

SILENCE AS A WEAPON AND A DEFENSE IN LEGAL DISCOVERY

Last revised: 10/31/2008



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
LIST OF TABLES	3
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	3
1 Scope	7
2 Requirement for the Miranda Warning: “You have a right to remain silent. . .”	7
3 First Amendment Response to Questions	8
3.1 The right to NOT speak	8
3.2 The right to remain silent about the author of materials that are in controversy	9
3.3 The right to WITHHOLD membership lists or membership information of groups you or others belong to	9
3.3.1 Bates v. Little Rock, 361 U.S. 516 (1960)	10
3.3.2 NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958)	10
4 Fifth Amendment Response to Questions	11
4.1 Fifth Amendment Generally	11
4.2 Only natural persons may invoke it: Artificial entities may not	13
4.3 Criminal Proceedings	14
4.3.1 Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 (1976)	14
4.3.2 Mid-America’s Process Service and Lynn Whitefield v. Ellison, 767 F.2d. 684 (10 th Cir. 1985)	14
4.4 Civil Proceedings	15
4.4.1 Minnesota v. Murphy, 465 U.S. 420 (1984)	15
4.4.2 Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 (1976)	16
4.4.3 Wehling v. Columbia Broadcasting System, 608 F.2d. 1084 (5th Cir. 12/28/1979)	17
4.4.4 Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258 (9th Cir. 11/17/2000)	18
5 Remedy for Silence: Witness Immunity	19
6 Silence by Fiduciaries: Constructive fraud and estoppel	20
6.1 Fiduciary duty	20
6.2 Public officers and attorneys as fiduciaries	22
6.3 Affect of silence by fiduciaries constitutes an estoppel	25
6.4 Suits instituted by “public officers”: Silence is an estoppel against both government attorneys AND judges	28
7 Silence as consent or agreement	28
7.1 Implied consent	28
7.2 “Laches” and “Tacit Procuration”	31
7.3 Procuring constructive consent or agreement through silence	34
7.4 Unrebutted Affidavits in Court Constitute Admissions: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6)	35
7.5 State versions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6)	37
8 Oaths: You DON’T Have to Take Them!	38
9 Rebutted Objections to the Content of this Document	41
10 Resources for Further Study and Rebuttal	43
11 Questions that Readers, Grand Jurors, and Petit Jurors Should be Asking the Government	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: State equivalents of Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(b)(6).....	37
Table 2: Summary of Cases.....	42
Table 3: Resources for further study and rebuttal	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

Article 1, Section 10.....	22, 41
Article III.....	28
Article IV	28
Constitution of the United States.....	50
Fourteenth Amendment.....	10, 11, 14, 39
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1	31
Seventh Amendment	40

Statutes

1 Stat. 23-24	23
18 U.S.C. §201(a)(1).....	8
18 U.S.C. §2514	19
18 U.S.C. §4.....	31, 32
18 U.S.C. §6002	19
26 U.S.C. §1461	49
26 U.S.C. §7203	49
26 U.S.C. §7343	49
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).....	40
28 U.S.C. §1652	40
28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A).....	14
42 U.S.C. §1981	31
Cal.Civ.Code §1589	33
California Business and Prof. Code, Section 17510.8.....	22
California Business and Prof. Code, Section 6086.8.....	20
California Family Code, Section 6086.8	21
I.R.C. Subtitle A.....	9
Internal Revenue Code	50
UCC 1-303	29
UCC 1-308	35

Rules

Fed.R.Civ.P. 17(b).....	40
Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(1).....	15, 17
Fed.R.Crim.P. 26(b)(5).....	19
Fed.Rul.Civ.Proc. 8(b)(6).....	31, 32
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	35, 40, 43, 47, 48
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 29.....	40
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 8(b)(6)	35
Federal Rule of Civil Procedures 8(b)(6)	37
N.Y. Crim.Proc. Law §50.10.....	19

Cases

103 S.Ct. 608.....	19
406 U.S. 441.....	19
406 U.S. 472.....	19
Abood v. Detroit Bd. Of Educ., 431 U.S. 209 (1977).....	8, 44
Agoranos v. United States, 5 Cir., 1969, 409 F.2d. 833.....	8
American Communications Assn. v. Douds, 339 U.S. 382, 402.....	10
American Nat'l Ins. Co., etc. v. Murray, 383 F.2d. 81 (5th Cir. 1967).....	25
Atilus v. United States, 406 F.2d. 694, 698 (5th Cir. 1969).....	25
Avery v. Cleary, 132 U.S. 604, 10 S.Ct. 220, 33 L. Ed. 469 (1890).....	25
Bates v. Little Rock, 361 U.S. 516 (1960).....	10
Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 (1976).....	13, 14, 17, 18, 37, 45
Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308, 316 (1976).....	15
Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308, 316-20, 47 L.Ed.2d. 810, 96 S.Ct. 1551 (1976).....	14
Bente v. Bugbee, 137 A. 552, 103 N.J. Law. 608 (1927).....	49
Bothke v. Terry, 713 F.2d. 1405, at 1414 (1983).....	49
Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, at 749, 90 S.Ct. 1463 at 1469 (1970).....	45
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 1245, 16 L.Ed.2d. 314 (1966).....	45
Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478 (1978).....	43
Campbell v. Gerrans, 592 F.2d. 1054, 1058 (9th Cir. 1979).....	18
Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296, 303.....	10
Carmine v. Bowen, 64 A. 932 (1906).....	27
Chiarella v. United States, 445 U.S. 222 (1980).....	26
Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452.....	22, 48
Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181.....	22, 48
Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).....	14
Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958).....	43
Cox v. New Hampshire, 312 U.S. 569, 574.....	10
Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Tech. Assocs., Inc. 557 F.2d. 1280 (9th Cir. 1977).....	35
De Jonge v. Oregon, 299 U.S. 353, 364.....	10
Delo v. Lashley, 507 U.S. 272 (1993).....	14
Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258 (9th Cir. 11/17/2000).....	19, 45
Dunkin ' Donuts, Inc., v. Taseski, 47 F.Supp.2d. 867, 873-74 n.3 (E.D. Mich. 1999).....	41, 42
Electro Med. Sys., S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc., 34 F.3d. 1048, 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	19
Erie R.R. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	40
Estate of Hemingway v. Random House, Inc., 23 N.Y.2d. 341, 348, 296 N.Y.S.2d. 771, 776, 244 N.E.2d. 250, 255 (1968).....	8
Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976).....	14
Garner v. United States, 424 U.S. 648, 654 (1976).....	16
Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524.....	22, 48
Gitlow v. New York, 268 U.S. 652, 666.....	10
Griffin v. California, 380 U.S. 609, 85 S.Ct. 1229, 14 L.Ed.2d. 106.....	15
Grosjean v. American Press Co., 297 U.S. 233.....	10
Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47 (1905).....	12, 13
Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises, 471 U.S. 539, 559, 105 S.Ct. 2218, 85 L.Ed.2d. 588 (1985).....	8
Higley v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 69 F.2d. 160 (1934).....	49
Hoffman v. United States, 341 U.S. 479,486 (1951).....	12
In re Folding Carton Antitrust Litigation, 609 F.2d. 867,872-73 (7th Cir. 1979).....	12
Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App) 656 N.E.2d. 1172.....	22, 49
Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11.....	10
Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.....	22, 48
Jones v. B. C. Christopher & Co., 466 F.Supp. 213, 227 (D.Kan.1979).....	18
Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441, 444 (1972).....	18
Kisting v. Westchester Fire Ins. Co., 290 F.Supp. 141 (W.D.Wis.1968).....	15, 17, 28
Kovacs v. Cooper, 336 U.S. 77.....	10
LaSalle Bank Lake View v. Seguban, 54 F.3d. 387, 391 (7th Cir. 1995).....	15, 18, 45

LaSalle Bank, 54 F.3d. at 391	15
Lefkowitz v. Cunningham, 431 U.S. 801, 807-09 (1977)	19
Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70, 77 (1973)	15, 18
Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1, 12 LEd 581 (1849)	25
Lyons v. Johnson, 415 F.2d. 540 (9th Cir. 1969)	15, 17, 28
Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist) 161 Ill App 3d 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697	22, 48
Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1, 11 (1964)	15
Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1, 84 S.Ct. 1489, 12 L.Ed.2d. 653 (1964).....	17
Marcus v. United States, 422 F.2d. 752 (5th Cir. 1970).....	7
McNally v. United States, 483 U.S. 350 (1987).....	20
Mid-America 's Process Service v. Ellison, 767 F.2d. 684,686 (10th Cir. 1985).....	41, 42
Mid-America's Process Service and Lynn Whitefield v. Ellison, 767 F.2d. 684 (10th Cir. 1985)	15
Minnesota v. Murphy, 465 U.S. 420 (1984).....	16
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).....	7, 41
Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105	10, 11
N. A. A. C. P. v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449	9, 10
N. A. A. C. P. v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449, 460	10
N. A. A. C. P. v. Alabama, 357 U.S., at 462	10
N. A. A. C. P. v. Alabama, 357 U.S., at 463	10
National Life Ins. Co. v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co., 615 F.2d. 595, 598-99 (3rd Cir. 1980)	12
Nat'l Acceptance Co. v. Bathalter, 705 F.2d. 924, 930 (7th Cir. 1983).....	15
Near v. Minnesota, 283 U.S. 697	10
New York Times Co. v. United States, 403 U.S. 713 (1970).....	9
Old Wayne Mut. Life Ass'n v. McDonough, 204 U.S. 8 (1907)	37
Padelford, Fay & Co. v. Mayor and Aldermen of City of Savannah, 14 Ga. 438, 1854 WL 1492 (Ga. 1854.).....	31
Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319, 324.....	10
Peiffer v. Lebanon Sch. Dist., 848 F.2d. 44, 46 (3d Cir. 1988).....	15, 18, 45
Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 5 S.Ct. 903 (1885).....	33
Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158.....	10
Proprietors of Charles River Bridge v. Proprietors of Warren Bridge, 36 U.S. 420 (1837).....	14
right to silence, a due process right to a judicial determination of his civil action.	17
Roberts v. United States, 445 U.S. 552, 559 (1980).....	16
Rogers v. United States, 340 U.S. 367, 370 -371 (1951)	16
Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62 (1990).....	13
Schneider v. State, 308 U.S. 147	10
SEC v. Colello, 139 F.3d. 674, 677 (9th Cir. 1998)	15, 18
SEC v. First Financial Group of Texas, 659 F.2d. 660,669 (5th Cir. 1981).....	12
SEC v. Graystone Nash, Inc., 25 F.3d. 187, 190 (3d Cir. 1994)	19
SEC v. Thomas, 116 F.R.D. 230,234 & n.7 (D. Utah 1987).....	12
SEC v. Thomas, 116 F.R.D. 230,234-35 (D. Utah 1987).....	41
SEC v. Zanfold, 535 U.S. 813 (2002)	26
Serafino v. Hasbro, Inc., 82 F.3d. 515, 518 (1st Cir. 1996).....	19
Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377, 394, 88 S.Ct. 967, 19 L.Ed.2d. 1247 (1968).....	17
Spevack v. Klein, 385 U.S. 511, 515, 87 S.Ct. 625, 628, 17 L.Ed.2d. 574 (1967).....	18
State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321	22, 48
Staub v. City of Baxley, 355 U.S. 313, 321	10
Talco Contractors, 153 F.R.D. at 508-09	41
Talley v. California, 362 U.S. 60 (1960)	9
Taylor v. Kentucky, 436 U.S. 478 (1978)	14
Thomas v. Collins, 323 U.S. 516, 530.....	10
Thomas, 116 F.R.D. at 234 & n.7	12
Trammel v. United States, 445 U.S. 40, 47 (1980)	19, 45
Turley, 414 U.S. at 83-85	19
U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021 (5th Cir. 1970).....	25, 26
U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F.2d. 297 (5th Cir. 1977).....	27
U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F.2d. 297, 299 (5th Cir. 1977)	25, 48
Ullmann v. United States, 350 U.S. 422, 426-427 (1956).....	11

United Liquor Co. v. Gard (In re Seper), 705 F.2d. 1499, 1501 (9th Cir. 1983).....	18
United States ex rel. Vajtauer v. Commissioner of Immigration, 273 U.S. 103, 112 -113 (1927).....	16
United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass) 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed Rules Evid Serv 1223.....	22, 48
United States v. Bryan, 339 U.S. 323, 331 (1950).....	44
United States v. Harriss, 347 U.S. 612, 625 -626.....	11
United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill) 816 F.2d. 304.....	22, 48
United States v. Kordel, 397 U.S. 1, 13, 25 L.Ed.2d. 1, 90 S.Ct. 763 (1970).....	15
United States v. Kordel, 397 U.S. 1, 7 -10 (1970).....	16
United States v. Mandujano, 425 U.S. 564, 574 -575 (1976).....	16
United States v. Monia, 317 U.S. 424, 427 (1943).....	16
United States v. Rumely, 345 U.S. 41, 46 -47.....	11
United States v. Sclafani, 265 F.2d. 408 (2d Cir.), cert. den., 360 U.S. 918, 79 S.Ct. 1436, 3 L.Ed.2d. 1534 (1959).....	25
United States v. Solano-Godines, 120 F.3d. 957, 962 (9th Cir. 1997).....	18
United States v. Talco Contractors, 153 F.R.D. 501,507 (W.D.N.Y. 1994).....	20
Wehling v. Columbia Broadcasting System, 608 F.2d. 1084 (5th Cir. 12/28/1979).....	15, 18, 28
Wooley v. Maynard, 430 U.S. 705 (1977).....	8, 44

Other Authorities

1 Peter 2:15-17.....	43
27 Am.Jur.2d, Equity, §153: Parties Chargeable With Laches.....	32
27 Am.Jur.2d, Equity, §154.....	33
63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247.....	20, 22, 49
7 Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Attorney and Client, §4.....	24
8 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 2018 (1970).....	17
American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §27: Definitions and Nature.....	27, 46
American Jurisprudence 2d, Estoppel and Waiver, §28: Basis, function, and purpose.....	27, 46
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, pp. 1086-1087.....	29
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, pp. 1183-1185.....	29
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, pp. 276-277.....	29
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1017.....	32
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1372.....	33
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1480.....	34
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1593.....	29
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 164.....	24
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1684.....	25
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 625.....	20
Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856.....	29, 37
Case No. 05cv0921, Judge Nita Stormes, Docket #41.....	41
Executive Order 12731.....	24
Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002.....	35
First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition.....	8
First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, pp. 266-267, Jerome A Barron, West Group, 2000; ISBN 0-314-22677-X.....	8, 44
Internal Revenue Manual.....	50
Matt. 5:33-37.....	38
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003.....	31
Restatement 2d, Agency § 388.....	34
Restatement 2d, Agency § 403.....	34
Rutter Group, Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, 2005, pp. 8C-1 to 8C-2.....	39
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001.....	9
The Law of Nations, Vattel, Book 1, Section 199.....	31
What Happened to Justice: Why you Can’t Get Justice in Federal Court and What to Do About It.....	28
Wright & Miller, 8 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ.2d 5 2018.....	12

1 "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men."
2 [Abraham Lincoln]

3 **1 Scope**

4 There are many occasions in your administrative dealings with the government, the legal profession, and during legal
5 discovery where a knowledge of the following may be very helpful to you:

- 6 1. Knowing how to use your Constitutional rights in order to avoid giving a response that will advantage your opponent.
- 7 2. Knowing the legal implications of a response of silence from the other party.
- 8 3. Knowing when to be silent and what to be silent about in order to protect your rights.

9 This paper will carefully analyze this most important subject so that you can use silence either on your part or on your
10 opponent's part in order to improve your chances of winning in a legal forum.

11 **2 Requirement for the Miranda Warning: "You have a right to remain silent. . ."**

12 The seminal case on the right to remain silent when in the custody of the police is *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436
13 (1966). When police take you into custody, they must give you the "Miranda Warning" before they are allowed to
14 interrogate you. If they forget to administer the warning, then any evidence they gather during interrogation of the prisoner
15 is not admissible in court.

16 In the context of civil proceedings, such as IRS audits and examinations, IRS revenue agents are not required to give you a
17 Miranda Warning. This was discussed at length in the case of *U.S. v. Prudden*, 424 F.2d. 1021 (5th Cir. 1970), in which the
18 court said:

19 *We cannot agree that every administrative official who confronts a citizen with a request for information that*
20 *might disclose criminal conduct, thereby exerts a compulsion on the citizen that must be dispelled by the*
21 *Miranda placebo. In today's vast and complex network of widespread daily administrative contacts between*
22 *citizens and government officials, such a holding would open a veritable Pandora's box. When a census taker*
23 *returns to recheck information he has received or a building inspector comes to investigate a report of*
24 *noncompliance with provisions of the city housing code or a game warden who hears shooting out-of-season*
25 *stops a man he finds in the woods or a bank examiner questions a teller whose figures are out of balance, would*
26 *each then have to give the Miranda warnings? In each case a governmental official is confronting a citizen and*
27 *criminal charges may result. There are a thousand and one administrative inquiries routinely made every day*
28 *in every city which could evoke responses that might form a part of the basis in proof for a charge of perjury,*
29 *falsification of records, failure to file a report or perform a legal duty or other criminal conduct. Most of*
30 *these routine administrative confrontations would be rendered ineffective to the citizen and his government*
31 *by imposing Miranda requirements. Indeed, if the warning became too commonplace, the very purpose of its*
32 *requirement could be undermined. If "authority" were allowed to supplant custody -- the deprivation of freedom*
33 *-- as the determinant We cannot agree that every administrative official who confronts a citizen with a request*
34 *for information that might disclose criminal conduct, thereby exerts a compulsion on the citizen that must be*
35 *dispelled by the Miranda placebo. In today's vast and complex network of widespread daily administrative*
36 *contacts between citizens and government officials, such a holding would open a veritable Pandora's box.*
37 *When a census taker returns to recheck information he has received or a building inspector comes to*
38 *investigate a report of noncompliance with provisions of the city housing code or a game warden who hears*
39 *shooting out-of-season stops a man he finds in the woods or a bank examiner questions a teller whose figures*
40 *are out of balance, would each then have to give the Miranda warnings? In each case a governmental official is*
41 *confronting a citizen and criminal charges may result. There are a thousand and one administrative inquiries*
42 *routinely made every day in every city which could evoke responses that might form a part of the basis in proof*
43 *for a charge of perjury, falsification of records, failure to file a report or perform a legal duty or other criminal*
44 *conduct. Most of these routine administrative confrontations would be rendered ineffective to the citizen and his*
45 *government by imposing Miranda requirements. Indeed, if the warning became too commonplace, the very*
46 *purpose of its requirement could be undermined. If "authority" were allowed to supplant custody -- the*
47 *deprivation of freedom -- as the determinant.*

48 [. . .]

49 *Marcus v. United States*, 422 F.2d. 752 (5th Cir. 1970) is our latest decision which discusses this question.
50 *Marcus* was convicted for failing to file individual tax returns. One ground of his appeal was that he had not
51 been given Miranda warnings nor expressly told of the criminal nature of the investigation by special agents of
52 the Internal Revenue Service until after he had supplied records and made damaging admissions.*fn16 *Marcus*

1 contended, as Prudden now does, that *Miranda* applied to noncustodial tax fraud investigations. We rejected
2 this contention with the statement: "In a criminal tax fraud case, this Court has recently held that the
3 *Miranda* doctrine applies only to in-custody interrogation. *Agoranos v. United States*, 5 Cir., 1969, 409 F.2d,
4 833. Since [the taxpayer] was at no time in custody during the Internal Revenue Service investigation, the
5 contention is without merit."*fn17
6 [*U.S. v. Prudden*, 424 F.2d. 1021 (5th Cir. 1970)]

7 **3 First Amendment Response to Questions**

8 The First Amendment is the most powerful and yet most often overlooked tool of all to lawfully avoid disclosure of
9 information in legal discovery. The following subsections will describe how to invoke this right as a shield from legal
10 discovery.

11 **3.1 The right to NOT speak**

12 Very few people, in our experience, are aware that the First Amendment gives us a right to *refrain* from speaking or to
13 NOT speak, and that this right may be invoked to avoid speaking about any subject within the confines of legal discovery.
14 The best and least risky response to a question that you don't want to answer is to state the following:

15 "First Amendment. I have a right to NOT speak to the government or the state, and compelling me to do so
16 represents a form of compelled association."

17 Of the right to refrain from speaking, the book *First Amendment Law in a Nutshell*, Second Edition states the following:

18 *Just as there is freedom to speak, to associate, and to believe, so there is freedom not to speak, associate, or*
19 *believe.*

20 "The right to speak and the right to refrain from speaking are complementary components of the
21 broader concept of 'individual freedom of mind.'" *Wooley v. Maynard* [430 U.S. 705] (1977).

22 *Freedom of conscience dictates that no individual be forced to espouse ideological causes with which he*
23 *disagrees:*

24 "[A]t the heart of the First Amendment is the notion that the individual should be free to believe as
25 he will, and that in a free society one's beliefs should be shaped by his mind and by his conscience,
26 rather than coerced by the State." *Abood v. Detroit Bd. Of Educ.* [431 U.S. 209] (1977)

27 [*First Amendment Law in a Nutshell*, Second Edition, pp. 266-267, Jerome A Barron, West Group, 2000; ISBN
28 0-314-22677-X]

29 Of the right to refrain from speaking, the U.S. Supreme Court has said:

30 *Moreover, freedom of thought and expression "includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain*
31 *from speaking at all." *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705, 714, 97 S.Ct. 1428, 1435, 51 L.Ed.2d. 752 (1977)*
32 *(BURGER, C.J.). We do not suggest this right not to speak would sanction abuse of the copyright owner's*
33 *monopoly as an instrument to suppress facts. But in the words of New York's Chief Judge Fuld:*

34 "The essential thrust of the First Amendment is to prohibit improper restraints on the voluntary public
35 expression of ideas; it shields the man who wants to speak or publish when others wish him to be quiet. There is
36 necessarily, and within suitably defined areas, a concomitant freedom not to speak publicly, one which serves
37 the same ultimate end as freedom of speech in its affirmative aspect." *Estate of Hemingway v. Random House,*
38 *Inc.*, 23 N.Y.2d. 341, 348, 296 N.Y.S.2d. 771, 776, 244 N.E.2d. 250, 255 (1968).
39 [*Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises*, 471 U.S. 539, 559, 105 S.Ct. 2218, 85 L.Ed.2d. 588
40 (1985)]

41 Mention in the above holding about the right to avoid "public expression" is highly relevant to a court proceeding because:

- 42 1. All the jurists are "public officers". See [18 U.S.C. §201\(a\)\(1\)](#).
- 43 2. The judge is a "public officer" who works for the government.
- 44 3. The attorneys are "officer of the court" and the court itself is a "public office". See:
45 <http://fanguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/Corruption/WhyYouDontWantAnAtty/WhyYouDon'tWantAnAttorney.htm>
- 46 4. All the records of the proceeding are "public records".