



**THE INNOCENT PERSONS'  
GUIDE TO THE LAW**

**SAM FRYMAN**

# The Innocent Persons' Guide to the Law

by Sam Fryman

Copyright Sam Fryman © 2006

# Contents

Introduction	3
Chapter 1 – Motive, Philosophy and Law	8
Chapter 2 – The Genesis and Evolution of Law	19
Chapter 3 – Trust and the Law	30
Chapter 4 – Zero Tolerance, Rape and the Law	39
Chapter 5 – Crime and Punishment	58
Chapter 6 – Violent Crime - <i>Games People Play</i>	69
Chapter 7 – Miscellaneous Injustices	87
Chapter 8 – Natural or Spiritual Law	114

## Introduction

In the 1966 classic movie, *A Man For All Seasons*, Sir Thomas More, a lawyer, Lord Chancellor to and originally close friend of Henry VIII, finds himself compromised when his beautiful and erudite daughter's suitor, also training as a lawyer, outspokenly condemns the then current corrupt state of the law and cries that surely even *anarchy* would be a better way.

But Thomas More severely castigates him, and tells him that the walls have ears, and that he must understand his position as Lord Chancellor, and there are certain things "he must not hear." He says further in defence of the status quo that were the law, corrupt as it may be, to be removed, a terrifying wind would blow through the land that would not leave a stone standing, and every decent man and woman in peril of their lives.

For without the law, after all - just what would be there to stop the less salubrious members of our community from robbing, murdering and raping us? So surely without the law, there could be no civilised society in any plausible form at all.

That is to say, there is no question whatsoever that even a corrupt system of law is better than none at all, and that a pretence of justice is better than no pretence of justice at all, just as there is some *chance* that when the politicians of our world keep talking about freedom for their peoples they might actually some day *mean* it.

But as mankind has advanced further throughout its long evolutionary history, and history itself – in so far as we have the proper facts to assess it – has come increasingly under scrutiny, and now upon our planet, there are millions who are studying the present in the context of the past more than ever before, and seeing how the repeated patterns of the history of nations and their systems of law have gone, and how this has never led to any well documented state of peace, order and justice for all.

As "the law" in modern times is now regarded as a very sought after and esteemed occupation and destination for the modern educated man or woman, and the rest of us will find ourselves likely at some or even several critical moments in our lives at its tender mercies, it is therefore important for us all to have a sound appreciation of how modern laws are being made and functioning, and where that is leading us as individuals and a society.

Those who believe law to be a “dull, boring or tedious” subject, not relevant to them, need to quickly overcome this erroneous and deluded belief for their own good, and indeed personal security, as well as that of their citizens in the wider world.

For as we shall attempt to show, there is no subject more fascinating and more important to each of us in our daily lives.

For example, who can deny that the issue of and laws upon “freedom of speech” have become totally central to our lives, as surely, this question is regarding a basic fundamental human right and freedom, without which we can surely not imagine ourselves as free humans in any convincing way?

Then there are the laws regarding marriage, divorce and sexual relations, which again, are becoming either prisons or freedoms for us all, depending on which side of the current law we may find ourselves.

And then again, there is *copyright law*, which seeks to protect the rights of those who are usually wealthy and powerful, from those who are generally far less so, and may not even have the money to purchase the media products of society, which are now considered a common possession of the average citizen, but many citizens are unable to afford the price of and therefore consider *extortionate*.

Then there is tax law, which many citizens have fallen foul of, either deliberately or not so, and had their lives ruined thereby; there is the commercial law, such as that of the “limited company”, which it appears in numerous cases has enabled many businesses to defraud ordinary citizens without ever having to compensate them for their crimes; and there is the employment law, which seeks to sometimes it appears protect the employer from the employee, though one in theory might have imagined that as *the employer* is generally the more powerful party than the employee, that it would be principally be working quite the other way around.

Then, there is the enormous and lucrative area of *negligence law*, which seeks to find parties who have had some non-criminal but destructive act inflicted upon them, but though they cannot likely imprison the perpetrator, can seek damages by way of compensation, such as in personal injury or medical negligence cases.

Next, we should mention *criminal law*, which seeks at least in theory to protect our basic human rights in regard as attacks on our property and person, and convict the guilty and acquit the innocent. If only it always worked out that way.

Finally, in this brief survey of the major areas of modern law, we should mention *defamation* law, which seeks in theory to protect the rights of the individual against false accusations which might damage his or her reputation. Yet in practice, we often find that only the wealthy have the power to protect their reputations by this means.

There are of course many other areas of “specialist” law which have been “invented” or “identified” as time has gone by such as “civil liberties” or “human rights” law and so on, but if we get too far bogged down in the varieties of law, we will feel we are confronted with a maze so detailed that it makes the construction and design of the Pharaoh’s great pyramids look like child’s play.

Clearly, this is a sign that the law itself has become far too complex, as on the one hand, the ordinary individual cannot possibly be aware of all these increasingly abstruse specialisms that are appearing ever more so by the day, and the countless sometimes seemingly petty rules and regulations governing all kinds of situations – such as the administration of state welfare benefits and tax laws – but on the other hand, is in the author’s view wholly unjustly *expected* to do so.

As is commonly said, *ignorance of the law is no defence*.

Then of course, there is the question not merely of the letter of the law, but of the *administration* of law itself – the judges, courts and juries who seek to put into practice the rules the various lawmaking bodies have created to guide them as to what to do in any particular case of dispute.

For example, take the recent Michael Jackson alleged child molestation trial. The jury was composed of *eight women* and *only four men*. Was their not some “gender biased” issue there, which might have “perverted the course of justice”, just as would some modern lady now seeking to accuse and convict a man of rape feel herself unfairly treated, were she to see a jury of *twelve men only* adjudicating on her case?

Then again, we have the recent case of David Irving, the “holocaust denying” historian. Does it seem just that this man gets two years or more in prison, merely for holding a contrary viewpoint to other historians,

whether it is right or wrong, whether he is a crank or he is not – whilst muggers, rapists and even murderers many times walk free, without a stain upon their characters or slap upon their wrists?

But we are not necessarily *here* trying to take *sides*, as surely the ultimate goal of any system of law, is to create a system of *impartial* justice, and thus any valuable treatise of law must seek to do the same.

So just what is the purpose of this work then, one might *legitimately* ask, if the author does not just wish to offer us his personally petty opinions?

Firstly, it is to acquaint the vast majority of our national and global citizens, those who may have never – unlike the author – had the opportunity to study this fascinating and utterly relevant subject, and to help them if possible see the vital importance of this area to their lives.

In that process, the author will try in so far as possible not to try to talk “legalese” and therefore blind the general reader with a jargon he or she is in no position to absorb and appreciate, but rather to demystify the whole subject, and to express in as simple and clear a manner as possible the main parts of the law the individual should be aware of for his or her own protection and good.

But the purpose here however is not at all to act as some kind of “law made simple” book with which one might then learn to protect one’s assets and so on.

It is mainly to explain what is going on *as a whole* in the modern law, and thus enable the reader who may have little time – as is true of us all – to look at the specialist aspects of law, to see what it is that actually confronts them, and what in general society should do about this problem:

i.e. that the individual is in no position to be able to study and appreciate all the laws that he or she is unjustly expected to know.

But for the legally trained reader also, we feel there will be much to consider here, and we will attempt in so far as is possible within the confines of a moderately sized work, to find some fresh insights and avenues of approach on as many as possible of the modern legal issues.

However, as we have said, above all we are going to concentrate on *the big picture* relevant to all citizens, so that everyone who reads this work will find that even the reading of a few chapters of it will likely leave

them with a feeling of security and “empowerment” that they perhaps never had regarding this subject ever before.

Above all, we are going to here, as it were, *put the law itself on trial*, not to remove it in some kind of anarchistic holocaust upon the law libraries and the legal authorities, but to ask above all, *how should we seek to rule and govern our nations and world?*

For as Solomon said, for those who believe in Bible Stories, or even only consider them as some interesting myths and fables:

*Give me wisdom Lord, so that I may justly govern my people.*



## Chapter 1 – Motive, Philosophy and Law

We want to assure the reader right away that this is *not* going to be any difficult to read, boring or unduly intellectually demanding book upon law, though certainly no idiot will be reading it either, as such a person will not have likely got beyond the introduction.

For as we have explained in our earlier work *What is Intelligence?* we are not going to use the device of creating abstruse and Gordian-knot like arguments and theories, with which to *escape into abstraction* and confound all our readers.

We are rather, going to talk from *simplicity*, from what we hope and feel should be clear to all, using as little jargon or complex concepts as possible, so that *all* may understand.

For example, some readers may be unaware of what in the above paragraph we were referring to when we mentioned “The Gordian Knot”, which any good dictionary or encyclopaedia will quickly explain to them.

But we do not wish them to try so hard as to make such an effort – for surely by implication they will realise the approximate meaning from context – i.e. of an intricate and tightly bound knot of numerous interwoven and tangled strands.

Rather, we aim to like *Alexander the Great*, cut through the massive tangled knot of law that surrounds us with a single swipe using not a real sword, but a mighty sword of *truth and logic* which should make the real purpose, motives and modus operandi of the law clear and visible to all.

Although the author has made serious academic study of law, he does not however claim to be or indeed *desire* to be a *specialist*, because as he has argued in his earlier work, *What is Intelligence?* such specialism in itself tends to be the enemy of the more intuitive, broader and therefore *wiser* view of life and all its aspects.

For what is required in *honestly and objectively* assessing all fields of knowledge is rather the unblemished mind of the *innocent but informed*, like that of the little boy in the Emperor’s New Clothes story, who is not afraid to see and state the truth, while all the “courtiers” are busy trying to restate and reinforce the lie.

The first principle we need to appreciate if we are to take this honest and innocent view is that *laws have motives*.

Every law is made for a reason – it is to protect or enforce some principle that we hold, or which rather *the law-making entity (person or body)* wishes to see protected or enforced.

For example, in Biblical times, Moses (“the lawgiver”) allegedly produced the law under guidance from “God”:

*THOU SHALT NOT KILL.*

The *motive* of this law was therefore to protect human life.

The *principle* to be protected was that *human life is “sacred”, or of great importance, and that no individual should be given the right to take it away from another.*

Therefore, we see that *philosophy* underlies *motive* which therefore underlies *law*.

Thus we see that *philosophy* is the key to all human law.

Is it what we *believe* to be right or wrong that eventually forms our legal system, or rather therefore, the beliefs and philosophies *of those who have the power* to make the laws.

That is to say that those who believe in a God – or rather *their version* of “God” - will naturally make different laws to those who do not.

Their philosophies of life will surely be different.

For example, if the “God-driven” person, like allegedly Moses, says *THOU SHALT NOT KILL*, the materialist who does not believe in a god might well ask, *why not?*

And what does the God-believer answer?

He says “you will rot in hell if you do this wrong thing, or you will go to heaven if you don’t.”

But the materialist says, “I believe in neither heaven nor hell, but only in the here and now. Therefore, I will do what I please, and what seems fit to me.”

That is, he is like *Aleister Crowley* said, following the philosophy of

*DO WHAT THOU WILT SHALL BE THE WHOLE OF THE LAW*

We are not here seeking to denigrate or attack *Aleister Crowley* or anyone else however, who no doubt like the rest of us was partly “good” and partly “bad”, just as we are not seeking to justify or deny any belief in a god.

We are just discussing *cause* and *effect*.

We are just pointing out that someone’s philosophy, ideals or belief system will form the basis of the laws enacted, should that person get into the position of power to the extent of being able to make, alter or influence the law.

Thus if a “dictator” such as *Stalin* or the *Emperor Nero* gets into power, he will start making laws according to his own philosophy, which in the case of a “dictator” will generally therefore be laws which benefit himself and his associates at the expense of everybody else.

For without using these words glibly such as a “dictator”, let us ask exactly what a “dictator” is.

We mean, do we not, someone in whom *power is centralised*. That person then gets their individual voice to have “sole authority” over everybody else.

So we could thus look at the former British *Margaret Thatcher* government, or the current *Tony Blair* government as examples of governments in which the power seems to have become unduly focussed and *centralized* in one person, and therefore could be regarded as “dictatorships.”

But on the other hand, what about leaders such as *Moses* or *King Solomon*, whom history judges to be “good”?

They too surely appeared to be virtual dictators, or “rulers” who by definition *make the rules*.

For example, Moses is said to have come down from the mountain with his tablets of laws, to find the people worshipping “false idols” like the “Golden Calf.”

Did those people ask for the “law of Moses”? They were so the story goes busy having orgies and enjoying lots of drink, partying and wearing fine clothes and jewellery.

So what gave Moses the *right* to come down from his “holy mountain” and start “laying down the *law*” and spoiling their “fun”?

So he says “God”, but for those who did not believe in any god, which presumably there were many of, just as there are now, then objectively speaking he had *no* right, did he?

No more than any other person.

So it is clear that the issue of whether people believe there is a god or there is not is central to the formation of law.

Even to those who are firm atheists, it is fairly obvious that there is a strong correspondence with and resemblance to the commandments of Moses, to be found in virtually all systems of modern law.

But then leaving “religious beliefs” aside, others would say, laws surely should be based upon the philosophy of common interest.

That is to say, we should all consider how we would ideally like to be treated by the law in any given situation, and see to it that laws are passed to that effect.

Which sounds just wonderful does it not, and therefore, surely the basis upon which all laws can be agreed?

But there is a problem with that. And that problem is that there is not necessarily any such thing in our modern society as *we*.

Just who is this *we*, that *we* keep talking about?

Is it the British, or the Americans or the Chinese, or indeed the Muslims?

Is it the gays and lesbians, it is the negroes, or it is the animal rights protesters?

Is it men or it is women, or are men and women now so unanimous in their thinking that we can just say *we* assuming that it refers to both?

So the truth is that there is no identifiable *we* except that we are all as far as we can see all *human beings*.

But unfortunately, we are all divided into warring little groups and factions, whether that battle is between nation and nation, or two or more warring ethnic or religious groups within a nation, or between even men and women, either individually or collectively speaking.

Most of us have a grievance about something, and wish that the politicians and other governmental bodies would *do something* about *our particular problem* on our behalf, that is, generally speaking to *make a law*.

And thus, as there are all these often small or “minority” warring groups within our society, there are enormous number of laws made, with all these competing groups large or small all trying to protect their own little specialised and particular interests.

And of course, for every little group who has a grievance, when these laws are made, there is *a paid job* waiting for someone who can study the typically intricate depths of all these laws, i.e. a *lawyer*.

The more laws governmental bodies pass, the more lawyers there have to be, and indeed we see more lawyers now in the Western world especially than surely have ever been throughout all of recorded history.

Is this a healthy situation?

We would say not.

Why would we say not?

Because the fact that we *need* these numerous lawyers, is proof positive that we are a society which is increasingly at war within itself.

Men are at war with women, and women with men, parents are at war with their children, gays are at war with straights, and “believers” are at war with “unbelievers”, one tribe within a nation is at civil war with another tribe, and nations are at war with nations.

It is surely obvious to anyone that this is the growing pattern of existence on planet earth.

We just cannot get our neighbour to *treat us as he or she would have him or herself treated*.

And thus we seek the protection of the law.

But on the other hand, those who seek to gain what in objective terms might be called “unfair advantage” equally seek to use the law to their own ends.

And now we see *what is really going on*.

Which is, the law is being used as a tool to *dominate one philosophy with another*.

For example, the feminists are forever demanding more rights for women, but these may often be at the expense of men.

Because the feminists hold a *philosophy* that the pre-existing state of men holding the dominant places in society and as leaders of the family, and in their treatment of women throughout history has been *wrong*, and they want to use legal means to prevent those kind of relationships between men and the women continuing.

But as we have said, we are not *here* trying to adjudicate or judge, and say whose philosophy is right or wrong. We are just pointing out *motive*, and that *philosophy* is the key to motive, and therefore the basis of law.

Again, for example, in “International Law”, countries such as America or England argue that they are entitled to have equipment in nuclear industries, such as nuclear power and weapons, but that other countries are not allowed to have these technologies and weapons, as is the current policy regarding Iran.

They use such “legal bodies” as the United Nations to pass “resolutions” and so on to “outlaw” the actions of these so called “rogue nations.”

Yet, rightly or wrongly, they are thereby denying to such nations the same rights as they themselves possess.

And thus we see that the emphasis on modern International Law making tends to be *one law for you and another for me*, just as in the feudal system, the days of “the Lord of the Manor” there was one law for the lord, and a different one for the “serfs” or effective slaves.

We call this behaviour of *one rule for you, a different one for me* “hypocrisy.”

But when this charge is levelled at the alleged hypocrite, they do not of course admit it. Instead they hire, guess what - *a lawyer* - to argue the case *for* them and *against* us.

For example, in defamation cases – i.e. those in which either *slander* or *libel* – is *alleged* – huge sums of money can change hands depending on the outcome, which the lawyers rub their hands over taking a sizeable percentage of, regardless of which party is “proven” right or wrong.

Let us take for example the case of a politician who is accused of some action that is not actually illegal (in most Western countries), such as using a prostitute, but will nevertheless damage their reputation and career if widely believed.

Clearly in this example there are *the facts, the truth*, and we the public, or even the judge or jury, do not typically know the facts or truth, as incidentally quite often *do not even the solicitors and barristers*, who also know *only what they have been told*.

We are asked in a *civil case* (which this as *defamation* is, where prison is *not* a possible outcome) to decide the truth on *the balance of probability*, which is a lower “standard” of proof than that in a criminal case (where prison *is* possible), which must like murder or rape be proven *beyond reasonable doubt*.

So again, in this example, both parties may be acting from different motives. One has a motive to *show the truth* and the other party has a motive to *repackage or suppress the truth*.

So the issue here again is of *philosophy*.

Some individuals, parties and groups in society thus hold the viewpoint, the *philosophy*, that *telling lies or presenting false images* is for them at least a “legitimate” way to achieve their ends.

That is, they believe that some people (i.e. themselves and their group) are entitled to have rights and privileges that others do not, and that lies and false accusations are an acceptable means to obtain and maintain those exclusive rights and privileges.

But like any other, surely this is just another *philosophy*.

So now we have determined that the source of all our laws is the philosophy that individuals and groups hold, the next question is therefore, where does the individual's philosophy come from?

And there seem to be only two possible answers to this:

- a) it is from some intrinsic quality within each of us, which might even be described as “religious” or “spiritual”, or:
- b) our so called “philosophy” is really just the direct outcome of *desires*, of *what we want to do*.

For example, take the issue of prostitution, which is mostly legal in Western countries, but still illegal in some non-Western ones.

Suppose we ask a woman who is happily married whether she thinks prostitution should be legal or not. She may based on *her* desire to stop her husband associating with other women say *no*.

However, if we ask a woman who is a single parent, and finds being a part-time prostitute is a very easy way to produce or supplement her income and support her children, and has no moral qualms about it, she will be in favour of its legalisation in whatever way makes her life the easiest.

Therefore, in the case of these two different women, their so called “philosophy” has no consistent basis, but is merely rooted in their *desire*, their individual wants and needs.

Incidentally we should point out here that if there were no such women who had to support children without the *adequate* financial support of a male, or even the state, as for example is largely true in the more religiously influenced countries and cultures, the need or *desire* to become prostitutes in these countries *for this reason* would therefore be more or less zero.



So therefore, we see that the aggregate philosophy of our society can either prevent or create problems, such as that of prostitution.

But the main purpose here is to explain the genesis of law – that is, it is rooted in either generally speaking a strongly held religious or philosophical position, or it is merely the product of *desire*.

We could even argue of course that any religious or moral philosophy is based on desire.

So as we now see that at the root of what laws are made and not made is ultimately, the individual and collective desire, we need to be specific about the nature of *desire*.

And in this regard, we need to distinguish between *wants* and *needs*.

(briefly, the *spiritual view* or *law of the prophets* is that we should base all our social structure and laws on *needs*, not *egotistical wants*).

For example, a man who has a job where he must travel around a great deal, such as a doctor on call, *needs* a car.

But many of us *want* a car, just for the pleasure and freedom it can bring.

Both wants and needs fall under the term *desire*. But clearly, as a community we need to distinguish these two things.

For if continuing our example, there were only a limited number of cars to go round, if we were to attempt to fulfil all our *desires*, then the person who actually *needs* a car, like the doctor, may not get one, in favour of someone who merely *wants* a car, but has no easily definable *need* for them.

But of course, what people think they *need* is a great subject for debate.

For example again, one man may say he *needs* a mansion and a thousand acres of land, and another may say he only needs a few small rooms.

So then we might ask *why* the first man feels he needs the big house and lands, when the second man says he does not.

And again, it is philosophy, it is how each man sees his own personal circumstances and life.

For again, one man may say – I have a powerful sex desire, I need several women or wives. But another man says, I will be content if I can find only one good wife.

Who is “right”, who is “wrong”?

Is the first man to be regarded as “greedy”, taking more than his fair share of women, or does he because of his greater desire simply have a greater *need*, that the second man does not?

And thus, playing “the Devil’s Advocate” we can already see how different people justify themselves having rights or desires or needs – however they like to put it – that others do not.

And so then when a certain man or woman wants to assert their right to such desires that are disputed by others, they hire a lawyer to “prove their cause.”

For example again, the politician who desires to use prostitutes may hold the philosophy “I do my duty for my community as their elected member, and what I do in my private life in terms of sex activity is nobody else’s business, and does not affect my duties.”

Thus he may feel entitled to use a lawyer to disprove some accusations even if they are true, because he feels that the newspapers or whomever have no right to bring out what he sees as his private life into the public arena, knowing that will likely damage his career and electability.

Whereas some of the women’s rights campaigners may have the *desire* to see no women forced into the situation of prostitution, and feel that to do so is against the dignity of women, even though some women may *choose* this way of life and means of earning a living. So such campaigners will be keen to vilify and condemn any politician who uses prostitutes, because they will see that as supportive of the abuse and degradation of women.

Whereas, other species of women’s rights campaigners will demand that women have *the right* to be prostitutes, yet in a safe and controlled manner, such as in government administrated and regulated facilities.

So here again, we see that there is a war of *philosophies* going on even between those who would seem to the casual observer to be *batting on the same team*.

Thus we see already the complexity of trying to create laws in a society and world whose citizens all hold countless conflicting philosophies and desires, and some of whom regard as *needs* what other merely regarded as unnecessary *wants*, and thus we see how this has all caused the legal systems of the various countries to be vastly more complex the otherwise they need be.

In particular however, as we proceed we would therefore like the reader to bear in mind these two questions of *philosophy* and *motive* in the creation and administration of law, which as we have explained tend to be either based on some kind of religious or “ethical” beliefs and position, or are simply the cumulative result of “common or garden” desires.

## Chapter 2 - The Genesis and Evolution of Law

We have pointed out that the major sources of our modern laws have been religious or philosophical ideas and our collective desires and feelings about what we want for ourselves, and to what degree we feel it is appropriate to extend rights to others to satisfy their own desires, depending on our own social position and status and theirs.

We have seen *hypocrisy* plays a part in this, particularly in respect of those parties who are at any point in history dominant, and therefore in a position to demand and defend exclusive rights that weaker parties do not hold, and thus which amongst parties of equal power would be seen as unjust.

Let us not however get into the realms of a detailed intellectual and historical analysis of how law evolved, when and where, but let us rather use our intuition, imagination and above all *logic* to show how things *must* have happened, based on our commonsense understanding of human nature.

That is to say, in the early history of mankind, where there were perhaps only a few thousand humans in any country on earth, naturally some groups would form, just as in the animal kingdom, for their own protection.

However, inevitably under the basis of greed, of Richard Dawkin's "selfish gene", the fundamentally selfish nature of man would express itself in the desire for more mates and territory, so that various small but aggressive groups, just like our modern gangsters, would inevitably seek to take as many females as mates, and as much territory as possible.

However, they would not as society became more complex, necessarily kill off the weaker members of the groups they belonged to, as they would see that there were many benefits to keeping alive the less privileged members of their group, such as them being good hunters or gatherers who could therefore make the dominant group members' lives more easy, luxurious and comfortable.

In short, we would see the beginnings of *slavery* and *serfdom*.

Some "big chief" in any tribe would then not only get to mate with all the females of his choice, but would also get some inferior tribe member to

for example waft a big palm leaf to keep him cool and the flies away, to make his life more pleasurable and lazy.

It is an interesting and probably to most people reprehensible aspect of the human animal, that it would employ other members of its group to do such pampering and preening services on its behalf, whereas typically a horse or bull or other animal will be content to swish its own tail by its own efforts to scatter the flies way.

However, there was an equal if not more powerful reason for keeping the non-dominant human group members around – which was to use them as warriors or soldiers to protect the group from other rival groups situated in some not too far distant place.

So thus we see some kind of social order arising.

Naturally these “big chief” humans in the tribe and their close associates would start giving orders of some kind, to force the rest of the tribe members to carry out their wishes, and as they would in time tire of repetition of their instructions, to make life easier for themselves they would try to *codify* them, and therefore create some system of rules or *laws*.

No doubt before the time of widespread literacy, which is of course a very recent phenomenon for the mass of humans whose importance must not be underrated, they would employ some especially eloquent member of their tribe to gather together the rest and start “laying down the law”, just as does a teacher or head teacher in a modern school.

We observe in gangster societies how the often equally illiterate members of the gang are made to follow “the rules” or laws.

One lieutenant of the big boss will say to an underling “Big Joe don’t like you looking at his dame. He says he will blow your head off if he sees you doing it again.”

So that gives a message to all the gang members as the gossip gets round that Big Joe’s woman is his exclusive property and possession, and all other gang members are forbidden to take any sexual interest in her.

So of course as society grew beyond little tribes, for example in the times of the Feudal system in England in the middle ages, which had its “lord of the manor” who ruled over the “serfs” (effective *slaves*), as literacy

spread, at least a few people in a district would be able to read or write – those in the Church for example - and thus *written codes of law* were created, even like King John’s famous Magna Carta.

However, it was clear that because most of the people still could not read it, or have access to it, this law was still more or less totally in the hands of local judges or “sheriffs” who could within limits more or less twist the rules any way they liked.

But the basis of the law, it is clear has therefore been always the rules made by *the Lords* to rule over the masses, the serfs.

For example, in a few well known movies, including Mel Gibson’s *Braveheart*, we saw the law of *prima nocta* which gave a presiding local ruler the right to have conjugal rights with any serf’s bride on the first night of their married life before the serf husband himself.

Obviously now, we would not regard that as fair or just, as likely did not the peoples of those times, yet *it was the law*.

But why is it we must ask that we *now* regard such a law as unjust?

For clearly the Lords did not care to see things that way.

They might well have said – “I, as the Lord of this Manor feed and protect you all. Should an army or band of marauders from afar come to threaten your lives and women and children, I will organise and lead you and call for guards or soldiers to protect you. Thus, all I ask is one night with each of your brides, and then as husbands you may enjoy your wife for the rest of your life. Is that not fair?”

Or if he was really clever, he might have hired *a lawyer* to do the talking for him.

Because even a Lord of the Manor must have realised that were he to behave abominably without justification, he might make himself into a sufficient object of hate, that he might be murdered by some over-bullied serf, so he had to find ways to justify his behaviour and make it seem reasonable, while he continued to oppress his people, just as we see all the political leaders doing now.

Equally, though the lord would assign special privileges to himself, to keep himself living in luxury, he had to keep his serfs happily working

for him, which meant at times resolving the disputes that they had with one another, and on that level, he could assign them all *equal rights*.

That is, though he would hold himself in a class apart, and in that sense above the laws which after all, he himself had created, he could give “equality” to his serfs or “subjects” *between themselves* and once again make himself seem like a just Lord or ruler that way.

We note looking at Nature, that although in the animal kingdom in general the stronger animal will always rule over the weaker animal, that even puny humans have for millennia shown their ability to rule over the dumber animals such as dogs and horses, whom they have trained to be man’s servants.

That such powerful beasts as horses and elephants can be made to turn tricks for relatively puny men and women seems a miracle, but likewise in human society, throughout history, the cleverer and more cunning even if physically insignificant (think of Napoleon and Hitler) have been able to rule over whole groups of men, who if acting only even in small numbers could remove or murder their ruler without hardly any difficulty at all.

Thus the principle of rulership has been largely of hypnotic force. The mass of the people have been controlled throughout history like trained animals jumping at the sound of their masters’ commands.

In this, the principal means also has been to create a very easily hypnotised and loyal bunch of armed servants to keep the rest in fear of retribution should they challenge the ruler, just as the gangster boss keeps a bunch of especially vicious and brutal cronies around him, who will at the drop of a hat threaten, beat or murder anyone who challenges their boss’s authority.

These cronies or lieutenants are “kept sweet” by giving them special privileges that the mass of the gang members do not have, just as in times of war, soldiers are generally *allowed* to get away with various crimes such as looting or rape, just as the Vikings did on their “murdering, raping and pillaging” expeditions.

Thus it is in the interest of the “police” or “army” members in the gangster group to keep the boss in his place, as they have a privileged status in the group and able to satisfy desires that the rest cannot, at least not to the same degree.

So we see that the human tribal society has been since time immemorial based on a privileged minority ruling - and thus making laws regarding - the rest.

The only real basis of the rulers giving *justice* to the people at large who were not part of the elite, was to try and maintain *order* for the sake of their own security and advancement. Order created cooperation and organisation, and cooperation and organisation created wealth. The farms would work better if the serfs were as happy as could be arranged, not squabbling amongst themselves and murdering each other, as long as they didn't get too greedy and start wondering too much about where all the wealth they created was going.

If that happened, the few guards, police, or soldiers would make an example of a complaining serf now and then, and the rest would therefore out of fear accept being content with their typically miserable and underprivileged lot.

And of course this would be done on the basis of some *laws* or other, such as by taxes being imposed on all farms and others with a source of income.

So what has changed?

Have our laws changed since the feudal times of the middle ages, and if so, how and why?

For what can have changed in any case?

We still have the rich, we still have the poor - the haves and the have-nots.

But what has changed in our modern society is *the proportions*.

Before - such as in the middle ages - there were perhaps one percent or less "Lords" or "big chiefs" and their cronies, and everyone else was in poverty.

Now, there are that same one percent or less very wealthy, rich and super-rich, but there are a very large proportion of society who have now become what we might call wealthy *in the Western world*, depending on how we define wealthy.



But on the whole we mean *property owners*.

And this has made their attitude to the law quite different. Those who have the “good jobs” – managerial, or professional or run their own businesses – whom we might term the “middle classes” – and are purchasing or own their own homes and cars, jewellery and so on.

Unlike the feudal serfs who had only the basic means of survival, they have a great deal to *protect*.

Thus they need *laws* and happily support any government laws which will protect their property.

Thus they do not wish to *rebel* against the “lords” any longer, as they have too much vested interest in not doing so.

That however does not apply to the “underclasses” – i.e. those who do not have the natural aptitude, the connections or the willingness to jump through the hoops necessary to rise to where the property owning classes are, and thus do not have much property of consequence to protect.

Thus there are then three tiers of law. Those to protect the rich (such as *defamation law and certain tax loopholes*), those to protect the property owning middle classes from the under-classes, and finally those (mostly *criminal ones*) to protect the under-classes from one another.

But the basic point to bear in mind, is that *nothing* has really changed in terms of the law, in that it is mostly there to protect the possessions, rights and privileges of the haves from the have-nots.

The haves say and even in many cases actually *believe* that the have-nots have got equal rights to themselves, because they like to ignore the fact that those who are born without the same talents, aptitudes and backgrounds cannot remotely have an equal chance in life.

For equally, if they consider *their* position as compared to the “upper classes” or “super-rich” they too realise that they do not remotely enjoy the rights or privileges of the truly elite.

They don’t want the law done away with however, like the have-nots, who have got little to gain from it. They merely want laws made to give them just *a little bit more*, which is why Western governments are forever promising to cut their taxes, when cutting the taxes that fund the public

services for all, is not really in the best interests of anyone but *the rich* who are able to fund their own *private* healthcare, and if necessary even police (i.e. *security*) and fire stations (e.g. *Star Wars* mogul *George Lucas* has his own fire station on his ranch).

Thus *inequality* is at the very basis of a society that the laws seek to control and hold together, just as this same inequality is at the basis of the laws that govern international relations.

However, there is another influence on law, apart from merely the rules and regulations which have evolved to protect the assets of the privileged and powerful minority from the rest, which has been the religious, spiritual or philosophical aspects of human thought.

The influence of Christ, Buddha and Mohammed and many others has been enormous upon society. It is difficult to say what shape society and the law would now be in had they not existed and preached their philosophies.

And in the West, Christ has been the greatest influence, or that is to say, the gospels that have been written about the life, works and words of a man whom history would not otherwise suppose to exist, as he did not as far as we are aware receive a mention in any conventional history regarding his own time, as he was not important as a “political figure” or “ruler” such as the Roman governors, kings and so on.

But regardless of where it came from this Christian message of “love thy neighbour as thyself” has become part of the awareness of every modern Western human being.

This is of course wholly contrary to any kind of “special interest group” or “elite” seeking the privileges that the rest do not enjoy.

For if the neighbour has as many rights and privileges as ourselves, we would have to regard Christ as the first *true* “socialist” or “communist” depending upon how we define those terms.

We would certainly have to get rid of the idea of *serfs* or *slaves*, who would by definition do the work we choose not to, yet still profit from, so that the reality of this Christian “fair sharing” law, has really been resisted to the present day.

As in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, the actual prevailing "equality" is expressed as:

*All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others*

(simply substitute *humans* for *animals*).

This concept of illusory equality has been operative in virtually all human societies in all eras.

For example, we mentioned that the rich can defend their reputations using *defamation law* but if an average member of the public has some damaging article or report made about them in the media, there is little they can do to redress the situation.

That is to say, generally speaking, because law is so expensive, and so called "legal aid" is limited to specific kinds of claims, the poor or even middle-classes cannot generally go to law to protect themselves from such damaging reports upon their lives and therefore reputations.

Of course many rights and laws were fought for, such as rights in employment law. In 19<sup>th</sup> Century England for example, ten year old boys would be employed working down the mines, and so on, with little concern for their education, health or safety.

The rights modern Westerner employees have gradually won over the last few centuries appear to being eroded once again however, especially since the Thatcher era in Britain in the 1980s.

The *centralisation of power* has again brought this position about.

For democracy – meaning at least two different options of political party to vote for and elect with genuinely different policies – has been eroded in the UK, as the parties have more and more sought to ignore principles, and simply court the votes of the ever swelling numbers of property owning citizens, who were originally only the smaller middle and upper classes, but have grown large enough to be an easily manipulable common power base for either party who courts them and makes "the right noises." i.e. all the political leaders now have to do is claim to protect the public services, defend property, and as we have said (ridiculously and miraculously) simultaneously lower taxes.

So this has the effect of still maintaining the power of the haves over the have-nots, but actually is carried out by persuading millions of those who are not really very privileged and must work more or less unceasingly for their relatively luxurious lifestyles (do we really consider only two or three weeks holidays break from work annually to be anything other than slavery?) that they are a part of the esteemed classes, by as Tony Blair has done calling them “stakeholders”, encouraging them more and more to buy their own homes (which takes most of their lives to pay off), have a limited amount of share ownership in companies, and so on.

The more people who are made to feel *winner*s in society, the more they will support any government who seeks to maintain their superior status above the rest and its laws, even if this amounts to injustice being imposed on the under classes, the *loser*s.

The effects of the modern “war on terrorism” on the law have also begun to slowly but surely remove “civil liberties.”

In England now, any “terrorist suspect” can be locked up for weeks on end *without any evidence whatsoever*, whereas previously police could only hold crime suspects without major evidence for up to forty-eight hours, so that in practice it now means the law has the power to lock up *anybody* without evidence or having to bring them to any trial.

If this is not a clear sign of a growing police state and dictatorship with the injustices which the West has long accused countries like Communist China and Russia of, please tell us what is?

Though in theory we all have rights to privacy, the British are the most monitored people in the Western (if not *whole*) world, and any British person who goes out in public in a major city will probably be captured on hundreds of security cameras on a single outing.

As in George Orwell’s *1984*, the feeling is that “Big Brother is watching you”, though most of the citizens have meekly “got used” to such surveillance, as most of the cameras are now so small that they are hardly aware of them in any case.

Security cameras are also common in work places under the grounds of *preventing theft*, and we can easily guess that some of these recordings could be used for shall we say *unsavoury purposes*, which again, must form some kind of a breach of human rights, about which little or nothing is done.

Similarly cameras are, again, for *the public's protection* so they tell us, placed in major places of entertainment such as bars, and again, the sort of data that could be collected about individuals by for example gangsters or other unscrupulous people who may be part or full owner in these places, could obviously be used for all kinds of dubious or criminal purposes.

But again, these issues are not brought up in the media or government committees who would create laws - *nothing is done to protect the people*.

There is thus a stealthy but rapidly growing erosion of privacy, freedom and human rights, that because most of the public are kept entertained, increasingly fat and selfishly happy, they do not have the will or inclination to object to, just as sheep who are given their daily rations do nothing but baa, mate and produce more lambs who hang around waiting to be slaughtered.

But people of the masses do not as we have pointed out see the totally dominant effect the law has on their lives. For example, in England, certain anti-terrorist measures have been brought in, as we have said, such as the ability to detain suspects without evidence.

So the *motive* of these laws was stated as being to protect the public. But we have already had one famous instance of a feeble Jewish man in his eighties being manhandled, thrown out of a public governmental meeting and arrested, for standing up and saying "Rubbish!" when a government minister was speaking, under this "anti-terrorist law."

The British prime minister, Mr Blair, apologised for this "misapplication" of the law, but this was a televised incident which could not be glossed over or ignored. What of the fate of those *quietly* arrested for some kind of "peaceful protest" which never sees the media headlines?

Thus it is clear, that as ever, the philosophy of the law is *still*, just as in feudal times, to protect a powerful upper class from the rest, so that our modern laws may seem "just" on paper, but in practice are still resisting of the only truly "equal" law, expressed in Christ's saying:

*Treat thy neighbour as thyself.*

But because science since the time of Darwin has brought religion into disrepute, most educated people mock it now, not realising however that religious or spiritual figures such as Christ, Buddha, Mohammed and the like have been the only true advocates of *the common man*, and thus it has been in the interest of every powerful ruling elite to suppress or reject these religions and spiritual philosophies, as if accepted they would have resulted in a *true* justice and equality that the rulers or “winners” in any society have obviously never wanted and have thus resisted either openly or secretly by any number of determined means.

For those who have been made to believe that Muslims and Mohammed are evil by one mean or another, we should point out that the Muslims generally do not allow *usury*, which was once forbidden in Western society also and opposed by many Christian saints, but now forms the basis of our modern banking system, i.e. *the ability to charge interest on loans*.

Thus the all pervasive banking systems upon which the economies of the Western nations are now based, have got the most enormous vested interest in opposing *Muslim ideals*, which has got nothing whatsoever to do with terrorist bombers or religious disagreements.

Those who have been made to hate the Muslims due to government propaganda or out of fear of the so called “terrorists” should therefore carefully consider the true agenda of this so called “war on terrorism”, and ask themselves long and hard the question - *am I being manipulated?*

## Chapter 3 - Trust and the Law

Each day that goes by, our governments seek to create a never ending stream of new laws, rules and regulations which they assure us will make our lives safer and better.

But they appear to ignore the wisdom of the ancient Chinese book the *Tao Te Ching* which stated:

*When governments govern much,  
The people are miserable.*

*When governments govern little,  
The people are happy.*

*The more laws that are made,  
The more lawbreakers (i.e. criminals).*

Whatever is this ancient book of “wisdom” talking about? Is it merely nonsense, along with all the rest of the “New Age” mystical claptrap, the hardened “rationalist” and “non-believer” may ask us?

Well, let us begin with a sporting analogy.

In football (British invented *soccer*, that is, please understand, which means *football* to virtually everyone in the world outside of America) for example, we have the law in the form of *the referee* with his whistle and yellow and red cards, who has in theory at least studied thoroughly and understood how to apply all the laws of the game.

He is the judge and jury and in some cases (with his red card) the “executioner” as to crimes perpetrated upon the football field.

But this referee, though seemingly limited in his powers, has the ability depending upon his behaviour and *application of the laws* to alter the course of a whole game, by some bad decision he makes, such as giving a penalty or alternatively *refusing* to give a penalty, or just by generally failing to be *sensible* and use correct *discretion* in his application of the rules, the laws, can utterly ruin the game for the spectators and the players.

A famous, very successful and outspoken and controversial British football manager named Brian Clough however, who many would say

arrogantly used to address many adult people he was talking to as “young man” made an interesting observation however. He said in one interview:

*Football reflect life (young man).*

Just as an interfering busybody of a referee can ruin a football game for both players and spectators, likewise interfering busybodies who make too many laws and apply them too often and also many times unjustly and whimsically, can ruin everybody’s lives.

That is we are saying, that the best official or referee is one whom *we hardly notice*.

He keeps the game flowing, he is *firm but fair* and *consistent* in his application of the rules, *the law*. He stoically ignores the boos or shouts of the crowd, *the mob*, who may be displeased with his decisions, should they go against their team, just as he deals with the efforts of players who seek to harangue or persuade him to make decisions unjustly in their favour.

With all these powerful pressures upon him, especially in a huge game on which not only the hopes and dreams of millions of fans may be riding, but nowadays millions of pounds, dollars or roubles may also be at stake upon, the task of the referee is a very difficult one indeed, and thus we find that few referees are up to the challenge of the pressures of a big important game.

One would imagine by now, that modern technology and video evidence would help him, but mysteriously this has not yet been introduced, and many awful decisions are still made, sometimes innocently, as the referee has only his *eyes* to rely upon, which in comparison to the many cameras situated all around the sports arena that are now trained upon every major football game are a very limited “evidence gathering” device.

But as Mr Clough said *football reflects life*, and just as we see countless injustices in everyday life about which *nothing is done*, likewise it is confirmed to us upon the football field.

For those who may be utterly bored with the use of a football analogy, we apologise, but our point is that this small field of *law* i.e. the rules of football, is one of the few that millions and billions see being carried out in practice, whereas until something awful or rare happens to them, most people *never* see what happens in a court room, except they imagine in



the TV dramas, whose content many times, is not remotely like the actuality.

Thus we are warning them that the real *justice* they can in real life expect to receive is very much likely to be what they have seen in the whimsical and often unjust and incompetent performances of the football or other sporting referees, who in many cases, do not even appear to understand the finer points of the rules or laws that they should by definition be *expert* upon, just as we find in the case of lawyers and judges whose appreciation of the finer points is sorely lacking.

For example, without boasting unduly, but rather merely illustrating a point, the author himself, after only a few weeks study of one area of law, was able to “catch out” a successful solicitor of many years experience who was giving the class, who had not spotted one of these finer points in one well known area of law.

As in all occupations or professions, there are those who are *true experts* in their fields, whom we would have to say statistically speaking, as per the famous “Gaussian Distribution” must inevitably be few; the mass of merely *competent* operatives in the middle; and then the mercifully few genuine incompetents at the bottom strata of any occupation or profession, who somehow remarkably seem to continue to keep their jobs, despite likely inflicting untold damage on those who naively or unluckily encounter and use them.

So that situation inevitably applies to lawyers and judges, as equally it applies to other professionals such as teachers and doctors.

But as we know typically *far less than they* about their specialism, many times, we are in no position to assess their competence *until it is too late*.

But as the law itself has, as we have pointed out, become an enormous mass of intricate threads, almost impossible to unravel, like the aforementioned Gordian knot, we can hardly blame lawyers *totally* for missing some of these often obscure rules and regulations that are happening in their own field, can we?

For it is like asking the (often not terribly high IQ) soccer referee to take on *one thousand* rules, instead of the fifty or whatever that are likely all that is necessary to properly conduct a football game.

To put so much *mental, intellectual burden* on one individual is surely not a sane or sensible thing to do.

Due to this ridiculous over-complication of the law, judges and lawyers must study like chess grandmasters all the “statute” (written rule of law like *the ten commandments*) and “case law” (the way judges have decided to *interpret* the law, in such and such a case – e.g. *Jones v Davis*, 1929, etc. - filling in “the gaps” and exceptional situations that those who wrote the “statute”, the *rule book* never anticipated) to see if they can find a way to “defend”, “prosecute” or “rule upon” any particular case, just as the chess master studies the “openings”, “middle games” and “end games” to defeat his opponent.

But this complication is felt necessary to *consistently* carry out *the rules*.

For otherwise, the decisions of judges might be whimsical or *arbitrary*, giving one kind of “justice” to one person on one day of the week or in one court, and then a different version of “justice” to someone else in a different court on a different day of the week.

So as comedian Peter Cook (working partner to excellent jazz musician and fellow comic Dudley Moore) said in one of his hilarious soliloquys dressed as a working class miner with a flat cap:

“I wanted to be a judge, but I didn’t have the Latin, so I couldn’t pass the rigorous judging exams, which are well known for their rigour. Very rigorous, those judging exams...etc.”

Thus we appear to be *stuck* with law being an almost infinitely tangled mess, composed of more rules and regulations than the stars in the sky.

And why is this – as we have said, we cannot *trust* individual judges to correctly apply the law. We cannot give them *discretion* because they might abuse it (though abuse it in any case, they still do, as we have said, in some cases, by even failing to understand it, or its finer points).

So in the final analysis we therefore see that it is *the calibre* of judges that is at fault. If we were to appoint the most intelligent and understanding members of society to be judges, the law would not need to be anything like as complicated.

But because now, they are in many cases, clearly *not so* competent or understanding and wise, unlike our fabled *King Solomon*, or our wise and

just (so the Hollywood version at least goes) *Sir Thomas More*, they cannot be *trusted*, we do not *dare* give them such freedom to *decide with their own minds*.

And thus we are just pointing out in passing, that the law is, and always will be at least to some extent *an ass*, unjust – unless or until the wisest people – to whatever extent they really exist – are allowed to become judges in society.

But now, in our study of the *crime* that in many cases is modern law and “justice”, we come again to the question of *motive*.

We have explained in previous chapters that the law is made according to the philosophy of the ruling classes of the society, or those who have somehow sneaked into government though who may not have originally ever appeared to be part of that ruling elite.

We have also explained, that the law has become more amenable to *the property owning classes* because they are now required to elect the government, and thus the government must to some degree at least *please them*, and thus make laws they *desire*.

But in this we see that the current philosophy of the elite and those who own more property than average, is to support the unequal materialist philosophy, which says that “*I* am entitled to more possessions and justice in life than *you*” which we see also expressed in international law, governing the clearly many times unjust international relations.

Thus our modern law and its makers is emphatically *not* the law of Christ or Buddha, that it to say “the good Samaritan who gives ‘the enemy’ half his coat”, or said differently “treat thy neighbour as equal to thy self.”

Thus, if our goal, our motive is *equal justice for all*, the current leaders and governments *cannot be trusted* to create and administrate it.

Thus as each day goes by and our governments ask for *more and more powers*, more and more *new laws* to control and regulate us, and collect data about us, and track our movements with computers and surveillance equipment, all *for our own good* they tell us, why is it that we do not ask this question?

Why do we not say – we would like to give you this power, but because you have lied to us, for example about the dossier of weapons of mass destruction you claimed that existed in Iraq - *you cannot be trusted*.

If we are to give any government – which for example in England was elected on less than forty-percent of the vote, most probably meaning *the majority of the British people are against them* – more power to make more laws, we are giving them more power to make our lives a misery, with which powers they clearly cannot be trusted.

Fortunately in England, there is something called “the House of Lords” which is able to stop some – *though by no means all* – of the current government’s wilder and more draconian proposals to change the law.

Thus this government is constantly talking about trying to limit the powers of, or even completely abolish, this body of generally speaking *older and wider people*, who have lived through much the *increasingly younger* ones have not.

And this *ageist* issue is in itself worth pointing out.

We have a culture of youth dominating our society nowadays, largely because of the great spending power of the young – i.e. under 40s or 50s let us say – and we feel this has damaged society deeply, in terms of the composition of the people who make up politics and the law.

Under the drive of *ambition*, very young and inexperienced people – for example, who have not had children or a serious close relationship, or grown old enough to see themselves ageing and thus sensing *the reality* and therefore to some extent meaning of, not only death, but *suffering* in general - are being increasingly placed into positions of power and responsibility.

In Plato’s *Republic* he suggested that no person should be allowed to be a part of government until at least the age of fifty years old.

Youth is always inclined to be hasty, hot-headed in its ambitions to *achieve*, just as your author himself once was. It takes *decades* for most people to *mature*. It is largely a *painful* process which the young generally speaking – though we accept have many pains of their own, especially nowadays – know little or nothing about.

Unless we have suffered much ourselves, it is nearly impossible to understand the suffering of others, but say we have had cancer or some other awful disease, we are then fully cognisant of the state of mind and life situation of others who have also had it.

But the young, under the bright light of youth, tend to forge ahead fearlessly, and after a time, they may come to realise *unwisely*.

Note also, that despite his fame, and likely wise decisions, it was the *young* president Kennedy who probably brought the world closest to a nuclear war.

Though we will not pretend to be an expert historian – for who, after all is in full possession of *the facts* – this was likely not his own fault, but due to the older Russian premier, Khrushchev, trying to test the mettle of the younger man, seeing what liberties he might take.

But nevertheless we see a *volatility* in youth, an impulsiveness, which might be required upon the field of battle, when wars *must* sadly sometimes be fought, as in the case of a *true* defence of a nation, but surely we do not wish to see in our foremost leaders who hold the fate of millions and billions in their hands?

Let even the young ask themselves – just who is it they would rather trust – their still ambitious and selfish parents in their late twenties, thirties or early forties or rather their older gentler grandparents (if still *compos mentis*)?

*Youth*, now - due to the glamourization of politics as just to make it another field of celebrity, which we would suggest really began with the Kennedy era, and carried on into the Clinton era, and the current Blair era in England – has become an essential ingredient of *electability* in politics.

The new British conservative leader David Cameron has largely been chosen for this reason, as he is seen as *young, charismatic, energetic*.

Why?

Because people *hope* he will *change* things for the better.

But it is never asked *why* should we want change?

Change implies there is something wrong with the status quo, which indeed there surely is, but we are suggesting that is only happening because our society is running off the wrong “script”, the wrong “philosophy” to begin with.

And of course, history has shown that despite government after government, things are not getting *better* for the mass of the people.

If one looks at newspapers or TV reports only twenty or thirty or fifty years ago, one sees that the problems and issues are much the same.

There were wars and scandals then, there are now.

Society has not and will not ever fundamentally change unless the Christian or humanist principle of *treat the neighbour equally as oneself* is applied.

But the people are now irreligious, only looking out for number one. They say they want “equality”, but they only mean it like in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* – equality for *them* but not necessarily for *everyone*.

Because the very ownership of property and company shares is against equality.

A rich man dies and his house goes to his descendants. Those who don’t have a rich parent want *equality*, they say the man who inherits the house has done nothing on merit to deserve it, he is just privileged, just lucky – it’s not *fair*.

But the man who has the rich parent says everyone should have the “equal right” *to inherit*.

He says – *hands off my property*. And thus, the more the governments encourage ownership of property, the more they encourage inequality.

Is the author really campaigning against all private ownership of property?

Not necessarily. What does it matter as long as there are adequate homes for all, whether people rent or “own”, as long as they are able to satisfy all their *needs*?

Likewise, is the author against business, against “private enterprise?”

Not necessarily, as long as the employees get fair pay and conditions and “the dignity of labour” – i.e. *respect* – and the owner of the “business” does not amass a huge fortune at everybody else’s expense, for example by charging outrageous prices for his or her products or services.

That is, how can we avoid *trade*?

Some people produce things and offer services that others *need*. So the issue is surely regarding *fair trade*, not to abolish individual ownership altogether, certainly not at this stage in our collective evolution, as this would seem to be unworkable.

Were we all Christs or Buddhas the answer might be different. Why would *then* there be any need to *own* property at all, all would share, and each would receive what they need. But such a method of the administration of all the world’s resources is surely a little too far off as yet, to make real.

So for the moment, we must deal with the reality of human nature as it currently exists, and thus we must have suitable laws to protect the innocent and deter the excessively greedy, or malevolent intentions of one person towards another.

## Chapter 4 – Zero Tolerance, Rape and the Law

We are seeing especially in the Western world, the imposition of an increasingly petty series of what many would describe as *draconian* measures to impose “law and order” upon us all.

In countries like England, totally bizarre and pointless cases are coming to law, such as a transport authority taking a man to court for putting his feet up to rest upon an opposite seat, and such police measures in support of these overzealous acts, such as for some reason which escapes the current author - most likely to do with the overmastering obsession and paranoia regarding child molestation – regarding a very recent instance of police officers wasting precious time in taking a child’s t-shirt out of a window that had the following slogan on it:

*I am the winner of the egg and sperm race.*

(clearly, both a truism, and a kind of lollipop-stick type joke).

The author agrees that such a slogan on a t-shirt for young children is probably not a good idea, but that *the police* are the body who are called in to deal with such an issue, which is surely just one arguably of *bad taste*, seems appalling, when as we all know, there is so much serious *unprevented* and subsequently unsolved crime in our society, such as the mugging and battering of old ladies and gentlemen and so on.

And this same British government, which is behind this kind of crazy waste of police time, has recently had a committee stating that convicted muggers may be able to avoid prison on the grounds that they were forced into it by “peer pressure.”

Are these people utterly insane???

It would seem so.

One major *offender* in this category of injustice however is the so called “zero tolerance” policy.

For example, a six year old boy in America was allegedly suspended from school for giving another pupil a cough drop, as this violated some kind of ruling on *drugs*.



So the zero tolerance policy is basically again, just like the horrendously complex legal system itself, designed to ensure that each authority or “law enforcement officer” carries out *the letter of the law* in some kind of ultra-authoritative consistent, but non-discretionary way.

In short, now have sprung up a totally paranoid and totalitarian set of regulations, like the often ridiculous “school rules” about every petty little thing, that those who have left school long ago imagined they had *as adults* forever left behind.

Under these kind of policies, those who drop litter or spit on the sidewalk are fined relatively huge amounts, whilst as we have said, rapists, murderers, violent criminals and thieves go unpunished.

But of course it is *easy* and *cowardly* to pick on “good citizens” who make some minor error like dropping litter, and *difficult* and requiring *bravery* to tackle the serious and often organised criminals who are the real threat to the common good.

But police chiefs and politicians want to keep their jobs.

And so the petty minded, principle-free zone *youths*, who govern us and make up an undue proportion of the legal profession, judiciary and law enforcement agencies, feed on these *statistics* as a measure of their *success*.

Each year in Britain for example, at Christmas, a huge media campaign is launched upon the drink drivers, who are regarded as the most evil beings in society, in their continual efforts to murder pedestrians and children.

We do not of course *approve* of drunken drivers, who may of course due to their poor judgement cause accidents in which people (including *themselves* incidentally) may die.

But the official statistics show that only in a small proportion of fatal accidents has alcohol found to be *the cause*, and in most cases it is not even clear if alcohol was *the cause* but only was said to be “involved” and therefore only *may* have been the cause.

Thus the largest causes of death on the road – driver inexperience and incompetence and negligence – remains largely untackled.

It is *easy* and again *cowardly* to criminalise – over the years – *millions* of drink drivers, most of whom statistically were found to be barely over the legal limit – but have not actually committed a crime *as such* – i.e. robbed, injured, assault, raped or murdered anyone – but to leave alone the major causes of accidents – driver incompetence, undue pressures to meet work deadlines causing speeding and driving in unsafe conditions, over-busy roads and so on.

For example again in England, a few years ago a motorist fell asleep at six am in the morning, on a trip to work whilst taking a breather *parked up* off the road. Then sadly, because he had not fully applied his parking brake, his car rolled down onto a railway line, and the train driver did not see it until too late, and tragically a few people died when the train was derailed.

So what should the law do with such a man?

He was exhausted, and this was surely wholly an accident.

So what do you think the judge decided?

Several years in prison.

Muggers and violent attackers walk free or get asked to meet and likely (some time later) laugh at their victims as a “punishment”, but a man who made a tragic and unintended mistake, which will no doubt haunt him for, and ruin the rest of his life, gets several years in jail to further add to his misery.

Questions such as – hang on, just *how and why* was it so easy for this man’s car to roll off a main road onto a railway line with no intervening obstacles? - do not seem to have been asked.

Rather as usual, some relatively innocent *scapegoat* is held up and made accountable, *made an example of*, while the likely negligent *authorities* escape scot-free, just as we have explained happened in the case of those *serfs* who protested against the injustice of the feudal Lord of the Manor in the middle ages.

Revealingly, in *employment law*, much of the law is still couched in terms of the relationship between *master* and *servant*, rather than *employer* and *employee* showing us clearly what the origins of this law were really all about.

Of course, the most zealous area of this application of zero tolerance is in the arena of relations between the sexes.

The women's rights campaigners want to see *zero tolerance* of "crimes against women."

There are of course two main issues here, *violence* and *rape*.

As to rape, the issue of *consent* between men and women has been the "bogyman" of this situation, and is surely in many cases almost impossible to determine the truth of *for those parties who were not present*, i.e. *all the rest of us*, for example in the Mike Tyson case.

The author does not pretend to be fully informed on the details of this trial, but the point is we *must* repeat once again. Who on earth can be???

Unless we were *there*, or have an *undoctored* video recording, or a *true confession*, it is simply one party's version of events against another.

If the party in question, like Mr Tyson, is by definition as a boxer, a rather brutal looking, and in his particular case not very eloquent man, he is likely to be made a fool of by a clever lawyer, and may under appropriate provocative questioning "lose his cool" and thus seem guilty even if he isn't.

But the current increasingly female-controlled and oriented legal system does not want to consider the issues of *enticement*, *entrapment* or *responsibility* on the part of the woman.

That is to say, applying commonsense, what young, attractive woman *in her right mind* would go *alone* to the hotel room of one of the most physically powerful, aggressive and famous celebrity men in the world *with whom she is not properly acquainted*, and who already has a reputation for assault, and expect him to imagine she would be sexually uncooperative?

Lady readers may howl – "ah, but that doesn't matter. He should *behave properly*. *He should behave himself*."

Yes, if he was Christ or Buddha, he would have behaved himself. But to make assumptions about powerful men in the *real world* is not realistic, it is placing upon a man a temptation he may not be able to resist, which

clearly in the Mike Tyson case, with or without consent, he apparently could not.

So what in England over a decade later are the British government suggesting in their continual efforts to get more and more men *convicted* of rape? (whereas their *real* efforts should be to *stop women getting raped in the first place*).

They are saying in the case even of a man and woman who meet up in a night club and may wake up in bed together, not even remembering each other's names or how they got there, that a man must gain clear *consent*.

Just what planet are these people living on, that they could imagine that a man and woman heavily under the influence of drink are going to remember to take careful note of what the government official has suggested about getting "consent" whilst they are in the heat of passion?

As we have said, clearly they are (even if *chronologically old*) inexperienced in life, or they are youths who could not possibly be expected to have lived long enough and considered deeply enough these issues.

But we see, it was part of the rebellion of the 60s to mock the old, call their fathers insultingly as "daddy-o" and so on, and to say "hey, as soon as we get these old fossils out of power, everything will be a-okay."

Well, that has been done largely. The old and experienced have been ousted, forced to the "back benches" of parliament where the major decisions are not made.

So is it???

Is everything now a-okay, now we have had the forty-something Clinton and Blair and all what were known as "Blair's babes" – young women in their late twenties, thirties or early forties – who were somehow suddenly installed into the British Labour Party (restyled as "New Labour") government, which before that time had been the bastion of *working men*?

We should note in passing, that *working men* no longer have *any* political party in England. But then there are virtually no *working men* in the sense there used to be in England now in any case, now most of its industry has been neglected and destroyed by successive governments and

progressively transferred to poorer nations in the Third World where low pay and unfair conditions are tolerated, so that the “wealthy West” can exploit them.

Of course, the average Westerner in the street has no ideas whatsoever where the goods they buy off the department store shelves are coming from, or moreover rather, *the pay and conditions* under which these goods are produced, so please don't be too harsh on them for being totally ignorant about what their media and government have not told them about.

But the world is not going to become a paradise over night, so how in the mean time should *the law* deal with a male rapist?

Incidentally, it is of course always assumed that the *male* is the instigator of sexual activity, but again, those who have experience in *the real world*, know that this is not always remotely the case.

For generations, many women have taken advantage of men's sexual weakness i.e. the almost overpowering desire implanted in them by nature, which from time to time *demands* release, though obviously not necessarily by having intercourse with a woman (let's try asking a woman if she thinks she can spend a lifetime never scratching an itch, if she thinks that men ought to be able to fully control their sexual desire.)

That is – instead of doing “the decent thing” – i.e. allowing a suitable man to court you, and marry you, before having sex with him – many women in their anxiety as to whether they could really hang on to any particular man, who might well in term of *marriage* be beyond their reach, have decided to seduce him into having a baby.

It is not difficult to seduce especially an inexperienced young man, who is anxious to prove himself to his peers, but when he discovers a few months down the line that she has got *pregnant* – which we assure you has happened to countless millions of men throughout history *undesired and unplanned* – he is more than a little worried about what is going to happen next.

At best, he is going to decide he is happy to be her partner and help with the children. But if she has seduced and tricked him, and he is still young, likely too young to “settle down”, this will not happen, and then the lady will be condemned to be a one-parent family, and likely cause her child to

suffer the fate of growing up without a father to help educate, support and protect it.

But in all this furore about men gaining the consent of *women*, this question is never asked – i.e. could it be perhaps that the woman has forced herself on the man, and should it not therefore be *she* also, who is asking for consent?

And let's face it - once a woman has started fiddling with a man, and he is excited, it is going to be hard for him to stop, even if ideally he "wants" to.

Was there *genuine consent* in this act, we might ask?

And we also therefore, addressing the *working lawyer* now, or any man thus "entrapped", who might seek to get a lawyer to argue such a case, that if he was "entrapped", should he really be made to pay maintenance for a child he has been virtually "raped" into fathering?

Of course, most women's and even sadly some men's answer to this situation, is that any man who gets raped by a woman is "a lucky guy."

Sorry, but we are not going to buy that playground talk.

Decent men don't want to be pressured and bullied into having sex with women any more than decent women want to be bullied and pressured into having sex by men.

That is why some *wise person* invented marriage, which many in our society are seeking to destroy as an outmoded custom.

For it was designed to protect the *decent* people in society from the illegitimate and unwanted attentions of the abusers.

But modern, "with it", "swinging", "liberated" people have decided that marriage was a bad idea, thought up by an idiot, that couldn't possibly ever work or last.

Well it is true, it cannot work or last in a society full of undisciplined, out of control and unprincipled people, of course.

But that society is not the condition of *all of us*.

And even those who struggle more than other with their wild desires, it is argued would do *better* if society said “please follow some simple rules” on this matter.

i.e.

a) before having sex, *marry someone* you love and intend to stay with (or if you must have sex before marriage, don't have sex with anyone who is a virgin, or “respectable person” who seeks a faithful long-term partner, and still has a chance at having a proper life)

b) Don't interfere with somebody else's husband, wife or child.

Short and sweet. No enormous long law books required.

But no – the modern person cannot accept simple rules like that.

And thus, a huge army of lawyers appear in order to convict rapists, and split up the property and children of couples when they divorce.

Of course, we can't all be perfect, mistakes will always be made, some couples will find they just can't stay together and so on, but the following of such simple *laws* would make these incidents isolated, and then there would be no need for armies of lawyers and vast libraries full of law books, but only *wise elders* in local communities who would *justly*, armed with *the fact* from *first hand knowledge* of the parties involved, sort the problem out.

That is, in attempting to solve our crime with vast number of laws, lawyers and judges, we have concentrated almost wholly on the *effect* and thought little about *the cause*.

By incompetent parenting, we have created now several generations of out-of-control humans, who have no roots or traditions in any sense of the word that matters.

Celebrating Bob Marley and wearing dreadlocks, or dancing an Irish jig and listening to the Ceilidh band, is *in itself*, not going to teach anyone how to live in a stable civilised community.

The traditions we need, need to be shared by the entire community and ideally nation in which we live, if they are to work well.

Then we have a sense of *community, identity*.

Then everybody knows how to behave towards one another without anxiety or fear.

For example, under such a *common code*, if a man is interested in a woman, he talks to “the local matchmaker” or even sends a note to her parents asking for an introduction.

Then the daughter decides if she is interested or not, and things proceed or not from there.

Whereas nowadays, if a man sends a note to the parents of some women or girl whose parents he does not already know, he might end up getting accused of harassment or being a stalker.

And while we are “on a roll” let us discuss the *stalker* issue.

This is another huge arena of the absolute mess that is going on between men and women, along with the “date rape” and so on, which we have earlier discussed if only briefly, regarding the *consent* issue.

Since for generations men have been fascinated with women and the contrary, and it has been a natural activity of men just as it has been with women to “sneak around” and try to find out about the other party and what the other party is up to.

The *selfish gene* after all, is here at stake.

A decent man wants to know if the girl he intends to court, marry or father children to, is the faithful sort, or whether if she gets pregnant he will be in some doubt as to who the father really is.

Likewise a decent woman wants to know if a man is the loyal and faithful sort, or whether he is going to drop her like a hot potato, when the pregnancy testing kit shows up positive.

Above all, a man wants to be *near* his chosen one. So that is to say, the only difference between the so called “stalker” (that is, as long as he isn’t violent or threatening) and the “legitimate admirer” is as to whether the person being admired *wants it or not*.

And *there* is our dilemma.



Because now that modern girls have become “liberated” and out of parental influence, and adhere to no “old fashioned” courtship rituals, many such can play at tormenting their admirers, particularly egged on by other girlfriends, who may hate the man who is as they see it “going to take her friend away from her.”

So they may even be persuaded to bring false accusations even of “stalking” against a man whom they actually may want.

Does this seem unbelievable?

Well consider what happens when a violent cruel woman cuts off an allegedly unfaithful man’s *sex organ* with a pair of scissors or whatever.

Even the supposedly “civilised” and “decent” women have a good laugh about it.

Indeed the author recalls a picture he once saw of a “women against rape” march, and they had a big banner with a pair of scissors on it with the slogan “chop their *wotsits* off.”

This was a march of a “jolly” bunch of professional type and student girls, who judging by their smiles we would suspect have never been raped, and just think that protesting in such a manner is a bit of fun, and whatever effect that has on decent non-rapist men - they really don’t care.

But these are the kind of women who are now holding “important jobs” in society, like teachers, doctors, nurses, police officers, politicians and yes, *lawyers*.

So they are not so they say in favour of the death penalty (in England, that is). They are not in favour of corporal punishment in schools or flogging criminal youth. But the cutting off of the sex organs of the male, probably the most horrific act you could perform on a man, is just a bit of a laugh?

So this childish playful state of inexperience and ignorance these people display – and we are including many *adult women* in that estimate, if they think that cutting off a man’s sexual organ *in any circumstance* is just a bit of harmless fun - is the kind of spirit that is ruling us all.

We think that Mrs Cherie Blair, a leading *high court judge* no less, and married to British prime minister, Tony Blair, judging by what we have seen of her behaviour so far, is one of the gigglers.

We even saw on a TV show a few weeks ago, a black lady barrister, and *judge*, whom we shall not name, but is now famous enough to have appeared on television, discussing this issue.

This lady was discussing the policies that the law and government should take re *alleged* (remember that word please, *alleged*) child molesters (and let us also ask *what exactly is a child? An under 16? An under 13? An under 10?* - given that in some countries, “children” can marry at 13 or younger).

The interviewer asked her - as a judge - what she thought should be done with child molesters.

Surprisingly she *smiled*, and said with this same *smile* on her face, *I can't really say, but we're looking into it*, still with this same sick smile on her face.

(i.e. the author would guess the kind of thing she had in mind was castration, disembowelling, etc. - *you know*).

Is this the spirit in people which should lead us to make them into judges?

And we wish to point out in support of our earlier works that this lady, as explained before, was one of the countless other women who seek these positions of high office and public importance, who has been *systematically abused in childhood*, and in this instance, had even given interviews or written accounts detailing this abuse.

We are very sad about that, she seemed otherwise a nice lady, but clearly she was very damaged behind her vengeful smile.

So we have here, a clear example of someone with a hidden agenda, an axe to grind, a chip on their shoulder, about *their own personal history of abuse*.

And thus, like any average citizen who has some single act happen to them - like being mugged, or burgled or whatever, they think *now it happened to them* that *no punishment* is too severe for the offender.

A woman whose child has been knocked down by a driver (a sober one, as is most likely, let's say) wants all cars banned, or if she can't do that, well someone is going to have to walk in front of every car with a white flag to warn of its presence (as originally was the case), which kind of defeats the object, doesn't it?

But what *doesn't* happen, is the judge and all concerned to ask - *just why was that child out playing on a dangerous road with fast cars going by all day? Why was not that child supervised and trained to avoid danger? just as every adult must.*

And of course, as usual, the driver who kills a child will be tormented about it for the rest of their lives – may never even dare drive again. But for the often *negligent mother* that “life-sentence to torture” is not enough.

So our laws *cannot* be made by people who are so blindly emotionally motivated, acting out of their own personal traumas, but this is nevertheless *exactly* the kind of mentality that we have got composing the current laws.

And that is why this increasingly draconian set of laws is appearing ever more by the day.

One day someone says – “hey - that lady is wearing a fur coat. Outrageous! Cruelty to animals! - she must be *hanged.*”

So the “we can plug every gap” scared and paranoid government says “right, we must have a law against that.”

Arrest that woman for wearing that coat!

Have her flogged, hung, drawn and quartered for daring to threaten the survival of that endangered species!

And because motorists, whether drink driving or not are such an easy target, they are now being increasingly harassed by the authorities with a huge number of so called “speed cameras” which also double as yet more *surveillance* cameras, which impose automatic fines on motorists, who in many cases may well be going over the legal limits, but totally at risk to *themselves*, when no other vehicle or pedestrian is remotely present.

In the James Bond spoof movie, *Johnnie English*, Rowan Atkinson was shown actually destroying one of these speed cameras with glee using a missile fired by his “secret agent car”, which reflected how frustrated and angry the British public have got with all these kind of invasive impositions on its freedom.

In certain places and situations it is *relatively safe* to speed, in others it is not, but we have a zero tolerance policy carried out robotically by the automatic speed cameras which record only the crime, and not the circumstances, and of course, the result is always *more money in the government coffers*.

There is thus no *trust* given to the citizen to behave sensibly using their own discretion and common sense.

The greatest hypocrisy of this however is that those highest in the government themselves have committed these crimes such as Harriet Harman – a Member of Parliament, and the then *Solicitor General*, the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest legal adviser to government in the land - who drove at around 100 miles per hour on a British motorway upon which the legal limit is only 70 miles per hour. But did she lose her job? No. Did she get imprisoned? No, she got banned for only *7 days* and fined £400 (a relatively small amount for someone like her on a huge annual salary).

So by driving at 100 mph she could have caused absolute carnage, a multiple motorway pile-up for example, in which tens or even scores of people (suppose a bus or coach was involved) could have died, but she received only *seven days driving ban* and a fine.

Whereas if a drink driver who is even marginally over the limit (most of whom, though by no means all, are highly stressed *males*) who has injured no one and caused no accident is caught, there is a mandatory minimum 12 month driving ban, which once he receives it may cause loss of his job, and possibly even his family relationships and whole life as he knew it.

Likewise the government has introduced laws to permit “on the spot” fining of vandals and hooligans and litter louts and so on, as if this was a sensible and just way to deal with the problem – i.e. fining people who likely in many cases have money problems to begin with, and just driving them further into madness and despair.

The injustices are so numerous that we are certain that the reader does not need more examples.

So the point the author is making is as follows.

We *fail* in our duty to properly raise and educate the young, and by putting all kinds of burdens on them when they become adults with which they cannot cope, such as allowing them to fall into debt (the *usury* again) by offering them too easy credit, encouraging via the media the destruction of social customs that tell them they can get easy sex with strangers they meet in bars or whatever, and that marriage is not a contract that is meant to be kept, and fidelity and the pre-marital virginity of women (and don't forget if women stay *virgins*, the only women *men* will get their "wicked way with" will be experienced and therefore not "ruinable" ) means little or nothing.

We further tempt all strata of society to worship luxuries, to believe that they are *nothing* without them, like mobile phones, designer clothes etc., and we continually show them bad examples as entertainment of the behaviour of "rebellious" celebrities and characters in movies who "don't take no crap" and "break all the rules", and often are shown to be "cool" drivers of fast cars and users of "recreational" drugs.

And then, we, as a society – or rather, these not wholly democratically elected leaders - have got the totally outrageous cheek to go around making laws saying "don't do this", "don't do that" – "or we will fine you, bang you away in prison", about every little freedom people try to have, which they have more or less been hypnotised into wanting by the media and other negligent parental, education and social forces.

So the people, under the encouragement of the state, make a total mess of their children, and the state gives free rein to unscrupulous businesses and employers to carry on and thoroughly corrupt, overwork and abuse adults.

But there is no mercy, as since as soon as someone cracks under the stress, and does something stupid, even if it's only dropping a sweet wrapper, the state via its laws is ready to come down on them like the proverbial "ton of bricks."

And due to this unreasonable power that is being given to malevolent people by these overzealous laws, all kinds of misery and mischief goes on, eats up huge amounts of police and court time, when it could and should be sorted out quickly and easily by commonsense means.

For example, recently a British ex-pop star named Mike McGear (actually the half-brother of Paul McCartney) – whom some may remember was in 1960s band, *The Scaffold*, who had a number one hit called *Lily the Pink* - was accused of slapping a waitress' bottom in a party at a hotel, which he completely denied.

As usual, it went to court wasting a lot of police and court time before him being found innocent.

So what was the truth? Did this waitress concoct the story imagining she could blackmail him, or earn money from “her story” knowing he was related to Paul McCartney?

*We weren't there, we don't know the waitresses's private thoughts, so therefore we shall never know, shall we?*

But the point is that these paranoid kind of *zero tolerance* policies empower such “mischief makers” to create untold misery for individuals such as Mr McGear, who as far as the court was concerned was wholly innocent.

Whereas, for example, even more recently, on television was shown an interview of a rather forward, assertive and star-struck plump black lady, interviewing ex James Bond star, *Pierce Brosnan*, who during the course of the interview jumped on Mr Brosnan in some sort of mock affectionate – shall we call it - display.

In this circumstance, when the lady turned her back on him, bent forward in front of him, her facing to and talking to the camera, more or less boasting about the exploit she had just carried out, Mr Brosnan felt “empowered” to slap her gently on the bottom which after all was more or less being pushed towards his face.

But did this result in some kind of accusations of assault – which indeed we should point out he would have equally or more so been entitled to bring, after her jumping on him?

But no, after the show cut back to the studio, the presenters just laughed at the antics of this lady, and not the slightest mention was made of the bottom slapping incident.

So this would suggest to the innocent bystander that slapping a woman's bottom is something that in certain circumstances famous celebrities can

get away with, but ordinary people like you and I, or the now no longer famous Mr McGear dare not even *consider*.

Even if we are half or more drunk at an office party, or some other occasion where “our guard is down”, and some lady teases us to the point where we have as Roger Waters put it “a momentary lapse of reason” – we now do so at our peril.

When really, all that is required is a bit of commonsense and tolerance. If a man in such a situation, where the attention is *genuinely unwanted*, in olden times – i.e. before the current “zero tolerance” madness - a woman might give a man a firm slap across the face for doing such a thing, and be entitled to do so also, we might add.

Such behaviour, especially if in the workplace or whatever, would also get him *a reputation*, which again would be a punishment of sorts.

For we want to ask the reader in all seriousness – when there are really serious crimes like rape, murder, burglary and so on, is an adult (i.e. 16 or 18 plus) girl having her bottom pinched or slapped by a momentarily out of control man really a hanging offence?

*Not* that we are saying, *it's OK*.

We are just saying – how do we best discourage such behaviours?

And in the author's view, the *only* real, sensible and lasting way to stop this kind of unwanted behaviour towards women is to create a climate once more in which women are respected.

And that *includes* women themselves using a little commonsense in their behaviour. If a woman deliberately dresses and behaves in a provocative manner this *must* be considered as an act of irresponsibility.

Because she is creating an atmosphere and expectation of sexual availability, of tease, which most men find difficult to resist.

Because women refuse to accept that men's desire is so strong and difficult to control – largely because all the evidence suggests, *their own sex desire* is much less strong and more easily controllable (e.g. the fact that millions of women say they have never had orgasm or find it very difficult to achieve, and *biology alone* suggests that women *don't* need

orgasms to pass on their “selfish gene”, whereas men *do*) – they reject this sensible argument to act responsibly in public places.

But the result of this *denial of reality* is that as a consequence of women’s failure to “cover up”, *other women* get molested, once that men in general are excessively wound up by all the sexual signals saturating the human environment, which have been growing steadily in intensity since the post second world war era and have now reached a crescendo, with for example, aside from the TV sex and nudity and pornography, even such lascivious displays in pop videos aimed at children and teenagers as by Madonna, and to some extent even Britney Spiers, which are more or less shameless attempt to sell pop music almost wholly on sex.

But all this is ignored, and we are just about to show the hypocrisy of this situation in the next chapter.

In closing this chapter, however, we wish to address the reader who has to live with all these zero tolerance policies at least for the moment.

Protest where you can, but the best advice would seem to be in order to protect your liberty *do nothing wrong*.

If you fear you might get out of control at the office party, simply don’t drink, or don’t go. Women may unexpectedly use these occasions even to try to entice or seduce some man whom they have long been drawn to, but has not realised it, and alas *may not reciprocate her feelings*, which could then be awkward to say the least.

Whole careers and lives have been ruined by some momentary loss of control on these occasions, or even a false accusation made due to having rejected a woman in an incident such as the above.

And it is plausible now that some women in particular – who also are in many cases responsible for assaulting men and young boys sexually, but again, this is seldom ever mentioned or taken seriously – may use these occasions as an opportunity to entrap some men, for example because they want their jobs, and if they can get them sacked or forced to resign after some kind of such accusation, they will achieve their goal in such a wicked way.

As to courting or dating women, a wise person should make sure that everything they do is *safe*.



It is dangerous to be alone in a room with a woman you aren't sure if you can trust, just as neither should good women be alone in a room with a man they do not properly know, again, if we accept the court findings in the same Tyson case.

Try to always have *third parties* whom you know and trust well in any delicate situation, so that dating “in groups” is safer than in couples unless the relationships is well established and advanced.

In short, in the face of these “zero tolerance” policies which we regard to be simply paranoid, ultimately unworkable, and more honestly just a form of extreme *intolerance*, we would advise all innocent and honest people that the best action is to do no action whatsoever which could place one in a *compromising situation*.

And if that means doing *nothing*, then right now, in this crazy and dangerous world which seeks to entrap many of us in one way or another in any number of ways, as boring and unsatisfying as it may often be, sometimes *nothing* is the very best thing one could do.

For example, we shall say finally to our likely younger readers, if some lady you have expressed your interest in *does* reciprocate your interest, she will find a way to show it to you sooner or later.

Do not play with relationships in their early and formative stages with excitement, but rather like a very careful, cool and calculated game of chess, until you are sure that the relationship is getting on to a solid and trustworthy base.

For as we have said, regarding our main subject here – the right composition and conduct of the law is largely *a matter of trust*.

The zero tolerance of the current Western governments, which they are reaching for as a desperate measure to try to correct the out of control behaviour of youths and adults – who in turn are a product of the failed experiments conducted with “child care” in the 70s, 80s and 90s, which discarded the old two-parents and more disciplined ways which preceded them – are the *wrong* approach to trying to remedy an out-of-control society, because such an approach shows no respect or *trust* for the individual, it seeks to forever bark orders at *adult citizens* like a bossy school teacher, who therefore clearly resent it, and will sooner or later find other ways to fight back or protest (such as *voting such a government out, at the very next opportunity*.)

They are merely having the effect of driving good citizens to despair, and driving bad ones into an even more entrenched state of psychopathology from which they are likely to commit even worse crimes than the horrors so far, which inspired such songs as Bob Geldof's *I Don't Like Mondays*, regarding the child who comes to school and shoots everyone, so they said when asked, simply because *they didn't like Mondays*.

Ultimately the only solution will be to regenerate society in a fundamental way, to stop the development of these kind of humans – psychopaths and serial killers and so on - in their formative years.

This in turn can only come about from caring families, who raise their children decently, and caring communities who can see in time when something is going wrong, and take steps to remedy it before it's too late.

In the meantime however, the policy must surely be to be tolerant (rather than *zero-tolerant*) and understanding of all, to rehabilitate those criminals who can be, and protect the rest of society from those who currently cannot, and even that in the most humane way, bearing in mind that ultimately, few if any humans are *born* monsters, but in most cases, it is likely that *what was done to them* made them that way.

Thus though they must be held responsible for their actions, they cannot be held *wholly* responsible, as they are the products of an entire society gone wrong, which has lost its way.

## Chapter 5 – Crime and Punishment

The biggest problem on the minds of law makers and governments in this modern age is, how shall we punish offenders?

If we have failed to stop people offending and they have gone so far as to commit a crime, and are found guilty, what shall we do with them next?

As we have indicated previously, the only *real* solution is to create a society that stops them offending in the first place, by raising and educating them properly, and seeing to it that they can satisfy all their needs in a legitimate way.

But we are not in that “Utopia” as yet, which clearly cannot be created overnight, were even the will to do so there, which currently we feel it is not.

To understand this problem, we have to see the kind of mindset that it is operative in our society, in the minds of those who are involved in government and the law.

And we *accuse* governments and *some* of the legal and police operatives of not actually caring about, but rather *accepting* of the current status quo.

That is, there is a mentality that goes: “here comes little Johnnie again, caught robbing again. He’s a bad lad, that one. He’ll go down for six months this time, but he’ll be out in four and do it again.”

That is to say, there is a feeling that some people are just thieves, “bad lads”, and will *never* be anything more, and that to believe such is possible is just an improbably fantasy of a deluded “liberal” with his or her head in the clouds.

Well, firstly, the author would not describe himself as a “liberal”, but rather hopefully as a would-be *liberator*.

That is to say, he seeks at all times, to provide ideas or insights that he hopes will enable others to *start liberating themselves*.

But there are all kinds of motives going inside the people involved in the law, and some of these are regarding the treatment of offenders. There is an egotistical satisfaction in being a judge and “passing sentence” on

others, which we have likely *all* experienced to some degree, by for example *judging* and *passing sentence upon* (i.e. saying what we think should happen to) the alleged criminals who daily appear in our newspaper and on our TV screens.

There is for example in the case of many people an element of sadism.

We think to ourselves – “Ah, that evil person should get banged up for a hundred years, and they should throw away the key.”

So when the ordinary people have these *judgmental* tendencies, how on earth would we expect that judges in courts were some kind of superior beings who didn't suffer from these kinds of egotistical kinks?

Imagine for example, as we have said, the black lady judge who has suffered years of child abuse, having an abuser just like her father put before her, whom she is *now* able to pass sentence upon.

Can she possibly be expected to act with only *impartial justice*, but experience no desire for vengeance, and gain no satisfaction from imposing the maximum possible sentence that the law will allow?

It seems hardly believable does it?

And as most people in the authorities, including police officers, will at one time or another earlier in their lives, have suffered at the hands of the kind of people now brought before them, or under their authority, is it likely that such people will get fair and humane treatment at their hands?

After all, these people are *criminals*, aren't they? They are *no good, a bad lot, ne'er do wells, worthless villains, the scum of society*, and so on.

How can we expect police officers in particular to not hold such attitudes and beliefs?

We could even say that it might be difficult for them to do their often dangerous jobs at all, were they *not* motivated by such forces, that sought to somehow correct the injustice that had once been carried out towards them.

Undoubtedly there exists the same attitude in many “social workers” who have no doubt also in many cases been victims of abuse, which they are therefore again seeking to right through their work.

But surely vengeance is not justice?

If we can just *kill, exterminate* all the “criminals” that will surely soon dramatically reduce all crime. They will certainly not re-offend, will they?

But as obviously such a solution is unacceptable to any modern society, somehow we must find a better way.

And this must surely start with *the intention* to actually break this unceasing cycle of crime and punishment, as if the one led inevitably to the other, and that “no leopard could ever change its spots.”

But on the contrary, we have seen many famous cases of rehabilitation, such as in murderers even, and we must also appreciate that the circumstances which caused a particular crime to be committed may have been virtually unique, suggesting that crime will likely never be committed again by that person.

For example, take the real life case of a man whose wife and children were killed by a hit and run driver. He was so incensed and destroyed that he tracked down the driver and killed him. But apart from that, he was not known to be a violent man.

Clearly, those kind of extreme circumstances are unlikely to recur, and thus though this man must surely be taught a lesson, and the public protected from him for a time, it is a very different crime than a thief who carries out a murder to steal some diamonds from an uncooperative victim.

The problem then is of a different kind. He is clearly holding the philosophy *I can kill to get what I want*.

If there is no evidence to suggest that this man’s attitude has not changed, he should surely never be released, in order to protect the public.

So it is clear, that the punishment of offenders cannot be decided easily on any set of easy to assign rules, but in *all cases* individual circumstances must be taken into account.

And thus we come back to the question of *the wisdom of judges*.

So then we have a question to answer – how do we find the wisest people and make them judges?

And for the moment, we can only say, this society is not encouraging wise people to go into the law, as there is too much corruption.

In the movie of the true historical story with which we opened this work, *A Man For All Seasons*, Sir Thomas More was beheaded due to his principles, due to this corruption around him, which caused his enemies to plot and bear false witness against him, so that they could eventually execute him *under the law*.

And surely there is chicanery and corruption in almost everything we see now, which explains the huge number of laws and lawyers in our society.

Citizens are all trying to deceive and cheat one another, but that would not in itself cause the wise not to become lawyers in the hope of sorting these disputes out.

It is the corruption *in the law itself* which would prevent them, and in the often unscrupulous behaviour of the legal operatives themselves, which would make life difficult for them.

Not that we would wish to discourage any person with a good intention from entering the law, which if rightly practised must surely be one of the most satisfying and worthwhile professions.

We would just advise them it is not necessarily going to be like Perry Mason or Ally McBeal, and that they should carefully consider just what any law firm they might join up with is trying to do.

No doubt more scrupulous and principled people will be likely to be found in some areas of the law, more than others.

And we should equally remember, that in our zeal, we may have quite different standards and aims, which may be beyond the standards of our colleagues or superiors, *and they may not like us for that*.

But as we have said, the punishment of offenders must be decided by both what is in the best interests of society and the convicted person.

It seems right that a man or woman who has *intentionally* caused the death of another, *for whatever reason*, should at least lose their liberty for some time.

But here in England, we have had very recently the case of a nurse, who gave a lethal injection to a 78 year old man who was having cancer treatment.

In her defence, she merely said “I wanted to give him a good night’s sleep” but had deliberately injected a lethal dose which killed him within thirty minutes. The doctors however had said this man had a good chance of leaving the hospital successfully treated.

She amazingly *walked free* from court, with a 2 year suspended sentence, partly we would guess because she was

- a) pregnant
- b) she broke down in tears in court

But there seems, does there not, to be a certain mysterious absence of this *zero tolerance* kind of policy here?

However, without knowing full details of this case, it appears perhaps that this lady was not mentally sound, and certainly not fit to be a nurse.

Again, without wishing to labour the point, one wonders what would have happened to a *male nurse* who had carried out exactly the same actions, but had no state of pregnancy or tears to offer as defence.

But her case brings open a wider issue, if not several.

For example, surely, the attitudes of anybody who seeks to become a nurse must be carefully examined, before they are given such “life and death” powers.

Naturally, the murder of this man being seventy-eight and ill with cancer, was considered a lesser crime than if it had been a young person she murdered in the prime of life, but if we imagine ourselves in his position, we might not necessarily agree, that any nurse has the power to terminate our lives against our consent, any more than she did that of the life of a younger person.

For thus, we see, that society *or at least law* is therefore judging the life of a young person as more important than that of an older person.

Is this the principle we want to base society on?

We imagine if polled a lot of the young would say *yes*, but would change their opinion as soon as they got older. Thus again, it is clear, that the wise, experienced, older and impartial should be those who make and judge law, and not the inexperienced, or prejudiced (e.g. by their own experience of abuse) young.

Governments however are talking more in terms of *rehabilitation* and avoiding prison sentences altogether in so far as that is possible, but this leaves many victims of serious crime and their families without any feeling that *justice* has been done.

For it would appear for example, in the case of the nurse above, who still incidentally has to face a nursing disciplinary hearing at the time of writing, and is more or less presumed certain to lose her job, that the decision of the court has more or less legalised murder by nurses, in that it has created that decision as some kind of *precedent*.

For those who are not aware, briefly, British law and that in most Western countries is made mostly by two parties: *governments* as *statute law* – that is written general rules, as we have said, like Moses Ten Commandments or even “the school rules”, but with *clauses* and *sub-clauses* in them detailing variations on the general rule and taking into accounts special circumstance; and *judges* by *case law*, by creating *precedents* such as the one mentioned above.

In fact, in some ways, the average law book of *statutes* is not unlike the Bible, from which is quoted *chapter and verse*.

The law on any major field likewise has its chapter and verse as *statute law*.

But the rules laid down by parliament as statute law cannot possibly cover every circumstance. Then judges have to *interpret the law*, decide what they think parliament meant when they wrote the law.

They cannot simply request parliament *tell them* because the law may be old, and its originally formulators may not even be alive, and in any case,



there are too many cases going on at any time to make such requests a feasible option.

The fundamental problem is that the intricacies of the human interpersonal world, or *real life*, are such that no limited list of rules can cover it all.

Thus judges have to use *discretion*, have to *interpret* the statute law, to “read between the lines” of the dead pages of “the letter of the law”, the “book of rules”, and decide who they think the law should be applied in these *particular circumstances*.

Thereby the judge makes a *precedent* which if accepted by the legal community at large may become a new general rule, e.g. the case of *Adams v Butcher 1998*, and is quoted as such in any similar case that comes up to justify the decision *on law* that the judge or lawyers wish to apply.

Thus, the competent lawyer must become an expert in not only the written rules, the *statute*, but also the *case law* in his or her particular field.

As cases not only in his or her own country, but even *around the world* can be applied with lesser or greater effects in any trial, this of course can become an utterly enormous task, in which modern computer databases and retrieval systems have now become an essential asset.

And thus, due to this complexity of almost every single area of law, we can again see why so many lawyers are required.

Each area of law is rather like playing a board game we have never seen before, which comes with its own little rules booklet, which we have to take some time to study until we “get the hang of the game.”

Such board games as *Monopoly* for example, can take some time to properly explore the possibilities and strategies of, and in comparison to most fields of law, we must be aware that such a game is a very simple one indeed.

Thus it is hard to enter any field of endeavour without encountering a whole lot of legal rules, that we did not even know existed, and in most cases, we do not remotely have the time or feel the necessity to learn.

For example, if we get married, take a job, or start a business, or have children, we are immediately in a whole maze of such rules and regulations which we mostly do not know exist.

Just as we are if we drive a car, or even just walk out upon the street.

Even if we dare not go out, and merely sit in our home watching television or browsing the Internet, again, there are huge bodies of laws governing those situations, many of which may apply to us.

For example, in England, one cannot legally view any television station, even using a computer TV card, without purchasing a fairly expensive television license from *the BBC*, or British Broadcasting Corporation, which many British people deeply resent.

For as virtually every British citizen owns and watches at least one television, it would seem less onerous to many if a small adjustment – roughly a half to one percent - were made to the basic rate of income tax to cover the cost of the BBC.

But no, as usual, the sensible option is not taken. Instead the British public for generations has been *threatened* with the idea that “television detector vans” are patrolling every area, and threatening those who possess no license with huge fines, and now this harassment mainly of *the poor*, such as even *old age pensioners*, who find the paying out of such a lump sum in one go difficult, has been made far easier by computer databases which can easily produce lists of the addresses of homes to which no TV license has been registered.

The likely reason for this annoying situation continuing, is that as the government seeks constantly to get re-elected by appealing to the property owning classes by promising to *lower taxes*, this sensible, understanding and tolerant measure is never taken.

But the situation is far worse with those who enter self-employment, who in many cases are wholly ignorant of the tax system that they are thereby forcibly entering.

As usual the principle is, *ignorance of the law is no defence*.

And further as usual, the weak – the individual or small traders - tend to be harassed for tax money far more than the strong – the big businesses and corporations – as the latter are protected by an army of *lawyers*.

Typically, what happens in the British tax system is that once the authorities become aware of a trader's existence – which they may devise numerous devious ways to find out, such as checking small ads in newspapers and other such “spying missions” – they issue what is known as an “estimated assessment”, which is generally an outrageously large tax bill that arrives on someone's mat one day.

Then in horror, they are obliged to ring the tax office, under threat of even eventual imprisonment – remember how they put even *Al Capone* away, after all (on *tax evasion* charges) – and then the trader is forced to submit some accounts which are then assessed for their *realism*, and if accepted, the trader is then given a revised assessment (i.e. bill) of what he owes the tax authorities. If however the accounts are *not* accepted, then begins an often unjust and unholy war to make him pay up more than he may ever have actually deserved to pay.

As in the feudal system we earlier mentioned, the government, the law, takes taxes extremely seriously, and those who have had any significant dealings with them get to see them as a kind of quasi-police force of sorts.

That is, nurses can murder old men, can get a suspended sentence, but those who evade tax may well get *prison*.

Thus, we see the priorities of our society, in all their naked glory.

So in light of the above, it is suggested that a *revision of priorities* is desperately needed if we are to have a *true* civilisation based on *equal justice for all*, so that we start putting people and human life before money and property in our formation and application of law.

In the case of offenders, we need to look at *why* they are offending.

Is this because like young vandals they *are unsupervised, have no role models, have no guidance, have nobody who cares about them?*

And if so, can we not find those role models, and guidance for them?

Can we not find sensible ways to organise their burning energies?

For example, in one experiment a few old cars and a small race track was set aside for so called “young hoodlums” who had been stealing cars and

tearing round the streets dangerously in them. They were also taught car mechanics by a good citizen who gave them some of his free time.

Miraculously – *so it would appear to those who are without belief that these youths can ever be reformed* – the car crime fell almost to zero whilst this experiment was running, once the “idle hands” of these youths were put to legitimate and satisfying activity.

But amazingly, we find that this *successful solution*, now more than a decade old, has *not* been duplicated in other areas who still have similar problems, which incidentally are costing *millions of pounds* in policing, court appearances and damage, thus invalidating any arguments to the contrary that these sensible and enlightened rehabilitatory measures could not be afforded.

So why are they not?

The author has heard nothing but *a deafening silence* as to this and other similar questions.

The only reasons he can come up with, are that the current government does not actually *want* to solve these problems, that is, to correctly guide and rehabilitate troubled youth. The reasons for this, may perhaps be found in some of the other of the author’s works.

That is to say *briefly*, those who rule this society, do not do so with *love*. (i.e. *Christian love - genuine concern for one’s fellow man and woman and child regardless of religious belief or non-belief*).

Likewise, we have discovered recently that the conditions in some British prisons are so oppressive and hopeless for the inmates that around seventy-percent are using cocaine. And again, fascinatingly, it has been reported, that inmates who volunteer to do a job such as cleaning floors or peeling potatoes are given an allowance currently of over twelve British pounds per week, whereas those who agree to study for qualifications are given only an allowance of eight pounds per week. Does this indicate that the authorities wish to see prisoners educate and better themselves?

*You be the judge.*

Thus as we said, the first real step is *desire by the authorities* to rehabilitate. But they don’t seem to want that, they just seem to “enjoy” convicting people, and punishing them, in short *making them suffer*.

Of course, we see the same interest in creating human suffering currently in the treatment of the prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and Iraq, do we not?

It is the view of the author, that genuine means of rehabilitating *most* convicted criminals will *easily* be found, just as long as there is a *genuine will* and compassionate desire to do so.

Once these so called “criminals” are rehabilitated in an effective way, for example, mainly by being taught a trade and occupation with which they will be able to make an independent life “on the outside”, the cycle of *crime and punishment* will surely break down.

In the remainder of cases, criminals may be seriously mentally disturbed and unlikely to be able to control themselves in an ordinary social environment, and thus the public may need to be permanently protected from them.

Nevertheless, regardless of what these truly dangerous people have done, their *confinement* should surely be deemed punishment enough, and they should be given as much a normal life as is possible, and treated in so far as is possible a humane way.

For all concerned should realise, that to treat these offenders in such a just manner – remembering also that many in prison should not be there, and have been falsely accused and convicted – is not merely for *their* own good, it is for the sake of our own humanity above all, without which we too cannot be seen as in the true sense of the law as *innocent*.

## Chapter 6 – Violent Crime - *Games People Play*

In chapter 4 we discussed rape, though incidentally did not include the issue of rape of prisoners (usually *male*) inside prisons, by men denied women driven to turn to homosexual relationships for gratification, or simply already possessing those tendencies, which is rarely mentioned in the media, or discussed by the law making bodies, except as a now somewhat “clichéd” scene in various gritty drama movies.

But we did not discuss women’s other big gripe with men – the use of violence against women by men, which here we now intend to do.

Instead of however just accepting this ceaseless cycle of *crime and punishment* as inevitable, rather let us look at the *genesis* of the bully, the person who thinks that violence is a legitimate way to achieve their ends.

It is first of all necessary to point out that all legal systems are not only based on justice, but ultimately upon *force*.

That is, though no children are allowed (in England, parents currently *are* allowed, but are made to feel *criminal* for doing so) to use force on their children as physical discipline, if an adult is deemed to have committed a crime, or even only suspected of doing so, the police *will* use force if necessary to detain or imprison him or her.

For how can we possibly stop a criminal who is intent on evading the law from committing their crimes if we do not either actually threaten or use force to physically control them?

Indeed in the case of even peaceful protests, the authorities, like in some kind of Stalinist regime, as it appears wholly calm about beating their citizens sometimes mercilessly with batons, making them sick enough to vomit using tear gas, or simply dragging them along the ground until they can *forcibly* hand cuff and lock them in the back of the police van.

But for some bizarre reason, best known to the shall we say “liberal psychologists” who have been interfering unasked for several decades now in the relationship between parents and children, *only adults* are allowed to be beaten and abused in this way, but children are increasingly not allowed to be even touched – again, no doubt, partly due to the totally overblown anxiety about “child molestation.”

Again, we judge the media *guilty* of creating this over-anxiety. That is to say, currently they are frightening the public with the numerous images of child pornography available on the Internet.

Some recent statistics say this is coming mostly from *America* itself, and to a slightly lesser degree Eastern Europe, and it is somewhat ironic to discover that the land where the paranoia and concern about child molestation is the greatest, actually has *so it would seem* the worst record of any Western nation in rooting out or stopping it.

In actual fact however, the real truth is likely that America merely has the most Internet connections and users of anywhere in the world, as well as likely the largest producers in the world of pornography – the home of *Playboy*, the seamier side of Hollywood (many actors started out of desperation in porn movies, even ones such as the sometimes excellent Jim Carrey), etc. - and thus it may not be especially worse as an actual *abuser* of children than any other place, but merely has a bigger presence.

But the more significant reality is that even if there were a million images of child sex on the Internet, that only takes *one thousand producers* to produce *one thousand* images each.

So that means that this stuff is just being *produced* by perhaps a few thousand people in the whole world, so the point that is never made is *there are about six billion of the rest of us who are NOT involved in it*.

Of course, there are many more who may download these images either deliberately or accidentally, and some like Pete Townshend, of rock group, *The Who*, who apart from smashing his guitars on stage as a publicity stunt in the early days of 1960s pop has likely never harmed a fly, claim to have downloaded such images only as *research* investigating child porn and abuse of children in general.

Incidentally, in his *defence* Townshend himself claims to be the victim of child abuse, which we find plausible from his works, including for example the “deaf, dumb and blind kid” who gets interfered with by his “evil Uncle Ernie” in the rock-opera *Tommy*.

But nevertheless Pete Townshend has found himself placed - again due to one of these draconian and discretionless *zero tolerance* policies - on what is known as “the sex offenders register”, whilst people like Sir Mick Jagger get made a knight of the realm for going around the world taking drugs and bedding numerous women and fathering children all over the

place, and thus despite his admittedly genuine talent, high intelligence and some good songs, being *a great role model for the rest of us* - which the awarding of his knighthood would surely suggest?

But do even these law enforcement and law making entities *understand* the Internet we ask ourselves?

Do they realise for example that people can be routinely tricked by web site technology into going on web pages they never intended to, which may display some of these child sex images?

Well, it's for *defence lawyers* to tell them if they do not, and overturn the "blind justice" of these ridiculous zero tolerance policies that fail to use *commonsense* and discriminate between dangerous criminals and those who either have unwittingly, or due to some unhealthy fascination with the darker areas of pornography, have stumbled across these images and therefore *technically* committed an offence.

Which brings us to the subject of what in British law is called in Latin as *mens rea*, or *intent* (as Peter Cook said "I wanted to be a judge, but I didn't have the Latin...")

That is, we cannot *in principle* be judged guilty of something we did not mean or intend to do, but somehow happened nevertheless.

For example, suppose a man who had a dagger throwing circus act was practicing when some unwitting person walked through the door unexpectedly and got impaled. He might be found guilty of practicing his art negligently – not practicing it safely enough or far away enough from possible harm – but we could not surely under the law accuse him of *murder*, as there was clearly *no intent*.

So we surely hold this to be a fundamental and incontrovertible principle of justice and law, as any standard work upon the British legal system will confirm.

But what do we find in practice?

The aforementioned *drink driving law* is found in English law to be a law where *intent* does not enter into it, a crime in fact for which there are *no defences*. Even a man over the limit taking his pregnant wife to the hospital has been found guilty on this count.



And we put it to you, that such laws – again, prompted by “zero tolerance” philosophies, in this instance in terms of the paranoia about children getting knocked over and killed by drink drivers – *for which there is no defence whatsoever*, are totalitarian and undemocratic.

Of course, if a man over the alcohol limit knocked down and *killed someone* whilst driving his wife to hospital that would be a different thing. He would at least have to shoulder *some* of the blame for having killed an innocent person, *if he was the party at fault*.

But as the police officer said to Michael Douglas in the movie *Fatal Attraction* “we can’t go arresting (and convicting) people for what they *might* do...” – can we?

And of course, the man whose vehicle rolled onto the railway track whilst he was asleep but got *several years in prison* also did not seem to display this intent, this *mens rea*, but nevertheless was dealt with harshly by the law.

So once again, we should consider what somebody’s *intent* is, ask the question – are they *really* a danger to society or children? – before we start locking them up and throwing away the key, or placing them upon some “sex offenders register”, which may have them hounded, attacked or murdered by a vigilante group, or maybe forced to suicide, for merely looking at some pictures on the Internet that do not necessarily in any way prove that they ever *intend* to commit any crime *in the real world*..

The broader issue as we have said, is instead of being godlike judges condemning others from a high throne as *pure evil, subhuman* and so on, to rather look at this situation *impartially* , as surely all true law and justice *must*, and see what is the best way of not only dealing with these crimes, but preferably of *preventing them*.

So what is lacking in the law, and its punishments is *a correct understanding of the genesis of the violent or abusive criminal*.

The “right wing” *hang them, flog them* brigade, which incidentally many if not *most* people soon join, when one of these acts is perpetrated against themselves, or those close to them, continually says “we have had enough of these bleeding heart liberals excusing these criminals saying they came from broken homes, etc.”

And surely they are right, but *only* to the degree that the public *must be protected* from people who are so damaged or somehow have become “evil” that they are able to commit these crimes.

But what these right-wingers and everyone else must also acknowledge is that *crime prevention is better than punishment after the crime*.

For even if we were to flog, hang, draw and quarter every *proven* rapist or child molester we could find, it still would not prevent *what has already happened to the victim*, which may have already been sufficient to ruin the victims’ whole subsequent lives.

So our essential purpose in trying to *understand* the genesis and psychology of the perpetrator of abuse and violent crime, is not so much to *excuse*, but rather to *prevent* the appearance of such potential criminals.

For if instead we only deal with these people with rage, and blind fury – *as is typical* – we never break this unending cycle of *crime and punishment, punishment and crime*, circling again and again, forever and ever and ever, till all eternity.

And we put it to you that *stuck groove* on the “record” is what our current social and legal thinking has got us trapped in.

So here, we shall briefly look at the genesis of the violent and abusive criminal mind.

We either have to say that some people are *born evil* or they are made so. It is either *nature or nurture*, or a combination of the two.

Because we have observed that violent and abusive criminals come from all strata of the intelligence brackets, from almost genius level “Hitlers” to our local perhaps mentally deficient pervert and thug, we would suggest that likely Nature plays the smaller part, and *nurture* the larger part.

But we are not merely going to make a baseless claim, we are going to explain the plausible mechanics of *how* this occurs in at least a general way, attempting to be totally rational and logical, arguing in terms of easily identifiable *cause and effect*.

So it is unavoidable to say that the creation of the personality is formed in childhood. This is true of *every animal*. As the saying goes *we cannot teach an old dog new tricks*. Or as the Jesuits used to say – *give me the boy till seven years old, and I give you the man*.

We know also, that it is rare *though not impossible* for a great musician to appear, such as Mozart, Beethoven or in modern times Yehudi Menuhin, Nigel Kennedy or even Vanessa Mae, pianists like Ashkenazy, Dudley Moore (an excellent *classical* as well as jazz pianist, and composer, whose movies were probably the lowest manifestation of his talent) or whomever, if they did not study their instrument from *a very early age*, typically between three and seven years old.

Even if they do not start *playing* their particular instrument until seven or later, we almost always find, like in the case of Paul McCartney for example, whose father was an amateur musician, that they have been directly *exposed* to the playing of a musical instrument at an early age.

Some very-ambitious-for-their-children parents even play music to babies in the womb for such a reason, which we personally would regard as a little overzealous and “premature”, though we won’t definitely say they are wrong.

And correspondingly we are arguing that just as with learning *music*, by being *exposed* to it, people can learn *violence and abuse* by being *exposed to it*, likewise.

What needs to be understood above all, that a child’s mind is like the potter’s clay.

If we have skill, when we spin the wheel we make a beautiful well shaped pot, cup, vase or jug.

But if we lack the skill, or if in some rage at being not able to control the clay, we *lash out at it*, we will end up with a very deformed or ugly pot indeed.

But we might not actually be so uncontrolled and brutal as to *lash out*, we might make an almost perfect or at least *normal* looking pot, but we might *perversely* decide to scrape its side with a knife, and leave some kind of “scar” on it, because *there is something inside of us that can’t stand to see its perfection*.

And *this desire*, which is found to some degree in almost *all* humans, we need as individuals and as a society most *desperately* to understand.

That is, there is the desire to carefully build up a beautiful house of cards. Then there is the desire of someone else to come along and *wickedly, perhaps gleefully* knock it down.

The person who knocked *our* house of cards down however, may then go off and make one of their own, which understand - *they do not want anyone else to knock down.*

These kinds of behaviours – which of course are fundamentally *bullying* behaviours - we easily observe in children in a nursery (not that we *approve* of nurseries generally speaking, and this is largely why) or playground.

One person has something they are possessive and *proud* of, which gives them *comfort* or *pleasure*, and another person comes along, *resents it*, and wants to steal away or destroy the possession that the other person has got but they currently don't.

This is the fundamentally selfish nature of the human animal, which *must* be stamped out at an early age, or otherwise takes a hold, and then creates an out-of-control, bullying, and potentially criminal personality.

We are not giving this as *proof* as such, but we are going to quote here the age old Chinese “book of wisdom” the *I ching*, which is estimated to be at least five thousand years old, using the Richard Wilhelm translation as some kind of *supplementary or eye-witness evidence*:

“There is no task so difficult to carry out or more easily avoided than *the breaking of a child's will.*”

The idea that one must “break a child's will” is foreign to modern “parenting” and child psychology.

But this persistent and never satisfied *want* in children, is the real currency of the relationship between parents and children, as one can easily see in the pleas and even *demands* of the child to its parent regarding the rows of sweets at the checkout desk in a supermarket.

But now that “modern psychology” is against parents giving their children a quick, not too zealous “let them know who's boss” slap on the

arm or thigh (not *bottom* or *head* please, as in the first case there are unwise sexual overtones, and in the second case, may harm the child's skull or brain), we find that this *will* of a child is never properly broken, and in many cases we can easily see – for example when a mother calls a child, and it ignores her request completely – that *the child is the real boss*.

In England, as no doubt in other places, we have a TV series, called *Supernanny*, involving a rather fearsome looking “no-nonsense” lady who goes round trying to teach parents who are unable to control their children – which of course is *millions* – who are running wild and ruling over them, how to “turn the situation around.”

She tries to teach the parents all kinds of techniques, but *without hitting them*, to get them to behave, and amazingly these techniques seem to succeed. But what we discover is that, the techniques only work *while Supernanny is present*. As soon as Supernanny is out the front door, it may take a few days, but the whole situation again unravels, and the parents lose control as badly as ever before.

We do not know what “Supernanny” does with *her own children*, but the point is, we believe, that Supernanny has got it in her to give the children a good smack they won't quickly forget, and that the reason she is effective is because *the children sense that*. They sense that *here* is an obstacle they cannot find a way to “get around.”

We are not saying that there are not parents so skilful that they can control and discipline young children effectively without ever hitting them, just as some *very few* teachers in the era of corporal punishment in schools could achieve the same, but that for most parents as the Supernanny series easily proves, this is *impossible*.

There is no effective *deterrent*.

For example, as we write, the West – America and England in particular – are making “sabre-rattling” noises at Iran, as they claim it is intending to manufacture nuclear weapons.

And upon what basis could the West possibly influence Iran? By threats of *force*, by military action, by threats of “grievous bodily harm” and *murder* of course.

This threat and means of *persuasion* in essence is no different than our gangster “friend” *Big Joe*, who says “Look at my dame again, and I’ll blow your brains out.”

Or as *Marlon Brando*, as Don Vito Corleone, said in the *very uplifting and humanitarian* example (please note, we *are* being ironic) to society movie “The Godfather”:

*We made them an offer they couldn’t refuse (chuckle, chuckle).*

The “chuckle, chuckle” part above, is not regarded as trivial.

For we have identified that there is *pleasure* in hurting or intimidating others.

So this is a dangerous state of the human psyche, is it not?

Because we *all* want *pleasure*, to “feel good”, and we have discovered here that there is pleasure in hurting other people, just as some children (and adults) take pleasure in killing a defenceless animal, or seeing two grown men beat one another to a pulp with their fists, just as the “citizens of Rome” took pleasure in watching gladiators maim and murder each other.

(we are not however here campaigning against “hunting, fishing, or shooting” however, which we believe should be an issue of *personal freedom* and made less prevalent in indirect ways – e.g. giving people *something better* to do, or in the case of those who club seals or whatever to death *for a living*, by providing them with an alternative means of livelihood).

But sticking to the point, we have unearthed this very worrying psychological reality here, which is surely *central* to all efforts to formulate and enforce the law, that virtually everybody can at certain times, or in certain circumstances enjoy seeing or carrying out the infliction of pain or suffering upon others.

We even see this gleeful infliction of suffering and even murder upon others in the names of armaments such as the wild-West Colt *Peacemaker* handgun, and the modern *Widowmaker* assault rifle (go on, *smile, you know you want to*, is the idea).

For example again, there was a newspaper report some years ago of some kind of party of a male club, whose members hired a stripper to “entertain” their fellows.

This lady arrived in a nurse’s uniform however, ready to do her “act” but she did not get half-way started when one of the already partially drunken party revellers hauled her across his knee and proceeded to smack her bottom.

This obviously was not part of the deal, for just as even with the modern “lap dancers”, by whom millions of modern men are now being enticed and likely corrupted, the rule is *you can look, but you can’t touch*.

(we should explain what we mean by “corrupted” here – we mean, the invitation of women to ever more stimulating sexual activities is a “slippery slope”. It starts with – shall we put it politely – the “pinup magazine”, and then *progresses* to the stripper or “lap dancer” and then *progresses* maybe to the prostitute or escort. And then *maybe* the wife finds out, and the relationship or marriage is *destroyed*. It is in that sense we mean it is *corrupting*, i.e. it ends in destruction of what the man really cares most about – his relationship with his wife and family).

So of course this illegitimate bottom smacking exercise, caused the outraged girl to take the man concerned to court, which is why it appeared in the newspaper (quite apart of course, from giving the lecherous public something to drool over in order to sell more newspapers).

But what we wish to focus on here is *the motive* of the crime.

For as we have said, people take pleasure in *inflicting pain*, and surely this has got to be avoided or stopped or at least confined only to activities between “consenting adults”, when in our example, the girl had not given any such consent.

So let us return to the story, and what we want the reader to especially observe, is that the *effect* of the girl having her bottom smacked on the other party members was to produce laughter and *a round of applause*.

The feeling was *she deserved it, she asked for it*.

The feeling was, that she had not behaved like a lady, and therefore did not deserve to be treated like one.

But let's go still deeper, go to *the root*. The feeling was, that she was just like all those other women whom men *in the West* are daily tempted by, in her short skirt, black stockings and high heels, who *as they see it* torment them endlessly, but in most cases, whom they can never have.

So *as they see it*, they are made to suffer daily, tormented by desires that they cannot ever satisfy, and therefore they *hate* that woman who has tormented them, and her kind.

They feel “disempowered”, they feel like *nothing* and above all they *hate*.

So we see now the root of this dark desire – it is about one person feeling good, *being* something that the other person is not, and the other person who witnesses it envying it.

For example, one fine musician displayed his talent to a friend. And instead of the friend enjoying the music as he had expected and hoped, the friend shocked him by saying “Hey – you had better watch out, with talent like *that*. People are going to *hate* you for it, who won't ever play like you can.”

This was shocking to the musician, as his only aim was not to actually “show off” a skill as such, but to *share beautiful music*, to enable the other person to experience and enjoy something they never otherwise could have done, it being rare for anyone nowadays to see a personal performance of that kind, rather than merely on a recording or in a concert hall.

So we see that the cause of the hate, the envy, and consequently *the crime*, is a society amongst whom a very sizeable percent of people are all walking around feeling *unimportant*, like *nothing* and therefore waiting for the opportunity to attack in whatever way they can those who clearly *feel like something*.

We see this clearly dramatised in the sadomasochistic practices.

That is, one party or another is asked to “eat dirt” or told they *are* dirt.

Then, they are whipped or beaten or spat on or urinated on or whatever.



These psychological “games people play” that are seen in their most naked and ugly forms in the sadomasochistic practices are really what are underlying our society.

Some of them are explained in a famous psychology book written as long ago as 1964 by Eric Berne, MD, entitled *Games People Play*. Although this book is claimed over the decades to have sold many millions of copies, it appears that our politicians and lawmakers have not read it, or otherwise they would not continue to make the ridiculous laws and judgements which they do.

That is to say, this book explains the seemingly bizarre *real life transactions* that occur between humans, on the psychological level, which show for example the mechanics of how countless women *allow* themselves to be *abused*, when all logic and reason dictates they would leave an abusive relationship.

Perhaps however, the reason this book is not sufficiently appreciated is because the author does not fully explain *why* these “games” occur, merely that they *do*, which we have explained in our other works is really due to *hypnotic and compulsive emotional states*.

Here, however, we are just going to continue our theme, which is to say what the *fundamental force* and therefore *mechanism* is in *all* games, and this is as we have seen basically the condition of *egotism*, or our *sense of identity* and *self-worth* which others can use against us in any of numerous ways.

“You are stupid”. “You are clever.” “You are good.” “You are wicked.” “You are perverted.” “You are kind.” “You are a whore.” “You are a bully.”

All these *judgements* upon and *suggestions* to us, play with this sense of self.

And as we can see, the kind of example above, many parents will repeatedly tell to their children, and over time will create their *self-image* or sense of *self-worth*.

But *words alone are not enough*.

We can say to our children “I care about you so much.” But then what we *do* does not equate with what we say. We run off to our job, or are too

“busy” to give them attention, or we tell them to “go and play outside” while we have sex with our new boyfriend or girlfriend or husband or wife.

Then they see *words* as being *empty, meaningless, as lies*. They learn that they can be used as a device to inflict pain on others, to deceive them, just as they have been deceived themselves.

But whilst we are too busy doing what *we* want, we do not notice all this, and then our children grow up *mixed up, neglected, disturbed*, but above all from the point of view of our study of the genesis of the even slightly *criminal mind*, they have inside them a feeling of worthlessness, of envy and *hate* of those who don't feel worthless like themselves.

For even “average people” will say about someone “that person thinks he or she is “God's gift” - I really wish something *awful* would happen to them (*to bring them down to where I am*).”

So we might call that a “thought crime.” We *wish* others pain, suffering, bad luck, ill fortune, on the basis of *what we think they deserve*.

We are all *judges*, who give *the verdict*, and who then pronounce *the sentence* upon our fellow man and woman.

It is therefore little wonder, is it not, that Christ (whom we shall term as a “philosopher” at the least, for those who do not hold any “religious beliefs”) said in the hope of trying to foster a peaceful and civilised society:

*Judge not lest you be judged.*

Because we all like judging others, and seeing them in pain, but we don't like having others judge *us* and causing pain in us.

So parents – especially in their behaviour towards *one another* unwittingly teach children these games.

They inflict their own mixed up psychological states, their cruelties and neglect upon their children.

And then we wonder why adults become criminals?

It is simple *cause* and *effect*. It is rarely if ever about “inborn evil” which is the lamest, most uncompassionate and inhuman excuse for avoiding the effort to understand other people who have *problems* in their psyches which we could possibly make and *accuse* them of.

In particular, after enough inhumane treatment, the thoroughly traumatised, bullied and abused child will be carrying such a case of “emotional explosives” bottled up inside them, that they become like a bomb on a “trip wire”, and thus it only takes a little nudge for them to *explode*, we say *that person is on a short fuse*.

They *lash out* in frustration or rage, as it is the only way they have found which gives them any relief at all. They may in their envy of the relatively unconflicted, “happy” and “privileged” state of the other children they meet, decided to start bullying and punishing them, to bring them down to the same state of suffering which they experience more or less continually themselves.

In fact the only *relief* they may ever get as children, may be in the bullying and therefore suffering of other children.

As teenagers or adults, they will quickly graduate to drink, drugs, sex and stealing or violent crime, again, to gain themselves a feeling of “empowerment” and blot out the pain they feel should they sit still and be left without all their drugs, slavish girlfriends and other comforting props.

Sensitive people – which most if not all of us *started out* as – can feel the “vibrations” coming off these people of discontent from even yard away.

We aren’t being “psychic” here or talking about “auras” *necessarily*, we are just saying using our ordinary and generally adequate *five senses*, we can see the movements, facial expressions and behaviours of discontent and disturbed people quite easily in most cases.

In many cases, the parents will have so thoroughly traumatised and destroyed the child’s mind, and that means, like messing up the clay pot, will quite likely have set some possibly unerasable scars upon its *brain*, that the child will not be likely able to be “therapised” or “rehabilitated” in any significant way, without perhaps the most enormous and persistent efforts of *a saint*. And if there are *any* saints around – or the really “wise”, like the fictional Masters in the “Kung Fu” temple - they are certainly a very rare occurrence in our current world.

So the reality is going to be, that these seriously disturbed children and their adult counterparts can only be “controlled”, “subdued” by prescription or non-prescription drugs, which is what we see happening in reality.

For many decades now, “troubled children” whom their parents had unwittingly created, and totally denied any responsibility for, have been shipped off to the psychiatrist, as if it were their fault, and not that of the parents (usually *the true cause*) and as mostly the psychiatrists were powerless before the messed up being before them, this generally had little effect, and many of these then went on to become career criminals, social misfits, or mischievous troublemakers at the very least.

So then we have to look at *the degree* of the messing up of children, in order to explain the existence of those like for example “the Yorkshire Ripper” who killed over a dozen prostitutes saying he heard “voices in his head” telling him to do it, or those who abuse children *sexually*, or beat the tar out of their girlfriends or wives (or sometimes boyfriends or husbands) for no good reason that we can see.

We are not however going to detail the horrors that adults can inflict on children – and don’t forget, whilst much of the abuse may be *carried out* by the males, in many cases the *females* stand by and “approve it” or “do nothing” - which in itself is surely as bad in its own way, unless it is out of total terror for what the male perpetrator might do to them should they “tell”, which we assure you, as in the Myra Hindley “Moors Murders”, is very far from always being the case.

For moreover, we wish to illustrate only the *cause*, which is that to the degree that people are abused, are taught this “unholy music”, they can inflict it on others also *when they get the chance*.

So we are talking *prevention of crime*.

And the only genuine and *permanent* answer is therefore, parents must be given the *understanding*, just as we have explained here, however long that may take to sink in – which will be only *gradually* in most cases – of how careful they must be to truly raise their children properly.

If people realise for example that they have no patience, they are so self-absorbed, and could not devote their life to a child, they had better not have one, unless they have a partner who is patient and devoted enough to *properly* do that caring for both of them.

But even in the milder cases of *abuse*, which likely the majority of people have undergone, we see that this envy that likes to inflict pain on others to make itself feel better, can occur *to some degree* in a father or even mother.

Mothers and fathers can in fact, become envious of the beauty, innocence and “perfection” of their own child, especially when it is witnessed by the other party in the marriage.

Before you write that off as nonsense, why do you imagine that so many mothers become the “wicked witch” to their daughters? – as for example one of the less extreme feminists *Nancy Friday* admits openly in her 1996 work “The Power of Beauty” in relation to her own mother?

In this book, this poor lady is trying to figure out what has been done to her and why, though your current author is not boasting about his own understanding, which he has admitted in his other works has been explained to him largely by *someone else*.

But the answer is simply *mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of them all?*

And in her book, Nancy Friday foolishly obsesses over the idea of “physical beauty” when we know that there is for one thing *no standard* for assessing such a thing, and the current author himself would judge the true standard of beauty as *inner character, true intelligence and harmony* expressing itself via the bodily shape, movements and face.

That is, for example, your current author does not care much for Marilyn Monroe – except in a *compassionate* way, as he sees her as only a confused child.

Whereas he feels much more *attraction* to a lady like British comedian Jo Brand, who despite being a not conventionally attractive woman, and self-confessed “fat cow”, has it appears to him got far more intelligence, wit, compassion and human charm, which are the qualities that any evolved person would seek in a friend, which arouse in us *love* for her and similar more evolved women (which *may* or *may not* have sexual overtones).

Without getting too far diverted, we hear many modern women saying the mantra “sex(ual attraction) is in the mind”, and this is more or less what we mean.

So what are we to do with this *hate*, this *envy*, this potential to *violence* which will if not stopped sooner or later flower into the lesser or greater varieties of *crime*?

We have to *stop it in its tracks* at an early age. We have to teach *sharing* and if an occasional and judicious (i.e. not abusive or physically damaging) smack has to be given *at an early age* to enforce that principle and deter greed, that this *timely and occasional* smack be given is rather essential, rather than to be avoided.

But if we only show the disciplinary side of child care, and not also provide the child the attention it needs - which as we have explained in our other works is not about smothering it in hugs and kisses and praising it, but rather about allowing it to develop naturally, educating it, and slowly and patiently showing it and explaining things in a natural order that it can handle - then our smacking, which should grow less and less necessary after time, and finally disappear – will not have the right effect, which should – like in any classroom – be merely necessary to create *order* so that the education and care and attention can then be given in the right way.

So it is clear that parents cannot but fail to make a mess of their children unless this fairly simple psychology is widely appreciated, understood and *accepted*.

We say it is simple, but that doesn't mean it's easy. Because to carry it out properly, to properly but not *cruelly* “break the child's will” and therefore *enable it to grow into a self-controlled and civilised human being*, takes *a great deal of patience, a great deal of care*.

Which we openly accuse most modern parents of not possessing – not that it's ultimately *their fault*, as they in turn are just the products of their parents before them.

But *somebody* has to *break the chain*.

One generation is now going to have to restore sanity to how we raise children, or else we will all be finished. We will continue – as clearly if we study the crime reports, such as three teenagers who set fire to and

kicked to death recently who had fallen asleep at a bus stop in England – to create *monsters*, which clearly we are doing.

But what does the government do?

Instead of *thinking* and exploring and therefore *understanding* all this, as the author – though it took him decades – troubled to do, they merely unwisely role out more and more draconian “zero tolerance” laws.

If they carry on like this, they will make every Western nation into a totalitarian concentration camp, in which even to breath without first checking the impossibly enormous and ridiculous rule book of law will become an act of fear.

So has what will have seemed to some a longish diversion into human and child psychology been appropriate in a book which claims to be about *law*?

Well please tell us just how anyone can imagine they can formulate laws, prevent crime and effectively punish and rehabilitate “offenders”, without first understanding *human nature*, without understanding all *this*?

## Chapter 7 - Miscellaneous Injustices

In this chapter, we are simply going to take a quick “pot-shot” at a few of the many of the current legal issues and injustices we may have overlooked in our deliberately loosely structured work so far.

Why deliberately lacking in structure?

Because we did not wish to duplicate the look, feel and style of any kind of modern law textbook, as we were intent on making it *readable* and not having the reader immediately *switch off* in the face of what may have looked like straightforward and sometimes tedious “academic study”, though to some extent this work inevitably and deliberately also *has been*, in that the reader who has never done any academic study of law will have by now absorbed and grasped many important legal issues and concepts which might have been previously lacking in their education.

Yet on the other hand, as we believe that we have hopefully touched on some of the fundamental and root issues that all the standard law texts of which we are aware of never have and likely *never will* - such as the root cause of crime on the psychological level - we would like to gently boast that the diligent reader will actually have by now a *superior* understanding of what law *in the true sense* is really all about, and how it should ideally be practiced and administrated, than the vast majority of practicing lawyers and judges may ever have.

So in no particular order, we will now attempt a rapid fire analysis of some key issues which we may up until this point have omitted.

### 1. Trial by Jury and Composition of Juries

In England signs of removal of “trial by jury” are appearing, and a tendency towards - especially regarding terrorist suspects - *in camera* (more *Latin*, I’m afraid, Mr Cook) trials, that is – in secret, or without the general public or media being allowed to witness the proceedings.

Of course, it is well worth pointing out that many kinds of “kangaroo court” hearings happen in work places and office buildings up and down the land, also more or less in secret, so that typically an employee will be disciplined and sacked by a manager and their witness and assistant, and is not in any way represented or has a “next friend” (another legal term, though not *Latin*, Mr Cook) or witness, him or herself.



Thus we warn employees who may be treated unfairly to ask for or even *demand* the right to have such a third party *in their corner* present at any such “disciplinary hearing.”

In particular, both employees and employers of different genders (assuming the parties are *both* “straight”) should beware of having such confrontations in secret (i.e. in a closed room alone) as sexual assault accusations could become part of the subsequent proceedings.

As to the more general issue of jury versus judge only trials, just as Clint Eastwood asks his criminal quarry, each member of the public has to ask him or herself the question: “do I feel lucky?”

We mentioned the Michael Jackson alleged molestation trial in which the jury was composed of eight women and four men.

Though we cannot say that in this case, which fortunately for Mr Jackson went in his favour, this composition had any adverse affect on his trial, and moreover, we cannot with any certainty say that the “average man” is more likely to be fair than “the average woman”, for example, surely a proven *feminist* woman would be less likely to give such an *accused* party a fair trial than the average woman.

Fortunately, in America, there is generally the ability to “challenge for cause” on the *beliefs* or *prejudices* of the jurors, but in British Law this ability is severely limited to very narrow factors, such as if the juror is personally known to the accused or a relative, which *in serious trials* seems to be a very huge injustice in itself, deserving investigation and reform.

But with or without “challenge for cause” we still have to ask ourselves: does a bunch of average citizens picked more or less randomly off the street – you know, the people we might meet in the bar, the office, the racetrack, or even the church - seem more likely to arrive at a fair and wise decision than a highly experienced judge who has in most instances “seen it all before”?

And ideally, with beings like *King Solomon* in mind, we would say *no*.

But on the one hand, that would be to place a huge burden on any *ordinary* judge to decide the fate of life after life, in the *serious* cases, where long sentences or even in some countries the death penalty may be the possible outcome.

We have suggested that professional jurors might be an option in one of our other books, because assessing real life cases, just like as with police detective work, would seem to be an ability that improves with experience.

Again, however, this would depend wholly on the *calibre* and *philosophy* of the jurors who were appointed, or “accepted” to such jobs or role, so that without such assurances, random selection may still be the preferable option.

For as we have said, the proper conduct of the law can only be assured on the basis of *trust*. Thus as we cannot *trust* the modern judges, who may be to some extent “political puppets” of the state, it seems unwise to take out the element of *impartiality* that as far as one can see a *randomly selected* group of jurors will always at least to some extent guarantee.

## **2. Defamation and Anonymity.**

We have already mentioned that in most cases the defamation law composed of the laws on *slander* and *libel* is mostly only available to the wealthy or rich. That is to say if some negative report about us is made in the media, if we are just the “average Jane or Joe” we have little chance of recovering the damage to our reputations that has been done, and may end up in us being falsely demonised in our own communities, and the target of hate and possible violent attack.

It therefore seems a basic human right, that *the law* should give individuals the right to keep their names out of any newspaper article or media report, unless they give their *consent*, excepting perhaps some allegation is *proven* in court, and even then, it may not be desirable to publish names of the guilty, as it may lead to vigilante actions.

Just as children are given anonymity under the law, surely *all* persons accused of serious crime should therefore be given the same, unless there is some unavoidable basis for revealing their names, such as if they have tried to flee the country, which could be considered an admission of guilt.

Again, we see in the absence of such measures the *motives* of the current law makers, which are clearly in many cases, not to protect the weak from the strong, which as we have pointed out, the Christian ethic *in its pure form* for example would have us do.

### 3. The Treatment of Prisoners

The purpose of prisons is in theory to protect the public from those who are likely to re-offend, to rehabilitate, and to punish.

But the issue is, how far should the *punishment* aspect go?

And we would argue that the *deprivation of liberty alone* can be the only *humane* and *civilised* approach to punishing offenders.

That is to say, even if a man has killed another, we are effectively taking *his life* as he new it and enjoyed it away, by imprisoning him. If it's just for a short while, we may argue – oh, they even have TVs and football games. It's like a holiday camp. But if he gets seven, ten or twenty years of his *life*, which may in fact turn out to be *the rest of his life* taken away from him, even in the case of the shorter sentences, that can really be a very hard punishment indeed.

For let us ask the average man a question who is say a rapist.

Would you rather be castrated, or would you rather spend ten years in prison?

And our money is on *the latter*.

And thus, since we can see, that the average man, who may have got a long sentence just for some single moment of madness, or even accidental and unplanned overuse of force, is going to have the right to ever have sexual or even *romantic* relations taken away from him for many long years, decades or even forever, this is surely once again shown to be a very hard punishment indeed.

For example, a so called “serial killer”, a British GP (a “family doctor”, a “general practitioner” ) who apparently gave a lot of local old ladies overdoses of sedatives and killed them thereby, possibly for some financial profit, but mostly it appeared not so, decided to *hang himself* a few years into his sentence, though it turned out this was timed also so that his wife would not lose certain pension rights.

So it may in many cases, actually be more tough and cruel to take a man's liberty (or a woman's) away for the rest of their lives than actually to execute them, as the American soldier Timothy McVeigh actually *requested* in his own case.

But moreover, though it seems reasonable to expect society to be able to imprison those, even indefinitely, who are perceived to be a serious threat to the public at large, does this then give us the right to have them homosexually raped, or attacked and perhaps even murdered?

For as one political “prisoner of conscience”, a whistle-blowing ex-British Intelligence officer pointed out, one can be placed amongst a block of people all serving life sentences, who in theory then have impunity from anything they may do, *including murder*, because under British law at present, they cannot be executed.

So clearly, a cynical decision has been repeatedly taken regarding prisons at a very high level to:

- a) not put the proper resources into prisons to *humanely* care for prisoners.
- b) Allow the possibility of rape, violence and so on against individual prisoners, by again, failing to provide proper security procedures.

Easily affordable modern technology would appear to make this task of ensuring the safety of prisoners is more or less guaranteed.

For example, electronic tagging of prisoners could warn of the approach of one prisoner who is known to be hostile to him or her.

And we are aware that the situation for women prisoners is not necessarily any better - we have even the supposedly “true to life” fiction of the many TV drama series such as “Prisoner Cell Block H” and “Bad Girls” and so on, which we would suggest despite their unsavoury content, are still only *hinting* at how bad things can in reality really get.

We also find the idea that male prison guards in a women’s prison and female ones in a men’s prison is only likely to be productive of all kinds of problems, which seem so obvious to anyone with even a little imagination to point out.

This is said against the background for example, that in some British *mens’ prisons* there are as many as *one third* female prison guards, which the author finds a shocking discovery to say the least.

For we would briefly point out for example, in defence of that view, that many men who are in prison are there due to some conflict with women, and that they should then have women peeping at them through prison

bars and keeping them under lock and key, is likely to result in a degree of humiliation that may cause attacks on female staff or even prison riots.

Clearly also, the possibility of sexual liaisons developing between prisoners and staff – including in the extreme cases, even the rape of female prison guards taken prisoner in some riot or whatever – suggests once again, that basic common sense is being overlooked in favour of ridiculously “equal opportunities” employment laws.

Equally, briefly, the idea that men can keep women under lock and key, which has sexual overtones to it also, is not something that the state and legal system should really be encouraging *in a civilised society*.

But as usual, as with the whimsical application of justice that millions witness weekly in the conduct of the average football referee, little or nothing is done, above all about the basic issue of overcrowding of prisons in the first place.

If prisons were made into well organised but fair (i.e. non-exploitative) *work places*, where the prisoners were given proper training to do valuable work in so far as is possible of their choice, this would both provide a means for prisons to improve their own funding, and also afford a much stronger chance that the prisoners would be truly rehabilitated, and more able to have an occupation and independent life on the outside.

But it appears *the will, the desire* is not there in high places to make these creative and sensible policies happen. It is thus *the will* of those in high places which must be confronted and assisted or even embarrassed into carrying out such policies which would bring about the truly humane and sensible treatment of prisoners.

#### **4. Freedom of Speech**

This subject is really so vital, that it merits a chapter of its own, but we do not wish to tire the reader with a longer work than the present.

The main issue here is that the current Western governments wish to reduce this freedom of speech on the grounds that free speech can only be *relative* not *absolute*.

That is, for example, speech that may incite violence or be *offensive* is deemed to be against the law.

But the trouble is, how do we know what will offend people?

Almost anything we might write or say will undoubtedly offend *someone*.

For in most cases, we have discovered, that as explained earlier, as everyone is looking out for their own selfish interest, they are quite happy to offend others, but do not wish anyone to offend them.

Yet the law now has gone so far as to actually make illegal the right to say or place into print certain things.

We are not going to waste words on detail however, because we would argue that these increasing inroads into dismantling our *fundamental human rights* by government, and therefore cannot be tolerated, full stop.

There can be *no* compromise on the issue of free speech.

Free speech is the most fundamental freedom in any society, because if people are not allowed to honestly express what they think and feel, this “gagging” of people by the state, cannot possibly give them any kind of true freedom.

Again, we see that *no trust* is shown in the public. The public are not asked to *regulate themselves*, and act with dignity and good sense in regard to speech as a *true education* would lead them to do, but are instead bullied into fearing to say what they truly think and feel.

Again, this is clearly the instrumentation of a totalitarian regime, and thus these signs – for whatever excuse – that we see, are the process of building of such a place, of such a *hell on earth*.

It is rather *the philosophy and conduct of the whole society* which must be addressed, rather than this endlessly invasive, repugnant and ultra-authoritarian “politically correct” list of “do’s and don’ts.”

And we might well ask exactly *whose politics* are these rules considered correct in regard to?

For example, the governments tell us we must give up our freedoms, such as putting us all under surveillance in order to protect us from terrorists.

But surely this is the wrong answer. They should instead be making peace with other nations on our behalf, such that no terrorists wish to attack us.

The root cause of terrorism by members of national or racial groups is also found to be some sort of attack on *their* freedom or community, and it is *this* that must be addressed, rather than taking rights away from a nation's own citizens, and making their lives insecure and miserable.

## 5. Copyright Law

Copyright law is perhaps the most mysterious branch of law ever invented. Again, it is clearly based upon *our philosophy*.

That is, we are really saying, that for example the author of a book or a piece of music is entitled to some money every time someone reads that book, or plays that music he or she composed.

Whereas in former times, the “wandering troubadour”, “minstrel” or “poet” had to “sing for his supper.”

That is, we clearly regard someone who gets on a stage and sings or plays a piece of music as having done some *work*.

However, do we also regard him or her having done work if he or she is merely sitting around a swimming pool, drinking champagne, whilst millions of people who *do work* in the ordinary sense we commonly understand - i.e. go to some workplace several hours a day, several days a week – hand over their money to buy his or her CD or book?.

If he or she is lucky – like for example, Harry Potter authoress J K Rowling – they can live a whole life of idleness and luxury, whilst everybody else does the *real* work.

Is this *morally* right? Is it *fair and just* to one's fellow human being?

We don't think so.

And thus, when those who are typically too poor to afford the generally vastly overpriced hardcopy books and CDs, find some electronic way to download these materials “for free” - whilst after all, those who have good jobs buy them in the shops many times over - are not really, we don't see, committing anything that one would really call *a crime*.

We have said “for free” in quotes, because of course, that is an illusion in itself, a piece of false propaganda, because everyone who has a connection to the Internet is generally paying a substantial monthly fee.

And what is more, the Internet service providers know this well, and that their own subscriber figures would be devastated if many of their users were not able to get this quasi-free material.

So the record and video production and software companies who are so upset about this we would suggest should really not be.

They should factor into their business plans that only those who are in a position to afford their products, such as well established business and educational institutions, government authorities and so on, can necessarily be expected to afford their hugely expensive pieces of software.

But of course to the terminally greedy, enough is *never* enough.

And if they are not happy with that, then perhaps they should be taking the *ISPs* to court, not taking the ridiculous “zero tolerance” (*our old friend*) policy of trying to make people who likely in most cases have got nothing much anyway, pay up what they don't have or can't afford to give.

And in the instance of software piracy especially, we are suggesting that if the authorities continue to start coming down hard enough on people who are simply likely unable to pay, over this issue, in the end all such sufficiently harassed and threatened people will simply move into an every more sophisticated community of freeware, or loosely licensed shareware, which will in the final analysis put all the commercial software companies out of business, because even the commercial non-software companies will start using the freeware if it gets as good as the “industry standards” they now are obliged to pay sometimes quite huge and painful sums of money to provide for their workers and customers.

As to the *popular* books and CDs and videos (and note, it is not easy for people to download material by lesser known artists or “copyright holders” anyway) these companies and individuals already make millions generally speaking, living vastly extravagant lifestyles that those who are so called “pirating” their works will never dream of.

Thus it is again, utter hypocrisy and overblown greed, and *cowardice* to attempt to put the thumbscrews on “the little people” who download a few MP3s or whatever.



Of course, if the authorities are concerned *only* with those who then go on to sell *pirated* and frequently *defective* versions of these products to others, that is perhaps a different matter.

But even then the question has to be asked, how these *pirates* have been driven to a position of having to do illegal activities to meet their needs in the first place.

Which in practice, is likely governmental policies which have taken away their jobs.

The same *mentality* of “persecution of the innocents” however is true in the case of drugs. The users are hounded, but *the dealers* are rarely challenged – which bring us to

## **6. Holding legally responsible the *real* criminals.**

For in any case, as we have just hinted, we must surely ask just why do people in countries like Pakistan or Columbia have to live this way, when their countries could be reorganised with proper economies of their own, *should the international community have the will to do it?*

*Creative solutions* as usual, are required.

For example, *cut off the supply of weapons to these countries* which are run and controlled by gangster drug gangs.

If the sole step of stopping the arms dealers in their tracks was made a number one priority, above all other things, the power of the gangs would soon dissipate, the guns and bullets would sooner or later run out, and the fear these gangs could then create would also then disappear.

If instead of attacking Iraq and Iran, the Western forces set their sights upon destroying the international trade of armaments, that is surely the best thing they could do in assuring long term security to the world.

And acts of *generosity* would help.

If instead of dropping bombs, the Americans were to give aid, drop food parcels and so on – far more than the “warlords” *with their armaments* could collect and keep from the people - they would gradually get the message – *America cares about and loves you.*

Then in time – once *trust* was established - such countries could be infiltrated with *genuine* freedom fighters who would remove the true bad guys.

And quite possibly even the bad guys could be persuaded to cooperate by bribes or amnesties.

The Americans or rather *international community* acting via the United Nations could offer them an amnesty, and allow them to keep some wealth, providing they would step out of the way and let a proper civilised community grow in their nations.

Since there are not all that many genuinely bad people in any place in the world, once the seriously crazy monster types were removed, the rest of the gangs would soon likely crumble.

But unfortunately we do not see this chasing after *the big guys*.

Just as in the case of downloading child porn, the emphasis is always on catching the easy target, the home user, rather than the persons who are actually conducting the child abuse, the *real criminals*.

We are not saying that those who are using child porn are not some risk to society. But they need to be *assessed* to see exactly what they are up to and why, and whether it is just a research project like the unfortunate Mr Townshend, or an unhealthy addiction they have fallen into, or whether they are genuinely threats to other peoples' children or their own.

But *whitewashing* of suspects and what the law now deems to be offenders, i.e. those who have merely *looked* at a picture, but not yet harmed anyone - will not do.

(clearly if they have *paid* to look at a picture, above and beyond their standard internet fee, that could then be judged to be *encouraging* child porn, which is a different question).

They may have some monstrous *tendencies*, but like former pop star Gary Glitter for example, they are still human beings, and we will get better results if we treat them that way, in *preventing* these activities, and also preventing *re-offending*.

So generally speaking, it appears in the case of crimes where *addiction* is involved, such as the illegal forms of pornography or hard drugs, it is

almost always the *user* who is pursued and caught and punished, rather than *the supplier, the dealer*.

Take the average citizen for example, who discovers that little did he realise when he bought his PC that it would open the door to an enormous amount of pornography available at the touch of just a few buttons.

He is surely as much or more so a *victim* of becoming addicted to pornography by this means, than a criminal, which arguably the people who produce much of this *darker* kind of pornography rather are.

## **7. Paranoia and the Law**

In the movie *Fatal Attraction*, Glenn Close plays an unbalanced professional lady, who terrorises the character played by Michael Douglas and his family, after he rejects her after having an unwise affair.

She does a few cranky things, which he finds scary, boils his daughter's bunny and so on, but there is unfortunately no proof that she is the culprit or that she will do anything more serious to harm anyone.

Yet Michael Douglas's character is upset enough and convinced enough that she eventually *will*, that he goes to a police sergeant and detective to see if he can be protected by the law.

The police officer however merely tells him: "we can't go around arresting people for *what they might do*."

And though the law has moved on since that movie was made, and likely now has some dubious powers to deal with such people, again, we surely have to keep a balanced view on all this as to how it affects human freedom or as they say "civil liberties."

Let us therefore please remember, and be clear, that whatever people may think or even *say*, until what they think or say is somehow proven to be more than merely an idle threat, it cannot ever be the grounds for an arrest or conviction, as *statistically* almost all such talk is said in the heat of the moment, without any real intention to carry out further actions, and is usually subsequently regretted.

## 8. Unreasonable Expectation of the Public to Know the Law

It is surely the general principle of any true system of natural justice surely that if someone is unaware that a law exists, they should not be punished for ignorance of it.

In practice of course, in modern law, we find that *the exact opposite* is generally the case.

Therefore, we must briefly point out, that firstly not only is simplification of the too difficult to understand law required, and that laws should be made that tend to *confirm* commonsense measures, rather than *act against them* as we find so many laws do, but moreover, secondly that only the provision of a very major effort during school education to acquaint *everyone* with a detailed law of the knowledge of the laws of their land, given as much or more emphasis even than the teaching of mathematics, should be given to every student, so that the widespread ignorance of the law cannot any longer, and should not any longer in such a circumstances be considered to be an excuse.

It should be explained to every citizen by the age of ten or fifteen at the latest, what the basic aspects of every area of law they are likely to encounter in modern life are, and how they should go about checking and upholding their rights.

Again, without such measures, the imposition of laws on those who were unaware of them, unless they clearly are *common knowledge*, such as the general obvious prohibitions on murder, robbery and rape, can only be considered totalitarian, inhumane and uncivilised.

## 9. The Appointment and Independence of Judges

It has never been clear in British Justice how all the judges, particular the senior ones are appointed. This process must surely in any society which calls itself democratic become *transparent*.

Otherwise, as depicted in the excellent current BBC drama series, *Judge John Deed*, we may discover that there are continual efforts to *pervert the course of justice* by bribing, and otherwise pressurising senior judges into following the “party line” or pandering to the needs of big business and other vested interests.

## 10. The Frame-Up – *the Pressure to Convict*

Many times *solving* some major crime, such as a huge bank robbery, or murder of some famous person can become a *political* issue, such as in England, the two “Great Train Robberies”, and the murder of members the aristocracy, celebrities or especially brutal murders of children.

And of course, now, chillingly, the pressure has become dramatically more intense in the case of the “terrorist attacks” on Western countries.

These incidents all make national news, and thus the pressures upon the government *to be seen to be doing justice*, and the police and courts to capture and convict the perpetrators and villains are *enormous*.

The concern here is that as these cases lie unsolved for weeks and months, the public begins to mock the law enforcement authorities and government who makes laws and administrate “justice” as useless.

Thus it seems almost inevitably that where at all possible, some quite possibly innocent parties are brought to trial, convicted and imprisoned for any amount of time.

For example, an alleged IRA bomb blew up a British pub in Birmingham in 1975 killing a number of people, and the so called “Birmingham Six” – a group of Irishmen – were convicted and sentenced to *life imprisonment*.

It turned out later however that they were actually all *innocent* and had nothing to do with the crime, but it took *sixteen years* of their lives away, until their eventually release in 1991.

And we might ask – *did they get compensation?* Not as far as we are aware. They just got a “oh, we’re terribly sorry, this was a simply *awful* mistake.”

But the British legal system did not stop there in bringing these Irish “terrorists” to “justice.” It continued in the 1970s to falsely imprison for similar bombings *the Guildford Four* (which include *one woman* incidentally), and *the Maguire Seven*, and again these convictions were not overturned for decades, and Tony Blair only apologised for these “tragic errors” in 2005.

In the case of the Guildford Four, the story says that “confessions” were beaten out of the suspects by the police, evidence that could have cleared them was withheld, and one of the falsely imprisoned died in prison.

Amazingly, in such a set of ghastly circumstances, no police or law enforcement agency member was *ever* held accountable for these *crimes*.

And now we have a new set of Muslims “terrorists”, it is no surprise to find that similar injustices are starting to happen.

Perhaps here, we are somewhat opening the eyes of those many who wish to come to England, imagining it is a haven or justice, peace and prosperity, when in fact we have for example shamefully almost *half a million* British citizens who are homeless, and forced to live and sleep on the streets.

In our continuing survey of in this case *British* “justice”, we have the *celebrity* murders, such as the case of the unfortunate very nice and inoffensive lady TV presenter, *Jill Dando*, who was shot dead at close range as she left her home.

Some suspected that this was a political crime, because she had made a charity appeal for one side of two factions involved in an ongoing war.

However, this idea (perhaps the truth, which would have reflected negatively on the British government) was quashed, and instead a fairly local man to the lady, Barry George, who seemed to be somewhat a fantasist and mentally feeble – too feeble we personally think to have carried out this pre-meditated and cold-blooded crime - was convicted of this, on what appeared to be wholly *circumstantial evidence*, which was an alarming *precedent*.

For if we have “a likely suspect” in the frame, it is easy for the police to fabricate or plant a little *confirming evidence* in such a case, and how will the public ever know?

We cannot be certain he did not do this. But for example, no clear  *motive* was ever shown, unlike for example the person who shot John Lennon, who clearly had a personal obsession with him.

Nevertheless, this dubiously convicted man now rots in prison seven years later, and is talked about no more and forgotten.

The use of *psychological profiling* techniques, to start hunting in the community for “character photofits”, and then start intimidating innocent and in the Jill Dando’s case, not terribly bright and easily intimidated and confused people into confessions, need to be seriously looked at, in this *zeal* of the authorities to vainly *solve the case*.

Numerous instances of ordinary people being wrongly convicted for such murders have come to light over the years, which of course in itself suggests that many more people (almost always *men*) have been wrongly convicted of murder and other crimes, *under this pressure to convict someone*, and not only is this one of the strongest argument against the death penalty, which gladly has been removed from British justice since 1965, but reveals to us also that numerous murderers and other serious criminals have clearly *got away scot-free*, while these innocent parties rotted in prison for the rest of their lives.

## 11. The Death Penalty

As we have pointed out, those who have wanted the toughest penalties are those who are themselves *victims of crime*. But if the law was to be decided by what therefore in the final analysis would be the collective “baying of the mob for blood”, it surely could not lead to the impartial and correct justice that any nation which calls itself civilised should have.

And when there is so often *doubt*, as in the Jill Dando case above, despite the assertion that anyone convicted of a serious criminal case is supposed to be convicted *beyond reasonably doubt*, surely on that basis alone the death penalty is not a safe process of law, since it is *irreversible*, and such people as the Birmingham Six, Guildford Four and so on, could not possibly get the justice of release when their conviction is finally overturned and shown as a sham.

Even according to the commandments of Moses, the *thou shalt not kill* commandment would seem to urge those who call themselves Jews or Christians and “swear on the Holy Bible” to discount this ultimate penalty.

The question is – should the law operate on the basis of *justice* or *vengeance*?

The Old Testament however also mentions the *philosophy* (please note) of “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth”, and we have the saying “let the punishment fit the crime.”

But of course *the New Testament* says “turn the other cheek”, and “judge not”, and “let he without sin cast the first stone.”

So this is clearly a more *evolved* concept of justice.

Of course the public must be protected from serious criminals, *justice* must be imposed by fitting punishments, but to on any basis take away somebody’s *ultimate human right to life*, seems to be a matter for “gods” to decide, not men.

*Always* we must ask the question: *is this justice or is it vengeance?*

Because, it is more a question of what “legalised murder” does to *us*, as a nation and a world, than the issue of vengeance upon the perpetrators of crimes, which after all, cannot then be prevented after the event whatever we do to them.

There has been little evidence to suggest that the death penalty is effective in preventing murders, because most of these crimes are committed in the heat of passion or rage.

We feel it is therefore a sign of evil, and inhumanity, that any nation can continue to murder its own citizens *under the law*, and in time humanity must evolve to grow beyond such savage and vengeful solutions to the problem of crime.

## **12. “Equal Opportunities” and “Sex Discrimination” Law in Employment**

This is, in the Western world, and England in particular, an extremely active area for the lawyers, because it is tied up with the womens’ rights issues, and the race rights issues.

As to the race rights issues, it does not seem fair if members of racial minorities are appointed to jobs *not on merit*, merely to satisfy the demands of some kind of modern governmental “witch-hunters” who more or less *demand* that certain quotas are met by employers.

As to equal employment rights between the sexes, again, the issue of *merit* must surely be the basis *in all cases* of suitability for employment, which would clearly suggest that there cannot *ever* be a fifty-fifty split between the sexes of jobs in every individual field.



Obvious examples are that *most* women make better nurses than men, and *most* men make better soldiers than *most* women due to the physical strength and ability required.

In an Australian best selling book by *Allan and Barbara Pease*, entitled *Why Men Don't Listen & Women Can't Read Maps*, the *biological* and *behavioural* differences between men and women are detailed and explained, based at least partly so they say on certain undeniable *brain research*, and it is clear that lawmakers must start taking these *realities* into account before they start imposing upon us all more ridiculous totalitarian rules telling us whom we *can* and *cannot* employ.

Again, we see this is a kind of “zero tolerance” policy, and the zero tolerance here is, just as is usual, against that of *individual choice and judgement and freedom*.

*Merit* alone *must* decide who is given what job, or *incompetence* is *inflicted upon the public*, on *us all*, making all our lives not only miserable - such as when we are forced to try to get proper service out of some incompetent call centre staff member, who may not (regardless of where we live, or what race we are) even speak our language properly – but far worse, actually *endanger* our lives, if some person is due to some forced quota system made into a police officer, doctor, nurse (like the homicidal nurse *who got away with murder* mentioned earlier) or airline pilot, but not *on merit* suited to that occupation and truly competent in it.

In a *civilised* and *free* society, which clearly none of us really have currently got, it *must* be left to the individual *discretion* to appoint or even dismiss people *on whatever basis they see fit*, given that society then is also willing to take care of the unemployed and needy satisfactorily until they can find more suitable work.

For example, if we decide a certain woman is best for a job, we *will* give her that job in preference to any man.

Wouldn't it be much better for women and ethnic minorities to be given jobs that they *know* therefore they have got on merit, rather than because some governmental body is holding a legal gun to the employer's head?

In a *civilised society*, surely it clearly would.

We see that only in totalitarian regimes such as the former soviet union, have people been told *by the government* what jobs they should do, or

who should be given which jobs, and we therefore *accuse* the modern Western governments who employ these so called “equal opportunities” laws of being such totalitarian states *in disguise*.

### **13. Violence Against Men and *the Unwritten Law***

Though violence against *women* can never be approved or regarded as a good thing in any civilised society, it seems that society as a whole is overlooking the issue of *violence against men*.

Though the letter of the law says that men cannot use violence on one another like gangsters to achieve their aims, we find that in reality, it is happening unceasingly in every so called “civilised” Western country.

Often time of course, the violence does not happen, but *the threat* is sufficient, which is therefore in fact a form of violence in itself, and though is also against current law, in practice is almost never *purused* or *prevented* by the law.

For how many times have we heard the kind of words used in some public place as: “is you do that again (or even once) I will bloomin’ kill you.”

And we also accuse *women* or approving this situation.

We accept that there are instances where men must use *force* sometimes, to protect themselves, or their families or friends, or even strangers who are being attacked, should they be brave enough, but it appears to be *an unwritten law* that men can have violence used upon them in all kinds of circumstances – most of which no doubt are never reported – for example let us say, if a man says what *in her opinion* is an insulting thing to a woman. It could even be only what she deems to be “an offensive look.”

In such an instance, threats of violence or attacks from her male companions or in some case “stooges”, are all too common, and any decent civilised man must have experienced at least one of such threats or attacks in his life.

Just as equally we see the bullying of children at school in playground is accepted and *very irresponsibly* depicted by television and movie makers as “normal” in Western society.

Is this the way to live? Is this the only way to have a civilised society? Has every society had these problems throughout history to the degree we now have?

Surely not – this is merely a developing bullying, near-gangster culture we are seeing *created* and even *encouraged* – for example in particular by the constant images of violence of men against men in TV soap operas - to be growing before our eyes.

Probably most Westerners know at least one friend or relative, and more likely *several*, who has had some serious and possibly life threatening attack perpetrated on them at some point in their life, and as the years go by the severity and frequency of these attacks is getting ever more intensive.

But in the media, and amongst legal discussion, we hear little about this *violence of man against man*.

Surely, if we are to have *zero tolerance* of violence against women, we must equally have *zero tolerance* of violence *against men*.

Surely, if we are to have a *civilised society* this should be *the very first* issue that should be tackled and campaigned upon.

That is - *zero tolerance* of *violence* (but please, think clearly, and distinguish that from *moderate physical discipline* of children) against *all* humans, or is the truth that *some humans* (in this case *women*) *are more equal than others*?

Would all the womens' rights campaigners, politicians, judges and lawyers answer *this question, please*?

## **14. Divorce Law**

Because this is such a major issue to men and women everywhere, we would have liked to have given this subject a whole chapter, but we wish to keep this work relative short, and therefore *readable*.

So we shall just bring out one or two salient points, which we think could improve things drastically in this awful, and we believe *needless* war between modern men and women.

Divorce law is not now in many Western countries much about *fault*. It doesn't really matter *who* the guilty party is in terms of infidelity, but *conduct* can be an influential issue on how divorces are treated.

For is it realistic *for example* for us to assume, that if the court is told (whether in fact it is true or not) that the man has been violent or abusive to or has humiliated the women, or the children, that this would not then very significantly affect the outcome of the proceedings?

For the two issues at stake here are clearly *property* (including money) and *custody*.

Many wives are even successfully arguing that they are entitled to a man's *future* earnings, which is a strong *precedent* to bear in mind.

But instead of trying to get into the finer points of the law in this situation, we would rather like to offer an "elegant solution", just as Alexander the Great, you may recall, slashed through the Gordian Knot with a single stroke of his sword.

We suggest that a contract detailing exactly what will be done with all financial and property issues, and what will happen to any children in the event of a divorce be drawn up, agreed and signed by both parties *in front of witnesses* as usual of course, *before* any marriage ever takes place.

That is to say, the famous "pre-nuptial" contract must be made *compulsory*, and unlike in the present, *given full legal effect*.

For surely, if the two intended marriage partners cannot even agree about what would be done in the event of a split *before* they marry, what on earth will happen afterwards?

Which exercise of formulating such a document *together* incidentally, we feel, would be a very good way indeed to decide if couples - *who in reality may have little in common other than sexual attraction*, and *do not truly remotely know who each other as human beings* - really ever *should* marry in the first places, which in many cases, they clearly should not, and in cases after the event, they should not ever have done.

For let us remember that when two people marry, and it turns out a disaster, it is not only *they* who suffer, but any children who may follow who did not ask for that, and therefore these two individuals who are no doubt totally *in lust* with one another, have no *right* to make these

innocent new human beings the pawns in their demented and vicious chess game which commences in most splits and divorces.

So if a prospective husband says in such a *pre-marital* discussion – “yes, half the house for you would be OK, and I think you should have custody of the children” then at least he has *agreed* to that, even if he later regrets it.

And if he says, “if we have children, I think you should have them until they are at least five, but then I should take over custody of any *boys*, *whether that’s what they want or not*, and you should keep custody of any girls, *providing that is what the girls want*” then that will sort the children issue out, won’t it? (obviously the party with *the right* can later change their mind, *if they so choose*, and award it to the other party).

For in all this *desire of the children* issue, as adults and parents, we cannot necessarily always accept that *their desire* is best for them.

For example, if their father or mother “spoils them rotten”, likely they will want to stay with him or her, but is this really the basis we should be using to say who is best fitted to raise an independent, mature and civilised human being, i.e. based upon this egotistical *want*, we have earlier explained?

And though we would like to see the necessity to make such an agreement made *law* as soon as possible, not only between two parties who marry *officially* but also any who are married in any *common law* sense, that is, seek to live together (or even apart) and cause children to be born - there is no reason why we should not take this step *now* for ourselves in our own relationships.

For though such a signed and witnessed agreement deposited with a solicitor or other *wholly trustworthy* impartial persons may not have full legal effect for the moment, it could surely be at least *influential* in deciding what should be done if the chaos of a divorce eventually does unfortunately arise.

All these arguments that pre-nuptial agreements are *so unromantic* and so on, do not reflect *the fact* that in the West, few marriages are expected to last more than so many years, so it is simply a “head in the sand”, self-deluding position that would reject this practice, as a relationship disaster could happen *to anyone*.

We simply *cannot* predict what the human heart is going to do next. Only teenagers undergoing “love’s young dream” imagine they can, but after getting burned and scarred a few times too many, they eventually soon wise up.

But let us realise that those who wish to control, deceive and dominate us will *howl* unceasingly that this is a bad idea. They will resist such an idea as if they were made of stone, come up with a thousand pretexts, evasions and excuses, as to why it’s “wrong” or “can’t be done”, but do not be deceived, for it is simply because *they cannot accept a just, fair and equitable arrangement for the other party*, full stop.

And thus, in the process of putting together such an agreement, we may very well *for the very first time, find out who that person really is*.

But let us not imagine that pre-nuptial contracts are only a device to enable *men* to protect their assets, as especially nowadays there are an enormous number of women who have many valuable assets of their own.

If may even be just the wife’s home which she has inherited, but fifty-percent of the proceeds of that could mean a great deal to any unscrupulous man who may have sneaked somehow into her life and bed.

But on the other hand, equally, *under the current law*, if a man has a big-earner wife – like J K Rowling or someone, you know – if he feels *he* has played some supportive part in *her success*, well surely, he should be able to get a “settlement” for that support too, just as the women are doing.

We would also liked to briefly suggest that the custody battles over children could be based upon a principle which does not yet seem to have been considered in law, highlighted for example in the movie *Kramer versus Kramer*, with Dustin Hoffman as the man who can’t get custody of his children.

That is, why not give *the presumption* that in a divorce, the woman will get custody of the *girls* and the man will get custody (if the wants it) of *the boys*?

For surely, a girl needs her mother as a role model, and a boy needs his *father* as a role model?

And if that principle is not accepted, please tell us where this *equality* between the sexes which we have heard so much *talk* about is?

### 15. The Possible Use of Higher Courts

It is worth mentioning that most countries have a hierarchical system of higher courts, to which an appeal can often be made. Even public authorities and governments can sometimes be held accountable in this way, their decisions falling under what is known as “Judicial Review.”

This is worth considering, for those who have felt some governmental injustice against them on a certain matter.

For example, regarding the previous point, as hopefully in some quarters *men* are still regarded as coming under “human rights laws”, many men who have been unfairly treated or *discriminated against* in one situation or another, might attempt to use their rights as *humans* to gain better treatment, for example, in the workplace.

It should also be well noted, that in most Western countries, despite all rumours to the contrary, *religious or philosophical beliefs* can be taken into account in various legal situations, for example, as related to employment or welfare benefit laws.

That is, sometimes we can turn even *a badly inspired law* to a *just cause*.

However, more generally speaking, if the issue is *a point of law*, that is, the use of evidence, or the *interpretation* of particular laws or cases, one can generally *appeal* to a sequence of successively higher courts, such as at the very top the “Supreme Court” in America, or “the House of Lords” in England.

However, in most cases, under British justice appeals cannot be made against the conviction itself, i.e. the decision made by a jury, but only perhaps against *the sentence* made by the judge.

Nevertheless, where a *law or its application* is felt to be unjust, this is a vital means of fighting back which should be employed by every truly unjustly treated citizen where possible.

For example, in Europe, there is a growing body of European “human rights law” which has to some extent become a thorn in the side of the British government, who are not always keen to accept its decisions.

Unfortunately (in some cases) this European law does not prevail, which makes it of dubious value, though is still in many cases welcome, because it is *influential*, can be used as a lever, a *guideline*.

## **16. DIY LAW and Legal Self-Help**

We have pointed out that going to law is often too expensive for the average citizen to afford. But we should point out there is also the possibility of legal self-help.

If anyone is really determined, they may find that there are powers within the law, or even *loopholes* in the law, they did not suspect.

That is, believe it or not, despite their constant erosion, we may actually discover some freedoms we didn't know we had, for example, that in most Western countries, children who are being bullied at school can be taken out of the school and educated in some other satisfactory manner, possibly by their own parents as long as certain basic standards are met.

So the DIY lawyer does not necessarily need a professionally qualified lawyer, and could study in libraries and so on to become legally skilled in some situation they are concerned with, and learn the court procedures for example attending trials in the public gallery.

Again, it is deemed essential in the author's view, that children of a sufficient age, should be taken to court to see such trials so that they start to learn what the law is really like in practice *first hand*, so that they are not merely deceived by the largely unrealistic depictions we see in movies and on television.

Many individuals throughout history, such as Theosophist Annie Besant, who was associated with J Krishnamurti, however have taken this route, of successfully conducting their own legal campaigns in court.

We do not however recommend this as *a general piece of advice*, for in most situations an experienced, sincere (if you can find one) lawyer, is to be preferred *just so long as in your country you can get legal costs assistance or afford the bills..*

But if we are determined enough we may also be able to find means of gaining legal assistance on some ground that the lawyers may not have considered before.



We can for example seek out human rights lawyers, to try to make cases on the basis of International Laws which could be used to gain us back the freedoms which we are being denied. We could throw many spanners in the works of the unwise people in power by such means, and force them to reconsider their plans.

Even on the very small local level, suppose we have a problem with work, suppose a manager is harassing or abusing us.

We could tell them at the appropriate moment that we are keeping a detailed record of how they are treating us, and are going to *if necessary* present this to various higher authorities than themselves, or even threaten to make this material public in some way, even to TV or a newspaper if they persist in their ill treatment of us.

For sadly, we may find that the only way to get certain people to treat us fairly is by *exposing them*, or otherwise confronting them with these kind of threats that could substantially damage themselves, their jobs and reputations.

We should conclude this chapter, which of course cannot possible within the scope of a relatively short book like this even cover anything but a small fraction of the legal scenarios that life may throw at us, with the warning that justice is not going to appear out of thin air for any of us, in the damaged and troubled world that surrounds us.

We will have to keep *fighting* for it, in whatever way we can, small as that may be.

At the very least we can *refuse* to cooperate.

We can *vote with our feet*.

Whatever wrong thing we see, we can *refuse to cooperate*. If we disapprove gambling, we can refuse to take part. We don't condemn those who do (the end users again you see, rather than "the house", "the dealers") but *by our example of resistance* we may encourage many others (even without our knowledge) to do the same.

The power of any individual who *resists* all this madness can be great.

Just look at how Mahatma Gandhi or Nelson Mandela or others who said *no* to injustice - long enough and convincingly enough - freed their countries from the most powerful and oppressive regimes.

As Spartacus said, *when just one man says “no”, Rome trembles.*

But when thousands and millions say *no*, Rome will crumble.

We may not be able to create justice or “free” the whole world overnight, but we can start freeing *ourselves* right now.

## Chapter 8 – Natural or Spiritual Law

In this final chapter, we are going to take a *very brief* look at the impact of the “thinkers” of the ages upon law.

Is there indeed such a thing as *Natural Law*?

What on earth do we mean by *Spiritual Laws*?

It is clear to everyone that there are *laws of nature*.

To that degree, in the utterly rational and scientific sense, we must all accept that we are totally at the mercy of *natural law*.

We also see there is day and night, and there are seasons and we have to harmonise ourselves with these natural cycles as best we can, because we can in no way protest against or defy these incontrovertible natural laws.

But is there such a thing as “spiritual law”?

We are not going to labour the point too much, as we have expressed it in our works before.

We have basically said, due to the kundalini explanation of evolution, that has been well documented in numerous spiritual scriptures and accounts of the lives of the Saints, prophets and so on, throughout the ages, as well as the modern accounts of the lives of Gopi Krishna, J Krishnamurti, David Icke and the author himself to a smaller degree, a few details of which he has expressed in his recent work - *Kundalini – A Personal Experience* - that human evolution, which is mainly now based on *the evolution of the brain*, cannot be properly conducted unless the society is well organised upon the guidelines laid out by the prophets such as Moses Ten Commandments.

Moreover, we are really suggesting that this can be the only *true basis* of any human system of law which is fair to everyone, as expressed in Christ’s dictum:

*Love thy neighbour as thyself.*

For we do not believe that otherwise society will ever accept any kind of justice based on only secular ideas, such as communism, because without

this added spiritual dimension, we do not see there is any *incentive* for all but a few intrinsically decent people to ever behave themselves, but rather only to “make hay while the sun shines.”

Of course the major figures such as Christ, Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius and so on, have in any case been by no means the only *thinkers* in history.

For example, in relatively modern times we have had such figures as Albert Schweitzer, psychologists such as Abraham Maslow, and numerous writers and philosophers such as Voltaire, Herman Hesse, Karl Marx and many others who had these feelings that there should be justice and equality in human society.

The Kundalini Yoga view of life, which we regard whether it is accepted or not to be the central cause and constituent of *all* religions, says that these ideas of “religion”, of “justice” are *intrinsic* to us, somehow *embedded in our very nerve cells, our brains* and that is why “spiritual leaders” such as the major ones we have mentioned like Christ, Buddha and so on have held sway over million and even billions even hundreds or thousands of years after their deaths.

It is not therefore “religious brainwashing” and hypnosis which has created the underlying basic message of human unity, and in at least some sense the existence of *eternal life*, but rather that their words and calls for justice strike a chord in us all, just as for many people does the watching of a movie about human liberation from oppression like *Spartacus*.

Clearly, without needing to ask for any *belief* we can see that the laws in nature, are inevitably exactly the same ones that are operative in the core of our cells and atoms.

So whether we believe in a god, and an afterlife, or we don't, we have to accept that somehow these laws of nature have produced in us the urge towards more harmony, peace and justice, and this is therefore at least to some degree intrinsic to more or less all humans alive.

John Lennon sang “Give Peace a Chance” and “All You Need is Love” and even in a few short years *hundreds of millions* worldwide responded to his message.

And of Christ's message of *love of and equality with one's neighbour*, clearly billions have responded to that throughout history.

So we are just really saying, that it is foolish for those even who do not believe in any spiritual dimension to deny this seemingly deeply planted and intrinsic quality that seems to echo to at least some faint degree in every human being alive.

It therefore appears the wisest course, that those in power should themselves seek to appeal to this seemingly deep sense of Natural law and justice implanted in every human being, and to attempt in a spirit of humility and kindness to create and administrate as simple and effect a system of laws and justice as can be made, which would seek to bring the maximum possible peace, freedom and harmony to all.