



1-1-1992

Id.

Gerald F. Uelmen

Santa Clara University School of Law, guelmen@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/facpubs>

Recommended Citation

1992 BYU L. Rev. 335

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact sculawlibrarian@gmail.com.

ID.*

*Gerald F. Uelmen***

A great tradition of the American bar is under increasing attack. The tradition I refer to is name-calling. From the earliest inception of our profession, lawyers have been masters in the art of invective. We are frequently retained because our inarticulate clients need our voices to hurl epithets at their enemies. The greatest lawyers of the age were noted for their skill, dexterity and wit in insulting their opponents, as well as the judges who ruled against them.

Consider the argument of Cicero, the Roman orator who tried murder cases before the birth of Christ. In one of his trials, he turned to the prosecutor and said:

Now Erucius, please do not take offence about what I am going to say next. I assure you I shall not be saying it just in order to be unpleasant, but because you need the reminder. Even if fortune has not given you the advantage of knowing for certain who your father was, which would have given you a better idea of how a father feels towards his children, at any rate nature has endowed you with your fair share of human feelings.¹

Or consider the reaction of Rufus Choate, the greatest lawyer in Boston during an era which included Daniel Webster,

* This article may simply be cited "*Id.*," followed by a page number which need not relate to any of the page numbers in this article. No reference to the author or this law journal is necessary. We will get all the glory we need in the *Guinness Book of World Records*, where this article will be enshrined as the most frequently cited law review article ever written.

** Dean and Professor of Law, Santa Clara University School of Law. B.A., 1962, Loyola Marymount University; J.D. 1965, LL.M., 1966, Georgetown University Law Center. Dean Uelmen is the co-author of two Widely-acclaimed collections of legal humor: *DISORDERLY CONDUCT* (W.W. Norton Co., N.Y. 1987) and *SUPREME FOLLY* (W.W. Norton Co., N.Y. 1990). See Widely, *Book Review*, 62 *BEST BUYS THIS WEEK AT PRICE CLUB 2* (1990).

1. MARCUS T. CICERO, *MURDER TRIALS* 52 (Michael Grant trans., Penguin Books 1975).

as he summed up an adverse ruling by Chief Justice Shaw: "That judge is . . . a fool, - he can't put two ideas together . . . he's bigoted as the devil!"²

Clarence Darrow's denunciation of Harry Orchard, the prime witness in the Haywood murder trial, sets a standard to which all lawyers should aspire:

He is unique in history. If he is not the biggest murderer who ever lived, he is the biggest liar, at least, who ever lived . . . Why, gentlemen, if Harry Orchard were George Washington, who had come into a court of justice with his great name behind him, and if he was impeached and contradicted by as many as Harry Orchard has been, George Washington would go out of it disgraced, and counted the Ananias of the age.³

Now I will be the first to admit that the level of invective among lawyers has declined in quality in recent years. Consider the lawyer who turned to his opponent during a deposition, and said: "You are an obnoxious little twit. Keep your mouth shut."⁴

Or consider the lawyer whose pithy response to an obnoxious letter concluded: "*****⁵ you. Strong letter to follow."⁶ But this decline in the erudition of our discourse should inspire a summons to greater heights of malediction. Instead, we are hearing bar presidents and judicial committees bemoaning the decline of "civility" in our profession. Recently, the Committee on Civility of the Seventh Circuit released an interim report which placed the blame for declining civility right where it obviously belongs—in the lap of the law schools.⁷ Just as the remedy for lawyers who lied and connived across the front pages of Watergate was to require all law students to take a course in legal ethics, the Committee

2. CLAUDE M. FUESS, *RUFUS CHOATE: THE WIZARD OF THE LAW* 176 (Archon Books 1970).

3. CLARENCE DARROW, *ATTORNEY FOR THE DAMNED* 451 (Arthur Weinburger ed., 1961). Ananias lied to St. Peter. See *The Acts of the Apostles*: 1-5.

4. GERALD F. UELMEN, *SUPREME FOLLY* 67 (1990). The lawyer was fined \$250 plus \$693 in costs for this outburst.

5. The missing letters are on permanent file at the Office of the Dean, Santa Clara University School of Law, Santa Clara, CA., 95053. Please enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

6. Uelmen, *supra* note 4, at 70. In *Schleper v. Ford Motor Co.*, 585 F.2d 1367 (3d Cir. 1978), the Court held that a response of "***** you" to a written interrogatory could not be punished by contempt.

7. INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVILITY OF THE SEVENTH FEDERAL JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, INTERIM REPORT, 47 (1991).

suggested that law schools consider instituting courses in civility in the law school curriculum. That set me to thinking about what a syllabus for such a course might look like.

I think it would be appropriate to begin the course with a strong interdisciplinary note, by studying the civility of discourse in other professional callings. Like baseball. Students should be exposed to these examples:

Harry Wendelstedt: "Call me anything . . . but don't call me Durocher. A Durocher is the lowest form of living matter."

"Bugs Bear," describing outfielder Ping Bodie: "His head was full of larceny, but his feet were honest."

Charlie Finley: "I have often called Bowie Kuhn a village idiot. I apologize to all the village idiots of America. He is the nation's idiot."

Umpire Marty Springstead: "The best way to test a Timex would be to strap it to [Earl] Weaver's tongue."⁸

We could also assign the reading of some very articulate law review articles, so students could behold the contribution that legal scholars have made to the preservation of great moments in courtroom history. They could consider an article entitled *Defendant Nomenclature in Criminal Trials*, which collects all the appellations prosecutors have successfully affixed to criminal defendants in closing arguments.⁹ My favorite was the Missouri District Attorney who suggested the defendant "ought to be shot through the mouth of a red hot cannon, through a barb wire fence into the jaws of hell," and after that "he ought to be kicked in the seat of the pants by a Missouri mule and thrown into a manure pile to rot."¹⁰

Most prosecutors seem to favor animal allusions. Cases are collected in which defendants were called dogs, hogs, hyenas, rats, rattlesnakes, skunks, vultures, wolves and worms.¹¹ It

8. King v. Burris, 588 F. Supp. 1152, 1157 n.9 (D. Colo. 1984).

9. Arthur N. Bishop, *Name-Calling: Defendant Nomenclature in Criminal Trials*, 4 OHIO N.U. L. REV. 38 (1977).

10. *Id.* at 71 (Citing State v. Richter, 36 S.W.2d 954, 955-56 (Mo. Ct. App. 1931)).

11. James Gorman suggests that an evolutionary scale can be utilized to assess the level of disgust that animal allusions engender, noting the difference, for example, between calling Ed Meese a "dirty rat," an "insect," and a "slug":

Part of the answer may lie in evolutionary biology. Evolutionarily, slugs are pretty distant from us, what with all our limbs and our clearly defined ears. And the further things get from us, in evolutionary terms, the creepier they seem. Other mammals may be fearsome, but they're seldom disgusting. Birds are cute. Reptiles at least aren't gooey.

calls to mind the observation Mark Twain offered in the introduction to *Pudd'nhead Wilson*. Pudd'nhead, incidentally, was a lawyer. He said:

Observe the ass, for instance: his character is about perfect, he is the choicest spirit among all the humbler animals, yet see what ridicule has brought him to. Instead of feeling complimented when we are called an ass, we are left in doubt.¹²

Another contribution to the literature of vilification is entitled *A Study in Epithetical Jurisprudence*.¹³ It collects every case in which someone was called a "son of a bitch." A case is reported in which the defendant relied on the defense of truth, and set out to prove that the plaintiff truly was a son of a bitch. As his final witness, he called a tall, lean, sun-tanned gentleman to the stand. In answer to the question, "What is your business or profession?" he testified, "I am an expert judge of sons o' bitches. Out in Texas we got a lot of 'em, and my business is knowing how to spot 'em. I can spot one a mile away on a clear day." He was then asked to carefully observe the plaintiff. He looked, turned to the jury, and said, "Gentlemen, he's a son of a bitch if I ever saw one."¹⁴

Amphibians are pushing it. And once you move outside of the vertebrates, it's yuck city. Insects, spiders, worms, grubs, slugs.

James Gorman, *Does Creepiness Recapitulate Phylogeny?*, DISCOVER, Oct. 1987, at 30-31.

12. MARK TWAIN, *PUDD'NHEAD WILSON* 3 (Heritage Press 1974) (1893). *Pudd'nhead Wilson* should also be assigned reading for a course in civility. Mark Twain describes the initial debate among townspeople as to whether the young lawyer was a fool, a damn fool, a lummo, a labrick or a perfect jackass. They finally settled on pudd'nhead, which stuck. While my Funk & Wagnalls describes a lummo as a stupid, clumsy person (*cf. infra, schlemiel*, text accompanying note 25), I have been unable to find a definition of labrick anywhere.

Stuart Berg Flexner suggests good reason for Americans to be left in doubt when called an ass:

Until World War II it was assumed that *ass* for a stupid person referred to jackass, but since 1940 it has increasingly referred to [anus], . . . (this confusion doesn't exist in England, where *ass* refers to the animal, *arse* to the part of the body).

STUART B. FLEXNER, *LISTENING TO AMERICA* 321 (1982). Flexner collects and catalogues 87 ways to call someone stupid, an invaluable resource for lawyers and law students.

13. Saul Cohen, *A Study in Epithetical Jurisprudence* 41 L.A. B. BULL. 374 (1966).

14. *Id.* at 379-80 (footnote omitted).

Students who seek to master the art of civil scurrility must also be exposed to the nuances of the law of libel. Use of epithets which are not capable of factual proof or disproof will receive judicial protection. Thus, the coach of the Denver Gold got away with calling a sports agent a "sleazebag who slimed up from the bayou," because it was impossible to prove whether someone is a sleazebag or not.¹⁵ On the other hand, recovery was allowed by a plaintiff who was called a "turkey," because this connotes "ineptitude, dumbness, and ignorance" which can be easily proven or disproven.¹⁶

A good deal of attention in any effort to raise the level of civility in our profession must be devoted to the simple task of increasing the vocabulary of law students and lawyers. I have a strong suspicion that the perceived decline in civility is simply a decline in the typical lawyer's arsenal of insults. As motion picture and television script writers increasingly resort to four letter words for emphasis, the "dumbing down" phenomenon has infected our diatribes as well as our polite discourse. This phenomenon is comparable to that noted by Justice Robert Gardner, in bemoaning the crudeness of the demands currently utilized by American robbers:

It is a sad commentary on contemporary culture to compare "Don't say a word, don't say a mother-***** word," with "Stand and deliver," the famous salutation of Dick Turpin and other English highwaymen. It is true that both salutations lead to robbery. However, there is a certain rich style to "Stand and deliver." . . . The speech of contemporary criminal culture has always been a rich source of color and vitality to any language. Yet, when one compares the "bawds," "strumpets," "trulls," "cut-purses," "knaves" and "rascals" of Fielding and Smollett to the "hookers," "pimps," "Narcs," "junkies" and "snitches" of today's criminal argot, one wonders just which direction we are traveling civilization's ladder.¹⁷

Justice Gardner's lament is equally applicable to the argot of attorneys. Compare calling the judge a "butt brain" to calling the judge a "mumpsimus" or a "sophonist."¹⁸ Compare calling

15. *Henderson v. Times Mirror Co.*, 669 F. Supp. 356, 357 (D. Colo. 1987).

16. *Ferguson v. Park Newspapers*, 253 S.E.2d 231, 232 (Ga. Ct. App. 1979).

17. *People v. Benton*, 142 Cal. Rptr. 545, 546 n.1 (Cal. Ct. App. 1978).

18. A classic source of "words to describe life's indescribable people" is DAVID GRAMBS, *DIMBOXES, EPOPTS AND OTHER QUIDAMS* (1986). Grambs offers at least ten labels that might be appropriate for judges who occupy the bench at every level:

opposing counsel a “jerk” with calling opposing counsel a “big-endian,” a “cunctator” or a “malapert.”¹⁹ Instead of labeling your client a “deadbeat,” imagine referring to him as “embusque.”²⁰ Rather than calling a witness a “dirty liar,”

AGELAST: One who never laughs or smiles; a total deadpan. In Yiddish, a *farbissener*.

BATTOLOGIST: One who repeats the same thing over and over, like a broken record, e.g., “objection overruled.”

CATAGELOPHOBE: One who bristles at the least suggestion of criticism. “May the record reflect that Your Honor is bristling?”

LATITUDINARIAN: One who is broadminded, willing to stretch things a little. Now that “liberal” has become a dirty word, latitudinarian makes a nice substitute. At least it will never be reduced to four letters.

MUMPSIMUS: One who stubbornly persists in error, even after it is rationally and patiently explained. A play on *sumpsimus*, the stickler for precise correctness. A *sumpsimus* is a *mumpsimus* who’s right.

MISOLOGIST: Hates rational discussion. You have to reduce your argument to gut level or below.

OPSIMATH: One who learns late in life. It is better that wisdom come late than that it come not at all.

PRETERIST: One who lives totally in the past. Still cites Warren Court precedents.

SOPHRONIST: One who is excessively cautious, wary, and hesitant. “Can you supply points and authorities on that relevancy objection?”

WITWANTON: One who tries to be cleverly amusing, but misses the mark.

19. Grambs’ collection also includes ten gems that match most lists of the top ten lawyers you love to hate:

ATELOPHOBE: The morbid perfectionist. Ten pages of deposition testimony can be devoted to one typographical error.

BIG-ENDIAN: The anal-retentive with a magnifying glass. The trivial achieves epic proportions. (From *Gulliver’s Travels*)

CACOEPIST: Consistently mispronounces words. The **CACOGRAPHER** consistently misspells them.

CUNCTATOR: The ultimate procrastinator. Never does anything that can be put off.

ERGOTIST: The pedantic reasoner. Every other word is “consequently” or “therefore.” Not to be confused with the **ERGOPHILE** (workaholic) or the **ERGOPHOBE** (afraid of work).

MALAPERT: Impudent, always sassing back.

PRONEUR: Constant flatterer, a toady who offers nothing but praise. In Yiddish, a *Tochis Lecher*.

QUODLIBETARIAN: The hair-splitter who loves to divide everything into six categories, even the luncheon check.

SNOLLYGOSTER: Totally unprincipled. Keep your hand on your wallet.

ULTRACREPEDARIAN: The overreacher, whose analysis extends far beyond his own comprehension.

20. “Embusque” comes from the French term for draft-dodger. In English, it refers to a shirker who accepts no responsibility whatsoever. I found descriptions in Grambs’ catalogue for nine other clients I have represented on occasion:

ATABILARIAN: The gloomy hypochondriac who develops a new symptom every morning and calls to tell you about it.

CASSANDRA: The true prophet of evil, who is never believed.

think how memorable your closing argument would be if you called him a “Vicar of Bray.”²¹ A “Vicar of Bray” is a colorful British phrase describing someone whose version of the truth depends completely on who’s winning. The Vicar’s flexibility, which allowed him to survive King Henry VIII and each of his children, is immortalized in a brief poem:

“And this is the law I will maintain
Until my dying day, Sir,
That whatsoever King shall reign,
I’ll still be the Vicar of Bray, Sir.”²²

Just a simple rule that any insult must exceed two syllables would carry us a long way in raising the level of civility in our profession.

We should also devote some time in any respectable civility course to a cross-cultural perspective. I personally think

LAODICEAN: Totally indifferent, nonchalant.

LATTANT: One who’s hiding out, lying low. Wants you to take his messages.

MISARCHIST: Dislikes all authority, including that which you occasionally assert.

PANJANDRUM: The pretentious bigwig, very self-important.

PHILOPOLEMIST: Loves being the center of controversy.

PSYCHASTHENIC: Totally indecisive neurotic. “Well what do *you* think I should do?”

SUIST: Not a perennial plaintiff, but one who is simply unfazed by approval or disapproval of others. Simply does his or her “own thing,” oblivious of your advice.

21. Nine other ways to call a witness a liar, most drawn from Grambs:

DENTILOQUIST: Speaks through clenched teeth, with real determination.

CHIROSOPIHIST: Sleight of hand artist who changes the facts faster than the court reporter can get it down.

GANSER’S SYNDROME: Compulsive inability to give a precise answer. Every answer is preceded by “about” or “approximately.”

GREMIAL: The bosom friend through thick or thin. Always good for an alibi.

GRINAGOG: Always smiles even when lying. Opposite of the lachrymist, who cries on cue.

HYDRA: Grows two heads for each one you cut off. When you catch Hydra in a lie, you’ll get two more in the explanation.

PHILALETHE: Loves to forget. Favorite answer is “I don’t recall.”

PSEUDOLOGIST: The truly systematic liar who constructs an elaborate house of cards.

SYNTONE: Goes with the flow. Will agree with contradictory propositions as long as they’re advanced by two different lawyers.

22. WILLARD R. ESPY, *O THOU IMPROPER, THOU UNCOMMON NOUN* 60 (1978). Espy’s etymology of words that once were names includes many expressions that lawyers will find useful. JEDBURGH JUSTICE and LYDFORD LAW are both places that became synonymous with injudicious trials:

“First hang, and then draw.

Then try the case at Lydford law.”

Id.

students would gain a great deal by learning the rudiments of Yiddish.²³ A single Yiddish word can capture all the subtle nuances one might need to contemptuously characterize the depths to which an opposing lawyer has sunk. Rather than an indignant objection that "Counsel is deliberately interposing frivolous objections to delay these proceedings," you can simply chortle, "The *nebbish* is *putzing* up this case."

One of the great advantages of Yiddish is that the same word can be used to insult in one context and express admiration in another. *Chachem* can denote a savant of great wisdom, or a foolish jerk, depending on the intonation. Thus, you might greet a judge's overruling of your objection by sighing, "Such a *chachem*."

Judges have even been known to use Yiddish labels to insult each other, all the while denying that an insult was intended. In one notable California Court of Appeals opinion, a justice responded to a dissent with a footnote in which the first letter of each sentence spelled "SCHMUCK."²⁴ The German definition of *schmuck* is a jewel. The Yiddish definition is somewhat less flattering, although equally treasured by some. It refers to the male reproductive organ. The dissenter protested that English dictionaries use the Yiddish definition, and California law requires that appellate opinions be written in English. The author of the offending footnote, however, included a reference to a German dictionary. Thus, the dexterity of Yiddish insults should be apparent.

Many laws schools have already incorporated some basic Yiddish into their curriculum. Justice William O. Douglas, for example, reported that the most important distinction impressed upon him as a student at Columbia Law School was the difference between a *schnook* and a *schlemiel*. He said a *schnook* is a fellow who gets dressed up in his dinner jacket and goes to a very elegant dinner party and proceeds to spill the soup, and spill the gravy from the entree and then slobbers the chocolate sauce when dessert is served. The *schlemiel* is the person sitting next to him, upon whom he spills it. Edward Bennett Williams observed that in every case involving multiple defendants represented by separate lawyers, there is always one lawyer who's a *schnook*, and he makes all the other lawyers look like *schlemiels*.²⁵

23. See Gerald F. Uelman, *Plain Yiddish for Lawyers*, 71 A.B.A. J. 78 (1985).

24. *People v. Arno*, 153 Cal. Rptr. 624 (Cal. Ct. App. 1979).

25. *The Problems of Long Criminal Trials, A Panel Discussion*, 34 F.R.D. 155,

Lest we feel too sorry for the schlemiel, however, we should note the difference between a schlemiel, who brings on his own misfortune, and the schlimazel, who is simply plagued by bad luck. When a schlimazel drops a piece of toast, it always lands with the butter side down. When a schlemiel drops a piece of toast, it's only after he has put butter on both sides.²⁶

Now that we have a syllabus for our course in civility, the problem is finding a professor to teach it. The traditional Socratic technique, which is undoubtedly the least civil form of dialogue ever devised, will have to be discarded. The teacher will have to serve as a role model of gracious civility. Judging from the civility of their behavior at faculty meetings, most deans will have great difficulty filling this position from their current full-time faculty. They will have to embark on a search to recruit a Professor of Civility.

Finding a role model of civility in today's bench and bar may require an arduous search. Even among the ranks of the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, I'm informed, oral arguments have become embarrassing displays of sniping and snarling.²⁷ Ultimately, we may have to employ the services of the Walt Disney Company, to create a professor somewhat like the mechanical Abraham Lincoln at Disneyland. Perhaps we could construct a plastic mechanical replica of John W. Davis to teach the course.

Devising a final examination for this course should be quite simple. The most efficient way to test a student's civility is a multiple choice exam, similar to the format utilized for the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination. A sample of fifteen questions, utilizing the "quadruple distractor" format highly favored by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, appears as an Appendicitis²⁸ to this article. Under the "quadruple distractor" format, *no* answer is correct. The student is challenged to select the answer that is least incorrect.

The greatest challenge we will face as legal educators in the decade ahead will be to preserve the great traditions of

184 (1963) (statement of Edward Bennett Williams during the Judicial Conference of the Second Circuit of the United States).

26. PAUL HOFFMAN & MATT FREEDMAN, *DICTIONARY SCHMITIONARY* 129 (1983).

27. Russell W. Galloway, *Conservative Inquisitors Run the Show*, *L.A. DAILY J.*, June 11, 1991, at 6.

28. An appendicitis is an inflamed appendix.

insult and invective which have always characterized our profession, while still training our students to deliver their insult and invective in a civil way. Law school courses in civility should be designed with this goal in mind.

APPENDICITIS

*Multistate Civility Examination
Sample Questions*

1. The proper way to address Chief Justice Rehnquist during oral argument is:
 - a. Bill
 - b. Chief
 - c. Your Excellency
 - d. Most Honorable and Exalted Lordship, Sir (while drooling)

2. A judge who observes a lawyer picking his nose in the courtroom should:
 - a. Publicly rebuke the lawyer
 - b. Hold the lawyer in contempt of court and jail him overnight
 - c. Call the Bar Association "hot line"
 - d. Make a crude joke, like "Hope you pick a winner, Counselor."

3. The proper attire for male attorneys to appear in municipal court is:
 - a. Slacks and a sport shirt
 - b. An Italian silk suit and alligator shoes
 - c. Striped slacks and a swallowtail coat
 - d. A Columbo raincoat

4. At a state dinner, U.S. Court of Appeals judges rank:
 - a. After U.S. Supreme Court justices and before five-star generals
 - b. Between five and four-star generals
 - c. Between four and three-star generals
 - d. In the kitchen with John Sununu

5. An "aperitif" is:
 - a. A vicious breed of dog
 - b. The hot towel served on some airlines to wash your hands and face
 - c. Two cigars
 - d. A partial denture

6. When setting the table for a Bar Association dinner, the napkin should go:
 - a. Under the knife, on the left
 - b. Under the knife, on the right
 - c. Under the spoon
 - d. Under the table

7. In addressing a letter to a U.S. Magistrate, the appropriate salutation is:
 - a. Dear Magistrate:
 - b. Dear U.S.:
 - c. Greetings!
 - d. To Whom it May Concern:

8. When denouncing a judge's adverse ruling at a press conference, it is appropriate for a lawyer to refer to:
 - a. The judge's difficulty in passing the bar exam
 - b. The judge's ABA "unqualified" rating
 - c. The judge's drunk driving conviction
 - d. The judge's Law School Grades.

9. Two days before a long-scheduled deposition of your client, opposing counsel calls to request a continuance, informing you his mother passed away and the funeral is set for the evening of the day of the deposition. The most appropriate response is:
 - a. Can you supply a notarized death certificate?
 - b. Were you close to her?
 - c. Can't you get someone to substitute for you (at the funeral)?
 - d. No problem. We'll finish the depo by 5:00 p.m.

10. When opposing counsel is a woman, a male attorney should address her:
 - a. Miz (emphasize zzz with slight hiss)
 - b. Madam (or Ma'am)
 - c. By her first name
 - d. Don't address her directly; direct all comments at the wall or the ceiling.

11. Upon receiving contributions from lawyers for his reelection campaign, a judge should:
 - a. Not acknowledge receipt
 - b. Send a personal note of thanks
 - c. Call and pledge undying gratitude
 - d. Any or all of the above, depending on the amount

12. The American Inns of Court are:
 - a. Slightly sleazy cocktail lounges
 - b. A chain of motels
 - c. Schools that teach lawyers to speak with a British accent
 - d. The fastest growing lawyer's organization since Diner's Club

13. An offer to stipulate to obviously provable facts is:
 - a. A sign of weakness
 - b. A tactical move best saved for the eve of trial
 - c. Revocable at will
 - d. Most effective if made in the jury's presence, after opposing counsel has called the witness

14. When a filing clerk refuses to accept a brief because the cover is the wrong color, you should:
 - a. Berate the clerk with colorful epithets
 - b. File a writ of scire facias
 - c. Demand to see the chief judge immediately
 - d. Offer the clerk your tickets to the twi-night double-header

15. When you write a nasty letter to opposing counsel, complaining that her secretary disconnected you while you were on "hold," you should:

- a. Send a copy to her client
- b. Send a copy to the judge
- c. Send a copy to the Bar Discipline Committee
- d. Send a copy to the Committee on Civility of the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit:

c/o Judge Marvin E. Aspen
U.S. Courthouse
219 S. Dearborn Street, Rm. 1946
Chicago IL 60604

Note: All questions utilize the "quadruple distractor" format highly favored by the National Conference of Bar Examiners. Thus, *no* answer is correct. The challenge is to select the "best" answer, *i.e.*, the one that is least incorrect.