Bashing lawyers and telling “lawyer jokes” remains a popular sport these days. From radio talk show hosts to the latest wannabe comics, everyone has their favorite slight directed against the profession.

Many have heard some variation of the tiresome quib that asks, “How do we know when a lawyer is lying?” Answer: “When his lips are moving.” Or the clever one about the heart surgeon, who gave his patient the choice of obtaining a new heart from two people who had recently died: a twenty-five year old marathon runner or a sixty year old lawyer. “The sixty year old lawyer,” said the patient without hesitation. “But why would you choose that one over the young marathon runner?” asked the doctor. “That is easy. I want the one that has never been used.”

Audiences smile or laugh at lawyer jokes, no matter the circumstances. Usually, the joke-teller begins with the standard, “Have you heard the story . . .” and then continues, “. . . about the family member shopping for a close relative’s tombstone? When asked what words she wanted inscribed, the bereaved daughter said, “Here lies an honest man and a lawyer.” The owner apologized for not being able to honor her request. “Sorry,” he said, “In this State, it is against the law to bury two people in the same grave.”

Greed, of course, is a familiar theme. Like the joke told about the personal injury lawyer, who moved to appeal her client’s case on grounds of newly discovered evidence. “What is the nature of the evidence?” asked the judge. The lawyer replied, “I discovered that my client still has $500 left.”
My favorite zinger came when I invited some friends for dinner. One of the early guests noticed I was still working at preparing for my class the next day. She asked me what course I was teaching. “Legal ethics,” I said. Without missing a beat, she replied, “now, that is an oxymoron.”

Lawyers as lying, heartless, dishonest and unethical people who care only about money—are these really the same lawyers practicing law whom we know? Frankly, these are offensive examples of slanderous humor. These “jokes” are untrue for most lawyers, particularly for those whose work product and ethic I know best. Many lawyers stand tall and strong when fighting the uphill battle to protect the human rights and dignity of the least powerful in our society. These unsung heroes give voice to tenants, workers, consumers and immigrants, as well as the disabled, the health impaired, the unemployed, the small business owner, the environmentally conscious and the accused defendant. They meet the ideals of the profession and are committed to equal access to justice.

The public, though, is rarely aware of the everyday battles that take place in and outside of court. Most people are not informed or educated about the bigger stories surrounding legendary attorneys like Charlie Huston, Thurgood Marshall and the NAACP legal team, whose legal successes led to the dismantling of racial apartheid.1 Nor do most know about the courage of attorneys like Sam Liebowitz, who defended the nine Scottsboro defendants during the lynch-mob atmosphere and racial terror that pervaded the courtroom in the 1930s.2 Too little attention is given to the courageous human rights lawyers who traveled to the heart of segregation country to defend ordinary people seeking to exercise freedom and citizenship rights against the force of local law enforcement and vigilante white mobs in the south and in the north.3 Attorneys like Arthur Kinoy, Morty Stavis, Bill Kunstler, Haywood Burns, Ann Fagan Ginger and Doris Brin,
have answered the call from local attorneys and confronted biased local court systems. It is
difficult to describe the dangers and personal risk these lawyers faced, not to mention their clear
underdog status. If you have been marveling at the many upsets in this year’s tournament,
consider the public’s reaction when attorney Thurgood Marshall overcame the overwhelming
odds against the undefeated and number one ranked attorney, John Davis, his opposing counsel
and a founding partner at one of Wall Street’s most powerful firms.

Presented here is the picture of a different type of lawyer than the public’s distorted
image of the self-centered and uncaring one. The modern lawyer is a member of a profession, a
public citizen, and someone mindful of his or her “special responsibility for the quality of
justice.” Eloquent words, don’t you agree?

These are not my words, nor my subjective definition of a lawyer dedicated to social
justice for the underserved and disadvantaged communities. These are the words found in the
American Bar Association’s ethical code since 1983. They are included in the very first sentence
of the Preamble to the ABA’s Model Rules of Professional Conduct, which most states have
adopted as their ethical standard for lawyers’ behavior. The Preamble’s consensus statement
reminds lawyers that they have a “special responsibility” to enhance every person’s access to a
lawyer and to improve the quality of justice that litigants receive when they enter the legal
system. Model Rule 6.1 declares that, “[e]very lawyer has a professional responsibility to
provide legal services to those unable to pay.” The ABA’s Preamble recognizes that
“deficiencies” in people’s lack of access to counsel exist in most states where four out of five
lower income people, and more than half of the middle class, cannot afford a private lawyer in
the civil arena. Similarly, in states’ criminal justice systems, most poor and working people
accused of crime are typically denied counsel during the early stages of a criminal prosecution.
Ironically, we are speaking here about the leadership taken by the American Bar Association, which until the 1960s had limited membership to white and male attorneys, who were almost exclusively Anglo-Saxon and from a “better” social class.¹⁴ During the past four decades, the ABA has been one of the champions of the legal profession’s move toward enhancing justice and ensuring access to counsel for the many people who currently represent themselves in civil and criminal courts across this nation.

And so I pose the following questions to those who enjoy the privilege of teaching and preparing this generation of law students to enter the academy: How often do you bring the Preamble’s language to your classroom? How much time do you devote toward informing students that being a lawyer and fulfilling the attorney’s ethical obligations requires acting as “a public citizen”¹⁵ committed to justice and conducting pro bono work? How many in the academy remind their students that we are not merely a law business, but a profession that is charged with “having [a] special responsibility for the quality of justice?”¹⁶ We all know many colleagues who make tremendous pro bono and public service contributions as scholars, teachers and participants in public service. However, the question remains: Are we doing all we can to instill the profession’s ethical obligation of public service to our students, to members of the bar, and to faculty colleagues?

The Dean, you say, talks about public service at the first-year orientation and again at your school’s graduation. Faculty colleagues teach mandatory professional ethics courses. Other faculty members promote and supervise pro bono projects. But what happens during students’ three and four-year law school experience? What takes place after the Dean’s orientation and before her graduation speech, during which she expresses pride in the school’s commitment to service and tells students not to forget the needy and disadvantaged? When was
the last time your faculty engaged in discussion about what we are teaching in our classes to
reinforce the lawyer’s role as a public citizen dedicated to justice and public service? I say this
with enormous respect to many law professors who are doing good work and making substantial
pro bono contributions.

While offering my genuine praise, though, I must take issue with those who believe I am
not preaching to the choir. To the contrary, I am convinced we can do more to teach the
Preamble and Rule 6.1, and to inspire our students by describing the work remaining to complete
the bar’s commitment to public service. Indeed, we can lead by example.

That is why the Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) has embarked on an Access
to Justice Project that seeks to reform the legal curricula and encourage colleagues to introduce
the concept of the lawyer as public citizen in their classes and within the law school institution.
We who teach and study law have this grand opportunity to complete the century-old circle of
the legal profession’s ethical code and to see the day when lawyers, as a group, accept their
professional duty to serve communities in need of legal assistance. Many law professors already
have observed signs of this taking place among the law students and lawyers, who volunteered
and traveled to the Gulf Coast after Hurricane Katrina and who engage in volunteer legal work in
the local community. I am persuaded that a significant portion of the current law school
generation is ready to embrace their ethical duty of public service, but they need active faculty
intervention. Students want to hear from professors and know what they must do to be an
ethical lawyer. With access to this information, a sizeable portion of this next generation will
succeed in performing at least fifty hours of legal services to people who cannot afford legal
counsel, and will encourage many other experienced lawyers to do the same.
If you agree, you will be joining a distinguished group of colleagues who took bold steps at the turn of the twentieth century to change the status quo of a bar, which previously had been known for only serving the powerful and those who could afford their services. Consider future Justice Louis Brandeis’s address to the Harvard Ethical Society in 1905 and his attempt to urge lawyers not to remain adjuncts of the great corporations. “We hear much of the ‘corporation lawyer,’ and far too little of the ‘people’s lawyer.’”\(^{17}\) Shortly thereafter, President Theodore Roosevelt echoed Brandeis’ words at Harvard’s graduation commencement, when he urged “the great profession of the law” to cease providing the legal strategies “to override government regulation.”\(^{18}\) Instead, the President implored the soon-to-be lawyers to “actively frown on corporations seeking even greater accumulation of wealth at public expense,”\(^{19}\) and to use their legal skills on behalf of the public interest.

Of course, it took many decades before the ABA would transform its public image of being a business and trade that cared primarily about money and “personal aggrandizement.”\(^{20}\) At first, the leadership used the President’s admonishment as an excuse to invoke ethical guidelines against the new immigrant lawyers who were educating workers about their legal right to sue an employer for injuries they sustained from dangerous working conditions.\(^{21}\) The ABA leadership referred derisively to these plaintiff lawyers as “the shyster, the barratrously inclined, the ambulance chaser and the member of the Bar with a system of runners.”\(^{22}\) Sixty years later, in 1969, when the ABA revised the first Cannons of Ethics and created the Model Code of Professional Responsibility,\(^{23}\) it was clear that the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*\(^{24}\) and the role of the civil rights lawyer had a dramatic impact upon lawyers’ capacity to acknowledge their ethical obligation to treat the individual with dignity and to follow a non-discriminatory policy. This shift was reflected in the revised Preamble.\(^{25}\) The Model
Code’s new language also reflected Supreme Court rulings in the 1960s that recognized, for the first time, an accused person’s constitutional right to counsel in a felony cases, as well as other due process rights of lower income people. In 1965, ABA President Louis Powell, the previous defender of the segregated public school system in Prince County, Virginia, led support for a Legal Services Corporation that would provide legal representation to hundreds of thousands poor people in their civil matters.

Following the 1969 Model Code, the next generation of lawyers—the ones who went to law school in the 1970s and chose to work as full-time Legal Aid and Legal Services lawyers—helped to introduce the current language of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. They, along with other veterans, engaged in a vigorous battle over whether lawyers must devote time to pro bono work, which nearly succeeded in requiring public service for every member of the bar.

Today’s public citizen lawyer faces an ever-present crisis in people’s access to justice. Our legal system fails to guarantee access to a lawyer’s representation when people’s fundamental human rights are at stake. Imagine the enormous difference it would make if this generation of law students were to embrace its duty to serve when entering the profession. If lawyers shed their public image of being selfish and instead dedicated one week each year to providing legal counsel to the underserved, it would transform the bar’s public image and fundamentally change the quality of justice that ordinary people receive. Instead of hearing new lawyer jokes, people would become aware of the many untold stories about lawyers stepping forward to ensure individuals gained access to justice in criminal and civil matters. Consider for a moment how much this next generation would accomplish if they led the movement of
attorneys committed toward contributing fifty hours of service each year. The total amount of free legal assistance would be staggering.\textsuperscript{31}

Law professors have an important job ahead. We must prepare law students to meet their ethical responsibilities and inspire each to fulfill their obligation as public citizens when they join the bar. We can set the example through our teaching within the classroom, and outside the classroom, too, by volunteering to meet the unmet legal needs of the community where we live, work, or practice. The crisis that people currently face in gaining access to counsel and the bar’s professional responsibility requires that we begin right away.
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