



“REFLECTION – UPON THE RULE OF LAW”

By: David L. Cleary, Esquire

THE INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF TRIAL LAWYERS
DEAN'S ADDRESS

MARCH 30, 2012
PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

“REFLECTION-UPON THE RULE OF LAW”

PREPARED AND DELIVERED
BY DAVID L. CLEARY, ESQUIRE
ON MARCH 30, 2012 AT
THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF TRIAL LAWYERS

Madam President, Honored Fellows of the Academy, especially our new Fellows, Honored Judicial Members, Judge John Cherundolo and Judge Mary Katherine Rochford, spouses, guest speakers, friends, my lovely and devoted wife, Valerie, and special guests, my son, Sean Michael, a plaintiff's lawyer in Miami, and lo and behold, a surprise visitor who just flew in this morning, my daughter, Megan Lynn Tapply, who is an attorney defending Mass General Hospital in Boston, Massachusetts. As has every Dean before me, I must start by telling you how honored and indeed, challenged I am to be speaking to you today as your Dean. It was a great surprise when then-President Searcy asked me if I would accept the nomination of the Nominating Committee to be the Dean of the Academy. He did point out that there were two or three other choices, so I best decide quickly! I asked how the Nominating Committee had come to the decision I should be Dean, and with a very puzzled look, he candidly stated, "well, it was kind of an experiment!"

Our organization was first chartered in 1954. The goals of the Academy, and therefore your goals as members of this august body, are: (1) to cultivate the science of jurisprudence; (2) to promote reforms in the law; (3) to facilitate the administration of justice; (4) to elevate the standards of integrity, honor and courtesy within the legal profession, and (5) to cherish the spirit of brotherhood among its members.

There is, even the newly-inducted Fellows will attest, a tremendous spirit of brotherhood and camaraderie that permeates our Academy and its many functions. There are certainly other spirits of the brotherhood, such as we will have at the noon reception that are also highly cherished! I suggested Bloody Marys and Mimosas for breakfast in an attempt to induce receptivity, but I was out-voted. Indeed, it was suggested it might have the opposite effect, and I do notice that all of those blue water glasses are capable of being thrown!

The Bylaws provide that the Dean is required to give the annual address to the Academy, and the subjects are really limited to topics relevant to the rule of law and trial advocacy.

So, as every other Dean has wrestled with the issue, I too wrestled with trying to figure out what I would say, how I would say it, had it been said before, where can I get some advice on this, etc., etc. The brightest of the pundits said, “Just give it your best shot, but remember, the reception starts at 11:30.” I decided fairly recently that the title of it ought to be “Reflections,” not simply because as one ages, reflection may occur more frequently, but also because when you think about a reflection, it’s really an image that’s bounced off the subject in such a way that it can be seen from a different angle or perhaps from a new perspective.

Just as going to church, or temple, or mosque does not make you a Christian, a Jew or a Muslim (anymore than going into a garage makes you a mechanic) just going to court does not make you an advocate, let alone a successful advocate. Reflect this morning as I speak with you, who you really are. You are indeed the choicest and the most select of our profession, and as such, you have the highest obligation to achieve the goals of your Academy.

You have weathered an exhaustive review process, and before you could be admitted to fellowship in this Academy, it had to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Admissions Committee and to the entire Board of Directors, that you possessed not only superior skill and recognized ability in trial and appellate practice, but that you also had rendered service in promoting the best interests of the profession and the highest standards and techniques of advocacy, and that you are indeed of excellent character and absolute integrity.

Those being the standards, I am sure that there are many of us who have wondered, as we were notified of our invitation to fellowship in the Academy, how on earth it happened. It is a truly humbling experience. The easy answer is that despite the deep research, thinking and consideration of all involved, sometimes they never get all the facts. At least in my case, they must not have!

As we look back over the 58 years of our existence, there were only two years in which a Dean's address was not given: 1957, and why it was not given then still remains a mystery; and 1979, which was unfortunately due to the untimely death of the elected Dean. I can tell you the stress of waiting to give this talk is enough to give a guy a heart attack! I think the Academy has done very, very well to have been able to archive all of the Dean's addresses from 1967 on, so out of the 56 times a Dean's address has been given, we currently have 44 of them archived. It took 10 months just to read all of them, and in the end I'm left with the unbelievable challenge of trying to think of something new to say or something old to put in new clothing or to be delivered with a new reflection.

The subjects have been far-ranging, and each is memorable and impressive in its own right. The Deans' addresses have particularly focused very poignantly on issues such as our role and obligation to cooperate in achieving world peace (Lee Kriendler, March 1973); on our obligation as the select of the profession to live up to our pivotal role as players in society and our democracy, and its influence abroad (Walter Chuck, 1995). In the spring of 1996, Bob Josefsberg, as Dean, stressed that given all of the talent of the members of our organization and all of the power it represented, if we failed to act as we should, then we must bear the responsibility for the potential destruction of such a noble profession. He stressed that we are, indeed we must be, the custodians of the community's legal and ethical sense. He spoke to the whole issue of civility among advocates.

In 2004, Dicky Grigg, for all his humor in his *Minkey* address and his speedy cheetah in the back of a pick-up truck, focused on the best of our democracy, and pointed out that it's not our military might nor economic prowess, but rather it is our legal system and its relation to upholding the rule of law.

We are all aware that our democracy has not always truly upheld the rule of law, and just by way of a few examples, look to our treatment of Native Americans, African Americans, the women in our society how long before the vote; Japanese and German Americans in World War II, and of course, most recently, issues raised by our reaction and approach to the safe-guarding of our liberties in the aftermath of 9/11.

Dicky also, I think, pointed out something very important, and that is the opportunity for personal enrichment through participation in the Academy and its activities.

Recently, our President, Bobbie Pichini, shared with us personal examples of how our rule of law and our democracy work and how it is viewed by others, such as delegates from China learning about the rule of law within our China Program. Incoming President Herman Russomano spoke about our solemn oath to make democracy work. Michael Stitt spoke of the problems in Northern Ireland, the so-called "troubles" as they are known, and their relationship to the absence of the rule of law.

And then, of course, we all recall the stirring Dean's address given by Dennis Suplee and Pat McGroder - the only two Presidents in history who did not have to go through this and give their own address. Actually, I think Dennis did give one in the bar of the hotel the year he ascended, but I have forgotten if it was after lunch or

possibly after dinner!

Deans have spoken to crises in our system of justice, erosion of the rule of law, the role of human dignity and constitutional protection, and the pursuit of excellence and the role of advocacy.

So, where do we go from there? How do we get out of the past and into current reflections on the rule of law? Whatever I do, I will try to do it quickly. It would be nice to be sure that you are still here when I finish!

I thought perhaps a good place to start would be with our own Academy emblem or logo, and its surrounding inscription, "*Salus Populi Suprema Lex Esto.*" What does it mean? Where did it come from? How does it apply to and fit within the overall concept of the rule of law and our obligations as advocates within that system of law?

The translation is fairly simple. It means the welfare of the people must be the highest law. It comes from a monumental work of one of the early world's finest orators and statesmen, Marcus Tullius Cicero, certainly a firm believer in the rule of law. He was born near Rome at Arpinum in 106 BC, and married very well (as have all of us), which gave him the essential time that he needed to write all of these commentaries and dialogues. And imagine, he was writing them in Latin! He started this work which is entitled, *De Legibus* around 58 BC when he was about 48 years of age. He actually stole the title from Plato's famous dialogue about law, but of course Plato, being who he was, wrote it in Greek. Cicero worked on this commentary for some years before he finished it. I think over half of the original volumes have never been found, but this particular quote obviously comes from a volume that was discovered.

De Legibus is actually a fictionalized account of a dialogue between Cicero and his brother Quintas, and a mutual friend by the name of Titus Atticus. It turns out that Titus Atticus has current relatives in the Texas Bar Association; one I think is a third cousin, twice removed, Broadius Spivius, and another much more distant relative, Josephus Jamailus.

Cicero firmly believed that there was a natural law basis for the entire legal construct. For Cicero, and indeed for other commentators on the law since, including the likes of St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and other Medieval and later philosophers (even some of our own Founding Fathers), natural law was the perfect construct, since it was viewed as universal and unalienable, and not something that was bestowed or capable of being bestowed by government. It could not really be dependent upon the laws, the customs or beliefs of any particular culture or government, or state for that matter. Therefore, it was the perfect so-called natural underpinning upon which law and the rule of law could develop. Think back to some of our key documents in our American democracy, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Gettysburg Address, “we hold these truths to be self-evident,” etc. Cicero waxed long and eloquently on how and why laws should be principally based upon this natural law construct. He believed that the development of law from that basis would not only arise from, but would support the natural harmony among all classes of people (except, of course, slaves)!

You may be asking yourselves how does this hick lawyer from the tiny state of Vermont know something, anything, about Cicero? Well, before I decided the study of law might be something worth pursuing, I was actually studying four years or so to be a priest. Notice I said “studying to be!”

Ours is not the only nor the earliest association to employ Cicero's quote. In our hemisphere at least, it seems to appear first around 1822 as the motto of the state of Missouri. While it is on their state seal, their legislature has never formally approved it. It appears on the crest or coat of arms of Duquesne University School of Law, and indeed, we have Professor Ken Gormley, who is the Dean and a professor at Duquesne University School of Law, as an honored guest speaking to us at this meeting.

Perhaps the most important place that it appears is on the coat of arms of the International Court of Justice at The Hague. There it is carved in stone and is quite impressive. As you know, the roots of that court are in World War I and its aftermath.

In his work *De Legibus*, from whence our motto is borrowed, Cicero is dealing with what he perceives to be necessary reforms to the then-existing Roman constitution. Bear in mind that this was one of the early forms of democracy, or at least partial democracy. He was trying to renovate the constitution, not destroy it, and he firmly believed that true justice in law was the only secure foundation for a rational society. For his part, he saw the then-existent judicial system, particularly the so-called trial courts, as being too open to tampering, with bribery and sharp practices rampant.

The author of our motto firmly believed that the judicial system needed more popular involvement, like a jury system composed of the populace, but there would always be a selected or appointed magistrate to preside over the jury trials, when they were back in the hands of the people. He believed there should be special courts for penalties that were the most severe, such as death or exile. He felt that the senate should be the true legislative authority, since they were in his view, the quasi-aristocrats, who would then be able to balance

the populists or democratic assemblies, and perhaps respond to any unwanted tendencies of a jury system. Don't we see that happening in the legislatures in some of our states even today, i.e., their attempted correction of what they at least perceive as jury verdict excesses?

He proposed that there should be very tough penalties for legislators who were caught self-dealing or who misbehaved or had developed a "tarnished reputation." The same stern measures would apply to those guilty of over-acquisition or greed. He proposed censors be appointed who would have the power to remove these bad actors at will. I suppose we could use some of them today.

He hoped that a truly reformed senate would be the example for the rest of the Roman state and would blend common admirable interests and fair play and encourage harmony in the republic - quite similar to our current Senate! He believed that "a state takes its character from that of its foremost men, and if indeed they are appropriate, so then will the state become the same."

So where did all of this philosophizing about the law get Cicero? He certainly did not benefit in any way from the rule of law. He was murdered on his own Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 43 BC, at the ripe old age of 63 because he refused to throw in with Mark Anthony and the gang that was fomenting revolt and a division of authority in the Roman Republic after Caesar crossed the Rubicon and started the civil war. He was such a gifted speaker that part of his punishment was to have his tongue nailed to a door or a table, I forget which! So much for the rule of law as Cicero saw it.

So, as we continue to reflect, where then do we fit within the framework of the rule of law? We know all too well that our own fellow Americans and others around the world see commercialism as

the current dominant trend in the legal profession. They would argue that the concept of business success overshadows, or even sometimes replaces the ideals of professionalism within the law. Some of you may be aware of recent movements in Great Britain regarding the sale of law firms to outside non-law firm entities for investment purposes. Even now the debate continues at a rather rapid pace, not only within the law review literature, but principally there, dealing with issues of lawyers - professionalism/ethics in advocacy, and criticism of the role of the lawyer within the rule of law.¹ We will be reflecting much more on this a little later on.

But we lawyers are indeed the guardians of the sacred flame that illuminates the society and the democracy in which we live. We are called upon and sworn to devote our professional lives to the service of the law, which therefore inextricably links us to the rule of law. You, **we** are essential to achieving the true rule of law for the “*salus populi.*” Your special skills are essential to deal with the law’s subtleties and to help maintain the balance of power within the rule of law.

We lawyers need to reflect upon, understand and appreciate those institutions that are responsible for fulfilling the rule of law, and on the actual elements of the rule of law, so that we can support it and help ensure its continuance. The rule of law itself assumes a system of rights and responsibilities in the application of the law, and it is one of our foremost functions as advocates to preserve the inherent safeguards of the rule of law.

It is certainly a masterful plan of ideal accountability and true fairness in the protection and vindication of rights. It sets the expectations for our behavior as lawyers, and sets the standards for what we should

¹See the discussions between Professor David Luban of Georgetown University Law School, a law professor, ethicist, and world government and law commentator and Professor Norman Spaulding, the Sweitzer Professor of Law at Stanford University.

do in our role as advocates - for the *salus populi*.

It mandates that government must exercise its power (coming as it does from the very consent of the governed), in accord with well-established, clearly written and understood rules, regulations, and principles. There must necessarily be provision for resolution of grievances/disputes and charges, as expeditiously as is fair. There must be free and open hearings, “that justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done².”

It must be a system without judicial compromise and one with truly independent judicial review, where a full review and examination of judicial decisions takes place so that all can hopefully understand, again with the help of us lawyers/advocates, what the decision means within the rule of law, and how it affects the “*salus populi*.”

Guaranteed rights of appeal provide the opportunity for analysis and debate, challenging where necessary court decisions which lack impartiality or where it is evident that bias or prejudice has been permitted within the jury deliberative process.

It is the lawyer advocate who plays the key role in analyzing and challenging judicial decision making, and for that matter, judicial conduct. We are the vanguard of protection from any judicial tyranny or abuse. Our presence in the adjudicative process is by itself a clear inducement to better judicial performance. We cannot be afraid to exercise our responsibility and participate in these challenges wholeheartedly whenever the need arises.

²Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales, Gordon Hewart in the matter of Rex v. Sussex Justices. Lord Hewart was Chief Justice of England and Wales from 3/8/22 to 10/12/40. Lord Hewart is described in the Concise English Dictionary of National Biography as “a brilliant advocate; less successful as judge through tendency to forget he was no longer an advocate.”

The moral authority of law comes, of course, ultimately from the people themselves, and the law must be for the “*salus populi*,” the welfare of the people. It is for the populace within the framework of the rule of law to challenge laws that are unjust or unfair, either through their lawyer advocates, or by changing the lawmakers through free elections.

So what are the essential ingredients of the rule of law? They are popular sovereignty without anarchy, a detailed system of checks and balances along with a separation of powers, the role of limited government, and judicial fairness and guaranteed access to justice with lawyers. What we are really talking about here is accessibility, intelligibility and predictability regarding the law, and the avoidance of its inherent enemies: arbitrariness, injustice, prejudice, and secrecy.

Remove any of these cornerstones or key links such as an independent judiciary, access to lawyers, etc., and the ability to enjoy, let alone enforce the rule of law is severely impaired. While I won't directly delve into the issue of judicial independence today, I commend to your examination the updated commentary entitled *Without Fear or Favor in 2011: A New Decade of Challenges to Judicial Independence and Accountability*, published by the Defense Research Institute (DRI) 2011. It refocuses on significant issues that continue to threaten judicial independence and presents a great case-specific analysis of the issues. I urge you to read it. In fact, I would suggest in each of our states we should make copies of it available to our judiciary.

A nation's adoption and practice of the basic principles of the rule of law not only mark the parameters, but become the identifying marks of a true democracy. We have only to look to the recent past, what accompanied the fall of the Soviet Union and the rise of nationalism in middle Europe: Serbia, Croatia, and then on the African continent,

Uganda, Chad, the Sudan and other notorious African massacres, the recent Arab Spring, the continuing slaughter in Syria, and the absence of rule of law in other countries such as Iran, North Korea, etc., to see that the rule of law is certainly not practiced worldwide.

This Academy is a very unique organization, because of who you are and because it is truly an international organization. Recently, the Academy, through our President, with some fine drafting help from Joe Matthews and others, has written to the Minister for Justice Equality Defence of the Irish Republic, to the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers Office of the UN High Command for Human Rights, and to the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, to express our concerns that proposed so-called reforms of the legal system in the Irish Republic will endanger the independence of the judiciary and the legal profession, which is absolutely critical to a free society. The proposed law includes breath-taking controls over nearly every aspect of the legal profession.

The Academy pointed out very specific areas of the proposed legislation, including the role of the new Legal Services Regulatory Authority and its usurpation of the role of supervision of lawyers and their professional conduct. The core objection which our Academy voiced is based upon the simple principle that legal professionals must be independent from the government whose actions they must often challenge in order to ensure the rule of law and preserve human rights. The degree of governmental control over Legal Services Regulatory Authority as proposed in this legislation is fundamentally inconsistent with the independence of the legal profession. As our Academy's commentary pointed out, "It is fundamentally wrong in principle for lawyers to be subject to the regulatory authority of the very political bodies they most often fearlessly oppose in court."

I have spoken somewhat to the issue of the role of the lawyer advocate within the system of the rule of law, but there is an ongoing debate, not only in our own country, but in other democracies, criticizing the role of the lawyer within the judicial component of the rule of law. I made reference to that earlier.

Unfortunately, the anti-lawyer portion of the debate focuses on the all-too-available examples of lawyers who do not uphold their sworn oaths and professional responsibilities, and their true obligations within the adversarial system. To the extent that these deviations from the expected are present, they certainly erode the rule of law and give opportunity for the criticism that we have seen.

What do these nay-sayers say about us?

1. They argue that we use the guise of maintaining client confidences, even at time when it would result in harm to third parties. I would argue that we need only look to our ethical constraints and prescriptions, focus on our obligations, and assume compliance with those ethical obligations by way of reply.
2. They point out that we represent clients whose past, present or future behavior is socially harmful or even condemnable by society, but they don't necessarily speak to the equal access to justice requirement, the role of due process, presumption of innocence, etc.
3. They emphasize that we employ litigation tactics that can inhibit or prevent truly honest and factual-based decisions by judges that are not truly on the merits. Indeed, there is much to talk about in terms of potential and actual discovery abuses,

failures by parties to adequately disclose, and even failure by prosecutors to adequately disclose. However, we often see the results of these abuses corrected in the appellate setting; convictions vacated, cases remanded, etc. That is, of course, why truly independent appellate review is such an essential part of the rule of law.

4. They argue that we should be condemned for counseling, aiding or abetting our clients' calloused behavior. They point to the mid-1700's, Sir Edmund Burke, a significant contributor to legal thought and jurisprudence, who said, "It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do, but what humanity, reason and justice tell me I should do" (that controls). They go on to argue that it is actually the adversarial advocacy system that is at fault. They say it is not the best way to fulfill or obtain justice or to achieve the "*salus populi*," and that this is because of the way we apply our rules as adversarial advocates, which they say is the reason the public at large gives us only tenuous acceptance.

5. Professor Luban argues in part that the whole jury trial system inherently encourages us to "manipulate, confuse or override the substantial rights of others (parties and witnesses)," and therefore, inferentially he seems to be saying the more skilled we are at our "art," the more abusive we must therefore be! He goes on to say that few of the institutions within the entire complex of the rule of law are trusted less than we are, and that it is precisely within the epitome of the adversarial adjudicatory system, the jury trial, where we are licensed to trample truth, justice and legal rights.

6. He would have us look at recent wholesale corporate

misbehavior and its resulting litigation, governmental abuse at the suggestion or consent of lawyers (waterboarding/confessions obtained by torture). Indeed, we have to concede that on occasion, conflicts do arise between the role of advocacy and the goals of the rule of law. We are well aware that there are those who employ tactics that forestall or prevent revelation of true material facts, which then can prevent a true adjudication on the merits.

7. There is in our own civil litigation recognition that evidence most always is open to competing interpretation; required proof is only by a preponderance of the evidence. While we won't concede that our goal is to use passion, perception and our persuasive talents our art of advocacy to anesthetize the fact finder from finding true facts, we would have to concede that our goal in using our talents IS TO persuade, arguably to manipulate the jury to our view of the facts. Don't we start at voir dire and continue through closing argument in our efforts to influence and persuade? In fact, seeing Bill Wagner with us today from Tampa, Florida, reminds me of one of the first seminars I ever attended. Bill was President of the Florida Bar at that time, and led a two-day seminar entitled "The Art of Persuasion." Is that really an abuse of our role within the rule of law, or is it simply a necessary corollary to adversarial advocacy? What do we say about the role of the less-than-stellar advocate, or the role of incompetent representation within the rule of law? I would argue that appellate review then must be the dispassionate step where the playing field should hopefully be finally leveled.

We are the advocates and we practice advocacy. We are entitled to a much greater presumption of legitimacy than Professor Luban and

others would concede. I would also point out that the continuing reforms to the adversarial process and our rules of practice and procedure occur within the constitutional framework of the process itself. They are, for the most part, enhancements to the truth-finding function of the adjudicative process, the goal of which is the vindication of substantial legal rights, and the recognition of the rights of all parties to meaningful participation in the process for the *salus populi*: the welfare of the people.

It is our own Academy and our active participation in its activities, by virtue of its goals and by virtue of the urging of many past Deans and our participation in teaching and elevating the standards of integrity, honor, and courtesy within the legal profession that allows us to counter these criticisms of our professional lives. Our role in advocacy and its relationship to the furthering of the rule of law is indeed inextricable. Without you (without us?), we will not have the social cohesion and stability that provides the basis for a peaceful social order and allows our institutions to function, and generally to function very well.

Lawyers in litigation are at the cutting edge of the rule of law. We are the ones who produce the evidence and frame the issues for the judiciary and for the jury's determination. We continually challenge and test the value of the evidence to be presented to courts and jury fact finders. We detail the precedents, we muster the arguments, and we most always fulfill our role of service to the *populi* and in so doing, substantially assist in the maintenance of the rule of law. Its continuation gives life to the peace, order and freedom, and indeed, the decency of the society in which we live.

We have a very substantial role to play in continuing our support of the rule of law and in fulfilling our educational commitment

consistent with our Academy's goals. We have been guiding lights in the forefront of proselytizing the rule of law to foreign nations such as China. I have told you about what the Academy is doing recently to assist our brethren in the Republic of Ireland. In addition, the Academy has a new International Collaborative initiative which would make us available at the request of foreign countries to assist lawyers and the judiciary in those countries to further develop the lawyer-advocate and judicial element of the rule of law.

It is the rule of law that not only protects us from our enemies, but also from our own worst instincts. Have we not responded admirably in the face of the government's arguments on behalf of national security and pointed out that those needs can never be the basis for a license to pursue policies and take action that cannot stand the close scrutiny that the rule of law mandates? We are certainly aware of the tremendous efforts expended by many of our Fellows to assist those imprisoned at Guantanamo Bay to help assure that they receive the benefit of the rule of law. It is precisely in these moments that we must be most vigilant in reliance upon the rule of law to govern the conduct of all concerned.

Let us reflect for a moment upon the wisdom and commentary of some who have preceded us. Perhaps we can find some motivation and inspiration, some cause for reflection, to aid us in fulfilling our essential role within the rule of law.

Walter H. Beckham, Jr., who had an unbelievably impressive career and died this past fall in Asheville, North Carolina at the age of 91, was President of the Academy in 1973. His accomplishments are impressive, graduating from Harvard and becoming a professor of law at Miami in the 1960's through the 1980's. He was indeed an extremely distinguished member of our Academy. His son, Walter,

III, became a member of the Academy in 1994, and in speaking of his father said, “His personal and professional life truly mirrored the goals of the Academy, and are reflected in the words of his favorite poem:

*I dare you to give to those in need, to share your strength
and your time,
For in giving and sharing you gain new hope for the
world and all mankind.
I dare you to always live your life so that others might
catch a glow,
And use your life as a beacon, as through their life they
go. Amen.”*

Francis Scott Baldwin, another famous father of several of our current Fellows, the Baldwin family from Texas, put it most profoundly in the closing comments of his Dean’s Address in 1993:

I am proud to be a trial lawyer. It is the trial bar that makes up the vanguard of social change. Yet it is the trial bar that nurtures and protects the freedoms that this great nation was founded upon: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to our own beliefs, and the right to trial by jury. We are the guardians of the poor, the unfortunate and the oppressed. It is our lot to stand at the bar of justice. Whether it be for a large corporation or the poorest individual on earth, our charge is the same: to seek truth and justice with honor. Let us go forward and perform our obligations with courtesy, dignity, and due respect to our fellow man to the end that Lady Justice shall prevail.”

Let us then reflect. Our goal is the salus populi. Our responsibility is

achievement of that goal and preservation of the rule of law. Our art is advocacy and our pride is in the accomplishment of our goal, the fulfillment of our responsibility, and the perfection of our art, that the welfare of the people may forever be the highest law.

I urge you to participate in your Academy to the fullest extent, to support its programs, to give of your time, and when needed, your resources, that our motto may be fulfilled and that our goals may be achieved.



INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF TRIAL LAWYERS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE 5841 Cedar Lake Road, Suite 204
Minneapolis, MN 55416

TOLL FREE 866-823-2443
PHONE 952-546-2364
FAX 952-545-6073
WEB www.iatl.net