

# Workshop Week 1 GROUP D

## Thesis 1

We agree with the statement provided by Mr. Lieverse & Mr. de Ruijter. We believe that preventing is better than having to solve the problem after it occurs. Because when you hire someone, they are a fixed cost, you know how much you have to pay a legal practitioner on an annual basis so there are no surprises. However, when a legal case comes up unexpected you have to pay a larger sum of money to hire an attorney and a small enterprise might not have counted on having to spend such a large sum of money all of a sudden. We are convinced that an expensive lawyer is not always needed. Many problems can be solved by legal practitioner. Someone who has knowledge on all the fields of law would be more useful, we think, than someone who has an extensive knowledge of one topic (attorney) might miss out on other fields of law.

However, as a counterargument. Company's nowadays are cooperating with different countries all over the world. It would be rather difficult for one legal practitioner to know all the different legal systems.

## Thesis 2

Yes, we believe it would be beneficial for companies for once again, like we mentioned above preventing would be better than having to solve the problem after it occurs, also concerning the financial aspect. As an example we can use the German law system that contains specialized legal practitioner. Those specialists are well-known in their area. They can reduce the risk rate.