

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Conversations in Legal Education

Legal Research Center Archives

9-7-2006

Conversations in Legal Education: Stephen Hartwell, September 7, 2006

Stephen Hartwell

University of San Diego School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://digital.sandiego.edu/law_oral_histories



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Hartwell, Stephen, "Conversations in Legal Education: Stephen Hartwell, September 7, 2006" (2006).
Conversations in Legal Education. 24.

https://digital.sandiego.edu/law_oral_histories/24

This Oral History is brought to you for free and open access by the Legal Research Center Archives at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conversations in Legal Education by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

CONVERSATIONS IN LEGAL EDUCATION:

ORAL HISTORIES OF THE FIRST HALF-CENTURY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF LAW

Narrator: Professor Stephen Hartwell

Interviewer: Ruth Levor

Recorder: Ruth Levor

Date: September 7, 2006

Accession No.: OH-LRC-Hartwell-2A

TAPE 2A: SIDE A

RL: This is an interview with Professor Stephen Hartwell for the project Conversations in Legal Education Oral Histories of the first half century of the University of San Diego School of Law. The interview is being conducted by Ruth Levor at the University of San Diego School of Law Legal Research Center on September 7th 2006. This is the second session of this set of the interviews. Tapes and transcripts of this interview will be archived at the University of San Diego's Copley Library.

RL: Welcome again.

SH: Thank you.

RL: During our last interview you talked about telling all of your students that you have a condition known as prosopagnosia and you described that a little bit and how it affects your face recognition of faces and I have to admit that because my daughter is a PhD cognitive scientist I shared that information with her and she asked me many questions that I didn't know to ask you about that condition. And you've agreed to answer some of those for us as well. So, let me ask first and foremost how and when you found out about the prosopagnosia?

SH: I'm not sure. I think as a condition probably not later than when I was in college and be in high school. In terms of its symptoms when I look back in time as a name to a neurological condition much more recent. I think about 8 or 9 years ago. I realized it had a name and there's websites and the dictionary. And it's a neurological condition and that it's more common in men than in women. And that's not uncommon and there are various levels of severity and that I'm in the moderate condition for a person that doesn't answer my question.

RL: And what was it that you became more aware of in high school or college?

SH: It is interesting that I can picture faces of kids in my grammar school today. So, I don't think I had it until I was like high school age. But with kids in college I don't have a recollection of what their faces look like. So, my guess is that, even though it's apparently genetically patterned in the genes, I think in my case it was triggered by something that happened early in adolescence. I don't know, maybe like 12 years of age or something like that.

RL: And you just became more aware of an inability to remember people?

SH: No. I don't remember faces. I look at somebody, I met somebody that I know I met two weeks ago and I don't recognize them. I mean it's not subtle. It's just the realization that you're different than other people when you realize that other people don't have that problem.

RL: Right.

SH: You take it as normal.

RL: So, do you know that you met them 2 weeks ago because of cues that they give you? they speak to you in a recognizing kind of way?

SH: Well if Ruth, if I had only just met you, I knew you were in here a week ago, Thursday, if I had just met for the first time and then I came back today I would be more sure that I have the right person by being in this room with you. And, also, I know your height and your general body shape, and I would probably remember you had glasses. And I might remember some of the distinguishing features, you've got kind of shortest hair, that sort of things. But the face, it would have been guess work. It doesn't the, you don't, the face doesn't come to you like a gestalt like it must for most people. I remember faces, but like for you for example, if you were a student in my class, your eyebrows are kind of a V. I might remember you are the woman with the eyebrows in the sign of a V shape. Now, if there's another woman with V shape eyebrows, I might mistake her for you.

RL: You are sunk.

SH: Even though she doesn't look like you at all. I'm just remembering one item.

RL: And you came to this understanding or self-knowledge through your own experience more than from feedback from others?

SH: Entirely from my own knowledge. Nobody ever told me. You ought to remember my face because you just met me. You must have something wrong with you.

RL: So, you were subconsciously compensating all the time.

SH: Consciously compensating. Although I didn't know it had a name. I was aware of the fact that I was working overtime trying to remember who people were.

RL: Consciously. So how do you memorize the person and the name as a pair when you first meet them?

SH: I typically don't. So, when I see them a month later, I don't know who they are.

RL: So, there's nothing, no technique that you use?

SH: I mean I could do that. But to try to do that and carry on a conversation, and not knowing whether it's worth the investment, because most people I meet once I'm not going to meet again. If it's somebody, if it's a student in class, I know I'm going to see him next week and that's worthy of investment of time and energy. But if it's somebody I met casually at a party or an occasion where I'm meeting 60 people, I don't have the time to do it. I don't have the energy to do it. And it's not worth the investment, so I figured that I'm not going to know him next time.

RL: But you do have a commitment to learning the names of the people in your class. That's what you discussed last time.

SH: Right.

RL: So, what do you do to learn that?

SH: I watch the tape. I watch the video and then I say Jodie is the one with the dark hair and she's got kind of a funny ear. And Frank's the one with a kind of a long nose and so and so forth. Then by the third to fourth week I've learned enough and I have a name attached to it and I know where they are sitting most of the time. I don't use a seating chart but people tend to sit in the same place. I have enough cues that I can be confident I know who they are. But I still mix up some people on occasion. I get students mixed up.

RL: So, you turn the video camera on the class?

SH: I have them come by one at a time. I video one at a time. They stand in line. I have them give their name and something about them. And then I hear their voice and that helps too. I can sometimes separate two people by voice. And I get to see how tall they are and those sorts of things. Because I remember that Frank is the tall guy. I don't have any trouble remembering height or weight, things like that. It's just that there is a Neuro program for faces. Just for faces. And that's the one that doesn't work very well.

RL: Do you have trouble reading people's emotional...

SH: Well that's a very peculiar...

RL: Facial messages?

SH: I don't know whether it's a compensation or not, but I think I'm better than average at it. I think partly because I'm interested. But I floor students. I'll give you an example, a student was talking about his style for negotiating. And that he is a share or Cooperative type. And I saw him, he sits about 20 feet away, and I saw him swallow. And I said you have strong feelings about that. And he said yes, I do. I said this isn't just the way you negotiate, it's a commitment for you in your way of life. He said yes, it is. He said something like how did you know that? I said I saw you swallow.

RL: Which arguably is exterior to the face.

SH: It is exterior to the face. That's a very interesting point. It probably is.

RL: Interesting.

SH: I have a good friend who is a Neuropsychologist, I guess would be her title. She's got two degrees. One in Clinical psychology and one in Neuroscience from UCSD. And she noticed before she knew about my prosopagnosia, she said that I don't track faces like other people. That she said I have a different pattern. I don't know what that pattern is but I'm not doing what most people do because my brain doesn't do that for me.

RL: Interesting. That's interesting because so many people don't make eye contact at all. So, I'm not sure what she's talking about but I'm sure she knows what she is talking about.

SH: I think what I tend to do is look off and then to stare. That's what it is. I don't think I go around the face but that is my guess. I don't know what other people do. I don't watch them.

RL: Right. Do you have trouble making any other kinds of discrimination besides faces?

SH: Well that's interesting. I'm very good, I'm off the charts on like abstract pattern recognition, remembering abstract patterns. I'm part of UCSD study about that sort of stuff and I get the highest scores the woman says that she's ever seen. And but when I go with friends like for flower shows they all look kind of alike to me. I get, I like the color but they're looking at this and looking at that and I got no interest in it. And I think it's because I'm not picking up the details. And I'm unbelievably clutzy at trying to find something in the refrigerator. Get the milk. I'm looking. I can't find the milk, it's right in front of you, oh yeah, there it is. I don't know whether that's related to the prosopagnosia I mean it sounds like it. It's a cousin about the same but I have those sorts of problems but they don't interfere with my life. This one does.

RL: Right. Right. Who is this scientist at UCSD? The neuro scientist?

SH: I only know Lori, who is the person who does them. Does the testing. I think I can get the name for you. Something like Phyllo Tophyllo Falletti, Falletti. He's doing neuroscience testing. I'll get you the name.

RL: Okay. Great.

SH: Your daughter, she works at UCSD?

RL: She was at UC Irvine but she did take courses at UCSD. She did audit courses at UCSD.

SH: He does his work at the veteran's hospital but I know it's UCSD.

RL: She, you know through all her reading and conferences, she knows a lot of things. So, I knew she would ask me that question. Have you met other people who are prosopagnosia?

SH: The most dramatic was a student who graduated two years ago and we used to joke together because she is ten times worse than me. She's a very good student. She came in second in one of the major moot court competitions. The one that Scalia judges.

RL: Okay.

SH: That one. She came in second place. Hartman is her name. Do you know her?

RL: No. But it is interesting that your names are similar.

SH: We have similar names. I think its Hartman. And she doesn't recognize a face from week, day to day, week to week like me. She cannot could not find her way from the Grace courtroom down to the coffee cart, coffee cart and back again.

RL: Wow.

SH: She had to go with somebody. She had to memorize cues to find rooms. Or ask directions over and over again. She could get her way home in the car but she had to know the route. She got off the route, she'd have to go back to where she lost it to start over. So, hers was much more generalized. It wasn't just faces, although she had the face problem, but hers was all kinds of mapping problems.

RL: My guess would be we didn't see her in the library. I would think a library would be pretty overwhelming for a person like that.

SH: In what sense?

RL: Well, everything is a finding tool. Everything is a symbol for finding information or an object, an object with information. Plus, the fact that the building itself is, can I would think be confusing because of the different levels.

SH: Right. I think that I was thinking the later but not the former. I think the former is more of an intellectual doing in your head.

RL: But you have to combine the two.

SH: The latter...

RL: When someone comes to me at the reference desk and I say it's up in the room overhead, that's the reading room, I'm assuming that a person can specially recognize...

SH: She would have that problem. She would have to have someone get her to the reading room. But she had a very good brain for organizing arguments. So, the interior space so to speak was intact but she was unable to translate that interior model in her mind to the exterior world.

RL: So, then what should the exterior world perhaps do differently to make wheelchair ramps for people with prosopagnosia?

SH: Well if it were, if it were socially okay to do so, for people who had this condition they could wear like a dot on their forehead so that anybody that could see them could recognize them and know to give you their name. Because I can't explain to every person that I meet that I don't remember them and it's nothing personal but it's a condition. So, please excuse me, but you have to tell me your name over again. I can't do that. I mean when you're going into a meeting with 40 people you can't do that. It's socially unacceptable. It's been said that the early hearing aids functioned not because they amplify the sound but when people saw a hearing aid they talked louder. So, what they need is a cue, like a hearing aid, for a prosopagnosia, (what's the adjective?), people so that other people know, and my students do that when they come to the office. And, I hate it when they say guess who I am.

RL: Oh dear. I normally when I see people that I don't see regularly say my name again. Every now and then someone, maybe someone a little older, gets a little annoyed and says I know who you are.

SH: In a creepy voice. Yeah, so I tell my students, if you meet me on the street just say I'm Sally from your Negotiations class. Then I don't have to go to my card catalog to figure out who you are.

RL: Now is it possibility that would happen between you and me, who have known each other for over 10 years?

SH: If I met you in an unexpected place. And if you were, like you're sitting on an airplane seat, and you got a blanket pulled up around yourself so all I see is your face and you were not on the flight to San Diego so I don't have any cues, all I've got your face. I would...

RL: So, in the shopping mall if either you or I were ever found in the shopping mall, I would say hi Steve it's Ruth and that might help.

SH: Exactly. Right. Well it would more than help. As soon as you said hi Steve, I would have a pretty good guess. The voice would help. And then the name. But it's conceivable if I knew three Ruth's that all looked a like, I mean it's conceivable but highly unlikely.

RL: Right. Right. That would be, well if you still looked puzzled, I'd know why. As far as you know does anyone else in your family have prosopagnosia?

SH: I have guessed that my father did, but I never knew to ask him. He was very shy and he was not unfriendly. But he had few, not very many friends, not wide acquaintances. And he would never go to a party or anything like that. He only hung out with people that he knew, like at work. Then when he retired playing Canasta with the Canasta group things like that. So, he was also more shy than I am. So, I think there's a possibility. My brother doesn't have it because I asked him. And my sister doesn't have it. And my children don't.

RL: I think you kind of did this, but I'm going to ask this question anyway, how would you describe it to someone who's never heard of it? And I think you actually did that when you introduced the subject, but maybe there's something you want to add.

SH: Well, in class because I'm interested in developmental psychology and developmental stages I usually work that into whatever I'm teaching. At some point, I draw a happy face on the board. I draw it upside down. I said if you show this to an infant at birth, they will be upset if it's upside down, because the infant already has in their infant's mind a model of what a face is supposed to look like. The line that's the mouth is at the bottom not at the top. I said if I were an infant and they showed me this they would look the same to me. I often use this as a starting point.

RL: That's a good starting point. And have you read anything or do you know anything about any theories about the infant development in people that have this condition?

SH: No, I don't I... having said that about myself as an infant it's inconsistent with the fact that I remember faces from childhood.

RL: Yes.

SH: So, I don't know whether I saw the same kids in grammar school over and over and over again for six years so that I know their faces. Another thing, which your daughter may be interested in, and we mentioned in the hall after the taping last time, is that I'm at least as good as average recognizing faces in movies.

RL: Yes.

SH: Humphrey Bogart I saw and Jean Tourney, I think her name is Jean Tourney.

RL: Hmm, hmm.

SH: The actress back in the forties. I saw a little blip of a film and I said that's Jean Tourney. I haven't seen her face in years.

RL: Yes, and we kind of speculated about what the two-dimensional aspect of that.

SH: The two-dimensional aspect. I also can't go from pictures to people very well. I go from picture to picture okay. But we need to have face match for students and Facebook that does not help me very much. I have to have a video where there's some movement.

RL: I see.

SH: That I remember much better.

RL: So, if there were a group picture of your family, well let's say someone not as familiar as your family, if there was a group picture of a group that you were at a conference with and I pointed to someone and said oh who is this? You may or may not...

SH: If I know him then I would recognize him. If it's a person that I would recognize face to face when I met them, I would recognize them in the picture. But I couldn't go from the picture and say that's him over there.

RL: I see. I see.

SH: The picture doesn't help me get to the real world. Picture to picture is okay. If I know somebody, I recognize your picture but a picture is not a cue for me. A learning cue to learn a face. Not a very good one. I tried doing that the first couple years of teaching. And it was miserable. I was always getting people mixed up. And there's certain kind of faces that all look alike to me. 5'10" blondish males that are kind of light. And they weigh like a 165 pounds so they're all the same height. They've all been for me cut out of the same cookie cutter for me because I have to find... I had two guys that sat next to each other. I couldn't keep them straight.

RL: Did you make them separate?

SH: No. I didn't do that but I told them I'm going to mix you two guys up.

RL: Well thank you for answering these questions. For being willing to answer these questions. Among many things I think that we learn from a conversation like this is that we never know what someone is dealing with at any given time.

SH: You never know what is going on. Also, I always mention this in class because other students may have that and not know it. And, virtually everybody has got some disability. Some learning disability and if they haven't recognized it then they have no opportunity to compensate for it. They have trouble conceptualizing, or putting things in categories, get categories screwed up, or have dyslexia or they do something, get numbers backwards. I also have dyslexia. I get numbers backwards.

RL: Oh, do you?

SH: Yes. 1,2,3,4 I write as 1,3,2,4. That sort of stuff. It's interior numbers that I get backwards. Why in the world my brain is designed to get the one right and the four right but mix up the two, three. So, when I was in law school, I had a terrible time getting case citations.

RL: Wow, of course.

SH: I had to get them off of the person sitting next to me.

RL: Of course. If somebody dictated a case...

SH: 127 count out 3426, I beg your pardon.

RL: Well I don't know that that's a very useful ability anyway but when you don't have it. It shows.

SH: Well it doesn't bother me. Is not a factor in my life. Dyslexia.

RL: Now it probably is as I say because of empathy.

SH: Well I was talking about the number dyslexia.

RL: Well I just mean that anything like that that you have to make a little special effort for may boost up your empathy quotient.

SH: Oh, I see. For other people. Yeah, I think it does.

RL: Yeah, I think so. I think it might too. And I want to talk about that some more too and some of the research that you've done into various kinds of Ethics questions and things like that but we'll get to that later because I'm going to try and can now jump back to a bit of chronological order. We have been talking and I think we kind of wound up talking about your service in the Peace Corps., which was very fascinating. I still myself and I was talking to some people at lunch there are those of us that aspire to the goal of being like Miss Lillian Carter. Do you remember?

SH: Oh, yeah.

RL: Do you remember with the Peace Corps in her 80's?

SH: Went off to India, I think.

RL: She did. She went off to India and she found it a little uncomfortable in India. I do remember that. We agreed that there is hope for us if Miss Lillian could do that. Maybe after we discharge our familiar duties.

SH: Well, you've got your project. Your narration projects, plural.

RL: Well, that's true but there's no reason that couldn't be done in Kenya for example.

SH: But you better do it quick because those stories are getting lost.

RL: Yeah and I hope, I hope that there are people working on that. But after the Peace Corps then you worked for Legal Aid in San Diego and I think we talked a little bit about how you got to Legal Aid but maybe just do a quick review of coming to Legal Aid. How that happened. How you came to San Diego.

SH: Okay. We came back from Columbia in the Spring, June of 1970 and I wanted to do Legal Services work because it seems consistent with my politics and such. And but we didn't

want to go back to L.A. which is where I'd been raised. So, we interviewed in Bakersfield, Riverside, San Bernardino, and came down to beautiful San Diego. And found out that San Diego Legal Aid Society had just gotten a grant of something like a million dollars to expand from something like four attorneys to 15 attorneys and they were particularly interested in people who had commitment for social change and could speak some Spanish. So, I fit in perfectly so I was hired on the spot. How times have changed.

RL: How times have changed. Even for Legal Aid.

SH: Even for Legal Aid.

RL: Because I imagine that the funding is much more restricted now.

SH: I should think so and the number of attorneys seeking those responses are greater than ever.

RL: Yes, and we do our share with our Center for Public Interest Law in our clinics. In interesting people in Public Interest Law. And then in Legal Aid you talked about some of the work you had done. At one point did you have an administrative position?

SH: Yeah, I was director for a couple of years from 1970 I'm not sure, '73 or '75 something like that.

RL: Well here it says '72 to '81.

SH: That's my years working there.

RL: That's your years working there, I see. Right. So, how did that come about? I think that's when you told me that someone had...

SH: Phil Isaacs. I thought of his name.

RL: Okay.

SH: Isaacs with an s on the end.

RL: Who was past his prime.

SH: Well it was more tragic than that. He had had an automobile accident. He hit a drunk. It wasn't his fault and it just shattered Phil. And, he just, he came to work but he literally sat at his desk. He couldn't do anything. So, Michael Wise, you wrote his name down. Michael and I went down. We knew we had to talk to him but it was unplanned what we were going to do. I thought about this after we talked last week. And, so Phil asked us what should I do? And it dawned on me, you've got to go. That's what you've got to do. You have to leave.

RL: Here's the ball. Catch it.

SH: So, he said okay, I'll resign. And it was therapeutic for him to do that. He was suffering. He had to take a leave of absence. I don't know what happened to him then.

RL: That was going to be my next question.

SH: I never saw him again.

RL: But you moved into that position then.

SH: Yeah, I became sort of by informal acclamation. And Steven is using code marks up in the air.

RL: With his fingers.

SH: With his fingers. And then they had a meeting of the board out of about a month later. I was director for, I have to go back and check, about two years.

RL: Did that change your work a great deal a lot?

SH: A lot. I became an administrator for the staff of attorneys and staff people of about 35. And a budget of about a million and a half. I was head of one of them at that time one of the larger law firms in San Diego. Course, now days that would be a small firm. Some of the work I did really well. I was, I had very good organizational plans for how the work should be distributed. And I had a radical plan for salaries, did I tell you this? I don't think so.

RL: No.

SH: I suggested that we should all have a single base salary, whoever you were, whatever work you did and that you would get additions to that base. That would be based on factors that we'd all agree to. Everybody would have to agree to a base essentially and that would be by vote or something. So, if you came in you would earn \$10,000 a year. If you had a college degree you can get a \$2,000 boost. If you had a law degree you get three thousand. If you had passed the bar you get another two thousand. If you had X number of years of experience you had this. If you had a family and children and your spouse didn't work then you get another add-on. It was open. If you had to drive further there could be compensation for that. If people wanted to do that. So, we met with that in mind. And the attorneys, it wasn't just the attorneys, but the attorneys who once thought it was a wonderful radical idea, when faced with the consequences killed it. So, it got off the ground but it didn't fly very far. That was my most radical idea. Most of my ideas were much more specific. We created the divorce mill. That was run by one attorney and we were turning out 100 divorces a month. We had three long tables. Files moved down from one end of the table to the other. We had side tables where they would go if they got off to one side. And we had a conduit off if we couldn't handle them because there were children involved or something like that. There had been a back log of divorces for people in San Diego because the funding that we had got prior to the Federal funding didn't permit us to do divorces. Can you imagine that? It got that divorce from the county when they let us do that. So, anyway that sort of stuff I did well. The part of it that was hard for me with prosopagnosia. I had to go to

meetings, I didn't know who people were. All that stuff started to haunt me. And I found out I was not cut out for administrative work. I'm the academic type. I'm the attorney type. I'm not an administrator. I think I told you this but I don't know if there is enough tape. I saw Jack Stanford. I don't think it's on the tape. I went to see a counselor who was a union trained minister. Jack was the head of the Episcopal Church at 6 then. Right of the park. 6th and Laurel. A lot of music. I don't know if you are familiar with it.

RL: Yes. I know the area.

SH: Anyway, Jack had been, I guess he was called the rector or whatever the priests there are called. I'm not particularly religious.

CONVERSATIONS IN LEGAL EDUCATION:

ORAL HISTORIES OF THE FIRST HALF-CENTURY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF LAW

Narrator: Professor Stephen Hartwell

Interviewer: Ruth Levor

Recorder: Ruth Levor

Date: September 7, 2006

Accession No.: OH-LRC-Hartwell-2A

TAPE 2A: SIDE B

RL: So, just to complete the thought that was at the end of the tape you were starting to talk about...

SH: Yeah, I talked to Jack Sanders and Jack Sanders' first question is about why are you here? And I said I'm unhappy with my work and he listened to me about 10 minutes. He said why do you do it if you don't like it. I said, well, I have to learn a living. I've got a wife and I've got two kids. And he said, you mean you'd stay if you stayed in the same organization and if you went back to becoming an attorney you'd starve to death? Oh, no. He shrugged his shoulders like what's the problem?

RL: What is the question?

SH: Not what is the problem, what is the question? So, about a month later I told him I was going to resign. And now my happiness, my depression which was getting started went away, like overnight. Then I became a happy person.

RL: So, you stayed with Legal Aid for a while after that?

SH: Oh, A long time. From '75 to '81. Another five or six years.

RL: I see. And then if you can talk about your transition into law teaching.

SH: Well, there's a guy named Ken Roy, who was one of the attorneys at Legal Aid. And he was a Cal Western graduate. And he had formed a class course over at Cal Western. Cal We as we know it, it was known in the day, on kind of Public Poverty, Law, Center. The sort of mish-mash of stuff like consumer rights and landlord tenant law and so forth that he taught at Cal Western, which at that time was out at Point Loma. And Ken couldn't make it all the time so he asked me to sit in for him when he couldn't make it. That was the first year. The second year he said why don't you do the class then. I'd love to do the class. I just enjoyed it. It was so much fun. And then they, Cal Western, was moved from Point Loma to its present location on Cedar Street, Third and Cedar, between third and fourth. And that was a five-minute walk from Legal Aid. And so, I started teaching a class on a regular basis, because they liked my teaching and

then it was popular and it was easy for them to do and it didn't cost them any money. You know how it is with that... And about that time, they started, which is like '81, 1980-81 they started the ideal of a Clinic program and I was there at the first dates of the Clinic program and then I got notice that USD was looking for Clinic professors. I heard that through Alan Schneider I think I heard about it. And they were both looking for Clinic types at the same time and I interviewed at both places and I got job offers at both places. I took USD because it was closer and at a University and it was a beautiful place. And at that time USD and Cal Western ranked about the same, which is surprising because USD has gone so far ahead in terms of National ranking. So, I took USD and I've been here ever since.

RL: Who was the dean at the time?

SH: Weckstein.

RL: I see.

SH: I took a cut in salary. He said yep, that's the way it's going to be.

RL: And that would have been so at either place, no doubt.

SH: Yes.

RL: That's just a common comparison between practicing and academia, although we do hear that Public Interest lawyers are now well paid.

SH: I was making \$28,000 in Legal Aid and I made \$21,000 at USD.

RL: That's a huge, that's a 25% cut.

SH: And I signed a one-year contract. And at the end, towards the end of the first year, it was extended to a two-year contract and at the end of the second year it was extended to I think a four-year contract. Before that expired, they created a tenure-track Clinicians.

RL: I see and that tenure track, did that come about under Christine Strahan?

SH: No that was Sheldon.

RL: Sheldon Crazz?

SH: Sheldon Crazz. Although she made changes since she boosted our salaries.

RL: Right. So, at that point you left Legal Aid and came here full time.

SH: I had a transition year where I supervised students, USD students, at Legal Aid. In the following year, I'm not sure the year, be like '82, I came here full time.

RL: When you supervised the students at Legal Aid, you were still being paid by Legal Aid?

SH: Right. I was like an Adjunct at USD.

RL: I see. I see. So, what was the Clinic Program like when you came here? What was the composition of program? Who was in charge?

SH: Charlie unintelligible.

RL: Charlie Lynch?

SH: Charlie Lynch. Charlie Lynch I had met at Legal Aid and my first day of work he was in the downtown office. And he supervised the first case I had. Which was just kind of interesting. Then he left Legal Aid immediately. That would have been like July or August of 1970 and I think that he came to USD and he, in 1980 was, had just been replaced, I think, I'm not sure about this because I wasn't here, by Walt Heiser. And I think my first year here was like Walt's first or his second year as Clinic director. At that time the clinics were field clinics. I also was involved in the first field clinic that USD had. I didn't realize the implications at the time. I don't know what year, it was in the mid-70s. I got a phone call from somebody wanting to know if I would supervise USD students who were going to go to a clinic. One was at the Mac Center and the other was in South East San Diego. I don't remember the exact location. It seemed we were like in a church building, or something. It was kind of a community hall. And I found out years later I learned that was the first USD Clinic group.

RL: Was that an Immigration Clinic?

SH: It seems like it was more of general property law. I don't remember it being on immigration. I would have been out of my water doing immigration work anyway. Corky might have been in that group too because I remember...

RL: As a student?

SH: I think Corky was still a student. I'll have to ask Corky, or you can ask Corky, because it was all part of the same beginnings.

RL: I'll ask Corky next week.

SH: And then I used to supervise USD students at the Mack Center. Some came from Cal Western, some came from USD.

RL: What was the Mac Center?

SH: Well it had an Ethnic name and it was too Ethnic so they changed it. It was Mexican-American Advisory Committee I think it was MAAC in National City. And they changed it to Metropolitan something or another to get rid of that Mexican title because it was never a good waiter from the county.

RL: I see. Where was it located?

SH: National City. I remember how to get there, but I can't remember where the building was. A public building, like a day center for school projects, that sort of stuff. We did it in the evening from like 7 to 10.

RL: How many students did you have in that group?

SH: Oh, we had between four and a dozen. Any way your question, if you had to do it, what was clinics like at USD when I arrived and I gave you an earlier answer what it was like five years before.

RL: That's true and that's good too.

SH: So anyway, when we started to USD we had a couple Civil clinics. We had an interviewing counseling / negotiations course. There was no Lawyering two course. And we didn't have the proliferation of very specialized clinics. We had a Civil Clinic, I'm not even sure we had a Criminal Clinic until Laura Berend came. But you would have to ask Laura about that. I would never have been involved in that because I don't have any criminal background.

RL: And what were your duties?

SH: Supervise Civil Clinic and Teacher Simulation course. I think the first question I taught was interviewing counseling - negotiations and he was being, had been taught by Michael Evans. And Michael and I had about one year of overlap. And it was kind of a Saturday night Massacre. But Michael and the other guy, whose name I can't pull up right now, and it was down the hall. They were sort of unceremoniously relieved of their duties at USD.

RL: Why?

SH: Why don't you ask Walt Heiser or somebody.

RL: OK.

SH: Who knows more about it than me because I wasn't much involved in it. I was sort of on the edge myself. I'll tell you when the tape is off.

RL: Well okay. That's entirely appropriate. What kinds of cases did Civil Clinic handle?

SH: Well, Civil Clinics and Legal Aid Societies basically handle the same kind of cases. Which is why they, USD, appropriately hire people from Legal Services program. You got Terry Player, Alex Snyder, and myself, all worked contemporaneously at Legal Aid. We all worked together. We all came here together because the case loads are virtually identical. The main criteria, two main, three criteria are that the person to have insufficient funds to hire private attorney. That's one. Second that the case be characteristic of poor people. You could be poor but

not have a case characteristic of poor people. Like copyright, we don't do copyright because that is not a characteristic problem of the poor. Third that they be opposed by somebody who's not themselves poor. That is to be opposed by a governmental organization like welfare benefits or Social Security. Or that they be opposed by a large business or something like that. If it was two poor people who ran into each other and had an accident, we wouldn't represent either one of them. So, those are your basic criteria. Oh, and I'll add one more criteria, it can't be generating case. The case would make money than that goes into a private attorney. Then there's some other sort of broad things you don't take. Cases that are just too complicated because you could have to have students to do this. You must be comfortable in yourself. That you can supervise at a distance and not get yourself in too much hot water.

RL: Right.

SH: And then you are always looking for cases that have interesting learning possibilities. Because the clients are interesting or whatever. My own feeling was it for your first time out any case is interesting. You don't have to look for interesting cases. Small claims cases are really fascinating, if it is your first case. Even your second or third case because there's always human dynamics and personality conflicts.

RL: I agree.

SH: There's no such thing as a simple case.

RL: It must be rare then for these cases to be law making cases.

SH: That's correct.

RL: What is your background for teaching, interviewing and counseling was it entirely experiential?

SH: No. I had a period after I saw Jack Sanford that I thought about doing counseling work. And I went to National University in the evening for close to two years. And you don't get Stanford education over there. But you do get to meet a lot of practitioners who are naturally good teachers and are doing this because they like it. Plus, the kind of students were not academics. There a lot of almost blue-collar types who go to National. So, I met a group of people who are fun to be around. Unpretentious just ordinary folk who wanted to do counseling. Taught by teachers who love teaching. I have a fond spot in my heart for National. They are not a pretentious place, but they do what they claim to do. And that and Peace Corps my experience at National and experience in the Peace Corps are probably where I learned my practical ways of teaching and how I conduct a classroom. We did a lot of hands on. A lot of small groups at National. A lot of conversation dialogue. Bringing in new materials. It was spontaneous. A lot of spontaneity in the classes. And I realized as a student how dull my law school education was. It kills the spirit and numbs the brain. And at National I was fun. And we were learning stuff and people were talking and they were animated. And I thought between being entertained and we hope we learn something, and god dammit you're going to learn something, and I don't care if you are entertained. The former outweighs and beats the latter because students, if students are

awake and they're interested they'll learn anything. And if they're bored and if they are impotent and they're afraid they will learn enough to get by, and they'll never have a creative thought and they'll hate it. So, it changed how I teach. It had a profound impact on my teaching.

RL: Was the counseling, did it include mediation or was it more personal?

SH: It was more personal but the skills you learned for mediation, the human skills, empathy and understanding and probing questions, paraphrasing, all that kind of stuff you learned in mediation system. They are packaged differently.

RL: When you came to the clinic Allen and Terry came with you.

SH: Allen was here first as a visitor. Terry came the year before. I think.

RL: And Michael Evans?

SH: He had already been there.

RL: He had already been there and this other person. Who else, was there anyone else teaching here at the time? In the Clinic Program? Besides Walt?

SH: There was a big guy and his name I can't remember at the time. Allen I remember.

RL: Is it uh, Laura has mentioned a man named Rod Jones.

SH: Rod Jones that's who it is. There's Rod Jones and there's a third unnamed guy that she probably can't think of either, because you'd have the name. But Rod Jones I think had left or left the same year that I started. He went off to, he started a law school in Malibu, which I think fell through. Not Pepperdine.

RL: Not Pepperdine.

SH: No, further up like Monterey Bay. I think it was going to be called Monterey Law School, something like that.

RL: I see.

SH: Never made it.

RL: I see. Okay. Now, did all the students who took classroom courses in the Clinic also participate in providing Legal Services?

SH: That is to say, the simulation course and the clinic course are the same people?

RL: Right.

SH: No.

RL: So, they could just do simulation?

SH: Correct.

RL: I see. And you dealt with both students because you said you were teaching a simulation class.

SH: Yes. You could be an interviewing counselor and also in the civil clinic. There are limits, arcane rules, about how many clinical units you can have. I forget what the number is. Something like 12 units or something like that so there's a bumper. The student bumps up against a limit of credits at some point, but you can take various configurations of Clinic courses at the same time.

RL: Right and I've met a number of the clinic students. I audited Margaret Dalton's, the special education class.

SH: Did you? How interesting.

RL: It was fascinating. and I think that I was left with the same feeling as you, not expressed as articulately, which was I wish I had had this kind of class in law school. I would have had a much better feel for the practice of law.

SH: I also think I agree with what you say but I go a step further. You learn theory better if you're having fun. You learn difficult ideas if you're having fun and very interesting to you. It isn't just that you learn practical things which is what I hear from academic types.

RL: Right. No, I agree with that. I mean I actually did at the University of Cincinnati have some fun teachers in traditional courses and there are little bits and pieces that I remember.

SH: Getting through.

RL: There's something about there has to be a pony in there, which I'll tell you about later, which has to do with civil rule. I can't remember the number right now but I agree with you but it's there.

SH: It's there.

RL: It's there and I know what it is about. At the time when you started teaching in the clinic as a USD Professor were there also members of the local bar who were supervising the students with you or was it all done by the on-campus people?

SH: Let's see did we have Adjuncts? I'm sure we've always had Adjuncts do supervision.

RL: Are there any that stick in your mind?

SH: Any of the supervisors?

RL: Any of the Adjuncts that stick out in your mind?

SH: No.

RL: What would you, what would you actually supervise? What, what, how close were you to the student client interview physically and otherwise?

SH: Well we used to go over to the senior center on Victory and Ash for example. And the senior center is about 600 square feet of floor space. And it's got three little offices plus another office in the lobby. And we be over there in the afternoon and I'd be there with the six students and there would be, we would take over the three little offices. And I would be in the outer office whenever I had to talk to somebody away from a client. Otherwise I would circulate through the three offices where they were doing the interviewing and sit in for a couple minutes. I was always very careful not to intervene between student attorney and clients I didn't want the clients talking to me. I wanted them to talk to the student attorney so that I would say hello to the client but only talked to the student attorney. And then I would go back to the outer office and then you need to come out and ask questions. I mean it's a very intimate. It's very close. You're staying with them continuously for the 2 hours or 3 hours that you're there. And that's how I think all of us operate that way. But you can be the judge of that.

RL: I'll let you know.

SH: Right, proof is in the pudding.

RL: Right. Now did any of these cases go to court?

SH: It depended upon the... yes to your question. There is if it was a clinic which we ran for ourselves a civil clinic or the client came over to USD than those were. And if, and if they were bound for court and then we would undoubtedly take him. If we are at the senior center then there's complications between who's keeping the file and all this sort of stuff. And so we tried not to take those cases that were more than just advice.

RL: You would try to find an attorney to represent them?

SH: Right, or send them over to our own clinic and they became not senior center clinic clients anymore then became clients of USD. So, that's more of a complication because you've got a transfer case and all that sort of stuff. So, all things being equal those cases that started at the senior center I'd try to leave them there if I could. Those that are already in the civil clinic and the client is being interviewed here at USD then if this is to go to court then that's perfect for us to take the case.

RL: Where was the senior center? Was it in Linda Vista?

SH: There are various senior centers. The one that I've pictured in my mind is in Linda Vista. There's one up on Linda Vista on the street right opposite Mesa College.

RL: Not Genesee?

SH: No, not Genesee. But not too far from Genesee. That's not a senior center. That was called family, family, something or another Center. We used to see a lot of clients up there because it was close.

RL: So, if the case was going to court the student would follow through?

SH: Yes.

RL: The student could by then by law represent the client in court under certain circumstances. Would you also accompany every student to court?

SH: Oh, you had to do that. That was required. Most of the time the student did all the work and I just sat. Often, with the permission of the judge, I wouldn't sit at the table. I would sit on the other side of the little swinging gates.

RL: Right. You would get the permission of the judge not to be at the table so you could kind of stand back.

SH: Right. Yes, if the student wanted that. If the student wanted me to sit next to them, then I would sit next to them.

RL: Did you ever jump up and say recess your honor? Laughter.

SH: I intervened once. and once when I should have and took a break. And I didn't intervene another time and I wish I had to this day because the student just got killed.

RL: By opposing counsel?

SH: By opposing counsel who at that time was President of the county bar. I've never forgiven him. It was brutal and I didn't get up quick enough and I felt awful.

RL: Funny how those things stay with you. We are so hard on ourselves.

SH: She was so humiliated and I was ashamed. I felt real sad. I don't like to talk about it.

RL: We'll move on. The case where you did intervene you felt the student was going off track in the question?

SH: No. They just sort of lost it. They lost confidence and didn't know to ask for a break.

RL: I see. How was the, if you can say such a thing as success rate, in the student's work in court?

SH: When students do motions, appearances that are, you know what I mean. When they do motions they do really well because they can prepare and they're like legal arguments that you make at school. And they typically don't make a motion unless they have the law on their side so their success rate for motions was 90%. I mean most all of them. If it is a specialized hearing, an administrative hearing where expertise and interpreting the regulation is significant, very high percent of success. And other kinds of administrative hearings like Social Security where the government is it is a charade and the government is not going to give you benefits. They are just there to go through the motions. They're extremely hard to win. It's not the fault of the students. In a fender bender automobile accident and it's based on the testimony of the witnesses in the law that says nothing to do with it we do so so. There the experience of telling a story gives them the advantage and, also, I think there's a sense that students aren't as able, and they ought to lose sort of thing.

RL: Quotation marks in the air.

SH: Quotation marks in the air. So, the more law rich it is the better we do and the more factual the less well. Then the other two dimensions if you want to make it top and bottom in the other direction the more it moves towards favorable forum like unemployment benefits we do well. And TC hearing we would generally do well. And negative hearings places like Social Security where I don't think any advocate does very well because the forum is set up against you. Oh, immigration can be extremely difficult to. They are very hard to win. And they've gotten worse. So, it is slanted towards the government, towards exclusion nowadays.

RL: Right, right. So, it also sounds like perhaps a harder skill in general, not just for students, is directing client testimony and dealing with opposing testimony.

SH: Yes, correct.

RL: Dealing with witnesses that you can't really control. You can control your legal research but you can't really control what people say and how they say it.

SH: It is exactly right.

RL: That's fascinating. That's probably reflected in the larger, in the outside the clinic arena, probably in legal aid as well.

SH: Yep.

RL: And the students were graded pass fail on their work, so you didn't have to deal with curves and things like that.

SH: I never have, with the exception of teaching PR.

RL: Now were most of the students in the early days that you worked with fresh out of college rather than second career people?

SH: I think this is correct. But I'd have to go back and check the numbers. But it seems to me that early on there were a higher percentage of women who were returning from childbearing years and coming in in their late 30s, then men in similar situations, so that you had a group, very substantial group, of women in their mid-30s. Having said that, I don't think it was that much different than today. That is to say, the typical student in the clinic and the typical student then and now is 23 years old coming into law school. And 26 on graduation.

RL: And was the typical student then aside from these returning homemakers, of which I myself was one during that time period, more male than female in the beginning?

SH: Oh, yes. You could probably check the register and get those numbers. Things changed in the 80s, one is women, the other is Asians.

RL: Asians?

SH: Asians. I used to go down and check in the mailboxes how many last names with Park. You know Korean and we used to have like one or two or one or zero or one or two and now it's like eight or something like that. And that's Korean. So, the Asian influx has been. Karl would have all those numbers. I mean, that's what I noticed.

RL: Interesting. My son in the mid-80s told me that the most common last name at Harvard was Lei. The Asian Lei.

SH: Yes. Chinese. Well Lei could be either and Parkhurst could be either. But it's not a common non-Korean name but it is very common Korean name. I can take a quick look and I can make a guess.

RL: Well that's interesting. I think we see that antidotally as we walk around campus.

SH: That's the most significant change. African American hasn't changed. American Indian hasn't changed. I don't think women has changed in the last 15 years.

RL: Well probably that was the point at which women became the slim majority in the class. And that remains today. But we still are lagging behind, as are many law schools, in their representation in the student body of the other groups that you mentioned and somewhat on the faculty as well. How well did you find the students to be prepared in general for the rigors of law school education?

SH: I find them well prepared.

RL: And you did then as well?

SH: Yes. They are bright and able. Inventive. Curious. What do you want?

RL: Sounds good.

CONVERSATIONS IN LEGAL EDUCATION:

ORAL HISTORIES OF THE FIRST HALF-CENTURY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF LAW

Narrator: Professor Steven Hartwell

Interviewer: Ruth Levor

Recorder: Ruth Levor

Date: September 7, 2006

Accession No.: OH-LRC-Hartwell-2B

TAPE 2B: SIDE A

RL: This is an interview of Professor Steven Hartwell for the project Conversation in Legal Education. Oral histories of the first half century of the University of San Diego, School of Law. The interview is being conducted by Ruth Levor at the University of San Diego, Legal Research Center on September 7, 2006. This is the second session of this set of interviews. Tapes and transcripts of this interview will be archived at the University of San Diego's Copley Library.

RL: We've been talking about students being well prepared for law school and it sounds from your response like you don't see any degeneration.

SH: No, no, in fact I've found they have gotten better. I find law students just amazing. And when you get to know them, did I mention the cellist?

RL: I'm not sure.

SH: I'm sitting next to Nicole Bayer Bayer at a Moot Court sort of a competition to pick people for the team. She turns out to be the student judge and she says, she asked me, Professor Hartwell, you have on a musical t-shirt. She asked me about it, finds out I play cello. She said she's a concert level cellist. She plays the Elgar. She plays the Lalo. She plays all of Devotchkas.

RL: I hear a recital coming.

SH: She plays huge Concertos'. I asked what you are playing. That's what she plays. I mean we're talking about literally world-class cellist. So, we go back down the hall and talk to another guy, who's name I don't know, who is also one of the team captains. He is a symphony level trombone player. He could make the San Diego Symphony. He's a law student for goodness sakes. I had a student last year, who plays poker in Las Vegas. He plays a system. He's like a genius at it. He could literally write a book about it. I'd asked about it. He goes, I have a software guy who's got off the wall, off the chart's knowledge of software. We got into some complicated conversations about how you create, how you replicate, evolution by having complicated programs that have non predictable chaotic variables in it. He knows all this stuff. I mean these are my conversations in the last few days. Those law students are astounding in their backgrounds. Unpredictable.

RL: I wonder why the musicians are going to law school.

SH: Beats me.

RL: I've also met concert musicians, but not quite, in other words, you know that world is very unforgiving in terms of providing substance.

SH: Well she might not make, but it doesn't mean she's not a brilliant cellist.

RL: That's right. That's absolutely right.

SH: It could be she doesn't have the style or whatever.

RL: Well there's just a limited number of positions. Symphonies are struggling.

SH: About six, last time I looked.

RL: Right, right, symphonies are struggling. So that's fascinating.

SH: I have a student with a photographic memory. I was talking to her. How do you remember things? And she says I see them on the page. I can count the lines down. What a brain.

RL: You must want to slap her silly. Laughter. That's great. That's great.

SH: They put in intense work hours.

RL: Yeah.

SH: They are most of them are working. Because they've got these huge stats.

RL: Are these night students?

SH: No.

RL: So, they're working other than in law school?

SH: You bet.

RL: Some point of empathy between you and them.

SH: Yes, that's true.

RL: The loans are absolutely...

SH: I was thinking about the changes after talking with you last week. I'm sure the people at the top are fighting it out for first place. But anybody could get a job. When I graduated from,

when I was graduating from law school and the idea of trying to make it in the top 20 or 30 or 10% in order to get a job was not on anybody's mind.

RL: That was in 1964.

SH: I graduated 1964.

RL: Right. It was different when I graduated in 1985.

SH: More competitive? I'm sure.

RL: Yes, yes.

SH: Not in L.A. at least. To graduate from USC in L.A. you had a job.

RL: And now of course particularly. To graduate from USD and to want to remain in the area really does put the pressure on.

SH: We just didn't have the pressure on. I'm sure, as I said, whoever is trying for valedictorian there was a lot of pressure. And I don't remember students flunking out. I'm sure we had some. We must of lost some.

RL: Yeah, interesting.

SH: Yeah, there wasn't a big fear.

RL: In your teaching. Do you use the Socratic method.?

SH: Meaning?

RL: That's a good question. Of the many people that I have asked that question, you may be the only one who's asked me to define what I mean by Socratic method. So, I'll kind of skirt the question and say as is it is typically viewed in law schools. But I'll go a little further and say teaching by asking questions.

SH: Well I just asked you a question.

RL: Yes, you did.

SH: And that would be what I would probably do in class.

RL: I see.

SH: But I don't think students identified it as the Socratic method. One of the things I do, for example, which I think is Socratic method. It's probably is not what you had in mind, is if I have a difficult question rather than asking a student, I pose the question, then I have the students meet

in groups of three and four and talk about it for five minutes. Then get reports from each group of students. I think that's Socratic method.

RL: Yeah, but it's a different style.

SH: Completely different style. I do that a lot.

RL: Right.

SH: Or I have them do quick writes. I pose a question and have them hand write an anonymous writing and then we read them off and talk about the answers. That's Socratic method too.

RL: Yes. Yes, it is. I think it's also associated with kind of hiding the answer or I think there's a spectrum of what professors will report that they do in terms of supplying the answer to the question that they've posed.

SH: I think it's extremely important, particularly with second- and third-year students, that have been through this already, not to embarrass students, not to humiliate them. Based on what students tell me in journals they are regularly humiliated in some of their classes which is why they don't talk after. Here. And it takes me half a semester to get students to talk. Some students to talk. They have to be sure they're not going to be insulted. I don't know whether you had that in mind as part of the baggage of Socratic method.

RL: It's traditionally the baggage around that name. That movie: The Paper Chase and that's the Hallmark of the Socratic method and I've always wondered what the pedagogic result was supposed to be. Of putting the student through a public humiliating experience. Was it supposed to prepare them for courtroom?

SH: Top of the mouth? Well we know the depression within the first month of law students they come in around 4% which is the national average and it's 20% within a month or so. It's 40% by graduation. It's 30% by the end of the first year typically and we're no different. And then it never goes away. At roughly thirty or forty percent of lawyers are clinically depressed so it's got to come from somewhere. I don't think it's the food. That's been tested rigorously for the last 25 years with the same results. If there were the research is more than 25 years old.

RL: And yet the legal education community is slow to respond to that in any positive way.

SH: Slow is being gracious. I'd say they are in denial.

RL: I wonder and I don't know if either of us has a real way of knowing whether that's less true of younger faculty members.

SH: You mean they're less inclined.

RL: Less inclined...

SH: Less inclined to humiliate their students? I don't know. I don't have any idea.

RL: No, I don't know either.

SH: I just know the rates remain the same.

RL: I don't find that hard to believe.

SH: Well you've got solid data for it.

RL: Yeah, I remember working in the library of my alma mater after I left law practice and having classmates come in and just look at me so wistfully and say you must be having so much fun. Which implied a lot about what they weren't having or experiencing and that they clearly were aware there had to be a disparity in our incomes.

SH: Yes.

RL: And so, I certainly have had anecdotal experience to support what you're saying. Do you have some favorite stories about some of the clinic students' experiences with clients that maybe went comically array?

SH: I'm not sure I know what you mean.

RL: I'm not sure either but sometimes there are client-attorney experiences that kind of are, I don't know, if they're apical, but they're kind of amazing.

SH: I'd have to think about that.

RL: Okay.

SH: Because the things that come to my mind are usually like embarrassments. I mean they're funny after the fact but at the time they were embarrassments.

RL: More to the students or to the client?

SH: To the student. The client might have been embarrassed but I wouldn't have known it.

RL: Right.

SH: So, the students just goofed up. I mean they're funny after they happen.

RL: Right and would it be more based on kind of a lack of life experience where they would say something that reflected...

SH: Oh no, it's just things that happened.

RL: What do you think is the greatest the surprise to students when they start working with actual real clients?

SH: It's not exactly a surprise, but if they see it it's a shock, and that is the realization that if I am a student, I am emotionally and socialized to believe what my client has told me. And to overly, grossly, overestimate the veracity of the client. But the justice of their cause. And the shock when you come to grips with what the opposition has to say. The realization that you may not have been lied to but you have been selectively set up. You can read that. You can be told that and you come back and say Professor Hartwell this is really in case we need to take. You can't believe what happened to my client and I say to myself, no I can't. I know as a beginning lawyer that was my greatest shock. And I think for law students it's not that your clients are a bad person, that they have any character flaw or that they're even consciously fibbing to you ,but they have come to believe in their own cause and even more significantly they believe they can't get help unless they give you a sufficient story. It's almost like going to the doctor. You know I've got to have a sufficient disease or I shouldn't be here. I have to have something sufficiently bad happen to me and I have to be in the right. Clients don't think that they have rights unless they were good people but in fact bad people have the same rights as good people. Your rights don't change and just because you're nasty. and you're entitled to the same representation whether you are Saddam Hussein or whomever. I mean you're entitled to certain legal rights. So clients don't know that. So, they put their stories to them. They are only selling their stories and I think that's the biggest surprise.

RL: I do too but I was interested in hearing you say that. You said it much better than I would have and I think I'm going to call time right now and see if we can schedule a follow up.

SH: Okay.