

License to Steal

A Bar Lawyer's Confession

© 2025 by **Jurisdiction**[®]

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

19420 Heritage Harbor Parkway

Lutz, Florida 33558

866-LAW-EASY

Preface

I wrote this book to entertain you.

I hope it makes you smile.

I also hope it makes you angry!

I hope you ask, “Why weren’t we told?”

Why are the Bar and its lawyers, judges, and law professors hiding secrets from you?

Secrets *you have a God-given right to know!*

Secrets that are *ridiculously easy to learn!*

Secrets that *could empower each and every one of you!*

Secrets about the simple easy to learn Rules of Court and tactics that use those rules to win cases that affect real people.

Secrets lawyers hoard so they can make more money by doing far less real work than any other profession on this planet.

Secrets we could be teaching our children in school.

Secrets that could be available at NO COST to every American using today’s AI tools and cyber technology.

Secrets that give lawyers a License To Steal.

Secrets you and your children have a right to know.

Secrets that could be taught in our public schools!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The \$300 Sign

We were *required* to attend a “professional standards” class as soon as we passed the bar exam.

So we did.

Failure to attend could mean sanctions or even disbarment.

There were several dozens of us.

I was 42.

The rest were in their early 20’s.¹

We were in a large lecture room, curious about this required class, eager to get out and start lawyering for dollars.

We’d spent three tiresome and expensive years reading law books and listening to lectures by pompous law professors. We all had our law degrees. We all passed the dreaded bar exam. We’d been sworn in.

We were lawyers!

But now we sat obediently for yet another lecture, trembling at the power of the Bar that could cancel our hard-earned licenses if we failed to meet *any* of the Bar’s strict requirements.

The Bar was our bread and butter.

So we sat as a well-dressed man at the front wrote on a blackboard and talked to us about professional standards, how to manage our trust account, how not to dip into our client’s retainers until we’d earned our fees, how to represent ourselves at court, and a host of other things the Bar wanted to make certain we understood before we began taking on clients.

¹ I didn’t begin law school until I was already 39 years old. I’d sailed through the eye of a full-blown hurricane off Cape Hatteras. I’d see elephants and visited island nations where people dig in the dirt for a morsel of food. I’d read a very large number of old writings by men like Penn, Paine, Woolman, Washington, Franklin, and a host of others who told me about the “Geometry of Good Government” for which all right-thinking human beings should strive. I learned these things *before* law school. I spent those three years studying dusty old books just to get the prized law degree so others might take seriously the things I already knew, things I’d already begun to write about. All I ever wanted to do for a living was write and teach others what I know to be true. Hurricanes, elephants, and impoverished people eking out a sparse living on remote islands in the sea will do that to a fellow if he has a heart that isn’t stone.

While the man at the blackboard chatted away, a strange second man paced back and forth between us and the man at the blackboard. He looked intently at each of us. He demanded our attention. He walked repeatedly across the room in front of us, always facing us, making eye contact with each of us.

He carried a large cardboard sign.

The sign was nearly 3 feet wide by 2 feet tall.

He would hold it near his chest then extend his arms to push the sign toward us then pull it back toward his chest. His assignment was to make absolutely certain that we knew what that sign said and what it was intended to communicate.

The sign had nothing but a large hand-printed number.

“\$300”.

No words.

Just that number.

\$300.

The man at the blackboard droned on about many things that could get us disbarred if we didn't obey the Bar's strict professional standards. Today I don't remember any of it in detail.

But I remember the large cardboard sign!

We were there to learn what that sign said.

The professional standards lecture was all about things we learned in law school. Things we were tested on in the bar exam. We weren't there to learn all that again.

We were there to remember: \$300!

That number filled the sign.

The blackboard business was official business of the Bar.

The large cardboard sign was unconnected with the well-dressed man at the blackboard.

The well-dressed man said nothing about the sign.

The sign was unrecognized.

The sign was a silent message from the Bar.

It clearly was not “official Bar business”.

What do *you* think that sign was for?

It was clear to me.

Before law school I’d worked as handy man, night class teacher, busboy, dishwasher, ferry boat skipper, and a host of other jobs during my forty years before the Bar permitted me to sit in that room with the wandering sign.

Before that day I seldom had \$300 in my pocket at any time. There were days when I could barely pay my rent.

I was 42 years old, seated in a classroom with younger men and women who would soon be licensed lawyers and someday judges who would make decisions impacting the lives of innocent people and directing the political path of our nation.

I watched with wonder at the \$300 cardboard sign.

Yes, Mr. and Mrs. America.

We were told to *fix our fees!*

That \$300 sign could mean nothing else!

Nothing was said about it then, and nothing was ever said about it in the 40 years since. I don’t remember any fellow lawyer ever speaking about it.

It was as if it never happened.

When I began my practice I set up a small office in the front room of my modest two bedroom home. I hung a handmade sign beneath my mailbox. I had some simple business cards printed with my name and phone number.

And I charged \$35 an hour ... more than I’d ever made in an hour.

I've no idea what other "new lawyers" charged after leaving that strange room long ago, but surely that large \$300 sign had significant influence on their decisions.

Nothing I learned in law school was rocket science.

Most of it was simply common sense.

Indeed, the rules of court procedure and evidence are simple enough for an average 8th grader to understand (if you can get an 8th grader to sit still long enough).

You've been led to believe lawyers are so expensive because they know things too difficult for you to understand.

That is not true!

We know a lot that you don't know, but none of it is difficult to learn, and our time is not worth the exorbitant fees most of us charge.

That sign (and similar *unlawful signs* shown to tens of thousands of newly admitted lawyers these past 40 years) should be understood by every one of you.

It adversely affects your life and the lives of your children, who inherit a world in which members of the legal profession profit by your not knowing even the most basic concepts of law and justice. The basic concepts of law are hidden from you.

The Bar refuses to make any genuine effort to teach to you or your children even the simplest concepts of law or the rules of court that I've been teaching rank-and-file Americans for 30 years with my online legal tactics course.

The Judiciary is failing you.

The Bar is failing you.

Things you would easily understand, if they were offered to you using today's AI and other cyber technologies, would empower you to know what's going on in "high places" in this country of ours, instead of remaining in the dark while others decide what's best for you and your children ... what's right and wrong, what's moral and immoral.

This nation was founded on the idea that We the People should have a say-so that goes beyond our single vote at the polls.

But, until you know the simple truths the Bar continue to hide from you and your children, lawyers and judges will decide your future for you and get rich doing it.

What do you suppose those signs are saying today?

\$500?

\$800?

\$1,000?

How much is a lawyer's time really worth?

If an average 8th grader can learn the Rules of Court and a few of the common-sense tactics that win legal battles, would you still think a lawyer's time is worth more than what most medical doctors earn?

Do you think it might be a good idea to learn those rules and a few of the tactics so you know what lawyers are up to?

Would that be worth doing?

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The American Bar Association

The American Bar Association is a *private* organization.

It is NOT authorized by any branch of our government.

It is NOT approved by popular vote in any way.

It is NOT subject to the “Will of the People”.

It is a *private* organization.

It is dedicated to promoting the interests of its members.

Period.

Yet, its influence, opinions, and decisions impact every aspect of your life and the lives of your children.

The Bar and its operations are NOT authorized by Congress.

It is NOT authorized by the United States Constitution.

It is the Bar.

And at this hour the American People have *no control whatever!*

Nearly 95% of America’s law schools are “ABA Accredited”. All those law schools and their law professors march to the tune of Bar policies that are decided by Bar delegates and the Bar’s board of directors.

You have no say in this.

The American People have NO say whatsoever!

Bar policies impact the decisions of judges and the highest justices in our highest courts ... decisions that affect *you and your children*.

Decisions about morality, the economy, the power of corporations, and far more things than you can possibly imagine.

The Bar takes positions on purely political issues that influence judicial decisions, guide legislation, and regulate what is taught by law professors to more than 100,000 new law students every year ... law students who become judges and justices with power to decide for you

and your children what is right and wrong, what is moral and immoral, what is American, what is Constitutional and what is not.

All of their decisions are influenced by the Bar and its members.

The Bar impacts every aspect of our daily lives, without being answerable to the American People in any way.

To pass the dreaded bar exam and practice law or sit on the bench in 46 of our 50 states requires applicants to be graduates of an American Bar Association accredited law school, i.e., a school where ABA ideas and attitudes are inculcated, where ABA approved law books are studied, and where ABA positions on political issues shape the minds of men and women empowered with positions in government and society that touch every detail of our economy and our lives.

When I passed the bar and was admitted to practice law in Florida, the ABA solicited me to join. Membership would include an automatic subscription to their monthly “ABA Journal”. Before paying my dues to join, I read a copy of the “ABA Journal” and found that powerful but private organization taking a formal position on what was then a hot issue in politics. The article took sides on an issue about which most reasonable people had differing opinions. It was an issue unrelated to the practice of law, regulation of the bar, or any other matter proper for that all-powerful professional organization to address. The issue was outside the Bar’s wheelhouse, so to speak. The issue was beyond the scope of professionalism. I did not wish to support that position. So I refused to join.

The political influence of the ABA extends far into matters about which the American People have no knowledge whatsoever!

For that purely private organization to influence the decisions of judges and legislatures on purely political issues *should be a matter of concern for all of us*.

Take a peek through Wikipedia and Google® to learn more about the ABA and its influence in matters directly and indirectly affecting your lives and the lives of your children.

It's an eye opener ... as I hope my book is becoming for you!
MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Plea Deals

While you've been reading my book, dozens of innocent people were arrested, locked in a cell behind steel bars where some will remain for years, away from their loved ones, caged like animals ... *all because the Bar has yet to improve the process by which our courts handle criminal complaints!*

The convenience of the courts frequently outweighs the rights of us humans to a fair trial.

If you're like four-out-of-five Americans² who can't afford to hire a competent and courageous criminal attorney, you'll likely be stuck with a public defender who will negotiate with the prosecutor and offer you a plea deal, rather than researching the law thoroughly and doing the work required to find evidence to unravel the prosecution's case at trial and set you free ... free to live your life without further interference.

Instead of 20 years locked away from your family and friends in a maximum security prison with dangerous felons, you might be offered a generous 2 year sentence.

"It's the best I could do," may be the assuring words from the public defender assigned to your case (and possibly many dozens of others he or she is charged with handling).

Taking any case to trial (criminal or civil) requires work, and work requires time. Few public defenders have the time or other resources that are required to properly defend their clients at trial. So they negotiate a "deal" with the prosecutor.

It's convenient for a system that after thousands of years still has not yet been perfected, that still punishes innocent people *every day!*

The sentencing guidelines for the crime you *allegedly* committed might be 20 years in a maximum security facility. The prosecutor and

² The ABA reported this as 82% of Americans who cannot afford to hire a lawyer.

public defender (both paid by the government) might suggest you spend “only two years” behind bars *if you will kindly plead guilty for us.*

“But, I’m NOT guilty!” you complain.

“You run the risk of 20 years locked up if we lose at trial.”

That *is* how our criminal justice system works.

It works that way for more than 80% of you!

That’s more than 4 out of 5 who can’t afford to hire a lawyer of their own.

And, of course, none of you yet knows the simple rules of evidence that could set you free.

None of you yet knows how to make timely objections that would secure the court record so you’d have a chance to win an appeal if you lose at trial.

None of you yet knows these things that can be made simple enough for an average 8th grader to learn in a single weekend!

Criminal defense lawyers do not work on a “contingency basis”. They insist on being paid up front. The best ones do not work for free.

If you cannot pay for your own lawyer, you will be forced to rely on a public defender, low paid lawyers who usually have dozens if not hundreds of cases on their desks and cannot be expected to give your case the attention it deserves.

That’s the reality, and it isn’t going to change until more of you learn what the Bar has been hiding from you ... the rules of evidence, the proper way to object, how to deal with the essential elements of your case, and how to move the court to enter orders in your favor..

“Innocent until proven guilty?”

Sounds noble and laudable.

That’s what we teach our children.

But reality is cruel.

Cruel to tens of thousands of innocent people accused of crimes they can't afford to hire an effective criminal defense lawyer to *prove their innocence!*

Tens of thousands who *could* know at least some of those rules, some of those objections, some of those essential elements that the opponent must prove to win the case.

But none of you are taught anything about the law in America!

If you wish a better world for yourself and your children, take a closer look at the Bar and ask, "Why weren't we told?"

Tens of thousands of innocent people are sitting in prison or jail at this very moment, people who could have known at least the basic rules of evidence and how, when, and why to make effective objections.

Many (if not most of them) would be free right now if the Bar did not refuse to make any genuine effort to teach these simple things to you or your children.

They *are* simple, easy-to-learn, and not abstruse complexities that the Bar and its minions would have you believe.

The first duty of government should be to protect the innocent!

But, the Bar is "outside" our government, an independent private organization beyond your control.

The adage, "Ignorance of the law is no excuse," ought to bring shame on the Bar and its leadership. Nothing of significance is being done or ever has been done by the Bar to teach the American People about our law and its common-sense rules of court!

If you're arrested and charged with a crime, demand that the government meets its "burden of proof"³ to establish that you committed the crime. Demand to know what are the "essential fact elements of the

³ The burden of proof in every criminal (and every civil) case is the obligation of the party asserting a claim to prove the claim with admissible evidence. This maxim rule is frequently ignored in today's courts, so innocence suffers needlessly.

crime”⁴ and what tangible evidence exists to substantiate that *each and every one of those essential fact elements can be proven without violating the Rules of Evidence that every school child should know and understand before graduating from high school.*

Zealous advocacy is impossible for public defenders burdened with dozens of accused people who are unable to hire their own lawyer.

Public defenders lack sufficient funds to do what zealous advocacy demands.

Plea bargaining is commonplace.

Innocence suffers.

Take a closer look and ask, “What does this really mean in the spirit of our nation’s laudable premise of Liberty and Justice to ALL?”

ALL?

Not on your tintype!

How many of you have any idea what’s going on down at the local Courthouse today or last week or last month where lives are destroyed each day by incompetence, indolence, and indifference?

You hear of a few startling cases that come before the courts in the course of a year, but tens of thousands of cases are decided every year in this country, and too many innocent people suffer.

The next victim could be you or someone you love.

Tens of thousands who did nothing wrong are arrested, held in jail for weeks before given an opportunity to say a single word to a judge.

They they are offered the “2 years or 20” routine, or perhaps even worse?

Those cases don’t show up in the 6:00 o’clock news.

Yet, in every city that hateful choice is offered every single day.

⁴ Every criminal (and every civil) case is established *only* by alleging and proving (by admissible evidence) that each and every one of the essential fact elements is present and applies to the party charged. This maxim rule is frequently ignored in today’s courts, so innocence suffers needlessly.

Innocence is devalued.

Judicial efficiency outweighs Justice!

Bring them in.

Line them up.

See which ones can afford a lawyer.

Send the rest to the Public Defender's Office for processing.

So it goes ... and with it our nation's honorable promises.

It doesn't have to be this way!

Public Legal Education will improve things once more of you are aware of what the legal profession and its Bar are hiding from you.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Rule 1.370 Scam

A notice in The Florida Bar News back in 2003 caught my eye.

The Florida Trial Lawyers Association filed a motion with the Florida Supreme Court seeking an order limiting the number of Requests for Admissions⁵ that we lawyers (or any of you *without a lawyer*) could file to win a case.

They are like leading questions *in writing*.

They must be responded to *in writing*.

They are powerful to help innocent people win!

The incredibly selfish reason the trial lawyers gave in their motion (a matter of public record you can Google[®]) was that some people were using Requests for Admissions “as a discovery tool and/or as an improper method of proving up the elements of one’s case or defense”.⁶

That’s what they’re for.

Our Civil Procedure Rule 1.280 says, specifically, *that’s what they’re for!*

And the trial lawyers who filed that motion knew this!

They are one of our five evidence discovery tools! Those tools belong to you, not just to the lawyers who abuse them.

They *are* a powerful method to prove the essential fact elements of a case *before* going to the expense, delay, and uncertainty of taking a case all the way to trial.

“Admit you were at Joe’s Tavern on October 6, 2023.”

No wiggle room.

⁵ Requests for Admissions are simply written lists of things that your opponent must admit or deny. They are not rocket science or differential calculus that an average 8th grader could not understand. They might say something like this: Admit or deny the following statements. (1) You were in Chicago on Halloween 2024. (2) You were driving a 2023 Oldsmobile that day. This is NOT something an average 8th grader cannot do, and we *could* be teaching our 8th graders today!

⁶ https://supremecourt.flcourts.gov/content/download/326665/file/03-161_report.pdf

No rocket science.

A very powerful tool.

They are leading questions you can ask in writing *before* trial (and without a lawyer) to force your opponents to admit the Truth of any matter and, if used cleverly, to avoid trial altogether!

Hold that thought.

If your opponent refuses to answer a Request for Admissions in the time allowed by the rules, you can move the court to enter an order declaring all those things you listed to be “admitted for all purposes”.

A very powerful tool indeed!

A tool that any average 8th grader could understand and use to win his or her case (if we allowed 8th graders to litigate cases in our courts).

This is a simple case-winning power *you were never told about*.

Power that belongs to every American.

Power that’s not restricted to lawyers’ use alone.

This power belongs to *you*!

It’s a tool *anyone* can use, whether you can afford a lawyer or not.⁷

Why do you suppose Florida’s trial lawyers organization (a private group) wanted Florida’s Supreme Court to limit the number of these powerful leading questions anyone can use to establish contested fact elements before trial?

What do you think their motive was?

It doesn’t take a crystal ball to see the answer.

Trial lawyers make money by *taking cases to trial*.

That’s why we call them “trial lawyers”.

Trial lawyer incomes would be severely limited if their opponents could resolve disputed facts *without waiting until trial*.

⁷ Please hold this thought. 4 out of 5 Americans cannot afford to hire a competent attorney. And none of you knew about this simple evidence discovery tool that you could have learned about in 8th grade.

The trial lawyers insidiously finagled the Florida Supreme Court to reduce the number of Requests for Admissions to 30.

Prior to this hearing in Tallahassee that I attended on behalf of the people of my state, there was no limit on the number of these written “leading questions” we could ask our opponent before trial.

The justices ignored my plea *and refused to acknowledge that the selfish motive of the trial lawyers’ motion should be denied, because Requests for Admissions are intended for the very thing they complained about!*

Before that date, we could use as many “written leading questions” as we needed to force our opponent to admit the truth, and many people *were* winning without the delay, expense, and uncertainty of trial.

Justice Harry Anstead (former Chief Justice) and Justice Fred Lewis (also former Chief Justice) agreed with me. They dissented from the majority decision. They agreed with me that the trial lawyers self-interest motivated motion lacked proper predicate.

But, the majority caved to the Bar’s political pressure, ignoring fundamental principles of American Justice!

All of you should have the right to ask leading questions in writing *before* bearing the expense, delay, and uncertainty of going to trial with its dog and pony show of smoke and mirrors that makes lawyers rich!

You don’t need a law degree to use Request for Admissions.⁸

“Admit the following:

1. On 13 March 2024 you did not have a license to practice medicine.
2. You performed surgery on plaintiff Miss Scarlett on 13 March 2024.
3. Miss Scarlett was pronounced dead on 13 March 2024.”

Powerful stuff.

⁸ Fully explained with sample forms in my case-winning Jurisdictionary® course at www.HowToWinInCourt.com

Requests for Admissions can even be used to establish content or to authenticate disputed documents and thereby limit evidentiary issues with just a few sentences on a simple form.

“Admit that your signature appears on the attached Exhibit A.”

Limiting the number of Requests for Admissions to 30 means only that more cases can now be dragged on and on so trial lawyers can make more money.

The 80% of you who cannot afford to hire a lawyer could be taught how to use this powerful pre-trial tool to pin down slippery adversaries with just a few *written leading questions* that the rules of court require your adversaries to respond to *on the record in writing!*

But the rules of court are not yet taught to you or your children.

If you can win *before* trial by using your five evidence discovery tools,⁹ then why should any of you be required to hire a lawyer to go to trial for you, *voir dire* the jury, call your opponent to the witness stand, and only then be permitted to ask, “I show you what’s marked as Exhibit A. Do you recognize your signature?”

That can be gotten *before trial* with one Request for Admissions.

You can have the answer *before* trial and win *before* trial.

You can have the answer in the official court record, inexpensively, simply, effectively ... *without hiring a lawyer.*

The Florida Supreme Court caved in to a private association of self-interested trial lawyers.

The people lost more of their God-given rights.

The Chief Justice of the Florida Supreme Court actually confessed to me that day in Tallahassee (it’s a matter of record) that “trial judges don’t understand discovery”.

You can look it up!

⁹ Requests for Admissions, Requests for Production, Interrogatories, Depositions, and Court Orders.

I told them that trial judges should be required to learn the rules!

Instead, Florida's highest court used the BAR's flimsy excuse that Requests for Admissions should be limited to 30, *because that's the number permitted by the federal rules*.

They refused to address the ignorant grounds put forth by the trial lawyers' stupid, selfish, money-motivated motion, that *some lawyers are using them to limit issues before trial*.

That's what they are for!

All this happened without your knowledge.

It's happening throughout the nation.

The BAR runs your world, friend.

Much of what the legal profession does is good.

Too much is not.

The majority should have denied the trial lawyers' motion on the grounds that the motion was a sham. Complaining that some people were using Requests for Admissions to limit issues for trial makes a mockery of the issue.

Those Supreme Court justices *knew* the motion was a sham.

They knew that Rule 1.280 expressly states that's what Requests for Admissions are for.

They all knew.

I told them!

Everyone *knew*.

Yet the trial lawyers' private organization was allowed to prevail.

Trial lawyers got their way so there will be more trials in cases that could have been resolved *before* trial without draining pockets dry.

More of your power to use our courts to enforce your God-given rights *without a lawyer* was stolen from you by men and women whose income depends on keeping you ignorant.

Power to force bad actors to answer leading questions in writing *before trial* was deleted.

Requests for Admissions are as much a part of your God-given rights as the right to vote and speak your mind freely without fear of being locked up.

They are one of the ways to secure Liberty and Justice for ALL.

They are provided by Rules of Court that belong to *you*, rules too many brave men and women gave their lives to secure for you.

Those rules are not the exclusive property of the private business association known as the BAR.

They are power each and every one of you has a right to know and use *without unreasonable restriction!*

Wonder why “Jurassic Park” theater audiences burst out with an ear-shattering cheer when the giant T-Rex dinosaur ate the lawyer?

C’mon, people.

We’ve got work to do!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

1st Semester Criminal Law Shock

My first class at law school was Criminal Law taught by a short little fellow, Professor Bob Batey.

There were 125 of us “first years” in that class.

Most in their early 20’s, straight out of undergraduate school.

I was already 39.

Professor Batey was about my age, a jovial fellow, full of wit. He was nothing like the stern, demanding law school professors that I had expected. He made his criminal law class fun as well as interesting.

That first day he climbed up on a chair, then up onto a table, and stood before his shocked class looking around the room, taking stock of us, pausing for eye-to-eye contact with each of us in turn.

He then asked the following question.

“If science could use DNA taken from a hair follicle to predict the likelihood of a person committing violent crime, how many would vote for a law requiring people to submit to the DNA test?”

All but two hands were raised.

123 of those young people favored the idea (most of whom went on to become lawyers and judges in positions to make such decisions for the rest of us.

I didn’t raise my hand.

I was shocked.

Neither did the second oldest student in the room.

But, we were the only two refraining.

123 out of 125 would require everyone to submit to a hair follicle test!

Not all of those passed the bar, thank goodness, but a majority did. They not only passed the bar but were admitted to practice in our courts, where they now make decisions about who goes to prison, who loses

their home or children, and other critical rulings that impact the lives of every American directly or indirectly, according to their personal view of right and wrong or how they felt when they got out of bed this morning.

Many become judges. Some law become justices in our appellate courts or even justices on the United States Supreme Court.

They all graduated from law schools.

They all passed the ubiquitous bar exam.

And today they decide issues that affect us all in ways we cannot challenge, altering how our children view the world, promoting a new view of morality *with which most of us wholeheartedly disagree!*

I enjoyed law school. We were provoked by our professors to think deeply. I'd like to believe most of us had our minds changed for the better during those three years before we were permitted to graduate and open our own or work in someone else's law office.

We studied classes on contracts, torts, property, corporations, tax, and other topics where we were persuaded to see the world through the opinions of many hundreds of published appellate court decisions.

I'd like to think most of us entered the so-called legal profession *accepting our responsibility to stand firm against all inroads of legal invention that threaten to undermine the traditional human rights that the founders of our nation insisted were fundamental and self-evident.*

Unfortunately, as you're learning from my book, law school cannot cure stupid.

Today's law schools no longer inculcate the Primary Principles of Justice. They no longer promote those principles that should be the primary focus of every law school as well as every elementary school, middle school, high school, junior college, and university in this wonderful nation of ours.

So, we increasingly suffer from the destructive but all-too-common malady we know as legal stupidity.

"Legal education is failing in this country!"

The Dean of the University of Florida's College of Law (largest law school in Florida) said exactly those words as he took the podium at a luncheon meeting of my local county bar association several months ago. The room was filled with lawyers and judges. We were anxious to hear what this brilliant man had to share with us. There was a hush of anticipation as he began to speak.

He said, "Legal education is failing in this country!"

First words out of his mouth!

Clearly a critical concern in this influential man's mind. It is what he wished all of us there to understand that day. It was a warning. It was a harbinger with repercussions currently impacting the practice of law and the decisions of our highest courts. It is permitting a trend of judicial activism that in years past was frowned upon. It is opening the floodgate to allow increasing abuse of the Constitutional authority granted to our judiciary that too often ignores the ancient principles of Justice and fair dealing in favor of political agendas and the profit line of corporations.

Law schools are becoming trade schools. They equip law students to do the work of lawyering. There is little or no commitment to uphold the Primary Principles of Justice *that are no longer taught in law school or anywhere else.*

Young people enroll in law schools around the country, bringing with them their preconceived notions of right and wrong, what justice is and what it's not.

If law schools fail to teach the Primary Principles of Justice to the young people who become our lawyers and judges who rule you and your children with misplaced ideas about those Primary Principles, where will those Primary Principles be taught?

Hold that thought!

The Primary Principles *could* be taught in our public schools!

They are NOT rocket science!

They could be taught with AI and other cyber technologies.

The children don't have to read books as I was required to do for those three years and the four years of undergraduate school earlier.

They can watch animated videos.

They can learn how to protect themselves from other members of my profession!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Stupid Langdell Method

When I tell you *nothing* we learned in law school was difficult, you'll likely raise your eyebrows and respond, "Sure, Graves. Tell us another one!"

But, it's true!

That's why I launched Jurisdictionary® on the worldwide web in 1997. Since that date (my classes were on the internet before Google® got started) more than 27,000 people just like you have learned and used the rules and tactics I've taught them and understand the process of litigation and the mechanism of evidence rules that control judges!

Why aren't we teaching this stuff in public schools or, at least, in private schools and home schools where political influence cannot stop this imperative movement to MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN?

I'll tell you why!

Because the truth has been hidden from you by the Bar.

The BAR has been hiding the truth, either negligently or intentionally, to serve the BAR's purposes and to benefit its member lawyers and judges.

The stuff we learned in law school *didn't have to be so hard to learn*.

They could have been made much easier, but for the influence of Christopher Columbus Langdell, Dean of Harvard Law School (1870-1895) who wrote the first "case book" on contracts, a collection of published appellate court opinions called Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts.

Landell's idea was to present what was then a loose collection of published appellate court decisions that exemplified some of the "legal logic" that was applied by justices in those cases so we law students might thereby learn "how to think like lawyers".

There followed, of course, more casebooks on contracts plus others on torts, property, wills and trusts, intellectual property, criminal law, evidence, and so forth.

Every case we read by Langdell's Method was nothing but a story about people who had a disagreement that was resolved and settled with a court order issued by an appellate court.

For 3 of my 81 years (and more than \$100,000 of my hard-earned savings) I read the tedious terminology and redundant reasoning of high court justices whose rulings form the foundation of our American system of jurisprudence.

And they were truly tedious!

It may surprise you¹⁰ to know that the historically pure concepts of American Jurisprudence that gave birth to our nation were (and must again be made to be) just common-sense resolutions to the problems of common people through the application of Love and Wisdom.

Love and Wisdom intertwined *is* Justice.

Common-sense!

Common-sense the common man accepts and supports.

Common law today, however, is no longer common-sense.

Common law today (the total of all un-reversed appellate court decisions¹¹) is far too frequently NOT common-sense *and does not serve the common man*.

Too many decisions of our highest courts today are NOT accepted nor supported by the common man in America, the working class that keeps the wheels of commerce turning.

Christopher Langdell, who died in 1906, is controlling legal education from his tomb.

We need to be done with him and his antiquated idea.

¹⁰ I hope by the time you finish my book you are no longer surprised.

¹¹ Appellate court decisions filling those thousands of books you see in law libraries and lawyer's offices.

This is the 21st Century. We have cars that drive themselves, park themselves, and display real-time road maps on the dashboard. We have hand-held devices that let us see as well as talk with people on the other side of the planet while allowing us to tap into every tidbit of knowledge anyone could care to know *all at the touch of a few buttons*. The list goes on.

Every case I was required to read in law school could have been presented with AI animations, images, and audio explanations.¹²

Yet, every significant law school in America (and in other nations as well) teach law students by the “Langdell Method” that has been the standard curriculum for more than 150 years *without any significant change*.

Clearly, no one but ambitious law students would willingly force themselves to read those tedious tomes, so the Primary Principles of Justice have remained hidden from the American People (and the people of other nations as well) because those principles have until now been locked securely in the pages of those thousands of old books.

Books and concepts of Justice that could today be accessed from that device you carry with you everywhere you go, principles that could be illustrated cleverly in color with sound and even music backgrounds on computer monitors in classrooms around the world, with children eagerly entertained, informed, and empowered by knowledge that should have been ours long ago *but now is possible for the first time in history*.

Three years we read appellate opinions from those dusty old law books and, interestingly, the opinions we read were opinions that the Bar chose for us to read!

Think about that!

We started with a few of the oldest appellate court opinions that made common-sense, legal doctrines most Americans would agree with

¹² Just as the more important cases and their common-law doctrines could be taught to our children in home schools, private schools, and someday in our tax-supported private schools, once Mr. and Mrs. America are made more fully aware of what’s going on behind the Bar curtain.

today, doctrines rooted and grounded in the philosophy of law that was widely shared with our nation had its birth.

Gradually, however, we were introduced to more recent opinions of those high court justices, opinions that increasingly lean away from the God-given rights of individual citizens in favor of the imagined and purely invented “rights” of collectives, corporations, and the government itself.

Beware, dear reader.

There is something powerfully significant going on.

We might pause to ask, “Who *is* the public?”

Are corporations part of the public?

Are politicians?

Native Indians?

Gay people?

Blue-eyed heterosexuals?

When did “the public” begin to have more God-given rights than us individuals?

But, that’s what the Bar-selected cases taught us.

We were instructed to read case after case after case and accept the justices’ reasoning, just because they were the justices, and we were mere law students, good little boys and girls anxious to pass the dreaded bar exam and embark in our illustrious careers (when we anticipated making ridiculous amounts of money by possessing knowledge you and your children, dear reader, were never given the remotest opportunity to learn.

Could the Bar have an invidious motive in this?

We would surely run afoul of propriety and fail to be politically correct if we suggest such a dastardly thing, however the end result is clear as resplendent crystal ... at least to those of us not yet completely addled by social media and the pharmaceutical company supported TV

programming that spews its sponsored dicta into our daily lives and the lives of our innocent, easily persuadable children.

What today could be taught to you and your children in secondary schools (and to some extent in primary schools as well) remains totally hidden from you ... *keys of knowledge that form the foundation of law that controls you and those you love from cradle to grave!*

You were taught *nothing* about it!

Nothing!

Yet, none of it is rocket science or differential calculus!

None is above the ability of an average 8th grader!

We require our children to learn algebra, chemistry, trigonometry, foreign languages, and other technical topics that few of them will need in later life. We spend countless billions providing drama, music, home economics, and physical education classes ... all of which is good.

But!

Why are the Principles of Justice ignored?

If, as I assert, the most fundamental of those principles can easily be taught with AI and other cyber technologies, why have we not begun?

We do not need our children to learn by Langdell's method.

Indeed, law students could be freed from that tedium with just a bit of creative curriculum revision bringing legal education into the modern world.

Landell holds legal education frozen by a century and a half of no longer practical tradition. "Because we've always done it this way," is no justification for remaining stuck in the past.

We have artificial intelligence.

We have video animations.

We have the technical means to transmit critical information and these essential teachings into every home and classroom in the world *at virtually no cost*.

Let me say it again: *Every case we read by Langdell's Method was nothing but a story about people who had a disagreement that was resolved and settled with a court order issued by an appellate court.*

Each of those appellate court decisions creates new law.

Appellate court decisions are judge-made laws, laws that control and can repeal the statutes of your state legislatures and federal codes created by Congress and agency rulings of every executive office in the land.

Common law controls our courts today.

You and your children were taught *nothing* about it.

Later in my book I will tell you a bit about Hadley v Baxendale, Kirksey v Kirksey, and Palsgraf v Long Island Railroad, appellate court opinions you will see to be exactly what I say they are: STORIES.

They, and thousands like them, are stories about people who had their disagreements resolved and settled by court orders *based on a simple recipe of common-sense reasoning ... OR NOT.*

It's that "OR NOT" that should trouble you, because too many decisions coming out of our highest courts today are NOT common-sense nor accepted and supported by the common man.

Many justices today are twisting what was long ago America's common-sense common law into something foreign to the Primary Principles of Justice on which our nation once drew her strength.

We must return again to those Primary Principles of Justice.

We must teach those principles to our children.

Or ... our nation will fall in the chaos of lawlessness as other republics have fallen.

You know nothing about those cases mentioned above.

No one in his right mind is going to read the tediously worded appellate decisions in those three cases (unless aiming for a lawyer's

life, earning money than 99% of you by just sitting in a chair writing or strutting about in a courtroom asking questions).

Hadley is a story about a miller who was grinding corn when the mill shaft broke. He hired a man to take it away for repairs, and the hired man didn't get back quite as quickly as the miller thought proper.

Kirksey is a story about a widow whose brother-in-law offered her a place to stay. A movie about this starred Meryl Streep and Daniel Day-Lewis.

Palsgraf is about a little old lady who claimed to suffer injury as she boarded a passenger train in the days of steam engines and Pullman cars. It's just a story!

Every case that we read by Professor Langdell's Method was just a story about disgruntled people who could have taken matters into their own hands, settling things the old-fashioned way with physical violence.

Instead, these people took their beefs to court, and the cases ended up on appeal where the appellate decisions created new law.

These are simple stories an average 8th grader could understand, if told with AI animations and other cyber technology available today.

If you could feel the passion in my heart as I write these words. If you could catch a glimpse of America being rescued from the insanity of today's high court decisions that increasingly override the God-given rights that formed the basis for the birth of our nation. If you could see us working together to MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN.

If "wishes" were horses, beggars would ride.

We need to act.

We need to begin at once to teach our children those stories from the old cases ... *stories that made sense before the rise of collectivism, populism, and the destructive political correctness craze undermining everything we once held dear.*

Everything I learned in law school can be taught (not only to your children but to you and other adults as well) using today's technologies

to un-veil what is shamefully hidden in those published appellate court opinions.

You, Mr. and Mrs. America, can know what lawyers are hiding from you.

You can know, instead of remaining in the dark.

You can successfully oppose the modernist thinking in our courts that threatens a purely secular society in which political leaders will decide what is right and wrong, a society in which police power will rule your behavior, a society in which every living soul will labor for the good of the collective, regardless of the God-given rights of individuals.

And those who dare to think for themselves or challenge authority of state leadership will be destroyed.

It has happened too many times in the past, and there is no reason to believe we are immune to it today.

The annals of human history repeatedly show us the consequence of permitting darkness to overcome the light of truth, avarice and greed to displace the efforts of honest labor, and the dissolution of principles to leave nations in the clutches of ambitious politicians and tyrants.

We dare not believe history no longer applies to us for, as surely as we contentedly rest in that delicious dream, bold reality will wake us to horrors we could now prevent by acting to teach what has too long been hidden from us.

This present fast-paced day was predicted by countless authors in old books nobody reads these days. Wise men and women warned us to watch for these signs and be prepared to stand against the evil trends that can sweep us all away from what we once held dear, forcing us into the rat-race of a brave new world, where innocence is punished for the convenience of the collective.

Think that day is not yet here?

Think again, friend.

You don't know the half of it.

You haven't read the appellate court decisions of our highest courts these past few decades.

You hear only what TV pundits have to say about a sparse few of those critical cases, of which dozens are added to the books each day.

You have no idea what the majority of those cases are saying.

You have no idea how they are changing the legal landscape.

You have no idea how they are moving the moral margins of society, allowing insidious ideas to weaken the minds and will of children too young to understand the hazards that follow living without moral restraint, children heedless of the consequences that befall both men and nations when truth is rendered relative and reality is whatever each one of us wishes it to be.

The structure of society will not strengthen itself.

High court justices are twisting what you once believed.

This unacceptable, unendurable trend will only continue to grow and expand if not opposed by *you* and a few million like you.

This generation must restore the landmarks that make Liberty and Justice possible for ALL of us.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

License to Steal

William McKinley Smiley¹³ was my torts professor at Stetson College of Law in St. Petersburg, Florida back in the 1980's.

He was a brilliant man.

Son of a state prosecutor.

Nobody's fool.

Unlike many of professors who never represented a client nor entered a courtroom to argue for clients (where lives and livelihoods depend on presenting legal arguments under pressure, as opposed to proclaiming ivory tower ideas in an academic classroom) Mickey, as he liked to be called, had done his share of successful litigating.

He was adviser to one of the foremost personal injury firms in Florida at the time.¹⁴

He examined law with old-fashioned wisdom and common-sense.

He wrote the following in his dedication to Trial Advocacy, the official handbook of Florida Trial Lawyers:

“Trial Lawyering is a special form of service to humanity. The implementation allows the weak to be strong...the vanquished to have hope... the victims to be restored. Trial Skills emerge through commitment to the most significant characteristic associated with the Trial Lawyer - a willingness to share. Please accept these contributions as a passing of the baton in the race for justice. May you go forward with diligence and heart, knowing that a precious legacy has been placed within your hand.”

A precious legacy.

¹³ Professor Smiley died December 5, 2016

¹⁴ Searcy, Denney, Scarola, Barnhart, & Shipley

Diligence and heart were the “precious legacy” that Professor Smiley shared with me. He inspired me to see the practice of law as a sacred calling that is abused by far too many in the bar today, as it has been throughout history.

The redress of this abuse is in your hands.

It is presented to all who exercise courage and commitment to learn what the Bar has been hiding from you and your children for far too many centuries.

After graduation, passing the bar, and being admitted to practice as a licensed attorney, Mickey and I became good friends. We enjoyed music and sailing and good food. He was my mentor.

In congratulating me for passing the bar exam and beginning my practice as an attorney, he quipped, “You now have a license to steal.”

A license to steal.

That was 1986.

In the four decades since I’ve learned how true that statement is.

The temptation to use one’s Bar license to drain clients’ pockets is extreme.

From years of experience I tell you the majority of lawyers I was hired by my clients to do battle with would use any means whatever to win “at all costs”. They did this full well *knowing* their tactics violated both the letter and the spirit of the law.

Money is the driving force.

Money and the prestige that money can buy.

Rules of Procedure and Rules of Evidence are routinely ignored and subverted in order to win cases for clients who *should not win*.

Judges are lied to.

Knowingly lied to.

Professor Smiley’s quip is far too true for far too many lawyers.

We were celebrating with a group of other recent graduates who'd just been sworn in, when Mickey turned to me with an impish smile and half-jokingly and half seriously said, "You now have a license to steal."

And we did.

William McKinley Smiley stood for all that's good about our American system of justice. He was a man unafraid to stand unswayed by changing tides of public opinion. He believed there is a Truth we can hold fast to, believe in, and work for to benefit others.

Of all the things he taught us about what's right and good, he also told us about the twists and turns whereby some lawyers evade the truth and prostitute the Principles of Justice.

He insisted that each of us should be protected by our courts and judges from the sorry all-too-common consequence of selfish human negligence and outright malice.

Some of the younger students (still in their 20's) complained to the Dean about him over some slight that offended their childish opinions. Those attacking him were children of rich parents, families with money that influences the decisions of institutions like my law school that depends on charitable contributions. They tried to get him fired.

I went to the Dean to discover the ignorant root of their puerile uprising, and the matter was squelched.

From that day he and I were friends. We visited often for several years after I started my private practice. We went sailing, dined out, or just sat around his or my place playing guitars and making up songs.

His insight and advice stayed with me.

To a large degree he inspired me to start my online courses that have helped many thousands to learn how to win in court, thousands unable to hire their own lawyer.

He is the one who introduced me to the view that when one looks at the processes of law step-by-step they are truly easy-to-understand.

His tactics gave me win after win in court, applying his common-sense approach that can never be gained from reading law books alone.

He warned me to require my clients to sign affidavits swearing to every fact they wished me to allege in pleadings, motions, and other papers I was required to file with the court on their behalf. By this I was able to avoid fighting cases I could not win for, unless opposing lawyers are utterly brain dead, falsehoods *will be* uncovered. If I'd foolishly let myself be a mouthpiece for lying clients, I'd have egg on my face and lose the reputation with judges that I was able to gain by religiously attending to Mickey's sage advice.

In my years of practice, I represented only people willing to sign affidavits under oath (in the presence of a notary) attesting that facts they told me were true. This also helped me to win. It's far easier to win when the facts you represent are actually true.

In case after case I was able to overcome flimsy fabrications and sneaky subterfuges of other lawyers who cared nothing for truth or the financial hardship their outlandish fees had on those burdened by the necessity of being "represented".

I knew far too many lawyers whose self-interested refusal to obey the spirit and the letter of the law defames the profession and undermines public confidence in our system of law and order that must be restored quickly in this present age, because it is the bedrock of civilization itself.

The public has no idea what goes on in many law offices, where love of money and the push to win *at all costs* drives lawyers to bend the rules of procedure and evidence while draining their clients' pockets dry.

Not every lawyer is a scoundrel.

But, enough are scoundrels that teaching teach our children the Rules of Court and tactics they need to defend themselves against other members of my profession has become a moral imperative.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Why Lawyer Jokes?

“Take the lawyers, for instance, Miles,” Rupert Hardinge said. “What can you make of them? They hire their consciences out. They talk and reason as zealously for the wrong as for the right.” *From Ashore and Afloat by James Fennimore Cooper.*

Funny?

Depends on who you ask.

Millions are injured by lawyers every year.

There are *far* more pejorative jokes about lawyers than about all the other professions put together.

Why is this?

Perhaps it's time we all asked that question.

“Why?”

Only a few jokes about rabbis, priests, boy scouts, and horses walking into a bar.

There aren't nearly so many jokes poking hateful comments at car salesmen or real estate agents, professions many people consider at the bottom of the barrel barrel when it comes to honesty and fair dealing.

No hateful jokes about butchers, bakers, or candlestick makers.

No hateful jokes about school teachers, barbers or beauticians, nor at automobile mechanics, photographers, chefs (short-order or *haute cuisine*), airline pilots, or any other occupations you can think of.

No jokes come even close to those that attack lawyers as a species of sub-human organisms.

None criticize people generally as lawyer jokes do.

“What are a dozen lawyers at the bottom of the ocean?”

“A good start.”

There has to be a reason.

Seems a good idea to ask ourselves, “What is that reason?”

And, “What can we do about it?”

You know enough lawyer “jokes” already. I won’t regale you with some of my favorites.

If you think fairly about it for a moment, however, you’ll have to admit they really are no laughing matter.

Like it or not, lawyers are the mechanics of our legal system.

Our legal system is what keeps the great machine of government from exploding at the seams.

Lawyers serve in Congress and your state legislature.

Lawyers write the contracts you sign when you buy a car, buy a house, or enter into a rental agreement with a landlord.

They argue cases before our higher courts that result in appellate court decisions that affect you and everyone you love.

Every man and woman sitting on the on the benches of our highest courts first had to pass the the bar to become a practicing attorney. It is a pre-condition to hearing cases and making the life-changing rulings you hear about on the evening news!

Every judge was once a lawyer.

So, why the bad rap?

Why are a dozen lawyers at the bottom of the sea a good start?

What is it that lawyers do, or don’t do, that makes them targets for hatred and abusive epithets that draw such semi-serious chuckles from us and leave us with with an aftertaste of disgust?

There are, in fact, many answers.

We need to examine the Bar and legal profession from “within the veil” so to speak, where I’ve had privileges as a long-time practicing attorney and law professor sharing my case-winning experiences and tactical knowledge with tens of thousands of students in my How to Win

in Court course.¹⁵ Many of my many of my online students have been victims of unscrupulous hired lawyers who didn't care to do their very best or didn't know how. They lost winnable cases then took their fees without apology.

Abraham Lincoln allegedly said, "A man who represents himself in court has a fool for a client."

But, more than 80% of Americans¹⁶ are compelled to be fools, for they have no option but to mortgage the family home or knock off a liquor store to get the money that lawyers require to be paid.¹⁷

If you're poor enough, you may get free help from a legal aid office, where staff lawyers are bogged down with towering stacks of complex cases that prevent giving individual clients competent service.

Or, if you're accused of a crime, you may get free help from the public defender's office, where staff lawyers are similarly bogged down with so many cases they cannot do their very best. Instead, they choose to negotiate with the prosecutor's office for a reduced sentence. They will tell you something like, "Agree to spend 2 years in prison, or we must take your case to trial where, if we lose, you'll be facing 20 years instead of 2."

Justice should not be for sale.

But it is.

Until you demand that the Bar begin at once to start educating you and your children *so you know how our court system works and what must be done to get Justice.*

Lawyer jokes aren't funny!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

¹⁵ I launched my Jurisdictionary® course "How to Win in Court" online in 1997 for the 4 out of 5 people who cannot afford to hire a competent lawyer or simply don't trust them, choosing to fight for their rights alone rather than risk being fleeced by a Bar member.

¹⁶ The percentage of Americans who can afford to hire a lawyer as of the time of this writing is less than 20%. This is not my figure. It is from a published report of the American Bar Association. That's only one in every five adults.

¹⁷ Personal Injury lawyers claim in their TV ads and ubiquitous billboards that they work for free, that you pay them nothing unless they win; but they take 25% to 40% of whatever they get for you ... *if they choose to take your case, and only if they win.*

The Xeroxed Will Caper

An elderly lady employed me to write a will for her.

She wished her beachside Florida home to be left for her friend, another elderly lady who visited her frequently over an extended period of years when the two enjoyed many pleasant adventures together.

This nice lady had two adult children.

They rarely visited her.

I drafted her will stating her wish that the children get nothing at all when she was gone.

She died soon after, and I was hired by the friend to file the will with the court and proceed with what should have been a series of very simple steps that constitute probating¹⁸ the will, whereupon a judge would sign orders directing that title to the decedent's property be conveyed to the beneficiary named in the will.

So I filed the original will with blue-ink signatures of my client, two witnesses, and an attesting Notary Public.

All was in order.

In addition to filing the will and various other required papers, I published newspaper notices to creditors and to those known to have a potential interest in the estate, *in this case the children*.

A few days later the widow's son filed a petition with the court to probate a one page document he insisted was a later will signed by his mother on the hood of an automobile outside his home during a recent visit from her.

It was not an original document.

It did not have what we call a "wet ink" signature.

It appeared to be a Xerox[®] copy.

¹⁸ The word "probate" means simply to "prove".

That was evidence enough to challenge his petition.

Florida's Probate Code at the time provided that a "copy" of a will could be probated, but only if three "essential fact elements" could be proved by a preponderance of admissible evidence.

I knew, from things the son said in his petition, that one of those "essential fact elements" was missing.

I knew his "copy" could not be probated.

The law was clear.

He and his hired lawyer, however, pressed the matter.

I filed a motion to strike the petition as a sham.

They filed objections to my motion.

This went back-and-forth for nearly a year!

I think he hoped my client (now the decedent's friend) would run out of money and be unable to continue paying reasonable fees. Or, he may have thought my brain was very small and he could outsmart me or bamboozle the probate judge with clever paperwork and persuasive legal arguments at hearings.

He chased me with paper for several months.

I pressed on, knowing I would win when his smoke and mirrors pony show ran out of steam.

He pressed on.

After a month or so a second lawyer's name appeared on papers filed against me and my client. I now had two aggressive lawyers hired by the son to push his "will" through probate.

The battle grew more heated, but I held my ground.

I read the law. I knew the son and a dozen lawyers could not prove the essential fact elements required to probate a purported copy of a will. From what I already knew it was impossible. There simply would not be sufficient "admissible evidence" to meet the burden required.

And, not to put too fine a point on it, I knew those two lawyers also knew what I knew, or they were too stupid to look up the law before taking the case, or were promised a great deal of money to do whatever they could *no matter what the law might say*.

After months of back-and-forth, a final evidentiary hearing was scheduled before a judge I greatly admired, a retired Brigadier General, a no-nonsense eminently fair judge who permitted no departure from the rules or law. He had a reputation for expecting top-drawer performance from us lawyers appearing before him to argue our clients' cases.

And, low and behold, a third lawyer appeared at the hearing, a venerable old court warrior so well regarded that dinners were held in his honor. He was the very image of the slow-speaking southern lawyer, lacking only the seersucker jacket to perfect the show.

The judge called us to order then commanded me, "Whatcha got?"

I replied, "If it please the Court, your Honor, the burden to prove their Xerox® copy should be admitted to probate as a legitimate will is on them. It's not my job to prove it isn't."

Since I refused to start the proceedings, the judge ordered the old man across the room to begin our contest of words.

My opponent made various statements in a slow metered southern drawl designed to impress us with the depth and extent of his great legal knowledge and superannuated wisdom.

Nothing he said, however, came remotely close to addressing the still absent "essential fact element" I'd known for months he could not present, much less prove by the greater weight of admissible evidence.

This dragged on for the better part of an hour, during which the elder lawyer called the son as his only witness, questioning him about several things that had no bearing whatsoever on the "lynchpin legal issue" of the missing essential elements.

When he finished questioning the son and returned to his seat, the judge asked if I had any questions for the witness.

I answered simply, "I don't need this witness."

"It's getting late," the judge responded. "It's after 5:00 o'clock. I want to get home! *What do you have, Mr. Graves?*" he demanded,

I replied, "I'll wait till my opponent rests his case."

This irritated the judge, but he turned to my opponent and waited.

The old veteran hemmed and hawed, as good old boy small town southern lawyers to do in the movies. He reluctantly said, "I don't have much more."

Judge Pennick turned back to me, "It's your turn!"

"No, your Honor. It is *not* my turn."

I was determined to have my way. I would follow the rules, do what I was hired to do, and require my opponent *and the judge* to also follow the rules.

"When my esteemed opponent rests his case as a matter of record, I do have something to say that will interest you, your Honor."

The retired brigadier general was clearly steamed, but he turned to the elder lawyer and asked what more there was from that side.

Again, with slowly measured drawl, the evasive non-response was dragged forth from a man who knew what he was doing, leaving a door open for rebuttal if I said my say too soon.

"Your Honor," he said, as if he was confused at my refusal to take up the sword and attack, "there really isn't much more I can say."

The judge turned back to me.

I responded respectfully, "When my opponent states unequivocally that he has *nothing* more, I will tell you what my client hired me to say so we can get the original will probated according to the requirements of Florida law."

After another minute of my opponent's ridiculous foot-dragging, the judge finally ordered my opponent to utter those all-important words that can decide who wins or loses the most hotly contested legal battles.

“I rest my case,” the old man finally drawled out.

I looked at the court stenographer to confirm that those words were securely written into the court’s record.

Judge Pennick then turned to me and demanded with impatience again, “Whatcha got?”

“I move for directed verdict, your Honor.”

The judge stared at me as I recited the Probate Code provision that allowed the court to admit the son’s copy of his mother’s will *only if three essential fact elements could be proven by admissible evidence*.

One of those was clearly missing from the record.

The judge jumped from his chair announcing, “I’ll be right back!”

He was gone nearly half an hour.

When he returned to the bench he blurted out, “Fred is right!”

He went to the courthouse law library. He did the research I’d done nearly a year earlier. He reached the conclusion I knew he must reach. It was the end of this unnecessarily drawn out battle of who will blink first.

Three lawyers my opponent paid to accomplish what could not be done without sleight of hand, smoke and mirrors, or outright lying to the judge. Three lawyers to wear me down. Three lawyers to drain their client’s pockets dry. Three members of the Bar who knew *or should have known* that they could not win with the facts their clients presented.

As I gathered my books to leave the courtroom, I walked past the opposition table and heard the old lawyer apologize to his client, “There is no way we could have known that this would happen.”

Those were his exact words.

I’d known for months they could not win.

I wonder how much that Xerox® copy cost the ungrateful son.

It came to my attention later that the son had allegedly written a book explaining how to forge documents using a Xerox® machine. That may be mere rumor and little to do with what I want you to learn about

lawyers and the things that go on in court *that aren't a thing like what you see on TV*. But surely you see that what goes on in court is not all on the up-and-up.

Justice should be something we all can rely on.

It's not always what it seems.

Good people suffer.

My elderly client had to pay me from her social security and hard-earned savings to overcome the unnecessary resistance of my opponents who knew, or should have known, they could not win.

Justice should not be nearly as expensive as it is.

It would not be if lawyers stuck to the rules.

And lawyers would be required to stick to the rules if you and your children knew those rules a bit better than you now do.

TV Lawyers

“Pay nothing unless we win.”

“Free consultations.”

“Billions already won for our clients!”

Billboards and glitzy TV ads with lawyers touting their legal skills and promising, “We work for free. Trust us!”

They do *not* work for free.

They work for a massive percentage of whatever they can squeeze out of your case.

You get only what may remain after deducting the cost for expert witnesses, depositions, and other expenses.

In some states the contingency fee may be 40% of the recovery.

TV lawyers will *not* represent you if you’re accused of a crime you did not commit.

They will *not* come to your rescue if Child and Protective Services take your children away when Aunt Suzy lies about your using cocaine or endangering the kids with unsecured firearms.

They will *not* take your side in a divorce battle.

They will *not* go to bat for you if the bank tries to take your home away in a bogus mortgage foreclosure action.

They aren’t interested in working those kinds of cases.

To a great extent they aren’t interested in working at all. It’s far easier to negotiate with insurance companies and avoid the hard work that properly preparing and prosecuting a personal injury case requires.

The cases they advertise for are those with “better than even odds” of winning and, unless the projected settlement is at least six figures, it’s unlikely that most reputable firms will be interested.

Small cases go to small law firms.

Most TV advertising lawyers seek cases in which it appears from the facts that they will not have to fight bitter contested issues at trial to receive their share of the proceeds.

They aim for quick settlements with insurance companies or other deep pocket corporations.

They do *not* want to go to trial.

They want to settle up front.

They want to negotiate their way to quick cash.

Trial is time-consuming and expensive.

Time is their only stock-in-trade.

Time is what lawyers sell.

The more money they get for working the fewest number of hours is how they pay for those expensive billboards and glitzy TV ads.

If they take a questionable case with weak facts, the deep pockets may refuse to settle. In those situations, the lawyers must spend money to prepare and prosecute their case all the way to a jury trial (or wiggle out of the contingency contract and leave you hanging).

They don't make "the big bucks" going to court.

They are skilled saber rattlers ... at least the successful ones are.

They invite you to their office. They listen carefully to the facts. They promise to call you in a few days. They then get together in the back room to consider how hard it will be to win your case or how likely it is that they can finagle a settlement from the insurance company or giant defendant corporation that injured you.

They won't even consider going after defendants with less than very deep pockets.

The bigger threat your facts pose to insurance companies or other deep pocket defendants, the greater the odds they will get big dollars to share with you, their golden goose client, keeping anywhere from 25% to 40% of the take for themselves.

Some giant law firm letterheads boast about offices in Chicago, New York, and Toronto ... or wherever they can get a fellow attorney to let them put his or her office address in their promotional literature.

You won't see ads for lawyers promising to take your case for free if it's a criminal matter, divorce, child support, or anything other than personal injury.

Do the math.

If you need help with anything other than personal injury, you will pay your lawyer up front. He will set up a retainer agreement, promising to keep money in his or her trust account to cover anticipated costs and hourly fees. You will undoubtedly be required to replenish that retainer balance from time-to-time. In all but a simple open-and-shut case your cost for legal representation will exceed what you were promised.

A little boy asked his teacher, "What's two and two?"

The teacher replied, "Four."

The little boy asked his mother, a certified public accountant, and the answer was, "What would you like it to be?"

The little boy asked his father, who was a lawyer, and the answer was, "Four for now, but as we proceed with your case it could end up being a good bit more."

And so it goes.

And with it the fate of a nation run almost entirely by lawyers.

Is this beginning to ring a bell?

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Right to Advertise

On 27 June 1977 the United States Supreme Court in a narrow 5-4 decision¹⁹ opened the floodgates to allow lawyer advertising.

Prior to 1977 lawyer advertising was prohibited in most states.

It was generally believed that advertising encouraged litigation.

In earlier times the encouragement of litigation by a disinterested person was a crime. It was a crime for a person having no personal interest in the outcome of a case to finance a lawsuit, whether or not he did so expecting some financial benefit.

Long before America declared her Independence, England (and other nations as well) provided criminal penalties for barratry (lawyers instigating lawsuits), champerty (non-parties encouraging legal battles for financial benefit), and maintenance (non-parties financing cases for a piece of the proceeds pie).

Champerty, barratry, and maintenance were commonplace.

Crooked dealings by lawyers were commonplace.

Then, as they are today.

Lawyer advertising was seen as encouraging legal battles between people who otherwise would not have taken their disputes to court.

Ambulance chasing was widely frowned on as recently as a few short decades ago.

Today, TV ads by lawyers urge people to get rich quickly by turning their personal injuries into cash.

The repeated promise is, “You pay nothing if we don’t win.”

It’s a litigation lottery.

“Have you been injured?” the ads boldly inquire.

¹⁹ Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350 (1977)

Of course people should have access to the courts when injured. It is our God-given right to seek redress for our grievances.

But, for lawyers to encourage litigation from which the law firm receives 40% of the proceeds is something that was not permitted until recently when lawyer advertising burst onto the scene.

When I was a boy, if you wanted to gamble for money, you went to Reno or Las Vegas or an Indian reservation where gambling was legal. In today's permissive society, millions of people living on limited means are encouraged to use their cell phone to fritter away rent and grocery money on the bogus promise they will get rich in the process.²⁰ My dad taught me long ago, "The house always wins." In the long run, nobody gets rich gambling.

Unless they are lawyers.

We live in a litigation free-for-all.

The insidious consequence of lawyer advertising reaches beyond the pestering presence of giant law firms spending advertising millions to grab their piece of cash-winning pies.

Those giant billboards and blaring TV ads incite litigation.

There can be no dispute about this.

And, moreover, they motivate lawyers to go after the "pain and suffering" aspects of cases where "punitive damages" can add many millions on top of what otherwise might have been a simple case for a few thousand to repair a banged up fender.

Charles Dickens' novels teach us how lawyers in his day glutted on the common people's legal woes. We should have paid attention.

Now the gate is open.

The bell is rung.

Legal advertising is here to stay.

²⁰ Where permissiveness is promoted, the consequence is not considered.

The origin of the traditional ban on advertising legal services is rooted deep in English history. It is related to the evil of solicitation by other “professions”.

Advertising and solicitation were historically frowned upon.

The flimsy reason stated was that advertising by lawyers was not “professional”. The true reason (the reason that should have prevented the Bates v State Bar of Arizona decision in 1977) is that it clogs the courts ... courts that your tax dollars support.

Just this week in The Florida Bar News we read of massive changes to rules of procedure to deal with the massive loads of litigation that are crippling the efficient administration of justice. The article quotes a Bar official acknowledging that some judges have thousands of cases on their docket.

The consequence for *you* is the loss of effective access to the court when you need it. If you are arrested, you’ll spend more time in jail awaiting trial. If you are involved in a civil suit, you’ll be tied down by an inability to schedule hearings.

This is the reality you and the rest of the American People know little or absolutely nothing about.

Lawyer advertising might be good for giant law firms.

We have not yet begun to feel the full weight of this mistake. All you see now is a tiny tip of the consequence iceberg.

“So what?” you may ask. “Why shouldn’t lawyers be allowed to advertise like everyone else? Isn’t lawyering just a business like selling shoes or renting motor scooters?”

Actually, NO!

It’s a dangerous can of worms that five of those Supreme Court justices (also lawyers) failed *or refused* to see. Their 5-4 decision was predicated on arguments from lawyers who wished to advertise so they could make a profit serving middle-class clients too well off to qualify for free “legal aid” but too poor to pay lawyers’ fees. Legislating from

the bench once again, with an jaundiced eye toward what seemed best for other lawyers, *without seeing the harmful consequence threatening the rest of us*, they didn't count the cost.

The Bar is a closed society.

Open our courthouse doors to everyone!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Fear of the Bar

Law school instilled in us a worrisome fear.

We were terrified of the Bar and its power to control us or to take away the benefits we sought by attending law school in the first place.

We signed up for three years of studying books, attending classes, and preparing for the dreaded Bar Exam.

We could flunk out.

Many did.

There was the climactic challenge of passing contracts, torts, property, evidence, and all the other classes standing between us and our law degree.

We constantly faced the fear of failing.

Each class had a final exam, failure of which was irredeemable.

Fail the final and you fail the class.

Most had no mid-terms or pop quizzes.

At the end of each semester there was a final exam, after which we anxiously looked for our grade posted on the bulletin board to see if we passed. There were no make-up exams. If you failed, you failed. And if the class was on the required list, you'd have to take it over.

Law school was no piece of cake!

Law books are thick.

The tediously worded appellate court opinions are hard to follow.

Professors are demanding and purposely enigmatic. Someone in the ancient halls of legal education decreed that law professors should be mysterious, teaching by indirection so we would learn to “think like lawyers”. It's all hogwash, of course.

Law school didn't need to be nearly so hard as it was.

We never knew when we'd be called on to answer questions in class. Our embarrassment when called seemed to give some professors a perverse pleasure, as if intimidation was in keeping with law school's traditionally honored professorial pedagogy.

By the end of those three tedious years, IF we passed all of our classes and received our treasured law degree, *we still had to pass the Bar Exam before we could hang our shingle and start serving clients!*

First there were in-depth background checks we faced *before* we could even sit for the Bar Exam. Investigation was made into every aspect of our lives - where we lived before law school, where we worked, whether we were fired from a job or had run-ins with the law. We could survive three years of law school, get our degree, and still be prevented from sitting for the Bar Exam because of some event in our past, a debt we didn't pay, a traffic ticket, a run-in with a neighbor, anything the Bar might consider evidence of character defect adversely reflecting on the legal profession (a profession already suffering from a questionable reputation).

Then we faced the two-day exam itself.

Not everyone passes on first go. I did. Many did not.

Some took the Bar Exam again and again before passing. Others gave up after spending three years and more than one hundred thousand dollars for books and tuition.²¹

We waited weeks for the results, hoping we passed, praying we passed, gripped with icy worry bordering on panic.

For those who passed, the struggle had only just begun.

There was a swearing in ceremony, continuing legal education classes required to keep our licenses current, and the constant breathing down our backs by the Bar with its Rules of Professional Responsibility, regulations with regard to our trust accounts, how we behaved in the

²¹ Not to mention lost income, housing, food, and the other requirements of life that must be paid for while one "studies law".

courtroom, whether we upheld the honor of our profession, anything that might disqualify us from the privilege of practicing law.

We could endure all those prerequisites and still lose all we worked for by the complaints of just one disgruntled client or a fellow attorney lying about us to the Bar.

In every issue of the Bar news we saw lists of lawyers disbarred for one thing or another.

We skated on treacherously thin ice at all times.

Why mention all this?

Because fear of the Bar affects how lawyers perform in court.

The best lawyers fight tooth-and-nail for their clients.

But, many timidly hold back, afraid of tripping over some precious protocol that might trigger Bar scrutiny.

Some, who should be champions for “what’s right”, are afraid of being too furious in their fight for Justice. It’s safer to kowtow, to stay on the soft side of political correctness, to remain near the middle of the profession’s bell curve of polite behavior, never to ignore the Bar’s precious precedents, never to kick at sacred cows of convention lest they trigger adverse professional consequences and terminate our careers.

America was built by sacred cow kickers!

Too few today understand that the power to restore our American Heritage *is in the hands of lawyers more than anyone else*.

We need more cow kicking lawyers.

Lawyers alone²² can force justices in our high courts to turn again to the Primary Principles of American Justice that are abused by modern ideas and improperly persuaded by popular opinion.

Mediocrity knows nothing higher than itself.²³

²² Until we get legal education into our schools and onto the streets and into the minds and hearts of the American People so the mothers and fathers in this great nation can begin to control the Bar with practical knowledge of those eternally true Principles of Justice.

²³ A quote by Louis Pasteur.

Lawyers could restore the landmarks of reason and old-fashioned common-sense too much missing in our current conversations.

Lawyers could MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

But!

Faint heart never won fair lady.

Timidity in fear of the Bar will never restore the broken bulwarks of a nation under attack by divisive ambitions and insidious intrigues.

Self-interest seeks only what benefits self.

Aggressive ambition of politicians is hell-bent on promoting their platform of lies and subterfuge of innuendo to secure their coveted seats by hook or crook, and the rest of America be damned.

We need lawyers who do not fear the Bar to once again lift the precious Lamp of Liberty for us and our children, until the American People are made to understand the process by which clever, courageous lawyers compel judges to do what's right.

We need champions uninfluenced by the opinions of their peers.

We need word warriors who don't "belong" to a party that controls their private view of right and wrong, men and women unafraid of the Bar and its bell-curve mentality.

The Bar performs a much-needed service when it regulates lawyers who abuse our balanced system of Law and Order.

But! When the Bar's powerful influence stifles legal invention and intimidates those who might otherwise fearlessly reform and improve our legal system by challenging current trends that are taking us farther and farther from the Primary Principles of Justice that make Liberty possible, the Bar goes too far.

The time has come for what we learned in law school to be shared with *everyone*.

Everyone should be told what the Bar is hiding.

Everyone should understand the mechanism of American Justice.

Everyone should be taught the doctrines that could control judges' decisions.

Everyone should be equipped with the tools and tactics that should secure Liberty and Justice for absolutely ALL of US.

There is nothing I learned in law school that an average 8th grader cannot learn with interactive cyber tools and artificial intelligence.

We have this opportunity now.

It was not possible 20 years ago.

We can create entertaining curriculum experiences for home schoolers, for children in private and parochial schools, and eventually for students in every one of our tax-supported public schools.

Fear of the Bar must be supplanted.

We must remove the barrier it presents to the American Public.

Every American should be provided with the knowledge necessary to understand what is happening in our courts, why it is happening, and whether it is in our best interest for it to continue happening.

It is simply wrong for our courts to be changing the framework of our lives without our having even the slightest idea of the processes that result in their decisions.

Our courts are modifying morality and threaten the future that our children must inherit when this present generation fades away.

The American People have a right to know what Justice is.

You have a right to know!

The American People need to know what is involved in procedures that decide who wins, who loses, who goes to prison, who remains free, who pays taxes, who enjoys exemptions, who decides what's right and wrong, *and who is behind the curtain calling the shots.*

The Primary Principles of Justice essential to good government and the preservation of society are too often ignored by our highest

courts, too seldom challenged by members of the Bar afraid to rock the boat and lose their license to steal.

Without courageous lawyers risking their livelihood and careers by standing against the dangerous trends influencing our Judiciary and its often immoral or financially irresponsible decisions We, the American People, must stand in the gap *for our children's sake*.

Let this be the age in which we begin to work together removing the Bar Barrier that prevents us from learning what Justice is and what is required to secure it in our courts.

Let this be the age when the Bar is required to educate us, instead of glutting on our legal ignorance.

Unlock the keys of knowledge.

Kick some sacred cows!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Fear of Judges

Law school also indoctrinated us to be afraid of judges.

And, when I got into practice, appearing before actual judges, arguing actual cases, for actual clients, I was amazed how some lawyers were more interested in appeasing judicial egos than honoring their obligation to serve Justice and their clients.

I've known lawyers who were so afraid to cause trouble for judges that they intentionally missed opportunities to win their cases. Rather than do anything that might cause the judge any discomfort or, God forbid, anger that might jeopardize winning future cases for future clients, they caved.

Some were afraid of being held in contempt.

Many had the ridiculous idea that staying on a judge's "good side" would help them in other cases. They appeared to think that somehow winning legal battles was about making judges happy.

That is nonsense.

Dangerous to those who hire lawyers expecting courage!

Winning is always about presenting the law and facts with well-drafted tactical pleadings and arguments that compel judges to do what the law and the demands of Justice require.

It's got nothing to do with *pleasing* the judge!

The sad reality is that many lawyers never learned how to use the Rules of Procedure and Rules of Evidence to tilt the legal balance in their client's favor.²⁴

Not all lawyers feared judges. A few were extremely clever. They fought tooth-and-nail for their clients using the rules skillfully to get justice, with no concern about whether the judge "liked" what they were doing. These, unfortunately, were a minority.

²⁴ I was fortunate. I had Professor Smiley to teach me some of those things and put me on the track to learn more about case-winning tactics we weren't taught at law school.

Good lawyers don't butter judges.

They don't have to.

They know the rules!

Rules any average 8th grader can learn in a weekend.

Good lawyers know how to require judges to enforce the rules so both sides have an equal chance, so the party who should win pursuant to the law and evidence that gets admitted, receive the outcome Justice demands.

Nobody should be afraid of judges, *except guilty people in criminal cases and crooked people in civil cases.*

Lawyers should *never* be afraid of a judge!

I knew many judges in my years of representing clients. Every one of them was honorable and diligent. One was rather ignorant and had to be educated by an appellate court's order for him to allow me to depose the plaintiff in a case filed against my client (I filed an appeal and won.) One other had such an aversion to me personally that he would walk off the bench at first sight of me entering the courtroom. The rest were men and women who took the sacred obligation of their office seriously. All did their best to enforce the rules fairly, favoring neither side. They all upheld the highest standards of decency. They cared about people. They worked hard (for far less money than they could have made in private practice). They upheld The Rule of Law, protecting the principles of due process that make Liberty and Justice possible for ALL of us.²⁵

When a lawyer tries to "please" a judge (instead of doing the work his clients pay him for, he makes it harder for the judge to do what the judge is charged with doing, i.e., to be totally impartial and enforce the rules. That is the judge's *only* job. Impartially enforcing the rules!

I learned early on that judges wish that lawyers who come before them would present the law and necessary evidence (the essential fact

²⁵ Not ALL get Justice, but it is "possible" when one knows the rules.

elements) so the judge can make the right decision *without* considering other matters.

That's what judges want.

Give them the essential facts (by getting those facts into the record as admissible evidence).

Give them the law that should control the outcome (if the alleged fact elements are supported by evidence).

Then move the court to sign orders that decide the case according to the law and facts admitted.

Many lawyers have no idea of this simple case-winning process.

So, they try to please the judge with pandering and flattery (instead of doing the work their clients pay them for).

Lawyers who don't know how to win without twisting the rules or placating the judge with palliatives are undermining public confidence in our legal system.

Trial level judges are not the problem. It's ignorant, self-interested lawyers who abuse the "system of rules" ... rules that are the *only* thing protecting the innocent ... rules that exemplify the spirit that once was America.

We must work together to MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN.

Sharing what this book presents and working for legal education in our schools is what's required to cure the inefficiency of our courts.

If we had long ago introduced the Rules of Court to our school children, many problems threatening us today would long ago have been cured and forgotten.

We can no longer permit the Bar to hide the truth my book reveals.

Nor can we continue to imagine the Rules of Court are too difficult for an average 8th grader to learn, because I've proven conclusively since 1997 when I started my online case-winning tactics course that anyone of intelligence can learn the Rules of Procedure and Rules of Evidence.

They aren't rocket science!

They are common-sense rules each and every one of you has a God-given right to know and rely upon.

These rules *are* the "Power of the People"!

They've been too long hidden from you and your children.

If more of you knew the rules, there'd be far fewer lawyers taking advantage of our courts.

Teach your children!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Frog in a Teapot

Every appellate court opinion I studied in those three years of law school (and I studied hundreds of them) was nothing but a story about people with issues needing a judge to decide between them.

Every case!

No exceptions.

We read case after case after case.

Three long years of them!

We read published appellate court opinions, something very few of you know anything about (because you learned nothing about it in grade school or secondary school *when you could have been learning the Primary Principles of Justice that control your entire world*).

The sum total of all those appellate court opinions is what we call the common law.

A frightening number of people pandering patriot mythology on the internet today have no idea what common law is. Many seem to think it stems from the United States Constitution when, in fact, it is not created by our Constitution.

It pre-existed our Constitution and our nation by many years.

It began, for the most part, in England's courts.

As the United States were getting their footing, we had little law other than what we inherited from England, common-sense decisions of English judges.²⁶

Because we have no public legal education in this country (yet!) you and your children have no idea that common law is judge-made law, common sense decisions that decide what's right and wrong, what's just and unjust, what's reasonable and unreasonable.

²⁶ Louisiana is the exception, having initiated its legal system based on the Napoleonic Code. Still, even in Louisiana, American common law has built on the French concept these past centuries of our independence, and for the most part common law in all states today has become somewhat uniform in spirit and purpose.

In the early days of our nation, we relied on the published opinions and common-sense thinking of those English judges to guide our courts.

Gradually, in these intervening years, we've added our American viewpoint on law and Justice. We have our own appellate court decisions defining and setting limits on your rights, due process, morality, and generally what's best for you and your children in this world, whether you like those decisions or not.

At the beginning, case after case was decided based on what some English judge decided years earlier.

Some of those old common-sense English cases are controlling law even today.

As America began to expand, people took their grievances to court so American judge's pens could redress them with final orders. Our own appellate courts expanded and gradually revised or ignored those old English cases.

Decisions were increasingly influenced by our different culture.

Strict social boundaries that permeated English life in the 18th Century, when our nation declared its Independence, did not exist here in America.

Primogeniture, for example, i.e., the right of the firstborn son to inherit the father's estate entire, land and holdings, does not exist here as it did in England, where it tended to exacerbate the social divisions and distinctions of class that we find repugnant here in the New World.

We eschew the very notion of nobilities and presumed superiority of an upper class. Though these prejudices still persist in some circles, they are generally frowned upon by our American courts and American Jurisprudence in general.

Still, the common-sense of those old English court cases promoted commerce here, gave meaning to our criminal and tort law, and gave our judges and justices a solid starting point from which they could build a *new* common law here in the States, common law purely American.

Until the American Civil War in the mid-19th Century, appellate decisions here remained mostly common-sense. If you took time to read some of those early American decisions (as we were required to do in law school) you'd agree that they made perfect sense, that the rulings were fair to all parties, that their judge-made law was something you could approve and support, that American common law was off to a good start.

After the Civil War, however, new ideas about Justice and its administration began to pop up. If you could take time to read those late 19th Century cases and follow them chronologically you would see these new ideas popping up. If we presented them to your children using AI and other cyber technologies available to us today, you would see for yourself the inroads and innovations beginning to appear, inroads and innovations that might have been reversed before they took root.

After the First World War these new ideas began taking on a new flavor.

The fear of international disruption flamed by the introduction of mechanized warfare gave birth to the idea that "the collective" has rights separate from and beyond the God-given rights of us individuals.

Appellate court opinions began to reflect this new thinking.

You, your children, and the American People at large, of course, do not see how these changes began to influence our common law, because you know *nothing* about them. You and your children were never told about them. The trail of appellate court decisions these past 100 years can be seen only by reading those tedious cases from dusty old books none of you take much notice of, *but those cases are the law of the land today*.

The insidious trend continues.

Cases in the last century began to turn on whether a decision was fair to both parties but also good for the "collective". Whatever the "collective" might be from year-to-year was undefined.

America's highest court decisions seemed well-intentioned but varied from the "original idea" that gave our nation its birth, i.e., that each of us is entitled to equal protection under the law.

That original "American" idea began to conflict with interests of an unidentified "public" (a term also yet to be adequately defined).

The Second World War ended with a flash of light that obliterated our once honorable history of being the "good guys", and our American philosophy predicated on God-given inalienable rights of individuals was further weakened.

We entered WWII to aid the fight of Europeans in a European war. Our guys bled and died on European soil and later on beaches in the Pacific Ocean, fighting in cornfields and jungles to protect the "good" that was our mantra.

We were good people.

We knew that the age-old dream of establishing and perpetuating governments to protect human liberty and those God-given rights of individuals (like farmers, miners, carpenters, and all the rest of us) was something that *must* be undertaken at all costs.

So we shipped our soldiers "over there" once again.

We weren't yet a perfect people. We still aren't. We have lingering selfish social issues that we inherited from our European past and its sometimes arrogant culture ... issues like racial bias and other bigotries.

For the most part, however, we were an honorable country until the sacred lives of 150,000 innocent souls were extinguished instantly and needlessly at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The bomb terminated Japan's intention to prolong the war. That is without dispute. But, the stark reality that our power could be delivered by airplane on Tokyo if necessitated by the Japanese Emperor's brute persistence to continue fighting, could have been done by destroying a nearby deserted island *just as effectively*.

J. Robert Oppenheimer, the bomb's "father", reportedly said when that first test succeeded in the New Mexico desert, "Now we are all sons of bitches."

And so we were.

The goodness and common-sense that had once guided our common law suffered a similar upheaval.

The insidious inroads and inventions in the decisions of appellate courts after the bomb shifted our American philosophy even more away from our American Heritage of "individual rights".

Read the chronology of American case law, and you will see this is true.

It is impossible for anyone to see this gradual change, however, unless you read the cases chronologically from the eminently solid thinking of John Jay, our first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, to the insane decisions emerging from our High Court in these jurisprudentially out-of-control times that threaten individual human liberty as never before.

This transition is persistently edging us away from the Primary Principles of Justice, the keys by which the God-given rights of individuals are secured harm at the hands of other individuals, corporations, and collective groups!

Perhaps you were told of the little frog dropped into a pot of boiling water and how the little fellow did his best to jump back out, instead of staying to take a leisurely swim. Clever frog.

And then there was the frog like most of us who are dropped into a pot of luke-warm water that we find comfortable, before the pot is heated gradually and we are cooked. Frog soup.

America is dangerously near to becoming frog soup.

The trend in juridical thinking is to get away from the clumsy and inconvenient idea that every case in our courts should be decided on fixed principles *that never change*.

Increasingly our judges' and justices' decisions are trending with modern ideas, concepts that consider each of us and our individual God-given rights as merely secondary to what's good for the public at large, or the corporations that feed us and provide us with goods and services, or the political pandering of special interest groups, or some other entity that seems to them more important than you or I.

You don't see this change.

You haven't read the old cases and compared their common-sense with the "Big Brother" ideas of today's courts.

You don't yet see how the economy and current politically correct thinking is taking precedence in our courts over the old idea that We the People of these United States are people, after all, not some collection of abstract entities existing solely to keep Wall Street healthy and minority groups happy and peacefully content.

It needs to be said.

The water in the pot is getting hotter. If we allow it to reach the boiling point it will be too late.

At this very hour autocrats are planning to rule you, denying your God-given rights or even that there is such a thing as God determining our destiny with an Unseen Hand.

Our Founders *knew* the Unseen Hand is reality. They *knew* that we cannot ignore the Consequence of failing to consider the foreseeability of failure when the Unseen Hand is ignored.

But you and your children were never told these things.

The American People are kept in the dark by the Bar that has never made any effort whatsoever to teach what you and your children need to know and have a God-given right to know, i.e., what's been going on behind the Bar's curtain for many, many years.

I hope my book is opening your eyes to see and, by seeing, to be motivated to work for public legal education.

Every American should be told what's going on.

Every American should be provided the legal knowledge necessary to rein in our highest court justices, forcing them to return again to the common-sense of common law that was once our foundation.

America's common law should be common-sense for the common man, not a political platform or legal philosophy promoting profits for the ultra-rich or mega corporations.

We can't afford to be frogs!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Old Mill Case (1854)

Hadley was a successful miller, grinding grain for his customers.

All was going well until Hadley's mill shaft broke.

Production stopped.

Hadley hired Baxendale, a waggoner, to take the broken shaft to a nearby city where it could be used as a pattern for a replacement shaft to be manufactured.

Baxendale was to return the new shaft when the manufacturing was complete.

Hadley promised Baxendale a sum of money for this service.

Baxendale agreed, came with his wagon for the broken shaft, and transported it to the manufacturer.

Baxendale later returned with the new shaft as agreed.

Baxendale fulfilled his promise.

The period of time, however, between picking up the broken shaft and returning with the new shaft, included days Hadley considered more than necessary.

During that "extra time" Hadley was unable to grind corn or make money for his family.

So Hadley sued Baxendale for his lost income, the money he contemplated based on the number of days he considered unnecessary, money he certainly *could* have made if the new mill shaft had been delivered sooner.

A judge was required to resolve the parties' dispute.

This old case has been adopted here the United States from the common law of England and controls court decisions in all our courts today. It establishes what our common law considers a fundamental principle in contract law, i.e., that parties to a contract can only be bound

by the terms of their contract and that the agreement cannot be altered by one party without the other party's consent.

Hadley hired Baxendale for a job, and Baxendale did what he was hired for.

Baxendale did not agree that delay would make him responsible to Hadley for lost income. Indeed, if Hadley had requested such, Baxendale would likely have refused. It would not be “just” for a court to make Baxendale pay Hadley for something their agreement did not consider.

The court agreed.²⁷

This case makes common sense.

Common law *should* make common sense.

We who deal with others in matters involving money and services need the assurance of our tax-supported courts that the contract agreements we make with others will be enforced to-the-letter ... *but not a syllable beyond.*

We need the assurance that people we deal with cannot change our bargains mid-stream when it benefits them to do so.

All American courts rely even today on Hadley v Baxendale to protect us from overreaching greedy plaintiffs *when this common law principle is known and raised as a defense.*

In all likelihood, however, you never heard of Hadley v Baxendale or the common law principle by which this case protects vulnerable people who are victimized by shady dealings, *because the Bar has never made any effort to teach you or your children this or any other of our common law concepts.*

Nothing about this story is anything but a “story” and a simple one at that.

It is not a complicated story.

²⁷ Google®. “Hadley v Baxendale” to learn more about this important English contracts case that is still controlling American judges more than 170 years later.

It is not hard to understand.

If you take the time to read the old English court's published opinion, you will probably find it tedious reading (as are most published opinions of appellate courts throughout the ages) but this simple "story" could easily be portrayed with an animated video created with artificial intelligence delivered to every classroom in this nation for mere pennies *if the Bar would stop hiding the legal balls they play with to make money.*

Bar lawyers get rich while the American People are "barred" from knowing what could so easily be presented in our schools, so disputes like this need not end in court or in acts of violence when one party or the other is disappointed with the outcome of an agreement gone sour.

Common law should be common sense for the common people!

Today it is hidden from you, so Bar lawyers can earn the big bucks relying on your total ignorance of what goes on in our judicial system that comprises one of the three branches of our government.

It's time for change.

It's way past time.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Garbage Cases

Newer cases (especially cases after World War Two) ignore the original common sense common law principles that decided between individual parties as *equals*.

These more recent cases interject the indeterminate “collective” into their legal reasoning.

Things like race, gender, sexual preference, and even the amount of money you own distinguished you from an individual human being and placed you in a group, and the group you were in became a factor in how the courts made their rulings.

Some group members are given advantages solely by virtue of belonging to a specific group favored by contemporary “public opinion” (whatever that arcane term might actually mean remains in question).

Other group members (or individuals who do not belong to any group) face steeper thresholds in their quest to be treated equally before the law.

This is *not* how the Founders planned our nation, but increasingly we are moving away from the doctrine of equal rights and sliding ever more down the slippery slope away from the pure equality and blind justice that must be restored *as soon as more of you know what the Bar has been hiding from you*.

New York Times v Sullivan

Once case illustrative of this new way of thinking from the bench is New York Times v Sullivan that decided that “public figures” could no longer sue for libel or slander²⁸.

People who are not “public figures” can still sue for money if lies cause them damages.

But, if you belong to the “group” that court loosely referred to as public figures, you are fair game for anyone who wants to make fun of

²⁸ Lies that cause injury when communicated to others. Libel if written. Slander if spoken.

you with false statements, publish untrue things about you for any reason *so long as you cannot prove they did so with "malicious intent"*.

It's hard to imagine what other than malicious intent would cause someone to knowingly make false statements about another person, but this case gives free rein to anyone who chooses to malign another human being unless the injured party can *prove* the maligner did it with malice, i.e., *intending injury*.

Of course anyone can say, "Aw. I was just funnin'." And that gets them off the hook unless you can prove otherwise.

Choose your groups cautiously.

Sullivan was police commissioner in Montgomery, Alabama when the New York Times ran a full-page ad criticizing the police department for its handling of civil rights protestors. Most of what the ad said was true. Some was not. The case wandered through Alabama courts where Sullivan prevailed, until the giant big city newspaper took their appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. By unanimous decision the Supreme Court invented the idea that a "public figure" (whatever that term is supposed to mean is left to question) may not sue for defamation, unless the aggrieved party can prove the publication was *intended to cause harm*.

That was NOT the law before Sullivan, and this idea that the Supreme Court can "invent" things was NOT how business was run in our courts prior to the early 19th Century when we began to be infested with "newthink" (a term coined by George Orwell in his too seldom read 1984 story about a brave new world where Big Brother decides what's right and wrong, moral and immoral).

Before the Court's "newthink" in 1964, if you lied about someone (whether or not you intended harm) and if your lies caused your victim damages in his or her reputation or ability to earn a living or such similar factors, our courts were duty-bound to rule in your favor.

You were entitled to use the court to put the world on notice that what was said or published about you was false and caused you injury. If

the injury was substantial, so was the amount of money the court to award you for your injury.

Not so after Sullivan.

Far too many other recent cases are similarly insane in their attack on our Founder's concept of common sense, common law, and the rights of the common man in this country!

The Sullivan court imagined that the value of "public discussion" outweighed the right of a slandered person to complain.

The invented "right of the collective" to open dialogue related to people whom the court considered "public figures" kicked that doctrine of equal rights to the curb.

Equal treatment under law was tossed in the dustbin, at least when it came to "public figures".

What a "public figure" is and where to draw the line remains in question to this day, when TV pundits and comedians lie routinely about whomever they wish to slander or humiliate without threat of being sued, so long as the victim may be considered a "public figure" and it cannot be proved the false statements were made with "intent to injure".

A person's "intent", of course, is a subjective thing, what goes on inside one's head. It can only be inferred from our behavior, but it can never be properly proven.

This may seem an odd point to make in this book, but the fable about the frog in the pot of cold water should be considered. Frogs have no problem in cold water. If heat is applied slowly enough, the frog will cuddle up and enjoy himself *until he is thoroughly cooked!*

Citizens United v Federal Election Commission

This case further advances the trend of juridical thinking in our highest courts, holding that our rights as individuals are secondary to the rights of collectives, especially corporations *that are not "people"!*

In this case the court ruled that giant corporations and other business entities may compete against us individuals in the political

arena, outspending us and thereby taking greater control of our lives by deciding who gets elected and what policies are passed.

Corporations and other collective bodies with unlimited cash can now control elections and influence decisions of legislators favorable to their collective's interests *without regard for what's in the best interest of We the People, i.e., we "individual human beings"*.

This is an extremely dangerous precedent.

It exists because you and your children are allowing it to exist, and the Bar refuses to return to the original Primary Principles of Justice that *should* once again be protecting us individuals from the collectives.

Collectives have no God-given rights!

God-given rights are for people ... *individual people!*

This case must be reversed.

It will not be reversed unless and until more of you complain.

Roe v Wade

Without wading into the hot water of that decision, what must be said is how the cases leading up to Roe "invented" the idea that our federal Constitution contains within it "the right to privacy", *which is nowhere mentioned in that venerable document*.

The tangled mess began with Eisenstadt v Baird in 1972, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against a Massachusetts provision that made it difficult for unmarried people to gain access to contraceptives. In the Eisenstadt case, the U.S. Supreme Court asserted that the privacy of married couples in Massachusetts is protect by this imaginary privacy provision of U.S. Constitution.

No such provision exists.

It was created out of thin air.

I was the product of what we call “legislating from the bench”, but few paid any attention. The Roe case was a hot issue on many fronts, so the Constitutional “adjustment” slipped by and now is law.²⁹

Courts should not legislate.

Legislating is for the Congress and state legislatures, not judges.

Roe builds on the back of Eisenstadt.

The Roe justices “legislated”.

They wanted that decision and intended that outcome, knowing the result violated several established principles of American Jurisprudence. Whether abortion is moral or lawful was beyond their concern.

They stepped far outside the boundary of common-sense, making as part of their argument that Greek and Roman societies practiced abortion “without scruple”. If you and other Americans had been made aware of what that case was intended to do, you’d have demanded to know what ancient Greek and Roman attitudes have to do with our laws here in America! Clearly, the Roe court broke away from the rules and principles of American Jurisprudence by relying on ancient Greek and Roman practices as justification for a decision from which we may never recover.

What the ancient Greeks and Romans did with their children, born or unborn, should have no bearing whatever on what is right and wrong in these United States.

But, such is the latitude our highest courts are using these days to stretch their decision-making power to meet what they see as demands of “public policy”, rather than restricting their work to interpreting the law, rather than creating it out of thin air.

I make no comment here on whether abortion is right or wrong, but it should be clear to you that stretching Reason to reach conclusions that might tend to appeal to a majority of voters is NOT the way our courts should operate.

Yet that is what Roe did ... it and many other cases are doing it, ignoring the common-sense doctrines of our American Heritage.

²⁹ Until more of you begin to see behind the Bar’s curtain, learn what’s going on, and work to make our judicial branch begin again to obey the Primary Principles of Justice, including the Rules of Juridical Reasoning and common-sense that the common man in this country can understand and rely upon.

What I reveal to you here will be clear to anyone who will take the time to read Eisenstadt and all of the opinion in Roe.

We send our soldiers overseas to die for us.

It should not be too much to ask the American People to set aside a bit of time now-and-then to read the current our appellate court opinions that are moving our morality and economic common-sense farther and farther toward the godless totalitarian views of other nations where the rights of individuals are whatever a handful of powerful politicians and military people say those rights are.

When the Light goes out, only darkness remains.

Conclusion

We can teach our children and their parents the common-sense of common law that should protect the common man, or by our refusal to take action (that should have been begun generations ago) we will be complicit in further empowering the monster mind of Big Brother that will eventually reduce us all to a mere number.

By failing to act now, we submit ourselves and our children to be mere cogs in the economic mechanism by which the rich get richer, while the poor among us get whatever they can gather of the crumbs that fall from their masters' tables.

Think it can't happen?

Think again.

Everything I tell you in this book is true!

Our schools teach little more than the bare essentials, preparing our children with sufficient tools to take their place at the great wheel of commerce, while doing little or nothing to instruct them in the Primary Principles of Justice that are the keys of knowledge³⁰ and the Geometry of Good Sense that makes civilization possible for all of us.

Justice cannot survive in darkness!

³⁰ Luke 11:52

Liberty cannot exist where Justice is a commodity bought and sold by an elitist few practicing a form of imposed priesthood, while hiding the power of legal knowledge they alone possess, knowledge that *could* be empowering you and your children to build a better tomorrow.

Peace and Prosperity are impossible for the ignorant.

Education is the answer.

Public Legal Education.

This choice has been ours from the beginning.

It presents itself to every generation.

Do we allow the lawyers and their Bar to continue hiding the keys of knowledge?

Or do we act?

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Simple Rules

We could *at least* be teaching our children the most fundamental rules that make Justice possible for everyone.

We could secure Liberty and Justice for ALL, instead of leaving those keys exclusively in the hands of lawyers.

You ask, “Isn’t law too difficult for average folks to learn?”

The fear of learning is easily overcome by making a distinction between the “law” and “the rules”.

The rules are simple.

Any average 8th grader can learn the rules.

The “law” comprises more than any one of us will ever learn. The law includes everything from speed limits to the complicated IRS Code. Even the smartest justices on our Supreme Court do not, indeed cannot, know all the “law”. It is contained in tens of thousands of dusty old books lining shelves in law libraries. Nobody has read all those books.

The “rules” can be included in a single book.

A very small book, actually.

Or a website.³¹

When I started Jurisdictionary® in 1997, I was surprised to find out how few pages are necessary to explain the rules of civil procedure that control judges in civil cases.

I was starting to draft a motion with the following words, “Comes now the Plaintiff, by and through his undersigned attorney, and moves this Honorable Court pursuant to Rule _____”

I forgot the rule number.

So, I grabbed my handy copy of the official rule book and thumbed through the first few pages in search of what turned out to be Rule 1.370 Florida Rules of Civil Procedure (a provision that permits anyone to

³¹ For example, www.RulesOfCourt.com or www.Jurisdictionary.com or www.HowToWinInCourt.com.

require his opponent to admit the truth of any matter no privileged and to do so in writing *on the record of the court*. It's a simple rule that won many cases for me and my clients, but more about that later on.

The amazing thing that happened that day, as I searched for that rule in a thick book of 400 pages or more, is that only the first few pages of my book were dog-eared.

Actually only about 30 or so pages.

I'd been practicing law and winning cases for more than 10 years using fewer than three dozen pages of the Rules of Civil Procedure. The rest of those pages were un-thumbed!

A bright light came on.

"I can teach this stuff to people!"

I then turned to the Rules of Evidence.

This was even more amazing!

It turned out that the Rules of Evidence required less than 20 pages to list all those simple rules, including many lines that were comments on the rules and not the rules themselves.

Fewer than 50 pages to learn the rules that control every trial judge in every court, state or federal.

Not too much to learn.

Emphatically not too much to learn *if you want or need Justice!*

But, no one told you ... *until now*.

The remainder of this short chapter shows you some of the simple rules the Bar has never made the slightest effort to share with you, your children, or any of the American People at any time.

The Rules of Evidence.

The Rules of Evidence are filters.

That's all they are.

Keep that in mind, and the rest is a piece of cake!

The Rules of Evidence *and the common-sense reasoning that they promote* could be taught to our children today in home schools, private schools, and eventually in our tax-supported schools that are currently controlled by an elitist system that is clearly failing on multiple fronts.³²

You already know that cases are won or lost on evidence.

What you don't yet know is how simple those rules really are.

What gets into the court record (admissible evidence) and what stays out (inadmissible evidence) is decided by the Rules of Evidence.

It's that simple.

The simple Rules of Evidence decide what comes "in" and what stays "out".

These incredibly easy-to-learn rules are misunderstood and abused on a daily basis at trials and hearings.

Innocent people get hurt.

Needlessly!

As more of you learn these simple rules, fewer innocent people will lose their property, their children, their freedom, and their lives at the hands of unscrupulous lawyers and indolent judges.

The Rules of Evidence filter the facts.

That's all they do!

The majority of the evidence rules³³ fall into one of six categories.

Two R's.

The two C's.

The two P's.

Seriously!

³² If I prove to you in this short chapter that what I say is true, then I hope you will make an effort to learn more about "other things" the Bar has been hiding from you and your children. Together we can MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

³³ This is true in state and federal courts, whether in civil cases or criminal. It's even true in most other nations, where The Rule of Law and the principles and practices of due process are honored.

Here's a mnemonic any average 8th grader can memorize.

Rapid Rabbits Can Catch Pokey Penguins³⁴

- Relevance
- Reliability
- Competence
- Credibility
- Prejudice
- Privilege

Relevance

Every fact offered in court must be “relevant”, i.e., able to affect the outcome of the case. If it can have no genuine effect, it isn't relevant and is therefore inadmissible. A timely stated objection will keep it out.

Reliability

Every offered fact must be “reliable”, i.e., trustworthy, able to be established by independent means. Testimony by an adult who was under the influence of mind-altering substances when he saw an event, for example, is unreliable. A timely objection should keep it out.

Competence

Every fact must be competent, i.e., the offeror must have personal first-hand knowledge of the offered fact. A witness cannot offer a fact learned second-hand from someone else. Such facts are inadmissible. This is the root of our hearsay objection.

Credibility

Every fact must be credible, i.e., believable. Witnesses cannot testify about spaceship landings or alien abductions. If a witness has been convicted of a crime involving dishonesty, his testimony may be excluded on this ground. A timely objection will keep it out.

³⁴ If what I tell you here is true, you and your friends should ask yourselves *and ask those who decide what your children learn in school*, “Why weren't we told?”

Prejudice

No fact may be admitted into evidence if it will shock the jury and unjustly influence their decision, unless its potential to prove a relevant fact outweighs its potential to unjustly influence the jury with emotional impact. A timely well-stated objection will keep it out.

Privilege

Facts communicated between spouses, clients and their lawyers, and in other such circumstances where communication was intended to be private is protected and will not be admitted into evidence. A timely objection will keep it out.

That's it in a nutshell.

Did you think the Rules of Evidence were more complicated?

These are rules you could teach your children.

These are rules your children could be learning in school.

The Bar, however, teaches no one!

Each of you has a God-given right to know these simple rules.

Each of you has a God-given right to use these rules to prevent bad people from destroying you and your family by abusing these rules.

Yet, good people like you are destroyed every hour of every day, simply because they do not yet know the rules and so must rely on Bar lawyers who too often do not know the rules or are too timid to stand up to the judge and demand that the rules be enforced.

Why weren't you told?

Innocent lives are destroyed daily as these simple rules are abused, twisted, misused, ignored, and prostituted to the self-interested motives of lawyers and their clients.

Make the Rules of Evidence more widely understood, so they can save innocent people in court and even prevent unnecessary disputes at work or at home with loved ones who don't yet "know the rules".

KNOW THE RULES!

There's more to learn about the rules of evidence (and how to use them to control what evidence "comes in" and what "stays out"), but all of it follows the simple outline above. None of it is rocket science!

None is too difficult for 8th graders to learn.

You and your children would already know these rules, if the Bar had already been forced to reveal the secrets it hoards so lawyers can earn unscrupulously large hourly fees!³⁵

Every court, state or federal, civil or criminal, is bound by the same Rules of Evidence. Wording and application may differ slightly from state-to-state, but most states pattern their evidence rules after the federal rules.

You know the ones.

They are Rapid Rabbits Can Catch Pokey Penguins.

Why weren't you told?

This BAR negligence³⁶ is unacceptable.

America is predicated on the sacred, inviolable promise of Liberty and Justice for ALL of us, not just the 4 out of 5 who can afford lawyers.

The only people secure in our courts today are those who know the rules or are wealthy enough to hire a clever lawyer who knows the rules.

That is *definitely* not ALL of us!

Not by a dam site.

Fewer than one in five of us can afford to hire lawyers.

It's really only about 19 out of every 100 of us who can afford one.

That's not nearly enough.

³⁵ Far more today than the \$300/hour the Bar encouraged us to charge back in 1986!

³⁶ I choose to believe it is negligence, for otherwise it would be a punishable crime if this simple knowledge is being kept secret to advantage members of the legal profession who profit from your not knowing and thereby require you to rely on hiring lawyers to represent you in court when troubles strike or when others injure you and you need the courts to redress of your grievances as the First Amendment of our Constitution guarantees!

This hidden truth that *should make you angry!*

Millions gave their lives fighting for your right to be “heard” in court, to put on evidence, to require your enemies to answer questions under oath, and for judges to enforce the Rules of Evidence.

That’s what those millions died for: Liberty and Justice for ALL of you!

They didn’t die for General Motors or Wall Street.

They died so you and your children could be secure in our nation’s promise.

ALL OF YOU ... not just the rich and famous.

Our courts belong to *you* ... not to the lawyers.

Most lawyers aren’t nearly as smart as you’ve been conned into believing. I’ve known a great many of them.

Nearly all, however, know things you know nothing about!

Things that should protect the innocent.

Things that should protect ALL of you.

You should know more than you do!

Your children should know more.

But!

You’ve been conned into believing lawyers are smarter than the general population.

You’ve been made to believe the things we learn in law school are far too complex for the average man, woman, or child to learn.

That is a lie!

I pray my book is convincing you of this.

You can be a catalyst for change!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Courtroom Objections

Objections control courts.

Objects win legal battles.

That's the long and the short of it.

Without timely objections, victory in court is impossible (unless your opponent is brain dead and stupidly allows you to win).

Objections enforce the Rules of Evidence!

Make sense yet?

Here's how legal battles are won.

This may seem too simple, but that's just the point. That's why I wrote this book. I want you to see just how simple it really is!

Judges don't like to be appealed.

There you have it!

That's where the rubber hits the road.

They especially don't like to be reversed on appeal.

They don't want an appellate court to send a case back "down" to them with instructions that require the judge to do something the judge failed to do in the first place.

That's why clever lawyers object!

We don't object to impress the jury.

We don't object to make the opposing lawyer angry.

We don't object to convince our client we are doing a good job.

We object for two reasons.

#1 ... To keep inadmissible evidence out!

#2 ... To give the judge an opportunity to *enforce the rules* and avoid being appealed!

If you don't object, the judge will allow the evidence.

If you don't object, then lose and try to appeal, the appellate court will not let you fix the problem on appeal that you failed to fix when you had the chance in the trial court.

Appeals will not give you another bite at the apple.

You cannot raise an objection for the first time on appeal.

A lawyer asks his witness, an operating room nurse, "What was the surgeon thinking when he decided to remove my client's left foot?"

What do you do?

Do you sit there and let the nurse tell the jury what she thinks the surgeon was thinking? She has *no idea* what the surgeon was thinking. She lacks competence to testify as to what the surgeon was thinking.

"Objection, your Honor! Competence!"

This is *not* rocket science.

Yet, you were never told how easy it really is!

Objections stop testimony like this nurse was about to give. They win cases if they are made quickly.

You only need to make them before witness testifies (not like TV lawyers who make them after the damage is done, then move to strike the testimony, as if the jury's bell could be un-rung).

You probably didn't know this before now.

If you did know, then you probably don't know much about the dozen or so other easy-to-learn objections the Bar has never made any effort to teach you in school.

Hundreds of millions of Americans like you could have been given these simple tools to understand how our courts operate.

You could have already known these rules that are broken every day as court orders are entered and decisions made that change your world *entirely without your knowledge!*

If your opponent's lawyer asks his witness, "What did that man say to you?"

Don't let the witness so much as take a breath or open his mouth.

"Objection! Hearsay!"

Or lose.

Just one more, "When did you stop beating your wife?"

Just kidding. But, I hope you get the idea, as I hope you can now see how important this knowledge is that is being hidden from you.

The "game" of court affects individuals.

The "game" of court affects us all.

The "game" of court has rules that are still hidden from you!

It doesn't matter whether hidden on purpose so lawyers can make more money preying on your legal ignorance, or if it's just something the Bar hasn't yet gotten around to after all these hundreds of years.

The point to take notice of is that you and a few million like you could be demanding that the Bar's curtain be pulled back so you and your children can know what you have a God-given right to know.

Together we can make the promise in our Pledge of Allegiance to be true at last!

Liberty and Justice for ALL.

We do NOT have Justice for ALL in this nation or any other.

Let's start here.

Let's start now.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Matriculator

I learned a few things in law school.

Most was a huge waste of time.³⁷

You, however, were taught *nothing!*

Law school (and the Bar that regulates legal education and the practice of law in this country) matriculator.

What do I mean by that?

Law school filters out all but the wealthiest and most-determined applicants.

Most Americans are “barred” from becoming lawyers.

To begin with, the four-year undergraduate degree required to apply for law school averages \$150,000 (tuition, books, room, board, food, etc.)

The average cost to attend a 3-year law school is \$130,000.

That’s \$280,000 up front.

Plus seven years of life with your head stuck in a book or being bored to death listening to professors drone on and on.

Not everyone who tries is able to get their undergraduate degree.

Then one out of ten law students flunk out.

Of those who graduate, almost half fail the bar exam and cannot practice law (or become a judge) without passing.

The word “matriculation” refers to meeting certain standards for admission, and admission to the bar is what law students seek.

We are matriculated into the bar.

We must meet certain standards before being admitted.

Getting admitted to the bar is a giant hurdle.

³⁷ Any honest trial lawyer will agree. The case-winning tactics required to overcome adversaries in court have little or nothing to do with the mass of information shoved into us those three years of law school.

Few attempt it.

Of the few who try, fewer still are admitted.

Only 4 out of every 1,000 Americans are lawyers.

That means the remaining 996 of every thousand of you have *no idea* how our courts work.

That seems unacceptable to me.

I think it should be unacceptable to you and every American who cares about protecting the innocent.

Only 4 out of 1,000 Americans know the rules.

These rules protect you and your children from tyranny, rules that keep the wheels of commerce turning, rules that put groceries on the shelves and in your pantry, rules that prevent evil people from robbing you blind, driving you out of your home, and murdering you and your loved ones.

Seem extreme?

That's because it is extreme.

Without rules to govern our courts, what do you think keeps the bad guys from taking everything you own, slitting your throat, and laughing at our laws?

Laws that cannot be enforced are worthless.

Courts without rules cannot enforce the laws.

Yet, less than half of one percent of you have any idea what those rules are or how they protect you from mayhem.

To make legal education for the masses more imperative, keep in mind that those rules are easy to learn.

Yet you know virtually none of them and even less about the tactics one must employ to use the rules effectively.

The BAR alone knows the rules.

The BAR rules!

BAR lawyers will gladly take your money to represent you.

We who make it through the matriculation of undergraduate school, law school, the bar exam, and admission to practice owe you a duty. Our duty reaches far beyond charging you exorbitant fees to assist you with legal matters about which you could have been taught *at least a few things* in our tax-supported schools. Our duty goes beyond keeping you dependent on us to protect your Liberty and secure for you the benefits of living in these United States where you are promised life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our duty includes *teaching you what each of you should know about the rules we use to make money*.

America's rules should be known to ALL of you.

They are America's rules, not the BAR's rules!

If "ignorance of the law is no excuse", then the BAR owes you a duty to see that you are no longer ignorant, that you at least know the rules of court so you can protect yourselves from other members of my profession.

You have a God-given right to know how *your* courts work.

You have a God-given right to understand the thought processes lawyers and judges use to decide issues that affect you, your children, your children's children, and the myriad generations that will follow all of us when this modern age so-called is distant history.

Force the BAR to put legal education in your children's schools!

The BAR will do *nothing* if you remain silent.

Take your complaint to court!

That's what our courts are for!

Do nothing, and nothing will be done.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Right to Teach and Advise

In case you haven't noticed, it is against the law to advise a friend about the law in this country.

Think about that for a moment.

The same is true in other countries.

To help a friend with legal issues in some states is a felony!

You can be imprisoned for helping someone prepare for court or make a will or write a contract or do other things the BAR considers their exclusive bailiwick.

Prison!

Take breath.

Let that thought sink in.

The First Amendment to our Constitution promises "freedom of speech", but you can be arrested and locked behind steel bars in a prison cell with murderers and thieves just for helping a neighbor understand the simple rules of evidence and common-sense courtroom objections.

Ponder that.

Telling a friend how to object when the prosecutor attempts to put on hearsay evidence at a trial where your friend is in jeopardy for his life and liberty, is a felony crime in many states punishable by more than one year in prison!

A crime?

Yes!

A felony crime.

Something is out of whack in this country.

We have a problem that sorely needs to be dealt with.

The Rules of Court should not be a guarded secret!

Your friend has a right to know what he's facing in court.

He has a right to be told what the rules are and how they can be used to protect him.

He should not be required to pay a lawyer.

But!

Until you and others decide to demand that those rules be taught in our schools and made available to every American, this sad situation will continue to benefit us lawyers.

The BAR “bars” your God-given right to free speech.

The only other laws regulating free speech are laws against yelling “Fire!” in a crowded theatre or inciting a riot or insurrection.

You can call your neighbor a thief and suffer nothing other than a possible civil complaint for slander, but you will not go to prison for it.

You can preach the benefits of smoking tobacco, insist the moon walk was a hoax, or blast the President of the United States as a fool, but you will not be imprisoned for it.

But, tell some friend facing a prison term how to use objections to prevent the prosecutor from introducing evidence forbidden by the rules, and in some states you could be charged with a felony!

You could explain how his alleged crime must assert specific fact elements and how to prevent the prosecutor from proving those facts, and if the prosecutor finds out you could be sitting in prison *for more than a year!*

Or, help your friend understand the simple tactics that undermine the prosecutor’s plan by showing there are alternative theories of the case that prevent proof “beyond and to the exclusion of any reasonable doubt” and off you go in handcuffs to your new home in the hoosegow.

Do you sense a wrong here?

I certainly hope so!

You and a few thousand other Americans can correct this wrong.

Americans should *never* be “barred” from speaking truth.

Our courts are for the common people.

Our courts do *not* belong to the BAR!

Our courts exist for YOU and those you love.

Millions gave their lives on bloody battlefields fighting for this dream that is America ... land of the Free ... a country where each of you has a right to petition our tax-supported courts to redress your grievances.

This Constitutional “right” works great, *if you are not one of the 4 out of 5 who cannot afford to hire a lawyer who hopefully knows the rules and isn’t afraid to stand up to the judge!*

You are NOT free to help a friend in court.

You are NOT free to assist an elderly couple to save their home from foreclosure by explaining the difference between a promissory note and a mortgage or how to object when the bank insists the court should order the home to be sold without the bank’s first being required to produce both of those essential documents.

You are NOT free to explain to the victim of a vicious civil complaint filled with lies that a Motion to Strike Sham forces the falsifier to prove the truth of his claims *before requiring the victim to spend his last dime paying a lawyer to carry the case all the way to trial.*

NONE OF THESE THINGS IS ROCKET SCIENCE !!!

But, unless you are a lawyer, you do not know these things.

It my firm, unyielding opinion that you and your children have a God-given RIGHT to know everything you wish to know about the law and court proceedings and to teach and advise others without being put in jeopardy of being prosecuted for a crime!

None of this reality will see the light of day if YOU do nothing.

After 40 years in the “bar business” fighting other lawyers and compelling judges to enforce the rules, I do not know a single member of the BAR who is willing and unafraid to tell you this truth.

The media talks about The Rule of Law.

The news media occasionally tells you about a rare case now and then, *if it might encourage you to stay tuned-in and purchase what their advertisers are selling.*

But *nobody* tells you *how or why* those cases were decided as they were.

Nobody tells you what rules were used.

Nobody tells you the tactics employed by the winning side.

And ALL of it is easy enough for an average 8th grader to know.

You are “barred” from knowing.

Barred by the people who paraded that \$300 sign in front of us in 1986 (and you can only imagine what dollar number they are parading today for young lawyers embarking on their careers).

Your Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure is meaningless if you don’t know how courts decide what is reasonable in that restricted context and what is not.

Your First Amendment right to enjoy worshipping God (whatever you think God to be) without interference from government officials is meaningless unless you know how to make your case clear for a jury to understand and vote in your favor *without being required to expend your last dime to hire a lawyer.*

Your First Amendment right to print a newsletter promoting your views on what our schools are teaching your children and to pass your newsletter out on a streetcorner is protected by our “freedom of the press”, yet if you do not know how to file a lawsuit against those who oppose and try to silence your message, *without your being required to hire an expensive lawyer*, that guaranteed right to publish your views is worthless.

Your First Amendment right to peaceably assemble, whether your group is seeking recognition for some public wrong or simply promoting an idea you feel would make your world safer for us all (like promoting

public legal education) is also meaningless if government officials refuse to provide you a public forum where you can get your community's attention *without having to hire a lawyer to take your case before a judge to force the government to make good on that First Amendment promise!*

The right to petition your government to redress your grievances *is the most important right we have been promised!*

But, that right is utterly meaningless *if you have to dig deep into the family savings or mortgage the family home to hire a lawyer to draft, file, and prosecute your petition in court!*

I believe my book is beginning to reach the core of your being.

I believe you are beginning to agree that public legal education is, indeed, a moral imperative.

The question is whether you urge *others* to read my book and ACT on what you know down deep in your soul is a "moral imperative".

Without legal knowledge you are pawns in the hands of an elite collective of men and women who use your ignorance to make money and advance their private ideas of what's right and wrong for you and your children.

You do agree.

I know you do.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Legalese & Common Sense Terminology

You may think, “But the language lawyers use is too hard to learn. All that Latin rigamarole and complicated terminology is too far above us average working class people.”

Nonsense!

It is not.

All that’s needed is for it to be explained.

The word “interrogatory”, for example, is no harder to understand than “internet” or “gigabyte”. You know both those terms. You did not know them 30 years ago. You know those terms because you use them every day.

“Interrogatory” may sound complicated, it’s really just a written question your opponents must answer under oath. It’s not any harder to understand than internet or gigabyte. It not impossible to learn. It does not require more than an average 8th grade mind to comprehend.

The same is true of other words lawyers use; words like deposition, inference, mandamus, testimony, or affidavit. All are just technical terms, not unlike terms used every day by people in other fields of business.

But, you were never told.

A deposition is simply a proceeding whereby a witness is required to appear and answer questions under oath in the presence of a recording stenographer. The deposition transcript³⁸ can be used later in court to prove what the witness said *before trial*.

An inference is simply a conclusion one may reasonably take from a set of known facts. An inference can only be taken from known facts, not from other inferences (as is too often done in today’s courtrooms where circumstantial evidence is used to convict innocent people who don’t know these simple things.

³⁸ Printed report made by the recording stenographer.

Mandamus is simply a command. A writ of mandamus is an order from a judge commanding someone to do something or to stop doing something.

Testimony is simply what someone says, spoken or written.

An affidavit is simply a statement made in writing under oath. It exposes the person making the statement to criminal penalties if what is said is false and known at the time to be false when said. An affidavit does not make anything true. It's just a statement in writing under oath.

There is not a single "legal term" too hard for an average 8th grader to understand.³⁹

Anyone who thinks the language lawyers use is "designed" to fool the rest of the public simply hasn't made the slightest effort to learn the words we use. Not one of them is any more difficult than other words we use in our daily dealings.

Gigabyte. Modem. Router.

Derivative. Option. Deduction.

Blueprint. Architect. Bid.

Every profession has its language.

Lawyer language is no different.

Lawyer language is not difficult to learn.

Forcing the Bar to promote legal education in our schools is what's needed.

Or ... funding American Justice Foundation® so we can do the job for you, forcing the the BAR to stop hiding the golden ball that makes its members rich.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

³⁹ Indeed, if any of the rest of us Americans were taught these simple things and allowed to use them in court *without being required to hire a lawyer to use them in court in our place and stead.*

The Reluctant Plaintiff

I was required to appeal a trial judge's order many years ago.

My client was sued by her mother.

My client was in her 40's.

Her mother was in her late 70's.

The complaint alleged facts that appeared to be untrue.

The rule in *every* case, civil or criminal, requires that party who starts the fight to prove the facts he or she alleges. This is called the burden of proof. At the beginning of every case, the burden is on the party filing the case.

The plaintiff mother⁴⁰ offered no evidence supporting the facts she alleged in her complaint. She could not meet the burden of proof rule.

The judge chose to ignore this rule!

Since the mother offered no evidence, I served her with a Notice of Taking Deposition, setting the time and place for her to be deposed, i.e., to appear in person and answer my questions under oath in the presence of a recording stenographer. The goal was to obtain an official transcript that could be filed with the court showing that this woman had no case the court could rule on against my client.

Her lawyer filed a Motion for Protective Order, alleging that the elderly woman's declining health prevented her from submitting to be deposed.

The judge granted this motion, preventing me from placing the woman under oath and questioning her about the facts in her complaint.

I appealed.

In less than a week the appellate court issued its order stating that the woman must either appear to be deposed or have her case dismissed.

⁴⁰ People who start legal actions in civil cases are called plaintiffs or petitioners ... plaintiffs if they file a complaint, petitioners if they file a petition. Not too hard for an average 8th grader to understand.

The mother dismissed rather than be put to the requirement of the rules that she *prove* the facts she alleged in her complaint, rather than requiring my client to prove that the complaint was false.

This is not rocket science.

Yet, many people I've helped these past four decades did not know this rule and believed it was up to them to "defend" when attacked.

This case brings up two topics of interest.

First, why did the judge break the burden of proof rule? The lady plaintiff was well off financially, but that should not shift the burden of proof to my client. The woman may have been in failing health, but that too should not shift the burden *nor tip the scales of Justice*. She started the fight. The rules require her to prove the truth about what she said about her daughter, *and the judge knew that rule!* I should not have been required go to my client's expense to file an appeal to get the appellate court to make the judge do what the judge *knew he should have done in the first place*. Rules are rules for a reason. Rules are what make Justice possible for ALL of us *when they are followed and enforced by judges and justices in our courts*.

Second, why do so very many people know nothing about the rules "that make Justice possible for ALL of us"?

If the rules are as simple as I claim (you've learned enough so far to at least consider that what I say may be the truth), then why are you and your children still in the dark?

The rules and common-sense tactics I used to win this case (and many others these past four decades) were simple and straightforward.

Nothing I've ever done to win cases for my clients required me to know anything that couldn't be easily and inexpensively taught to your children in the 12 years we abuse them with meaningless subjects they will never use.

Instead, we indoctrinate them with morally questionable ideas and political philosophies that should be excluded from the curricula your tax dollars are paying for.

Judges should *always* follow and enforce the rules.

The sad reality is that our prisons are filled with innocent souls who, but for the abuse of these common-sense rules of court, could be enjoying life with their loved ones at home.

Judges sit back and permit lawyers to play games with the rules.

By knowing the rules and using simple common-sense tactics I was able time-after-time to require judges to follow and enforce the rules so my clients could win.

Rules and common-sense tactics every one of you should know.

Rules and common-sense tactics that *could* someday soon make those last words in our Pledge of Allegiance ring true.

Liberty and Justice for ALL!

It's entirely up to good people like you!

I can write books.

You can ask, "Why weren't we told?"

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Contract That Never Was

The defendant promised my client's office manager several million dollars for my client's customer list.

That list was a valuable commodity in my client's business worth every penny of those several million.

I had evidence that this illegal promise was made *in writing*, but I didn't yet have the writing to prove it.

So I served the defendant's lawyers with a Request for Production that required them, pursuant to the rules, to produce all written forms, letters, memoranda, notes, and other communications between their client and my client's office manager.

They *predictably* dragged their feet.

This is what I ran into year after year. It was a typical response to every discovery tool I used to get evidence in all those years of fighting for my clients' rights.

They objected, claiming my request was "vague, ambiguous, overbroad, work product, seeks to inquire into attorney-client relationship" and the rest of the kitchen sink highly paid lawyers use to evade what the Rules of Court require.

They, like tens of thousands of other trial lawyers on the loose in this country, hoped my client would run out of money and give up.

That's what Justice is in this country, when the people are denied knowledge of the rules.

It's a game of attrition that far too many lawyers play. The rich who can afford to pay a squadron of lawyers and corporations who have their own lawyers on staff simply bury the little guy with paperwork, stalling tactics, hiding evidence, and even lying to the judge ... hoping the victim will run out of money and give up.

Not willing to give up, I pressed the issue with a Motion to Compel Production, set my motion for hearing, then argued with a court reporter

taking everything down, explaining to the judge why my foot-dragging opponents should “pony up”.

The judge was reluctant until I cited appellate court opinions from the District Court that would “reverse and remand” the case back to him if he refused to grant my motion and order them to produce the hidden document.

The hearing took nearly an hour of back-and-forth between me and the highly paid lawyers on the other side, while the judge hemmed and hawed, unwilling to decide in my favor.

But, before leaving the courtroom that day with my clever court reporter (who dutifully wrote down everything said by the judge and we lawyers) I made the judge *clearly state his Order on the record*.

My opponents were commanded to produce the contract.

It was a lengthy multi-page document heavily “redacted” with a big black marker striking out multiple sentences.

My opponents complained the blacked-out portion contained “trade secrets” that should not be produced.

I knew why they marked out those portions. The marked out lines were evidence of a multi-million dollar conspiracy.

I some online research and found several appellate court opinions that require judges to examine redacted documents when the resisting party claims they contain trade secrets.

I filed a Motion to Examine in Camera (the term “camera” from an old Latin word for “room”). My motion required the judge to examine the document in his “room” (i.e., in chambers) then sign an Order stating whether or not the document contained trade secrets.

The judge said, “I don’t have time to go through all those pages!”

“With due respect, your Honor,” I responded, “you don’t have a choice. The District Court will command you to do so if you refuse.”

So he did.

He ultimately ruled (drum roll please) that there were no trade secrets and ordered my opponents to produce the entire document *without any redactions*.

I then served them with a Request for Admissions requiring them to “Admit that the contract contemplates that XYZ will pay ABC more than one million dollars upon receipt of my client’s customer lists.”

How did my opponents respond?

They objected, “The contract is an inanimate object and cannot contemplate.”

They *knew* the term “contemplate”. For centuries lawyers have used that word to describe what contracts “do”.

That was their last attempt.

They hoped by dragging their feet long enough, hiding the ball that they knew would cost them the case, that my client would run out of money and be unable to continue paying me to fight for him!

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, this *is* how the game of court is played.

See who can drain the other party’s pockets dry!

It shouldn’t be this way, of course, but until you and your children are taught the simple rules and common-sense tactics, the games will continue, lawyers will keep getting rich, and the promise of Liberty and Justice for ALL will remain a dream.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Divorce and the Almighty Dollar

In all my years of practice I knew only one lawyer who encouraged people to stay married.

The typical divorce attorney has no financial incentive to persuade his or her clients to mend the broken ties that once bound couples in Holy Matrimony.

In today's legal realm of masquerading truth for pay, there's nothing "holy" but the almighty dollar and keeping the lawyers' time clock ticking, billing more hours, getting more clients, paying the secretary, paying the rent, paying the home mortgage and installments on the fancy car that marks a man or woman a success in today's world.

Bitter?

Yes. Guilty as charged.

One of the few things in life we have as humans to enjoy and strive for is family. Man and woman joined in wedlock, and enjoying each other's constant company, sharing life's adventures, enduring its struggles, standing by each other no matter what and, in most cases, celebrating the wonder of bringing children into the world to nurture and guide with love and wisdom.

When those ties are stretched to the breaking point, every reasonable effort should be made to explore the causes of friction and disappointment with an eye toward counseling the petulant parties to reunite or, at least, to communicate.

Instead, "the papers are filed".

The game is afoot, as Sherlock Holmes would say.

The time clocks are running.

Hours are billed at \$300 per hour *or more!*

Little ones are deprived of the love and attention of Mommy or Daddy. It's usually Daddy, of course (no matter what the law may say about parents having equal rights). They cry themselves to sleep. Their

sense of identity is shattered. Life is interrupted. Love is suddenly confusion and chaos.

No matter.

Gotta bill hours.

Can't make money encouraging parents to settle differences and go home.

So the lawyers end up pushing their clients to fight over stupid stuff like who gets the boat ... or the dog!

Cases that could be settled are perpetuated over who gets the dog!

Not every family lawyer is guilty of this abuse, but it is undeniable that the vast number of bloody divorce battles were encouraged for filthy lucre.

Lawyers in every field befriend their clients. Divorce clients are desperate for a friend to confirm "their side of the story", someone to punish the offender for the horrible thing he or she did or said, a champion to enter the fray and defeat all hope of happiness for that person who was once loved and adored.

When young children are involved, it is nothing short of criminal for lawyers to make no effort to restore the once sacred bond between their clients.

It's never one side who caused the parties' problems in the beginning, when the arguments began or when the inexcusable cheating took place or when their precious family union started to fall apart over who commands the all-important TV controller.

Never is it just one and not the other!

And every divorce lawyer with a brain knows this.

And still the dollars dance in their heads when a new client comes through the door complaining, "My husband is an ass," or "My wife ran off with another man!"

The temptation to agree is severe. “Come, come. We will make him sorry,” or, “My, my. She has clearly done you wrong. We know how to make her regret what she did to you.”

Perhaps this book will have some small influence on a lawyer or two who may, upon reflection, see morality in making at least some small effort to put people back together, especially when young children are caught in the middle.

If there’s a God in Heaven, perhaps Providence will reward those who do.

In the meantime, know that a substantial number of divorce lawyers are in it for the money, and they cannot make more money without billing more hours.

They can only bill for more hours if divorcing people don’t know the Rules of Court that they abuse to keep divorce cases dragging on.

Learn the Rules of Court.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

.

Motion to Strike Sham Case

A client once hired me to stop his previous lawyer from draining his pockets dry.

The lawyer was doing nothing to advance the case.

My client had been sued by his partner over some issue regarding leases, but some of the material allegations in his partner's complaint appeared to be false *and known to be false when the case was filed*.

The case had dragged on for nearly two years.

The lawyer was charging \$400/hour as I recall. That was a bit more than the average back then. That is \$400/hour for doing little more than keeping the case alive.

The lawyer had missed the false allegations of my client's partner's complaint, allegations that, if they could be proved, would win the case.

But, those allegations *were false!*

Lawyers like money.

Litigation lawyers make money by billing hours.

The more hours, the more money.

Charles Dickens wrote about this in many of his novels. One of those stands as a symbol for the despicable practice of lawyers draining their clients' pockets dry by dragging cases on for years.

The novel is Bleak House, in which a young man hoping to marry his sweetheart chooses to postpone the wedding until the probate of his rich relative (named Jarndyce) would be settled. The man expected to receive a substantial fortune to launch their marital life together.

He could have gotten a job like the rest of us, but the lure of that substantial fortune waited only for his lawyers to do their job.

Years went by as the lawyers' fees ate away at the value of the estate.

In the end, when the young couple were no longer young, the estate was finally settled with only pennies remaining.

The lawyers were handsomely rewarded for dragging out what could have been resolved in a matter of weeks.

In some erudite circles today, one may hear a case described as a “Jarndyce Case”.

Google[®] it.

We should all remember what Mr. Dickens attempted in many of his excellent novels to convey to us about the legal profession so-called, its avarice, indolence, and intransigent self-interest.

We should act at this present hour to lift the veil that too long has shrouded the Bar and its secrets.

We must put legal education in our public schools where it should have been many, many years ago!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Price of Justice

Justice is not a commodity to be bought and sold.

Justice is a human right ... *a God-given right.*

Justice in our courts should be free for ALL of us, as we've been teaching our children with their Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag!

Liberty and Justice for ALL is what our heroic soldiers went to war and died for. They died for your right to present your grievances to the judges of our courts. To be heard. To make a record. To call witnesses. To require people to answer questions under oath. To force them to produce documents and other evidence. And to have those who refuse to obey these simple rules to be imprisoned until they do what those brave boys and girls died for.

That power should belong to ALL of you!

So, what's the problem?

Perhaps the problem is that we've not yet considered all that we need to be doing to bring our judicial system further out of the dark ages.

We tend to think we are modern people.

We tend to think this is the modern age.

We no longer settle civil disputes by forcing the parties to fight to the death, adjudging the winner innocent. We no longer force people accused of crimes to pick up bars of red hot iron to burn their hands then wait to see if the hands heal or become infected, adjudging those that healed as innocent and those that festered guilty. No longer do we toss alleged criminals into wells to see if they sink, adjudging those that sink as innocent and those that float as guilty, or contrariwise depending on what a particular judge might deem appropriate.

No.

But we do drive people into bankruptcy and sometimes suicide with increasingly exorbitant price of court costs and lawyers' fees.

A continuing legal education course offered by the Bar some years ago actually portrayed a hypothetical case about a widow seeking access to the considerable assets of her deceased husband. One lawyer in that hypothetical remarked that she could never prevail, because she did not have enough money to keep paying her lawyers. The other side would drag things out until she would have to give up, *penniless!*

Think things aren't this way?

Think again.

Justice is expensive.

We have not yet improved our judicial system sufficiently to say we now have "Liberty and Justice for ALL".

Not nearly yet.

ALL DO NOT GET JUSTICE!

But!

With the implementation of Artificial Intelligence and other cyber technologies we *can get basic legal education into our schools.*

I do not mean civics classes. Civics classes are a step in the right direction but, as you probably know, even those are no longer taught in our tax supported schools. Civics classes are not a "bare minimum". They are good. They are important. We want our children to once again have an opportunity to learn how our government operates, how laws are made, and other such civics topics.

But, civics classes do not begin to touch the tip of the giant iceberg of knowledge the Bar has been hiding from you and your children as far back as recorded history.

In England lawyers are educated in "temples". That's what they call their "law schools". Temples where a temporal priesthood is raised and empowered to wear gowns and powdered wigs to govern England from the Bench and Bar on the other side of the pond.

It is the same here. We are ruled by a temporal priesthood who are given the power to decide your fate and the fate of your children and, if

you cannot afford to compete with their ideas and opinions of what's right and wrong, you will be plundered, incarcerated, or murdered by the power of the state.

Harsh?

I mean it to be.

I mean to wake you up to the moral imperative that is public legal education.

I mean to fully persuade you to not only consider these things but to act on them immediately, to join with others similarly minded, and to never give up until your 8th graders are being taught what a Request for Admissions is and how to use it to settle disputes between themselves and those who seek to abuse them.

I mean to do all my words can do to fuel a movement in this nation, a movement far too long in coming, by which you and your friends, the mothers and fathers of America, rise up and demand that the Bar *take responsibility to teach you and your children how their system works*.

The rules are simple. They truly are.

- Rules of Procedure.
- Rules of Evidence.
- Courtroom Objections.
- The Essential Fact Elements.
- Motions for Court Orders.

That's the bulk of it.

And you know virtually nothing about these things or how to use them to protect yourselves from bad actors or to force powerful people and government agents to obey the law and leave you and your loved ones alone!

If public legal education were impossible, I'd not waste my time writing this book.

I hope by what you've read so far you recognize that not only is public legal education possible, but it is also eminently inexpensive, doable, and something you and your friends can make a beautiful reality just by demanding that your political leaders get to work!

Justice for ALL is what we are promised.

It's time our leaders made that promise come true for ALL.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The God Factor

No matter what religious concepts you may have about eternity, life after death, there *is* a Reality that justifies (or *should* justify) the exercise of government power.

Remove that Reality, and you remove the legitimizing factor that makes the difference between being governed and being ruled.

In this chapter I hope to convince you that the BAR has done you and your children a great disservice in its mad denial of the existence of a self-existing “higher power” in our midst.

I wish you to understand where this error arises, and by the end of this chapter I hope you will commit yourself to working with others to repair this dangerous problem.

The First Amendment guarantees that, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Note the word “religion”.

Note that the word “God” is nowhere mentioned.

God is many things to many people.

God is *not* “religion”.

This simple minded confusion has caused our nation to go off the rails in several ways that I hope to touch on in this short chapter.⁴¹

Our nation’s motto is “We trust in God”.

It is *not* “We trust in religion”.

Nor should it ever be. Religions have fostered the most enormous errors and human sufferings this planet has ever witnessed. The great multitude of competing religions refuse to agree about much of anything. Instead they foment division, where unity should be promoted.

⁴¹ If I live a few years longer, I hope to write an entire book about this. If I perish sooner, I hope someone else will write that book, because the import of this critical point goes to the very heart of what Liberty is and what must be done to secure governments against their perpetual tendencies to devolve into despotism.

Union is the goal of wise nations.

Therefore, we dare not trust in “religion”.

But!

God is *not* religion.

No matter what faith you follow, or if you follow no faith at all, you must admit (if you are sane) that there is a Reality within which each of us lives and moves and has his being.

That Reality cannot be denied by any but fools.

Every religion agrees.

The God of every religion is Reality in which we live and move and have our being.

Reality that exists apart from you or me.

Reality that does what Reality does, without regard to what we wish or legislate or impetuously demand.

Reality brings flowers in the Spring, hurricanes in Summer, falling leaves in Autumn, and runny noses when the days get short in Winter.

Reality also promotes war where there are diverse competing opinions about things like money, land, and power.

Reality infests us with disease where ignorance and indolence ignore the necessities of cleanliness, potable water, and healthful food.

Reality assists us to make our world better when men work in unity with a due regard for the needs of others.

Reality is undeniable.

What religions call God *is* Reality.

Reality operates as an Unseen Hand to determine the destinies of men and nations according to what we think and what we do.

Reality and its consequences are inescapable.

To deny this is insanity.

To empower a government with authority to police and punish the people, without acknowledging that consequence follows our thoughts and actions is equally insane.

And immoral.

And corrupt.

The sole justification for exercise of government power is that each of us individual humans is accountable to the “foreseeable consequence” of our thoughts and actions.

It is foreseeability that justifies governments to intervene in our lives, to regulate, and to punish.

If there were no foreseeability, there could be no responsibility.

Foreseeability is determined by Reality, i.e., by God.

We cannot foresee all things, no matter how we try.

For those things we *can* foresee, however, we are responsible.

When those things threaten harm to our friends and neighbors, harm we could prevent or minimize by taking action, government has authority to “govern” us accordingly. The authority of government arises from the foreseeability presented to us by our knowledge of Reality.

If the consequence of our actions were not foreseeable, no judge could *justly* punish us.

Do you see where this is taking us?

Foreseeability legitimizes the administration of Justice.

Reality provides foreseeability.

God.

God in whom we *ought* to trust.

God we ought to consider when we write our laws.

God, the Reality that determines the destiny of both men and nations according to what we think and do.

God, the Golden Key that unlocks all of life’s mysteries.

I do not challenge *any* religion with my book. My purpose is to inform you about what the BAR is doing, and what the BAR is *not* doing, and what you might begin doing to make your world a bit safer for the children.

Choose whatever religion makes you comfortable.

Choose whatever you wish to believe about God.

God is.

God is Reality.

To deny this is madness.

To remove God from your government is lunacy.

God is essential to good government!

Removing God and the concept of God-given rights opens wide the door to invite the terrors of tyranny and submit yourselves to absolute rule under the thumbs of men beyond the reach of Law and Order.

Fools who cannot read English began in the mid-19th Century to take God out of our schools, out of our official deliberations, out of our courts, and increasingly out of our minds and the minds of our children. They used the First Amendment as the pretext for this. They refused to acknowledge that the word “religion” does not refer to God. That word refers to the myriad ways human beings conceive of God.

Yet *every religion* acknowledges that God is the Reality in which we live and move and have our being.

Every religion.

The fools may have been motivated by good intentions.

They may have acted with some invidious self-interested purpose.

No matter which, the end result is the same.

God is out.

And with that stroke of impudence the foundation from which our nation made its first step into the world was shattered and destroyed.

God-given rights cannot be protected if there is no God.

Without God, your rights and the rights of your children become whatever secular judges and high court justices decide.

As the BAR sees things, you are not born with God-given rights.

Your rights are whatever lawyers and judges decree and, in these recent decades, your rights are in many cases less important than the rights of the “collectives” like corporations and socially distinguishable groups with competing agendas.

The term “human rights” has no longer any fixed meaning.

Totalitarian governments, like Russia and China, are dominated by a handful of powerful men commanding vast weaponized armies. They care nothing for your God-given rights.

Authoritarian governments decide the people’s rights according to the flexible whim of leaders wielding absolute power.⁴²

This nation was not so formed or dedicated.

But!

The BAR is capitulating to fools. Our courts and legislatures no longer consider God-given rights as a legitimate argument for Liberty. Appellate decisions in our highest courts ignore the First Light that inspired Thomas Jefferson to write, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.”

God-given rights.

Members of the BAR, especially justices in the highest courts, now speak of “human rights”, not God-given rights, and I write these words

⁴² Read Brave New World by Alduous Huxley or 1984 by George Orwell. These stories predict what is happening at this very hour!

because most of you have no idea why this is critically important or how it adversely impacts your life and your children's future.

BAR lawyers, judges, and high court justices decide for all of us rights are and what they aren't, who has them and who has not.

When our rights as individuals interfere with the political agendas or demands of various competing collectives and corporate enterprises, our human rights are adjusted.

You have no control over the BAR or the decisions decreed by BAR members, *since you were never taught the rules of court so you could go to your local courthouse and demand to be heard.*

We are increasingly living in a godless nation, because fools can't or won't recognize the difference between two words.

Religion is not God.

God is not religion.

God is the anchor of human hope.

God is the predicate on which freedom-loving nations are born and by which alone they can be sustained, managed by us individuals to the exclusion of the claims of collectives and political aims of self-interest.

Reality is not a matter of opinion.

God is.

The BAR is erasing God.

Sound the alarm!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Secular Priesthood

America's plan to keep "church" out of government is probably a good one.

The Church of England at the time of our American Revolution was exclusive. Other religions were disfavored. In the 17th Century, when John Bunyan wrote Pilgrim's Progress, it was a crime punishable by prolonged imprisonment to preach any religious doctrine other than what "The Church" approved. Bunyan himself was imprisoned for "illegal preaching".

The Founders here had a better idea. Each of us would be allowed to follow our heart, believe what we choose about God and eternity, and assemble with whomever we wished to worship and study the ancient scriptures.

The concept of Liberty requires this.

But!

Where the priest craft of the Church of England was permitted to influence the Crown and by doing so to influence and regulate the lives and practices of every Englishman, our nation ended up with hundreds of churches in competition with each other. Our government has no standards with regard to God, religion, morality, and other such matters.

Instead, we have the BAR.

We have a system of judges and high court justices.

It is *these* people who lead you, regulate your lives, and teach your children right-and-wrong.

Look behind the curtain.

Consider the changes that have taken place in our society just in the past fifty years! Changes brought about by decisions of our highest court justices.

The BAR.

Our secular priesthood.

It doesn't take much thought to see that lawyers and judges are not "just" lawyers and judges. They aren't "just" putting people in jail for committing crimes or handing out fines for traffic tickets.

They control your world.

You may have thought the Congress and your state legislature decide what the law is, what taxes we must pay, how fast we can drive on the highways, or what chemicals can be added to our food.

You may even have thought the president of these United States has the final say-so when it comes to how our government operates.

If you believe either of those things, think again.

The courts are the final say-so in our system of government.

The judiciary rules.

The judiciary decides.

The judiciary power overrules Congress and the state legislatures.

The judiciary power overrides the executive branch.

President Truman may have said, "The buck stops here," pointing at the desk in his oval office, but he was wrong.

The buck stops at another building in Washington where nine men and women sit in black robes deciding for you and your children what is right, wrong, moral, immoral, good, evil, and so forth!

This is not widely understood.

The supreme courts of every civilized nation that is organized as a constitutional government is the final say-so on *all matters*!

The people in India refer to their supreme court as "The bulldog of the nation."

Most of you had no idea or, at least, seldom paused to consider the power of the BAR, *a private business organization beyond the reach of your votes at the polls*.

The BAR has an agenda.

A secular agenda.

A humanist agenda by which the blind force of the people will be ruled by the irresistible force of a regulated police state, where only giant corporations can compete in the marketplace,⁴³ where children are educated only with such tools as they need to become efficient worker bees, where morality is without guardrails of any kind, and nothing is sacred any more.

If you are old enough to be on Social Security you know this is true, because you've seen the changes.

Young people cannot see the changes. They are like frogs in the teapot, unable to understand that change is *not always good*.

Indeed, most BAR members are not yet AARP subscribers, not yet old enough to see the damage they are doing with their new world ideas of ultra-liberal thinking that ignores fixed truths that threaten to bite us all in the backside if we do not take a closer look at what is going on in our highest courts.

The BAR's agenda needs revision.

Only you, along with a few million just like you, can adjust the BAR's agenda so the rulings of our highest courts begin again to protect you and your children from secular anti-religious values that favor the collectives and corporations at the continuing expense of individual opportunity.

Collectives are not people!

Corporations are not people!

Only people have God-given rights!

⁴³ In just the past 50 years we see small mom & pop businesses that used to thrive in our cities and towns displaced by mega franchises. Franchises everywhere! The handyman carpenter with his hammer and saw can no longer work without meeting stringent, prohibitively expensive regulations and licensing. The would-be small town store owner is forced to have wheelchair ramps, two bathrooms, and pay exorbitant property taxes that leave little profit to take home. In the same cities and towns, giant corporations are offered substantial tax breaks or even subsidized to bring their businesses to the community. In some cases private homes and small businesses bulldozed to make room for a shopping "town center" that the city fathers call "progress", while pocketing the kickbacks. The good old days are gone forever, *unless people like you decide to get involved and learn what the BAR is up to*.

If the secular agenda of the BAR is permitted to continue without opposition, we will continue to see our nation and its once honorable peace-loving values replaced by rank commercialism and globalist ties that can only lead to a totalitarian state in which the individual becomes a mere mechanism without a soul.

You have a soul.

Corporations have no soul.

Corporations are secular by definition.

Secular judges and justices today don't see the distinction.

We don't need a priesthood of judges and justices ruling us from the bench in their black robes and secular ideas that give to corporations and other collectives the God-given rights that belong to us and us alone.

You have a God-given right to understand the core doctrines and principles that gave this nation its birth, doctrines and principles that are designed to protect you and your children from Big Brother, doctrines and principles that can be easily presented with AI and other cyber tools.

Justice is impossible without rules that protect individuals from the power of collectives and corporations, rules you have a God-given right to know!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

The Courts Belong to YOU!

You pay the judges with your hard-earned tax dollars.

Your tax dollars built those fancy courthouses.

Your tax dollars pay salaries for clerks, bailiffs, the people who scan you for weapons at the door, the janitor, the maintenance staff, and everyone else who works at the courthouse.

You have a God-given right to be there!

You have a God-given right to be heard!

You have a God-given right to present your grievances there, to call witnesses, to put on evidence, and when the facts and law are on your side to obtain a Court Order granting you the relief you have a God-given right to receive from our government.

All you need is to know the Rules of Court.

Rules that are *not* difficult to learn.

Rules that have been hidden from you far too long, so lawyers can make ridiculous amounts of money doing what any average 8th grader can learn how to do in a weekend.

Pleadings.

Motions.

Five (5) evidence discovery tools.

Trial (if you haven't won *before* trial).

That's it!

But nobody told you until now.

For thousands of years governments in every country, in every culture, in every language, provided a court where people with grievances could plead their cases before judges whose decrees were law.

The best research indicates that there were judges in Israel 2,000 years before Christ ... that's 4,000 years ago.

There were judges in Greece and Rome before the Dark Ages.

Then beginning with the Renaissance there were judges in Italy, France, Germany, England, and other nations around the globe.

They were there for the common man to air his grievances and get relief through the power of judge's pens.

They are there for you now.

All you need is to learn the simple Rules of Court.

Rules of Procedure.

Rules of Evidence.

You don't need to know "all the law that was ever written". The smartest judges on the planet do not know "all the law".⁴⁴ ,

Most cases, criminal or civil, turn on only one (1) law. It's not too hard to know what that one law is. If your case is about a dog who bit a child, you can use Google® to find the official law on dog bites in your state or province. You don't have to know about taxes, wills, trusts, or corporations, if your case is about a dog bite. Just look it up!

Then, once you know what we lawyers call "the law of the case", the rest is tactics.

Tactics that play the rules like a musical instrument.

The plaintiff's initial pleading (the Complaint) states the facts that trigger the law, if proven true.

The parties then files motions back-and-forth, fighting over what the plaintiff's Complaint alleges and whether it should be dismissed from the start.

⁴⁴ Sadly, there are many that don't even know the simple Rules of Court. Perhaps this book will cure that problem once good people like you begin to see how the ignorance and private agendas of judges is polluting your world with decisions with which you and a majority of the population do not agree.

Then, when the initial “flurry of motions” subsides, the defendant files his Answer and Affirmative Defenses, by which he makes known what his position is with regard to the plaintiff’s allegations.

None of this is rocket science so far.

The parties then engage like warriors, each using his five (5) tools to discover evidence and get it into the court’s record.

Requests for Admissions (statements made in writing that must be admitted or denied in writing).

Requests for Production (lists of documents and things that must be produced for the requesting party to examine)

Interrogatories (written questions that must be answered in writing *and signed under oath*)

Depositions (face-to-face meetings where witnesses must answer questions *under oath* in the presence of a notary or court stenographer)

Subpoenas and other Court Orders (commands from the court that require evidence to be revealed, for witnesses to appear, for documents to be released, etc.)

Those five (5) weapons are not only extremely powerful, they are also common-sense to use, and when used tactically they win cases!

Nothing so far is rocket science. Nothing so far is too difficult for an average 8th grader to learn in a single weekend!

Once all the discoverable evidence is in the record, the parties use motions to compel the judge to decide between them.

If the evidence discovery phase works as it should, the case can be won *without going to trial*. A Motion for Summary Judgment can close the book, or a Motion for Directed Verdict can decide the case then and there.

If the parties do not use their five discovery weapons wisely, the case is set for trial, and the battle continues in the presence of a judge (and sometimes a jury) to decide who wins based on whose facts are supported by the evidence then in the court record.

That's it, friend.

It's that simple!

You likely had no idea until now!

You should have been taught in public school.

It is not too late to begin.

The courthouse and its power to make life better for you and your loved ones is open to those who know the Rules of Court.

That should be absolutely ALL of you.

The power to get Justice in our courts belongs *only* to those who know these extremely simple easy-to-learn Rules of Court and common-sense tactics to apply those rules to compel judges to pick up their powerful pens *and make life better for you*.

When Jefferson wrote, "We hold these truths to be self-evident," in our Declaration of Independence, he made clear that we are endowed with *more* God-given rights than merely "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness". He said, "among these", indicating there are more than just those three God-given rights.

Common-sense tells you that none of those three can be guaranteed without power to control your government *by more than a single vote*.

William Blackstone (who compiled a book of common law that was used to establish courts in early America and, with a .45 revolver, Bible, and a good horse, brought law and order to settle the Wild West) declared, "The theater of the power of the people is in the courts!"

He used the word "theater" as we used that word in World War II, describing the Pacific Theater and the European Theater ... that place where the war for Liberty and Justice is fought.

The power of the people is *in the courts*!

But this God-given power is applied successfully only by people who know the Rules of Court and the common-sense tactics that apply the rules effectively.

None of it is rocket science.

None of it is too hard for an average 8th grader.

But you were never told!

Our courts do *not* belong to the BAR.

The BAR is a “private association” of lawyers and judges.

That private association has no God-given rights.

Our courts belong to *you*!

They are the *only* place where you have effective power to secure for yourself and your loved ones “the blessings of Liberty”.

Violence cannot do it.

Parading in the street with signs and pitchforks cannot do it.

You have a courthouse nearby.

It is there for *you* and your loved ones to use!

You have a God-given right to access its power.

All you need to use that power is to know the simple easy-to-learn Rules of Court and a handful of common-sense tactics.

With those rules and tactics you can compel judges (that your tax dollars pay for) to do what our nation’s Founders promised.

Liberty and Justice for ALL!

Teach your children!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Thoughts to Ponder

“The one great principle of the English law is, to make business for itself.” *Charles Dickens*

“If there are any three things opposed to the genius of the American Constitution, they are these: irresponsibility in a judge, unlimited discretionary authority in an executive, and the union of an irresponsible judge and an unlimited executive in one person.” *Herman Melville*

“They have a Right to censure, who have a Heart to help. The rest is Cruelty, not Justice.” *William Penn*

“If judges could see those whom they sentence after they have endured their punishment they would pause before passing fresh sentences upon wrongdoers, however guilty.” *George Forbes*

“Impartiality is the Life of Justice, as that is of Government.” *William Penn*

“In suits which a man doth not well understand, it is good to refer them to some friend of trust and judgment, that may report whether he may deal in them with honor: but let him choose well his referendaries, for else he may be led by the nose.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“It is no grace to a judge first to find that which he might have heard in due time from the bar; or to show quickness of conceit in cutting off evidence or counsel too short; or to prevent information by questions, though pertinent.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“It is one of the genuine marks of servitude to have the law either concealed or precarious.” *Sir Edward Coke*

“Judges ought above all to remember that the supreme law of all is the welfare of the people and to know that laws, except they be in order to that end, are but things to find fault and not well inspired.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“Judges ought to remember that their office is to interpret law, not to make law.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“You can not spill a drop of American blood without spilling the blood of the whole world.” *Herman Melville*

“Not to have a Right, and not to come at it, differs little.” *William Penn*

“So when any of the four pillars of government are mainly shaken or weakened (which are religion, justice, counsel, and treasure), men had need to pray for fair weather.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“The attendance of courts is subject to four bad instruments. First, certain persons that are sowers of suits; which make the court swell, and the country pine. The second sort is of those that engage courts in quarrels of jurisdiction, and are not truly amici curiæ, but parasiti curiæ [not friends but parasites of the court], in puffing a court up beyond her bounds, for their own scraps and advantage. The third sort is of those that may be accounted the left hands of courts; persons that are full of nimble and sinister tricks and shifts, whereby they pervert the plain and direct courses of courts and bring justice into oblique lines and labyrinths. And the fourth is the poller and exacter of fees, which justifies the common resemblance of the courts of justice to the bush whereunto while the sheep flies for defense in weather, he is sure to lose part of his fleece.” *Sir Francis Bacon*

“That the king, in the eye of the law, can do no wrong, is the well-known fiction of despotic states.” *Herman Melville*

“The Impartial Judge in Judgment knows nothing but the Law; the Prince no more than the Peasant; his Kindred than a Stranger. Nay, his Enemy is sure to be upon equal Terms with his Friend, when he is upon the Bench. *William Penn*

“Peace and Justice are two sides of the same coin.” *Dwight D. Eisenhower*

“When complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty attained. *John Milton*

“Injustice anywhere is a threat to Justice everywhere.” *Martin Luther King, Jr.*

“If you want peace, work for Justice.” *Pope Paul VI*

Conclusion

We need judges.

We need lawyers.

But we need to *know* how to use our power at the courthouse!

That power should not belong *only* to members of the BAR.

Thousands of innocent men, women, and children are in prison.

Thousands of innocent parents have their children taken from them by people with corrupt motives.

Thousands of innocent people lose their homes to foreclosure, even though they made all their payments on time.

Thousands are unjustly denied unemployment benefits.

Thousands lose everything in corrupt divorce proceedings.

Thousands are taken to the cleaners and end up bankrupt as a result of their own lawyer's indolence and incompetence.

Thousands are cheated by crooked debt collectors.

Thousands are abused by property appraisers and tax collectors.

Those and others would not have suffered if they'd only known the simple easy-to-learn Rules of Court and a handful of tactics to put truth on record, instead of allowing lawyers to obfuscate and hide evidence.

We need lawyers and judges to do what BAR members solemnly swear to do when admitted to the practice of law.

I took that oath.

I know what we swore to do, and at its core was a promise to serve the people, to advocate for Justice and do what's right, instead of playing hide-and-seek with the law and facts.

Lawyer jokes prevail because too many lawyers abuse the Rules.

That abuse will stop, when you and millions like you demand that those Rules be taught to you and your children.

Thomas Edison, inventor of the light bulb, was quoted as saying, "Opportunity is ignored by most people, because it's dressed in overalls and looks like work!"

There is a great deal of work that needs doing.

You have this power.

It already belongs to you!

All you need to exercise that power is to learn the Rules of Court and a handful of common-sense tactics to use those rules effectively at your local courthouse.

Abraham Lincoln is alleged to have said, "A man who represents himself in court has a fool for a client." Advice from a lawyer!

When 4 out of 5 of you cannot afford a lawyer, that opinion is an insult!

The working class and most of the so-called middle class in this and other countries *cannot hire a lawyer when legal trouble strikes!*

And legal trouble strikes all too often!

The American Bar Association admits that, "Two-thirds of people across all income levels in the United States experienced at least one legal problem in the past four years."

Two-thirds of you in just the past four years alone!

Two-thirds!

How many of those knew *anything* about the Rules of Court or any of the simple tactics they could have used to win?

You should not be ruled by a secular priesthood.

You certainly should not be ruled by a private association that refuses to make any effort to teach you the Rules of Court that are the keystone of Liberty.

You and your children should not be denied the knowledge that you need to understand how our legal system works and what one must do to make it protect the innocent from those who abuse it on a daily basis.

You should openly challenge the validity of legal philosophies now prevailing in our highest courts where justices sit as a secular priesthood deciding for you and your children what is moral and immoral, lawful and unlawful, disrupting and overriding the will of We the People in far too many arenas where we live and move and have our being.

Are judges wiser than you?

Are BAR regulated law schools to be the final authority for you and the rest of America on what wisdom is?

Are you missing something?

Clearly and with no room for reasonable doubt, decisions are being made in our highest courts by men and women who evaluate the merit of one party over another based on privately held doctrines and beliefs.

Where is the theater where we have opportunities to question and challenge those doctrines and beliefs if not in the courthouses that our tax dollars are paying for?

If the Rules of Court are hidden from us (simple as I say they are), hidden so we must employ a lawyer to open the courthouse doors for us, how will we ever be afforded an opportunity to challenge their privately held doctrines and beliefs that are infecting our children with ideas today that were anathema when I was a boy, ideas that would have raised a public outcry if they'd been presented all at once, instead of being foisted on us slowly over time while we luxuriate in our technological advancements and the bask in the leisure those advancements provide?

When I was a boy, many people cooked on wood burning stoves. Ice was delivered house-to-house in a horse-drawn wagon. Only a few had one of the new electric refrigerators. We didn't have a TV until I was seven years old; the screen was black-and-white and measured six inches on the diagonal. Our phones were mostly shared party lines. My home phone number was 749. The phone number for my grandfather's general store was 44.

If things that are increasingly commonplace today, *approved and actually encouraged by the justices of our highest courts*, the men in my home town would have taken up in arms!

They would have grabbed their pistols and rifles, organized, and made their voices heard loud and clear in Washington, "This is not what our dear departed friends fought and died for!"

But you have no control, because you don't yet know the Rules of Court that are your power to control your leaders!

If you took time to read the 18th and early 19th century appellate court opinions, you'd say, "That's the way things should be decided." You say, "That's the way things ought to be in these United States."

But if you read the latest appellate court opinions, you will see the rise of a new idea that has the world in its grip.

I pray each of you reading this book will ask yourself, neighbors, friends, loved ones, and every person you meet.

Should we know the rules that rule us?

The day I was born Hitler and his goons were stripping women and children of their clothing and sending them for their cyanide showers.

This was happening to people who lost their power in the courts.

We can force the Bar and its law schools and law professors to give us the power of knowledge that is our God-given right.

With that power we can protect ourselves from secular slavery.

We can reverse the arrogance of contemporary legal philosophy.

We can cancel the looming consequence of permitting the new idea that has our world in its grip from imposing permanent despotic tyranny.

Liberty cannot live where Justice is denied.

Justice cannot live in ignorance.

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Apology

I've been a member of the Bar since 1986.

I know what's written here is true.

I also know that you do *not* know.

The professional legal community, i.e., "the Bar", is hiding these truths.

Behind their closed curtain, where the legal profession hides its dark secrets, there are things that you, dear reader, know nothing about.

Nothing whatsoever!

Nothing yet ...

Nothing in my book is intended to criticize any individual lawyer or judge. Without lawyers to assist you with contracts, wills & trusts, buying and selling properties, and other such services, society would collapse.

I've known many excellent lawyers who handled wills and trusts, property and business transactions, and other everyday aspects of the legal practice outside the courts; men and women who were honest and committed to doing the right thing.

The litigators I had to fight in court, however, were a different animal playing every available angle to "win at all costs". Only by winning can litigators line their pockets with the big bucks.

Money is motive.

In no other profession does money have such a powerfully persuasive enticement to cheat. Trial lawyers struggling to make their mark in the world frequently ignore the rules or twist the rules and do "whatever it takes" to get their clients to write bigger checks or to win multi-million dollar personal injury cases and take up to 40% of the amount recovered "for their clients".

Not every litigator I've known twisted the rules.

Not every litigator I've known confused the judge.

Not every litigator I've known finagled bogus evidence.

But far too many did.⁴⁵

In my experience handling real cases for real clients, *most* lawyers I had to oppose deliberately broke the rules in their unjust effort to win.

It was my job to stop them by using the law and the rules correctly and forcing the judge to follow the law and the rules to-the-letter.

The Bar permits this to continue.

Judges and justices in our highest courts allow it.

Everyone suffers as a direct or tangential consequence.

My book unveils what you, dear reader, never imagined, not just about litigation attorneys but about the Bar itself, its structure, power, self-interest, and independence from the political power of the People in this and other nations.

My book is not the rantings of a disgruntled member of the Bar⁴⁶.

My book is a truthful report of what's going on behind your back.

My book reveals actual events that I experienced as a law student and later as a member of the Bar and successful practicing attorney.

The Bar may come after me for publishing their secrets, but you *do* have a right to know.

No malice intended.

I intend no harm to any individual lawyer, judge, or law professor.

The true stories shared here, however, desperately need telling.

⁴⁵ Most I had to deal with in cases my clients hired me to win went to extremes in hiding evidence, misleading the judge, or actually falsifying official records. My experience may have been unusual but, from what I know of lawyer reputations generally, my experience is probably not completely unique.

⁴⁶ I was admitted to The Florida Bar on 20 May 1986. On the publication of this book I was a member in good standing and hope my publishing these truths about the Bar will not jeopardize my license to practice law.

You need to know the ugly truth about a privileged class of people whose license to steal is abused every day in this country, in and out of court, where their daily dealings impact every aspect of your life.

You need to know and tell others until the Bar admits its faults and chooses at last to reveal to the American People what all Americans are entitled to know ... *the dirty secrets, scams, and slippery deals*.

You are a victim of Bar abuse ... whether you've gone to court or not, whether you've dealt with lawyers directly or not.

The Bar impacts your life both directly and indirectly.

The cost of lawyer shenanigans is a multi-billion dollar drain on our economy, inflating the cost of everything you buy.

Once a few millions of you know and share what I tell you here, *the bleeding can be made to stop!*

The hoped for result is Liberty and Justice for ALL ... not just for giant corporations and wealthy individuals who can afford lawyers to do their dirty work for them.

Tell others!

MAKE AMERICA WISE AGAIN!

Suggested Reading

Here are some resources you may look into to confirm that what I've said in this book is, in every aspect, true.

All of these can be accessed at no cost using Google[®] search.

Federal Rules of Evidence

See for yourself how few pages are required to list all the rules.

Notice how much of those pages are filled with “comments” to explain the rules, i.e., that the rules themselves can be printed on far fewer pages.

The official rules for major league baseball comprised 192 pages in 2024.

You will be amazed how few pages are required to print the official rules of evidence that control judges in every federal case, civil or criminal.

These rules are essentially the same in every state court, civil or criminal.

What weren't you told?

Common Law Cases

Google[®] these entertaining old appellate opinions to see that they, too, are just simple “stories” that should be presented as animated videos created with AI and provided to every classroom in America with currently existing, inexpensive cyber technologies.

Carlill v Carbonic Smoke Ball Co. (the failed flu cure case)

Donoghue v Stevenson (the snail in the bottle case)

Frigalment Importing Co. v. BNS Int'l Sales (the chicken case)

Hadley v Baxendale (the mill shaft case)

Hawkins v McGee (the hairy hand case)

Hollywood Silver Fox Farm v Emmett (the sensitive fox case)

Kirksey v Kirksey (the ungrateful widow case)

Leonard v Pepsico (the jump jet bait and switch case)

Lucy v Zehmer (the drunken buyer case)

Palsgraf v Long Island Railroad (the timid old lady case)

Regina v Dudley and Stephens (the cannibal defense case)

Vosburg v. Putney (the eggshell leg case)

Webster v Blue Chip Tea Room (the chowder bone case)

These are just a few entertaining stories that ended up in court and are now controlling common law in every American court today.