

# Thought Reversals, Part One

## How To Answer an MBE Question

[00:00:11] Hey everybody. Welcome to episode 290 of the extra mile podcast for bar exam takers. This is your host Jackson Mumey. I'm glad to be with you. As this episode is releasing, we are now in the two week window leading up to the February, 2020 exams. I know that for those of you preparing for the exam, your time is limited.

[00:00:38] We're going to get right to the the meat of today's episode. We'll get to that in just a moment. hope everybody is doing well with their studies. Want to just remind you that 15 days was a very long time, to prepare. So, you've got time a couple of weeks ago. Definitely enough time to keep working and improving.

[00:00:55] Today's message is going to be, the first of several parts we're going to do on what we call thought reversals. These are some of the basic underlying assumptions about study and taking the bar exam that had been around for a long time, decades really, and we're going to analyze them and show you why they might not be correct and what you could do differently that might change the result of your score.

[00:01:16] And, as we get into this first one today, we're going to be looking at how you take a look at information, particularly on the multistate bar exam. Now, as I've been talking, in recent episodes, I've been doing a shout out from a past or current student, that I thought might be interesting and just letting you know some of the things that people say to me.

[00:01:34] That don't always make it into the videos that we do. I was thinking back to a video or two, an email I got from a student a couple of years ago, who had been a photo reader who came to us to take the Alabama bar exam having failed the exam previously. and this was a, someone who was an adult.

[00:01:51] They'd had a successful career, outside of the law for many years, but had gone back to law school. Taking the exam in a traditional form and not been successful. Then they came to us. They studied, they used photo reading and mind mapping. and, this individual was, I think skeptical at first about whether it would work for her or not, but she did put herself into it.

[00:02:12] She threw herself into what she did, what we asked her to do, and here's what she wrote to me. right after the results came out. When the Alabama results came in on the UBE, I got an email from the head of the Alabama bar congratulating me. I broke out crying. My husband came in and thought, I must have failed the exam.

[00:02:30] You won't believe it. I told him the score I got on the UBE was 299.9 so a 300 basically now. She says, I improved over 40 points. Her previous score had been below the passing number of 260 so now she'd gone up more than 40 points. It's well above the 260 that she needed to pass. She said that might be why the head of the bar congratulated me personally.

[00:02:55] The wait for results is brutal, but with celebration it will happen. Signed, Cynthia H. Well, Cynthia, we want to congratulate you again for that wonderful result. Going up 40 points on the UBE is an extraordinary accomplishment no matter what state you're in, but to come back as a repeat bar taker and move your scores up.

[00:03:14] It's really extraordinary. And, I think it's well worth a cry and congratulations to the Alabama bar examiners who thought enough of your jumping scores to contact you directly and congratulate you. I can tell you that's not the norm. They don't normally contact people and talk to them after the results come out.

[00:03:30] That's quite a compliment to you and I can tell you that, Cynthia has gone into practice and is doing great and, using the skills and tools. Well, one of the skills and tools that Cynthia used was the idea of selective intuition. And that's what we're going to be talking about today. So I want to go ahead and jump right into that message about a thought reversal.

[00:03:51] I would encourage you to watch this as a video. you can do that by going to [celebrationbarreview.com/290](http://celebrationbarreview.com/290). That's the episode number. Of course, if you want to listen to the podcast, you can do that on Apple podcasts or iHeartRadio or radio.com but I think there's some advantage in this particular episode, actually being able to see a, we're going to work through a question directly and I think it's kind of good to be able to see that.

[00:04:13] So I would encourage you to do that and let's not wait. Let's go ahead and jump into this discussion about thought reversal part one. What is it you really need to know.

[00:04:23] Today, we're going to begin a series on what I call thought reversals. These are some of the concepts that we've learned, in law school, in education generally, maybe in the practice of law, probably am taking the bar exam previously.

[00:04:39] All ideas that many of us have, gained that probably aren't correct, and that if we examine those ideas. And if we put a spotlight on those ideas and really take a good hard look at them, we may discover that some of them simply aren't true, or they don't serve our best interests, or they at least ought to be examined more closely and questioned more closely than they have been.

[00:05:01] In other words, some of the old, sayings and bromides and things that we take for granted may actually not be accurate at all. And the first of those that I want to talk about today is a thought reversal around the concept that if you can know enough information, you can get to the right result. In other words, the underlying assumption is that you need to know more information.

[00:05:25] Now, I've talked in other places about this concept of knowing more information, and I've likened it to the difference between a water bucket with holes in it and a waterfall. Now, here's the way that the thought reversal works out in this particular area. We want to move from this statement. You can figure out the answers if you know enough information.

[00:05:47] That's the initial statement. That's the one that most people take as being a given or being a truth. Certainly around the bar exam if I know more information, I'll get the right

answers. So the result of that, the net result of that, the logical result is I should study more. I should learn more. I should know more.

[00:06:04] The concept here is that you have an empty bucket, and as you put more information into the bucket, you know more, and then you have more, ability to answer a question. The problem, of course, is that our buckets, our mental buckets have big holes and we can't remember everything. We can't learn everything.

[00:06:22] We can't know everything. That's the theory. And therefore, as we pour water into this bucket, the water of information, some of it is going to spill out. Some of it's going to leak out, some of it's going to just pour right through those holes. And so we're constantly in that battle to keep it. Filling the bucket a little bit like a Mickey Mouse in the Sorcerer's Apprentice for those of you who are old enough to remember that.

[00:06:45] And the idea is that you just keep filling them, filling and filling the bucket, and yet you're never really getting it full. It's frustrating and it's discouraging. And the result for a lot of people on the bar exam is that, they just don't get the results they want in spite of having studied really hard, put in a lot of hours, put in a lot of effort and being intelligent people.

[00:07:06] All right, so if that's the beginning thought pattern, where do we want to reverse that to? Well, I would make this statement instead of the first, I would say, you already know the answers. You just have to ask the right question. We say it again, you already know the answers. You just have to ask the right question.

[00:07:26] And here we are moving from the, the empty bucket up into the concept of a waterfall instead of an empty bucket that we're trying to fill. Now what we want to do is to assume that you have all the water you need. It's a huge waterfall. Think of the Hoover Dam. Plenty of water, not a problem. In fact, too much water.

[00:07:45] So what did they do at the dam? Well, they backed it up and they started to use it and push it through certain channels to make it productive, to make it incredibly powerful and useful. That's the idea. If you know where to direct the information, then it is incredibly useful to you and you don't have to worry about running out.

[00:08:03] You have plenty of water, you have plenty of information, you have plenty of knowledge. Now you can imagine how those two paradigms stacked up against each other create a completely different approach to studying and learning. If you think you're continually trying to have to fill up a bucket that's empty, you can see that you're going to spend your time frantically trying to get more information.

[00:08:23] On the other hand, if you assume that you already have the information and that it's come from your life experience, from your previous studies, from your law school, from your practice, from everything that touches you every day, and all you have to do is figure out what the right questions are to ask so that you can retrieve the right pieces of information, then everything changes about the way you handle test-taking.

[00:08:47] Now. I recognize that what I've just said is abstract, and some of you, even after hearing this though, I think it's quite logical and reasonable. Some of you will say, but that can't be because everything I've learned in law school and everything I've learned in education generally says, I've got to learn more and know more.

[00:09:02] Well, I understand that, but because it's the way it's always been done, doesn't mean that's necessarily the best way to do it or the way that's most productive. And I would certainly say when it comes to law school education, there's probably no more regressive a form of education in any field today than in law.

[00:09:17] This is still an area that really harkens back to the 1800s and a typical law school today in America is not all that different than what you would've seen in 1875 and so. The reality of the way we understand how people learn and how they take tests has dramatically changed. Now, in other episodes and videos, I've talked about something called the natural brilliance model, and I've described the confluence of two big movements in our world. One has to do with the area of human potential and what we know. And the other has to do with test making or something called authentic assessment. When you try to assess what people know rather than what they've memorized, you're able to take advantage of human potential.

[00:10:01] And that's what the bar examiners functionally have done certainly over the last 10 to 20 years. The bar exam today does not resemble the test of 1970 in any way. It's still called a multistate exam. There are still essays, but clearly what they're doing is very different because what they're really interested in is what you know and not what you've memorized.

[00:10:20] Now I want to try and help you see that in a very real way by actually taking on an actual multistate bar question and we're going to work through the question together and I'm going to show you how this second approach of you already know the answer and just have to know what to ask, how that actually plays out so that you can see for yourself the difference in the two paradigms.

[00:10:40] I hope it'll be an interesting experience for you. I encourage you to watch this as a video, but if you're just listening, I'll read everything out and you'll can hear it as well. But there's something to be said for actually having the visual impact of seeing the words and being able to process them.

[00:10:54] So what we're going to do is take a torts question, because torts is a pretty, fundamental, topic and we're taking an actual MBE question and we're going to actually go through that question and I'm going to break down for you, how you could, prepare and answer this question in the thought reversal mode that I've described, and then we'll consider that in comparison to the traditional way that a lot of people work through that problem.

[00:11:18] So let's jump into that question. Okay, so now what we're going to do is actually take a multi-state question. As I said, I'm going to read it. For those of you that are listening,

if you're watching the video, you can certainly read it along with me and we're just going to go through the question without any comment.

[00:11:33] I'm just going to read it first all the way through. It's not a particularly long question, so let's go ahead. Here's the question. After a long day's drive through the mountains, Pia arrived at what she reasonably believed was the home of her friend, Amy. Based on Amy's description of the home, including the fact that the home was completely isolated, Amy had given Pia permission to use her home while Amy was away on vacation.

[00:11:58] In fact, the unoccupied home that Pia entered was not Amy's home but was on the wrong road, and the home she entered, which belonged to Davis only happened to fit Amy's description of her home. Pia bedded down for the night on the living room couch and fell asleep with the TV on due to a wiring defect in the TV set of which Davis was unaware the TV burst into flames starting a fire, which caused serious injury to Pia before she could escape from the house.

[00:12:27] If Pia asserts a claim against Davis for her injury, will Pia recover?

[00:12:33] All right, so that's our question. If you are reading along, you can see it's not very long. If you are listening, didn't take all that long. Now I want to do the thought reversal process with you and kind of show you how this all works in the form of a question and how you can answer an MBE question.

[00:12:50] Now remember that the traditional approach says, I can figure out the answers. If I know enough information, I can fill up my water bucket. And so. If I'm looking at this question that way, I'm going to have a particular approach, but before we even do that, I want to use our thought reversal approach in a kind of a clean, unfettered way to help you see how this works.

[00:13:11] Remember that our thought reversal is that you already know the answer. You just have to ask the right questions. So here's the way that I would think through this problem. I've just read through the problem. I've seen what it's about, and now I'm going to do two things in my mind. The first is, I'm going to try to remember the call of the question is if Pia asserts a claim against Davis, will Pia recover?

[00:13:35] So that starts with a yes or a no answer. And I may have a sense of that one way or the other. Right now, I'd like you to think about that and just without trying to figure out the law or the rules or anything else, what's your intuitive response? Is it yes or no? Will the plaintiff recover, will the trespasser recover?

[00:13:56] Take a minute, I'll let you do that.

[00:14:00] All right, so the first thing I want to do is just answer the question. I want to get a yes or a no here in this particular circumstance. The second thing that I want to do is I want to try and identify a principle of law that really controls this question. So as we read through the question, a couple of things become pretty clear to me.

[00:14:21] The first is that a Pia does not have the authority or the invitation to go into Davis's home and that makes her a trespasser just generally. And then it's Pia, the trespasser who gets injured when this TV set blows up. And so the question in my mind at that point is, does the owner of the home have a duty to the trespassers?

[00:14:44] So the question that I want to ask about the principle of law is the duty to trespassers, now that's important. We'll come back to it later, but I just want to identify that. The yes or no question is our first inquiry, and the second is looks like it's duty to trespassers. Now why do I put it in that order instead of saying we'll figure out what the law or the principle is first and then answer. And the reason for that is that intuitively you already know the answer. You know what the correct answer is here and you don't have to go through a lot of legal analysis to get there, but it's helpful certainly to think about the rule.

[00:15:19] And I'm going to show you how in the first, the traditional approach we invert those two questions and why that causes a problem. All right? So now you've come up with your yes or no answer. Okay. Write it down on a slip of paper somewhere. Tell it, speak the word out loud. All right. Now notice we have not looked at the answer choices yet.

[00:15:39] We're just looking at the question, the fact pattern in the question. So now we're going to move on and we're going to look at the four answer choices. Okay? Now here are four answer choices. Again, I'll read them out. For those of you that are just listening,

[00:15:52] answer, choice A says yes if Pia needed to use the home for shelter.

[00:15:57] Answer. Choice B says yes if Davis knew of the defect in the TV.

[00:16:02] Answer, choice C says yes, if Davis could have discovered the defect by a reasonable inspection.

[00:16:09] Answer choice D says no because Davis had no reason to anticipate that Pia would be in his home.

[00:16:16] All right. Now those are the four choices. But remember, before we ever got to the four choices, we answered the yes or no question.

[00:16:22] Could Pia recover? How did you answer that question? Well, my guess is that most of you, when you answered that, thought it doesn't seem like Pia should be able to recover. She wasn't supposed to be in the house. Davis didn't know about the, the TV being bad. So it seems like we know the right answer. Therefore, you would've circled the letter D, No. because Davis had no reason to anticipate the Pia would be in his house.

[00:16:46] All right, everybody with me so far? Hope so. If you said yes, well, you had three choices to look at there and you could say, well, do any of those make any sense? We'll look at those each in a moment. but I think most of you would have said no, and there's only one no response to look at in that particular circumstance.

[00:17:05] All right. I think if you got to this point and you said, well, I just don't know if she would be successful or not. Now what you would do would be to read the four answer

choices and you would say, okay, I'm looking at all four, and now I want to just close my eyes for a moment and ask myself when I reopened my eyes, what answer choice jumps out at me?

[00:17:25] What looks right to you? And then mark that and go on. Okay, so those are the two steps, a yes or no in this case, in this case, if I can't find that answer. then I'm going to just make a guess, but because my, anticipated answer was no, it isn't going to be, she's not going to be able to recover. I looked down here, I see a no, in this particular case, it's one no and three yeses.

[00:17:48] That makes it pretty easy. Even with the if words here, which could certainly change the interpretation of these answers, but I see one no word that jumps out at me and I answered the choice D. Alright. Well, I don't want to keep you hanging on the edge of your seats. What's the actual answer? It's the letter D.

[00:18:05] in fact, Davis had no reason to anticipate Pia would be in his home, and that is the reason why Pia cannot recover. All right. Now that wouldn't have taken you very long to figure out what you read. The question, you anticipate an answer, you look for the answer and you move on. Now, I know some of you are saying, well, what if I don't know the answer?

[00:18:25] And my point is, how did you know the answer? I didn't ask you to study torts before this particular video? How did you know it? Well, you know it because you did study torts somewhere in your life, and because you went to law school, and because you're probably studying for the bar and you've lived life, and you just know that you're not entitled to get something when you break into somebody else's house, even if it was, you know, unwittingly.

[00:18:48] And so, as a result, most of you, would've said, no. Now, if you're someone that said, yes, okay, that's a different problem. All right? I think you've got a slightly different problem, but I'm willing to guess that most everyone's said no to this question, and I didn't pick one that was particularly easy.

[00:19:04] This is just an average actual MBE questions taken from an actual MBE test. All right. Now notice I didn't have to get into the duty to trespassers here did I? Wasn't necessary. I could tell from the answer choices, and that's what the thought reversal does. It tells me that I already know the answer. I just had to know what question to ask and hear the question to ask right from the call of the question.

[00:19:27] But let's assume that I got to that point and I, instead of being able to answer yes or no to question one, I said, you know, I'm really not sure. Now I'd go to question two and I say, what's the principle of law that's involved here? The principle looks like some kind of a duty to trespassers, and that becomes, now the question that I want to ask myself, my genius mind, that non-conscious brain, what's the duty to trespassers. And as I asked myself the question about the duty to trespassers, I'm now channeling the information in that waterfall of a brain to say, what do you know about that?

[00:20:03] Having asked that question, I can now begin to identify in these answer choices. So answer choice A says yes if P and needed to use the home for shelter. See, that doesn't sound like the duty to trespassers. There's nothing about shelter there. Or what if, if Davis knew of the defect about the TV, well, that's not even relevant because it says Davis was unaware. Okay, so we can't change the fact pattern to say, yeah, he wasn't aware, but yes, he was. No, that doesn't work at all.

[00:20:34] And that's not the fact pattern. So don't fight the facts. C says yes if Davis could discovered the defect by a reasonable inspection. Again. Same thing. He was unaware. There was no reason for him to know. So they are both saying the same thing and then D no, because Davis had no reason to anticipate Pia would be in his home.

[00:20:52] That sounds like the duty to trespassers. If I don't know you're trespassing on my property, if I have no reason to expect that, then I certainly can't be liable for what happens to you on the property. So in this situation, it's much easier to get a quick answer without having to get to this level of, looking at the second level and the question of the duty to trespassers.

[00:21:12] All right. I hope that makes sense to you so far. That's the way we prefer that you answer questions. But now what I want to do is back up again and try this question the way most people try to answer it, from a traditional standpoint. So let's just take a minute. We'll clear the deck and we'll run this question back again, kind of rewind and we'll do it without using selective intuition and we'll take the traditional approach.

[00:21:36] Alright, let's now look at the question again and this time, let's do it the way a traditional bar taker might try to work through the problem. Again, I'm going to read through it, but I'm going to do it now a little differently. So here's what happens.

[00:21:50] After a long day's drive through the mountains. Pia arrived at what she reasonably believed was the home of her friend, Amy. Based on Amy's description of the home, including the fact that the home was completely isolated. Amy had given Pia permission to use the home, permission while Amy was away on vacation.

[00:22:09] In fact, the unoccupied home that Pia entered was not Amy's. Pia was on the wrong road and the home she entered, which belonged to Davis only happened to fit Amy's description of her home. Pia bedded down for the night on the living room couch and fell asleep with the TV on. Due to a wiring defect in the TV set of which Davis was unaware the TV burst into flame starting a fire, which caused serious injury to Pia before she could escape from the house.

[00:22:36] If Pia asserts a claim against Davis for her injury, will Pia recover?

[00:22:41] Now, what a traditional bar taker does is they underline all those key words. They look at them, and now they immediately go to the answer choices. If Pia needed to use the home for shelter. Hmm. Is that the shelter doctrine? I don't know.

[00:22:55] Could be, B says yes. If Davis knew of the defect in the TV, well, I guess if he knew of the defect, then he'd have liability. Wouldn't be so that if Davis knew and that could be



important to me. C, yes if Davis could have discovered the defect by a reasonable inspection. Oh, so if he didn't know, but he could have discovered it by reasonable inspection.

[00:23:15] So that's kind of a, an offshoot of B. So B and C look a lot alike. And then D says no, because Davis had no reason to anticipate the Pia would be in his home. Okay you know, did he, did he have to anticipate that? Is that an element. Right? And now what happens is I start trying to analyze each of these answer choices.

[00:23:34] Alright, is B better than C or is C better than B? You tell me which one is better? Hard to know. Isn't it A, is better than B? If Pia used needed to use the home for shelter, I mean, is that an absolute a reason for her? Maybe. What about these words like if you know yes or no, because what does that mean?

[00:23:55] How do I analyze those? What's the anticipation that Pia would be in his home? What's that all about? And now what happens is I go back and I say, Oh, the duty to trespassers, and now what I'm going to do if I'm a traditional bar taker is I'm going to try and remember the elements to the duty to trespassers.

[00:24:17] Okay. Now that's kind of an interesting moment when you do that because you might be surprised at what comes up when you start thinking about the duty to trespassers. In fact, you start working through it and you say, well, is there a duty to trespassers around dangerous animals or dangerous conditions?

[00:24:33] Oh yeah. That gets back to that whole idea about reasonable inspection and definitely knowing the defect. What are the elements to the duty against trespassers? Oh wait, you can tell me what they are. No, you can't. Yeah. It's because in order to learn all of the elements of the duty against trespassers, you'd have to set up a mnemonic.

[00:24:50] You'd have to make flash cards, and when you learn that, it would undoubtedly push something else out of your brain. So in other words, as you try to fill up your empty bucket with all of that information, what's happening? Well, a lot of it is leaking out while you're trying to put the water in, and now you don't know what to do with the question, and so you start wrestling with it.

[00:25:09] Oh man. I mean, it could be this, it could be that, and you start trying, well, I, you know, she needed that shelter doctrine. I don't think that's right. All eliminate A. Now, what do I do with B and C, boy, those look good to me? Well maybe I can figure that out. And what do I do with D? I mean that's the only no answer.

[00:25:24] I don't know if it's yes or no because I'm trying to analyze the answers instead of thinking about it. You see the problem that you get worked up into. Now let me make the problem even more difficult for you. Let me tell you that you only get 90 seconds to answer the question. Now I've spent more than 90 seconds just underlining reading and analyzing and talking it out for you.

[00:25:44] 90 seconds. How can I possibly do that? In fact, it might take you two minutes to do this question, and this is a short question. What are you going to do? You're going to run

out of time. You're going to lose. Why? Because what you've been doing is trying to figure out the answers if you know enough, but you can never know enough.

[00:26:02] You can't know all there is to know about the duty to trespassers. Does it include some provision about being reasonably aware of the defect? Does it apply to televisions? Does it apply to people that are innocent trespassers, we don't know.

[00:26:15] We could issue spot this thing all day, couldn't we? I mean, it was a lonely road. It was late at night. She was confused. Maybe she shouldn't have been driving that late at night. Maybe she needed a street address. Right? There's all sorts of things we could ask about. We start breaking down the question this way. You see the difficulty that comes up. It's much more complicated. It's much more challenging and it's much more difficult.

[00:26:35] The first way that we talk through it felt pretty simple. You're probably saying to me, it's obvious.

[00:26:40] Now, you might be wondering why I've been using a backdrop of, these dandelions behind me today. And the reason is that they're, you know, four or five different dandelions and they jump out in different colors and you say, well, who's ever heard of a green dandelion or a purple dandelion but yellow dandelions?

[00:26:54] I see those. Those are pretty obvious, right? That's what happens when you're working intuitively, things are obvious, but if you start trying to analyze them, you say, in our dandelion example. And dandelions are usually white, but maybe you could put dye color in and make them purple. I've never seen a green one.

[00:27:11] Right. I mean, you just start chasing your tail and that's what people do on the bar exam. They chase their tail, they work around and around and around and around instead of just getting to the answer and moving on. So the thought reversal that we want to talk about here works this way. Instead of saying, you can know the answer, if you just know enough information filling up your leaky water bucket, what you want to do is say, I already know the answer.

[00:27:37] The answer was no. There's no reason to believe that Pia, had, there's no reason that Davis would know that Pia was in his home, so therefore he can't be liable. I already know that answer. I just had to ask the right questions. I had all the information in my brain, whether I had read or photoread or mind mapped or listened to lectures or read the outlines or done the practice questions. None of that stuff. It all adds up to the same thing. You know the information. Just go ahead and use it.

[00:28:05] Now I want to make one final analogy in this situation, and that is to what happens when you do a Google search and you ask the question, and so I'm going to stop for a moment, come back and show you what a Google search looks like on this particular problem, and then tell you how we might refine it.

[00:28:21] We said that in this thought reversal, it's really all about the questions you ask and I thought it would be interesting to ask Google these same questions and see what

happens. Because I think Google mirrors in some ways what a traditional bar taker does versus what we want to do intuitively.

[00:28:35] So you'll see that what I did here is I put in the, the Google search "duty of care to a trespasser," right? Remember we said that's the principle of law that's in play. And you'll notice that we end up with a very long list of different possibilities. We have something called the trespasser responsibility act, which is put together by the American legislative exchange council.

[00:28:54] And then of course, we have Wikipedia that authority on all things, that talks about what trespassers are, and who they are. and the undiscovered trespasser to whom the property owner property owner only owes a duty not to trap them in a situation. And we've got trespassing as a tort, and we've got constructive trespass, and we've got duty owed to trespassers, and we can follow that.

[00:29:17] And we see all of these rules. Look at all these big rules we've got, here about, all of these different things that happen, in our, duties to trespassers. Right? And so what can we do? Undiscovered trespassers and we've got British Railroad Board versus Harrington. We have a duty to warn and putting up signs.

[00:29:33] We have a theory of strict liability. I mean, it just goes on and on and on, doesn't it? I mean, there's lots of different things going on here. Well, this is what a traditional bar takers are doing in their brain. They're trying desperately to work through all of this data, all of this information so that they can figure out what the right result is.

[00:29:50] And in fact, if we continue on with our Google search, oh my goodness, we've got findlaw's got some things, and then we've got US legal has got some information, and then we've got Langley's solicitors, and then we've got scholarship.law dot. I don't know. wnm.edu. so all sorts of things going on here.

[00:30:09] We've got some law review articles and all sorts of things that we could get lots of information, right? And there's all of this information to help us solve our problem. Well, maybe if I wanted to wade through all that information, I might get to the result. Or maybe I'll look at my bar review outlines and I see one or two clear sentences about it.

[00:30:27] But it's a lot of information to ask Google isn't it? And Google isn't really giving us the information that we need. So my point here is that sometimes just asking for rules, asking for elements actually doesn't do us much good does it? The more we ask, the more confused we get, the more information is here and we don't need all of that information.

[00:30:49] Remember, all we were trying to do is to figure out if Pia could assert a claim against Davis when she was uninvited a trespasser. See how simple that is and how complicated people make it. I think that as you consider what thought reversal is about. This is a pretty good example of how you can go down the road and be down the rabbit hole, if you will, and without a particular answer.

[00:31:11] So to wrap up, I think that many people who are studying for the bar continue to use this bad principle that says, I just have to know more law and that doesn't work. And

you've gotten, I hope, a pretty good example of why it doesn't work, why it gives you too much information, why it's not the right thing to do.

[00:31:28] But if you ask the simple question about whether or not a Pia can assert a claim against Davis, it's actually pretty simple, and then you get to the right answer and it's right there for you. The examiners are not playing hide the ball. They're not trying to do something tricky. It's a very obvious question and many of you will say, well, he picked a really easy question.

[00:31:45] No, lots of people miss this question I can tell you statistically, and the reason they miss it is precisely what we discussed. They overanalyze it, they overthink it. They try to get into too much detail and then they get into trouble. You don't need any of that. It wouldn't even take you 90 seconds to do the analysis the way I first did it, to get to an answer on this question, and that's what I encourage you to try and do.

[00:32:07] You already know the answer. If you're in our course, you've already learned how to photoread and mind map and put that information into your non-conscious and you've learned how to activate it. But in this situation, the call of the question itself is the activation. That's all you needed to know and it was all you needed to be able to answer it, and then you just have to ask that question and the waterfall is directed into the right place.

[00:32:30] All right, well that's today's a discussion about thought reversals. We'll be back next time with some more thought reversal exercises. I hope this was helpful to you and look forward to speaking with you, and if you've got questions about this, reach out and let me know. I'd love to talk with you as well.

[00:32:44] I hope that that a thought experiment in thought reversal was helpful for you. I hope it, opened your mind up a little bit, made you think, wow, I wonder what's possible.

[00:32:52] Now in the show notes that we've got for today's episode, you'll see that there's an opportunity for you to set up a free consultation with me. We'd glad to talk with you about your bar studies and about your plans for the exam, particularly those of you taking the exam in July of 2020 or beyond.

[00:33:06] I also want to invite everyone that's on the podcast today to our special, free, online training. It's called do something different: make the next bar exam your last bar exam.

[00:33:16] This was an opportunity to look at the four steps that people like Cynthia, that we talked about at the beginning today actually follow. It's the step by step approach that will help you, make the next bar exam your last bar exam. It's completely free. And best of all, it's available on demand. All you have to do is click on the link here on the show notes or go to [celebrationbarreview.com/webinar](http://celebrationbarreview.com/webinar) to register.

[00:33:39] And then you can watch at the day and time that's most convenient for you. And if you have questions, all you do is, shoot off an email within the webinar itself. It'll go right to me and I'll be glad to respond to you. This has been a life changing program for thousands of people over the years that we presented it.

[00:33:55] I hope you'll take advantage of it and check it out. You could be the next person that this information changes their life just because you were willing to do something different. So make sure you check that out.

[00:34:06] All right, well, I'll let you get back to your studies of your a February bar taker. If you're a July bar taker, this is the time to get going.

[00:34:13] Don't wait, and consider what you want to do with this thought reversal. And next week we'll be back with another of those thought reversal ideas. I hope you'll find this interesting and we'll look forward to seeing you as always along the extra mile.