

Michigan Journal of International Law

Volume 20 | Issue 2

1999

Remarks on John H. Jackson for a Celebratory Dinner at the University of Michigan Law School, Feb 25, 1998. (Slightly Revised, Jan 17, 1999)

Alan V. Deardorff
University of Michigan

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil>



Part of the [International Trade Law Commons](#), and the [Legal Biography Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alan V. Deardorff, *Remarks on John H. Jackson for a Celebratory Dinner at the University of Michigan Law School, Feb 25, 1998. (Slightly Revised, Jan 17, 1999)*, 20 MICH. J. INT'L L. 103 (1999).

Available at: <http://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol20/iss2/4>

This Tribute is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Journal of International Law by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

**REMARKS ON JOHN H. JACKSON FOR A
CELEBRATORY DINNER AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL, FEB 25, 1998.
(SLIGHTLY REVISED, JAN 17, 1999)**

*Alan V. Deardorff**

By knowing John, I have gained knowledge and insight into many areas of the world and life that I would still be ignorant of without him. Like most international trade economists of my era, I knew little of the real-world institutions of international trade from my training. I learned about these institutions from John. Today's students, even in economics, know more than I ever did about them because they have read at least one of John's books. And I will be forever grateful to him (and also to Bob Stern, I should say) for dragging me, kicking and screaming sometimes, into the real world.

But John has educated me about much more than just the GATT and the WTO. From the time he started asking me to do a couple of guest lectures on comparative advantage and trade policy in his trade law course, we have gone afterwards to the Law School faculty lounge, where I have seen the true difference between his world and mine. In economics, we have no lounge, and I am confident that if we did it would not have half the amenities, nor one-tenth the class, that the law faculty enjoys.

Our conversations in that lounge have also sometimes touched on law-school politics, and that too was enlightening. At one time it made me feel that I was lucky to be in a department that was more easy-going and did not take things so seriously. Of course, that was some years ago.

My real introduction to the world through John, however, came not here in the law school but when we began to travel to Washington, with the students that we taught in our joint seminar—his seminar, really, in which he kindly invited me to share. Much more memorable than John's patient explanations of Super 301 and Article XIX were the places and people that he introduced me to in Washington.

All over that city, government officials, trade lawyers and practitioners would fall all over themselves to provide us with hospitality. At the Senate Finance Committee we were allowed to sit in the senators' chairs. At the office of USTR (what would be the Ministry of Interna-

* John W. Sweetland Professor of International Economics, Professor of Economics and Public Policy, Department of Economics and School of Public Policy, University of Michigan. B.S. 1966, Stanford; M.A. 1969, Cornell; Ph.D. 1971 Cornell.—Ed.

tional Trade in any other country), each year they gave us breakfast and paraded their best and brightest before us because they wanted to impress, and to thank, John. Even the enemies of liberal trade in the Commerce Department treated John as a god and made me wonder a bit about what he had done for them. Embassies welcomed us, law firms coddled us—all because John is the man that they count on to make sense of the nonsense that is trade policy. Perhaps most indelibly, John's lawyer friends at the International Trade Commission made it very clear to myself and to my economics students what they thought of economists. As I say, it was an education!

John and I have also struggled on two occasions to attempt joint research. The first time, once we had both written our parts of what was to be a joint product, we sensibly decided to leave them apart as two papers. More recently we tried harder to produce a joint product, and I think we more or less succeeded in finding agreement on content. We presented the paper at a conference, but we never finished our revisions, and I am afraid that John is probably still waiting for me to respond to one of his familiar lists of ideas. His ideas were always good, if somewhat cryptic, as he would dash them off on his computer.

That joint paper, incidentally, was the result of another process with John that I found unique and ultimately educational. For years when we taught his seminar together, we (usually John) would pick a topic from the law and economics of trade, and we would dedicate the seminar to that topic. Then we would both dig into it and try to make sense of it on our respective legal and economic terms. This process was very productive for me—I can point to at least six papers on my *c.v.* that were the direct result of working on these issues for that course. One year, however, John settled on a topic that was much less well-defined than before. He had, it seemed, a clear idea of what it was, but when he put it into words I, at least, only vaguely understood it. The title—I looked it up this afternoon—was “Problems of Regulating Economic Activity in a World of Increasing Economic Interdependence.” To a lawyer, undoubtedly, there are many issues this title does not cover, but to an economist, it sounded like it covered just about every aspect of economic policy and more.

We did the seminar twice on this topic with variations in the particular applications that we studied, and all the time, instead of trying to master the topic as I had tried in earlier years, I struggled primarily to understand what the topic was.

But in the end, I think I have got it. Not only that, the seminar has changed the way I look at economic policy in a whole variety of contexts. Today, instead of confining my attention narrowly to international

trade and trade policy, I find myself increasingly concerned with all sorts of other policies and the ways that they interact across national borders. That, I now think, is at least part of what John meant by that title.

There is much more than just economics and law that I have learned from John. One year, he told me about his analysis of the TIAA-CREF retirement plan, and since then I have trusted that his analysis made it unnecessary for me to think further about my own retirement. Another time he told me what he had learned about some medical condition of which we all should be aware. I do not remember what he said, but I assume that if I should be doing something about it, he would have told me, and I would have done it. So I must be fine, right?

In other words, John has been like a big brother (I actually have another big brother also named John, but he has not been nearly as useful), and I do not know what I will do now that I have to think about these things on my own. Of course, John is still on e-mail. So, I'm awfully glad to have this opportunity to thank John for the friend and the colleague that he has been to me. I hope that we will not lose touch. And yes, John, I am working on the paper I promised you for your journal.