

Robert Callaway VS. City of Grand Rapids Corruption Case

Case Background

Robert Callaway's situation started when the 61st Court would not let him see a magistrate to contest a repair and report ticket he had taken care of within the allotted 10 days and the police had signed off on. After many attempts to have the court review this situation, he tried the Grand Rapids Police Department's Traffic Division with no luck, but finally the then Chief of Police Dolan agreed to investigate the matter. Unfortunately, days after the Chief was looking into the matter, Mr. Callaway was involved in a fender bender and charged with driving with a suspended/expired license (could not renew his license because it was suspended).

Mr. Callaway went to trial because his **license was suspended illegally**. He can show **his trial was perjured/fixed** to prevent the jury from hearing the whole story. The unique aspect of perjury is shown by the 61st Court's own records, the Grand Rapids Police Department's own records, and 61st Court trial transcripts.

61st Court trial testimony: Callaway "Well did I actually say that it was under review? That the Chief was reviewing this matter? Officer Waichum "Not that I can recall."

Grand Rapids Police Department Internal Affairs Report: "Mr. Callaway told Officer Waichum that... Chief Dolan was looking into Mr. Callaway's suspension for him."

Anyone can see these statements are directly at odds with each other and there is perjury here. IA Report says Mr. Callaway told Officer Waichum the Chief was looking into the suspension- in court Officer Waichum denies this. This IA Report is clearly biased, false, and incorrect in its findings that no perjury was committed here.

The IA Report also begs the question why would Chief Dolan not outright state that Mr. Callaway was lying about him agreeing to look into a GRPD ticket that lead to Mr. Callaway's driver's license being suspended, but instead he agrees with the IA statement above? The only logical explanation is that Chief Dolan did agree to look into the ticket/license suspension before the accident, as indicated by calls to and from the Chief's Office (along with other evidence).

Judge Christiansen and Prosecutor Tomich lie in the same trial to mislead the jury:

Callaway "Did I happen to mention that I talked to the Chief of Police about this incident and that he was actively reviewing this?"

Tomich "Objection, your honor."

Callaway "Well he brought it up."

Tomich "No, no, no. The objection is that this is obviously a conversation with which Mr. Callaway thinks transpired after this incident."

Court (Judge Christiansen) "Well, I think he can ask the question as to whether or not- **I'm not sure how**

the police chief would know you were in an accident, unless you called him on the phone before the officer responded".

Tomich "**which would be after the fact**".

Callaway (talking to Waichum) "In this threat that I supposedly issued you, did I say that I talked to the Chief of Police about this incident, the suspended driver's license on Friday, that he was actively reviewing it"?

Waichum "That's not the way".

Now compare this testimony to:

Motion for a New Judge 2003-ot-10263 on April 15, 2005

I would like a new judge for I feel Judge Christiansen may be biased in this case. I base my request on the actions below:

1. Reprimanding me for contacting the Chief of Police's Office. I think it is only practical in such situations where the lower level of authority had been exhausted (court cashier, court supervisor, court administrator, and sergeant in the traffic division) to contact a higher level of authority that can make a decision on matters of policy...

This motion was written after Mr. Callaway met with Judge Christiansen and Prosecutor Tomich, and **before the trial** (Judge Christiansen also reviewed this motion and found himself not biased and went ahead and ruled on this case!). They knew the facts and it is obvious they are lying to fix the trial.

Judge Christiansen's plan of secretly, before the jury came in, of instructing Mr. Callaway not to mention the non-review of the ticket was about to come around through testimony, so they had to perjure themselves to prevent the facts from reaching the jury. Sucks when that happens huh? ("The judge may declare, for example, that the evidence that proves you are innocent or right, will not be allowed at the trial."- Global Research Website).

If the testimony gets back to the ticket, we get back to the court clerk's statement "You have to pay the ticket, but if you pay the ticket the matter is closed" (meaning no review). This is not due process of law! Under the constitution any time you are charged with a crime or offense you have the right to be heard in a court of law.

It is well established that the privilege of holding a driver's license is a legally protected interest which may not be suspended without due process. The court did not provide the necessary procedures which would have afforded the plaintiff the appropriate safeguards against deprivation of his license. The fundamental requisite of due process is the right to be heard at a meaningful time and a meaningful manner.

The court refused to let Mr. Callaway see a magistrate at the time, but many months later finally allowed him to see a magistrate after his license had already been illegally suspended. The court cannot go back and allow someone to see a magistrate on a matter they have already been punished for as happened here. What if he was found not guilty? **He should have been allowed to see the magistrate BEFORE the license was suspended.**

The denial of due process of law and trial fixing is self-evident and beyond a reasonable doubt, considering the records and actions of the 61st Court, the Grand Rapids Police Department, and the City of Grand Rapids prove their own guilt. The only reason they had to fix this trial is because they were wrong in not letting Mr. Callaway see a magistrate the first time he asked to see one.

Attorney Pete Walsh was hired by Robert Callaway to represent him on appeal. One the last day the appeal could be filed, Attorney Pete Walsh was nowhere to be found and Robert Callaway had to file his own appeal with the help of court clerks. Before the case went to trial Attorney Walsh dropped the case and left Robert Callaway to fend for himself at the appeal.

Judge Leiber heard the appeal. Despite the Grand Rapids Internal Affairs report that showed perjury on the part of Officer Wiachum, the judge ignored this. This same judge sentenced an African American lady who perjured herself in a different case to prison for 1 ½ to 30 years to “set the example”. Judge Leiber remarked “I don’t understand why people just don’t pay their tickets”... (Maybe because they don’t agree with their tickets?).

Judge Christiansen went on to steal \$490 from Robert Callaway by not calling a small claims case that was on the docket (an individual Robert Callaway was suing for nonpayment of work done did not even show up).

Judge Buter awarded Attorney Pete Walsh \$2995 despite three major conflicts of interests: 1. The attorney had represented Officer Waichum before, 2. He makes \$250/hour off appealing people’s traffic tickets when they should be able to see a magistrate for free, and 3. He is in front of Judge Christiansen trying other cases and would not bring up the trial fixing/perjury that occurred.

Judge Passenger heard the tax case the City of Grand Rapids brought against Robert Callaway. Robert Callaway refused to pay the City taxes for denying his constitutional rights. The Judge disallowed the jury from hearing any evidence of the Court’s or the City’s wrong doing, or the law that pertained to the situation (historical president “no taxation without representation”). Robert Callaway had submitted items of evidence that under court procedure could only be presented by calling himself to the witness stand, which he did not understand, leaving him defenseless. Robert Callaway did state at trial that he did not want to represent himself, but could not find a lawyer to represent him.

Attorney Andy Rodenhouse was assigned by Judge Passenger to represent Robert Callaway in this case, but told Mr. Callaway he could not use the defense Mr. Callaway wanted at trial because he “would get in trouble with the BAR Association”. This attorney at jury pick proceedings sat in the audience, never conferred with his client, never said a word in court, and walked out talking to the prosecutor! At trial he sat in the audience and never said a word, not even to advise Mr. Callaway on basic court procedure in presenting evidence. Any tax dollars paid this lawyer were a fraudulent overbilling.

The “checks and balances” that are supposed to be in our system are just frauds set up by those in authority to make the average person think the system is fair when it really is not. To see this all one has to do is look at the self-interest:

Grand Rapids Internal Affairs- a bunch of higher-ups in the police department who are to assess claims against their department. They just put the best spin on their side of the story to take the blame off their department. One can just look at the IA's report in this case for a good example (no perjury?).

Grand Rapids Civilian Affairs- Headed by a Grand Rapids City Attorney, with a handful of "civilians" selected by the city to give some credibility to denying peoples' claims against the police department. The City attorney in this case threw evidence away!

Grand Rapids City Commission- has passed city amendments to stand up for citizens' constitutional rights, but in this case they do not and prosecute an individual for standing up for his rights. Commissioner Bliss offered to investigate the matter but dropped the case when she learned the city was at fault.

The Attorney Grievance Commission- One lady who worked for a law firm said "Every time someone would refer our firm to this agency our lawyers would just laugh"?! There is good reason for this, only .40 percent of the time (not even 1%) is any action even initiated against a lawyer!

Judicial Tenure Commission - In the Grand Rapids Press, Executive Director Paul Fisher of the Judicial Tenure Commission comments about prosecuting Judge Servaas for political motives (Servaas opposed moving of the Rockford Courthouse) "either he broke the rules of conduct or he didn't". However, in a letter sent by Mr. Fisher to Mr. Callaway regarding Judge Christiansen's trial fixing "it is a matter of art". Apparently there are different standards used depending on who is being prosecuted.

Michigan legislative branch- Senator Levin and Representative Dean were both contacted but did nothing with this case.

Governor Rick Snyder's Office- Despite the Governor's oath of office to stand up for citizens' constitutional rights and his State of the State Address honoring service members for their service, he does nothing. When Mr. Callaway took the Governor's office to court, Judge Cherry in Lansing, ruled that under law the Governor has immunity in the case. Ok, did anyone else get the memo that our history books were wrong about the three branches of government (executive, judicial, legislative) providing checks and balances over each other? What better circumstance to provide this check when an individual is alleging misconduct by the court, because the court is not going to rule against itself? Evidently Governor Rick Snyder has immunity from doing his job!

Alternate Sources relating to this case:

(1.) **Law**- Former American Bar Association President William Neukom describes how our legal system should operate in one of his speeches:

1. System of self- government in which all persons, including the government, are accountable under the law.
2. A system that is accessible by all not based on might, wealth, religion or family connection, but is fair and just.
3. A process where rights and responsibilities are enforced.
4. A process lead by a cadre of diverse, competent, independent, and ethical set of umpires and advocates- judges and lawyers.

William Neukom goes on in his speech: "The rule of law, justice, these concepts only have meaning when we stand up and protect them".

(2.) Corrupt Legal System- "America's Corrupt Legal System"- from The Global Research Website:

"The Americans who still believe the Constitution protects them, are mostly those people who haven't yet dealt with the judges and lawyers of America's corrupt legal system. **America's Constitution and Bill of Rights are nearly dead**, not just because the judges will no longer enforce them, but even more because America's lawyers will not even fight for them.

All that's left is what American lawyers and judges call "**the game**". As part of playing this game, USA lawyers and judges just twist words around, in order to produce any excuse, however flimsy, to achieve their objective, whether that be to jail an innocent person, or give the verdict that was sought by the big company that paid the big bribe through its law firm.

It is an endlessly devious manipulation of words and phrases to get the desired result, just devious falsehood and lies backed by the naked power of the judges. The only "real" part is the power that the judges and lawyers hold in America, to jail you and take away your property. The words of the law don't protect you in the USA, because American judges and lawyers have no scruples about bending them to mean the opposite of what they say.

That means that any time you hire an American lawyer, he already is in a conflict of interest. He has to make the judge happy first. It doesn't matter what you paid the lawyer. He works for the judge, first and foremost.

So a totally unique factor in USA legal corruption is the amazingly dishonest profession of American lawyers, **these lawyers who "play the game" with America's judges and politicians and police. It is a savage culture of legal fraud, where lawyers work with judges to rob and terrify people, especially minorities, but also foreigners, and above all those who dare to question the system.** You will also find, in the American legal system, that you essentially have no recourse whatsoever against wrongdoing by your own lawyer. A lawyer can sell you out, betray you, steal your money, engage in malpractice, help out the other side, hide the evidence that proved you were right, or commit felony crime against you, and there is nothing you can do about it, so long as the lawyer made the judge happy.

American judges are very devious, and use all sorts of techniques to prevent a victim from getting justice. Judges set up a trial in all sorts of ways, giving orders that all sorts of evidence be hidden

from a jury, for example. **The judge may declare, for example, that the evidence that proves you are innocent or right, will not be allowed at the trial.**

Yes, there are appeals courts, but these are just more judges, who are often friends with the lower court judge who originally sold you out. The appeals judges tend to go along with the lower court judge, unless you have suddenly acquired some politically powerful backing on your side.”

(3.) Lawyers’ Obligations - “What are your Lawyer’s Professional Obligations?” by Lawyers.com lists the following:

Your lawyer must represent you ethically, zealously and within the bounds of the law.

Your lawyer must competently analyze legal issues and exercise knowledge of the law applicable to your case.

He or she must communicate with you in a timely and effective manner.

Your lawyer attorney owes you, as the client, a duty of loyalty. Your lawyer can’t simultaneously represent you and another client with legal interests that conflict with yours. An example of an obvious conflict of interest would be representation of both the landlord and the tenant in an eviction action.

For so long as he or she continues to represent you, your lawyer is required to follow your directions in handling your case unless those directions are illegal.

If a lawyer fails to abide by these rules, he or she can be disciplined by any BAR Association of which he or she is a member. It’s possible the lawyer may even be disbarred for serious violations. Criminal prosecution is also a possibility. And a failure to comply with the rules may be the basis for malpractice action.

(4.) Judicial Misconduct- the Judicial Tenure Commission list includes, but is not limited to:

Persistent failure to perform judicial duties (not calling cases on the docket).

Conduct clearly prejudicial to the administration of justice (fixing trials).

Conflict of interest or bias (failure to recuse oneself from hearing a trial in which the judge has a personal interest).

(5) “With Liberty and Justice for Some” By New York Times Best Selling Author Glen Greenwald:

“As a litigator who has practiced for more than a decade in federal and state courts across the country, I’ve long been aware of the inequities that pervade the American justice system. The issue isn’t just that those with political influence and financial power have some advantages in our judicial system. **Those with political and financial clout are routinely allowed to break the law with no legal repercussions whatsoever. Often they need not even exploit their access to superior lawyers because they don’t see the inside of a courtroom in the first place- not even when they get caught in the most egregious criminality. The criminal justice system is now almost exclusively reserved for ordinary Americans, who are routinely subjected to harsh punishments for the pettiest of crimes.**

The central principle of America's founding was that the rule of law would be the prime equalizing force, the ultimate guardian of justice. The founders considered vast inequality in every other realm to be inevitable and even desirable. The one exception was the rule of law. When it came to the law, no inequality was tolerable. Law was understood to be the sine qua non ensuring fairness, a level playing field, and a universal set of rules. It was the nonnegotiable prerequisite that made all other forms of inequality acceptable. Only if everyone was bound to the same rules would outcome inequality be justifiable. So central is this founding principle that most Americans absorb it by osmosis via numerous clichés: all are equal before the law. Justice is blind. No man is above the law. We are in the words of John Adams, “a nation of laws not men.”

It would be difficult to overstate the essential place of the rule of law in the American political tradition. The principal grievance against King George was his unilateral power to vest himself in himself and those he favored the right to act outside of the law. The goal of the American Revolution was to replace this arbitrary will of the monarch with unbending equal application of law to everyone. “Where is the King of America?” Thomas Paine, the great American revolutionary, asked in his 1776 pamphlet *Common Sense*. His answer: Let a crown be placed thereon, by which the world may know, that so far as we approve of the monarchy, that in America the law is King. For as in absolute government the King is the law, so in free countries the law ought to be King; and there ought to be no other.

The fundamental requirement of the rule of law is equality: the uniform application of a set of preexisting rules to everyone, including the rulers. But like the term rule of law, equality under the law has become merely a platitude, a phrase recited without much appreciation of its significance. Everyone claims to believe in it, but hardly anyone remembers what it means. And **yet the demand that all be treated equally under the law was no secondary concept to the founding of the United States, but its crux, and it is not difficult to understand why.** Preventing the government from succumbing to the temptations inherent in its power was the founders' central concern when they were creating the Constitution.

Of course the law itself also wields tremendous power. The legal system's reach is unparalleled: it can deprive a person of property, liberty, even life. It may compel people to transfer their material goods to others, block them from engaging in planned actions, destroy their reputations, consign them to cages, or even inject lethal chemicals into their veins. Unequal application of the law is thus not merely unjust in theory but devastating in practice. When the law is wielded only against the powerless, it ceases to be a safeguard against injustice and becomes the primary tool of oppression. **Unjust acts perpetrated in defiance of the law are relatively easy to fight against, but unjust acts perpetrated under cover of the law are much harder to challenge.** Thus, not only does unequal application of the law result in the loss of something good and necessary; it becomes a potent means for entrenching and protecting exactly that which law is designed to prevent.

In his essay *Dissertations on first Principles of Government*, Paine thus insisted that “the true and only true basis of representative government” is equal application of law to all citizens: rich and poor, strong and weak, powerful and powerless, landowner and tenant. Without equal application of the laws, Benjamin Franklin warned in his 1774 *Emblematical Representations*, society would fracture into two tiers: the “favored” and the “oppressed”. Revealingly, the central function of the Constitution as law- the supreme law – was to impose limitations not on the behavior of ordinary

citizens but on the federal government itself. The government, and those who ran it, were not placed outside the law, but expressly targeted by it. Indeed the Bill of Rights is little more than a description of the lines that the most powerful political officials are barred from crossing, even if they have the power to do so and even when the majority of citizens might wish them to do so.

In 1786 Jefferson argued that the essence of America was that “the poorest laborer stood on equal ground with the wealthiest millionaire, and generally on a more favored one whenever their rights seemed ajar.”

Even Hamilton, who made no attempt to conceal his belief in a strong executive, argued in Federalist 71 that the president had to be “subordinate to the laws”. The notion of law makes no sense, and has no good purpose, unless all are bound by its dictates.

George Washington – vowed in a letter written in December 1795, that there would never be immunity for wrong doing by high government officials on his watch; “The executive branch of this government never has, nor will suffer, while I preside, any improper conduct of its officers to escape with impunity.”

In seminal 1803 Supreme Court Case Marbury v. Madison... the court’s unanimous decision announced that the judicial branch not only had the right **but the duty to enforce the law on all citizens**, including high-level officials in the executive branch. **The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws,”** the Chief justice wrote.

Yet the founders concurred that nothing constituted a greater threat to the Republic than to allow this inequity of wealth or political power to determine treatment of citizens before the law. In particular, they disdained superior and inferior positions imposed by the state rather than determined by merit. Paine loathed inherited titles on the ground that they doled out rewards based on assigned status rather unrelated to entitlement. He declared: Nature is often giving to the world some extraordinary men who arrive at fame by merit and universal consent, such as Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, etc. They were truly great or noble. But when government sets up a manufactory of nobles, it is as absurd as if she undertook to manufacture wise men. Her nobles are all counterfeits.

To Paine, a system of legally enforced inequality would enable the elite to exploit the law to entrench unearned prerogatives or shield ill-gotten gains. And **those counterfeit nobles would turn the law into a tool to promote and protect injustice rather than to correct it.**

Contemporary scholars routinely emphasize that the rule of law cannot exist without legal equality. As the constitutional legal scholar Michel Rosenfeld argues, the rule of law is not merely weakened if “the ruler and his or her associates constantly remain above the law”, it ceases to exist by definition. **When the powerful can effectively exempt themselves from law’s punishments, we live under “the rule of men”, even if we maintain a façade of laws and other trappings of a legal system, such as courts, legislatures, and judges.** Indeed, it’s nearly impossible to find a definition of the rule of law that does not contain some requirement that the law be applied equally. As Judge Diane Wood, of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, observes, the consensus view is that “there is no one in a society governed by law who is above the law or immune from some form of legal constraint”.

Instead, the United States now has the exact opposite of a single set of laws before which everyone is equal. It has an entrenched two-tiered system of justice: the country's most powerful political and financial elites are virtually immunized from the rule of law, empowered to commit felonies with full-scale impunity and act without any constraints, while the politically powerless are imprisoned with greater ease and in far greater numbers than in any other country on the planet.

Over the past several decades, we have witnessed numerous examples of serious law breaking on the part of our most powerful political and financial leaders with no consequences of any kind. It is no exaggeration to state that the current consensus among journalists and politicians is that except in the most blatant and sensationalistic cases (typically ones in which other power factions are aggrieved- a Bernie Madoff here, a Rod Blagojevich there), criminal prosecutions are simply not appropriate for the country's elites. Courtrooms, indictments, and prisons are there for ordinary Americans, not the ruling classes, and virtually never for our highest political leaders."

(6) World Justice Project (also quoting from "With Liberty And Justice for Some" by Glen Greenwald):

"This decline of the founding American ideal is not just a matter of isolated incidents and outrageous news headlines; it can be measured in objective numbers, such as those provided by the 2010 "Rule of Law Index" from the World Justice project. The WJP employs a large team of international experts to gauge the extent to which the rule of law prevails in countries across the globe, and its findings leave no room for doubt: when it comes to fairness and justice, the United States now ranks near the bottom of the Western world.

The fundamental principles promoted by the WJP are uncontroversial. The rule of law prevails, they say, when laws are "clear, publicized, stable, and fair, and protect fundamental rights"; when they are enacted through an "accessible, fair, and efficient" process; when "competent, independent, and ethical adjudicators' are available in sufficient numbers and have adequate resources; and when "the government and its officials and agents are accountable under the law.

To say the United States underperformed its peers would be putting it mildly. In four out of the nine overall categories that were studied by the WJP, the United States placed dead last in its group. In two categories, it only managed a second-to-last finish. Aside from "open government", where the United States was third in its group, there was not a single category where the U.S. ranking was anywhere near in the top half of the Western nations.

The WJP report paints a grim picture indeed. Included under that rubric were such basic questions as whether "government officials are sanctioned for misconduct" And it is telling that one of the categories in which the United States finished last among western nations was "Limited Government powers"- which measures, as the report put it, the "extent to which those who govern are subject to law" and "whether government powers are effectively limited by the fundamental law, the legislature, and the judiciary." These sorts of restrictions on government authority were at the core of the American founding, yet they are clearly nowhere to be found in our country today."

(7) Principle of legitimacy- Described by Malcom Gladwell in his #1 Best Selling book "David and Goliath":

“When people in authority want the rest of us to behave, it matters- first and foremost- how they behave. This is called the **“principle of legitimacy,”** and legitimacy is based on three things. First of all, the people who are asked to obey authority have to feel like they have a voice- that if they speak up, they will be heard. Second, the law has to be predictable. There has to be a reasonable expectation that the rules tomorrow are going to be roughly the same as today. And third, the authority has to be fair. It can’t treat one group differently from another. And when the law is applied in the absence of legitimacy, it does not produce obedience. It produces the opposite. It leads to backlash.” What is harder to understand, however is the importance of these same principles when it comes to law and order.”

Analysis of Robert Callaway vs. City of Grand Rapids Corruption case

The facts in the case background are pretty self-explanatory with the court records, police records, and court testimony confirming perjury and trial fixing. The 61st Court and City of Grand Rapids could contest these facts, but if they did they would be contesting their own facts in their own reports. Robert Callaway has additional facts of his own including phone records, witnesses, and other documents to support his version of events, but using the City’s and the Court’s own facts makes the situation a no brainer.

Corruption can be defined as: 1. dishonest or fraudulent conduct by those in power. 2. The process by which something is changed from its original use or meaning to one that is regarded as erroneous or debased. 3. used as an adjective means “utterly broken”. Synonyms include: dishonesty, unscrupulousness, fraudulence, misconduct, crime, wrong doing, graft, grift, and sleaze.

The reliable and varied sources above all point to the corruption inherent in the system. Government responsibility to provide individuals their rights is not matched with the obligation of citizens to pay taxes. “A process lead by a cadre of diverse, competent, independent, and ethical set of umpires and advocates- judges and lawyers” is more like a process lead by self-interested criminals. The constitutional rights of citizens have been replaced by the power of judges, lawyers, and politicians playing some corrupt “game”. Lawyers will completely abandon any and all of their obligations to their clients in order to make the judge happy. Judges are not afraid to steal money from people by not calling cases on the docket, perjure and fix trials, and hear trials in which they will issue a biased ruling. The principle of the founding of our country, that everyone be treated equally under the law, has now been replaced by what Benjamin Franklin warned against of society fracturing into two tiers “the favored and the oppressed”. The international experts of the World Justice Project confirm this problem in America.

According to the Principle of Legitimacy- not being able to see a magistrate is not having a “voice”, not being able to see a magistrate on one occasion but being able to see a magistrate on the same offense many months later is not being treated “consistently”, and having a judge set the example by sending an African American lady to prison for 1 ½ to 30 years because she lied on the stand to protect her son, while overlooking solid evidence that a fellow judge, prosecutor, and police officer committed perjury is not “treating people equally” under the law.

We can gain additional insight into the corruption case of Robert Callaway VS. City of Grand Rapids Law and Order System by comparing it to other cases of corruption:

(1.) **The financial Crisis of 2008**

- a. **Corrupt Culture-** Quoting from ‘Predator Nation’ by Ferguson (Academy Award-winning director of Inside Job) : “Suppose you’re one of the twenty or forty (or five hundred) people creating, trading, selling, buying, insuring, or rating mortgage backed junk at Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, Lehmen, Moody’s, AIG, wherever. You see a horrific train wreck in the making, with all your coworkers contributing to it. But they are all making a fortune, and their manager- who is your boss too- is making even more money by keeping it going... So if you try to stop the party, you’ll probably get marginalized or fired, as happened to a number of serious, ethical people who tried to warn their management and curtail unethical and illegal conduct at Merrill Lynch, Lehman, Citigroup, AIG, and elsewhere. So you’d gain nothing by acting ethically- quite the contrary, you’d ostracize yourself and lose your chance to build (or, transfer to yourself) some real personal wealth- possibly a-once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.”

In Robert Callaway’s case, the employees of the Court, the City of Grand Rapids, and other politicians have little incentive to create enemies in the system by upholding their sworn oath of office or simply just doing what is ethical. If these individuals are aware of criminal activity and do nothing, they should themselves be held accountable for obstructing justice and assisting in the crime.

- b. **Lack of Prosecution-** Quoting again from “Predator Nation”:
“Since the 1990’s, its power (the financial industry) has been sufficient to insulate bankers not only from regulation but even from criminal law enforcement. The financial sector is now a parasitic and destabilizing industry that constitutes a major drag on American economic growth. This means that criminal prosecution is not just a matter of vengeance or even justice. Real punishment for large-scale financial criminality is a vital element of the financial re-regulation that is, in turn, essential to America’s (and the world’s) economic health and stability. Regulation is nice, but the threat of prison focuses the mind... If the financial executives know they will go to jail if they commit major frauds that endanger the world economy, and that their illegal wealth will be confiscated, then they will be considerably less likely to commit such frauds and cause global financial crises. So one reason for writing this book is to lay out in painfully clear detail the case for criminal prosecutions. In this book, I demonstrate that much of the behavior underlying the bubble and crisis was quite literally criminal, and **that the lack of prosecution is nearly as outrageous as the financial sector’s original conduct**”.
“Both RICO and federal antitrust laws provide tools for prosecuting criminal conspiracies. The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) provides for severe criminal (and civil) penalties for operating a criminal organization. It specifically enables prosecution of the leaders of a criminal organization for having ordered or assisted others to commit crimes... RICO was explicitly intended to cover organized financial crime as well as violent criminal organizations such as the mafia and drug cartels. Indeed, the law professor who drafted much of the legislation, G. Robert Blakey, once told Time Magazine that “we don’t want one set of rules for people whose collars are blue or whose names end in vowels, and another set for those whose collars are white and have Ivy League diplomas.” The RICO statute has been used in cases ranging from the sex-abuse scandals of the Catholic Church to Michael Milken.”

Just as it is important for our financial industry to be regulated and prosecute those who put our economy at risk, those in the law our order system who break the law and deny us our Constitutional rights have to be prosecuted for our justice system to have any integrity.

(2.) **The Columbian Army's War Crimes** (NPR's recent radio story)

Many of the lower ranked soldiers in the Columbian Army have been prosecuted for their part in mass murders. Investigators are now looking into allegations that higher ranking officers in the army who may have participated in these murders went unpunished and received promotions.

Using the same criteria in Robert Callaway's case, Officer Waichum was not held accountable for his perjury, but promoted to an undercover position within the Grand Rapids Police Department. Janice Bailey suffered in no way for her throwing evidence away as head of the "Civilian Appeals Board", but was promoted to the position of City Attorney. Commissioner Bliss's unethical and criminal actions in obstructing justice hardly marginalized her or put her job in jeopardy, for she will be the next Mayor of Grand Rapids.

(3.) **FIFA Corruption**- quoting from "FIFA Corruption Crisis: Key questions Answered" BBC News:

"FIFA, football's world governing body has been engulfed by claims of corruption since the early hours of 27 May (2015), when Swiss Police raided a luxury hotel in Zurich and arrested seven of its top executives. The seven were held at the behest of the U.S. Department of Justice, Which has indicted a total of 14 current and former FIFA officials and associates on charges of "rampant, systematic, and deep rooted corruption" following a major inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The World Cup is the most watched sporting event in the world, larger even than the Olympics, and generates billions of dollars in revenue from corporate sponsors, broadcasting rights, and merchandising. Why does it matter?

FIFA is the body responsible for running world football. In recent years it has been dogged by accusations of corruption, particularly the award of the 2022 World Cup to the tiny but rich and influential Gulf State of Qatar. **In December 2014, FIFA chose not to release its own investigation into corruption, instead releasing an executive summary which exonerated the bidding process.** The report's independent author, American Lawyer Michael Garcia resigned in protest. "

Robert Callaway's situation highlights this self-exonerating process of corrupt organizations in many instances. It is only logical for corrupt organizations to clear themselves or their members of any wrong doing and is quite common. The GRPD Police Department with its Internal Affairs investigations and "Civilian Appeals Board", lawyers with their BAR Associations and the "Attorney Grievance Commission", judges with their "Judicial Tenure Commission", and Grand Rapids City Commission that says they stand up for citizens' Constitutional rights, unless of course their own employees are the culprits.

(4.) **Arab spring** ("How the Arab Spring Started" - About.com)

The Arab Spring was started by a young Tunisian street vender who set himself on fire to protest his treatment at the hands of authorities. A local official confiscated his vegetable cart and humiliated him in public. Many say he was targeted for not paying bribes. Public outrage over police repression and corruption sparked a movement all across the Middle East.

Robert Callaway's small Mow and Plow Corporation (a separate legal and taxable entity, long time BBB member and highly rated on Angie's list), was targeted because Robert Callaway stood up for his constitutional rights and refused to pay taxes for City employees who committed crimes against him. At the company's last business license appeal in front of three Grand Rapids City Commissioners the company was denied a Snowplow license. Their reasoning:

Commissioner White: "You cannot not pay taxes because you don't agree with government policy". To which Robert Callaway replied "Government policy is not to have citizens be denied their constitutional rights and have crimes committed against them by government employees".

Commissioner Kelly: "Sounds like you have a good case, but that is a matter that should be handled in court". Well we have seen how the court handles issues they have an interest in. Also, the City should have taken Robert Callaway to court for Robert Callaway's taxes, not a totally separate tax entity with customers and employees who depend on the company.

Commissioner Schaffer: no reason was put forth for his denial.

If a business sent a bill through the mail to someone or company for a service or product, did not provide that service or product, and kept the money they would be charged with mail fraud. The City of Grand Rapids most likely is guilty of black-mail (extortion by threat) as well.

Methods of fighting corruption

We have determined that this case is a case of corruption which shares many of the same characteristics with other cases of corruption. It hardly appears as if Robert Callaway is the criminal the City of Grand Rapids and the 61st Court have made him out to be, deserving of being falsely arrested, having a criminal record, being forced to sort garbage, serving time in jail, heavy fines, having his wife stopped and her car impounded, having his livelihood threatened by taking away a business license, etc... In fact, the government employees in charge of providing service and protection to citizens in this case seem to be the actual criminals. So what can be done to right this situation?

- (1.) Punish those in positions of power that abuse their authority. As important as holding those responsible for the initial crime, is holding those who assist or willfully look the other way to it, especially if they have taken an oath to do so. Corrupt individuals could be prosecuted individually or as part as a conspiracy. This should also include compensation for the victims of these crimes.
- (2.) Reform our "checks and balances" system- overhaul or get rid of the fraudulent existing agencies that have a corrupt self-interest in oversight decisions.
- (3.) Public awareness and engagement- This is crucial, for without this it is hard to change the system or punish those in the corrupt system. Mohamed Bouazzi, the Tunisian man who lit himself on fire, was successful because his death made people aware of the situation, which engaged people into action (within months the old regime was thrown out).
- (4.) Education- An education initiative would have the advantage of providing a broader sustained awareness, with the added advantage of prevention. People should wonder about corporations polluting their environment, how much of the money they gave to the Red Cross is making it to the cause, is the politician they voted for doing what they said they would do, etc...

Unfortunately, by the time people start to understand the self-interest of others it is often too late.

The two dominant theories to date that describe Mans' circumstance are Darwin's Theory of Evolution and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. We have to go further than figuring out where we came from and our personal needs, to the thinking that will allow our society to be successful and survive in the future.

Modern Perspective Theory

The Modern Perspective Theory (MPT) realistically represents mans' idea driven environment of today. It identifies 5 major types of perspectives people use to make their decisions. We can become more successful as individuals and as a society simply by looking at how we are thinking. This theory can also be universally applied to business, government, religion, and the environment.

Synergist- "System Designer" - Looks to utilize resources in the most productive way for the benefit of all in the long term. Collaborates and shares credit with others. Possesses a broad base of knowledge and experiences, determination, positive appreciative attitude, a creative open mind, and "goes for effect". Actively searches for opportunities, even in problems. Responsible for own destiny by having the confidence to take risks or make sacrifices for what they believe in and accept consequences if things don't work out. Sense of being extends beyond physical self to others and environment. Focus is beyond existing labels and conventional boundaries. Innately strives for clarity, truth, and justice. Motto: "If you're not living on the edge, you're taking up too much room".

Slickster- "Corrupt"- one who has attained either a formal or situational position of power and uses this power for their own greed. Capable, intelligent, knows the system, but chooses to exploit it. Big ego and "above the law" attitude often lead to betrayal of personal and public trust. Prominence and authority make it hard to hold accountable for their actions. Adept at deception, re-labeling things, and finding loop-holes for their own benefit. Saying: "Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely". Motto: "There is a sucker born every minute".

Status quo- "Ingrained Normality" does things the way they have always been done in the past. At an early age learns to "Follow the yellow brick road" and later in life "climbing the corporate ladder". Education overly reliant on memorization and set formulas. Automatic way of thinking attributed to living within the parameters of society without testing, challenging, or questioning their worth. Problems are dealt with in a predetermined way, avoids risk/plays it safe, strict adherence to labels. Motto: "Don't rock the boat". Advice: "Don't blindly take the word of authority or experts especially when self-interest is involved, ask questions, and seek the truth".

Slacker- "Procrastinator" could be productive, but chooses not to. Has an idea or plan, but fails to take action on it out of frustration, little motivation, or lack of confidence. Postpones problems and loses opportunities to those with more initiative. Often becomes a parasite when others routinely have to finish his undone work for him. Motto: "I will do it tomorrow". Advice: "Whether you are a lion or an antelope, you better hit the ground running".

Self- “Immediate Gratification” – Inability to plan and does what is easiest and most pleasurable in the short run. Gives little thought to future consequences of actions for himself or others. Limited experience and education, poor communication skills, and often blames others. Labels are overlooked if convenient for selfish reasons. Problems are avoided. Pessimistic attitude, impulsive, and lacks maturity. Often operates from a perpetuating disadvantage of poverty, ignorance, and escapism. Reacts to environment out of necessity or desperation, and considers fate largely determined by luck. Motto: “Shit happens”. Copyright 2009 by Robert Callaway

Conclusion

The multitude of individuals in positions of power who unethically and/or criminally abused their authority to perpetuate the corruption in this case is very disheartening, but far worst is how “utterly broken” the system is, a system where the process has been changed from its original use or meaning to one that is regarded as erroneous and debased:

Those in the corrupt law and order system, who spend their whole careers making sure others pay for their mistakes, are too cowardly to take accountability for their own crimes. United States Citizens like Robert Callaway who have served overseas in the United States Military standing up for our American Ideals, will come back to this country and have their own rights taken away from them. Newly elected Grand Rapids Mayor Rosalynn Bliss will publicly take an oath of office to uphold the constitution and stand up for the rights of citizens, but in actual practice she contributes to people being denied their rights and criminally obstructs justice. Governor Rick Snyder now has immunity under the law from doing his job, while ideas such as “checks and balances” in government are only the myths of textbooks. We might eventually have to adopt Judge Leiber’s and Judge Christiansen’s philosophy of paying the Court and the City for every ticket they write whether we agree with the ticket or not. After all, they are the authority and know best, right?

If society cannot handle a corruption case so simple and so clear as this one, is it reasonable to expect that the next time our society experiences a larger and more complex case like the financial crisis of 2008, are the criminals involved going to again get away while the rest of us pay the price?

The most effective way for society to seriously fight corruption is to collectively change the way we think. We cannot take the word of those in positions of power that everything is operating as it should be. We have to be knowledgeable, question that which we do not understand, and be willing to stand up for justice (Robert Callaway will go back to jail if need be). This case illustrates how wide spread the problem of corruption is, but it also affords us the opportunity to “set the example” by holding these individuals in authority accountable for their actions. Our founding fathers were true “synergists” in developing the United States Constitution and its system of checks and balances, but over time our system has fallen into a state of disrepair requiring some much needed maintenance.