- Traditional Model
- Critique
- Criminal Law?
- Twist, not Transformation
Three Questions
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“How can you defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- “lend [their] exertions to all, [themselves] to none. The result of the cause is to [them] a matter of indifference

- Guilt, not truth

- Not about escaping conviction

- Vindicating rights
“How can you defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- Can = should?
- Knowledge and belief
- Defences run – false and/or affirmative?
- ‘Guilty’ clients – anti-Crown
- Perjured testimony – no, but ....
“How can you defend someone whom you know to be guilty?”

- Rule of Law -- all entitled to lawyer
- Why ‘you’?
- Already selective
- More socially beneficial than not
- Personal responsibility – last lawyer in town