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Introduction

Following the apex of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, was the rapid growth of public interest law. Concern about underrepresentation of minority interests in the legal system led to the founding of numerous public interest law firms. In general, these kinds of firms sought to "balance the scales of justice" by litigating for expanded rights in a variety of issue areas.

Paralleling the new conservatism of the 1970s, however, was the phenomenal growth of conservative public interest law. Conservatives, perceiving that liberals had tipped the scales of justice, sought to rebalance the legal system, yet, commentators continued to equate public interest law with the advocacy of liberal positions. This tendency has led to a misperception about the politicized nature of the legal system. Not only are "liberals" continuing to go to court, but conservatives also now are presenting the courts with their view of the public interest. This has led some commentators to conclude that the courts are battlegrounds of competing group interests. Thus, in this paper we compare the growth and future of liberal and conservative public interest law in the United States.

The Rise of Liberal Public Interest Law

While public interest law came to the fore in the late 1960s, "various movements and programs . . . contributed to [its] shape, structure and underlying ideology." The first of these, the National
Consumers' League (NCL), began to use litigation to improve the working conditions of women and children in the early 1900s. In fact, the litigation strategy it used to preserve the constitutionality of protective legislation later provided a model for other public interest law firms. Its use of the test case strategy and of the pioneering "Brandeis brief," tactics now regularly associated with public interest law generally, and the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association for the Advancement for Colored People (NAACP), specifically. In fact, from 1908 to 1936, the NCL regularly used both tactics to defend maximum hour or minimum wage laws.

During the same time period that the NCL litigated to uphold protective legislation, other organizations also began to represent their interests in court. For example, in 1920 several individuals organized the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to defend draft evaders and alleged communists against government prosecution and to protect unions against employer harassment. Nineteen years later the NAACP, which had sporadically participated in litigation since 1915, specifically created a Legal Defense and Education Fund (LDF) to represent the interests of blacks in court and in particular to litigate to end housing and school segregation in a systematic fashion. And, following the lead of the NAACP, the American Jewish Congress (AJC) established the Committee on Law and Social Action (CLSA) in 1945 to take legal action against the numerous religious accommodationist laws that were enacted during the 1940s. Thus, through the early 1960s, these three organizations were the major liberal interest group litigators in the United States.
In the mid 1960s, however, a new breed of liberal litigators--groups concerned with representing their definition of the public interest in court--emerged. At the core of this movement was Ralph Nader. His early campaign against General Motors and publication of *Unsafe at Any Speed* in 1966, alerted corporate interests that the courts would now be used to challenge them and their products. Within two years of this expose on the safety of Corvairs, Nader began to establish what is now termed the "Nader Network." Comprising this network, at least in part, were groups all dedicated to using the courts for reform of corporate practices and/or social change.

Almost simultaneously with the emergence of "Nader's Raiders" was environmentalists' resort to litigation to challenge other kinds of business practices. The Sierra Club, like the NAACP and AJC, for example, organized its own tax-exempt legal defense fund in 1969.

The instant visibility of these and other firms led the Ford Foundation to recognize the potential utility of increased litigation on behalf of minorities and other "disadvantaged" groups. Beginning in 1967, and continuing with greater force into the 1970s, Ford began to channel millions of dollars into various groups litigating in the public interest. The first groups to receive Ford funding included established civil rights organizations such as the LDF and the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (LCCRUL).

While newer than the LDF, the LCCRUL, which was founded in 1963 by prominent attorneys at the request of President John F. Kennedy, had quickly achieved a reputation for excellence, particularly in Mississippi
where its lawyers acted "as missionaries to" the (local) bar. Often functioning as a legal aid service in the South, LCCRL also worked to desegregate the bar and to revise outmoded criminal codes and bail bond systems, which adversely affected low-income, inner-city blacks.

Shortly thereafter, Ford moved to fund, and in effect create, several other public interest law firms. For example, in the early 1970s, Ford recognized the need for litigation on behalf of women. In 1972, Ford provided the Women's Law Fund (WLF), with a 140,000 dollar two-year, start-up grant to represent the interests of women in court. Since its initial grant to the WLF, Ford has funded numerous other women's rights litigators including the Women's Rights Project of the ACLU, the Women's Legal Defense Fund, the National Organization for Women (NOW) Legal Defense and Education Fund, the Women's Equity Action League Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the National League of Women Voters. In fact, according to a former President of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, "(a)mong the giants, only the Ford Foundation has moved in all the appropriate ways to meet the needs of the feminists." Ford Foundation dollars also were instrumental to the early successes of three environmental public interest law firms—the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund and the Natural Resources Defense Council. Foundation support allowed these groups to increase their litigation activities and to expand their involvement to a wide variety of areas including coastal-zone management, water resources development and the location of power plants.

The "public interest," however, has been even more widely represented by general public interest law firms supported by Ford and
other foundations. Groups such as the Center for Law and Social Policy at the Catholic University Law School (CLSP) and Public Advocates, Inc., unlike women's rights and environmental firms, litigate in a wide range of issue areas. CLSP, for example, has participated in cases as diverse as women's rights, health, international trade and mine safety. In addition to these firms, numerous other public interest law firms were created or expanded during this period. Thus, because of the growth and diversity of the movement, in 1974, the Ford Foundation sponsored a conference to assess the status of public interest law in the U.S. One outgrowth of that conference was the creation of the Center for Public Interest Law (CPIL) which among other projects, conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the public interest law movement. Its 1976 survey found that there were over 70 of these firms litigating in areas as diverse as consumer and environmental protection, political reform and mental health.

While this study dramatically illustrated the diversity of the movement, many of its component groups shared several common features: first, these firms generally prefer to represent plaintiffs rather than to file amicus curiae briefs, a more limited form of intervention. While direct representation can be a costly tactic, outside funding often allowed these groups to initiate important test cases by which to win precedential victories. Traditional liberal public interest law firms pursued this strategy in at least 39 percent of the 679 cases in which they participated during the 1969 to 1980 terms of the Supreme Court.

While most of these public interest law firms preferred to sponsor cases, they participated as amicus curiae, in 61 percent of the cases decided by the Supreme Court during that same 11 term period. When these
groups participated as friends of the court, they tended to reinforce each other's litigation efforts through coordinated briefs either in the form of co-sponsored briefs or amicus briefs filed in support of the sponsoring party. These firms cooperate because they have similar objectives and all generally stand to benefit from each others' victories. While individually they represent a range of "group" interests, they all seek expanded interpretations of legislation and/or of the U.S. Constitution. Thus, because each has a similar view of the public interest, rights that are secured for one disadvantaged group often affect the litigation efforts of other public interest law firms.

Second, at least through the late 1970s, most of these groups continued to receive foundation support. Recognizing the impact that these groups had upon the law, foundations continued to channel large sums of money to public interest law. Thus, these firms are similar because they continued to rely heavily on private foundations to support their litigation activities.

Sponsorship, foundation funding and growing expertise allowed these groups to increase their litigation activities steadily. In fact between 1970 and 1981, liberal interest group involvement in Supreme Court litigation increased by 15 percent. Correspondingly, these firms also were highly successful. Thus, for many, a cyclical pattern developed in which the more they went to court, the more cases they won. And conversely, the more often they won, the more often they sought to litigate.

While these similarities collectively fostered the development of a unified public interest law movement, several judicial decisions, federal
legislation, and access to the executive branch of government also facilitated that growth. For example, as early as 1963, the United States Supreme Court recognized the special role of group representation of minority interests. Writing for the Court in **NAACP v. Button**, Justice William Brennan noted that:

Fifteen years later, in 1978, the Burger Court continued the Warren Court tradition of support for public interest law. In **In re Primus**, seven Justices acknowledged the special role the ACLU has played "in the defense of unpopular causes and unpopular defendants." In **Primus**, the Court upheld an ACLU attorney's right to solicit clients by mail so long as the inquiry was not for personal or financial gain.

Additionally, off the court statements of some of the individual Justices reveal their support for the movement. For example, Justice Thurgood Marshall, who served as General Counsel of the LDF, and in fact, argued **Brown v. Board of Education**, recently commented that:
public interest law seeks to fill some of the gaps in our legal system. Today's public interest lawyers have built upon the earlier successes of civil rights, civil liberties and legal aid lawyers but have moved into new areas. Before courts, administrative agencies and legislatures, they provide representation for a broad range of relatively powerless minorities—for example, to the mentally ill, to children, to the poor of all races. They also represent neglected interests that are widely shared by most of us as consumers, as workers, and as individuals in need of privacy and a healthy environment.

These lawyers have, I believe, made an important contribution. They do not (nor should they) always prevail, but they have won many important victories for their clients. More fundamentally, perhaps, they have made our legal process work better. They have broadened the flow of information to decisionmakers. They have made it possible for administrators, legislators and judges to assess the impact of their decisions in terms of all affected interests. And, by helping to open the doors to our legal system, they have moved us a little closer to the ideal of equal justice for all.
Thus, since the rise of public interest law in the 1960s, the Supreme Court and some individual Justices have articulated their approval and support for those activities.

Another factor that facilitated the growth of public interest law was the inclusion of an award of attorneys fees provision in several civil rights statutes. While many organizations long have been recognized as "private-attorneys general" litigating on behalf of group interests, it was not until inclusion of specific provisions allowing for judicial awards of attorneys fees that public interest law firms could be reimbursed for litigating actions brought in the "public interest." In addition, in 1980, Congress passed the Equal Access to Justice Act, which allows prevailing parties who challenge U.S. governmental practices to petition the Court for an award of attorneys fees. Thus, some liberal public interest law firms rely very heavily on attorneys fees awards to provide as much as 80 percent of their operating budgets.

Finally, public interest law firms' access to the executive branch was greatly expanded by President Jimmy Carter. According to David Broder, Carter, in fact, was the first president "to recruit large numbers of public interest advocates into the executive branch." Examples of important Carter appointees drawn from the ranks of liberal public interest firms include Assistant Attorney General and Chief of the Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice, Drew Days III, a former LDF attorney, Joan Claybrook, who headed the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and formerly worked for Ralph Nader, and Joseph Onek, a former director of the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLSP) who worked on the White House Domestic Policy staff from 1977 to 1979.
In addition to Carter's appointments within the executive branch, he nominated numerous movement attorneys to the federal bench. Many of the judicial appointments made by Carter had strong ties to the public interest law movement. For example, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, who was appointed to the D.C. Court of Appeals, was the former head of the Women's Rights Project of the ACLU as well as a General Counsel of that organization. Also appointed to the D.C. Court of Appeals was Patricia Wald, who had formerly been associated with the Mental Health Law Project.

Thus, based on growing judicial receptivity, statutes favoring public interest law and access to the executive branch, liberal public interest law flourished during the 1970s. Its successes, however, soon prompted the formation of a new public interest law movement, which sought to counterbalance the growing liberal presence in court.

The Rise of Conservative Public Interest Law Firms

While liberal, or as conservatives call them, "traditional" public interest law firms were obtaining rights for disadvantaged members of society, as the movement grew, its victories began to affect conservative interests that often had a financial stake in the outcome of particular cases. For example, the LDF's victories in employment discrimination, environmentalists' litigation campaigns against developers and consumer attacks on business practices and products collectively began to have a substantial impact on American business. Thus, the cumulative effect of a string of movement victories led to a widespread belief among business executives and conservative politicians that their interests were not being represented in the judicial forum.
This was not, however, the first time that conservatives had recognized the need to litigate to represent their interests in court. In 1935, for example, conservatives opposed to the New Deal formed the National Lawyer's Committee of the American Liberty League. This organization was specifically established to litigate against New Deal legislation including the National Labor Relations Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act, but given the political climate and the Court's eventual abandonment of substantive due process, the group disbanded when it quickly became apparent that its efforts could no longer have any impact.

It was not until over 30 years later that conservatives once again began to discuss the need for organizations to represent their interests in court. One of the first conservatives to recognize this void was Lewis F. Powell, Jr. Two months prior to his Supreme Court nomination, at an appearance before a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, he claimed that:
It was these concerns that prompted leaders of the California Chamber of Commerce to conduct a survey to determine if there was interest in, or a need for, the kinds of actions suggested by Powell.65 The findings of this study are clearly reflected in the following assessment made by Raymond Memboisse, a member of the California Chamber. According to Memboisse,

Litigation purportedly brought in the public interest has not benefitted the people. It has deprived them of jobs, housing, food, and medicine. It has increased costs. It will soon limit their supply of electricity with resulting health hazards and hardships.

By any test, the general public has not been well served by many of our self-proclaimed "public interest law groups."67

Sentiments such as these when buttressed by the outcome of the Chamber of Commerce study, led several members of Governor Ronald Reagan's administration including current Presidential advisor Edwin Meese to found the Pacific Legal Foundation in Sacramento, California to bring their definition of the public interest to court.66 Thus, the PLF represented a pilot attempt by conservatives to determine whether or not conservatives could use the courts effectively in a variety of issue areas. It was founded on the view that traditional public interest law firms were not providing the courts with an accurate portrayal of the public interest.
The PLF immediately began to litigate in a wide range of cases with a particular emphasis on environmental regulation generally opposing the claims of numerous environmental protection groups. Its founders were well satisfied with its impact and perceived that other regional firms like the PLF could potentially form a conservative public interest law movement. While within two years of its creation it was too early to point to major PLF victories in court, according to its founders, its ability to make an immediate impact on the judicial process during its formative period can be attributed to the strong financial backing PLF received from the business community. Large corporate interests and/or foundations including the Lilly Endowment, the William Hearst and the John M. Olin Foundations and the Southern-Pacific Company have been and continue to be major supporters of the PLF. These funds allowed PLF immediately to hire several committed staff attorneys and requisite support staff and provided the money necessary to conduct important pre-trial discovery and pay for litigation expenses.

Many within the conservative community were convinced that this experiment had worked. In fact, the successes of PLF on the west coast led its founders to commission a study to determine if its sort of public interest law firm would work successfully in other regions. The results of this study, which indicated the "immediate success" of the PLF, in turn led its author, Leonard Therberge, to take steps that led to the founding of the National Legal Center for the Public Interest (NLCPI) without the support of the PLF.

The NLCPI was created to facilitate the establishment of "a network of regional firms," which would be modeled after PLF. Within a year of its formation, NLCPI acted to meet this objective by creating the first of
what were to be several member conservative firms including the Southeastern, Gulf Coast and Great Plans, Capital, Mountain States, Mid-Atlantic, and Mid-America Legal Foundations.

Once the NLCPI created and staffed these foundations, it claims to have "assumed the role of a clearinghouse and service organization" for member firms,76 but according to some member firms they no longer rely on NLCPI for very much, if any assistance.77 In fact, the Capital Legal Foundation has specifically disassociated itself with the Center as a result of a fund-raising dispute.78 Thus, while NLCPI has assisted and facilitated the increased conservative presence in courts, each member firm now "operates as an independent entity with its own board of directors, its own legal advisory board and its own funding responsibilities."79

The first regional center established by NLCPI was the Southeastern Legal Foundation (SELF). Charged with representing the public interest in nine southern states,80 SELF was incorporated in Atlanta, Georgia in early 1976. The Hon. Ben Blackburn, a former member of Congress,81 was elected the first president. Seed money from NLCPI was supplemented with support from several foundations, but by 1977 SELF had over 200 member foundations and firms including the Broyhill and U.S. Steel Foundations and General Motors, Gulf Oil, Sears Roebuck, and Pepsico Companies among others.82 This increased funding has allowed it to grow from 2 to 5 attorneys.83

Even though SELF has substantial corporate and business backing, its litigation activities, like the other regional firms reflect a strong concern for free enterprise. For example, according to Blackburn, "anyone with a special privilege granted at the expense of the general public is
fair game, and we don't care who is on the other side.\textsuperscript{84} SELF's concern with regional issues is particularly well illustrated by its participation in \emph{FERC v. Mississippi},\textsuperscript{85} in which SELF supported Mississippi's contention that the federal government's Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act (PURPA) of 1978\textsuperscript{86} represented "a form of federal control over the states which threatens the system of federalism and the individual liberties of the citizens of the states."\textsuperscript{87} Specifically, SELF attorneys argued that this Congressional regulation of commerce violated the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Thus, through these and other litigation efforts, SELF has attempted to represent the regional interest through its advocacy of the conservative definition of the public interest.

 Shortly after SELF's incorporation, NLCPI facilitated the creation of five other foundations also modeled after PLF. Each was designed to represent the public interest in a particular geographic area and all were headed by prominent conservatives. For example, the Great Plains Legal Foundation's first President, Christopher S. Bond, was a former governor of Missouri while its first Chairman was a former head of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.\textsuperscript{88} Additionally, like SELF, all of these firms initially relied heavily on seed money from NLCPI but now receive substantial support from corporate, foundation, and conservative sources.\textsuperscript{89}

 Business and conservative foundations also have been important sources of funding for the Mountain States Legal Foundation (MSLF), which has been the most active of the affiliated firms.\textsuperscript{90} For example, like the other regional firms, MSLF's first president was a prominent conservative, James Watt.\textsuperscript{91} And also similar to the other regional firms, MSLF operates
in a discrete geographical area, although it has a Washington, D.C. office. Maintenance of these offices, corporate funding and contributions from individuals have allowed it to guard the regional interest in four general areas of the law: constitutional rights, separation of powers and federalism, public access to federal lands, and state water rights cases. For example, in Idaho v. Freeman, MSLF sought "to establish the right of the state legislature to rescind its approval of a proposed constitutional amendment before ratification by three-fourths of the states occurs and to establish the constitutional necessity for three-fourths majority concurrence of Congress in extending any time limit previously set for state consideration of a proposed amendment."

But perhaps the most important of MSLF's contributions to the prominence of conservative public interest law has been its involvement in cases where environmental issues are at stake. For example, in Sierra Club v. Andrus, MSLF won what it considers to be a "major" victory when a federal appeals court protected "established water rights from federal interference sought by the Sierra Club." According to MSLF, had the Sierra Club won, "water use authorized under state law could have been cancelled in favor of water use for aesthetic purposes on all federal lands." Additionally, in Mountain States Legal Foundation v. Dickenson, MSLF challenged the Grand Canyon Park Service's banning of motorized rafts on the Colorado River. Thus, while MSLF has been involved in a wide range of public interest issues, given the region it represents, like the PLF, it often has found itself at odds with liberal environmental law groups.
With initial guidance and seed money from NLCPI, MSLF and several affiliated centers have attempted to model themselves after PLF. Like PLF, they have sought to represent their view of the public interest in a wide range of issue areas, often with a regional focus.

In contrast, however, are the activities of the Washington Legal Foundation, a non-affiliated firm. While it has the same ideology as the other conservative firms, it is "fully national in scope,"\textsuperscript{100} and does not seek to represent a regional interest. Additionally, unlike the other firms, the WLF intentionally limits its amicus curiae activity preferring to sponsor cases.

Under the leadership of its founder, Dan Popeo, WLF "aims (its) activities at the American public as well as the Courts and administrative agencies."\textsuperscript{101} Thus many of the cases it has selected to sponsor have been ones that have attracted significant media attention. For example, WLF represented Senator Barry Goldwater and 25 other members of Congress in their attempt to stop President Carter from terminating the Mutual Defense Treaty with Taiwan without Congressional participation.\textsuperscript{102} More recently, WLF attorneys are representing Timothy McCarthy in his 46 million dollar civil suit against the Hinkley family.\textsuperscript{103}

Like liberal groups in the mid 1970s, the activities of WLF and the other foundations have been fostered by a number of factors: first, several conservative foundations including the Scaife Family Foundation, Olin Foundation and Jos. A. Coors Co. have contributed heavily to conservative firms. Just as the Ford Foundation facilitated the development and direction that liberal groups took, conservative funders also left their imprint on the conservative firms leading many of them to
become involved in social as well as business issues.

Second, these groups, like their liberal counterparts generally share a similar outlook and thus can coordinate their efforts. But, in contrast to the liberal groups, they often try to stay out of each others cases believing that the issue already is being handled in the best possible way. This attempt to avoid duplication of efforts has served to conserve scarce resources and allow staff attorneys to concentrate their efforts in other cases. Thus, it is uncommon, particularly at the level of the U.S. Supreme Court, to see these groups participating in conjunction.

Finally, the activities of conservative firms also have been fostered by governmental support particularly from the U.S. Supreme Court and executive branch. While liberal groups benefitted during the Warren Court era, conservatives often have found the Burger Court to be receptive to their arguments. The Burger Court not only has become increasingly conservative in the areas of criminal justice, race discrimination, and economic liberties, but several Justices now serving on the Court have voiced their support for conservative public interest law. As previously noted, Justice Lewis Powell urged the Chamber of Commerce to litigate on behalf of business. Justice William Rehnquist opinions regularly support conservative interests. And, the lone Reagan appointee, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, also has expressed support for conservative interests both in her opinions and in correspondence with the NLCPI.

Additionally, there are numerous examples of executive branch support of or ties to conservative firms. From the beginning, close advisors of Ronald Reagan were instrumental in the founding of the PLF and
later regional centers. For example, in addition to the important positions held by Watt and Meese, Roger Marzulla, who replaced Watt as the head of MSLF was appointed as Special Counsel in the Land and Natural Resources Division of the Justice Department. In addition, the U.S. Solicitor General, Rex E. Lee, was a former member of the Legal Advisory Board of MSLF. Close ties between the current administration and other firms also are evident.

Thus, it is clear that public interest law no longer serves only liberal interests. Conservative interests are regularly represented by their own breed of public interest law firm.

An Assessment of the State of Public Interest Law

As the preceding discussion reveals, the term public interest law can no longer be associated with liberal interests alone. Yet, even though conservative and liberal firms have become frequent participants in litigation and share many similarities because of the nature of their constituencies, each faces a unique set of problems, the remedying of which may lead to the eventual prominence of one interest over the other. For example, while funds for conservatives have increased rapidly, those earmarked for liberal public interest law are in serious decline. Funds provided by the Ford Foundation which liberal public interest law firms depend upon so heavily are being cut back dramatically. In 1979, for example, Ford announced that it would terminate funding to ten public interest law firms. Additionally, the Legal Services Corporation, which has played a particularly important role in representing the poor and underwriting the operating budgets of several liberal firms is under serious attack by the Reagan administration. In fact, most of Reagan's
appointments to the Board of the agency have been committed to dismantling it. Thus, because of these problems, some public interest law firms are beginning to rely heavily on other financial sources including awards of attorneys fees.

The financial situation of conservative firms is indirect contrast to that of their liberal counterparts. For example, corporations and conservative foundations, many of which are reluctant to finance liberal firms, now contribute heavily to conservative firms which litigate in their interest. And, unlike their liberal counterparts, some conservative legal foundations have vowed not to accept or to seek attorneys fees awards. According to Dan Popeo, head of Washington Legal Foundation, WLF will not accept awards of attorneys fees believing that public interest law should be supported by the public.\textsuperscript{112} Thus, liberal and conservative public interest law firms not only differ in their attitudes about attorneys fees, but while the coffers of many liberal public interest law firms are decreasing, those of conservative firms are increasing at a steady rate.\textsuperscript{113}

Another area of concern to both types of firms is the recruitment and retention of expert counsel yet the problems faced by each differs substantially. For example, one factor often noted as having been critical to the success of the traditional firms--their ability to attract creative young attorneys from Ivy League law schools--may be in jeopardy. As one commentator has noted, the increasing non-ideological nature of recent law school graduates may lead to a reduction in the pool of capable students eager to work in liberal firms.\textsuperscript{114} This decreasing number, coupled with the financial problems faced by liberal firms,\textsuperscript{115} may, in fact, lead to the hiring of less than first-rate attorneys.
Conservative firms, on the other hand pay higher salaries than their liberal counterparts and often do not demand total devotion to the "cause."\textsuperscript{116} While these factors have increased the pool of lawyers willing to join conservative firms, some have criticized this approach to hiring noting that this lack of ideological commitment has been apparent in their litigation activities. For example, Office of Management and Budget Legal Director, Michael J. Horowitz has claimed that these firms:

\textit{... barely participated, if at all, in that war of ideas and ideologies that Irving Kristol has so articulately written about over the past five to ten years and about which I feel so strongly.}

There are a few firms that are doing what the traditional public interest law movement has so successfully done: giving young lawyers a chance to vent their idealism, creating healthy climates within the groups themselves for internal, vigorous debate, and using whatever tools of law are available to pursue their own visions of the public interest, which are, of course, radically different from those which Ralph Nader pursued.\textsuperscript{117}

This problem has been further exacerbated by the failure of conservative public interest law firms to associate themselves or to draw upon the talents of leading law schools.\textsuperscript{118} In fact, in an evaluation of these firms, Horowitz was prompted to comment that "few things more forcefully underscore the abject failure of many conservative public interest law firms than their total lack of association with law schools,
even those operating within the immediate range of its (sic) principal offices." 118a

In contrast, many liberal firms are either headquartered in law schools or closely affiliated with one. 119 Thus, these law schools provide not only additional, inexpensive legal services but also provide training opportunities for liberal attorneys. This fusion of liberal public interest law with law schools, 120 however, was not accomplished overnight; instead it was the result of decades long attempts at cooperation. Whether or not conservatives will follow in this "tradition" remains to be seen. 121

Development of this tradition, however, may hinge on conservative agreement on the need for such firms. While liberals and civil libertarians have traditionally recognized the imperative nature of resort to the courts, conservatives are not nearly so unanimous in opinion. 122 In fact, many conservatives have criticized judicial activism, regardless of its ideological direction. Thus, some have criticized not only the tactics of conservative firms, 123 but also the need for such firms per se. According to one conservative commentator:

I think they have been tactically wise and strategically unwise. Tactically wise because by cluttering up the courts with ideological pursuits, they have at least made clear to some neutrals left in this country that conservatives can screw up the legal system as well as liberals—making it possible, in the long run, for a consensus to develop again in the country which is hostile to the overuse of the legal process. 124
While interest group activity has not necessarily produced an "overuse of the legal process," it clearly has affected the number of cases brought and perhaps more important, has shaped the way issues are defined and presented to the courts. Thus, while liberal firms enjoyed a near monopoly on ideology in the late 1960s and early 1970s, today both liberals and conservatives are involved in structuring cases for later appeal. Which interest may ultimately prevail thus may depend upon which group can reconcile its present problems.
Notes

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the attorneys and staff of the Mountain States, Pacific, Southeastern, Capital, Mid-America and Washington Legal Foundations and the National Legal Center for Public Interest Law for their assistance and cooperation. We would also like to thank Willa Johnson at the Heritage Foundation and Michael Horowitz at the Office of Management and Budget for their useful insights. The authors also would like to thank Linda Boyte for typing this manuscript.

1See, Center for Public Interest Law, Balancing the Scales of Justice (1976) (hereafter, CPIL, Scales of Justice) for a complete list of firms founded through that year. See also Appendix A.


See generally, Weimbrod, Public Interest Law. In a comprehensive treatment of the public interest law industry, he and those contributing to the volume, focused exclusively on traditional liberal public interest law. Even as late as 1982, Robert Stover, in his study of law students entering the field of public interest law, excluded conservative firms from his analysis. In fact, in defining public interest law, he claimed that "for varying reasons, most public interest law has involved working for goals far more congruent with the philosophy of the political left than with that of the political right." Based on that observation, he proceeded to exclude conservative firms from his analysis. The Importance of Economic Supply in Determining the Size and Quality of the Public Interest Bar, 16 Law & Soc'y. Rev. at 455 (1982) (hereafter, Stover, Public Interest Bar). See also, note 2, supra, generally.

According to one director of a conservative legal foundation, "The Courts have become the battleground for the supremacy of ideas in this country." Popeo, Public Interest Law in the 80's, Barrons (March 2, 1981).

CPIL, Scales of Justice at 19.

Some would argue that public interest law can be traced to the first legal aid office that was established in New York City in 1876.
CPIL, Scales of Justice at 21-26. While clearly this and other offices provided legal assistance to the needy, legal aid societies were not concerned with the broad public interest, but rather the interests of individual clients. See generally, Smith, Justice and the Poor (1919) and Johnson, Jr., Justice and Reform (1974).


8In particular, its use of sociological data in the absence of legal precedent, was pathbreaking. Levin and Noise, School Desegregation Litigation in the 1970s and the Use of Social Science Evidence, 39 L. & Cont. Prob. 50 (1975); Vose, The National Consumers' League and the Brandeis Brief, 1 Midwest J. of Pol. Sci. 178 (1957) and Rosen, The Supreme Court and Social Science (1972).

8aSee n. 13, infra.


10See O'Connor, Women's Organizations' Use of the Courts at 72-73 (1980) for a list of these cases.

11Markmann, The Noblest Cry (1965); Johnson, A Challenge to American Freedom (1963); Bean, Pressure for Freedom, unpublished Ph.D.

In 1915, attorneys for the NAACP filed an *amicus curiae* brief in *Guinn v. U.S.*., 238 U.S. 347.

Vose, *Caucasians Only* (1959) and Greenberg, *Judicial Process and Social Change* (1977) (hereafter, Greenberg, *Judicial Process*). While the LDF facilitated the creation of a test case strategy, its formation was closely tied to changes in the Internal Revenue Service code. In early 1983, the NAACP successfully challenged the right of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to continue to use the NAACP initials.

For an account of the LDF litigation campaign that led to its victory in *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948) see Vose, *Caucasians Only* (1959).


Nader and the Power of Everyman (1975); and Snow and Weisbrot, Consumerism, Consumers and Public Interest in Public Interest Law (Weisbrot, et al., eds. 1978).

17 Figure 1, compiled by James Q. Wilson dramatically illustrates this point. (Figure 1 on next page) See also Burt, Abuse of Trust (1982) and Dye and Zeigler, American Politics in the Media Age (1983), chap. 7.


20 Cortner, Strategies and Tactics of Litigants in Constitutional Cases, 17 J. of Pub. L. at 287 (1968). Cortner claims that "disadvantaged groups" are highly dependent upon the judicial process as a means of pursuing their policy interests, usually because they are temporarily, or even permanently, disadvantaged in terms of their abilities to attain successfully their goals in the electoral process, within the elected political institutions or in the bureaucracy. If they are to succeed at all in the pursuit of their goals they are almost compelled to resort to litigation."
Figure 1

THE NADER NETWORK


22 These initially included several past presidents of the American Bar Association, all former Assistant Attorney Generals for Civil Rights and several former Attorneys and Solicitors General. CPIL, *Scales of Justice* at 55.


27 The LDF and LCCRL, in fact, became models for later organizations claiming to litigate in the public interest. For example, in 1967, at the behest of LDF attorneys, Ford met with Chicano leaders, who requested money to fund an organization that would litigate for Chicanos in the same manner in which the LDF had represented black interests. Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, *Los Anos Dias* (no date). Ford decided to grant that request upon concluding that "Mexican-Americans were the most disorganized and fragmented minority in American life and that they needed a national organization to serve their social, economic, and public needs." Castro, *Chicano Power* at 150 (1974) Thus, in 1968, the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) was established with a 2.2 million dollar grant from Ford. The Ford
Foundation Annual Report at 6 (1968) and Ford Foundation, *La Raza* at 18 (no date).


30 Tully, *Funding the Feminists*, *Foundation News* at 24-25 (March-April 1975). While the Ford Foundation has been the primary source of funds for many of these groups, the Playboy Foundation early on contributed heavily to the Women's Rights Project of the ACLU. NOW, however, declined those funds because of its negative image of Playboy.


32 It also should be noted that the Ford Foundation has funded several law school clinics, many of which litigate in the general public interest and often serve as training grounds for future public interest lawyers. For example, Ford helped to create the Institute for Public Representation at the Georgetown University Law Center. Harrison and Jaffe, *The Public Interest Law Firm: New Voices for New Constituencies* at 18 (1973).

Those attorneys responsible for CLSP women's rights litigation, however, recently founded the National Women's Law Center.

Center for Law and Social Policy, Annual Reports.

See CPIL, Scales of Justice.

Generally this occurs in the form of or in conjunction with what many refer to as a test-case strategy. Because this strategy often involves careful planning and coordination, it may be becoming increasingly difficult to pursue given the large number of groups working in closely allied areas. Additionally, it should be noted that in this paper, we use the terms direct sponsorship and representation of parties interchangeably.

For the growing use of amicus curiae briefs as a litigation tactic see Krislov, The Amicus Curiae Brief: From Friendship to Advocacy, 72 Yale L. J. 694 (1963); O'Connor, Women's Organizations' Use of the Courts at 115-123 (1980); O'Connor and Epstein, An Appraisal of Hakman's Folklore, 16 L. & Soc'y Rev. 311 (1982); Puro, The Role of Amicus Curiae in the United States Supreme Court, 1920-1966, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo (1971) and Vose, Interest Groups and Litigation, paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York City (September 1981). Additionally, for the apparent effectiveness of this type of strategy, see O'Connor and Epstein, Court Rules an Workload Justice Systems Journal (in press) wherein the authors found that the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court actually cited amicus curiae briefs of interest groups or public interest law firms in 18 percent of the 813 cases resulting in full opinion in which at least one amicus curiae brief was filed.

O'Connor and Epstein, Conservative Litigation.

See n. 38, supra.

Jointly authored amicus briefs have become a tactic regularly employed by liberal interest groups, See O'Connor and Epstein, Interest Group Participation in Racially-Based Employment Discrimination Litigation, 25 How. L. J. 301 (Nov. 1982) (hereinafter, O'Connor and Epstein, Interest Group Participation); Peltason, Federal Courts in the Political Process (1955); and Vose, Constitutional Change (1972).

O'Connor and Epstein, Conservative Litigation.

For a more thorough discussion of the importance of interest group perceptions of judicial acceptance of their claims, see Wasby, Interest Group Litigation Strategy in an Age of Complexity, in Cigler and Loomis, eds. Interest Groups and Public Policies (1983) (hereinafter Wasby, Litigation Strategy). For a discussion of the importance of this kind of "repeat player" status see, Galanter, Why the 'Haves' Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change, 9 L. & Soc'y Rev. 95 (1974).


49Thurgood Marshall, Foreword in Ford Foundation Public Interest Law at 6-7 (1976). Additionally, it should be noted that Justice Powell served as vice-president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association from 1964 to 1965.


51Private Attorneys-General and Casper, Lawyers Before the Warren Court (1972).


54See generally, Califano, Governing America (1981) and Bell, Taking Care of the Law (1982).

55Broder, Changing of the Guard: Power and Leadership in America at 237 (1981). Broder has estimated that more than one hundred key positions in numerous executive departments and commissions were occupied by former public interest advocates. Id. at 238. Former chair of the Federal Trade
Commission, Michael Pertschuk, in fact, often referred to the Commission as "the most active public-interest law firm in the government." Id. at 227. Carter, however, may not have been the first president to recruit from the ranks of public interest lawyers. For interesting analyses of Franklin Roosevelt's reliance on this sort of personnel, see Irons, The New Deal Lawyers (1982) and Murphy, The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection (1982).

56 Other examples of those with ties to the public interest law movement during the Carter administration include Benjamin Heineman who also served as an attorney at CLSP, who was an Assistant Secretary of HEW and Anthony Roisman, chief staff attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council who was made chief of the Hazardous Waste section of the Land and Natural Resources Division of the Justice Department. Id.

57 Report of ongoing research of Thomas G. Walker, Emory University.

58 Another example of an "activist" judge appointed to the federal bench is LDF attorney, Joseph W. Hatchett who was appointed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.


60 Belton, A Comparative Review and Wasby, Litigation Strategy.

61 Trubek, Environmental Defense.

62 See n. 17 supra.


Hueter, for example, claims that "business and industry (was) suffering as well as individual taxpayers." (hereinafter Hueter interview).


64Quoted in Mid-Atlantic Legal Foundation, Defending Your Rights at 1 (no date).

65Momoisse interview. According to Momoisse, then a California state attorney general, while he and Ronald Zumbrun, then in the Department of Welfare, were lobbying for and later litigating to uphold then Gov. Ronald Reagan's controversial welfare reforms, they came into contact with liberal public interest law firms, whose purpose was to "entirely destroy the governor's reform programs." During the same period that they were doing "battle with these groups," the state Chamber recognized the need for an independent public interest law firm and thus appointed a committee which in turn recommended establishment of PLF with Momoisse and Zumbrun as its first two attorneys.

66According to Hueter, the PLF was founded "to fight fire with fire." Hueter interview.

67Momoisse, Public Interest Law, paper delivered at the University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wisconsin, at 7-8 (April 3, 1980).
In fact PLF's first legal action involved contesting a preliminary injunction that was sought to stop the use of DDT to end the spread of a moth epidemic. Momboisse interview.

For example, in Kleppe v. Sierra Club, 427 U.S. 390 (1976), the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund argued that the Department of the Interior's exemption of coal reserve developers from the filing of an environmental impact statement violated the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970. While the Sierra Club's position was supported by an amicus curiae brief from the Environmental Defense Fund, the Supreme Court chose to adopt arguments of the PLF and U.S. government by upholding the Interior Department's exemption. See also Pacific Legal Foundation, Annual Report (1981).

Hueter interview.


Momboisse interview.

Id.

Hueter interview.

Id. See also National Legal Center for the Public Interest, 1980 Annual Report, inside cover, (hereinafter NCLPI, 1980 Report).

Interview with attorneys at Mountain States Legal Foundation and Capital Legal Foundation. In fact, according to Momboisse, PLF has never been affiliated with NLCPI and it was "questionable how much help the NLCPI actually provided to the other groups." Momboisse interview.

Interview with Kate Kimball, staff attorney at Capital Legal Foundation in Washington, D.C. (Nov. 3, 1982). (hereafter, Kimball interview).

Mr. Blackburn also was an unsuccessful Republican primary candidate for the Governorship of Ga. in 1982.


Id.


Hueter interview.

Singer, *Liberal Firms*.

Hueter and Momboisse interviews.

In fact, Mountain States was one of the last firms founded because of the lengthy search for a lawyer that was "savy politically." Additionally, its founders wanted a "westerner" who would be able to "litigate federal laws west of the 100th meridian." Interview with Chip Mellor, acting president of the Mountain States Legal Foundation, in Denver, Colo. (Sept. 2, 1982).


97MSLF, Summary at 9.

98Mountain States Legal Foundation, The Change and the Challenge at 4.

99Unreported case noted in MSLF, Summary.


101See n. 100, supra. Additionally, the WLF litigates in a far wider range of issue areas. For example, unlike any of the other firms, it participates in crime victims and abortion litigation. In fact, it even has a Crime Victims Program.


104In fact, the Washington, D.C. based Heritage Foundation sponsors monthly luncheons to bring a wide range of conservative litigators together to discuss strategy, cases pending, etc. Additionally, Huetter has noted that the NLCPI has continued to exist "so the right hand (knows) what the left hand (is) doing." Huetter interview.

105According to Momboisse, for example, the PLF has "seldom gone into litigation that the other public interest law firms are doing because there's only a limited amount of manpower . . . when the same view is being presented." Momboisse interview.
Goldman, Constitutional Law and Supreme Court Decision-Making at 542-543 (1982).

See pp. 11-12, infra.

See n. 106, supra.

National Legal Center for the Public Interest, What They Are Saying ... About the Work of NLCPI (hereinafter NLCPI, What They Are Saying) notes that Justice O'Connor has written "I will be pleased to receive and read the WATCH REPORT. It should help me keep abreast of current concerns affecting the judiciary."

It should also be noted that several former members of Congress also serve on the Boards of many regional centers thus providing important access to the legislative branch. For example, former U.S. Senator Clifford Hansen and former Rep. Wayne Aspinall both serve on the Board of Directors of MSLF.

In fact according to Solicitor General Lee, perhaps the "greatest measure" of the success of conservative litigators, is their placement of supporters in the executive branch. Interview with Rex E. Lee in Washington, D.C. (Sept. 13, 1982).


Singer, Liberal Firms. See also Clark, After a Decade of Doing Battle, Public Interest Law Firms Show Their Age, 12 National J. 1136 (1980). Firms particularly in danger are those funded by the Legal Services Corporation. They include: Center for Law and Education; Center
on Social Welfare Policy and Law; Disability Rights Education & Defense
Fund; Food Research and Action Center (FRAC); Handicapped Persons Legal
Support Unit; Indian Law Support Center, Native American Rights Fund;
Mental Health Law Project; Migrant Legal Action Program; National Center
for Immigrants' Rights; National Center on Women and Family Law; National
Center for Youth Law; National Consumer Law Center; National Economic
Development and Law Center; National Employment Law Project; National
Health Law Program; National Housing Law Project; National Senior Citizens
Law Center; National Social Science and Law Center; and National Veterans
Legal Services Project.

114Stover, Public Interest Bar.

115See n. 53 infra.

116Kristol, Public Interest Law: An Overview in Institute for
Educational Affairs, Perspectives on Public Interest Law, Foundation
IEA, Perspectives). Also Kimble and Mellor interviews.

117Horowitz, In Defense of Public Interest Law in IEA Perspectives
at 7-8.

118Interview with Michael Horowitz in Washington, D.C. (Jan. 13,
1983). It should be noted, however, that some firms are beginning to make
inroads in this area. For example, the WLF is actively pursuing ties with
law schools and academics, Washington Legal Foundation, untitled at 16
(1981). Additionally, some firms have attempted to recruit law school
faculty to serve on their advisory boards. For example, Thomas Morgan,
Dean of the Emory Law School serves on the Legal Advisory Board of SELF
and formerly served on the Board of the Mid-America Legal Foundation.
Horowitz, The Public Interest Law Movement: An Analysis with
Special Reference to the Role and Practices of Conservative Public

See n. 32, supra. Additionally, the New Mexico Law School
assisted the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Funds efforts
to establish a branch office in Albuquerque, New Mexico. MALDEF, Los Anos
Dias (no date). The WRP of the ACLU also has close ties with New York
City area law schools.

Additionally, several law schools offer scholarships to students
who plan to pursue careers in liberal public interest law. Perhaps one of
the most well-known of those programs is the Root-Tilden Scholarship
program offered at New York University. The Reginald Heber Smith
Fellowship program administered at the Howard Law School also has played
an important role in training public interest lawyers.

It should be noted, however, that several conservative firms now
have internship programs to facilitate the training of, and strengthen
ties with, several law schools. For example, in 1978, PLF established a
College for Public Interest Law, which awards law school graduates with
one to two year fellowships at PLF office. Grants to College of Public

See generally, IEA Perspectives. One area of particular
controversy among conservative firms is the acceptance of attorneys fees
awards particularly under the Equal Access to Justice Act. MSLF, for
example, remains philosophically opposed to recovery from the government
but according to one MSLF attorney, a failure to seek reimbursement for
attorneys fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act would be "cutting off
their nose to spite their face." Interview with Norman * MSLF staff attorney in Denver, Colo. (Sept. 4, 1982). Also, while PLF accepts awards of attorneys fees, in contrast to liberal firms, these awards account for "less than 5 percent of its income. Bob Best of PLF quoted in Jackson, Paying Lawyers to Sue the Government at 682. In contrast, NLCPI, has encouraged member firms not to seek recovery of fees. In fact, NLCPI attorneys have rejected requests from liberal firms to work cooperatively for increasing legislative and judicial acceptance of fee provisions. Huester interview.

123Horowitz, for example, has specifically criticized the regional foundations' reliance on amicus curiae briefs because he believes that their briefs "made no substantial difference in outcomes," but were merely propaganda tools. In Defense of Public Interest Law in IEA, Perspectives at 7-8.

124Silverman, Public Interest Law vs. Judicial Self-Restraint in IEA, Perspectives at 18.