

# Get Ready to Be Revolutionized with Legal Tech and AI: Articles for Consideration by Steve Embry, Esq.

## Technological Competence for Lawyers: Ethical and Practical Reasons

### Ethics

Much has been written about the ethical duties of a lawyer regarding technology, a duty found in Rule 1.1 (competence: [Comment 8 to Model Rule 1.1](#), requires us to be cognizant of the risks and benefits of technology relevant to our practices), Rule 1.6 (confidentiality), Rule 1.5 (ethical billing: we are prohibited from charging unreasonable fees. Technology can reduce costs and fees) and Rules 5.1 and 5.3 (supervisory responsibilities: we can use other lawyers or experts for things like eDiscovery but we still are captains of the ship and responsible for what they do. We can't adequately supervise what we don't understand). These rules and their nuances should, in and of themselves, be enough for lawyers to be as inquisitive and knowledgeable about tech as they are the substantive law.

But forgetting these for a moment and that technology can generally make us more efficient, there are also some very sound practical reasons lawyers should be familiar with and welcome technology and, as expressed in Comment 8, know of its benefits and risks.

### What is Technological Competence?

Before getting to these, it might be worth talking about what technological competence means. Many lawyers get uneasy when we use technology and competence in the same sentence. Some think this means knowing, for example, how to code. Some think this means knowing about anything and everything about all technology. Both are wrong.

What competence really means is being knowledgeable about that technology which is or could relate to what you do for a living. So for lawyers, it means knowing what technology is out there that could help our clients and help us be better at our chosen profession. It means knowing what this technology can and can't do. It means being aware how technology has changed how we see things, how we learn and what we do. It means being open minded and inquisitive.

So, if we define competence in terms of awareness, what are six practical reasons to be technologically aware?

### **1) Everyone Uses Technology**

First, no matter the nature of your practice or the size of your firm, your clients, your adversaries, judges and juries are constantly using technology every day in many ways. They demand and expect it.

Judges and juries are constantly using technology every day in many ways. They demand and expect it.

According to various studies, the time spent online and with digital media has been steadily increasing. We are all communicating, interacting and learning online and with digital media. We all expect instant access and immediate results. And we all expect to see technological bells and whistles in connection with almost anything presented to us.

Clients are expecting and demanding that we use available technology to do more for less. To be efficient. To use data and data analytics to better predict what the fee and even outcome will likely be. The only way to keep up with these demands is to be knowledgeable and aware of what technology is available to do these of things and what this predictive technology will and will not do.

And if you try cases — you had better become familiar with state of the art trial presentation technology. Otherwise you will be at a tremendous disadvantage to those that know how to leverage technology in the courtroom or even in the discovery process. Plus the fact that those on juries and those who you communicate with and are trying to persuade use the internet and social media and technology to learn and be persuaded.

Think about the judiciary you practice in front of who may be reading your briefs and pleadings electronically. How we read and understand on screens is different. Understanding this difference in how documents look on screens and how people navigate and read them is crucial if you want to persuade and impress.

So, if you're not aware of this change in how we digest information and how it has changed communication and learning, you risk being left behind and at a disadvantage. And where so many are comfortable with and are using technology in their daily life's, bragging about being a Luddite and not using technology may not be the best strategy.

## **2) Security**

The second practical reason you should know something about technology is security. Your security. More law firms are themselves targets of hacks and data breaches. The Panama Papers scandal. The cyber attack on DLA Piper that almost shut the firm entirely down. The Cravath attack that led to serious insider trading problems.

Many of the primary targets seem to be the mid-size and large firms although no firm is immune. Despite these statistics, a large number of law firms still have no security and many lawyers simply didn't know if they do or not.

And clients are demanding that we keep their digital information more and more secure. These numbers will only grow: our clients expect us to know about how to protect their secrets. What does this mean? It means we better have some basic understanding and awareness of how to keep things secure and the risks .

Think about and understand firewalls and firm wide protection. Know why and insure you and the people you work with need to be knowledgeable about scams and risks. Train everyone how to recognize and avoid phishing and spear phishing attacks that can lead to ransom ware. Know how to protect yourself with such things as encryption, strong Passwords and password managers and 2 factor authentications. Know about and understand the concept of full drive encryption. Understand why these things are important.

And blithely assuming someone else will take care of this for you is a recipe for disaster. Do you really want to call your client someday and say we have been hacked and your records were stolen? Or that you had client documents on a laptop whose unencrypted hard drive was stolen? Or, as was the case recently with Wilmer Hale, that the auto fill feature typed in a Wall Street Journal reporter address by mistake, resulting in client secrets not only being revealed but published in the newspaper.

## **3) Leveling the Playing Field**

Technology can level the playing field between large firms and small firms and solos. Tech tools can enable you to do things it used to take an army of associates and paralegals to do.

Being at least somewhat familiar with and aware of technology also prevents you from being at mercy of vendors who often are all too happy to mumble some jargon you don't understand and then charge you an arm and a leg.

While tech vendors may know how to make a fancy power point, they don't necessarily know how to tell a persuasive story.

And for us trial lawyers, remember that while tech vendors may know how to make a fancy power point, they don't necessarily know how to tell a persuasive story. That's our job; we have to be able to use technology tools to help us do that. And as we all know, things can change in the courtroom with less than a moments notice. Knowing something about the technology may save you from embarrassment and could be the difference between winning and losing.

#### **4) Death by a Thousand Cuts**

Technology can help prevent death by a thousand cuts in an area near and dear to many of us, profitability.

Many of us use the billable hour as our business model. Yet there is often a big difference between what we bill and what we collect. For small firm practitioners, you probably know this problem all too well. You work 8 or more hours a day. But you can't bill 8 hours a day.

According to the Clio Legal Trends Report, what you actually bill is much less than what you can bill. But then you must consider the collection rate, which is less than the what you actually bill. When you put all this together you have collected for only a few hours that you have actually worked. For a business, whose model is based on billing and collecting time, that's not to good.

Firm and billing technology can help with this by reducing the non- billable time and increasing utilization, realization and collections rates. Without awareness of these tools, you risk losing money.

On a broader front for all of us, solo, small and big firms and all in between, using technology can help us get back to practicing law, doing what we were trained to do. We didn't become lawyers to spend hours in dusty warehouses going thru millions of pages of documents. or reading email after email. We didn't become lawyers to proofread over and over the same document looking for typos. Technology helps us practice law.

#### **5) Lack of A2J Threatens Us All**

We frankly have an embarrassing access to justice problem and while we can continue to ignore it, we have some responsibility to our profession and to the public, who has extended to us as lawyers special self-regulating protections.

We frankly have an embarrassing access to justice problem and while we can continue to ignore it, we have some responsibility to our profession and to the public, who has extended to us as lawyers special self-regulating protections

80% below the poverty line and more than ½ of those in the middle class—the people who need legal help the most cannot get access to even modest legal advice on serious issues like custody, divorce and criminal questions. Small businesses and startups often ignore lawyers altogether and do things online without a lawyer.

The sad fact is to many people, lawyers are just plain irrelevant. That's not good for them or our profession. And just to reiterate how irrelevant we have become to so many, of the reasons for not consulting a lawyer in a civil justice matter, almost half said there was no need. Almost a quarter said it would make no difference. Sandefur, Rebecca, *Accessing Justice in the Contemporary USA*, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: American Bar Foundation, August 8, 2014.

Technology can help overcome this gap by making the practice of law more efficient and access more affordable. That's part of our responsibility as lawyers. And to think selfishly: given the statistics, do we really think the public will continue to tolerate our self regulating protections?

## **6) The Winds of Change**

The winds of change, primarily driven by technology, are blowing over the profession stronger than ever. Alternative service providers like RocketLawyer and LegalZoom doing things that lawyers once did like preparing documents and wills. Last year its estimated these providers were a \$8.4 billion industry. More and more you find people using web sites not just to get documents like wills, contracts and articles of incorporation done but to also find and evaluate lawyers. To compete and continues to thrive, we must know of these providers and how they are using technology.

Artificial intelligence technology is also threatening to alter the legal landscape particularly for young lawyers. You have chatbots taking over functions we used to perform. You have clients and insurers using technology in new ways to evaluate us and what we are doing. Even how good we are. The days of non-transparency are dead.

These things present new and different threats. Yet if we pretend they don't exist, ignore them and remain unfamiliar with them and their impact, we risk becoming more and more irrelevant.

### **There You Have It**

So, there you have it. Don't be a Luddite. Don't brag about being technologically incompetent. Become more aware of technology and how it can help (or harm) you and your clients.

## **AI, Generative AI, ChatGPT, Robot Lawyers**

Lately there has been lots of talk about new artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT, generative AI, neural networks, and large language models.

Of course, all the discussions may strike fear in many lawyers and legal professionals. This fear is often borne of misunderstanding what the tools can and can't do and concern that robots may take over what we do. There is so much information, hype, and miscommunication about these programs. It's hard to get your arms around what these programs can and can't do.

The natural reaction of many lawyers may be to throw up their hands and say forget it.

And the natural reaction of many lawyers may be to throw up their hands and say forget it. I'm just going to ignore all the hype and keep practicing like I always have. After all, there's been talk of AI before, but nothing really came of it.

But sticking your head in the sand this time may be a mistake.

### **What's The So What?**

So why should lawyers pay attention to the new tools and scope out what they can and can't do. Five reasons.

1. These tools can do certain things better and faster than we humans can. Things like automating certain repetitive and time consuming tasks. AI tools can Analyze large data sets quickly and efficiently, quicker and better than humans. This in turn can help us see patterns and trends. The tools can Initially handle certain routine tasks (subject, of course, to human review). They can do the tedious kind of grunt work many of us had to do

as young lawyers. Tasks that took time and for which we could often bill but tasks that did not necessarily require a legal education.

2. Yes, having a machine do these tasks takes away from some of what we may have historically done. But that gives us more time to do the things machines are not good at or capable of, like formulating strategy. Resolving ambiguous information. Determining the best possible outcome, which after all, is what our clients are really after. And for us litigators, creating persuasive stories either in a courtroom, in a mediation, or even with our own clients. Marshaling facts in a certain way to make our points. Let's face it. We are in the business of persuading other humans, not computers. These are things that most of us became lawyers to do. AI can give us more time to do what we are good at and what we are trained to do.
3. There is also an ethical consideration for the use of AI and automation. Most of us are familiar with [Comment 8 to Model Rule 1.1](#). That Rule requires us to represent our clients competently. Comment 8 to 1.1 mandates that we be cognizant of the risks and benefits of technology relevant to our practices. The Rule and Comment suggest that before you run out and use a tool like ChatGPT, you better know its risks. You need to understand the chances that what it tells you while persuasive may be flat wrong. You need to have some idea how these programs and large language models work, at least from an overall conceptual standing. And there is another applicable Rule that we often forget about. [Model Rule 1.5](#) prohibits us from charging unreasonable fees. AI tools can reduce costs by automating certain tasks. At some point, if not already, not properly using AI and computers to do certain work may result in an unreasonable fee. It's unreasonable to charge for humans doing work a computer can do better.
4. For lawyers who are solo or in smaller firms, these tools can make you more competitive with larger firms. Using machines to do some of the work on a matter lets you do what you do best. And make no mistake. The larger firms are using these tools. The behemoth global law firm [Allen and Overy](#) recently announced the creation of [Harvey](#). Harvey uses technology to enable lawyers to create legal documents or perform legal research by providing simple natural language instructions. And more sophisticated clients are already expecting us to use tools that can save time and money.
5. Being familiar with these tools and generally how they work allows us to be proactive with our practice. It enables us to better see where our practice and the world is going rather than being reactive once it gets there. And that can shape how and what we charge for, how and to whom

we market, and who we hire and for what.

### **Will Robots Replace Us Lawyers?**

There are often cries and worries that robots and AI will replace lawyers. But that's misguided, at least for the foreseeable future. As discussed above, there are things we do that machines can't. And may never will. Strategy. Outcomes. They lack the human judgment, intuition, and creativity that are essential for more complex legal tasks.

And much of what we do involves interpersonal relations. Communicating with other human beings with care and empathy. Providing reassurance and guidance in ways that invoke trust. Building relationship. That a machine can't do.

For litigators, there is another reason it will be difficult for machines to replace us. As I said before, we are in the business of creating and telling persuasive stories. Marshaling facts in creative and persuasive ways. We tell our stories not to computers but to other humans.

Certainly, partnering with AI tools will help us tell our stories and make our judgments. It will give us more time. It will provide us with better insights. Partnering with AI will help us be better and more effective lawyers, Just like we have seen in so many other businesses and professions. For a good description of this partnering, see Paul Daugherty and H. James Nelson's book [Human + Machine](#)

As Richard Susskind puts it, clients increasingly want us to achieve best outcomes. AI can help us do that by identifying and reducing the uncertainty associated with the various options. But picking the best one will still be a peculiarly human one.

So will AI replace lawyers? No. But as my good friend Pablo Arendondo recently put it, "the lawyers that will be replaced are the ones that don't use these tools."

And that's a very good reason to be familiar with what's out there.



# Should We Learn About and Use Generative AI and Technology?

Lots of questions and unease surround the use of ChatGPT and generative AI tools by lawyers. Do we as lawyers need to learn more about these tools and how to use them? Can these tools help us in practice?

There's little doubt that generative AI is here to stay and will impact those in all walks of life. Thinking that lawyers won't harness the power of tools like ChatGPT is foolhardy. And those who do will be at a decided disadvantage.

As lawyers we apply concepts and rules to unique factual situations and the kinds of unique problems of our clients. We do our job when we are the most persuasive. When we use the tools available to provide good service to clients at a fair price. Above all, law schools should be about teaching students how to find solutions to problems and assess outcomes. It's what we do in real life.

What does this have to do with ChatGPT? The best lawyers in the future will use tools like ChatGPT to help solve clients' problems. We need to understand and embrace this. We need to learn how to use generative AI and whatever new tools will come available over our careers effectively. To have an open mind about technology and be able to assess its risks and benefits. Indeed, the ability to evaluate the risks and benefits of technology is part of a lawyer's ethical duty of competence. We need to understand that tools like generative AI are changing and will change the profession. Law students need to be prepared for that change.

When I was in law school, no one said don't use the books in the library like [Corpus Juris Secundum](#) to understand legal concepts better. None of my professors said you can only use quill and ink on your exam because that's how we always have done it. Technology tools are no different: they enable lawyers to do their jobs better and faster than ever. The big difference is that technology changes and creates change more quickly than ever. As my friend [Pablo Arrendondo](#) recently said in a [webinar](#) on generative AI: "they jump in quantum leaps. I think it's fair to say that we are now in a new age of the practice of law, one where computers have, essentially, literacy."

The great lawyer of the future will marry their talents and knowledge with the abilities of computers so that they can both do what they do best. Law schools need to devote themselves to preparing students to be those great lawyers.

# ChatGPT 4: Do Lawyers Know Just Enough to Be Dangerous?

As lawyers we need to understand and use technology and generative AI tools. I have set out the benefits of doing so above. But we also have the ethical duty to understand the risks. Right now, there is lots of talk about a particular generative AI tool called ChatGBT. It's easy to use and often gives very confident-sounding answers to inquiries. But here's something big to note from the developer of ChatGPT, OpenAI., [GPT-4 Technical Report](#), 14 March 2023, states, "In particular, our usage policies prohibit the use of our models and products in the contexts of high risk government decision making (e.g., law enforcement, criminal justice, migration, and asylum), or for offering legal or health advice." (page 6)

It's easy to confuse ChatGPT with generative AI. Too often people use the term ChatGPT as short hand for generative AI. It's like how we use the term Kleenex. Kleenex is the name of a brand of tissue paper, but there are other brands of tissue paper as well. But we often use the word Kleenex when we really mean tissue paper.

ChatGPT is the public open generative AI tool developed by [OpenAI](#). It searches data from all public areas to provide its answers. ChatGPT is a sort of "brand" of generative AI. But it is not the only one. Other generative AI tools work differently and, importantly, use different and more limited data. [Casetext's](#) product, CoCounsel, for example, is an AI tool tailored for use by lawyers. It thus promises to be more accurate than ChatGPT, in part because the data it uses is more limited to legal sources.

Not only are there other stand alone generative AI products being developed, but developers are applying OpenAI's product to more limited data sets to improve its accuracy and reduce its errors (hallucinations). This allows the AI product to be more focused on the needs of particular users.

All well and good, except I fear many lawyers and legal professionals hear generative AI and think that ChatGPT is the only product. The one they should use for any and all purposes. This is borne out by the results of a survey done by [LexisNexis](#). These results suggest that there may be uninformed lawyers who believe that the hyped ChatGPT is something they should be using. And they may unknowingly rush to use it.

The Survey was based on the responses of over 4,100 lawyers, law students, and consumers (1,176 were lawyers). According to the Survey, 86% of the lawyers

said they were aware of generative AI such as ChatGPT. 51% had either already used it or were planning to. 84% believe it will increase lawyers' efficiency. It's hard to believe that many lawyers have taken the time to understand how generative AI works and the differences among the various products.

Since ChatGPT is the generative tool that has received the most publicity, many of the respondents may be using and thinking of ChatGPT as shorthand for generative AI without realizing that there are now and will be various generative AI programs. In a rush to use what everyone seems think is a great tool, the temptation may be for lawyers to jump to the public ChatGPT. But that public model is not exactly the best for what lawyers want to achieve. The error rate and hallucinations for ChatGPT are still high and, as the developers said, can't be relied on where accuracy is essential.

Another problem with using ChatGPT without understanding it: lawyers need to know when and how to use it and other generative AI tools. As the OpenAI developers noted, ChatGPT should not be relied on for "legal advice." As lawyers, we can better see the line between helpful background information and pure legal advice. But that line, even to us, is blurry. And I'm not sure whether our understanding as lawyers of what is or isn't legal advice may differ from those who are not lawyers. Like the ChatGBT developers. Lawyers might also need to consider whether their malpractice insurance extends to the use of ChatGPT, particularly given the position of OpenAI on legal use.

And, of course, there are confidentiality issues with using a public generative tool like ChatGPT. ChatGBT looks at all available information to formulate responses. If a lawyer supplies confidential information in asking ChatGPT a question, that material is no longer confidential. It can be seen and used by others who also use ChatGPT. By providing client information to ChatGPT, a lawyer may have breached confidentiality obligations. And may waive the privilege.

At the very least, lawyers contemplating using any generative AI tool need a baseline understanding of the tool. They need to know what it does, and what data it's looking at. They need to know such things as:

Can the results be trusted?

Can the system explain how the result was reached?

What are the impacts of interactions between the human with the tool?

Who are the major players in the space (and how different)?

What has the experience with the tool been?

Bottom line, the need for lawyers to understand the risks and benefits of all technology has never been greater. This is part of our ethical duty of competence as set out in Comment 8 to Model Rule 1.1. This need is especially true for generative AI. To understand what the program is looking at, its bias, and its accuracy. They need to be sure we know how to assess the validity of what the generative AI tools are telling us. And learn how to effectively and accurately use the tools.

## **With AI Technology and Automation, What's To Become of Us?**

We may be on the cusp of fundamental change in the legal industry.

There is lots of chatter and, well, hype about ChatGPT and generative AI. Tools that allow people to ask a question or for a task to be done and get a result. An AI tool that can write articles and memoranda for you.

And everyone seems to think generative AI is going to change the profession immediately. Many claim that the conversational ability of ChatGPT and other generative AI tools will make it so powerful that it will disrupt the legal industry.

Of course, it's been claimed for years that this technology or that technology will change legal. That AI tools and automation will eliminate or reduce the amount of work needed to be done or being done by lawyers.

But each time this kind of sea change has been predicted, it doesn't happen, at least on the scale that everyone thinks. And yes this time, it does feel different both because of the conversational ability and the potential power of the tools. So we will see.

### **The Logical Implications of AI Adoption by Legal**

But it's important to think of the logical implications that full scale adoption of many of these tools might have. The unintended consequences. I'm a big fan of technology, but we can't ignore the consequences both as practicing lawyers and journalists.

The common refrain is that these tools will eliminate much of the scut work that lawyers, especially younger lawyers, have traditionally done. That these tools will allow lawyers to focus on what they do best. Strategy, vision, legal advice, prediction, seeking outcomes, etc. As a result, the theory goes, technology tools

will not replace lawyers. They will just change the nature of what legal professionals do.

But let's think about this argument and where it might take us logically (I know, logic doesn't always apply to the legal industry and law firms.)

The elephant in the room is that by eliminating work that lawyers have done — even if it's drudgery—the number of lawyers needed to provide legal services the old way will be reduced. And that's bad news, especially for law firms.

The expansion of law firms and the explosion in profitability over the last 50 years have been based on billable hour and leverage concepts.

The business model for many law firms remains the billable hour. And because there are only so many hours in a day, law firms needed to leverage work to be really profitable. You can bill more hours to a file if two lawyers work on a project. Or 3. Or 10. The expansion of law firms and the explosion in profitability over the last 50 years have been based on billable hour and leverage concepts.

### **One Lawsuit One Lawyer**

But with automation and generative AI, you may not have work to leverage. Let's face it, in most cases. The lead lawyer is the one who strategizes and envisions. If the rest of the work can be done by computers, then the notion of "one lawsuit, one lawyer" (to paraphrase an old [Texas Ranger](#) saying) can become a reality. And those teams of associates and paralegals? No longer needed. Or better put, clients may no longer want to pay for their work when a machine can do it.

One of the panelists at LegalWeek opined that with generative AI, we would all become editors instead of writers. That's a change, but let's face facts, it takes less time to edit than to draft a document, Less time for law firms means fewer billable hours. Less need for lawyers.

It's analogous to what happened to legal assistants (formerly known as secretaries). When I was a young lawyer, your legal assistant (secretary) typed all our work. Busy partners sometimes had two secretaries to do all their work. But with the advent of word processing, all that changed. Most lawyers I know now type their own work. Legal assistants and secretaries? Few and far between. Technology rendered much of what they did obsolete. Law firms responded by eliminating these positions.

And make no mistake. Having senior lawyers able to do more on cases efficiently will inevitably lead to better work. The lead lawyer, knows the client best, sets the strategy and understands the best outcome. If that lawyer can use a computer

to find documents, do research, and the like—tasks that have been done by any associates —the result is better. I know in the later years of my career, I was able to rely less on other lawyers and paralegals to do work, and with computers, I could do it myself. To do the proverbial more with less. My partners weren't happy, but my client sure was.

And this may be the model for the future. Wait, you say. Those other lawyers and paralegals can now do other things like strategy etc. There's only one problem. I hate to say it, but in my experience, there weren't that many legal professionals with the ability and knowledge to do that vision thing. That didn't know how to do it or didn't want to. That's why they weren't lead lawyers on significant cases. Yes, the role of the non-visionary lawyer may change, alright. Like secretaries, they may not be needed any longer.

And there is another danger. If the leverage model is dying, then the lead lawyer-the strategist-should be worth a lot more. That lawyer may be more valuable, but the big question will be whether clients will be willing to pay more. Can law firms continue to pull in as much revenue and profit without the leverage model? One lawsuit, one lawyer may mean less money.

### **What About Alternative Fees?**

But you say, if leverage dies will the billable hour model die with it? Perhaps. But that doesn't solve the problem of too many lawyers and not enough work. The backbone of profitability from alternative fees hinges on doing more with less. That's how you make money with them. So when you move to an alternative fee model, you must embrace technology and automation if you want it to be profitable. And at least at present, most law firms are not culturally able to embrace alternative fees, doing less with more. Compensation and advancement are tied to doing more, not less. It's a hard pivot.

And clients have been slow to adopt the concept too. It's ingrained in law firm culture. The result of pivoting to an alternative structure is not easy. If firms don't pivot, clients will nevertheless demand more for less. If you do pivot, your profitability hinges on doing more with less. Either way, the leverage model-the goose that laid the golden egg—may be gone.

### **Will This Really Happen?**

Will this be our dystopian future? All too often, pundits have predicted a wholesale change in the legal industry. But it didn't happen. Lawyers are slow to change. In house clients—who often worked for law firms before they went in-house—are slow to demand change. And, of course, inherent skepticism of

lawyers of all things but especially technology may limit or at least slow change.

And, of course, one lawsuit, one lawyer may be a great business model if there are more cases. But technology may endanger even that. Technology, data analytics, and AI may work to reduce the number of disputes, not increase them.

We can only hope that new legal issues like privacy, increased ip cases and compliance requirements, and issues flowing out of AI may fill in the gaps. If it does, then the demand for really good lawyers could increase and drive up their value exponentially. But will increased caseload yield greater revenues than those produced by the leverage model?

Is the sky falling? Bill Gates famously said we overestimate the effect of technology in the short term but underestimate the long range impact. And logic suggests that in the long term, having work done by computers instead of lawyers will inevitably lead to less need for lawyers. And perhaps the demise of the leverage model that has made so many lawyers so wealthy.

Yes, change in legal is slow. But I'm not sure I would advise my grandkids to become lawyers.