

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

Introduction

The Following is a discussion about the role of lawyers, natural and civil rights, and the role of including non-legal stories into a curriculum in law school to expand the thinking of its students. Professor Anthony Baker of Atlanta's John Marshall Law School is the architect of this course entitled: Law, Lawyers, and Literature. These are my thoughts on the topics and works analyzed in the course.

I. "Howards End"

A classical liberal education, founded on Classical Liberalism, is based on the notion that to fully understand the world around us, we must pursue multiple avenues of thinking to come to a complete understanding of the world. By logically expanding a form of questioning of a singular topic, such as the law, into other associated topics, an individual is able to make logical connections and inferences into the topic in which he or she is investigating. In compiling a group of writings on a broad subject such as the law, it is essential to get to the heart of what the law actually deals with: people. The law is not a set of unimpeachable deontological rules preordained by God, but are human constructs, full of human failing. Thus, the inclusion of E. M. Foster's: Howards End (1910), that highlights the social inequalities of women's legal rights in society, is squarely relevant to a class entitled Law, Lawyers, and Literature. Moreover, Foster's story elegantly exposes the unfair property rights of women under English Common Law and ties in well with the other material.

A. Christian Roots

As with all things, where to begin? At the beginning seems best; so let's start there. In the Bible, the book of Genesis 2:4-3:24, God creates Eve out of Adam's rib to keep him company. A

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

notion of oneness, but also a notion of superiority. When God instructs Adam and Eve not to eat from the tree of knowledge, it is not Adam who initially disobeys, but Eve. This original sin has been used as a justification for women's traditional role in Christian societies. Now, it is clear there are big questions here. Such as, why did God punish Eve and declare that her: "desire will be for her husband, and he will rule over you," if God is omniscient? Should he not have known the Devil would tempt Eve in the first place, and that she would eat from the tree? Nonetheless, this story has been a fixed point historically as a justification for women's subordinate role in Christian societies and class structures of western culture.

B. Class Structure and Coverture

Class structures are evident in all human societies throughout time, regardless of modern forms of capitalism or degrees of socialism, there is always a working class, middle class, and upper class. Within western societies, women have typically been the keepers of the household. Not an easy job by any stretch of the imagination, but socially is considered an inferior position. What makes *Howards End* an interesting work, is that it focuses on the upper class. This is an important point, as a common misconception of the wealthy or upper classes, is that they have it easy, that the law doesn't apply to the rich, or that their money will solve any issue they can come up against. Well, not if you are in upper "society," and not if you are a woman in the western world prior to the twenty-first century.

A leftover legal doctrine from English Common Law is the Law of Coverture. This doctrine states that when a woman marries her legal entity as an individual is subsumed into her husband and they become one legal entity. This means that a woman loses her property rights to her husband, she is not able to file lawsuits or be sued separately, nor can she engage in legally binding contracts. In essence, she legally no longer exists.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

In *Howards End*, the issue is not only one of adultery and the social double standard that came from illegitimate children outside of marriage, but it highlights the lack of property rights women held in societies based on English Common Law. In the story, although Mrs. Wilcox had left a note that she wished for *Howards End* to go Margert Schlegel, her husband Henry (Mrs. Wilcox's husband before she died) by the law of coverture would assume the property unless there was a legally binding Will that transferred the property only to Margret. Since, the note was not a binding legal document, Margret lost her property rights to *Howards End* to her husband. If Margret were to have title to the property, when her sister became pregnant she could have provided for a home at *Howards End* for her. But, now she had to beg her husband to protect her sibling. With conscious disregard for his sister in law's wellbeing, Henry simply wants her removed from "society" because her pregnancy out of wedlock to a working-class poor man was an unconscionable embarrassment to him.

The manner in which Margret is forced to carefully dance around the power inequalities between her and her husband is exposed in this story. The reader can clearly see that Henry lacks any empathy towards his wife's sister and enjoys the reality that he holds all of the power. Thus, E. M. Foster is not focusing on adultery and illegitimacy, or the social ills of upper society, she is focusing on what happens to the family when the law is unequally applied.

C. A Connected Curriculum

Like E. M. Foster's story, multiple works in the course curriculum highlight the inferior legal and social position women have held in western societies. Some of these works include the *Crucible*, *A Jury of Her Peers*, and the *Trial of Mrs. Packard*. All of these stories illuminate how the legal system has created immense injustice and disparities towards women and their legal rights.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

The Trial of Mrs. Packard can be directly connected to E. M. Foster's story. The Trial of Mrs. Packard is from an American case in 1864 Illinois. At that time, Illinois had passed a law derived from the law of coverture that allowed any husband to declare his wife insane, and have her committed to an asylum. Mrs. Packard, a well-educated and upper class Calvinist, spoke her mind freely. Due to this, and her inherited wealth, her husband, a Calvinist minister, decided to institutionalize her to embezzle her property and silence her. Again, the story of original sin from the Bible, is used as a justification socially to subordinate women to the home, and the law of coverture is used to strip another woman of her rights. In comparing Mrs. Packard's real life experience with E.M. Foster's fictional Margret, it becomes clear how much power a husband had over his wife, and to what extent that power could be wielded backed by legal and religious systems.

Conclusion

In summation, the inclusion of E. M. Foster's Howards End is rightly included in the course curriculum because it adds in women's experiences with the legal system in the past. It connects the role religion played in the societal structure of English Common Law, and amplifies the stories of women's experiences from the other material mentioned above. If some of the students did not make this connection, they might have missed this point all together, Nonetheless, Foster's story amplifies the inequalities of women's legal rights and gives the perspective of women in the upper classes unlike the other material. Due to Foster's story highlighting the upper class, students can make the connection that laws based on prejudices and stereotypes can affect anyone at any level of society.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

II. Natural Right: A Law Against Political Expediency

What is the law? Is it simply politics in action as an expression of power by the majority, or of a chosen few wielding power? Or is the law predicated on moral principles derived from the deontological rules of religious moral codes and philosophical concepts of virtuous action? If the law is predicated on certain moral and ethical rules, do those rules override political expediency and fear if there is a possible threat to the community, such as a possible terrorist attack? Does the possibility of a threat give the government the right to arrest without probable cause and skip due process? Well, that might actually depend on what type of political community you live in, and what philosophies are the foundations upon the laws you live under.

A. Political Philosophies and Classical Liberalism

For millennia, most human societies were organized around a monarchy. These monarchies typically worked hand in hand with local religious beliefs of the people. In some societies, like the ancient Egyptians, or monarchies within the Roman Catholic Empire, the right to rule was a divine right to rule. The royal families of these societies imposed the rule of law by fiat. The word of the King was the law, and society, the military, economy, and cultural customs revolved within feudalism. Thomas Hobbes, famously stated in his book Leviathan, that without a strong monarch life would be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” Hobbes believed that no one had a right to anything in the state of nature, and that most human beings’ nature was selfishness. Thus, the might of the monarch was needed to stop those selfish impulses.

The belief that all people are inherently selfish and corrupt stems from realism or religiosity, and therefore, philosophers like Hobbes, Karl Marx, and Carl Schmitt believed that those in power would rule from a moral imperative. For Hobbes, the King would rule with an

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

iron fist and enforce the law. For Marx, the people would seize the means of production and through a communist revolution would give an equal share of the economy. Lastly, for Schmitt, those in power would simply recognize who their friends and enemies were, and use extreme violence against their enemies to ensure peace. Peace through strength. However, as it should be plainly seen, there is something wrong with these philosophical views on politics and the rights of the individuals within those communities. To be clear, Hobbes represents the philosophical foundations of imperialism, while Marx and Schmitt philosophies were adopted as the philosophical foundations of Communism and Naziism. These political conceptions are criticisms of classical liberalism and rely on oligarchy or utilitarianism, i.e. the greatest good for the group, or of a small group. However, suppression of ideas is not unique to totalitarian systems such as monarchy, communism and fascism. Even in democracies the corruptible force of power can override the tenet of classical liberalism.

Classical liberalism is epitomized by Plato's description of the trial of Socrates. Socrates was on trial for crimes against the state for corrupting the youth. Those striving for power will often blame perceived others or undesirables for the problems within their communities. In the first democracy on the planet, Socrates became the scape goat for ancient Athenians vying for power. What Plato was pointing out about Socrates's suicide was that he took the power away from those who attempted to use his philosophies and tools of argumentation as descriptions of social destruction. What is important to recognize here, is that freedom of thought, and the freedom to congregate with others to engage in the sharing and debating of those ideas is the core tenant of freedom in classical liberalism. The dignity and primacy of the right of the individual's thoughts supersedes the power of the group.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

B. English Enlightenment & American Constitutionalism

During the English Enlightenment (17th -18th centuries), the rediscovery of ancient Greek philosophies of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were seen through the eyes of new philosophers long under the yoke of monarchy. The monarchies in Europe were firmly entrenched in the concept that they had the divine right to rule: the “Divine Right of Kings,” and philosophers like John Locke began to question the validity of the divine right to rule.

In John Locke’s Two Treatise of Government, Locke expands on Aristotle’s politics and describes what is known as Natural Law. Under natural law, each individual has inalienable rights from God, not from the king or political community. The individual maintains the right to life, property, and freedom of thought. And those rights are not given up by the individual just because he or she lives in a community with others. These rights are predicated on reciprocity and empathy, not power and coercion. However, there are some rights the individual gives up when he or she enters into a commonwealth. The individual temporarily gives up the right to be judge, jury, and executioner to the legal system of the commonwealth. This is a temporary position as long as the commonwealth does not become tyrannical to the individual. At that moment, the individual is free to leave the commonwealth and revert to the state of nature. Here, Locke was well aware of the ability of power to corrupt individuals in government and was making it clear that the people had the right to throw off their government through the right of rebellion and institute a new government. This concept, is the spark that lit the American Revolution, and natural law is the philosophical foundation of American constitutionalism. A core concept of justice under the Constitution of the United States is due process. Due process ensures the right of the individual to have the charges against them brought to a trial and adjudicated in front of a Judge.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

C. Political Expediency, Terrorism, and Due Process

America has gone through many instances of Carl Schmitt's friend enemy dynamic throughout its existence depriving the people of their due process rights, e.g., the Alien and Sedition Acts, The Red Scare, McCarthyism, Cointelpro (FBI surveillance and operations to discredit and destroy organizations the government felt were subversive from 1956-1971), and the Patriot Act. All of these instances were counter to natural law and the right of due process, and would clearly meet the behavior of a tyrannical government according to Locke. These operations and legislative acts were all passed under the guise of expediency of an imminent threat. The nature of political expediency is that it is not fully developed. It is a bare minimum. Political expediency is not the sharing of ideas and debate in a commonwealth, it is the actions of Leviathan. It is power.

In Michael Waltzer's Just and Unjust Wars he discusses what is known as the Ticking Time Bomb Scenario. This thought experiment is used to test if torture is ethical in certain situations. In the scenario, we are to assume that there is a bomb hidden somewhere in the city, and if it detonates, thousands will be killed. In custody, we have a supposed terrorist that may, or may not, have valuable information about the location of the bomb. The question is: is it ethical or just to torture this person? Those in favor of torture, argue it is a logical means to an end to defeat an imminent threat. Thus, for proponents of torture, due process puts people's lives at risk. However, this is fallacious for multiple reasons.

First, a core principle of American law is due process. If the government is so sure they have an actual terrorist, then the government has the burden to prove that through due process. Second, even if the government actually has a terrorist, does that terrorist even know anything about the bomb? If the terrorist doesn't, then torturing him or her would likely induce a false

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

confession of a location that would waste the time of trying to find the actual bomb. Third, if the government knows about the bomb, how did they find out about the bomb in that city? Is the information even valid? Fourth, if the information is valid, are there other more effective ways to ensure the safety of the people in that city than spending valuable time torturing a person that may or may not have any information? Based on the procedural requirements of due process and the logical questions that should be asked before engaging in torture, the fallacious reasoning behind the necessity to torture as a defacto road to a result becomes clear as illogical and unethical.

Therefore, if there were new allegations of chatter on the web of extremism supposedly uncovered by the FBI, one should run through the same process as above. If the government has any actual information on alien residents returning to the middle east to engage in terror training then the government has the burden to prove that. Suspicion and circumstantial evidence is not enough. The group does not have the right to infringe on the natural rights of the individual. Desperate times do not call for desperate measures. Desperate times calls for logical and methodical thinking, not suspicion, violence and fear. It is in desperate times that free-riders and opportunists emerge taking advantage of chaos and fear.

D. Opportunism and Henry VIII

A prime example of the emerging of free-riders and opportunists that threaten the rule of law for their own gain involves the English Court of Henry VIII. In a scene from the movie “A Man for All Seasons” Sir Thomas More explains why the law is so important in times of turmoil. In the scene, More is approached by Richard who is trying to play both sides of the shifting political landscape in England. Henry VIII’s wild swings of passion and distrust have made England a very dangerous place. Thomas Cromwell has approached Richard to work for him but

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

he would prefer to work for More. Nonetheless, Richard is willing to work against More for Cromwell to get ahead. When More declines to hire Richard his family insists that More should arrest Richard now before he does anything. They insist he's a bad man to which More replies: "there's no law against that." More is clear that until Richard actually broke the law, the power of English law should not be used to preempt a supposed or possible crime. As More states of the slippery slope of injustice "...what would you do? Cut a great road through the law to go after the Devil?" More's point is similar to the ticking time bomb scenario, if you strip away the roots of the law that hold the principles of due process, fairness, and natural rights away, there is nothing left to hold a commonwealth together. Under More's thinking, even the Devil deserves the benefit of the law. Not for the Devil's sake, but for the sake of everyone else.

Conclusion

In summation, a proposal to strip away the rights of an individual, under the guise of safety, based on the speculation of terrorist activity, would undermine the rights of the individual, and strip away the core philosophical foundations of natural law that holds the United States together. This would do immense harm to the faith citizens have in the rule of law. The law either means something or it doesn't. The law either exists to protect the weak from the powerful, or it is a tool of the powerful. The law is either for the good of all, because it is equally applied at all times, or it's a whim and tool of power. Thus, fear should never be allowed to strip away the natural rights of the individual with calls for political expediency.

III. Question 3: Mechanic or Architect

"A lawyer without history or literature is a mechanic, a mere working mason; if he possess some knowledge of these, he may venture to call himself an architect." Sir Walter Scott,

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

from Guy Mannering (1906). What does this quote mean in regards to legal study? And how is it relevant to practicing the law?

A. Developing Legal Skills

As law students we are forced to recite code and common law elements at the drop of a dime. At times, it seems that if you can't recall every element when called on that you are an idiot. You start to believe that you are not cut out for the law because everyone else obviously had the answer with the flurry of hands that are raised when you stumbled. Thus, law school focuses on procedure, recognizing the issues, and applying the rules to those issues. An important and practical necessity if one wants not to commit malpractice. But, is this all that studying the law should be about? Doesn't history, philosophy, and literature on how the law is perceived and acted out important to a legal education?

To some, the answer is an obvious yes, the law is not separable from the whole in which it is connected to: people and communities. As Justice Frankfurter explained in a letter to young boy from Alexandria, VA, in 1954, who had written to Frankfurter for advice on what to do to prepare for studying the law. Frankfurter replied:

“The best way to prepare for the law is to come to the study of the law as a well-read person. Thus alone one can acquire the capacity to use the English language on paper and in speech and with habits of clear thinking which only a true liberal education can give.” “...deepen your feelings by experiencing vicariously as much as possible the wonderful mysteries of the universe, and forget all about your future career.”

Frankfurter's advice is important because he is letting the boy know that the law is not merely recognizing issues and how to apply the rules. It is about people's stories, emotions, and how those stories fit within the society in which you live in.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

Therefore, to have a greater understanding of another person's experiences, one must seek out those experiences and feel them vicariously. A classical liberal education is predicated on this notion. Unfortunately, as a society we have moved away from this reasoning. Now, college is about getting a career that pays well. It is no longer about learning how to educate oneself. This is precisely the point Frankfurter and Sir Walter Scott are addressing. One can become a mechanic through the study of the law by knowing code, and common law rules, but as Frankfurter advises the young boy, to excel in the law, to become a master of a skill, one must seek knowledge outside of their chosen career. An individual must be able to freely and smoothly move from the microscopic lens of the mechanic, to the macroscopic lens of an artisan or architect who envisions their work as complete before they have even begun. This does not mean that it is easy, but one must have the desire to become an artisan or architect.

B. Legal Skills and Totalitarianism

In Franz Kafka's: *The Trial* (1914), Kafka exposed the pull of mechanical bureaucracy that was enveloping eastern Europe during WWI. Kafka wrote *The Trial* in Prague as the Austro-Hungarian Empire was falling apart. Prague, under the authority of Francis I, who declared himself Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, had developed a dual governmental system, where Prague (Hungary in general, now the Czech Republic) had autonomy to effect local law, but Austria had the ability to supersede those laws. Therefore, distrust and paranoia began to build in Prague. Multiple legal systems created a gravitational pull to work for the government because there was stability through rewards and kickbacks. It is in this backdrop, that Kafka tells the sad story of K.

The story begins when K wakes up one morning to be informed that he is under arrest, but he doesn't know what he has done to be under arrest (this is an actual tactic of totalitarian

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

governments that was perfected by the Communist Party). The rest of the story is K frantically trying to find out what he is actually charged with. It is in this fictional plot that the mechanic in the law is exposed. K approaches many different characters who may have information on how he can find out what he is charged with. Unfortunately, he is met with a lack of urgency by those who claim to represent the rule of law. These judges, back door bureaucrats, and lawyers simply enjoy their positions in society and have no interest at all in K's issue. Their view of his issue is simply "so what if you don't know what you are charged with, you should know what you did wrong." This is a position one takes who simply goes through the motions. Skilled? Yes, as far as navigating the legal system. Educated to seek justice as a craftsman or architect? No.

C. Political Pressure, Identity, Reputation, & Purpose

Why do some law students, lawyers and individuals within a legal system feel the pull to become a mere mechanics or skilled bureaucrats then? There may be multiple reasons why, such as political pressure, money, social status, or narcissism. Political pressure can be a big one for young lawyers and law students. They often feel they need to adopt the political views of their professors and supervising attorneys. This often develops when the student, or young lawyer, disagrees with those in positions of authority over them, but don't speak up and simply do what is expected of them. George Orwell's short story: Shooting an Elephant, exemplifies how outside pressure can make individuals do things against their nature, and in some instances do horrific acts against the innocent.

C1. Political Pressure

In Shooting an Elephant, an English police officer in Burma, is forced to deal with an elephant that is in the midst of "musk" aggression (male heat). This is a natural process all male elephants go through during mating season. Musk can cause elephants to become aggressive and

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

tear up crops and huts, and can be very dangerous especially if the elephant finds its way into a city. This elephant was in the city causing damage and the English officer was called to deal with the elephant. Out of an expression of his authority over the Burmese people he grabbed his rifle.

When he arrives at where the elephant is, it is completely calm and simply eating grass. The musk has passed. However, now the officer is standing with a rifle in hand and a local mob has formed behind him calling for him to kill the innocent non-aggressive elephant. The reason the mob wants the elephant dead is not for its danger to the community, but because they want to eat it.

Faced with the pressure of what is expected of him, the officer goes against his instincts of protecting the innocent and shoots the elephant. The elephant doesn't die and the officer shoots it multiple more times. Still the elephant won't die. Now, the elephant is suffering, and the officer wants to end the suffering he has caused. So, he decides to increase the level of violence against the innocent elephant by shooting it in the mouth multiple times. Again, this does not kill the elephant. However, the mob of townspeople are satisfied and begin to butcher the elephant while it is still alive. Disgusted by his own actions the officer simply walks away.

Orwell's story is important, because it exposes how those within the legal community can be pressured by the group to do something against their own moral and ethical values for political expediency.

C2. Identity

Sometimes people, not just law students and lawyers, are not pressured by the desire for acceptance from the group, but desire to differentiate themselves from the group. They will consciously destroy their own naturally developed personality from their experiences, moral compass, and knowledge, and replace it with a manufactured identity. Sherman Alexie's: The

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

Toughest Indian in the World, is a prime example of narcissism and what may drive a person to manufacture an identity.

Alexie's short story revolves around attorney Edgar Joseph, who tells people his name is Edgar Eagle Runner. Edgar is Native American, but only tells people (mostly non-natives) his name is Eagle Runner for effect. As an attorney he lives predominately in wealthy areas and has only white colleagues. He is married to a white woman and is dealing with a marriage in crisis due to the loss of their child as a result of a still birth. Isolated because his wife is grieving, Edgar decides that he need to be with "his people."

He decides to go to a local bar that he has never been to. A bar where local Native Americans go. Rollin up to the bar in his expensive Saab, wearing typical casual Friday law office attire, Edgar clearly is out of place. Flaunting his long braids, specifically wearing his hair this way to appear more "Indian" in his day to day life, he is immediately snubbed by the locals. Edgar eventually gets into a fight at the bar and is beaten severely. Still this does not deter his narcissism. When the American Indian bartender attempts to help him with his injuries he thinks she's coming on to him so he grabs her breasts. It is in this moment that the bartender explains to Edgar why he is not accepted by the Indians and is seen as an outsider. She brutally tells him that pretending to be Indian when it suited him, but not to live with Indians, or to be aware of the issues that face that community, is why he doesn't belong. The bartender's opinion may be utterly wrong in reality, but within the context of the story it is the moment when Edgar realizes where he belongs: with his wife at home.

This story exemplifies how an individual who perceives their position in society as their identity can warp one's perception of their identity, especially if that person has a tendency to narcissism. Law students and lawyers beware.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

C3. Reputation and Purpose

Charles A. Reich's: *The Sorcerer of Bolinas Reef*, is a tour de force of the struggles young law students and budding lawyers go through. Reich's story is autobiographical and recounts his experiences with the law. From his first clerkship, to working in a high-end law firm in Washington, D.C. (D.C.), and finally questioning the meaning of it all one night in the library of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Reich explains that when he first came to D.C. and worked as a law clerk for Justice Hugo Black, that his "...personal dreams, my search for wisdom, and my plans for myself all came together in one perfect way..." Reich would live for one year with another law clerk on the first floor of Justice Black's Alexandria, VA., home. Reich recounts that living at Justice Black's was filled with conversations over the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the principles of Justice. This must have been an amazingly impressionable experience. However, a young Reich might not have seen that Black's control of the time he woke up, eating habits, and discussions were not about developing him as a free-thinking attorney, but developing him as an acolyte of Blacks.

After Reich's clerkship, he was offered a position with a law firm that was known for "New Deal Liberalism, and civil liberties." This job came with all the typical perks of a high paying legal career, e.g., reputation, suits, shined shoes, afternoon haircuts, an office, disposable income, and connections. Reich's impression of this time at the law firm was that: "[t]his is what everyone wants! This is really living! Where these men ate lunch, where they went for recreation, what they talked about, and what they wore was what everyone else wanted and tried to copy." However, this shiny feeling soon began to fade on him.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

Working at that law firm was all consuming. As Reich stated: “Work at the law firm simply did not include a factor that showed respect for the needs of the individuals.” Reich felt that: “Few people respected [his] right to have [his] own thoughts and feelings for very long.” This is a common outcome of those who simply go through the motions of life. Instead of asserting themselves, their own identity, and carving their own path, they simply do a job. They become a mechanic.

Reich knew this all too well, as he witnessed his friends experiencing the same thing, to which they simply fell “...back on craftsmanship as a justification for their work, virtuosity for its own sake, a job that other professionals could appreciate.” However, this type of craftsmanship is not the same as a skilled artisan or architect. It is merely being a really good mechanic who does a clean and efficient job. To be an artisan there must be a sense of purpose to what you are doing, or to have a sense of fulfillment that is beyond the work itself. For Reich, that purpose was that legal work “...must be morally and socially responsible...” This is quite aspirational despite the realities of life, but there is nothing wrong with seeking aspirational goals. That is what artisans do.

So what is the point if the work you are doing is not fulfilling? Or as Reich put it: “Was society as a whole equally engaged in activities with little social value?” These are good questions. Perhaps, it is not about what you do, but how you do it that is important. For lawyers and law students, the law has moral and social implications that are very important to recognize. Even if the work is not fulfilling for the individual, it is very important to their client. Thus, a level of respect must be given to the work.

It is true an excellent mechanic can still get the results the client is looking for, but

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

what if the case involves issues like that of *Buck v. Bell* 274 U.S. 200 (1927)? Will a mechanic suffice to protect the liberty and due process rights of those who can't fight for those rights themselves? A lawyer who has experienced the world, and exposed him or herself to other viewpoints, is more likely to see the implications of stripping away the legal and natural rights of the innocent in the name of political expediency. Unlike a legal mechanic, a legal architect can build solid legal argumentation on top of the foundation of natural law, which requires knowledge outside of the law.

Conclusion

In summation, studying the law and practicing the law can simply be a career path that will make some people happy if they are not the type of person to seek introspection, or challenge what life means to them. A job, 401k, disposable income, a house, a car, and a family may be all they need to feel fulfilled, and that is ok. These individuals can be extremely good mechanics. Skilled workers in a high wage bracket. It is this way in all things in life. However, the law provides an opportunity for those wishing to find purpose in life over mere reputation and identity within the group.

So, what does Sir Walter Scott's quote from *Guy Mannering* (1906) have to do with a legal education and practicing the law? Scott is pointing out that to do something of significance, such as the law, it necessitates more than just skill. An individual must seek to be well rounded, and educated in more than just the ability to recite code and common law, because a lawyer has an opportunity to do immense good for others beyond mere personal financial gain. This is an important distinction to make. Scott is drawing a line between merely calling oneself a lawyer, as a state of being in a career, and calling oneself a lawyer who relies on more than just the law to structure their arguments. The lawyer as architect creates precedent and protects the natural

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

rights of individuals through skill and artistry. The architect lawyer remembers that the law involves people, thus people's varying experiences matter. So, reading, watching, listening, and experiencing life outside of the potentially myopic legal community, allows those within the legal community, to apply everything that they have learned for a greater good beyond self-reward.

Law, Lawyers and Literature: A Discussion of the Role of Lawyers

Work Cited

-Professor Anthony Baker: Atlanta's John Marshall Law School. Course Curriculum and choice of primary material. May 2021.