

# Harwood stomps on some pests

- *March 26th, 2011*
- [\(5\) comments](#)

By Michael Costello for the Tribune



## Commentary

Pestocracies thrive when behaving as a pest is cost-free. We'll never suffer a shortage of shabby, rumped, pony-tailed, leftist lawyers thirsting for celebrity eager to volunteer their time for the pleasure of being a pain in society's rear end. And we'll never run short of pests who see it as their business to obstruct everyone else's business. Together these intolerant, remora-like vermin impose a drag on the normal conduct of life and commerce for the rest of us, destroying jobs and denying tax revenues to the cash-starved governments they claim to love.

Frivolous, harassing lawsuits are the preferred tool of pestocrats as they prosecute their permanent insurrection against democracy. Otherwise sensible judges will show deference to social and political activist lawsuits, even those lacking the slightest merit. And there are also judges eager to abuse their authority and impose their political will by fiat. In either case, courts grant even the tiniest minority making the weakest argument disproportionate clout.

Their choice of venue is understandable. After all, pestocrats have managed to elect a few of their own to high office only to see them shoved to the sidelines in obscurity. When was the last time that Dennis Kucinich exerted the slightest influence on anything? He could accomplish far more by joining his ideological soulmates by lying down on roads and blocking traffic or throwing rocks through windows, or by filing frivolous lawsuits.

Idaho Rep. Dick Harwood, R-St. Maries, has introduced a bill that would require pestocrats seeking to block megaloads in court to post a bond that they would forfeit should they lose. The bond is big enough that they would have trouble raising it in the first place and would sting if they lost it. Up until now, only the plaintiffs have suffered any tangible harm from pestocrat lawsuits. This would level the playing field.

In reality, this principle should be applied to all lawsuits, in which those initiating the lawsuit should bear some level of responsibility for wasting the court's time and peoples' money. Too many people look at the courts as a form of lottery, hoping that they will become the next person striking it rich after spilling hot coffee on themselves. Just this

last week, a woman sued Carnival Cruise Lines because she got seasick. If judges exercised the common sense God gave 6-year-olds, they would never allow their courtroom to be abused in this way.

Judges permit these sideshow acts in their courtrooms for any number of reasons. Anyone, even a jackass, is entitled to due process. And let's face facts. The judge is a lawyer loath to seeing his fellow lawyers underemployed. And many left-wing activist judges all but advertise their willingness to conspire with pestocrats.

On top of that, the law profession is a closed community sharing mutual self interests. They may have gone to the same law school or both the judge and the plaintiff's lawyer may once have shared an office in the law firm of Nasty, Brutish and Short.

Whatever the reason, judges cannot be counted on to filter out these frivolous lawsuits. These nuisance suits end up being tried and ultimately waste the time and money of genuinely productive people.

And because judges are loath to award compensatory damages to the defendant in even the most egregious cases, it is therefore incumbent upon the legislative branch to impose costs upon those who abuse the court system for simple political harassment.

Bravo for Dick Harwood.

As a postscript, I'd like to take note of the words of two prominent politicians who weighed in forcefully on presidential authority to wield military force without the approval of Congress.

The first said: "If he (the president) takes this nation to war without congressional approval, I will make it my business to impeach him."

The second politician said: "The president does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the nation.

"As commander-in-chief, the president does have a duty to protect and defend the United States. In instances of self-defense, the president would be within his constitutional authority to act before advising Congress or seeking its consent."

The first politician was Joe Biden on Dec.17, 2007. The second politician was Barack Hussein Obama, three days later.

Excuse me if I smirk. Sometimes this job is too easy.

---

*Costello is a research technician at Washington State University. His email address is kozmocostello@hotmail.com.*