
From: Richard Maggi <aquimore@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 4, 2020 10:31 AM
To: Comments Mailbox
Subject: [External]RE RULE1:42 AND CLE REGULATIONS TO REQUIRE CREDITS IN DIVERSITY, INCLUSION, AND ELIMINATION OF BIAS

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I write in relation to the proposed amendment TO RULE1:42AND CLE REGULATIONS TO REQUIRE CREDITS IN DIVERSITY, INCLUSION,AND ELIMINATION OF BIAS

The court's action plan from July 16, 2020 states that

the Court follows up on that statement by announcing specific interim goals that the New Jersey Judiciary will strive to achieve within the next year, while continuing ongoing efforts, including working internally and with our inter branch partners to identify, confront, and seek to remedy institutional bias and inequality.

First, if the study continues, why is a new rule being proposed now? It appears that you have not even determined that there is a problem within the trial bar contributing to what may be racial inequality in the system. How can you even formulate a program to provide to lawyers when you don't know what actions or inactions by lawyers may have contributed to the supposed problem?

To me the release of this rule at this particular time is a knee-jerk reaction to the seeming racial unrest of the last few months. Yet, there has been no effort to determine if the present unrest is driven by persons living in the involved communities who are truly aggrieved by discrimination or whether outside forces are trying to provoke violence and disrupt the peace of this country using unfortunate killings of black persons as the triggering mechanism. So it appears to me that there is not an imminent need to impose this rule.

Knowing the liberal bias that exists among many who create diversity courses and of those seeking to compel this requirement, I am concerned that the available courses for this diversity requirement will degenerate into indoctrination of critical race theory and gender ideology, among other radical ideologies. They will not likely address rising anti-Semitism, anti-Christian (particularly anti-Catholic) bigotry, and suppression of conservative thought.

Seeing no rational reason supporting the need for such training and suspecting that it will essentially include, as a condition for maintaining our licenses, indoctrination of a radical agenda, which I strenuously reject, I am totally opposed to this new requirement.

Lastly, it is hard enough to find courses that provide ethics credits. So to add a fifth one is really a burden regardless of its content.

Richard P. Maggi, Esq.