

A Brief Definition of Natural Law

Belief in God is part, a major part of the problem. God cannot form part of objective truth, because it's impossible to either prove or disprove the existence of a deity. But human nature and natural law are objective truths, they can be proven and apply to everyone, irrespective of whatever metaphysical beliefs they may hold.

For example, it's a natural law or an objective truth that every living entity, be it animal or plant, comes into existence with the inherent right to prolong or preserve its own existence, and if it belongs to a high enough order of life, to improve its conditions if it's able.

Some people call that right of existence a God-given right, but God is irrelevant to the question: whether or not there is a God, those rights exists in nature.

For humans, sustaining and improving one's life and conditions involves conscious thought, which introduces morality into the equation. Since everyone comes into the world with the same rights, and sustaining one's life is a right or correct action, being in accordance with natural law, it follows that in that sustaining, it's incumbent on everyone to allow all others the same freedom. So, we are free to sustain and improve our lives, as long as by so doing we don't harm or prevent anyone else from doing the same. That is natural law, and for some religious people (but by no means all) it accords with the imagined wills of the gods they worship.

The problems occur when many humans accept the concept of some people possessing authority to compel or coerce others to their will or their beliefs, or even their political policies. In reality, no such authority can objectively exist, since all are born with equal rights. So, whether the coercion that is practised in the world is motivated by greed, political ambition, or by manipulation by guilt, deception or fear, originating from religious belief or any other motivation, that is not a right action, and is wrong, or immoral.

When thought about deeply enough, it is not even a right to voluntarily surrender one's freedom to the immoral authority of others, placing oneself in a position of subservience or slavery to their whims or dictates, because it is voluntarily abandoning the innate responsibility for maintaining control over one's life, and actively encourages the development of wrong or evil behaviour in one's fellows. The types of wrongs done by those thus encouraged will inflict real, tangible harm on their victims, which is why it can never be a right to voluntarily surrender one's power and freedom to others, who might use the power thus unlawfully bestowed, to harm one's fellow humans.

It is this abandonment of responsibility and the craven submission to unjustified authority which is the source of virtually all the evil and immorality we see in the world today. It permits the abuse of inalienable rights, creates and perpetuates class

distinctions which are enforced by violence, and encourages criminality amongst those who might otherwise be content to be law-abiding, were they not subjected to 'legalized bullying' and extortion.

If you study the life of Jesus Christ, he rejected the authority of not only the religious leaders of his day, but the political authority of the occupying Romans, and the evils of the fraudulent money-changers. He taught that the knowledge of truth was what set one free, and that this had nothing to do with conditions obtaining in the world, but came from freeing oneself from wrong or immoral desires or motives. Jesus was an anarchist in the true sense of the word, which doesn't mean lawlessness, but does mean that no person should exercise unrighteous dominion over another, no matter from what motivation that might spring.

Sadly, almost everyone subscribes to the view that "someone should be in charge", and when given the chance, even casts votes in elections, hoping that how *they* think people ought to behave, will somehow be imposed on those with differing opinions or political views. That is obviously a very serious infraction of the natural laws we can all agree should be in place, and institutionalizes conflict within any community.

There is a proper method for ensuring that people comply with natural law and are held to account when they harm others, but it is not the holding of elections and enforcing the will of the majority onto the minority, which is just as immoral as one individual enforcing their will on a single other individual. Such wholesale immorality in a community removes the protection provided by adherence to natural law, and sets the stage for all manner of widespread abuses of that law, and the destruction of natural justice from the polity of the society. This is what we see on a global scale. Just as an individual's life reflects the choices they have made over time, and their overall level of contentment or happiness indicates the level of their moral values, the same is true for society as a whole. There is no escape from the consequences of our decisions made with respect to natural law: natural law is immutable.

The method for ensuring adherence to natural law is trial-by-jury, whereby the people retain control of the law, and can refuse to convict someone charged with a 'victimless crime', thereby rendering unjust legislation inoperative, without resorting to violence.

To learn more about this natural law and how it needs to be restored in our societies, visit:

<https://magnacarta1215.com>

Or email : mc1215a61perth@gmail.com

