

Episode 9: Global Thinking with Margaret Young.

Mimi is an Events and Engagement co-opt for the GLSA.

Margaret is a professor at Melbourne Law School who specialises in public international law, the law of the sea, international trade law and climate change law.

Mimi: The GLSA acknowledges that the land is situated on stolen Wurundjeri land of the Kulin Nation, of which sovereignty was never ceded. We pay our respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

[music]

Mimi: Welcome to the GLSA's Think Global: Careers in International Law podcast series. My name is Mimi, and I am one of the co-opts in the GLSA's Events and Engagement portfolio. Today we are very lucky to be joined by Margaret Young. Margaret is a professor at the Melbourne Law School and the Director of Studies for environmental law. She also specialises in public international law, the law of the Sea, International trade law and climate change law. Margaret is also an academic consultant to the World Bank's Blue Economy Program and serves as a member of the International Expert Group for the proposed United Nations Global Pact for the Environment. She's also an award-winning author and has also worked for the Department of Foreign Affairs. Margaret, we are so grateful to have you on the podcast today.

Thank you for joining us.

Margaret: Thank you Mimi. It's great to be here.

Mimi: I guess the first question we always like to start with is why did you initially decide to study law?

Margaret: Sure. Yeah, so I definitely didn't set out to become a professor of law at the Melbourne Law School. In fact, I didn't really know what I wanted to do as a career growing up. I knew I wanted to do something that related to the environment, perhaps because I watched David Attenborough on the ABC most Sunday nights. But I kept an open mind at the end of VCE. I didn't want to just fall into law because I had the marks and in fact I'd started degrees in science and arts at the University of Melbourne after my VCE subjects, I guess that were my best subjects, physics and literature. But then after one year I transferred into Arts law, I realised the advocacy skills in law were going to be really useful and I could perhaps further my interest in science and the environment through law rather than the lab. And this has proved to be a really good decision because I see how many of our environmental problems are to do with economic, cultural and social practises which the law shapes and responds to, but the law also has to be receptive and understand science. Another thing about

environmental problems is that they are really very rarely nationally bounded, so think of climate change or marine plastic pollution. So international law is an important area to understand, both in terms of its potential and its limits.

Mimi: With that goal in mind, how did you start your career?

Margaret: So directly after university, my first job was as a judge's associate, so I had met Chief Justice Michael Black, as he then was, at a Melbourne law school prize giving ceremony, in fact, he was handing out the prizes and I was awarded the prize for environmental law that year. He had been counsel for the Wilderness Society in a Tasmanian Dams Case, so perhaps he was interested in me on that basis, but on the basis of meeting him, I was inspired to apply to work for him. I deferred the articles that I had been offered at Freehills and I took up that position at Freehills after a year of being a judge's associate. And actually, what I always say to students these days is if you are interested in being a judge's associate, it's probably wise to do your trainee position with the law firm first, at least for a year, and then transfer across to be a judge's associate because the learning curve straight after university is always really steep and it might be better to travel that curve with a group rather than solely as the person responsible directly to the judge. But yeah, it was a fantastic year. I learned a lot about the federal court and about the Federation, so the Chief Justice has duties that are sort of broader than just court work. I did get to sit in on appeals, I also assisted in his work with the Attorney General travelling to the registries. Even at that time seeing his work designing the new Commonwealth Law Court on William Street. So yeah, it was a really fantastic year. After that year I then went across to Freehills to work for a range of practises and I mainly focused on litigation.

Mimi: Those sound like really good experiences. Did anything spark your interest or what goals did you have after that?

Margaret: Yeah. Well, I was really open at that stage. I was open to practise, especially litigation. So I was considering staying in a law firm environment. I was also open to the option of going to the bar and yeah, I wasn't really considering academia at that stage, but in terms of the subject areas, I guess I was really just open to trying to assist in global problems and I was finding that the law firm was intellectually extremely stimulating, but the problems were very much shaped by the practise of the corporate clients, and if I wanted to devote time and energy to broader problems, there wasn't always scope to do that. Sometimes the interests of the environment align with the interests of corporate clients but not always. In academia, on the other hand, you get a chance to really choose the problems that you want to address and really broaden out your interests and your expertise. So I decided at some point after about three years at Freehills to apply to do a Masters and I was successful in getting a scholarship to Cambridge and I think it was probably halfway into the Masters program that

I realised that academia was extremely stimulating and liberating in terms of the types of legal questions that I could pursue. So I applied for a PhD.

Mimi: Wow, how was it studying internationally? For any students that are sort of thinking about making that move, what kind of advice do you have or what were the things that surprised you or excited you?

Margaret: Yeah, well, I think studying internationally is a wonderful opportunity. And I know that with your association there will be people who are really open to that. It doesn't even have to be at the postgraduate stage. So for example, my first experience studying abroad was when I did an exchange program in Yogyakarta in Indonesia as part of my arts degree. So I had a major in Bahasa and that was an absolute eye opener. Experiencing Indonesia as a young student was amazing. Seeing the different cultural practises, the constraints for a developing country in trying to meet the needs of its population, the pollution, the historic aspects like visiting Bandung, seeing the site of the Bandung Conference for a new international economic order, that was really eye opening. I also spent a semester in my law degree in Amsterdam at the University of Amsterdam. That was an exchange opportunity. I really liked to pursue the connection between Indonesia and Amsterdam, thinking through the impact of colonialism, the effects of colonialism in both countries. So in Indonesia and then in Amsterdam, one of the richest cities on the basis of that international trade historically. There's a wonderful book by Gilbert Rist on the history of development, it's called "From Western Origins to Global Faith". In those countries and of course being in Australia, one really gets a sense of the development project, what that might mean for international law. And yeah, having that kind of tangible experience on the ground, I think is really really useful.

Mimi: What kind of interest did you run with then? Now you had that kind of scope to decide what your passions were.

Margaret: Yeah, so I guess there were a lot of connections that I didn't expect. So for example, the year after my masters at Cambridge, I interned for the United Nations at the International Law Commission in Geneva, and I found that my training in the law firm was really, really useful for the UN, so some of work practises that I'd accrued were really beneficial and I think I was adding a lot of value to the work because of the law firm experience. But yeah, the Masters of Law was a really great opportunity to study international law in depth, and I guess one of the attractions of Cambridge was the opportunity to work with the late Judge James Crawford. So he was very open and encouraging to junior scholars interested in international law. In fact, in my Masters program I organised a class trip to the Hague to view his oral submissions in one of the ICJ cases at the time, the Oil Platforms dispute between the US and Iran. And yeah, things like that, just sort of taking the opportunity to see international law from different angles. I guess another experience was when I finished the Amsterdam study I

stayed on in the city to intern at Greenpeace International which has its headquarters in Amsterdam and that was an opportunity to see inside an NGO and to sort of experience the disjuncture in especially oceans governance, where Greenpeace was fielding vessels to go and kind of monitor the illegal fishing and reporting back to the United Nations on the contact that they had found. So it was a matter of an NGO informing an international organisation who would then kind of notify the States and that was really this kind of the topsy turvy position of international law. One expects it to be kind of governed by states, but particularly in the realm of the environment it's often the NGOs that are providing the kind of alert that there are gaps in the law or gaps in implementation. So the ability to see how international lawyers are operating from the perspective of a State International organisation, NGO and then down on the ground in the cities and regions, I think is really, really important.

Mimi: That's so interesting. I've always looked at Greenpeace and thought that I'd love to see how that plays out, as you're saying on the international stage, and how they influence States. Do you think there were any valuable skills that you took from your law degree or law studies and how do they sort of play out in these either NGOs or at the UN?

Margaret: So I think a law degree is excellent training providing rigour, a willingness to read mountains of text. That is definitely something that we develop as lawyers, not to be fearful of mountains of text, knowing that you actually do have to put the time into reading. So if you think domestic cases are hard, once you get to some of the WTO decisions which can be a thousand pages, you know, you really know that you're being trained to spend the time, to have the patience and to just put your intellectual resources into an exercise. So legal training, I think, is really important internationally and also just the kind of sort of cultural awareness. So law is a discipline that operates in a social and cultural context, we know that, or hopefully we know that going through our law degrees. Getting that sort of critical awareness, and even that sort of exposure to the theory is important. I know that that does sound sort of counter intuitive if you're thinking of my career, practically engaged in so many different projects of international organisations and states. But actually I think a theoretical overview and understanding is so important. If I can drop a quote from one of my favourite Cambridge lecturers Philip Allott, he used to say "people who think they are practical people speak theory in everything they say, whether they know it or not". It probably took me a few years of practise to actually really understand how theory was in everything that we did and the way in which I think hopefully Melbourne Law School graduates are trained to think critically and to step back from the detail and to think of the overarching theoretical framework is really, really important. It's especially important in global problems like climate change because societal transformations are going to be needed, and if you can't spot and understand the theoretical frames in which we are working, especially the sort of economic assumptions globally, then there won't be an opportunity to make those transformations.

Mimi: That's amazing advice. Is there anything that has surprised you or things that were important that in the end you thought wouldn't be important, or vice versa?

Margaret: Well, yeah, there's a lot that I have come to realise is really important. So I guess one of the big issues that I've devoted a lot of time in my scholarship on is the fragmentation of international law and that's the tendency for law to be kind of siloed in disciplinary areas. For example, the Law of the Sea is very devoted to oceans' issues, but increasingly we realised that it's our conduct on land that is causing so many of the problems in the oceans. Climate change is an obvious one, but also marine plastic pollution. So we can't just look at Law of the Sea without thinking about our governance of land and our conduct on the land and I think that it's very important to understand the linkages between different areas of the law but also practically to think through the people who are involved in these areas of law. They might carry particular biases. So for example Mimi, if your training was as a conservation biologist, you're going to be seeing things in a particular way, and that might be really kind of embraced by somebody working as an economist for the World Bank, but they might not immediately see it. They might have a blind spot for some of those issues. So some of the challenges to global problem solving is to try and reduce the blind spots, acknowledge that they will arise, acknowledge that values will be different, but there will be conflicts of norms and that there needs to be some kind of way to address and resolve these issues. The conflicts can never be completely reduced. Instead, I think there needs to be an openness about them and also an ability for lots of stakeholders to be included, not just the sovereign states. So, for example, if you're taking a conservation biologist perspective, again, the nonhuman stakeholders have to be included in discussion, so you have to think through the needs of say the ocean ecosystem. And in law, that's moving into really interesting directions like rights for nature, rights for rivers, rights for the mountains, even rights for the ocean. And if we can include that in a legal framework, then the outcomes will be very different. At the moment there are blind spots in the law which don't see the needs of the ecosystem. But structurally, that can be changed. Law is an artificial, human made discipline. It's not as if there's anything natural about what we've created and if we start to understand the blind spots and remove them, then I think we can get to a better place, particularly for the environment.

Mimi: Yeah, what I'm hearing is it's important to be aware of your own bias in your own perspective as well, and I guess when you're coming together in these multidisciplinary things there are always going to be little gaps, and I suppose as well, to not put yourself in a box. You're saying you're going to have to be aware and open of multiple disciplines when you're wanting to work internationally.

Margaret: Yeah, so it's disciplines definitely, so the lawyers, the economists, scientists, etc. It's also regimes, so regimes of law. And I've looked at international trade law as a regime that has to interact with the regimes that protect the environment like the convention on biological diversity for example, or the Law of the Sea, which is its own special regime. So

thinking through how those regimes of law interact is also a really important question that can reveal a lot about what needs to change from a legal perspective.

Mimi: Yeah, thank you so much. I'm doing Corporations Law now and I'm like, okay, so if a corporation can be a legal person, why can't a tree be a legal person, like come on? We've just created this artificial thing.

Margaret: Absolutely, and there's a lot of scholarship that says exactly that. So corporations were very early on, awarded this special status and actually in mediaeval times that special status was accorded to say animals. Animals did have particular rights, but they had fallen away and it might be time to investigate how to change that situation. Increasingly, the kind of beliefs and rituals and practises of Indigenous peoples recognised as being really important because oftentimes those beliefs and practises did lead to a much healthier relationship between humans and nonhuman species. So yeah, there's another area for the law to really open up and learn from.

Mimi: Yeah, I guess on that, what do you think are some of the opportunities out there for someone like me who is trying to combine these passions together on the international stage, where do you see good opportunities coming up, or where the law is moving towards at the moment?

Margaret: Yeah, I gave a keynote recently on a climate change and legal education conference, which is going to come out actually later this year in the Bond University (Queensland) Law Journal. So I penned some of these ideas about what law students should be thinking about moving forward, particularly given the climate crisis. And I think yeah, carrying the ability to think critically about these issues is going to be really important, including some kind of ethical or moral framework to evaluate some of these issues. So we see that, particularly when we think globally about environmental problems like climate change, the burdens faced by countries won't be equal. I think having experience in different countries is really important. So again, knowing that law is operating in a particular context. Finding perhaps some hope from different cultural practises that might be encouraged and laws and the legal system definitely needs to change to respond to the more hopeful practises of humans and to try and reduce the problematic consumption and production practises that we know are causing these environmental problems. So I think that was quite a high level answer to your question, but yeah, I don't want to hone in on a particular path. I think it's just really important to be open to where your skills might best be contributed and that I think is so iterative. I guess talking through the opportunities I've had in my career sort of shows that different things were arising at different points, and I sort of was very fortunate but also kind of open to those opportunities and that's how I've ended up doing the really interesting stuff that I do these days.

Mimi: Yeah, just when you touched on the countries who may be smaller countries, I just thought about the thing I saw about the Torres Strait Islanders and how serious problems are happening with water inundating, with the sea levels rising. And yeah, it's like obviously they're at the forefront of suffering the consequences.

Margaret: Yeah Mimi I mean, that's a really great example, because it sort of emphasises the point I made earlier about the different areas of law. Those Torres Strait Islanders as you know are now bringing a case to the Human Rights Committee, arguing that Australia is violating some of those obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, including the right to life because yeah, inundation is actually reducing their ability to live, but there's all kinds of cultural rights of minorities that are also impacted. I think you know a couple of decades ago we wouldn't have thought of human rights law as the natural home for climate change challenges legally, and yet there's been such an evolution and such a shift and human rights law is definitely a growth area, particularly for some of these claims and the domestic and international litigation that we're watching. And that's been really interesting as a lawyer to observe. So lawyers like me were really heavily involved in the conferences of the parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, heavily involved in the Paris Agreement, you know, looking to these ways for states to negotiate to find solutions. And yet, it's actually perhaps been more meaningful to have these domestic litigation cases go through the courts where it's a completely different branch of government you know that asked to address these issues, and that obviously has problems for separation of powers, but with the executive saying Australia being so slow to respond to the climate crisis, there is this energy to turn to the court system to try and address the very obvious gaps. I mean, if you're looking at the science, and if you're looking at the evidence coming from places like the Torres Strait you realise yes, there's massive gaps here. Then there has to be societal change and law is a home for that.

Mimi: Yeah, I love what you said about human rights lawyers as well, because I always thought that's not me, I'm into the environment, I don't do refugees and stuff, that's not my thing, but knowing that that's actually maybe where, like you're saying, more meaningful changes can start being pushed from a different angle.

Margaret: Absolutely. There was an American Society of International Law panel that I was on earlier this year called 'We are all climate lawyers now', and so it was very interesting. We were able to discuss how there's not one model of a climate change lawyer you know. It used to be that you were a climate change lawyer if you kind of knew the laws that were devoted to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. That was kind of UNCCC and its associated mechanisms. And yet now we see that tort lawyers are climate lawyers, human rights lawyers are climate lawyers, and it goes on and on. Corporate lawyers, definitely with this task force on disclosure and all of these other associated reforms for directors' duties. Corporate lawyers are climate lawyers. I think yeah if you're ever attracted to making your career into a

noun, that could be a problem, and it might be much better to be the verb, so you're practising law, or you're theorising about the law, or you're doing both hopefully and you're doing it in a whole range of different areas, and that is, I think, a really important thing to remember.

Mimi: That's awesome. I guess it's like wherever you are, whatever path you're taken down if you're still interested in these issues, you could probably find something within that to be doing some sort of meaningful work. I guess touching on Indigenous communities, I know one of your books was the impact of climate change mitigation on Indigenous and forest communities and it really struck me as an interesting intersection between the two. Would you mind just telling us a bit about it and maybe what inspired this one?

Margaret: Sure, yeah. Well first off I should say that that book was the result of a project that was funded by the Australian Research Council, which was awarded to four of us here at their Melbourne Law School, and one of the best things about that project was the opportunity to work very closely with my MLS colleagues. So Kirsty Gover, Lee Godden, Maureen Teehan and I were interested to look at these climate change mitigation mechanisms that might impact on indigenous or forest dwelling communities in particular ways. This sort of came about from the scientific realisation that greenhouse gas emissions could be reduced through carbon sinks, so it's not just a question of reducing the emissions from factories and so on, but it's also about sucking the carbon from the atmosphere in forests or mangroves. This is known as 'carbon sequestration' and it's recognised to be an effective way to reduce the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and hopefully to lead to some kind of mitigation of what is a very drastic runaway greenhouse gas effect. So the mechanism that's been developed internationally is called REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation). And so this is a funding mechanism which is aimed to support countries to stop cutting down their forests essentially, with the realisation that sort of money has to be paid because there will be opportunity costs for those countries if they're not going to be cutting their forests for timber, or, you know, cutting their forests to create agricultural land, they might need some financial support to make those decisions. So it's an economic approach. It's part of a, I guess an area called payment for ecosystem services that grew up in the environmental law kind of space a few years ago, recognising that there might be a need for financial incentives rather than just kind of requiring countries to protect their forests in particular ways which hadn't been effective so far. There hasn't ever been an International Convention to protect forests for example, though there have been efforts to try and get one up. So with this financial mechanism, it seemed attractive to the economists. However, there was an important aspect which was to consider that there were people living in the forests already, perhaps using the forest for subsistence, or for their own economic needs, and so creating a financial mechanism was going to be problematic unless the needs of those people were taken into account and somehow recognised. And perhaps if there were benefits to this mechanism it was important to ensure that those benefits flowed down to the people for whom this mechanism was going to be most impacting, and that was going to be in the form

of some kind of access to benefit sharing, But of course there was also the issue that perhaps these people in the forest didn't want their forests to be to be used in this way, so you know the risk identified by some was that indigenous peoples or other forest dwelling communities were going to be shut out of the very forests that they've been inhabiting. And indeed this was a fear in some parts of the world. So we wanted to do work that was really empirically based where it actually looked at countries on the ground, so that involved interviews in particular countries, but it also involved us talking to the international organisations that were implementing these schemes. So the World Bank has a forest carbon partnership facility, which is lending money to try and give effect to this REDD+ scheme. The United Nations also set up a body called UN REDD+ which was a coalition between the United Nations Development Program, the United Nations Environment Program and the Food and Agriculture Organisation that was going to implement a different funding stream. So once we conducted a lot of the interviews and read through a lot of the implementation documents and sort of saw on the ground how these programs were operating so differently in different contexts we realised we couldn't say, you know a binary conclusion 'yes, REDD+ was good', 'no REDD+ was bad', but instead see how contextual this was, how human rights and indigenous rights were really important. So there's a concept called free prior and informed consent or FPIC that operates and has particularly been recognised in the indigenous rights discourse and including in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples at the UN. And we saw how FPIC was going to be so necessary for the implementation of REDD+, like giving an opportunity for groups to consent. So it was really important to see you know to follow it through to see how these schemes might work from start to finish. We can't really say finish because this scheme is designed to have longevity to ensure that the carbon is sequestered for 25, 50 or 100 years. But yeah it was really interesting for us to see how it's not just a matter of thinking about the framework, but it's also important to see the implementation of the scheme.

Mimi: Yeah, wow. It sounds like an incredible experience to be on the ground in countries and comparing what you see there with the institutions and what kind of frameworks they are coming up with.

Margaret: Yeah, it was really interesting to see the Australian context too, because although we don't have REDD+ funding, we're not a developing country that sort of qualifies under this climate scheme, we do have projects in Australia that aim for carbon sequestration. So there is a framework which is seeking to engage in consultation with affected communities. And to think through how that aligns with the existing native title framework was really interesting, and to see how Australia actually has got some schemes like fire management schemes, which do promise quite a lot in terms of climate mitigation. So again, the scientific work supporting indigenous practises for fire management which show that there's mitigation potential in those types of techniques.

Mimi: Yeah I did a lot of fire management in conservation biology. It was a really big focus, it's really interesting. I wanted to ask you more personally, you obviously do so many different things and work on really challenging topics. Do you ever find the climate change work gets a little bit draining if you're not seeing a lot of changes, or how do you kind of cope with working a field that obviously can be a little disheartening especially with Australia's political approach with it at the moment?

Margaret: Yeah, thanks for that question Mimi. I talk about this a lot actually and indeed there are people in academia, who are working much more at the coalface than me, the scientists who are looking at you know the coral reefs being destroyed. And for sure it's difficult to keep optimistic, and that can have impacts on mental health for sure. In the keynote that I gave on climate change and legal education, I talk about some of this, I mean, having had the experience of a decade of teaching, climate change law and every year revising my lecture notes to talk through what Australia is doing, you know when we abolish the clean energy framework, you know I had to kind of account for this position that was so counter to what was needed. That was in the Abbott government. Yeah, and so every year I have to sort of muster the strength to look through the Australian domestic response and to recognise how underpar it is. But on the other hand we talk through some of the initiatives, some of the developments you know, it's a very comparative course, so we look at different jurisdictions, and there's been some highlights. We look at the British Columbia carbon tax and how that achieved popularity, even under a conservative regime. We look at the carbon trading opportunities and what can be learned from the Clean Development mechanism. The fact that solar technology is improving, yeah all those kinds of things. I mean we do try and have the overview, but definitely on balance it's not going to be positive. Yeah, I tend to finish that class actually with a trip to the museum, because collectively we're all feeling a bit down. Obviously this year and last we couldn't do that because of COVID. So I can, you know, predict that I'll have to think of some new strategies to keep everybody's spirits high. But yeah, there's lots of literature now about what academics are trying to do for self care if they're working in climate space, yeah.

Mimi: Yeah thanks for that. You're right, I guess we just have to try and find some things that are going in the right direction. So I guess where is next for you in terms of your career, maybe in terms of any goals?

Margaret: Sure. So as you mentioned, I'm currently working with the World Bank on its Blue Economy program, and that's been really interesting as an opportunity to work practically through some of those theoretical frameworks. So regime interaction, for example, is happening on the ground with this work I'm doing. We've actually bought in the Food and Agriculture Organisation, International Seabed Authority and the UN division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, who are working with the World Bank on Ocean Governance. And I think that's so important because each of those organisations has a particular focus and

perspective, but they're all very aware of the broader issues for ocean governance, particularly the environmental problems. So that's been really interesting to kind of be out there in the international organisational space. I team that of course with my law school teaching in the Masters and in the JD. It's always great to see the diversity of students and the interest that they bring and the perspectives that they bring. I've been working on a project with Hilary Charlesworth, so another great opportunity I had to work with a Melbourne Law School colleague. We're working on the International Court of Justice and looking at Australia's engagement historically, so that's a project that really has emphasised the utility of an historical perspective, understanding how Australia arrived at the Court as an applicant or as a respondent and what the resolution of those disputes has meant for Australia. We work through archives, but we also interview some of the key protagonists who have been involved in the cases, and it's been extremely interesting to see the role of international law in domestic life. I think often the international is quite hidden, but through the work that we've done, we've actually shown that it did play quite an important part in the positions Australia has taken over time. Hillary, of course, has now been nominated to be a judge on the International Court of Justice. So whatever happens with that election, which I think is happening in November, we hope to get our book finished and published, which will I think give some more insights into the position that the International Court of Justice has in national affairs, not just in Australia, I should say, but globally. And we've also got a special issue coming out in the Melbourne Journal of International Law, which is run by some of your colleagues here at the law school, and that's looking at national encounters, not just in Australia, but looking comparatively at other jurisdictions as well. So we were really delighted to get a team of authors together for that special issue. There's ongoing work, of course. You mentioned the global pact for the environment, which is something that I'm still very engaged with, that's working its way through the United Nations and with I guess so many environmental crises this year, not just in Australia, but in Europe and in Asia, there might be more of an appetite for the kinds of initiatives that that global pact is proposing and the COVID crisis I think has also brought a lot more awareness of the interconnectedness not just between countries, but between environmental issues. So the fact that disease is thought to have been sourced from maltreatment of animals, you know it's obviously an unknown at this stage, but it does seem that the biodiversity crisis and the treatment of animals is linked to the propensity for pandemic diseases. So I think there's lots of scope for lawyers to work through those issues.

Mimi: Wow, yeah that all sounds really, really exciting. Thank you so much for everything you've discussed with us today. I've been really inspired. It's been really, really interesting to speak about the amazing work you're doing, so thank you very much.

Margaret: Great to talk, Mimi. I hope to see you and others around the law school face to face at some point in the future, not too far away.

Mimi: Fingers crossed.

[music]

Mimi: Thank you for listening to this episode of the Think Global series. In the episode notes you can find links to several things Margaret mentioned. You can also find these on our Facebook page.