

# IDIOCRACY, PHILOSOPHY AND THE "DUMBING DOWN" OF STATE BARS

By Evan Gutman CPA, JD (2013)

"Most science fiction predicted a future that was more civilized and more intelligent. But, as time went on things seemed to be heading in the opposite direction. **A Dumbing Down.** . . . The years passed. And mankind became Stupider at a frightening rate."

From the Comedy Movie "IDIOCRACY"

The movie IDIOCRACY is one of my favorites. The plot consists of an average man named Joe, who is placed in suspended animation and wakes up in the year 2505. Although he was only of average intelligence in today's world, he finds out that he is the smartest man on Earth in the 2505. The reason is that everyone else in the world has become dumber.

In one scene of the movie he is placed on trial for stealing and is represented by a lawyer who graduated from COSTCO law school. When Joe tells his attorney that he's innocent, the lawyer responds "Well, that's not what the other lawyer says." Ultimately, the prosecution asserts that Joe is guilty relying on the premise, "well, just look at him." The trial is a comical farce. The Judge is a buffoon who thinks both lawyers are doing a good job, even though they are both evidently morons. When Joe tries to logically and rationally state his case, everyone in the courtroom just laughs at him. Ultimately, Joe is convicted and sent to prison. While being admitted to prison, the narrator of the movie states that Joe used his "superior intelligence" to devise the best escape plan he could think of. The escape plan simply consists of Joe going up to the prison guard and saying that he's supposed to be getting out of prison today. The guard then calls him a moron and tells him that he's in the wrong line. With that, Joe gets out of prison.

In all fairness, I would have to concede that neither State Bars, nor the Judiciary has quite yet degenerated to the level of stupidity shown in the movie IDIOCRACY. But, they are headed in that direction and definitely in the midst of a "Dumbing Down." This is evidenced by the multitude of cases where litigants acting Pro Se present logical legal arguments in conformity with well-accepted legal premises, only to have attorneys and State Supreme Court Justices unfairly chastise their mental abilities. Once the Judiciary targets a Bar Applicant or a litigant in any type of case by labeling them as a "troublemaker," the law pretty much loses its applicability to that individual. The statutes and

court rules become meaningless. Cases quite often degenerate into mere legal lynchings of rational litigants by cognitively deficient lawyers and irrational Judges who function essentially as nothing more than a gang without regard for the written law.

My research of the bar admissions process has revealed that one of the primary tactics to neutralize Applicants who oppose State Bars is to challenge their mental competency. The case law is replete with admission committees ordering psychological examinations of Bar Applicants for no valid reason. The State Bar's basic theory is that if an Applicant challenges their decisions or processes, then the Applicant is presumptively suffering from mental illness. This theory applies no matter how correct the Applicant may be as a matter of law, and no matter how irrational the State Bar committee members conduct themselves. Thus, "mental illness" has become a fundamental strategic instrument to foster the maintenance of arbitrary State Bar power. Similar to how everyone in the courtroom in IDIOCRACY laughed at Joe who was the only rational man in the courtroom, State Bars and State Supreme Courts often denigrate the mental competency of litigants whose intelligence and knowledge of the law surpasses their own. It's basically a defensive mechanism used by the Judiciary to cover up their own mental infirmities. Put simply, it effectively conceals the "Dumbing Down" of the Judiciary.

Loose and unsupported allegations of mental illness by the Judiciary are quite problematic. For purposes of examination herein, I wholly exclude anyone who has committed any act of violence. The reason for this exclusion is that the commission of such an act lends substantial credence to the assertion that they are genuinely mentally ill. Rather, my focus is on those individuals who are labeled as mentally ill by the Judiciary even though they have not caused any type of harm to anyone.

The basic problem with asserting that someone is mentally ill is that it presupposes the accuser possesses empirical knowledge of what constitutes Reality. This is because mental illness in its most general sense is an inability to rationally deal with or recognize, that which constitutes Reality. But, if the true nature of Reality is unknown by any human being, then it is almost impossible to justify a finding of mental illness with respect to anyone who has not committed harm to someone else. And the true nature of Reality is positively unknown to all human beings. This is evidenced by the conflicting views of Reality provided by the greatest philosophical and religious minds in history. It is also quite easy to demonstrate.

Before addressing the conflicting views of Reality provided by philosophers throughout history, an easy example warrants some consideration. Let us assume the average person believes in GOD. Let us further assume that

the average person believes GOD is all Perfect, all Powerful, and can do absolutely anything without exception. Now, let us assume that a man is walking down the street with tin foil on his head. He is stopped by a police officer and tells the officer that he is wearing the tin foil, because it allows him to speak with aliens. Most people would assert the man is mentally ill and possibly he is. But, the operative term is "possibly." The bottom line is that if you believe in GOD and that GOD can do anything, it is not an absolute impossibility that the man wearing the tin foil on his head really is speaking with aliens. Any absolute, conclusive determination that the man is mentally ill, flies directly in the face of a steadfast belief that GOD can do anything. Thus, to a certain extent, it can be concluded that belief in GOD is incongruent with belief in the existence of mental illness.

It may very well be that all these people who the Judiciary asserts are mentally ill, have genuinely achieved some type of higher level of Understanding about the Universe. They just may not know exactly how to deal with it. As for the people hearing voices, they may be real. If one believes in the Afterlife and that the Soul is Eternal, it is not entirely inconceivable that other Souls could communicate with us through our minds. If the Soul and Spirit can leave the body when it dies, then there would seem to be no reason to conclude Souls and Spirits can not enter the body when it is alive. It is also not entirely inconceivable that since each of our Souls has not yet risen to the Afterlife, that each of our Souls are not entirely capable of fully controlling the Body while alive. Perhaps, our Soul comprises somewhere between 40% - 60% of the decision-making authority of our Body, with other Souls constantly flying into us and trying to influence each and every decision we make every single day. Under this theory, we would each possess the ultimate decision-making authority for the most part and thus be responsible for our actions. However, that decision-making authority would be influenced by other Souls in the Universe. I do not conclude that the foregoing is positively the case. But, it is a very real possibility.

The difficulty in ascertaining what constitutes Reality, upon which accusations of mental illness must inescapably rest upon, requires an inquiry into how the human mind functions.

John Locke in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding," asserts that we are restricted to looking at the "outside" of things. We view and perceive things as appearances, but that may not necessarily be how they really are. Locke asserts that we cannot form ideas, which will allow us to understand the "real essence" of things. Additionally, there are things that GOD has not given us to know at all.<sup>283</sup>

David Hume in his "Treatise of Human Nature" addresses theories quite similar to Locke. Hume asserts that perceptions of the mind consist of Impressions and Ideas. Impressions strike upon our Senses. From the Impression, the mind then takes a Copy. The Copy remains after the Impression and the Copy is called an Idea. But, Copies contain imperfections and thus do not necessarily accurately represent in full that which we call Reality.<sup>284</sup>

Rene Descartes presents his Cartesian system, where man is represented as consisting of two substances. They are the Mind and the Body. Descartes was known as a Dualist because he believed in both a Material (Body) man and a Spiritual (Mind) man. The relation of Mind (Soul) and Body is analagous to that of the pilot in the ship. The Soul is influenced by the Body and the Body by the Soul, so that in some respects they are separate, but they also constitute a Unity. According to Descartes, the apprehension by the Senses of Things is obscure and confused. Thus, Things may not be precisely what they seem to be. What is perceived is in the Mind, but it represents what is outside the Mind.<sup>285</sup>

Baruch Spinoza asserts that GOD is Infinite and thus must possess Infinite Attributes. It is his position that Infinite Divine Substance is indivisible and thus must include that which is Finite, including man. Thus, to Spinoza, GOD is everything. This would include both man and nature, since GOD is Infinite. He asserts that GOD and Nature are synonymous terms, since GOD is Infinity. For this reason, Spinoza was attacked by many as being an Atheist, because his notion of GOD was not in conformity with the Theistic notion of a GOD being someone above both man and nature. Rather, to him, GOD was Infinity and thus encompassed everything including man and nature.<sup>286</sup>

Gottfried Leibniz asserted the Universe was a harmonious system comprised of Monads. The Monads are each individual and unique and could be analogized with the Soul. Each Monad is a world in itself and changes in harmonious correspondence with the changes in all other Monads. Each Monad reflects in itself the whole Universe from its own Finite point of view. Thus, to Leibniz, to a certain extent, as Monads, each of our Souls creates its own form of Reality.<sup>287</sup>

Immanuel Kant in his "Dreams of a Ghost-Seer" presents a world of Spirits in which the Spirits influence men's souls. According to Kant, man belongs to the Sensible Order (the world as perceived by the Senses), and also the Noumenal Order (things beyond our Senses and Experience). Kant

---

**Most Information Pertaining to the Thoughts of Named Philosophers in this Essay is based on their Presentation in FREDERICK COPLESTON'S historically acclaimed books "A History of Philosophy" Volumes IV, VI and VII, Doubleday Books, NEW YORK. To improve readability quotation marks have been omitted.**

ultimately arrives at a bifurcated view of Reality. It consists of the Phenomenal World (the world as we Experience it) and the SuperSensible or Noumenal World of Spirits and GOD.<sup>288</sup>

Johann Fichte asserts that the Ego (Self) posits the Non-Ego (the rest of the World) in order to discover its own self-consciousness. Thus, it is the Ego that gives rise to the Sensible World (the World according to our Senses). Self-consciousness is not possible for the Ego without a Non-Ego from upon which it can recoil onto itself. Put simply, he is asserting that we each create a World extrinsic to ourselves, because without such a World, we would not know that we existed. This is because if we assert that Things exist independently of the Mind, we necessarily set ourselves above those Things.<sup>289</sup>

Friedrich Schelling expands somewhat upon Fichte's theories. Schelling's position is that self-consciousness is the Ego (Self). The Ego exists through knowing itself. But, to become its own Object, the Ego has no choice but to set something over against itself, which is namely, the Non-Ego (the rest of the World). Thus, the existence of the Non-Ego (the World) is a pre-condition of self-consciousness. Essentially, the Ego is creating a Universe for itself. Some people often say, "the world is what you make it." To Schelling and Fichte, this is a quite literal description. Schelling also asserts that the Sensible World (the World according to our Senses) is an indefinite succession of shadows, images, and images of images.<sup>290</sup>

George Hegel grapples with the problem of overcoming the antithesis between the Finite (Man) and the Infinite (GOD). The question to him is whether the Finite and the Infinite can be unified in a manner that does not result in either term being dissolved into the other. Stated alternatively, is it possible to achieve a unification of the Many into the One. Hegel argues that if the Finite and the Infinite are set against each other as opposed concepts, then there can be no passage from one to the other. Many people work from the perspective that the concepts of the Finite and the Infinite are irrevocably opposed. If Finite, then not Infinite. Hegel seeks to discover a Synthesis between the two, which Unites them, but without annulling their difference. He calls this Identity-In-Difference. A pre-condition of Self-Consciousness for the Self is the existence of another Self. One Self seeks to triumphantly asserts its Selfhood above the other Self. But a literal destruction of the other Self would defeat the purpose. For consciousness of one's own Selfhood demands as a condition, the existence

---

**Most Information Pertaining to the Thoughts of Named Philosophers in this Essay is based on their Presentation in FREDERICK COPLESTON'S historically acclaimed books "A History of Philosophy" Volumes IV, VI and VII, Doubleday Books, NEW YORK. To improve readability quotation marks have been omitted.**

of another Selfhood. Hegel asserts that the human mind does not create "Things," but it does determine the character of those Things (the Phenomenal World). Thus, to Hegel, we do not create Reality, but we do determine its characteristics.<sup>291</sup>

As the foregoing demonstrates, the greatest minds in the history of the world cannot agree upon what constitutes Reality. Nobody really knows with certainty what Reality is. Thus, it is irrational to accept the preposterous notion that unintelligent State Bar lawyers most of whom have no knowledge of philosophy or experience in psychology or psychiatry can ascertain what constitutes Reality, which is a necessary prerequisite to a finding of mental illness. Yet, State Bar admission committees regularly utilize unsupportable and quite vindictive assertions that Bar Applicants suffer from some type of mental infirmity to justify denial of admission. State Supreme Court Justices regularly give their rubber stamp of approval to these findings.

They do so as a defense mechanism to cover up the tragic "Dumbing Down" of State Bars and the Judiciary. Unfortunately, State Supreme Court Justices are not quite as funny as the movie IDIOCRACY. Nor concededly, are they currently quite as Dumb as the characters in the comedy movie. But, they're getting there. In the movie IDIOCRACY it took several hundred years before the "Dumbing Down" was complete. However, State Supreme Court Justices often take pride for being on the fast track.

---

**Most Information Pertaining to the Thoughts of Named Philosophers in this Essay is based on their Presentation in FREDERICK COPLESTON'S historically acclaimed books "A History of Philosophy" Volumes IV, VI and VII, Doubleday Books, NEW YORK. To improve readability quotation marks have been omitted.**