

Notes

1 Introduction

- 1 On the impact of critical legal studies on Harvard in particular, see Calvin Trillin, 'A Reporter at Large: Harvard Law,' *New Yorker* (26 March 1984), 53; Jennifer A. Kingson, 'Harvard Tenure Battle Puts "Critical Legal Studies" on Trial,' *New York Times* (30 August 1987), E6; and Eleanor Kerlow, *Poisoned Ivy: How Egos, Ideology, and Power Politics Almost Ruined Harvard Law School* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1994). A more detailed list of the numerous reports of faculty divisions at Harvard is contained in Neil Duxbury, *Patterns of American Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), at 495 n.421.
- 2 See Anthony Chase, 'What Should a Law Teacher Believe?' *Nova Law Journal* 10 (1986), 403; Jay M. Feinman and Marc Feldman, 'Pedagogy and Politics,' *Georgetown Law Journal* 73 (1985), 875; and Robert W. Gordon, 'Critical Legal Studies as a Teaching Method, Against the Background of the Intellectual Politics of Modern Legal Education in the United States,' *Legal Education Review* 1 (1989), 59.
- 3 In references to the Conference on Critical Legal Studies, I capitalize the name of this group, though this is not meant to imply any remarkable degree of cohesion or bureaucratic formality within it. Elsewhere in my discussion (and this is my preponderant usage), I have used the terms 'critical legal studies,' 'radical critique,' or, in adjectival contexts, 'critical legal.' My usage is on analogy with other terms used frequently throughout this book, including 'liberalism' and 'realism.'
- 4 A representative anthology of critical legal work, David Kairys, ed., *The Politics of Law: A Progressive Critique* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), revised and enlarged editions of which appeared in 1990 and 1998, resulted from a