



TO KICK OFF this month's focus on lawyers and marketing, I decided to indulge in a little tongue-in-cheek puffery of my own. Never one to shrink from a promotional challenge, I felt we couldn't opine on legal advertising without trying our hand at it. But, of course, such endeavors come with their own pitfalls. How many of you can spot them?

This Is A Top-Flight Magazine!

**Reading *Arizona Attorney* Will
Increase Your Legal Knowledge
By At Least 75%!**

**We Specialize In Legal News
And Views!**

**Mention Us To A Friend And
We'll Send You An *Arizona
Attorney* Pen!**

First of all, if the blurbs at left were written to advertise legal services, they would be in violation of ethical rules and subject to sanction.*

So there is the ethical imperative that dogs attorneys' heels. But beyond the ethics rules, marketing legal services is a complex business that requires more than exclamation marks to do well. It requires time, resources and a good grasp of your message and whom you'd like to reach. It also requires a solid plan for the trajectory of your law business—for a business is what it is.

To tackle this topic, we gathered together lawyers from firms large and small as well as marketing professionals who have spent years aiding attorneys in getting out their message. Our roundtable centered on how lawyers can market and what kind of job they

are doing at self-promotion.

Also in this issue you will find primers on promotion written by marketing professionals and a review of a book that takes law marketing apart brick by brick—or billboard by billboard.

Feel free to send me your own stories on marketing and the law. In fact, **the first reader to send a letter on the topic will get an *Arizona Attorney* pen—**and that's no puffery! 🖋️

—TIM EIGO



*In order of blurb, the first contains an opinion, representation or implication regarding the quality of services that is not susceptible of reasonable verification by the public—ER 7.1(l)(2). The second contains a prediction of future success—ER 7.1(l)(1). The third violates the imperative that a lawyer shall not state or imply that the lawyer is a specialist except in certain circumstances—ER 7.4. The last one violates the rule stating that a lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services—ER 7.1(j).

Of course, anyone who has ever used an *Arizona Attorney* pen may argue that it is the very definition of a valueless token. But that's neither here nor there.