

# Family Court Chronicles.com

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA. ©2007, Glenn Campbell, Box 30303, LV NV 89173. FamilyCourtGuy@gmail.com. May be printed and photocopied for non-commercial purposes.

Opinion #26

What the newspapers won't tell you!

July 2, 2007

★ ★ ★ *Special Independence Day Issue* ★ ★ ★


JOHN

# JENSEN

FOR

## FAMILY COURT ADMINISTRATOR

*He'll Defend our Morality!*



***Family Court Chronicles announces its endorsement for this long unfilled position. Bold leadership is the key.***

BY GLENN CAMPBELL

Family Court has been without a permanent administrator for too long. This county official is responsible for most of the infrastructure of the court, and without firm leadership at the top, too many things have been allowed to drift.

In dark times like these, the court needs a strong and bold leader who will cut through the bureaucracy and red

tape to defend traditional moral values.

That man is John Jensen.

He is already the Acting Family Court Administrator, so why not make the upgrade? Jensen has already proven himself under fire and shown everyone he's no wuss, sissy or limp-wristed pansy-ass liberal. He will lead Family Court where it needs to go: out of the morass of neutrality into a more active role in shaping the morals of our city.

The decision is close at hand. For all we know, it could have already been made, but it hasn't been announced, so there still may be time to write to your congressman or local judge to lobby for Jensen's selection.

More than any other candidate, Jensen carries on the proud legacy of our national leader, George W. Bush. He's not afraid to take a moral stand, regardless of the evidence. He knows what is right based on his special relationship with God, so he doesn't need to wait for the consensus of others. He's ready and willing to engage the court in protracted foreign wars because that's where the terrorists are.



The chief terrorist, of course, is our

own webmaster Glenn Campbell. In last week's massive Mother of All Newsletters (Opinion #25), we learned about Jensen's heroic effort to shut Mr. Campbell down and prevent him from further eroding the morals of the court.

Campbell has the subversive idea that he can improve the court system by clearly explaining court procedures to average citizens. He wants to produce a series of simple user's guides for court clients and have them distributed in the courthouse for free.

There's a word to describe this kind of effort: Communism.

Why do you think we have lawyers? Why should the court give out information for free when a qualified attorney can dispense the same data for \$250 an hour? Easily accessible information undermines the economic foundation of our legal system, which depends on the law being locked up in secret code only a lawyer can understand.

Campbell claims that he isn't trying to put the lawyers out of business, only establish a base of general knowledge that will help people choose and interact with their lawyers more efficiently. You know this is only a front for sedition. Once you start giving out information for free—truly useful information, not the murky pseudo-information the court dispenses now—then the people are going to start believing that the court system belongs to them.

Someone has to put a stop to this, and Jensen's our man.

Campbell never went to law school. Jensen did. He isn't a practicing lawyer now, but that didn't prevent him from running for Family Court Judge in Dept. M last year. Although he finished 6th in a field of 7, it shows he's got ambition. At 60 years of age, he is no longer satisfied being Guardianship Compliance Officer. He's ready to become captain of a ship.

When an opportunity arose last month for Jensen to prove his leadership ability, he rose to the challenge.

Juvenile hearing master Stephen Compan had a complaint. He showed Jensen some disturbing printouts from Campbell's website. Should the writer and photographer who produced this

material be allowed to write user's guides for the court? The dossier may have also been shown to one or more real judges, as yet unidentified. All of them apparently agreed that, as presented and packaged by Compan, the material was disturbing. At least it was maybe, sort of, kind of disturbing, as it would be if someone sticks something complex under your nose and tells you it's disturbing.

Under Jensen's guidance, the court has moved into the Brave New World of literary criticism—which takes courage. The administration is also now policing the internet, which is a really big job.

Jensen knew what needed to be done. Compan laid it out for him, and within only two business days of the creation of the offending material, Jensen made a bold executive decision: Campbell must go.

For anyone without Jensen's conviction, bureaucratic issues would have gotten in the way. There was the minor problem of whether Jensen had the authority to fire or blacklist Campbell—that is, to ban him permanently from all future proposals to the judges. This is the sort of test that separates the "doers" for the "wafflers." Jensen is not a waffler. When he knows what needs to be done, he doesn't have to wait for authority, evidence or consensus. The world to him is black and white, and once you know the answer, there is no point in getting bogged down in process or consultation.

Compan had worked long and hard on his own free time to find that offensive material. He spent 10 days obsessively searching Campbell's websites before that material even existed. Compan is another brave defender of the morals of the court. He wasn't always an internet decency crusader, but Campbell pushed him into it. In a private email. Campbell was critical of Compan's courtroom behavior. When Compan himself read the email, he knew instinctively what he had to do: discredit Campbell.

The email had a number of specific complaints about Compan, but probably the most inexcusable thing Campbell said was this: "I seriously doubt he would have got the job without Jones juicing him in."

Who would accept such an insult? This was a direct personal attack on the very core of Compan's existence. In the proud tradition of Joseph McCarthy, Richard Nixon and Judge Elizabeth Halverson, Compan responded with a brave and selfless crusade to protect others.

Any other administrator would have carefully avoided getting his office embroiled in judicial politics and private personal vendettas, but Jensen isn't any administrator. He has vision. Court administration, he obviously believes, should not be a neutral provider of services but an active defender of morality. How the disturbing material came to Jensen's attention is not important. The fact is, Campbell has an opinion and takes a stand, and that kind of unhealthy activism must be nipped in the bud whenever it appears.

Like Alexander Haig after Reagan's shooting, Jensen took command. He called Campbell in for a talk. Citing the authority of chief judge T. Arthur Ritchie, Jensen gave Campbell the bad news: that he would no longer be allowed to present proposals to the judges regardless of their merit.

A minor complication was that Jensen hadn't actually consulted with Judge Ritchie prior to speaking on his behalf. After the meeting with Jensen, Campbell wrote to Ritchie to confirm Jensen's statements. Ritchie's reply indicated that he wasn't even aware of the situation prior to Campbell's letter.

Jensen may have felt that the matter wasn't serious enough to bother Ritchie with. Administrators often have to make such executive decisions. What Jensen probably meant to say was that Ritchie *would have* approved of Jensen's actions and disapproved of the website material if Jensen had actually consulted with him.

Campbell calls this a "lie" and thinks Jensen should be sanctioned for it. We prefer to see it as an "exercise of executive authority."

If the Acting Court Administrator doesn't protect the court from Communists and perverts like Campbell, who will?

—G.C