

This discussion, in October/November 2006, covers 'thinking like a lawyer'; the relationship between brain structure and function (and the fact that may change during law school!), and behavior; and related, published and forthcoming material. LK

On Fri, 27 Oct 2006, Jill Breslau wrote:

> I've only recently joined the list; I am researching a book about legal
> education and the practice. One inquiry I'm involved in is the notion of
> "thinking like a lawyer." Has anyone defined that to the general
> satisfaction of legal educators? Has anyone outlined the educational
> theories and teaching practices that carry out the mandate of teaching
> students to think like lawyers? Thanks for your help. Jill Breslau
>
> --
> Jill H. Breslau, J.D., M.A.
> 2018 Helena St.
> Madison, WI 53704
>
> 608-241-7114 I started, last week, to send an email about what we can do to teach students how to remain more connected to the role of emotions despite law school's best attempts to make students contemplate only the logical. As I have concluded after years of teaching, thinking like a lawyer includes not just analyzing the law, but also assessing the assumptions or automatic fill-in with mental imagery that the audience does when the lawyer doesn't present enough detail. We use our own past experiences to fill in gaps so that we can create order out of chaos. Thus, beyond the law, the lawyering happens in the storytelling.

As a result, my teaching method, with my writing students and my clinical students, is to work through lawyering situations in which the students understand that it is critical to develop the client's theory of the case by fact investigation and subsequent storytelling. When the students start to get too sterile in their legal analysis I constantly remind them to step back and think through things as a layperson. In that way, the students learn (I hope) that the best lawyers do not "play a character" but are there as the narrators. I also suggest to my students that the story's theme might work better if it taps into one that the audience is already familiar with.

I just published an article on the subject of archetypal psychology and lawyering. The reprints just arrived a week ago. So far the article is not yet available on Westlaw but you can see it on SSRN.

Harry Potter, Ruby Slippers and Merlin: Telling the Client's Story using the Characters and Paradigm of the Archetypal Hero's Journey, 29 Seattle University Law Review 767 (Summer 2006) Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=931067>

Good luck with your project!

Ruth Anne Robbins

Ruth Anne Robbins
Clinical Associate Professor of Law
Rutgers School of Law – Camden
217 N. 5th Street
Camden, NJ 08102-1203
ruthanne@camden.rutgers.edu

You can access my papers on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) at <http://ssrn.com/author=603164>

-----Original Message-----

From: law-legal-ed-bounces@lists.fsu.edu [mailto:law-legal-ed-bounces@lists.fsu.edu] On Behalf Of Stephanie West Allen
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 11:51 AM
To: law-legal-ed@lists.fsu.edu
Subject: [Law-legal-ed] Additional thoughts on thinking like a lawyer

These are the rough notes for an upcoming blog post . . .

James Boyd White in his thought-provoking book *The Legal Imagination* looks at the relationship between the lawyer's language and the lawyer's mind. As a part of looking at that relationship, he discusses what is said about an event and what is not.

"The description of an event can go on forever and still be incomplete. . . . The new lawyer sees this as soon as he finds he must tell a real story and discovers that it can never be done, that there is always more to say . . . We shall return again and again [in his book] to the line that separates the expressed from the unexpressed, what can be said from what cannot."

White says that law school teaches a person what to cut out of a story.

Discussing the lawyer's distinct use and experience of language, White asks if the "peculiarities we observe" are due to the "existence of a discrete professional language with its own vocabulary and syntax" or to "habits of mind and ways of working that find expression in whatever verbal language the lawyer uses, even when he is talking, say, to his client or to a jury in ordinary English."

White then asks

"What relationship can the lawyer establish with these patterns of thought and language that he uses? Can he simply learn to use and master them without being somehow affected – perhaps controlled – by what he has learned? . . . What is the relationship between the lawyer and his mind?"

Given what we know about the brain today, the choices a lawyer makes about what is said and left unsaid, the language and syntax a lawyer uses, and the lawyer's "habits of mind" all change the brain of a lawyer. Thinking like a lawyer will physically change your brain.

Neuroplasticity (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neuroplasticity>) shows that our brains are changing all the time. If we change what we think about or how we think, new paths develop in our brain. If we get injured, new paths can develop to accommodate for the injury. When we have new experiences or learn something, our brains change. It was not so long ago that we thought that brains were hard-wired by the time a person left adolescence. The brain experts tell us that is not so.

Neural Darwinism (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neural_Darwinism) shows that the synapses we use are strengthened and those that we do not use atrophy and are lost.

What synapses are created and what are lost in law school?

>Hi Jill –

I may espouse an unpopular view, but I think that the problem is not thinking like a lawyer, but acting like one, or continuing to act in role at all times. Now, maybe it is impossible to split these things apart and perhaps we should debate that. From my own experience, the analytical and “diagnostic” skills that are the hallmark of thinking like a lawyer are powerful tools, and ones that I enjoy having. If we take our own clinical literature seriously, we share these tools with doctors. I don’t think those tools are the things that I identify as interfering with home life. And, I’m not aware that doctors believe that the power of diagnosis has ruined their life, but maybe there is – I’m not up on that community. For me, just the opposite is true, these tools have enriched my life and my insight to its mysteries to a great extent.

That said, I want to make clear that I have experienced the problem that I think you identify. Some examples of the problem are the tendency to cross examine instead of converse, and the tendency to try to behave as the objective and detached observer, the way that we behave with our clients rather than our friends. For lawyers in private practice, the need to be “on the clock” is also a problem. There also is a problem that relates to success equating with winning rather than satisfaction. These are just a few examples really. To me, I associate these problems with types of lawyering activities and the culture of law schools and law firms more than I do with analytical thinking.

Like I said, I think that we could have an interesting conversation about how the way we think or analyze legal issues influences how we feel and our values. But, from my own viewpoint, I have found some success in addressing the problems by being clearer about their genesis. The big question for me right now, is this: Is it possible to effectively teach legal skills and lawyering practice without creating the problems (and the attendant need to split life into roles to manage stress) that I enumerate above? I don’t know the answer, perhaps I never will.

At any rate, this was not entirely responsive to your initial post, but I hope it is helpful.

Victoria Chase
Clinical Associate Professor of Law
Rutgers School of Law - Camden

From: law-legal-ed-bounces@lists.fsu.edu [mailto:law-legal-ed-bounces@lists.fsu.edu] **On Behalf Of** Richard Zitrin
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 12:58 AM
To: 'Jill Breslau'; Law-LegalEd@lists.fsu.edu
Subject: Re: [Law-legal-ed] Question

Well, it may not answer your question, but I’ve always suggested that my students remember to think -- and feel -- like people.

Richard
RICHARD ZITRIN

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF LAW, UC HASTINGS

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR OF LAW, UNIV. OF SAN FRANCISCO
knew I’d just seen something on point, it’s “Thinking Like a Lawyer” PC Davis and Francois, 81 U.N.D. L.Rev. 795 (2005). She goes into the various human intelligences, and raises much of what Kate mentions re relational intelligence and psychological intelligence as core lawyer needs,

among other things. Much to do with Carol Gilligan's work, with some of which the author apparently collaborated . . .

From: Krieger, Larry
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 10:32 AM
To: Law-LegalEd@lists.fsu.edu
Cc: lawclinic
Subject: RE: [Lawclinic] [Law-legalEd] Question

Great question, yes, and I wonder if there is a more or less 'technical' definition that has general agreement. Seems to me it's just about facts, law, analysis, argument, doing the best you can for whater side you have to argue. whether educational or psych. theory has clarified it more, hmmm. I'm thinking some of the academic support, people, including Marty Peters (who has an Ed.D. also) now at Elon, might know or be the people to do that job if they want to.

Re. the narrow focus of first year and broadening back later that Bob described, this seems true to me as a good way to view the 3 years if more people did view them that way. The lack of clinical opportunities though, and more so I think, the lack of institutional intention concerning this 'plan', creates much of whatever problem one thinks 'thinking like a lawyer' training creates in people. I think if students were actually TOLD as 1L's: here's the plan, and then were read Bob's post or otherwise given a very clear understanding that T.L.L. is NOT a particularly good thing for most people, including lawyers and law students, in most life and work situations, it would be marvelous and go a long way towards 'problem solved.' As they were learning TLL they'd also be keeping in its proper place, as a limited tool for a particular piece of their professional work (and a larger piece of their schooling, no doubt), knowing that the other human faculties need to remain lively to preserve their personhood. I used an analogy in one of my booklets about learning to weld but not taking the welder out of the shop; many folks have liked that as a solid object lesson about this. As I'm thinking about it, maybe that's one more major thrust about "Balance" in legal education – getting more than the occasional outside-the-box faculty member or dean to keep students clear about this. It's a lot easier to create the integration Bob discusses if students have had in mind that it's coming as the capstone of their training, and are looking forward to it rather than getting lost in analysis entirely. L

From: lawclinic-bounces@lists.washlaw.edu [mailto:lawclinic-bounces@lists.washlaw.edu] **On Behalf Of** Seibel, Robert
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 1:15 PM
To: zitrinr@usfca.edu; Jill Breslau; Law-LegalEd@lists.fsu.edu
Cc: lawclinic
Subject: Re: [Lawclinic] [Law-legalEd] Question

Big issue with lots of nuances; you won't get complete answers (none are "right" anyway) so here is my 2 cents.

One thing may be to acknowledge and reinforce the basic foundation they come to law school with--being people who want to work for people or do some kind of good. The first year of law school then mostly equips them with specialized tools and knowledge in basic areas of law. This often is accomplished with a stripping out of the people factor, but that doesn't mean the human interest and people disappear, they are just often removed from this first chapter. In the second year the people start to come back and the students start to exercise choices about how to shape their own careers and education, and their professional persona. By the third year the people should be fully back in the learning scene and students should be developing ways to put

together their initial desires that brought them to law school, the foundations of the first year and the explorations of the second year. Clinics are crucial experiences in that capstone year.

I have evolved my focus for third year students, and clinic and externship students generally, to make my main missions to be about developing a passion for law, which I think rests almost totally on using law for people or purposes that help people, and for achieving integration of personal and professional values. Really I emphasize developing a passion for work and acknowledge that some significant number of law grads won't practice in traditional law jobs but will use their legal training. I want them to develop ways of enjoying themselves personally and professionally for a full working life of 30 or more years, and to feel, throughout, a spiritual sense of purpose and fulfillment. I don't have to preach this stuff to them; merely opening the door for discussion and examination frees them to do it and, I hope, makes it ok to recognize the centrality of these issues in legal education and law (and life).

I spent some of my teaching time at CUNY, where the mission of the law school is "Law in the service of human needs". I had that value before I went there, but my experience there reinforced it and allowed me to see more ways to make it work. I also tend to prefer not to emphasize the language of "balance" too much even though I like the concept, because it does also suggest separation rather than mingling (with apologies to those organizing an AALS section to promote these values).

When I started as a clinical teacher it seemed to me that the role was mostly about teaching skills and promoting social justice goals. I still hope to do those things, but now I am less concerned with legal skills and I believe that social justice is as likely to be achieved one client at a time as it is through any other movement or means. I think that students need to learn just how much personal satisfaction and fulfillment can be found in "ordinary cases for ordinary people". I also hope to help my students achieve some sense of inner peace and recognize its importance for them as lawyers and people.

I don't think that I answered your original question about definitions, and I would direct you to the Clinical Law Review for many articles that will help with educational theories and teaching practices. Sorry for the long and oversimplified rant, but I hope it helps in some way.

Bob Seibel
California Western School of Law
rfs@cwsl.edu
619 525 1458

From: law-legal-ed-bounces@lists.fsu.edu on behalf of Richard Zitrin
Sent: Sat 10/28/2006 8:32 AM
To: 'Jill Breslau'; Law-LegalEd@lists.fsu.edu
Subject: Re: [Law-legal-ed] Question

And I think you've nailed the question. For several years, I had the privilege of teaching an orientation program that included a discussion of just this topic. A student once told us in that discussion, "Before we become lawyers, we are human beings." My reply was "Even after we're lawyers...." Those became the quotes we used at our Center for Applied Legal Ethics to define what we were trying to do.

Law students don't need to unlearn the "learn to think like a lawyer" concept. They need to understand that it has more limited meaning than it is often given -- learn to analyze cases, parse out rulings, etc. When lawyers are enabled by their professors to be able to retain their humanity, their personal morals and

standards of behavior, they increase their wellness (many here, including Larry Kreiger, have written that integrity leads to wellness) and they become better lawyers.

Richard

RICHARD ZITRIN

the Carnegie Foundation has been engaged in a study of learning in the professions; they have published a book on the clergy and their book on legal education is due out in January. I am sure they will detail the learning involved in developing the skill of thinking like a lawyer.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Jill Breslau](mailto:Jill.Breslau)

To: Law-LegalEd@lists.fsu.edu

Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 2:50 PM

Subject: [Law-legal] Thank you!

To all, a preliminary thank you for all your informative and thoughtful replies to my question about thinking like a lawyer. I thought it might be timely to share a little more about the direction my book is taking, so you can more easily conceptualize where your responses fit.

As far as I've been able to tell, traditional legal education and the traditional practice still consider "thinking like a lawyer" the cornerstone of being a competent lawyer. Thus, I am exploring what that means. I confess I only have skimmed the MacCrate Report so far (thank you to the several people who directed me to it) but at first glance, it is not as accessible as I had hoped. I've ordered a copy, in hopes that highlighting and re-reading will help. I very much appreciate your individual perspectives. I realize that those of you on this list who are teaching are communicating a great deal to students that offers a richer, fuller life in the law than a particular kind of cognitive process typically provides.

I asked whether you see "thinking like a lawyer" as a skill set (i.e., competency), or something else, because I am increasingly convinced that it is frequently perceived or described as a skill set but actually is something else--a very potent something else. Stephanie West Allen's discussion of how the brain works is precisely what I am talking about. The habitual thought patterns involved in thinking like a lawyer change the brains of lawyers. (I have been awaiting MRI imaging studies demonstrating this phenomenon but am not aware of any as yet. If it's possible to show, by MRI, that London cab drivers have larger than normal "spatial relationships" areas in their brain, surely imaging studies could reveal what happens in the brains of lawyers.) If a habitual thought pattern is supported by a habitual behavioral pattern, then mind and body are both pressed into the service of that pattern. I think this combination accounts for the diminished lives so many of my colleagues appear to lead.

I am eager for more information, if it's available, on thinking like a lawyer. I am also very interested in the learning theories that describe how law students are taught, and how they learn. What grounding or training in educational theory is offered to legal educators, as a rule?

Thank you again.

Jill

For those of you interested in creating change, I wanted to let you know of several brain resources. Here's an excerpt from a blog post:

>>CIO included an article "The New Science of Change."

"Nothing is more frustrating than trying to get people to alter the way they do things. New research reveals why it's so hard and suggests strategies to make it easier."

Accompanying this article is a sidebar with 10 change management rules and the neuroscience behind each.

1. Stay on message. The brain needs repetition to move a concept from the prefrontal cortex, which handles unfamiliar concepts and complex decisions, to the basal ganglia, where habits are stored. For new concepts to become hardwired, those pathways have to be reinforced continually.

2. Keep it simple. The prefrontal cortex can entertain only a handful of concepts at a time. Therefore, complex projects need to be refined to one or two goals that businesspeople can easily understand so that their prefrontal cortexes do not become overwhelmed, causing fatigue and the psychological and physical distress that leads to anger.

Others include: expect fear, lead by not leading, focus on the big picture, and make it a personally relevant story. Read the article to learn the science behind management.<<

Resources and links here:

http://westallen.typepad.com/idealawg/2006/10/seems_about_hal.html

My best,

Stephanie

Stephanie West Allen, JD

Read my latest blog posts at:

<http://www.idealawg.com>

Learn your natural talents here:

<http://www.trackknacks.com>

Denver, CO USA

I guess i would ask, what are you comparing this "heaviness" or lack of playfulness to? Is this just a general phenomena; are these people who were privileged and blessed enough to have a lot of play and lightness in their lives in the first place (and don't get me wrong -- I'm the first one in line for more play and lightness. . .); so, i guess i need to ask. .to what are they, (these unhappy, heavy folks) themselves, comparing it. Do we think, for example, that our clients in the clinic are less heavy and more playful than us? Or our clients in a big corporate firm?Or do we think they/either is more playful; or are we saying we used to be more playful .. .?andif that's really what we are saying 'yes' to, then

i think we have to of course ask, "why" -- we were younger of course. . . ; perhaps we didn't have to work; perhaps we didn't have a sense of the 'world' until we met clients from other worlds (poorer or richer; whatever -- our clients tend to do and know different things than we do -- that's why we need each other. . . . Anyhow -- just some things i've been thinking about and that come up for me when i hear or see folks on the list talk about the lowering of lawyers life standards. . . ^ I think the sense of that being true is simply anecdotal, which is fine, but it's become a presumption that I don't think, frankly is true or if it is true, i'd like to see what that's based on. Maybe I'm just completely totally wrong -- which has happened plenty of times so I'm prepared. Good luck!

On Oct 30, 2006, at 5:03 PM, Jill Breslau wrote:

Interesting. I don't know whether I'm being referred to lawyers to interview because they've complained to their friends or whether I'm tapping into the sense of dissatisfaction that is presumably present in the practice. I have been talking to lawyers who feel they are losing creativity and playfulness, that their lives are serious and even heavy. They have different coping devices but they feel they are missing something. I appreciate being reminded that in the larger picture, there are also fulfilled lawyers.

I haven't looked at the question in the context of power, which is another fascinating vantage point.

Much food for thought.

Jill

On 10/30/06, **Suzanne Levitt** <suzanne.levitt@drake.edu> wrote:

I, too, have been interested in what you described; but i have to say, one of my fascinations is the constant (pretty much) statement that lawyers live diminished lives, or that law students have more personal troubles in their lives as a result of law school, etc. First, I guess, that is not my experience -- either personally or professionally. I know far more lawyers who live their lives as I would describe as fully (which has nothing to do with anything monetary, but more a fullness of spirit) than i do know lawyers who do not. I think more interestingly, law is -- in an important way -- power in our society; so, it seems counterintuitive to believe that those with access to power are "more" or "less" happy than those without -- or at least it's counterintuitive to me (though i can see that there are those who would say that with power comes responsibility; or with knowledge of power comes understanding of the real lack of any real power. . .) Don't know. It's interesting to me though. Please keep in touch and let me know how things are going.

Thanks to all for this discussion, interesting! For me, I do think it's important not to run too far to the assumption that lawyers are unhappy. I don't believe that either, per se. I do believe they are Disproportionately unhappy, compared to the rest of our society. This is based on the anecdotal reports sure, but substantiated by studies like the Johns Hopkins study finding lawyers to have the highest depression rate among 104 occupations in the U.S. that's relatively 'old' (1990 or so), but the few previous and subsequent studies of size and quality (virtually all coauthored by Andy B. it seems) do nothing but support the conclusion of disproportionality. And I think it's absurd that law schools don't take that on and fix it to the extent we can.

I personally think most lawyers are pretty happy, but that they do get a push in the wrong direction from:

- the institutional values of most law schools that are largely forced on them,
- the adversarial nature of much lawyering, meaning zero-sum, angst producing competition for very important things
- the institutional values of many law firms that are forced on them (if they take the wrong job)
- the necessarily pessimistic mindset that much lawyering requires
- the bogus values of many of the clients that one ends up representing
- the vicarious stress and trauma of trying to help people with serious problems of all kinds
- and ultimately, from the lack of information and preparation for dealing with all of these factors (there are others to be sure, not pretending to be a complete list . . .)

Many of these factors are inescapably part of practicing law (read Daicoff . . .), not inherently 'bad', but inherently undermining of well being UNLESS one has training and information to counteract their effects. That will, hopefully, be part of what 'balance' in legal education will provide . . . ??

Alan Lerner:

Having followed this discussion, and having read the Best Practices draft, with all of the experience and wisdom they share, I add my two cents with some trepidation. I am pretty much in agreement with all of the facets of "thinking like a lawyer" which have been presented. Yet, it seems to me that no explanation of "thinking like a lawyer," is complete without including the notions of service, effective problem solving for the client within the client's context, and professional responsibility. If our students don't internalize those concepts as essential to their work as lawyers, all of the legal knowledge, analytical skills, etc., that they do have will not assure that they are the people whom we will want to have the public know we educated.
ALAN

Roy Stuckey wrote:

- > To answer Jill's original question, has anyone defined the notion of
- > "thinking like a lawyer" to the general satisfaction of legal
- > educators? Two books that try to do this may be coming out in 2007.
- > The report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,
- > Educating Lawyers, will be published in March. And by the way Bob and
- > others, Carnegie recommends broadening the coverage of the first year
- > to include the ethical and social dimensions of lawyering, because it
- > concluded that law schools do a poor job of reintroducing these
- > concepts to students after the first year.

>
> Judith Wegner is also working on a book that may get published in
2006
> in which she discusses the meaning of "thinking like a lawyer" at
some
> length. Some of Judith's thoughts on this are in the March, 2006,
> draft of Best Practices for Legal Education which can be accessed, at
> least for the moment, at <http://professionalism.law.sc.edu> (look at
> the bottom of the "news" section on the left side of the main page
and
> follow the links to CLEA's Best Practices Project). The much
improved
> final draft of Best Practices incorporates the Carnegie report.
> Hopefully, it will be published in February or March.
>
> Jill's question is an interesting one because most first year law
> teachers claim to teach students to "think like lawyers" but
> some cannot tell you what it means and few can agree on any
definition.
>
> Roy (Stuckey)

Natt Gantt at Regent in Virginia has written a very interesting article
on this topic. It's publication is forthcoming. I've seen an early copy
and he's done a very thorough job reviewing the literature as well as
proposing some interesting ways of looking at the question himself. You
could contact him at nattgan@regent.edu.

Hope this helps -- Ruth

Ruth Ann McKinney
Clinical Professor of Law
The University of North Carolina School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Below is an edition of an ezine I write. I thought of it when I read this thinking/acting
comment. While the article is written in the frivolous style of a Hallmark card, it
nevertheless addresses the issue. It cites some of the authors who have written about this
topic, too.

Best,

Stephanie

Stephanie West Allen, JD

Lights, Camera, Action

WE BECOME WHAT WE DO

"Because we always have control over the doing component of our behavior, if we markedly change that component, we cannot avoid changing the thinking, feeling, and physiological components as well."

William Glasser, *_Take Effective Control of Your Life_*

Dr. Roberto Assagioli called this technique of controlling what we do "acting as if"

. . .

"If we are sad or depressed, it is difficult, if not impossible, to become cheerful or serene through a direct act of will. It IS within our power to smooth our forehead, lift our head, smile, and speak words of harmony, optimism, confidence, and joy.

"The use of this technology will actually change our emotional state. Little by little, and sometimes rapidly, the emotional state will follow, adapt itself to, and match the attitude and external behavior."

Roberto Assagioli, *_The Act of Will_*

The great acting coach Constantin Stanislavsky called aligned principles simply "the method."

What almost unimaginable, and transcendent, freedom we have. Act as we want to be, and we will become it. We do not have to be slaves to our emotions, our psychological barbs, our internal weather. We just need to imagine how we want to be and then put it into ACTION.

WHISTLING IN THE DARK

Our emotions are chemicals. (For more about emotions and chemicals, read Candace Pert's *_Molecules of Emotion_*.) Whistling in the dark, acting confident when we are scared, changes our emotions. Our chemical self changes and we have the chemicals of confidence. We are confident!

No longer just acting the part.

Let's all become actors today. Who will you be?

BETTER LIVING THROUGH CHEMISTRY

A queen in your court? Don that invisible crown and wave your imaginary scepter at life, commanding not cowering. Start now, Your Highness. Oh, so high.

A tycoon? Walk like a trillionaire. Get the chemicals of a magnate coursing through your blood and bones and you will become a magnet for riches -- the Midas method turning all to gold.

A jewel of joy? Put on a happy face, add a bounce to your step, and open your arms wide to life. To paraphrase some song I heard long ago, say loudly when you open your arms: "I'm big! I'm glad! I'm nationwide!" Those chemicals of delight will soon stream through every cell.

"Acting as if" lets you design a new life. Shall we hold an Oscar night? You can turn your role into a day-to-day reality. You will win much more than an Oscar.

AND TODAY . . .

Decide who you are going to be today. Confident? Optimistic? Vibrant? Playful? Patient? Successful? Loving? What do you really want?

Sit for a while and imagine how you would act if you were that person. Make notes on posture, gestures, tone of voice, manner of dressing, way of walking, enunciation, expressions, sound and action of laughing, topics of conversation, you'll think of more as you wholly and completely and fully imagine this new you. Take time with this exercise, no less than ten minutes.

Then stand up and begin to play the part. Go to the mirror and perfect your acting. This will be fun. You are doing what you loved to do as a child -- make believe. You have not lost that skill to make believe. You just need to let it out on stage today.

Your acting will change every molecule in your body. Not to mention your life.

Today you are the director, the actor, and the producer all rolled (and "role"d) into one transforming performance.

Ready? Roll those cameras. The first scene starts now. Action!

FYI: Bill Sullivan of Carnegie will be presenting on this forthcoming work, entitled *Educating Lawyers*, at the AALS conference.

(Lindsay Watkins)