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**INTERVIEW AS REVISED BY HENRY STEINER**

Entrevista: 04.03.2009

Gabriel Lacerda: Please start by telling us about your education and work before you got involved with CEPED, the nature of your participation in CEPED, and your present position.

Henry Steiner: My university education was at Harvard, including the four-year college, a year of graduate work, and three years at the law school from which I graduated in 1955. I then spent 15 months travelling widely abroad, and a year as law clerk to a Supreme Court Justice. After almost four years of international work with a Wall Street law firm, and a brief period at a government agency concerned with foreign economic aid, I joined the Harvard Law School faculty in 1962. My teaching and scholarly publications involved from the start international and comparative law, although I also taught and wrote in other fields like torts and legal thought. On the international side, my work had always included international human rights. In 1984 I founded the Harvard Law School Human Rights Program and remained its director until 2005, when I became professor emeritus. My research and writing in human rights continue. I do not teach any more at Harvard, but do give short courses and lectures during my continuing trips to foreign countries.

Now for CEPED. Soon after I started to teach, David Trubek began his work with a federal foreign-aid agency and became principally engaged with Brazil. His experience with Brazilian lawyers led him to see the
problems in the Brazilian legal education of the day, and to formulate inventive and bold ideas about the possible reform or renovation of that educational system. He communicated these ideas not only to his own agency but also to the Ford Foundation. A senior colleague of mine, Professor David Cavers, knew people at the Ford Foundation and learned of its interest in such a project. He gave my name to the Foundation as a possible participant in the proposed venture to be funded jointly by the federal agency and the Ford Foundation. On reflection, I became persuaded not only of the venture’s promise for Brazil, but also of how well it fit with my academic concentration in international and foreign fields and with my passion of many years for foreign cultures, languages, travels, and experiences. It all seemed like a great adventure that held much promise for my intellectual development as well as personal excitement. After all, Rio de Janeiro is not exactly Siberia.

So in 1965, I became a consultant with the Ford Foundation for work with the new Brazilian institution that already bore the title CEPED. I soon met the leaders and incipient staff of CEPED, David Trubek, and the engaged people at the Foundation. I learned Portuguese, *uma lingua gostosa*, from the wife of a Brazilian graduate student, and arranged for a long leave of absence from Harvard. Through two or three trips in 1966-67 to Rio I became familiar with the basic issues in meetings with Caio Tacito, Alfredo Lamy Filho, Alberto Venancio as well as five or so of the other CEPED professors, Trubek, Keith Rosenn, and the Foundation people in the Rio office. In this manner I began four years of intense cooperation
with the Brazilians in the conceptualization of CEPED, and in the planning of the initial years of its academic operations.

I also planned and hosted a ten-day stay of eight CEPED faculty members at Harvard Law School. I wanted to give the visitors a sense of the dynamics of the classroom; how students and teachers interacted; what it meant to be a full-time professor with respect to research and writing and participating in the government of the school; what it meant to be a full-time student in terms of preparatory reading before classes, research and writing; and some effects of ongoing interaction of these full-time students with each other in classrooms, the library, the dining halls, even the dormitories. We considered what relevance this American system of legal education might have for Brazil’s current problems and how any influence of the American system might be viewed in Brazil – perhaps as a fertile contribution, perhaps as culturally inappropriate or as an offensive form of cultural imperialism.

All these events culminated in my 18-month stay in Rio in 1968-69 to teach at CEPED and collaborate with its Brazilian faculty in developing the very young institution.

During those years at Harvard before my long stay in Rio and during brief returns to Cambridge during that stay, I talked with several young
Brazilians working toward the LL.M. degree at Harvard who either then were engaged with CEPED or who in any event would later become central to the creation of today’s two FGV Direito schools at Rio and Sao Paulo -- including of course you (Gabriel Lacerda) and two later direitores of the two schools, Joaquim Falcao and Ari Mattos.

Gabriel Lacerda: Did you enjoy the 18 months in Brazil?

Henry Steiner: That period of my life from early 1968 to mid-1969 was more than enjoyable. I loved it – the intellectual adventure and challenge, the fascination of Brazilian culture, good Brazilian friends, the intelligence and energy of my Brazilian colleagues on the CEPED faculty, an enjoyable apartment in Leblon, the carioca life and spirit, Rio’s stunning natural beauty. These are still vibrant memories, the other side of the dark part of my stay – harsh rule by a repressive military dictatorship, well symbolized by the then new Ato Institutional No. 5.

Gabriel Lacerda: I have a technical question regarding your role at CEPED. I understand that you became a consultant to the Ford Foundation during your stay here and were paid out of the funds that Ford granted to the CEPED project. So I suppose that your official role was to serve as consultant to make the Ford Foundation comfortable with the grant on the basis of your evaluations of the project. Correct?
Henry Steiner: Yes and no. I received an 18-month leave of absence from Harvard Law School. During that period, I did not perform any service for it or receive any salary from it. My only salary came from the grant of the Ford Foundation, for which I acted as consultant for the CEPED-related work. Part of that work included sending Ford periodic evaluations of CEPED’s development, triumphs and failures, problems and efforts toward solving them. The Foundation reacted to them as it saw fit.

But I was not a neutral and detached observer who basically wrote evaluations. As a CEPED professor, I interacted closely with the other faculty members and with numbers of students. Like the Brazilian faculty, I did the work of CEPED in terms of preparing materials, teaching, thinking of the relation between the school’s operations and what the longer-run goals of CEPED were (as I understood them), and urging where I thought appropriate this or that course of action to CEPED’s leaders. Unlike the Brazilian teaching faculty, my work with CEPED was full-time; I had no other job or commitments in Brazil. I was invited by five or so law schools in other parts of Brazil to give lectures about CEPED’s purposes and work, and about some features of my own country’s law schools. These were great opportunities to deepen my knowledge of traditional Brazilian legal education.
Gabriel Lacerda: And who determined all this, just how you as a Ford consultant and CEPED professor spent your time and what you did?

Henry Steiner: The word, “consultant” doesn’t itself suggest anything in particular. Of course the Ford Foundation had instructed me about the general purposes of my engagement with CEPED. But inevitably I had to work out my role in more graphic and precise ways after I was “on the ground,” in Rio. What were these Brazilians like? How would I get on with them? How did they view this project, or were there diverse views among them? Were those views similar to or different from my views of the time? I was charged with a general mission that the Ford Foundation supported through funding and consultants like me, not with following fixed orders and rules given me by Ford. Nonetheless, I was always in close touch with the Foundation, particularly through discussions with officials in its Rio office, partly through memoranda sent to headquarters in New York. The Foundation was not reluctant to give me its views of matters, where they differed from mine.

Gabriel Lacerda: What the Ford Foundation should have expected from you was then to create your own role?

Henry Steiner: No one in the States then, including David Trubek who had initiated the entire project, had a very clear idea of how CEPED would
function. CEPED was not an established institution but an unrealized work in progress, in its early youth, the opposite of a fait accompli. We were all shapers of that progress, surely not newcomers simply executing a fixed scheme.

Gabriel Lacerda: But weren’t there some broad ideas shared by the Americans involved about the nature of that shaping, about what shape to come up with?

Henry Steiner: Some broad notions commonly understood by the Americans had been talked about from the start. Terms like ensino ativo or método novo were already commonplace. Those terms spoke to heightened student participation, though the consequences of participation in the classroom were not then very clearly grasped, at least for the long run. For the Brazilians, the terms assumed more meaning as the project went on. We did, however, know that what was at issue was some radical change whose further implications would become apparent only over time -- more than a simple mudança here or there. We were looking to some serious transformation of the relationship between the catedrático and the students. That transformation would go a ways toward changing the entire dynamic of the aula from pedagogical, psychological, intellectual and political perspectives.
Gabriel Lacerda: Tell me more about the nature of that transformation.

Henry Steiner: The stress on method and aula was then central, though only part of a more complex scheme of innovation. Intimately related aspects of this scheme spoke not to method but to the substance of what was taught and to an understanding of law itself – for example, perspectives on the law from other disciplines like economics and history as well as those disciplines’ explicit or implicit relationships to the legal system. The inclusion of the study of economics, partly through the teaching of as distinguished a figure as Mario Henrique Simonsen, offers the most vivid illustration. Even economics would later be seen as but one of various efforts involving different fields of the social sciences, all of which had the effect or investing law with interdisciplinary inquiry. That achievement, still to be effectively realized, would help to redirect the law school’s attention away from a “pure” study of law with stress on its inner structure and character, to a study of the law’s links to the contemporary realidade brasileira on many issues of economy and society. These ambitious plans were inevitably longer-run goals, diffuse and only dimly understood at their first articulation.

At the same time, at a more precise and practical level, and with an accelerated pace, it was very important for the Brazilians and Americans to achieve the short-term goal: training more independent, inventive, and effective lawyers to work with business and government and thereby to
participate creatively in Brazil’s booming economic growth. That growth was giving rise to an ever more regulatory state and to ever more complex economic and financial transactions, all of which heightened the need for a better educated and “modern” bar. It was not by accident that the field of law stressed by CEPED was the *grande empresa*, a field of ascending importance that was ripe for rapid development.

Gabriel Lacerda: You helped then to create and develop the program?

Henry Steiner: Well, yes, as one voice among many in that process of development. Like the other Americans involved, I brought to the debate a comparative perspective on these issues growing out of a radically different experience as student and teacher, indeed out of a wholly different national experience and ideology. As an advisor, a proposer of ideas, a working companion in carving this new path for legal education, I hope that I was helpful. But in no sense was I a decision-maker who “created” the program. Among the Americans, David Trubek was the initiator, the author of the project. I entered the scene about a year after that. CEPED itself was a Brazilian organization charged with a Brazilian project addressing Brazilian legal education and, more broadly, Brazil. Brazilians constructed and staffed it. They led it. They made all the big decisions, right up to the ultimate decision about what its aims really were, where and how far this venture was to go, where it was to stop.
Gabriel Lacerda: When people talk of CEPED, they mention mostly teaching methodology and classroom participation – the famous ensino ativo and metodo novo. But I’d like to now how these basic ideas touched on the concept of law and the roles of the lawyer and law teacher in the larger society? What did you think the Brazilians should try to achieve? And did your thoughts change as you saw CEPED develop?

Henry Steiner: Well, those are surely the deep questions. But our present interview is not a good occasion for me to try to spell out my ideas of what underlay the entire venture. Instead, let me simply and briefly suggest a few important themes flowing from our different education system – including college and law school – and from the movements of legal thought that nourished it, such as American legal realism.

In no particular order, (1) Law can be viewed and understood differently from a variety of perspectives. There’s no one fixed, dogmatic notion of law and its social role, nor of course of any one field of law, to which all legal scholars and practitioners must conform. The character of law is contingent on time and context. (2) A world of choice and creation displaces a world of fixed and lasting content, organization and meaning to which the law teacher and hence the law student must conform. What purposes do or should animate the legal systems, what directions should it pursue? Purpose and policy become vital elements of legal thought and criticism. Instrumental and consequentialist reasoning play a vital role in
such thought. (3) Law is made and remade, a social artifact rather than a
given, whatever the religious or other source may be for those who
believe that law is given, discovered. (4) The study of law should not be
attentive only to the formal structure of principles and rules, as if it could
be understood as an autonomous subject with non-permeable
boundaries, separate from others. It must be understood in its
relationships to its socio-economic, political and cultural environment,
particularly to the evolving Brazilian socio-economic and political
context. As was famously said, look at “law in action,” not just “law in the
books.” In this process study must become more interdisciplinary in
character as teachers and students probe the ways in which theories and
methods from the social sciences and other disciplines inform a legal
system.

Gabriel Lacerda: Your remarks seems to describe an attitude about law
strikingly different than the traditional Brazilian attitude. The Brazilian
group picked up some of the ideas you mentioned and tried to pass them
along, rather than continuing to think about law in what I call “the Mosaic
approach”: Moses talks to God and talks to his people Israel, and says:
“Here is what God wants, and you must try to obey.” That’s the traditional
perception of law in Brazil, as if law is something God-given that has
always existed in the same form. What you describe is the need to
understand the law as something we make and which responds to
different needs and which we can remake. It is not something that
preexisted, it’s always in the making. It is not divine and eternal but
human and changeable. That, it seems to me, became the concept of law understood by the CEPED faculty.

Henry Steiner: Indeed, the ideas about law that the involved Americans brought to Brazil from their own legal culture have never stopped changing. One could almost say that the differences between the ways that law was studied in the 1960s in America’s best law schools when CEPED was created, and the way law is studied today in those schools are striking, if not quite as great as the differences between American and Brazilian approaches in the 1960s. American Law schools opened their curricula to what one might call the underbelly of American life – all of our social and cultural problems that barely figured in the schools when I was a student and even when I started to teach. The dramatic events and movements in my country during these decades powerfully influenced what law schools now value in teaching and research – for example, the civil liberties/rights revolutions from the 1950s to the end of the century including racial issues, gender issues, issues of sexual orientation, issues of the handicapped, a broad range of economic issues concerning poverty, welfare, and maldistribution of resources. Whatever sense of its “autonomy” the law was left with after the early-century progressives and the New Deal and the assaults of legal realism and economic analysis and critical legal studies was, at the least, seriously compromised. Courses examining such problems of the realidade norte-americana became commonplace, indeed indispensable for any law school of quality.
The ways of teaching and understanding law, whether traditional subjects like torts or property or the different types of courses that I've just described, themselves experienced considerable change over these decades. A prime example involves the degree to which and ways in which the social sciences and other fields like moral philosophy and literary criticism and psychology have permeated law courses, not simply as an “outside” body of thought selectively brought to bear on legal issues, but as offering a framework through which to see and understand the law. Moreover, admired and effective methods of teaching are far more varied than in the 1960s; there is no longer an effective consensus over the “best” way of teaching in a law school.

I try to imagine that CEPED was first created only a few years ago and American consultants were again part of the process. In comparison with the 1960s, what would our messages be, and what influence might we have on Brazilian reform?

Gabriel Lacerda: So what you are saying is that the basic idea of the CEPED program was not just method and classroom, but also a different conception of law, all of which you say has continued to change in your country after CEPED’s death. So CEPED as you see it is in an important way a moment not just in the legal education of Brazil, but in the legal education of the United States as well. You are describing Henry Steiner
as a young law student, as an American professor with a long career, and as he is and thinks today, with all the trends over those decades.

Henry Steiner: In some respects I can’t recognize in today’s Harvard Law School the old school that I studied at in the 1950s and started teaching at in the 1960s. In some serious ways, it doesn’t exist today – and I take it for granted that today’s school won’t exist in some deep respects fifty years from now.

Gabriel Lacerda: So with all of these new ideas to work with, CEPED did achieve a lot, but not as much as we all hoped. And then it just seemed to give up, having realized the more limited ambitions within it, but with little in the way of spreading the message to the traditional law schools. There was the grand effort in PUC in the early 1970s, but in the end that too didn’t continue. Can you suggest why CEPED didn’t push further?

Henry Steiner: I’ve thought about it but have no clear answers. Some of my memos to the Ford Foundation speak of the splits of opinion within CEPED, and stress that the most powerful advocate of staying within a limited notion of CEPED’s goals was also the most powerful person in the group, Caio Tacito. Was Caio implicitly stating that these years of military rule in Brazil were emphatically not the time to try to spread a método novo and all the intellectual baggage attached to that idea? Perhaps he
believed that there was a real, or potential, radical streak in CEPED that was not apparent in its key activities of practicing *ensino ativo* while teaching and developing corporate law.

CEPED had some splendid teachers who brought great spirit and learning and skill to the classroom, no one more so than Alfredo Lamy Filho. But when I reminisce about my long stay in Rio, I think mostly of Caio, that indispensable, powerful and often inscrutable leader, so private with his thoughts about what all this was meant to achieve. In my memoranda of the period to the Ford Foundation, I came to see him as the great barrier to real progress in spreading the message and mission of CEPED to the law faculties. I imagined his notion of what CEPED should achieve to be carefully bounded.

Though Caio never told me his views of these matters I can imagine him thinking something like: “These Americans have lost their senses”, or to speak more colloquially, “they’ve gone crazy. Do they want us to threaten the powerful legal establishment, including the *catedraticos* and others who might be severely disadvantaged were CEPED to become a model for the future? Do they think CEPED should irritate such people, and make more likely their complaining to the government? Is CEPED supposed to become an agent of change that would draw law students into a deep and critical reflection about Brazilian society? Above all, do they expect such
things to happen, or at least hope that they will happen, at so delicate and
dangerous a moment in Brazilian history?"

I think Caio would have viewed all such ideas as not only foolish but
counterproductive, a perilous diversion from a more modest and sensible
plan, and surely impossible to realize. Moreover, such thoughts may
never have been part of his own utopian vision for Brazil – but that too I
have no way of really knowing.

In any event, how could one be at all sure about how the long-run
message of CEPED would be interpreted and understood? What after all
does the new method imply? Once you open this important academic
world to encouragement of critical attitudes and capacities, may the
consequences turn out to be unsettling, even dangerous? Such may have
been Caio’s deep concerns. And it must be said that for me and some
other Americans, the purpose of educating students to develop a “critical”
mind and capacity was a central purpose of the entire project. When
rereading my memoranda to the Ford Foundation, it struck me how many
times I used that very term.

Gabriel Lacerda: There was a joke at that time that probably has a
bearing on what you’re now saying. It’s a guy who asks someone else, “O
que você acha? – What do you think about it? The other replies, “Eu não
acho nada,” because I have a friend who did have thoughts about what was happening, and ninguém achou ele, no one found him.” It surely was unwise to be publicly critical of many things that the then government did.

Henry Steiner: What you just said about criticism of the regime may have affected not only Caio but all of us. There were no genuine elections. Many people were barred from politics. A military junta was running the country. Newspapers couldn’t say, “Medici ought to resign.” Despite all this, in no sense was it CEPED’s role to examine politics directly, to question the methods of the security state, let alone to act as a powerful advocacy group for an open society and the return of civilian government.

Gabriel Lacerda: Were you and the other Americans concerned about this issue, the fact that the country CEPED hope to improve was then under a military dictatorship? Did you think that you were helping this regime to improve its performance, strengthen its power, and heighten its chances of holding power for a long period of time?

Henry Steiner: A painful question. In retrospect, to anyone with eyes, the contradiction would appear to have been striking between what we were trying to advance through CEPED and the military regime violating the Brazilian tradition of an Estado de Direito. Think of how CEPED’s
short-run purpose of training a more competent bar in corporate and financial matters could in time be applied to the entire political scene – let’s say, for example, pointing toward a way of educating a more competent citizenry. Writ large, the lesson of the reformed *aula* could be understood as: citizens, think critically for yourselves, form your judgment of the past and present, don’t just accept whatever those in power pronounce. In short, these are ideally basic elements of a democratic state.

Perhaps in the long run we Americans thought that things would improve politically, and that the changes associated with CEPED could become an important part of that broader improvement. As I recall those initial experimental years from, say, 1966-1971, my recollection is that most of us, and certainly I, either did not grasp or more likely preferred not to introduce into public discussions within CEPED the possible chain of developments, and the contradiction between CEPED and an authoritarian regime. As far as most of our writing during those years was concerned, we could have been living in a compassionate democratic state. We did not publicly or institutionally speculate about application of the core ideals that inspired CEPED to the existing government.

Such writing became more common as CEPED’s operations were winding down and as military rule became less harsh. There was growing talk of a turn to democracy. People started to reflect about the larger context
within which we had been acting. For example, David Trubek’s excellent article with Mark Galanter on scholars in estrangement explored these issues. A bit later, Jim Gardner directed strong criticism against those of us who were engaged with CEPED for failing to signal and give prominence to the military-political situation.

For me, it is interesting and surely more than coincidental that the two FGV Direito schools in Rio and Sao Paulo were planned and born after democratic government had been securely instituted. I’m not suggesting any single, or even paramount, element of causation in the creation of the two schools, but simply highlighting an important part of the changing political and cultural context.

Another way that I might answer your question about relationships between CEPED and democracy is to stress the contingency of all such experiments. As I grow older, two simple maxims become more important to my understanding of why and when and how things happen – say the changes that CEPED would have liked to institute more broadly. They are: (1) nothing happens until it happens, and (2) anything can happen. We set out to change something, modestly or radically. Our ability to predict what would happen years or decades down the road is so limited, so dependent on such a variety of cultural, political, social and economic trends or forces, and of course on the character and quality of the individuals involved. One does one’s best. CEPED started in response
to real needs and helped to meet them, but in another and larger sense it started in the worst of times. It lay dormant for many years, but the ideas survived, and a number of Brazilians who had been associated with it became advocates for its goals and some of them became leaders in the planning of the two new schools and indeed in their actual creation and administration. Those schools are not carrying on CEPED’s work; they’re developing their own broader conceptions and missions that express in part some of CEPED’s basic ideas.

Perhaps you might say, as the early critics of CEPED said, that what CEPED really accomplished was simply making people better technicians, better able to develop and apply corporate and financial law to advance Brazil in its new place in the world. But it’s important to stress that this achievement took place within an educational system, even if CEPED was not a formal faculdade de direito but an experiment housed at FGV, outside that formal educational system. We never know where knowledge and skills will be applied and change things; the internet and all the new modes of communication are an excellent major current example. The new image of the aula was a bit like that. It could have experienced an unnoticed and unmourned death. But it became part of the stock of ideas that continued to be drawn on. Maybe these comments are related to a pervasive notion in developed and particularly democratic countries that more knowledge and skills will in the long run contribute to a better world, though they may serve many different causes including anti-democratic ones.
Gabriel Lacerda: That’s all very interesting, your thoughts about these questions as you remember them from the early days and as you now think of CEPED forty years later. After all you were the only “outsider” who spent as long a time as 18 months working with Brazilians within CEPED.

Now let’s turn to my last question. I’d like your view of what may be CEPED’s most important long-run influence. Of course I’m referring to the two innovative law faculties recently created by FGV – Direito GV Rio de Janeiro, and Direito GV Sao Paulo. I know that the director of each school, Joaquim Falcao and Ari Mattos, recently requested that you write evaluations of the schools which were then about six years old. And this you’ve done. So how do you understand CEPED’s relationship to these schools?

Henry Steiner: Yes, I did have a recent close look at both schools, the two inspired by the same broad vision of reform and renovation. But at the same time they’re two quite different schools in spirit, emphases and organization. In a sense, the differences reflect those between Rio and Sao Paulo. But I’m going to stress the schools’ commonalities rather than how each goes its separate way.
I lost touch with CEPED as an institution as early as 1971. Though I returned to Brazil five or so times in the intervening decades for a lecture or conference, it wasn’t until creation of the FGV law schools that I really re-connected with Brazil.

You ask whether there’s some causal relationship between CEPED and the new schools. On the face of it, the answer is obvious. Of course. Start with the most graphic links: institutions and some of the leading actors. FGV housed CEPED, and some of its distinguished scholars lectured within CEPED. So FGV’s institutional memory held a lot of information about CEPED, even as its leadership started the process of bringing together people to plan the two new schools. Both those schools are quartered within FGV buildings.

Consider some of the important personalities who either were vitally engaged with CEPED or who were very familiar with such people – you (Gabriel Lacerda), for example. Joaquim Falcao comes immediately to mind, a participant in the CEPED faculty, a key figure in the effort to transpose some of CEPED’s ideas and goals to PUC, and of course a creative and successful director of FGV Direito Rio. Or Ari Mattos, until recently director of FGV Direito Sao Paulo. Ari was not part of the CEPED faculty, but he gained a graduate degree at Harvard Law School about the same period that some people of his age, like Joaquim, were also there
and hence was well informed early in his professional life about what was happening.

If we think of the critical influence, ideas, both schools have drawn on the teachings of CEPED for basic features. I refer to features like stressing active and engaged teaching, encouraging a critical spirit of inquiry among students rather than their continued obedience to the tradition of *magister dixit*, preparing teaching materials that students are meant to read before class discussions, engaging not only with traditional legal subjects but with the pressing issues of contemporary Brazil, bringing ideas from other disciplines into the law faculties to illuminate legal ordering and reveal their influence on it. So the answer to your question about CEPED’s influence must for me be an emphatic “yes.”

Just as clearly, CEPED’s was not the only significant influence, and the two new schools have far surpassed the CEPED experiment in ways that could not then have been imagined. This time bold experimentation occurred not outside the law faculties but within them. The two FGV Direito schools are law faculties educating students to become law professionals – so vital a change from CEPED if these schools are to influence legal education in the large.
Just consider the novel features of these schools, none more significant than the innovation of *tempo integral* for many professors and for the students. Bear in mind that the FGV Direito schools were being planned, years before they opened for business, more than three decades after CEPED effectively disappeared from the scene. During this interval, many of the law faculties had themselves experienced improvements here and there; the prevailing legal cultural and law school environment influencing the planning were not identical with those of the 1960s. To the same point, the intercourse between Brazilian and foreign law schools had really intensified. Many more bachareis spent time in foreign countries, including prominently the United States, gaining graduate degrees and returning with a keen sense of other ways of doing things.

Two broad considerations affecting all of society and not just law-related things, seem to have exerted an enormous if quiet influence over all that has happened. Brazil rejected its authoritarian-military past in favor of political democracy. The road to bold experimentation was at last open. Whatever relationship CEPED in its day, and the GV Direito schools today, bore or bear to democratic government, no external force like government sets up roadblocks. Moreover, the booming economy that Brazil has developed and its rapidly rising place in the world intensify the country’s demand for well trained lawyers who can participate in that development.
The FGV Direito schools assist and indeed reinforce these political and economic transformations. They are in every sense welcome. My belief is that they will grow and prosper for the benefit of the country and profession. But it’s just a guess today how deep or pervasive an effect they may have in the long run on legal education and the legal profession in general.