.
Behind Bars, Law Students Find Their First Clients

Via Harvard Law Record—By Colin Ross, J.D. ’16

I didn’t think my first cross examination would happen before my 1L Fall exams.

On a brisk December morning, I and my 3L supervisor drove the almost 40 miles to the maximum security Souza-Baranowski Correctional Center to defend our client, an inmate, at his disciplinary hearing on behalf of Harvard’s Prison Legal Assistance Project (PLAP). We practiced for much of the car ride, going over the Department of Correction’s evidence and our possible lines of argument. We edited and tinkered with my closing argument so much that by the time we arrived, the paper it was written on was a maze of cross-outs, scribbles, and underlines.

And then, six weeks before I first stepped foot in Criminal Law class, I walked into prison.

There are few things as humbling as having your client sit in shackles beside you even as you argue his case. At Souza-Baranowski, prisoners have even their hands shackled, loosened just enough so that they can sign documents. In a small visiting room, I, my supervisor, our client, the prison’s disciplinary officer (who can function as a prosecutor), and the judge-like hearing officer sat closely together. The hearing officer, himself an employee and former guard with the Department of Correction, started his tape recorder and we were off.

A hearing is a very fast, somewhat intense procedure. The hearing officer ran down the list of charges and asked our client for a plea to each of them: not guilty was his response to all charges. Then the disciplinary officer summoned in a guard as a witness, asked him a few basic questions and turned him over to me.

The legal scholar John Henry Wigmore once called cross examination the “greatest legal engine ever invented for the discovery of truth.” That guy was on to something.

In disciplinary hearings, cross-examination is the engine that can bring accountability to the normally un-scrutinized operations of a correctional facility. The banal sounding language of an official report can fall apart with a few well-crafted questions that point out its absurdity or contradictions. The examination becomes a subtle game of thrust and parry: press too hard and the guard may clam up; go too softly and he will have space to detail the many wicked deeds he is sure your client has done.

After the witness, the disciplinary officer ran down the case against my client. Finally, I had a chance to deliver an oral argument directly to the hearing officer, using any themes or arguments I could think of.

I’d like to say that I handled it as Atticus Finch might have. In reality, I just did the best I could for my first oral argument ever. Then it was back to the car, to Cambridge, and to Contracts. This is the work of the members of PLAP. As student-attorneys, 1Ls, 2Ls, and 3Ls alike travel to prisons and represent clients at their disciplinary and parole hearings. There is no right to an attorney at these hearings, so it’s PLAP or nothing. It’s embarrassing how much each inmate deeply appreciates the work PLAP does for them. Receiving gratitude from a person in prison is tough to swallow. But there’s precious little else 1L year that can so clearly and deeply remind you of the tremendous power that the law can have, and of our responsibility to wield that power responsibly.

Whether you’re more inclined to the defense, or to the prosecution (yours truly included), or even if you’re not sure you’d like to practice criminal law at all, PLAP is a powerful and perspective-shaping experience. To return to your home and to realize that your client will be in the same cramped space a third the size of your bedroom for the foreseeable future, while you go about your day, is a lesson in the value of freedom. In Criminal Law class, the cases we read usually end when the prison door slams shut. PLAP forces us to remember that that is not the end of the story, only the beginning of a new chapter in the life of the incarcerated human being. And that these human beings don’t stop being humans, or American citizens, when the prison door slams. The nature of our duty to help them as fellow humans, to love thy neighbor, changes when they enter prison; the duty does not end.

We lost the case. Disciplinary officers often throw every possible charge at prisoners, expecting some to stick. Our client had every charge dismissed except one, but that one was the most serious. We lost.

We appealed on multiple grounds, and were surprised when the Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Correction actually upheld our appeal because of a lack of a key witness and ordered a rehearing. In February, we did it all over again in Round 2. We lost.

But the resulting sentence was one month shorter than from the first hearing: one fewer month spent in the Disciplinary Detention Unit (DDU), Massachusetts’ version of solitary confinement, where inmates are usually kept in their cells for 23 hours a day.

I probably spent about 40 hours on the case start to finish, writing motions, travelling to prison, preparing and delivering arguments, and appealing. For being able to help another human being in a moment of need, for being able to represent my first client, for one month fewer of solitary, it was the best time I spent in my first year at Harvard Law School.
Faces of Excellence

HARVARD NEGOTIATION AND MEDIATION CLINICAL PROGRAM

Clinical Instructor, Alonzo Emery, Named to the Public Intellectuals Program

Via the Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program

The National Committee on United States-China Relations has named the next slate of Fellows in its Public Intellectuals Program and the Harvard Negotiation & Mediation Clinical Program (HNMCP) is pleased to announce Lecturer on Law and Clinical Instructor Alonzo Emery is among them.

The Public Intellectuals Program (PIP), launched in 2005, is dedicated to nurturing the next generation of China specialists who have the interest and potential to venture outside of academia to engage in the public and policy community. Over the course of two years, the program will help twenty young scholars and specialists working in various disciplines to expand their knowledge of China beyond their own interests by introducing them to each other as well as specialists from outside their fields. By requiring each of them to organize a public outreach program, the PIP also encourages them to actively use their knowledge to inform policy and public opinion.

“As the United States and China become increasingly inter-connected, citizens from these nations will benefit from greater mutual understanding,” says Emery. “Having dedicated my career to initiatives linking China and the United States, the Public Intellectuals Program expands my capacity to nurture future stewards of the US-China relationship—a relationship I view as critical to the world’s future.”

Mr. Emery’s interest in and scholarship around China began in his earliest university career when he studied at Peking University, Tsinghua University, and Taiwan University (in addition to Yale University, where he earned his BA with distinction in Political Science and Architecture). During his time as a student at Harvard Law School, Emery participated in HNMCP, helping to manage two projects with Hewlett Packard focused on human rights at their source factories in Dongguan, China. After law school, Emery served as Assistant Professor of Comparative Jurisprudence at Renmin University School of Law in Beijing, teaching courses in alternative dispute resolution, international, and American law. He also ran the Renmin University Disability Law Clinic, China’s first law school clinic dedicated exclusively to providing legal services to persons with disabilities. During his time there he managed a third project with HNMCP, this time as the client, and upon joining HNMCP, he organized and managed a fourth project with the Disability Law Clinic, this time acting as Clinical Instructor.

“I am so thrilled that Alonzo has received this well-deserved honor,” enthused Prof. Robert C. Bordone, Director of the Harvard Negotiation & Mediation Clinical Program. “The selection committee clearly recognized the many outstanding qualities that make him a valued member of the HNMCP team. I know he will make an important contribution to the work of PIP.”

TRANSACTIONAL LAW CLINICS

Congratulations to Amanda Kool on her promotion to Clinical Instructor

For the past two years, Amanda has served as the Transactional Law Clinics (TLC) Fellow, advising students in the Community Enterprise Project, a division of TLC. In that role, she and her students have worked in partnership with various community organizations to address persistent legal barriers to economic development in the City of Boston. Amanda also served as a supervising attorney in the Recording Artists Project, a student practice organization in which teams of law students represent recording artists in contract negotiations, intellectual property protection, and other transactional legal matters.

“AAfter two great years as a Clinical Fellow, I’m thrilled to remain here at Harvard Law School and step into the role of Clinical Instructor at TLC, as well as continue my work with the Recording Artists Project. I’m fortunate to work with such incredible students and colleagues and can’t wait to see where our hard work takes us next.” Amanda’s main focus will now be on supervising clinical students placed at TLC.

She is an active member of the American Bar Association and is the author of numerous publications on community economic development, entrepreneurship, and agriculture law. Recently, she co-authored the article ‘Many Advocates, One Goal: How Lawyers Can Use Community Partnerships to Foster Local Economic Development’ with Brett Heeger, J.D. ’14, and is currently co-authoring an article with Heather Kulp, Clinical Instructor and Lecturer in Law in the Harvard Negotiation & Mediation Clinical Program, tentatively titled, “An Uber Conflict: Dispute Resolution in the Sharing Economy,” which is slated for publication in the Washington University Journal of Law & Policy this fall.

Prior to joining the Transactional Law Clinics, Amanda worked as a corporate and finance associate attorney at Nixon Peabody LLP in Boston. During law school, she completed internships with Judge Susan J. Dlott in the Southern District of Ohio, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Resource Conflict Institute in Nakuru, Kenya, and Nixon Peabody LLP. Following law school, Amanda spent a year as a pro bono attorney with Conservation Law Foundation.

“We are delighted to have Amanda continue on with TLC in her new role as Clinical Instructor,” noted Brian Price, Clinical Professor of Law and Director of the Transactional Law Clinics. “She is a valued contributor to TLC, including her work with our Community Enterprise Project as well as the Recording Artist Project. The law school and HLS’ clinical community are fortunate to have her.”
Three Lessons about ADR
By Hon. John C. Cratsley (Ret.)

Having recently completed a manual about the ADR process, there are three features of mediation that jump out at me as noteworthy, but are often overlooked by the practitioner. First are the multiple opportunities for the alert attorney to engage opposing counsel in a mediation of a pending court case without seeming too eager to mediate. Second is the value to counsel of participating in one or more pre-mediation conference calls, whether joint or individual, with the mediator. And third is the necessity for counsel to keep up with the law on the enforcement of mediated agreements.

Starting with the multiple opportunities for scheduling your mediation, most state and federal courts now have some version of an early intervention event, shortly after the issues are joined, when mediation can, and in some jurisdictions must, be discussed with the court. These are mandatory events when counsel can freely evaluate and choose mediation, under the watchful eye of the court, and without the pressure of having to initiate the conversation cold with an adversary.

Often more appealing, due to the need for discovery and motions practice, is the opportunity to engage opposing counsel in mediation at the final pre-trial conference or even in the days just before trial. Most court rules, including those in Massachusetts, require counsel to report on the status of settlement discussions at the final pre-trial conference. This allows mediation to readily enter the picture and the trial date to be adjusted accordingly. On the other hand, persuading a judge to continue a trial at the last minute to permit mediation takes a skillful appeal to judicial economy and, to succeed, should be accompanied by a joint commitment to a particular mediator and date so the trial can be appropriately moved ahead.

The value to counsel of one or more pre-mediation conference calls with the mediator cannot be overstated. While Judge Lynn Duryee’s recent JAMS blog on the value of pre-mediation brief is required reading, the ability to engage the mediator in a discussion of issues in the brief as well as to answer the mediator’s questions is invaluable. Many mediators will hold a joint pre-mediation conference call, and some will make the content quite mechanical (names of attending parties, time constraints, etc.). This is no reason to miss emphasizing points made in the brief. Of particular value is the opportunity provided by some mediators for a follow-up private conference call. The mediator will usually have a specific question or two based on the brief or on the joint conference call, but again, counsel can use this opportunity to stress particular points.

Counsel is wise to keep up with the fact patterns of new appellate decisions because in Massachusetts, and generally, the basic principles of contract law apply to the enforcement of mediated agreements. Recent decisions, just in June 2014, enforcing or remanding mediation agreements include CEATS, Inc. v. Continental Airlines, Inc. (mediated agreement enforced despite mediator’s failure of disclosure), and Patel v. Patel (mediated agreement remanded on issue of authority to sign and ambiguity). Additional ways to keep current include the ADR Cases section of Dispute Resolution Magazine published quarterly by the American Bar Association and the Dispute Resolution Alert published quarterly by JAMS.

Alumni Profiles: Professor Luz E. Herrera ’99

Professor Luz E. Herrera, HLS J.D. ’99, is Assistant Dean for Clinical Education, Experiential Learning, and Public Service at the UCLA School of Law. Prior to this appointment, she was Assistant Professor at the Thomas Jefferson School of Law in San Diego, where she directed the Small Business Law Center (SBLC) – a clinical program that provides legal services to nonprofits and public spirited entrepreneurs and she helped found the Center for Solo Practitioners, a program to help graduates understand how to establish and run their own law firms to serve underserved populations. She was also a Visiting Clinical Professor at the University of California Irvine School of Law, where she taught students in the Consumer Protection and the Community Economic Development clinics.

Her scholarship focuses on helping young lawyers in their effort to launch their own law practice and provide assistance to traditionally underserved communities. Professor Herrera has written many articles on this matter including, Training Lawyer Entrepreneurs, Rethinking Private Attorney Involvement Through a ‘Low Bono’ Lens,and Educating Main Street Lawyers. Her research and ideas seek to address the access to civil justice gap and call for an inclusive response to the needs of both clients and legal service providers.

In May of 2002, she opened her own practice to help her community members in the Compton community of Los Angeles, in the area of family law, estate planning, real estate and business transactions. In 2005 she also founded Community Lawyers, Inc., a nonprofit organization that provides affordable legal services to underserved communities. And from 2006 to 2007, she returned to Harvard Law School to work as a Senior Clinical Fellow, supervising students in the Community Enterprise Project (CEP) at the Legal Services Center – a clinic where she also worked as a Harvard Law student.

When asked what advice she would give to current students, Professor Herrera said “I’d encourage them to be introspective about how their personal story and life experiences contribute to the law. They may find fulfilling opportunities in places and settings they may have never expected or know about.”

“My own career as a solo practitioner in an underserved community was fulfilling. It allowed me to advance my interest in helping those who didn’t have the money to hire lawyers at market rates, to use my language skills in a professional setting and to learn to advocate for a more inclusive public service agenda.”
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Moving Beyond A Call For “Dialogue”

Via the Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program

By Robert Bordone, Thaddeus R. Beal Clinical Professor of Law and Clinic Director

In the tumultuous days since Michael Brown was shot by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, we have witnessed a wide range of reactions, responses, and coping strategies. Some have been physical in the form of protests or even violence; many have been vocal in the form of speeches, articles, or punditry; and more than a handful have called for, among other things, increased dialogue.

We have heard these calls for dialogue before, especially with regard to race in America. Because it seems to be the go-to option for advocates of peace and nonviolence, and amid some pessimism that real change will occur in Ferguson, it is worth imagining what such “dialogue” would actually look like if put into practice. Many people might think of a dialogue as members of both “sides” of the issue sitting down together to talk about what happened in Ferguson and, perhaps, race relations in the United States more generally.

My fear is that this type of effort, while well-intentioned, would go in one of two potential unhelpful directions. One possibility is that individuals would make statements that others in the room might experience as intentionally hurtful and inflammatory; tempers might then flare, shouting matches might ensue, and members of the dialogue would leave the session feeling even more alienated from one another. On the other end of the spectrum, the opportunity to engage with opposing views might prove to be too much pressure and discomfort for participants, and what could have been a constructive dialogue would revert to niceties, politeness, and, ultimately, avoidance of the heart of the issues. Such a session might feel, to many participants, like a waste of time.

The problem with calling for “dialogue” alone is that putting people together in a room is simply not enough. Most Americans simply lack the skills for talking about difficult subjects, such as race relations, in a way that both expresses their own opinions and narratives while simultaneously engaging deeply with those who represent different or even opposing worldviews and experiences. Building skills for having challenging, emotionally-frught conversations where identity and partisan perceptions are in play has been long-ignored in most schools, including law schools; the traditional message to law students has been that resolving disagreements with others involves engaging in “winner-takes-all” debates or litigation. There is a collective lack of training and capacity for engaging disagreement. A recent MTV study showed that Millennials have a hard time talking about race and discrimination simply because they have no idea how to do it well. Avoiding these disagreements is easy. Engaging them takes courage, made more complicated by the lack of direction on how to engage effectively.

Over the past two years, I have developed a new law school course called the Lawyer as Facilitator Workshop, aimed at training students in facilitation skills, including how to lead dialogues on challenging and controversial topics that raise points of difference. To explore these differences, we encourage our students to acknowledge that hurtful statements might indeed be made; that provocation is not necessarily a dirty word; and that we are all capable of being more forgiving towards one another.

As long as we continue to handle disagreements and strong emotions poorly, we will fail to build relationships that are more than one mistake deep. When it comes to more productive dialogue, the first step in a new and different direction is to acknowledge that in the course of trying to articulate our complex feelings on difficult issues, we will all make mistakes. We need to create conversation containers that expect mistakes so that when dialogues do occur, the result is neither a room ready to boil over in violence nor a polite, avoidant interaction. The challenge to all of us—starting today and moving forward to a better future for race relations in the U.S.—is to push ourselves past our own kneejerk reactions to disagreement (whether that be unproductive accusation, anger, or avoidance), and towards an exploration and embrace of differences. This may not build a consensus on the issues—indeed, it probably won’t; nor should consensus necessarily be the goal at all. But it’s just possible that if we improve our ability to really talk about difficult topics, we may also find that we can more skillfully and more peacefully handle the challenges that our differences present.
For John Fitzpatrick ’87, a Senior Clinical Instructor at the Harvard Prison Legal Assistance Project (PLAP), being at HLS this September has a special meaning. “It’s my first September since my return from Afghanistan,” said Fitzpatrick, a reserve Major in the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General’s Corps who deployed there for an active duty tour last year. “I’m glad to be here in Cambridge instead of back in Kabul,” he said.

Fitzpatrick and his colleagues, Clinical Instructor, Joel Thompson ’97 and Administrative Director, Sarah Morton, oversee students who work on a wide range of prisoners’ rights issues. In addition to representing prisoners in disciplinary hearings and different types of parole hearings, PLAP students also take calls five days a week on a phone bank, respond to written requests for help, and litigate for their clients in the Massachusetts Superior Court. “It’s a busy law office offering a variety of services, from trial advocacy-like representation in prison disciplinary and parole hearings, to administrative appeals, to court litigation. From their 1L year on, our students get a chance to experience the A to Z of practicing law while helping a marginalized and underrepresented group of clients,” Fitzpatrick said.

Fitzpatrick originally thought he was being sent to Afghanistan last year to provide legal assistance to other soldiers and handle claims from local Afghans for damage to their property by U.S. forces. “That would be the typical combat-deployed assignment for a reservist, to help out with tasks like legal assistance and claims that are seen in the Army as mundane and not exciting but are crucial to supporting our troops. I’m a reservist, so that’s what I was expecting. But I got a bit of a curve ball,” he said. On his arrival in the Kuwait staging area for deploying troops, Fitzpatrick was given some surprising news a couple of days before going forward to Afghanistan. “I was re-tasked with reporting to a headquarters element in a three star (general) command responsible for detainee operations. In other words, I was going from dealing with Massachusetts prisons at HLS to U.S. prisons in Afghanistan,” Fitzpatrick said. “At the start I guessed it would be interesting, and it was.”

Although he is glad to be back, he admits that in hindsight he was glad to have been ordered up for his tour of duty. “It was an amazing experience and an important mission” he said. “From what I saw, I came away convinced we are doing a lot more good than harm in Afghanistan. Admittedly, I also found some incompetence, especially with what seemed to be a rather bizarre lack of cultural awareness by a few in the more senior American leadership. But overwhelmingly, our service members are dedicated to the mission and are incredibly selfless for taking on the risks of such a combat deployment. I was humbled to serve with such dedicated and brave women and men.” “And,” Fitzpatrick pointed out, “I’m really, really happy to be safely home!”

Among his assignments were reviewing prison policies and procedures, evaluating whether there was a legal basis to de-
A Warm Welcome to Anna, Carmel, Gabbie

**Anna Crowe** is a Clinical Advocacy Fellow at the Human Rights Program. Her focus is on civilian protection in armed conflict and the right to privacy. Anna supervises students on research, fact-finding, and advocacy projects in these areas. She is particularly interested in the impact of new technologies on the development of international human rights law and international humanitarian law.

Before she joined HRP, Anna was a Legal Officer at Privacy International, a leading human rights organization that campaigns against unlawful communications surveillance across the globe. She also spent a year in Colombia as a Henigson Human Rights Fellow, working with the International Crisis Group in the field of transitional justice.

Anna is a graduate of Harvard Law School and an alumna of the International Human Rights Clinic. Prior to Harvard, Anna was a constitutional lawyer for the New Zealand government in the Crown Law Office and served at the New Zealand Supreme Court as a clerk to the Chief Justice for two years. She has also previously worked as a Teaching Fellow at Victoria, University of Wellington Law School and clerked at a top New Zealand law firm. She holds conjoint law and arts degrees from the University of Auckland.


Prior to joining the Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation, Carmel was an associate in the health care group of Ropes & Gray LLP. She focused her practice in regulatory and compliance work, including advising client on topics such as data privacy and security, implementation of health care reform and public payer billing and reimbursement. Carmel has significant experience advising on managed care network construction, regulation and strategy for nonprofit and for profit clients. She also served as temporary-in house counsel to a large medical device company. During her time at Ropes & Gray, she authored two articles on Medicaid premium assistance programs in Bloomberg BNA’s Health IT Law & Industry Report, an article on the placement of laboratory staff in physician offices in G2 Intelligence and an overview of data privacy and security regulations for health insurance exchange entities in Bloomberg BNA’s Health IT Law & Industry Report.

**Gabriela Follett** is the Program Assistant for the Human Rights Program. She is a 2013 graduate of the University of Vermont, where she studied Environmental Studies with a focus on Food Justice. Gabbie’s passion for advocacy work about gender-based sexual violence on college campuses began while she was an undergraduate student at the University of Vermont. She worked closely with the Women’s Center on the launch of a campaign, “You Could be the First to Know,” a video guide for friends who are the “first to know” about an assault.

In her current position, she assists with the administration of post-graduate and summer fellowships, organizes various conferences and events, and supports the Visiting Fellows Program.

**Katherine Talbot** is the Program Associate for the International Human Rights Clinic. Prior to coming to Harvard Law School, she supported three faculty members at Harvard Business School as a Faculty Assistant.

Katherine has an M.A. in International Relations from St. John’s University in Rome, Italy, and a B.A. in Government and Politics from St. John’s University in Queens, New York.
Katie Garfield joined the Harvard Law School Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation as a Clinical Fellow in September 2014. Katie earned her J.D. from Harvard Law School, cum laude, in 2011, where she served on the Board of Student Advisers. Katie is a licensed member of the Massachusetts bar. Prior to joining the Center, Katie was an associate in the litigation department of Ropes & Gray LLP. While at Ropes & Gray, Katie worked on a variety of matters, including advising clients in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries on issues related to promotional practices, regulatory compliance, and anti-corruption laws. She also co-authored an article with her colleagues at Ropes & Gray regarding developments in the classification of Qualified Health Plans in Law360. Prior to joining Ropes & Gray, Katie spent a year working in the Housing Unit of Greater Boston Legal Services as part of the Ropes & Gray New Alternatives Program. At GBLS, she represented low-income families with dependent children who were seeking to gain or retain access to Emergency Assistance shelter benefits. Katie received a B.A. in English Language and Literature from Yale University, summa cum laude, in 2007 and an MPhil in Medieval Literature from the University of Cambridge in 2008.

Katie Garfield

Lia Monahon

Vivek Krishnamurthy

The Office of Clinical Programs extends a warm welcome to Vivek Krishnamurthy, a new Clinical Instructor at the Cyberlaw Clinic. Vivek is a graduate of the University of Toronto and the University of Oxford, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. At Yale Law School, Vivek served as a Coker Teaching Fellow, an editor of the Yale Journal of International Law, and a co-director of the Yale Law Review. After clerking for the Hon. Morris J. Fish of the Supreme Court of Canada, Vivek joined Foley Hoag LLP as an associate in its Corporate Social Responsibility and International Litigation practices. In this capacity, Vivek advised corporate clients on a range of business and human rights challenges and represented foreign governments and other clients in cases before domestic and international courts.

Vivek brings to the Cyberlaw Clinic his extensive experience with domestic and international litigation, privacy and data security, and counselling technology companies on social responsibility and human rights issues. He will contribute to the Clinic’s core work on domestic tech law issues while also expanding its practice into the international arena.

Lia graduated from Dartmouth with a B.A. in Women’s Studies, and a minor in African-American Studies (Cum Laude). She received her J.D. from Northwestern University School law (Cum Laude).

The Office of Clinical and Pro Bono Programs extends a warm welcome to Lia Monahon, a new Clinical Instructor at the Criminal Justice Institute (CJI).

Prior to joining CJI, Lia served as a superior court trial attorney with the Committee for Public Counsel Services (CPCS), where she was the lead attorney in serious felony cases, and represented clients in all stages of criminal prosecution from arraignment through post-dispositional advocacy. For the past six years, she served on the advisory committee for the “Campaign for the Fair Sentencing of Youth,” where she guided strategic coordination of multi-state legislative efforts with constitutional challenge to juvenile life without parole (LWOP) before the U.S. Supreme Court. Lia’s efforts were instrumental to the policy recommendations incorporated in Massachusetts’ Supreme Judicial Court ruling in Dietzenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District.

She has previously served as a legal fellow for the Children’s Law Center of Massachusetts, a legal assistant for New York Legal Aid Society (Special Litigation’s Unit), and as a Law Clerk to the Honorable Kenneth M. Karas of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.
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