Foundation for the Child Victims of the Family Courts
present their new program of:
Litigation Strategy and Legal Research and Support
(LSLRS for the FCVFC in the NWO)
Because the Practice of Law is Often Not
IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD
in the New World Order

The essence of law is words and the use of language. Either law is clearly written and readily understandable to a literate person, or it is not law. If the written language of any "law" is vague, imprecise, or overbroad, then that language does not constitute valid law. So the U.S. Supreme Court has held over and over and over again (although sometimes the U.S. Supreme Court seems to rely on unstated rules...). But under both the Anglo-American and the Civil Law systems of jurisprudence, a vague, imprecise, or overbroad law is quite simply "void"; it is a nullity. A perfect example of a vague, imprecise, or overbroad law is the phrase "the Best Interests of the Child"---wholly subjective and lacking in any objective grounds for testing or verification. "Best Interests of the Child" is just a "summary statement of goals and purposes" that no one dares deny.

An unstated policy many not have the force or effect of law unless it becomes written and published as law. There are no such things as "secret law" or "unstated rules"---but most people have learned to fear the language of the law and have been led to believe that there are such things as hidden signals or messages that only lawyers can understand. On these falsehoods, on such false fears, lawyers have built their imperial monopoly and their wealth in America and Europe, really all over the world.

Ideally, the role of a lawyer should be that of a specialist who knows and can explain the law clearly to a non-specialist, to give advice and guidance on how the law applies to the facts of a case, and to outline the protocols and procedure required by law to present the non-specialist client's position most effectively. In other words, the lawyer should be an educator and a guide, as well as an effective wordsmith, a master of rhetorical and argumentative technique.

Practical experience, however, teaches us, at least in most of the USA, that 99% of lawyers are specialists who keep secrets, who give orders without explanation, who never explain anything, especially the law, but more often

than not threaten and cajole their non-specialist clients into taking courses of action, which may be very different from what the non-specialist clients had hoped for or envisioned. Too often, what guides lawyers is neither the law nor the client's best interests, but unstated, hidden or occult agendas, unwritten or unstated policies having the force and effective of law.

And these hidden or occult agendas are not even well-meaning policies masquerading at law. Rather, these agendas often result, in grim reality, from local cabals or clubs of attorneys and judges who decide who should get how much money and when, or whose clients have enough money or influence to get an unfair, unjust, and legally unwarranted outcome in a particular case.

The task of many lawyers, in short, throughout America, is to explain why, in court, the sky, rather than being light blue with white or dark blue clouds, always seems filled with yellowish-purple haze and kaleidoscope clouds. Often well-educated clients will come in having read the law or even court decisions or commentaries and ask why the written law should not protect them (especially the constitution). The job of a modern American lawyer (and of many Australian, British, Canadian, Danish, Estonian, French and German lawyers as well), then, is often to explain away the written law, and then to warn that judges and law enforcement often regard those who demand enforcement of their constitutional rights as "terrorists."

We have formed the FCVFC LSLRS to try to counter these tendencies. We don't advocate a world without lawyers or say that you can always do without a lawyer in every case. We are, by education and professional training, sociologists, psychoanalysts, and anthropologists (as well as lawyers) who believe in "The Division of Labor in Society". Rather than replace or eradicate lawyers, we seek to educate and so to liberate people from dependency, and especially to empower people to use their own minds in defense of their own values.

We seek to give people, especially but not limited to parents in high-conflict divorce or child custody situations, the tools to represent themselves WHENEVER NECESSARY, and by "whenever necessary" we mean, whenever "normal" or "ordinary" lawyers are afraid to address certain issues or where these "officers of the court" feel that they cannot challenge a Court's injustice.

The head of our new LSLRS Division has a Ph.D. in Anthropology from Harvard and a J.D. from the University of Chicago. He clerked for two Federal Judges and has passed the bar exam and been admitted to the bars of multiple jurisdictions, from the east coast to the west coast. He will not be appearing as an attorney in your case, however, or in anyone else's case. In certain circumstances, he may even work with your current (or future) lawyer.

What the LSLRS of the FCVCF aims to do is to provide YOU with the tools to analyze what's REALLY in the "Best Interests of the Child" or in your best interests whatever your case may be (and in the real world we don't actually limit ourselves to advising or strategizing just in custody, domestic relations, or family cases at all).

We will educate you to read and understand the law, the rules of court, and your rights under them. We WILL teach you the protocols of evaluating, framing, and presenting your evidence. We WILL teach you the important differences between "fact" and "law"---presentation of evidence on the one hand and argument by factual or legal inference on the other. We may do some research and writing for you, but we will always share our research with you, and you will be the final editor and the final arbiter of every word you show to any opposing counsel, judge, jury, or court appointed specialist or investigator, or even law enforcement.

You will learn how to represent yourself---because no lawyer can ever know the true facts of your case better than you do, so long as you're capable of being honest with yourself. And if you absolutely have to have a lawyer, you will become one of the "top 1%" of the most sophisticated and best educated consumers of legal services.

We will have "moot court" sessions with you using the facts and law applicable to your case or cases. We will examine and cross-examine you so that you can learn how to be your own best witness, how to examine and cross-examine other witnesses, and we will teach you how to summarize and present an argument or two or three. We will go over court procedures with you at all levels, and help you comply with all valid rules and procedural norms. We will also teach you how to identify and challenge that which is INVALID and VOID---and to us, there are NO SACRED TEXTS---everything is subject to challenge. But we will also help you pick your fights, because not every challenge that could be made is going to be winnable.

The Curse of Judicial Immunity—and its Derivatives

Just as to us there are no sacred texts, neither are their any sacred persons or positions. A Judge (in the Anglo-American system, anyhow) is (or ought to be) a lawyer appointed, elected, or somehow hired or employed to act and serve as a referee among two or more conflicting parties. (Note: judges in the European Continental & Japanese Civil Law System, which has a few outposts even in North America, such as Louisiana and Quebec, plus all of Mexico and Latin America, function simultaneously as fact-finding investigators, surrogate prosecutors, as well as "referees" between opponents).

American Judges have acquired, quite wrongfully and unjustly, the mantle of "Kings with Divine Rights", except that their "divine right" is called "absolute immunity." There is absolutely NO basis for the absolute immunity of judges either in the U.S. Constitution or traditional English law and legal history (as the Supreme Court of the United States outlined carefully in a 1984 opinion, ***Pulliam v. Allen***, which arose out of the unwritten customs, practices, and policies having the force or effect of law imposed by certain traffic courts in Virginia).

But even worse that Judicial Immunity itself is the extension of such immunity to certain "experts" appointed by the court, to prosecutors in criminal and government sanction cases, and lawyers. There are probate court investigators who act as "eyes and ears" of probate judges in guardianship and elder-conservatorship cases. There are "guardians ad litem" and "attorneys ad litem" appointed by judges to investigate families and homes in child custody cases. There are court-appointed psychologists and psychiatrists who evaluate parties in every kind of case. In many states, New York for example, these "experts" are cloaked in something very close to the same illegitimate "absolute immunity" as judges.

We in the LSLRS at FCVFC are absolutely and irrevocably dedicated to abrogating or limiting judicial, prosecutorial, and quasi-judicial immunity of every kind. The ONLY kind of immunity authorized by the Constitution of the United States is legislative immunity, and this is true of almost every state constitution we have studied anywhere in the USA. Judicial, prosecutorial, and quasi-judicial immunity are incompatible with civil rights and constitutional government, and must be abolished. (And no wonder some judges and attorneys consider us to be "terrorists!")