

Pioneers and Pathfinders: Jordan Furlong Returns

(This transcript was generated through AI technology.)

Steve Poor

Hi, this is Steve Poor, and you're listening to Pioneers and Pathfinders.

We're pleased to welcome back Jordan Furlong. Jordan is one of the legal industry's leading voices on the future of the profession. He continues to advise legal organizations through his consulting practice Law21, and is currently working on a new book exploring how generative AI will reshape the practice of law.

In this episode, we talk about the balance between the commercial and societal responsibilities of today's lawyers, the evolving purpose of the profession in the age of AI, and his recommendations for firms navigating this wave of change.

It's always a wonderful conversation when I get to catch up with Jordan, and I hope you enjoy listening to it.

It is my delight to welcome back Jordan Furlong to the podcast. Jordan, thanks so much for making time to chat with me again.

Jordan Furlong

Steven, thank you so much for the chance to come back and chat. It's terrific to have a chance to catch up.

Steve Poor

Good. You've been busy, I presume?

Jordan Furlong

Very busy. Working on a number of different projects. The main thing I'm working on these days, though, is I am plowing my way towards a book that is all goes well, coming out in the spring of next year, talking about what's going to become of lawyers after AI is done with us. So that's foremost on my mind these days.

Steve Poor

That's something to look forward to. That's quite an undertaking.

Jordan Furlong

As it's turning out to be. Yes.

Steve Poor

Well, I'm sure you're making your editors happy.

Jordan Furlong

Well, trying.

Steve Poor

Yeah, yeah. As a devoted follower of your sub stack, I always read your posts and your blogs, and they're really fabulous, and I want to pick up on some of these themes around the impact of AI and what becomes the profession after AI. But you've got a bigger theme, working through some of your articles talking about this moment in time, and lawyers roles in it and the impact of some of the decisions law firms have made to fight executive orders, not to fight executive orders. How we manage ourselves in a time of I think the post was how to be a still point in a turning world. Yeah, and your most recent one about what are lawyers for? Share a little bit of your thinking about this moment in time in the legal profession, and what it means for those of us who are lawyers, we'll talk about AI later.

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, well, you know, and it's a very good point, because, on the one hand, I'm still, as we're all concerned with the the everyday reality of being lawyers and having clients and working within this profession and having to do all that in the context of this extremely unpleasant, if not hostile environment, the way I put it to someone the other day who's asked me about that, and I said, Well, look, you know, it's like looking around your house and saying, you know, the wiring has got to get replaced, and we've got some broken windows, and the furnace is not in good shape, but at the same time, the House is sliding off a cliff into the ocean. So, you know, so which of these do you focus on? And of course, you have to, you know, obviously, deal with the the more immediate fires first. So I think the obligation or opportunity depends how you want to look at it. That lawyers have is, on the one hand, to address themselves to these larger issues around what has happened and what is happening to the supremacy of law and the and the underlying respect for constitutional protections and human dignity that seem to have gone out the window recently, and really kind of addressing yourself to this moment because It's unlike anything almost any of us have encountered, historically and as and as lawyers, especially as you mentioned, under significant pressure, explicit and implicit about who you can work for and what you can do and what you can say is kind of crazy. At the same time, I'm also a big believer in, you know, think globally, act locally. You've got to do what you can on the ground where you are. So in one of the last posts that I wrote about this, one of the points I made was that look, if you're looking for a way to make some kind of a difference, look around your community, look around your city or your town or your industry, and look for the ways in which the rule of law is being bent or broken or shattered. Look for the ways in which people's rights are being rode roughshod over, and find some like minded colleagues in this industry, in this profession of ours, and just do something tackle it. Do you know, take some steps forward, because I think that's really in the face of a disruption of this scale to our social and professional norms, that is what you have to do. You have to find something in your own backyard to make a difference there.

Steve Poor

It's easy to feel helpless in a moment like this, isn't it? Because the issues are so large and they're so complex. Do you think, how can one person do it? That's great advice. You also talked about, in the

article, on being a still point in a turning world, which I thought was fabulous by the way. You talked about lawyers tend to search for reasons. Tend to search for rational explanations. And one way to right yourself in this particular storm is to recognize there aren't necessarily rational explanations. Talk a little bit about that. I thought that was a great point.

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, and that's something, and that really kind of came out of some of my own reflections and struggles with what's going on. And you open the news any given day and you just see the the irrationality, what what appears to be, the mindlessness, as more than one person has said, "It's not just that this is the worst timeline. It's also the stupidest timeline." It's just, we're seeing stuff like, you know, the president wandering around on top of the White House. And I was like, Oh, look at that. Isn't that interesting? You know, horse in the hospital territory. So, and I think that's frustrating for lawyers, frustrating for me, because I'm always kind of digging behind Okay? Why is this happening, and what's driving this and so forth. And I do think sometimes that, especially as lawyers, we can get too caught up in that, in that search. And I think there's a couple of downsides to that. The first is that a lot of times there isn't any particular rhyme or reason, or at least none that lends itself to useful analysis, and so you're essentially panning a river for gold that was never there in the first place. And you'll, you'll wind up frustrated, but also, because I, and I kind of addressed this in the in the article itself, you're not doing yourself any favors, either. You're putting yourself under this kind of stress. It's like, How can this be happening? Why is this happening and trying to wrench reality into some kind of a familiar shape that you can make rational sense of, and the only thing you end up wrenching out of out of order, out of shape, is yourself, right? You know, it just it adds to the stresses we're already going through. This is part of my, my larger theory on the ways in which I think we as lawyers need to kind of reconstitute ourselves, or maybe rebalance some of what we, you know, what we put into to our own nature and our own character. But I really sometimes think we have, as lawyers over developed the rational, analytical, investigative side of things, and we have not paid enough attention to the human side, to the sense of understanding the human condition and accepting the human condition in a lot of ways, we're not really good at accepting things that we don't like. We're programmed to deconstruct them and and argue against them. And there is a lot of wisdom. I know it's a cliché at this point, you know, you see it on, embroidered on, you know, little frame things on the wall, but there is a lot of wisdom in accepting the things you can't change and letting them roll by you. So for me, the trick when not trick even, but maybe the best approach when dealing with stuff that's fundamentally irrational, don't get hung up on trying to figure it out. Just focus on doing what you can if it's a harm, alleviate it, if it's a problem, try to eliminate it. If it's something that's missing, try to provide what's there. Sometime, you know, we I'm a great believer in root causes, but sometimes when you're too busy looking for root causes, the thing that's flowering all over and taking over your yard, you know, is going unchecked. So I kind of want to encourage lawyers towards a problem solving practicality. Deal with today's challenge today. Deal with tomorrow's challenge as it comes. Yes, of course. Keep, as I said before, keep some effort underway to restore those norms that we've lost. But don't get so hung up on it that you end up defeating yourself in a way. You end up undercutting your own confidence in your own ability to be of help to anyone.

Steve Poor

That's a great point. And you sort of elaborated on that point on your most recent post, where you talk about, I think the title is something like, "What Are Lawyers For?" And you talk about the various

components of being a lawyer, the commercial side and the societal side, which, of course, makes a lot of sense, but we're at a moment in time where those are often in conflict. As a human, how do you reconcile that when they're in conflict? How do you process that internal conflict? I mean, you see it playing out on big scales, like the law firms dealing with executive orders, and you see it playing out on micro scales with people practicing law on a daily basis. How do you sort that out in your mind?

Jordan Furlong

Well, and your example of the executive orders is a very good one. And I remember writing at the time, shortly after the first major firm to buckle under said, Okay, well, we're going to agree to what's in the executive order, even though we have, apparently haven't looked that closely at it. And I said, You know what? I do have some sympathy, because the managing partner is in a very tough spot, right? I mean, I don't hardly need to tell you that, because you have responsibilities to not just your colleagues and your fellow equity owners, but also everybody who works in the firm and everybody who depends on the firm for a whole bunch of different things. So as tempting as it is to, you know, stand firm and tall on principle and say, you know, I will or I will or will not do this. Sometimes it's not that simple. Easier for me. I'm an independent writer and speaker and consultant, and I have the luxury of speaking my mind on stuff like this, and not everybody has that, so I don't want to underestimate the seriousness of the conflict that anybody who's going through in that situation, and I think that you always have to make a judgment call in the moment to say, is the cost of standing up so high that it's going to do massive damage beyond just me and my interests. And that is, Is today the day that discretion is a better part of valor? You at least have to ask yourself that. It doesn't feel very satisfying. Sometimes maybe you feel you've let yourself down a little bit. But we live in the world as it is not in the world that we would like it to be. So that's my preface to that having been said. I'm also very firmly of the belief, and I said as. Much in that, in that piece, that if we are not prepared to stand for the things we say we believe in, and even if, in situations where the damage is considerable and it goes beyond us, we have to know where we must draw lines. And I think, as lawyers and as officers of the court and as guardians of the Constitution and the rule of law, we have obligations that go beyond simply running a business, simply keeping people employed. I don't think the public even necessarily thinks of it this way, but the public, the rest of our society, they do look to us in a way or whenever, when everybody says something like, where were the lawyers, they are implicitly saying, why weren't the people who are specifically equipped, specifically trained and specifically given the elite status in our society in order to protect us against these offenses and sometimes these atrocities, why didn't they act? And oftentimes, when you do very publicly buckle under, and this was absolutely the case in those executive orders when we saw a whole bunch of firms domino fall after that. When one firm says, we give up or we give in or we cave, it makes it so much easier for others to do as well. That's the thing about leadership, right? If you're going to, you know, you're going to set an example or precedent, whether you like it or not. So I do think that we are at one of these points in history in which, assuming we have the luxury in 20 years time of looking back on where we are now.

Steve Poor

Big assumption.

Jordan Furlong

Big assumption. But if we do, I want to be able to say, and I think most people want to be able to say, I did what I could. I stood up when it was necessary to stand up. And there's a lot of law firms out there that made that call. They say, No, we're not going to buckle down to this. And I find it really interesting that ever since that last wave of firms that signed the executive orders, there haven't been any more since then, and almost every case that I'm aware of in which the firms, those firms that did challenge those orders, have been successful in court. So there is great benefit to standing up. It isn't just a matter of minimize your risk. Sometimes you just have to know when to stand up, even if it's for your own self respect, even it's for your own professional status. Again, thinking on the one hand, oh, I don't want to do this, because people might lose their jobs, okay, but if you do this often enough, we're going to lose our profession and there won't be any commercial work left for us. What's the point of being a lawyer in a society that doesn't respect the law? And I think that is the question that I would have to pose to any lawyer, and that I think lawyers should pose to themselves in that kind of situation.

Steve Poor

It's such an interesting moment. Use interesting, because any other term I would use would not be appropriate for a podcast, because we've spent decades now focusing on big law, focused on the commercial side of the profession, the making the money, the performing the work. That's where the AI comes in. That's where automation comes in. And how are we going to how are we going to make money and survive? That we've drifted away, in my judgment, from the societal obligations that you just point out. And it's been interesting to watch that tug back to some core principles of the profession, because it is still a profession, and to watch how firms navigate that. I'm glad I was not in a chair position at any one of those firms having to guide them through this particular moment, because I can only imagine how incredibly difficult it is.

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, it is difficult, and it's not something any of those leaders asked for. But as I'm fond of quoting Gandalf, you know, when he said, "So says everybody who lives to see such times, but that is not for us to decide. What we have to decide is what to do, with the time that's given to us." And I think that should be some version of that ought to be framed to put on the wall of anybody in a leadership capacity, because that is part of the there is great honor, and there is great recognition in serving in any kind of leadership capacity, whether you are running a major law firm, or you are leading a small corporate team, or even if you're someone like me who like I have people who read me and take the stuff that I that I say, seriously, and I feel an obligation towards them as well to be able to not I don't want to mislead, I don't want to misguide anybody, and that is part of the responsibility that lies upon you when you are in that kind of position. So for me, the degree to which, at a lot of these, again, we're talking exclusively large firms here, a lot of these large firms, and I don't even want to point to figure out the managing partner so much, because I'm sure they got the signals loud and clear from their equity partners.

Steve Poor

Oh, I'm sure different voices coming very loud from different directions.

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, yeah.

Steve Poor

It had to be unbelievable.

Jordan Furlong

Oh, like a cacophony, right? That a lot of the had a lot of lawyers, a lot of very successful and wealthy lawyers whose status as a legal professional has made them a lot of money and given them a lot of freedoms in their lives, saying, don't do anything to draw negative attention to us that could jeopardize the work that I get, and I would just feel really disappointed in someone who decided that, having taken so much from this profession and from the legal system and the legal norms that are its foundation, decided they weren't going to give anything back. They weren't willing to sacrifice anything. And somebody said the other day, because it was, I was, I was writing something that was fairly critical of a particular group in the legal sector, and they said, Well, you know, that's that's pretty gutsy of you to write that kind of stuff. And I said, it's not really, it's not brave until you lose something, right? It's not a sacrifice until, all of us, until you are in a position where you've had to pay a price of some kind. And most people in that position who choose to pay that price, that is something they're proud of. They wear that like a, like a, like a war scar. So, and this is, in a lot of respects, wartime for the legal profession, we are in a situation nobody asked for, nobody anticipated, but it is a full scale, clear cut assault on the independence of the legal profession, the survival of the legal profession as we knew it, the rule of law, and in the case of your country, the Constitution. And if that's not enough to make you re-examine your priorities and put the societal mandate of lawyer service on the top of your list, then I think you might have missed the point of of this profession in a lot of respects.

Steve Poor

Right. We've allowed it to be not a profession. In that case, it's become a business. Yeah. And when you think of it as a profession in that sense, it does bring clarity to what you ought to be doing.

Jordan Furlong

Well, it's, I've always said it's, it's a professional business. I mean, yes, we're making money. Everybody's, you know, we all got to keep a, you know, roof over our heads. But I'm also fond and I've said this many times, not just to audiences, but on podcasts. I said law firm is not a pizza parlor and it's not a hair salon. And there's nothing wrong with pizza parlors and hair salons, but they're not given the extra responsibility associated with the continuing functioning of a democratic society, and we are whether we want that or not. So I think that, to me, is the is the thing for us to cherish and to really and to really work towards. And once again, it's something where you can't there's no hard and fast rule in any of this. You have to use your judgment. You know, there are times, as I said at the start, there are times when discretion is a better part of valor. You know, you retreat today so that you can attack tomorrow, whatever the case might be, so long as you attack tomorrow. You know what I'm saying?

Steve Poor

Fair enough. Fair point. Yeah, fair point. So let's, let's turn the focus a little bit. You're working on a book what the profession is going to look like in a post AI world, which is, I guess, my first question. We sit here today with, with open AI announcing 5.0 today, which I have not yet played with, so I don't know anything about it, other than seeing the headlines. This technology is advancing so quickly, and

there will be advances between now and spring, when your book comes out. How are you going to keep track of the advances? How do you work that into writing a book?

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, no, it is crazy. The analogy used the other day, it's like those old coyote road rotor cartoons where the coyote is going full speed, full speed, and he's got his closet just about the catch, and he looks around, beep, beep, takes off at hyper speed. I was like, oh, it's like, that is it? Because it is, you know, it would just about got our heads around GPT, four point whatever. And here comes five. And I haven't used it either. It's literally just out, you know, hours when we're recording this podcast. But the early indications I've seen is that it is a significant step forward. I think the way that I'm addressing, planning to address it in practical terms, is I'm not actually focusing all that much on the capacity of generative AI beyond what we already know it can do and what we can reasonably anticipate that it will do afterwards. For me, AI is important primarily in its role as a catalyst of change within the legal sector and within the legal profession. And Ethan Moloch has made this point a number of times. AI, development could stop right now, and we would still have years and years of figuring out what kind of an impact it's going to have. But it's not going to stop. It's going to keep rolling. At the very least, what we know, what I think, or I should, when I say no, I very least, but I think we can say with great confidence is that the increasing integration of AI into all aspects of the legal sector is going to, among other things, increasingly displace lawyers from the performance of legal tasks. That's not the same thing as saying it's going to replace lawyers. It's going to say that out of any given hour of work or activity or attention that a lawyer previously gave to a particular piece of work over the course of time, the AI is going to do more and more of that. They're going to, for instance, it's going to take you, say, five minutes to prepare an instruction to the AI, 30 Seconds to the AI to do it. Maybe 5, 10, minutes for you to review the results and make any changes to it, and then, then you're done, and then you apply that across the board. It's going to be ... So, on the one hand, from the law firm point of view, from the purely business point of view, it's going to be an explosion in productivity, the likes of which we haven't experienced before. But I think more profoundly, for lawyers, we're going to find that the activities with which we have concerned ourselves, and this is especially true for lawyers within their first, say, 10 years of practice, we're not going to be doing that kind of thing as much anymore. People aren't going to pay us to do that. They're going to say, well, that's something that we expect. You're just going to give to the machine to have the machine do. Not that. You know, it's a, it's a silly exaggeration to say, Well, I'm not going to pay you to write out 10 copies of this. I expect you to use the photocopier, right? But, but it's,

Steve Poor

It's the same concept.

Jordan Furlong

Yeah, it's not dissimilar so to me, and this is kind of the thrust of what I'm saying, I think it's going to introduce something almost like an identity crisis for lawyers, because we define ourselves. We look upon ourselves. We are doers, we are actors. We are smart people with a lot of expertise, and we think, and we follow the patterns and the rules, and we use our imaginations and our and our assessments and judgment to do all these things. And since there has been a legal profession, we as lawyers, have been the only people, the only resource available to carry out those kind of functions,

and that's not the case anymore. So if we're not doing these functions, and I think pure economics is going to drive us out of those functions, because that has been the case in every other instance of technological development ever, like no exceptions in history, then what are we going to do with ourselves? So the reason why I'm kind of thinking I'm talking about as lawyers after AI, but the emphasis is really on lawyers. So the heart of the book is really asking and trying to answer the question, what are lawyers going to be needed for? It's not so much a question we tend to ask. Oh, well, what will I do? How can I make money? I said that's you're addressing this from the wrong end. We don't exist, except that people need us for something. What are people going to need us for if the machines can carry out a lot of the tasks that we have heretofore spent our billable time doing? And so I want to investigate what I think will be the functions and the roles we play, both commercial and societal. I want to extrapolate back from that to say, and therefore these are the characteristics and attributes and skills and experiences we will need in order to perform these functions. And then pull back from that and say, and now we need a brand new development system for lawyers, new education, new training, new licensing, the whole bit. So it's not an unambitious book that I have in mind, but I think it's where we're heading.

Steve Poor

I'm really looking forward to reading it when it comes out. It sounds fabulous. I think you made a point in one of your posts. If not, I'll give you the chance to make the point now, where you talk about, what are lawyers? What are we going to need lawyers for? I've heard, you know, okay, you want to operate at the top of your license. You're going to do really intelligent work. Let's put aside the point that not everybody is capable of doing there are human frailties, and not everybody has the ability. One of the things that's interesting about the legal profession is that demand never seems to slow down, but technology is cutting into the work that lawyers humans need to be performing. How do you see that demand curve affecting the work lawyers do? Is it going to be enough of this kind of work to keep this type of workforce available? Is it going to shrink the need for lawyers at this operation.

Jordan Furlong

Okay, the short answer, which I'll expand upon, is that I think in the short term, it's going to contract the size of the legal profession. Or the long term, it'll expand. Or the medium term, I don't think it's going to take, it shouldn't take decades. But yes, I mean to your point, at no time, except, okay, maybe in the six months after the pandemic, but for at no time and otherwise in history has demand for legal services ever retreated, right? It's always grown because the world is more complex and more populous and etc, etc. There's always more need out there, and that's even with all of the restrictions we have built in. The monopoly lawyers have in terms of bargaining services, the great difficulty people have in accessing actionable legal information and so forth, which, by the way, AI will be able to tackle, but that's a different conversation. So yes, I think we can expect demand to increase. This is where you get a lot of the jeevans paradox conversations. To say, the introduction of new technology, it doesn't actually reduce work, it increases it because it explodes demand. Okay? And I agree with that, as far as it goes, part of my counter argument to that is that, yeah, it's going to generate a whole lot of new work, especially from people who weren't able to come near the legal system before now. But a lot of that work's going to end up going to the AI as well. What we're experiencing we're at the start, we're at the start of a process where we're seeing for the first time the significant diversification of legal supply, and that's something new. We haven't gotten around. We haven't gotten to yet, and as AI continues to

develop, the degree to which it will take on more and more of these tasks. Again, I come back to that word, the less we will be involved in that kind of thing, and the less we'll be called upon to exercise the kinds of skills and characteristics we have traditionally held in high esteem. We are brilliant, insightful thinkers, we are very creative. We are so good at writing things, yeah, well, so is the thing in the box. So the thrust, and I've kind of talked about this in a couple of pieces, and I'll be addressing in the book as well, the thrust of it, for me, is that our value as professionals is going to shift away from what we know and what we can do, and it's going to shift towards who we are and how we relate to people and how we behave and conduct ourselves and what role we play in I think we've had a very narrow Ambit as lawyers. We say, Well, we are advocates and we are advisors. You know, we fight you in court and we tell you what to do. Okay, that's fine, but there's other things that we are needed for. We need it for peacemaking, for conflict resolution and dispute settlement. We are needed in order to be trusted guides and stewards of people's affairs and people's interests. We are needed to be guardians, as we've talked about, of the system of laws that up until now, we all kind of took for granted to say this is part of the non collapsible foundation of our society and and I think that it's going to put a greater premium on our character and our attributes as human beings than it is going to be purely on a Oh, they're so smart, oh they're so hard working, oh they're so whatever we're we're a profession that has always prided ourselves on our IQ, quote, unquote, and our intellect and so forth. And it's not that that's going to stop being important. We're still going to have to be smart, but it's going to matter, I think, how we relate to people, how we build relationships, build connections, so that we are people's trusted guides through their lives. And I really think at the end of the day, that's what we are needed for. I think that is irreplaceable. I cannot think of any other profession or any other type of provider out there that can say we would answer to that description, we are your trusted guides, your trusted navigators. We're with you. We're on your side. We are yes, we're there to advise you. Yes, we're there to advocate for you. But most of all, we are there to accompany you on your journey and to talk with you and listen to you and give you advice and give you solace and give you perspective, whatever you need. We're there for you. That to me, if we wind up a few decades hence again, if we're still around and their legal profession has made that kind of transition, I think that is as bulletproof as you could ask a solution to be for what we will do after AI is done with us.

Steve Poor

That is incredibly inspiring. I hope 20 years from now, we're seeing it. So you're talking to the chair of a big law firm. He or she is sitting there saying, Okay, we've got technology changing by the moment, it's going to have these implications over the next year, two years, three years, four years, whatever the timeframe is. What do I do now to prepare my firm to be one of the survivors.

Jordan Furlong

Well, that is a that will be a lengthy conversation, and it would depend, of course, on the circumstances I'm talking to, like, am law 50 or the 10 lawyer firm down the street? However, I would say, first of all, stop thinking of yourself as a law firm and think of yourself as a legal solutions and experience destination, or legal solutions and experience provider, because that's what people are paying you for. They're not paying you for law. They're not paying you for lawyers. They're paying you because they need an outcome of some kind. They need to get from point A to point B, or they're at point B. I was like, get me the hot out here. I want to get back to point A, right? You know, something like that, but they need to get to somewhere better. They need that. And they're coming to you because of that. So

they want the outcome, and they want the experience not to be unendurable or bankrupting or demeaning, and so many ways, that is the experience other people have. So if you start to re envision yourself in that way, and think, what do we need here in terms of personnel, in terms of systems, in terms of training, in terms of tracking experiences and outcomes? What do we need in order to get that. That, to me, would be the first step, couple of quick points in that regard. I think law firms, no matter what their size, should think very hard about narrowing the number of clients they serve and providing more and deeper services to those clients. Well, again, you'd know better than me, but I think the number of clients, active clients, in any given law firm, law firm at any given time, is staggering, and it's incredibly inefficient, but most of all, it is. I think it's shallow. You can only get shallow so far. You can only get so far when you have that many clients. You can't go deep on anything but a few of them. And you well know, and most lawyers will know, it's the deep relationships that you care about, where you get to know the people on the other side of they get to know you. You know the business, you know the industry, you know the competitors. You have really absorbed that stuff, and you have become, in a lot of ways, their partner on all of these things. And that's not only the work which is the most interesting, has the most opportunity to go high level, and it's the most enjoyable, the most enjoyable, it's what we actually get a kick out of as lawyers. But you can't do that if you've got 1000 clients. You can't go deep on 1000 clients. You can go deep on 50 or 10 or 100 depending whatever. I don't know what the number is, but there is a number that is the, I think, optimal number of clients that you should make. I don't know. Maybe it's an 8020 rule, right? You know, but, but go deep on a small number of clients. Choose them well and say to them. And I kind of made this point on the brief blue sky thread today, I said make the value proposition to them to say, we are going to make your business better. We're going to make it bigger. We're going to make it more successful and more profitable, because we are brilliant and we are sensitive, and we have great ideas and insights, and you are going to give us a slice of that bigger pie, a proportionally larger slice of that bigger pie, because we helped make it happen. And I think that's something a lot of clients can say, all right, that makes sense to me. That's a win-win, rather than fighting over the zero sum game of, you know, you build too much for this, or I'd get a discount on that, and so forth. It's like that's a make it something where you're both aligned in your goals and aligned in your incentives. So that'll be the first two things I would say that meant to that managing partner.

Steve Poor

That's fabulous start to a conversation. Jordan, I could keep this conversation going forever, but we've...

Jordan Furlong

Me too.

Steve Poor

We've run a bit over so I appreciate your tolerance for this.

Jordan Furlong

Oh, thank you. I, as you can probably tell, I could go, I could go on about this for quite some time. We'll have to have another return visit at some point.

Steve Poor

We will absolutely, and I look forward to your book. Thank you very kindly.

Jordan Furlong

Looking forward to myself, hopefully, like I say at the moment, spring 2026, but who knows, sometime next year, it'll be, hopefully, available for people to look at.

Steve Poor

Absolutely. We'll keep an eye out for it. Jordan, thank you so much for making the time for us. I've really enjoyed the conversation.

Jordan Furlong

Thank you, Steven. Take care.