World Trade Review (2016), 15: 3, 407–408
© Alan Sykes doi:10.1017/S1474745616000161

For John: In Tribute to a Great Scholar and Friend

ALAN SYKES
Stanford University

I first came to know John Jackson in his role as a consultant to the international trade group at Arnold & Porter. Fresh out of law school and a novice in the field of international trade law, I quickly learned that John was the leading American expert on legal aspects of both GATT and domestic trade law issues. Only later did I come to realize that his stature in this regard was global. John's advice on GATT issues was sought after by academics and policymakers everywhere.

After my transition to academia, John graciously involved me in his multi-faceted intellectual endeavors at the University of Michigan. I remember numerous events in Ann Arbor, invariably populated by the most distinguished scholars in international economics. These events introduced me for the first time to such luminaries as Bob Stern, Alan Deardorff, Anne Krueger, and Gene Grossman, among many others. At a time when 'law and economics' was still a controversial endeavor at many law schools, John recognized the centrality of both disciplines to the study of trade and commercial policy and seeded the rich process of cross fertilization that continues apace.

But John was, above all, a first-rate lawyer. His classic 1969 tome *World Trade and the Law of GATT* remains a core reference in the field, and occupies a place of honor on my shelf. Nearing a half-century old, it is still the place to turn for an understanding of the origins of core GATT obligations.

He also developed the first comprehensive casebook on international trade law for law students, *International Economic Relations*, now in its sixth edition. Bill Davey joined him early in the project, and I was thrilled to join them a few years later. The book has many fine competitors today, but it pioneered the idea that GATT law was a field unto itself worthy of careful study by young lawyers. As with John's other projects, his commitment to interdisciplinarity infused the pedagogy. Many of the chapters begin with a survey of the policy issues in play from an economic perspective. The careful attention to policy ahead of legal detail reflected John's commitment to understanding the core logic of the law (or lack thereof in some instances, as with antidumping law) as much as the doctrinal details that occupy the time of most trade lawyers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474745616000161 Published online by Cambridge University Press

John was further committed to promoting the 'rule of law' as the alternative to 'power diplomacy' in international economic relations. He lamented the ability of large countries or blocs to hold sway over weaker trading partners, and the unilateralism that became more conspicuous over time. The United States, in particular, was something of a bully in John's view, especially in the waning years of GATT. He diligently promoted the idea that neutral adjudication was preferable, and was committed to strengthening the GATT dispute resolution system. His 1990 Chatham House book, *Restructuring the GATT System*, was in many ways a roadmap from the GATT to the WTO, and contributed greatly to jumpstarting a political process that culminated in the creation of the WTO and especially the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding.

Finally, John was determined to grow the field intellectually. He was always on the hunt for interesting younger scholars, and was generous with his time in helping them along. John also believed that a widely read peer-reviewed outlet for international economic law scholars was desperately needed, and took it upon himself to create and administer the Journal of International Economic Law, where he remained Editor in Chief until he was no longer able. The steady growth and expansion of its editorial and advisory boards during John's tenure is testimony to the success of the endeavor, and to the increasing depth and excellence of the field that was in many way's John's creation.

All of us in the academy aspire to achieve a level of scholarly distinction, but precious few can rise to the undisputed king of the hill in their field. Even fewer can say that they were substantially responsible for creating and nurturing an entire field of law. All of those things may be said of John Jackson. Ideas matter, and John's have mattered a lot. I will miss him.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474745616000161 Published online by Cambridge University Press