

## XXIV. FOUNDATIONS OF LAW, LESSON 21: ROAD TO REMEDY, THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE

### Part 1: Historical and Legal Foundations of Voting Rights

#### A. Introduction: The Silent Sentinels and the Struggle for Women's Suffrage

In the crisp air of a November morning in 1917, the streets of Washington, D.C., buzzed with the usual pace of government life. Amid the hurried steps of congressmen and workers, a silent figure stood in front of the White House gates. Her name was Alice Paul, and she was not alone. She and her fellow suffragists, known as the Silent Sentinels, held banners emblazoned with bold words: "Mr. President, how long must women wait for liberty?"

It was a turbulent time in American history. The nation was embroiled in World War I, and President Woodrow Wilson, despite his public support for democracy abroad, had turned a deaf ear to the pleas of women seeking the right to vote at home. For decades, the suffrage movement had grown louder, yet the doors to equal voting rights remained closed to women. Many suffragists had tried polite petitions, letter-writing campaigns, and impassioned speeches, but they were always met with resistance.

Alice Paul, a passionate and unyielding activist, believed it was time for a more direct approach. She and her fellow suffragists decided to take their protest to the very seat of power: the White House. Beginning in January 1917, day after day, through blistering cold and sweltering heat, the Silent Sentinels stood their ground. They carried signs that called out the hypocrisy of fighting for democracy overseas while denying it to women at home.

At first, the public and the press were intrigued, but as the months wore on, the peaceful protests drew anger. The sight of women openly challenging the president was shocking to many, especially during wartime. As the tension escalated, so did the backlash. The police began arresting the protesters on charges of "obstructing traffic," though they stood quietly, blocking nothing. Alice Paul and many of her fellow suffragists were thrown into prison.

Once inside the Occoquan Workhouse, their punishment became a nightmare. The women were subjected to appalling conditions: rotten food, filthy cells, and harsh treatment by the guards. But it was Alice Paul's hunger strike that turned the tide. Refusing to eat until women were granted the right to vote, she was forcibly fed through a tube in a brutal process that left her weakened but resolute.

Word of the mistreatment spread, and the suffragists' plight gained national attention. Public sympathy began to shift. The once-radical idea that women should vote now seemed like a righteous cause, and the brutality of their treatment shocked the nation. Even President Wilson could no longer ignore the growing chorus of voices demanding justice.

## COMMON LAW ACADEMY LESSON

In 1918, Wilson finally lent his support to women's suffrage, framing it as a necessary war measure, and a year later, Congress passed the 19th Amendment. On August 18, 1920, the amendment was ratified, and women across the United States won the right to vote.

Alice Paul's steadfast leadership and the Silent Sentinels' courage had sparked a turning point in American history. Their unrelenting fight proved that no unjust system could stand forever against the will of determined people. The suffragists had not just won the right to vote—they had cemented their place in history, showing that the struggle for freedom and equality requires both resilience and sacrifice.

As the first women cast their ballots in the 1920 election, they knew they had not been granted a gift by the government. They had claimed their right, one that had always belonged to them, by demanding it be recognized. Their victory was not just for women of their time but for future generations, reminding everyone that rights are not given—they are taken back when denied.

### 1. Courage and Determination

The Silent Sentinels, led by Alice Paul, demonstrated unwavering courage by standing in front of the White House every day, silently protesting for their right to vote.

Despite facing hostility from the public, the press, and the authorities, they continued their peaceful protests in all weather conditions, showing their resilience and commitment to the cause.

### 2. Belief That Voting Was Always Their Right

The suffragists didn't see voting as something that needed to be granted by the government. They believed it was an inherent right that had always belonged to them, as citizens.

Their protest banners calling out the hypocrisy of fighting for democracy abroad while denying it to women at home reflected their belief that voting was not just a privilege, but a fundamental right.

### 3. Enduring Brutal Punishment for Their Beliefs

After being arrested for obstructing traffic, the suffragists faced severe punishment in prison, enduring horrific conditions and mistreatment.

Alice Paul's decision to go on a hunger strike, despite the risk to her health, and the forced feeding she endured, highlighted the depth of their sacrifice for the cause.

### 4. Turning Public Opinion

The mistreatment of the women, particularly Alice Paul's force-feeding during her hunger strike, shocked the public and led to a shift in national sentiment.

What started as anger toward the protesters turned into sympathy, as the brutality of their treatment drew attention to the injustice of denying women the right to vote.

### 5. The Power of Peaceful Protest

The Silent Sentinels showed the power of non-violent resistance. Despite being physically mistreated and imprisoned, they refused to resort to violence or give up their cause.

Their peaceful stance, even in the face of such adversity, exemplified the strength of their moral position.

### 6. Forcing Political Change

President Wilson, initially resistant to their demands, could no longer ignore the mounting pressure from the public and the international attention on the issue.

His eventual support for women's suffrage, framed as a necessary wartime measure, was a direct result of the sustained efforts and sacrifices made by the suffragists.

### 7. Taking Back Their Right

The suffragists saw the 19th Amendment as reclaiming a right that had always been theirs, not as something granted by the government.

Their victory was framed as the people taking back control over their inherent rights, rather than the government “giving” them something they deserved all along.

### 8. Inspiration for Future Generations

The success of Alice Paul and the suffragists went beyond securing the right to vote for women in their time. It became a symbol of what determined activism could achieve, inspiring future generations to fight for equality and justice.

Their story serves as a reminder that rights are not given; they must sometimes be fought for and reclaimed, especially when they are unjustly denied.

## B. Origins and History of Voting

### 1. Ancient Democracies

The concept of voting has its roots in ancient civilizations, most notably in **Greece** and **Rome**. In **Athens**, the birthplace of democracy, voting was central to their government system, but it was limited to a small portion of the population—only free male citizens could vote. The Athenians used a direct democracy, where citizens participated directly in decision-making.

Votes were often cast using pebbles or pottery shards, and major political issues were decided by the public in assemblies. However, women, slaves, and foreigners were excluded, leaving only a fraction of the population with political power.

In contrast, **Rome** practiced a more representative form of democracy. Roman citizens voted for elected officials who would represent them in the Roman Republic. Voting was still limited to male citizens, and the power was heavily skewed toward the wealthy patricians. While both Greece and Rome laid the foundation for the concept of voting, their systems were far from the universal suffrage seen in modern democracies.

### 2. Development in England and Colonial America

The journey toward more inclusive voting systems progressed with the rise of constitutional governance in **England**. The signing of the **Magna Carta** in 1215 marked a critical shift, establishing the principle that the king's power was not absolute and that certain rights belonged to the nobles. While the Magna Carta did not establish a voting system, it laid the groundwork for future democratic developments, including the establishment of Parliament and the gradual extension of voting rights.

In **Colonial America**, voting rights were influenced by English law but were restricted largely to land-owning white men. Early American colonies, such as Virginia and Massachusetts, had limited voting rights tied to property ownership and, in some cases, religious affiliation. Voting was seen as a privilege of the landed elite, and elections were often designed to maintain the status quo.

### 3. Evolution in the United States

After the **American Revolution**, the right to vote became a topic of debate as the United States sought to define its new system of governance. Initially, voting was largely limited to **white, property-owning males**, reflecting the English colonial model. As the country expanded, so did the demand for broader suffrage.

- **Property-based voting restrictions** began to relax in the early 19th century, with most states eliminating property requirements by the 1820s, allowing more white men to vote.
- **African-American Voting Rights:** After the Civil War, the **15th Amendment** was passed in 1870, guaranteeing that the right to vote could not be denied based on race. However, discriminatory practices such as **poll taxes**, **literacy tests**, and violence were used to suppress African-American voters, particularly in the South, until the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
- **Women's Suffrage:** The fight for women's voting rights culminated in the **19th Amendment**, passed in 1920 after decades of activism by suffragists like Alice Paul and Susan B. Anthony. This amendment granted women the right to vote, marking a significant step toward universal suffrage.
- **Lowering the Voting Age:** The **26th Amendment**, ratified in 1971, lowered the voting age from 21 to 18, largely due to the argument that individuals old enough to be drafted for military service in the Vietnam War should also have the right to vote.

While the evolution of voting rights in the U.S. has progressed significantly, the journey from exclusive, property-based suffrage to today's more inclusive system has been marked by persistent struggles for equal access and the protection of those rights. Each step reflects the ongoing tension between expanding participation and maintaining control over political power.

### C. Classifications of Rights

1. **NATURAL RIGHTS (Unalienable Rights)** are those which grow out of the nature of man and depend upon personality, as distinguished from such as are created by law and depend upon civilized society; or they are those which are plainly assured by natural law (**Borden v. State, 11 Ark. 519, 44 Am.Dec. 217**) ; or those which, by fair deduction from the present physical, moral, social, and religious characteristics of man, he must be invested with, and which he ought to have realized for him in a jural society, in order to fulfill the ends to which his nature calls him. **1 Woolsey, Polit. Science, p. 26**. Such are the rights of life, liberty, privacy, and good reputation. See **Black, Const. Law (3d Ed.) 523**.

These rights are inherent in individuals by virtue of being human and are not granted by governments. They include life, liberty, and property, which cannot be surrendered or transferred.

2. **CIVIL RIGHTS** are such as belong to every citizen of the state or country, or, in a wider sense, to all its inhabitants, and are not connected with the organization or administration of government. They include the rights of property, marriage, protection by the laws, freedom of contract, trial by jury, etc. **Winnett v. Adams, 71 Neb. 817, 99 N.W. 681**. Or, as otherwise defined, civil rights are rights appertaining to a person in virtue of his citizenship in a state or community. Rights capable of being enforced or redressed in a civil action. Also a term applied to certain rights secured to citizens of the United States by the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments to the constitution, and by various acts of congress made in pursuance thereof. **State of Iowa v. Railroad Co., C.C.Iowa, 37 F. 498, 3 L.R.A. 554; State v. Powers, 51 N.J.L. 432, 17 A. 969. (Black's Law 4th Edition)**:

These are rights that protect individuals from discrimination and ensure their participation in civil society. Civil rights include freedom from arbitrary discrimination and the right to equal protection under the law, as well as rights that arise from legal recognition of one's status as a citizen.

3. **POLITICAL RIGHTS**. Those which may be exercised in the formation or administration of the government. **People v. Morgan, 90 Ill. 563**. Rights of citizens established or recognized by constitutions which give them the power to participate directly or indirectly in the establishment or administration of government. **People v. Barrett, 203 Ill. 99, 67 N.E. 742, 96 Am.St.Rep. 296; Winnett v. Adams, 71 Neb. 817, 99 N.W. 684. (Black's Law 4th Edition)**

Political rights relate to individuals' ability to participate in the governance of their country, including voting and running for office.

## 4. Legal Rights

### Definition (Black's Law 4th Edition):

- *Legal Rights*: "Rights recognized by law, either natural or guaranteed by statute or derived from the government or constitution. A right created, acknowledged, or protected by law."
- Legal rights are established by statutes, regulations, or constitutional provisions and can vary depending on the governing laws of the jurisdiction.

## 5. Property (Economic) Rights

### Definition (Black's Law 4th Edition):

- *Property Rights*: "The rights vested in an individual or entity to own, use, and dispose of property. This includes the right to enjoy, control, and transfer property."
- Property rights are the legal rights to possess, use, and dispose of land, goods, or intellectual property. These rights are protected by law but can be subject to certain restrictions, such as zoning laws or eminent domain.

## 6. Human Rights

### Definition (Black's Law 4th Edition):

- *Human Rights*: "The freedoms, immunities, and benefits which, according to modern values, all human beings should be able to claim as a matter of right in the society in which they live."
- Human rights are generally understood to be rights inherent to all human beings, often recognized internationally and protected by treaties and global norms.

## 7. Collective Rights

### Definition (Black's Law 4th Edition):

- *Collective Rights*: While not specifically defined as "collective rights" in this edition, the dictionary addresses group or community rights in contexts such as unions, indigenous rights, or group property rights. These are rights held by a group rather than individuals, such as the right to self-determination for a community or the right of workers to organize for collective bargaining.

## 8. Argument Against Government as Grantor of Rights:

Just as the suffragists saw the 19th Amendment as reclaiming a right that had always been theirs, not as something granted by the government, I see it the same way. How can a creation of the people exclude the people?

Their victory was framed as the people taking back control over their inherent rights, rather than the government "giving" them something they deserved all along.



## D. Misconception of Democracy in America

1. In **Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition**, *democracy* is defined as:

**DEMOCRACY.** That form of government in which the sovereign power resides in and is exercised by the whole body of free citizens, as distinguished from a monarchy, aristocracy, or oligarchy. According to the theory of a pure democracy, every citizen should participate directly in the business of governing, and the legislative assembly should comprise the whole people. But the ultimate lodgment of the sovereignty being the distinguishing feature, the introduction of the representative system does not remove a government from this type. However, a government of the latter kind is sometimes specifically described as a "representative democracy."

Town form of government constitutes pure democracy as distinguished from representative government. *Commonwealth v. Town of Hudson*, 315 Mass. 335, 52 N.E.2d 566, 572.

This definition highlights that in a democracy, the power is vested in the people, either exercised directly or through elected representatives, differentiating it from systems where power is held by a single ruler or a small elite group.

### Key Characteristics:

- **Direct or Representative Democracy:** In a direct democracy, citizens directly vote on laws and policies. In a representative democracy, citizens elect officials to make decisions on their behalf, similar to a republic.
- **Majority Rule:** Decisions are typically made based on the will of the majority, meaning that the outcome favored by the most voters is enacted.
- **Focus on Equality in Participation:** Democratic systems emphasize equal participation in the political process, with each citizen having an equal vote.
- **Potential for Majority Domination:** In a pure democracy, there is a risk that the majority may impose its will on the minority without adequate protection of minority rights.

**Examples:** Ancient Athens is a historical example of direct democracy, where citizens directly voted on laws. Modern democracies, such as the United Kingdom or India, use representative systems.

In a **democracy**, the majority's will is the primary mechanism for making decisions, which can sometimes threaten individual or minority rights if unchecked.

2. **REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT.** One in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people, either directly, or through representatives chosen by the people, to whom those powers are specially delegated. **Black, Const. Law (3d Ed.) 309; In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 35 L.Ed. 219; Minor v. Happersett, 21 Wall. 175, 22 L.Ed. 627.**

### Key Characteristics:

- **Representative Government:** Citizens elect representatives who make decisions on their behalf, rather than making decisions directly.
- **Rule of Law:** A republic is governed by a constitution or set of laws that applies equally to all citizens, including the government itself.
- **Protection of Minority Rights:** A key feature of a republic is that it protects the rights of individuals and minority groups from the "tyranny of the majority."
- **Separation of Powers:** Typically, republics are characterized by the separation of powers between branches of government (executive, legislative, and judicial) to prevent the concentration of power.

Examples: The United States is a constitutional republic, where elected representatives, constrained by the Constitution, govern on behalf of the people.

In a republic, the people hold sovereign power but elect representatives to exercise that power on their behalf. It emphasizes the rule of law and the protection of individual rights.

3. **Electoral College:** The Electoral College is the system the United States uses to elect its president. Instead of a direct popular vote, each state has a certain number of "electors" based on its population (the number of representatives in the House plus two Senators). There are a total of 538 electors, and a candidate needs a majority of 270 to win the presidency. Each state's electors are typically awarded to the candidate who wins the popular vote in that state, with a few exceptions (Maine and Nebraska, which split their electors). This system was established by the Founding Fathers to balance power between large and small states and to prevent big states or cities from dominating the election.

### E. Timeline of Election Fraud Allegations and Accusations (2000–2020)

#### 1. 2000: Bush v. Gore

**Accusation:** The **Florida recount** was at the center of the election, where disputes over ballot designs (e.g., "hanging chads") and the exclusion of some voters led to claims of fraud. Both parties alleged manipulation of the electoral process, and the case went to the **U.S. Supreme Court**, which ultimately stopped the recount, resulting in **George W. Bush** winning the presidency.



## 2. 2003: Hammer and Scorecard Allegations

**Accusation:** In 2003, **Retired Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney** claimed that two programs, **Hammer** and **Scorecard**, developed by the **CIA** under **Dennis Montgomery**, were used to manipulate elections. Hammer was designed as a surveillance tool to combat radical Islamists, while **Scorecard** allegedly manipulated vote outcomes in foreign elections to install U.S.-friendly leaders.

McInerney further asserted that **Scorecard** was first deployed in the **2004 U.S. election**, allegedly marking the first major instance of cyber warfare aimed at manipulating the outcome in favor of **George W. Bush**.

## 3. 2004: Bush vs. Kerry

**Accusation:** Allegations focused on **Ohio**, a key swing state, where reports claimed irregularities with **electronic voting machines** and vote counts. The **SmarTech** company, based in Chattanooga, Tennessee, was implicated in managing the electronic vote data. **Stephen Spoonamore**, an IT expert, claimed that **SmarTech** could have manipulated vote totals to favor Bush.

**Mike Connell**, a GOP IT expert connected to SmarTech, was subpoenaed to testify but died in a **plane crash** in 2008 under suspicious circumstances, further fueling allegations of a cover-up([Benzinga](#))([Democracy Now!](#)).

Allegations also involved servers in **Chattanooga** potentially being part of the data manipulation, and these servers were compared to the **2020 Nashville bombing** ([Benzinga](#))([Democracy Now!](#)).

## 4. 2008: Obama vs. McCain

**Accusation:** The **ACORN** organization was accused of submitting fake voter registrations, which some conservatives argued could lead to **voter impersonation**. These claims gained significant media attention but did not result in findings of widespread fraud impacting the election([Wikipedia](#))([FactCheck.org](#)).

## 5. 2016: Trump vs. Clinton

**Accusation:** Widespread allegations of **Russian interference** surfaced, involving hacking and disinformation campaigns intended to sway public opinion toward **Donald Trump**. Additionally, there were accusations of **illegal voting** by non-citizens and double voting, though these were not proven on a large scale.

Claims of possible **voting machine tampering** were also raised, but they did not gain as much traction compared to other fraud accusations([Wikipedia](#))([Brennan Center for Justice](#)).

### 6. 2020: Trump vs. Biden

**Accusation:** After **Joe Biden** was declared the winner, **Donald Trump** and his supporters filed over 60 lawsuits alleging widespread voter fraud, particularly around **mail-in ballots**. Claims included **dead people voting**, **ballot harvesting**, and **double voting** in key states like **Georgia**, **Michigan**, and **Pennsylvania**([Wikipedia](#)).

**Dominion Voting Systems** and **Smartmatic** were accused of altering votes through their software, leading to defamation lawsuits filed by the companies. The use of **Hammer and Scorecard** was once again mentioned, with allegations that the programs were used to manipulate votes in favor of Biden([Wikipedia](#))([Benzinga](#)).

This timeline presents the major election fraud allegations made from **2000 to 2020**, highlighting various accusations without commenting on their veracity.

### F. New Voting Laws and Restrictions (e.g., Michigan): Michigan Passes Laws Restricting Election Recounts for Fraud Allegations and Wide-Margin Victories

### G. Restoring Justice Through Legal Maxims: The Case Against the General Grievance and Standing Doctrines

#### Introduction

The **general grievance doctrine** and the **doctrine of standing** are pivotal concepts in American legal jurisprudence. These doctrines, intended to limit judicial intervention to cases of specific, personal harm, have often been applied to dismiss cases involving collective or widespread harm, thus denying justice to individuals whose rights have been violated on a broader scale. Upon closer scrutiny, the **general grievance doctrine** contradicts foundational principles of law, particularly when examined in light of legal maxims, which are recognized as the **fundamental law** governing justice and court proceedings.

This scholarship will demonstrate how the **general grievance doctrine** is unconstitutional by referencing **Maxim 64ff**, which defines the role of courts in declaring the law according to **the Law of God** and **fundamental law**. In this context, **fundamental law** specifically refers to **legal maxims**—principles universally accepted as true and authoritative. The critique argues that both the **general grievance doctrine** and the **doctrine of standing** undermine the courts' duty to provide remedies for injuries, regardless of how generalized the harm may be.

## The Origin and Application of the General Grievance Doctrine

The **general grievance doctrine** originated as part of the broader **doctrine of standing**, which is rooted in **Article III** of the U.S. Constitution. Article III limits federal court jurisdiction to "cases" and "controversies," meaning that courts are only meant to address actual disputes where plaintiffs can demonstrate specific personal harm. The doctrine of standing was developed to ensure this by requiring plaintiffs to show:

1. **Injury-in-fact:** A concrete and particularized harm.
2. **Causation:** A direct link between the harm and the defendant's actions.
3. **Redressability:** A likelihood that a court ruling can address or remedy the harm.

The **general grievance doctrine** is a subset of standing doctrine, holding that claims involving harm that is widely shared by a large number of people—so-called "general grievances"—are non-justiciable because the injury is considered too abstract or generalized.

This doctrine first took clear shape in **Frothingham v. Mellon** (1923), where the Supreme Court ruled that a taxpayer could not challenge federal spending, as their injury was too generalized. The decision established a precedent for courts to dismiss claims of collective harm, which has been reaffirmed in later cases such as **Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife** (1992).

However, the application of the **general grievance doctrine** stands in stark contrast to legal maxims, which constitute the **fundamental law** that courts are obligated to uphold.

## Maxim 64ff and the Role of Courts

**Maxim 64ff** states: "A court can only declare what the law is, and whether consistent with the law of God, and the fundamental or constitutional law of society" (*The State v. Post*, 20 N.J.L. 368, 370 (1845)). In this context, **fundamental law** refers specifically to **legal maxims**, which are principles that form the bedrock of legal reasoning and justice. These maxims are universally accepted truths that require no argument or evidence, as noted in *Chrisman v. Lindennan* (100 S.W. 1090, 1092), where it was held that a maxim is a principle "universally admitted as being a correct statement of the law or agreeable to natural reason."

Maxims, by their very nature, hold the highest authority and govern the application of justice. According to **Maxim 64ff**, courts are bound to declare the law in a way that is consistent with these maxims, which are considered **fundamental law**. This imposes an obligation on the judiciary to provide remedies for any injury, whether individual or collective.

The **general grievance doctrine**, by dismissing cases based on their generalized nature, directly contradicts this legal mandate. As **Maxim 94u** states, "**The law wills that in every case where a man is wronged and endamaged, he shall always have a remedy.**" No court can lawfully deny a remedy simply because an injury is widespread. Courts, under **Maxim 64ff**, must evaluate all grievances in light of the fundamental law, which demands that every wrong be addressed and remedied.

## The Sole Purpose of Government is to Secure Rights

The **Declaration of Independence** and the **Original Organic Constitution of 1787** affirm that the **sole legitimate purpose of government is to secure the rights of the people**. This principle is further codified in **Alabama Constitution, Article I, Section 35**, which states: “**The sole object and only legitimate end of government is to protect the citizen in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and when the government assumes other functions, it is usurpation and oppression.**”

This understanding of government aligns directly with the **maxims of law**, which further reinforce the role of courts in safeguarding rights. **Maxim of Law 51p** asserts: “**The main object of government is the protection and preservation of personal rights, private property, and public liberties.**” When courts invoke the **general grievance doctrine** to dismiss valid claims, they are failing in their duty to uphold these fundamental rights.

Furthermore, as **Tucker Blackstone** articulated, “**If in a limited government the public functionaries exceed the limits which the constitution prescribes to their powers, every act is an act of usurpation in the government, and as such, treason against the sovereignty of the people.**” When courts use the general grievance doctrine to dismiss cases of widespread harm, they enable government overreach, allowing **usurpation** of the people's rights. By denying collective grievances, courts indirectly allow the government to infringe upon the very rights they are meant to secure.

## The Rule of Right and the Obligation to Remedy All Wrongs

**Maxim of Law 59o** declares: “**Law is a rule of right, and whatever is contrary to the rule of right is an injury.**” This maxim reinforces the idea that any violation of a person's rights, whether individual or collective, constitutes an injury that must be redressed. The **general grievance doctrine**, by dismissing claims based on their generalized nature, contradicts this essential principle of justice.

Under **Maxim 64ff**, courts are not permitted to deviate from their duty to provide remedies for all wrongs. The judiciary's role is to declare the law in a manner consistent with **God's law, natural law, and the maxims of law**—which constitute the **fundamental law**. By dismissing claims that involve collective harm, the courts are violating their obligation to ensure that every wrong is remedied.

## Courts Cannot Deviate from Declaring the Law

**Maxim 64ff** is unequivocal: **a court can only declare what the law is**, and it must do so in a manner that aligns with the **maxims of law**. Courts are not permitted to dismiss cases based on artificial limitations like the general grievance doctrine. Their duty is to declare the law in a way that ensures justice for all, regardless of how widespread the harm may be.

By applying the **general grievance doctrine**, courts deviate from their primary role of **declaring the law** and providing remedies for all wrongs. The dismissal of generalized grievances represents a failure of the courts to uphold the **fundamental law**, which demands that no wrong go without a remedy, as outlined in **Maxim 94u**.

## Overcoming the General Grievance Doctrine

## COMMON LAW ACADEMY LESSON

To overcome the **general grievance doctrine**, courts must return to the foundational principles of law, particularly the **maxims of law** that form the **fundamental law** referred to in **Maxim 64ff**. Courts are obligated to provide remedies for all injuries, regardless of whether they are individual or collective, in alignment with the **Law of God, natural law, and constitutional law**. The **general grievance doctrine** conflicts with these maxims by allowing the courts to dismiss valid claims of widespread harm, thus denying justice to those who are wronged.

Furthermore, courts must recognize that the **sole legitimate purpose of government** is to secure the rights of the people, as stated in the **Alabama Constitution** and reaffirmed by **Tucker Blackstone**. The **general grievance doctrine** enables **usurpation** by allowing the government to act without accountability for collective harms. This is unconstitutional and violates the very purpose of government and law.

### Conclusion

The **general grievance doctrine** and the **doctrine of standing**, as applied today, create unconstitutional barriers to justice. By preventing courts from hearing cases involving widespread harm, these doctrines violate the **maxims of law**, which form the **fundamental law** courts are obligated to uphold. **Maxim 64ff**, **Maxim 94u**, and **Maxim of Law 59o** clearly establish that courts must provide remedies for all injuries, regardless of their scope.

To restore justice, courts must abandon the **general grievance doctrine** and realign their practices with the **maxims of law**. Only then can the judiciary fulfill its duty to **declare the law** in accordance with **God's law, natural law, and the constitutional law of society**, ensuring that every wrong receives a remedy.



<https://crosscheckusa.com/>

## Tamborine Borrelli CrossCheck USA Creator

I am excited to introduce you to someone who has tirelessly dedicated herself to the cause of election integrity, standing firm in her principles regardless of political affiliation. **Tamborine Borrelli** is not only the **Founder of CrossCheck USA™**, but also a dear friend. Since 2016, **Tamborine** has been an outspoken advocate for election transparency and fairness, having experienced the challenges of both major political parties as she remained focused on exposing the flaws in our voting systems.

Her journey—starting as a supporter of Bernie Sanders and later of Donald Trump—illustrates her unwavering commitment to truth rather than partisan loyalty. From founding the **Washington Election Integrity Coalition United (WEiCU)** to filing multiple lawsuits based on concerning election data, **Tamborine's** fight has been long and relentless.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you **Tamborine Borrelli**, the visionary behind **CrossCheck USA™**, a non-partisan initiative focused on bringing true transparency to our election systems.

