

Total
freedom
through
brutal
honesty



Automatic Peace

Automatic Peace

Total freedom through brutal honesty

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER ONE	
The ridiculous circus	II
CHAPTER TWO	
How we got into this mess	24
CHAPTER THREE	
Three easy principles	39
SUMMARY.....	49

INTRODUCTION

As long as you're not hurting anyone;

You're free to do anything.

Anyone who says different is an idiot.

Although the idiots are outnumbered, they have more control over your life than you do, because everybody else insists on playing idiot games and pretending it's acceptable:

It's a running joke that politicians are liars, but we're OK with it.

And celebrity hypocrites tell us how to live, because they think they're fuckin' clever.

We're infantilised by warmongering extremists, posing as world leaders; hell bent on making it a crime to not do as you're told, while they destroy every last shred of beauty on Earth.

It's like being stuck in an abusive relationship with total strangers. And these arrogant shits pretend to do it because they care too much...

Like so-called philanthropists; busy shaping the world, making it prohibitively expensive to opt out of their business plan...

Futurists describe tyranny and call it progress.

We're expected to believe that full spectrum surveillance through smart living with smart meters in smart cities is saving the world.

And encouraged to inject rushed to market chemical concoctions without hesitation, by people who know the pharmaceutical industry hands out **billions** of dollars in compensation for the lives they've already ruined.

Cash is being rebranded as suspicious, and bank staff believe it's their job to insult customers by assuming we're up to no good if we wish to spend our own money.

Are we pretending this isn't happening?

Or just pretending we're OK with that too?

Just let me know...

Perhaps it makes perfect sense to you that natural farming's being slowly outlawed so that interfering bastards can copyright the food chain with GMO crops, lab grown meat and other synthetic fodder.

There's a weather warning every other week and the forecast maps are all pink and purple, so it looks dangerously unnatural.

Storms have names now, because climate change needs brand awareness, if you refuse to notice it.

Even the air we breathe's under threat from cavalier intellectuals and their idiotic plans to block out the sun.

And back on Earth, the police act like hooligans, assaulting people for not following orders, and if you dare film them breaking the law, you're gettin' it too!

They don't care, because they'll never be prosecuted.

Maybe I'm a fool for expecting reason in a world where innocent people are in jail for having opinions, but child abusers remain free, long into old age, and protected by the state.

We're moments away from jury trials being removed from our judicial process.

I'm sure I don't have to explain the sheer insanity of a single person, trained by the state, paid by the state to uphold the interests of the state being the **only** person authorised by the state to pass judgement on **anyone** who breaks the rules laid down by the state.

Or are we pretending this isn't happening, too?

You tell me, because I'm fuckin' confused, and I don't think we're allowed to ask questions any more.

Caution and doubt have been redefined as the dangerous conduct of a lunatic fringe.

Legitimate inquiry is now a "threat to democracy".

Independence is selfish. Being prepared is paranoia.

Your own judgement's overruled by self appointed 'fact checkers'!

Or worse, computer generated AI nonsense.

And if you don't adopt the popular opinion; you're a hate criminal; whatever that means.

You can't discuss the insanity without alienating yourself.

Branded a "conSpiRacy tHeoRist" and bullied by the media. Which is only one of many reasons the media's proven itself worthless.

But this is the information age, so we become the media.

You can try to unite humanity by proving impossible things to closed minds.

Or sink into fear, anger and the fanatical polarisation of party politics. All expressed in deliberately aggravating soundbites to be easily distributed through social media.

Posting meme after meme. Trying to convert anyone who'll listen to your moronic political opinion.

Frantic to change some minds about the **war** or the **bankers** or the **digital prison**.

Like spectators at a sports match; hoping that if we shout just a little louder we might change the outcome of the game.

If you're not overwhelmed by several billion voices, all screaming to have their own way, you're stuck in an echo-chamber, and everything big tech pushes to your smart phone confirms your own bias and demonises everyone else.

Pushed further and further apart until it reaches boiling point and spills into the streets in protest!

But there's nothing more undignified than a herd of rebels demanding their freedom.

Demonstrating nothing but inferiority.

Powerful men don't protest.

They put their fuckin' foot down, because protests and petitions just prove that you answer to someone else.

And the juggernaut rolls on...

Whether it's caused by wealthy psychopaths with deliberate, malicious intent, careless boffins obsessed with progress or just the negligence of public servants, unfit for office—the results are the same:

Every doubt and fear is eagerly met with controlling authority and excessive interference.

Private life is being hijacked, and as human nature becomes forbidden—to fix endless problems—its important to remember:

Crime is wrong.

Even if it solves a climate crisis, cures disease or just stops people being mean to each other.

So when the protests have failed.

When petitions have failed.

When books, documentaries, youtube, tiktok, blogs, tweets, Facebook groups, memes, and emojis have all failed:

It's time you decided:

Keep playing the silly game...

Or grow a backbone.

CHAPTER ONE

The ridiculous circus

It feels like a dark, twisted fairytale.

The Emperors New Clothes on steroids and lsd.

The world's gone to shit: Violence, chaos and misery dominates. And nobody wants to point out the obvious.

So I will.

To defend against violence, chaos and misery, man created government.

Government is not a building, a political party, a minister or senator.

Government is just a system: A coordinated procedure carried out by a group of people.

Being elected to government by public vote can't guarantee the flawless moral character of a politician, nor rule out any tendency towards greed, corruption or violence.

Not only do I struggle to trust a career driven politician I've never met, I absolutely don't trust you lot to select the best one for the job...

The wisdom to direct public affairs sufficiently is beyond the competence of most well meaning people.

And to do so whilst remaining incorruptible, requires bulletproof integrity.

With unparalleled power and influence in **every** aspect of life:

Finance, healthcare, food, transport, employment, law, and especially military capabilities; it's always **government** which produces the most effective and dangerous expressions of tyranny.

Plausible deniability allows illegal wars, government corruption, corporate crime, financial domination, medical malfeasance, unlawful prohibition, propaganda and racketeering to all go unchallenged.

When far reaching control can be justified as assistance for those in need, and bloodshed re-branded as peacekeeping to protect the rights of others, tyranny is often celebrated.

And if you decide that government's not for you, you may object to it, protest, you can even abstain from voting, but you can never opt out.

Oppressive regimes aren't just dictatorships, they're **any** system you're **forced** to endure.

And even the fairest, most liberal administration will take freedom from half the population, just to please the other half.

Even though most of us accept democratic governance as transparent and accountable. It's also true that ambitious psychopaths deliberately seek positions of power, where they can satisfy their lust for control, whilst maintaining a veneer of legitimacy.

Is it worth considering that government is in fact the greatest source of violence, chaos and misery?

I'm not trying to undermine government.

I'm expressing a reasonable doubt about the Emperor and His Clothes.

The very thing we've created to defend ourselves, is the very thing with the power to destroy us.

And nobody dare admit it, for the fear of seeming foolish, or dangerous or worse.

Is it too much to ask for an honest conversation about the people and institutions we trust with such great responsibility?

Responsibility like law and order...

LAW

The process of making or enacting law is called legislation.

Legislation gives perfect strangers the power to make criminals of innocent people.

You're allowed to drink beer, until it's illegal.

You're allowed to use the internet, until you're not.

You're free to defend your own home, until government decides otherwise.

All over the world, people are legally ruined; just for growing plants.

Gangs of uniformed thugs break into homes, smash up greenhouses, destroy plants, and drag gardeners away clapped in irons.

They're locked in concrete boxes with thick steel doors, all because they grew a plant after the government told them they're not allowed to.

For someone to award themselves the authority to persecute others for growing plants—is heroic!

I'm joking; it's fuckin' cruel.

And if that plant could save a life; it's pure evil.

In Britain, several women were taken from their homes, separated from their families and locked away in prisons like dangerous crooks just for watching television.

The politicians—who work for our government—have decided that if we want to own a television set, we should pay for a permission slip.

Does that seem appropriate?

If I demanded 150 pounds from you, just for owning a TV, laptop, mobile or tablet... you'd laugh.

And if I locked you in my cellar for not paying me: I'd go to prison, because coercion, extortion, kidnap and false imprisonment, are very definitely criminal violations.

Someone explain to me why we let a gang of political idiots get away with violent criminal activity, while perfectly harmless activity carried out by free individuals has been criminalised?

And all you laughing at the UK for putting up with a TV licence... are in exactly the same position.

A marriage license is a legal document issued by a government authority that grants a couple permission to marry. And it's only in recent memory that government has deigned to allow same sex couples equal privilege.

Aren't they lucky?

The same applies to playing live music, fishing or even letting your child sell lemonade outside your own home.

If you go driving in your own vehicle without permission, the state has granted itself the 'right' to 'legally' steal your car.

Being without permission doesn't make driving dangerous. And having permission doesn't make driving safe.

Passing a written test and driving carefully for half an hour under supervision is meaningless in relation to long term proficiency.

But we put up with this ever expanding list of acts, statutes, regulations and licences because we enjoy unqualified strangers having the power to make shit up as they see fit.

What's to stop them creating a walking licence? You can easily commit crimes on foot, it makes sense to wear a human registration plate incase you're up to no good.

Don't worry about that, facial recognition's got it covered!

Soon we won't be able to leave home without government say-so, it's just to keep everyone else safe, so shut up and go along with it.

Legislation creates revokable permission slips for lawful activity.

Permission slips are called licences.

Licences are actually just ID papers.

And once Big Tech persuades [pays] Big Government to **mandate** digital ID, we won't have to worry about the dangerous bastards who insist on going to work, walking their dog or buying fresh food from local farms.

And we'll gleefully volunteer to pay them to monitor, regulate and licence the unavoidable circumstance of just being alive.

I can't fuckin' wait...

TAX

Our income is confiscated every payday and we call it Income Tax.

And again when we spend what's left and we call it VAT or Sales Tax.

We pay road tax, petrol tax, beer tax, council tax, stamp duty, import duty, capital gains tax, and even corporation tax ultimately comes from the pocket of customers.

And when you die, they'll steal another chunk of whatever you've managed to save, before your children can have what remains.

We tell ourselves we're funding roads, schools and hospitals, even though nurses are under payed and doctors overworked, the roads are full of holes and goodness knows what they're teaching kids these days.

Every unacceptable thing the government wastes money on—from their own second homes, all the way to intercontinental genocide—is funded by our involuntary contributions.

Let's be honest, tax is what we pay government for permission to stay out of prison, which is an absolute piss-take.

Luckily we have the foresight to defend ourselves against coercion and racketeering, we built and funded our very own police service, to serve and protect.

To defend the weak from the criminal fraternity...

POLICE

They're the uniformed thugs I mentioned earlier.

The attack dogs of the state.

They're busy carrying out the diktats of corporate and political interest.

The modern copper looks more like a military commando than the friendly, local bobby.

Be honest... do you feel when safe when there's a police car driving behind you? Or instantly nervous, worried if your driving's adequate?

Have you given the proper signal?
Are your lights working?
Are you on the straight and narrow?

They're like pirates, cruising around all day looking for opportunity.

Giving orders to free people; stopping, searching, interfering, bullying anyone they choose.

And they'll keep you as long as it takes to find an excuse to extort money.

They don't really need a reason; your behaviour's suspicious, you fit the description, there's been a lot of break-ins.

They can arrest you for doing a swear word if the mood takes 'em, and justify it using a catch all phrase: "under the terrorism act".

Doesn't have to be true, there's nothing you can do about it, and their superiors will back 'em up.

They'll get violent if their authority's challenged, and call it resisting arrest. Now you've got criminal charges for assaulting a police officers fists with your face.

And if you make a complaint, they'll investigate themselves and find no charge to answer.

If the fire service behaved like police; roaming the streets. Stopping and searching private individuals. Looking for flammable material, handing out fines... We'd be in trouble.

Next time you see a video of the police "leading beyond authority", ask yourself what'd happen if you behaved that way.

Imagine you dragged a police woman from her car, smashed her face on the road and then tied her up because you didn't like her tone of voice.

You think you'd be let off, or sent to prison?

They don't even lose their jobs.

Do the rules that apply to us, not also apply to petty, resentful control freaks wearing fancy dress?

BUT: Not All Cops Are Bastards.

Some of 'em are cowards.

They're cowards when they turn a blind eye to the criminal activity of their colleagues.

They're cowards when they enforce rules that no man's required to follow.

They're cowards when they say "I'm just doing my job", rather than face up to their own conscience.

Not everyone has our best interests at heart.

We tend to give them the benefit of the doubt, trusting them with great power and immense responsibility.

And the results speak for themselves.

But we don't have to put up with it...

CHAPTER TWO

How we got into this mess

If you don't know how some idiot with political ambition, or a psychopath with a fuck-ton of money has the right to rule over you, let's go over the basics...

We're in a mess because of our deep misunderstanding of power and authority.

Authority is considered to be the 'right' to determine, adjudicate, command or control.

Power, on the other hand, is the **ability** to determine, adjudicate, command or control, regardless of your rights.

Power is a real and essential part of life.

We're all in a natural peckin' order. Some people have great strength, whilst others—less.

Some are smart, others naive. A few of us are born into wealth and power.

And many acquire status through their achievements.

These differences give us the opportunity to influence those who lack what we have.

Influence can be physical strength, or force.

And it can be intellectual skill, or persuasion.

Influence is power.

POWER is not AUTHORITY.

Imagine a world where only two people lived.

One is likely stronger, and could force the other to accept him as king and serve his every whim.

But the weaker individual may be smart enough to persuade the stronger one that it's he who has the divine right to rule.

Neither has any legitimate authority; the 'right' to command or control the other.

They're both using power to achieve their personal goals.

The one with the most power, gets his way.

Now imagine a world where a hundred people lived.

One of these people is called Pete, and Pete wants to be Emperor, and force everyone to give him half of their money.

Now, we'd assume the rest of the community would tell Pete to go fuck himself. But, in all societies there are people who struggle with independent choice.

They require guidance and discipline. Some people prefer to be controlled, others need to be controlled.

They're easily influenced, but that's not a fault: It's just their nature. They feel comfortable with familiar routines and few responsibilities.

These people are absolutely essential to the functioning of society.

To ensure support from these people, Pete guarantees to make life comfortable, easy and predictable.

The dependent members of the community lend quick, unthinking support. Surrendering all personal responsibility—and half their money—for security, happiness and convenience.

Let's say Pete finds only 9 such people interested in this offer...

That leaves **90 people** who did not accept his offer.

Of those:

Some are uncertain what to think.

Other's can't bring themselves to care.

A handful have never even heard of Pete and his offer.

A portion would let Pete have their money, only if he promises to mend the potholes.

But most don't want Pete to take their money.

Of those, some feel it's they who should rule the world.

Others think that Mary should rule the world, because she's got plans for free food, healthcare and schools.

Or maybe a committee would handle it better.

Many want to keep their own money and look after their own security and rule their own world.

One extremist vows to kill Pete to solve the problem, and a solitary nihilist offers to genocide the population so there's no one left for Pete to exploit.

None of them are enthusiastic about giving Pete any money or letting him rule the world, but they all stand separate to each other; divided by desires, opinions and preferred outcomes.

Besides Pete and his 9 followers, there could easily be 90 alternative options, each with only a single supporter.

Pete only needs to maintain more people in direct support of himself, than any single alternative option—and they become the majority.

The well informed tyrant knows that more options available creates less chance of people agreeing.

It's in Pete's best interests to encourage individual preference; so he appears broad minded and considerate, whilst his own modest support maintains power.

A dominant power is broadly considered 'authority' with the 'right' to command or control the community, because many people fail to recognise any difference between power and authority.

Illegitimate authority is hard to undermine as our primal instincts take over.

We're social animals and depend upon one another; for companionship, food, shelter and unlimited extra benefits.

Rejection from the crowd can mean crippling shame, or in extreme circumstances—death.

We've all got an intuitive drive to remain within the safety of the herd for our own survival.

Fear prevents us challenging any assumed consensus. On impulse, most of us will accept any perceived authority, to avoid alienatin' ourselves.

With the majority rule, Pete has legitimised his false authority in the eyes of the community, because they've all had their say in the outcome.

Not only is it possible for one person to rule over 99 others, but a population of a million could easily be controlled by only a handful of bullies who understand these rules of power.

Take comfort in knowing that only a minority is necessary for tyranny to hold power.

And the same applies to freedom...

Our job isn't to unite humanity around one single idea, but to identify the most fundamental aspects of human cooperation.

The things so essentially basic they're impossible to reject.

Like, for example; morality...

MORALITY

Sometimes, we're afraid of power because power dominates and controls.

Sometimes, we're ashamed of our own power, because good people think power is only used for dominance and control.

But power can also liberate and defend.

We've no choice but to accept that power is an inescapable aspect of life on Earth.

But it's the **morality** with which it's handled that's makes all the difference.

For example, **moral power** is when a teacher, who's physically stronger and intellectually smarter than a child, uses their wisdom to guide juveniles through the early stages of life, allowing them to build confidence in their own mental and physical capability.

An example of **immoral power** is when a teacher uses their position to manipulate and commandeer a youth's development in a way which supports their own interests, rather than what's best for the child.

The same is true in the relationships we have with friends and relatives. Lovers and rivals. Bosses, preachers, police officers, politicians, judges...

Even nation states and multi-national corporations have a moral choice to make when flexing their power and influence.

Moral power doesn't force itself on others.

Moral power doesn't deny anyone the opportunity to learn, develop or progress. It teaches and encourages; helps others to thrive.

Moral power respects the choices of others.

Because of these qualities, moral power naturally creates freedom.

On the contrary, immoral power forces itself on others.

Immoral power denies others the opportunity to learn, to develop or progress.

It promotes ignorance. It discourages and often prevents others from thriving.

Immoral power undermines your ability to make choices.

Because of this, immoral power creates tyranny.

Both tyranny and freedom need power to be effective:

Tyranny needs power to DOMINATE.

Freedom needs power to DEFEND.

I invite you to consider your own morality, and the power you exert.

DIFFERENCES

The fact is, we've all got different ideas about how to live. We'll never agree, and that'll never change.

Our differing opinions, needs and abilities create competition.

Competition generates improvement and growth.

Without the challenges of rivalry to inform compassion or progress, there's really no need for any change.

Without our individuality, we'd live in a barren, artless world. A stagnant pool.

Our differences are beautiful and necessary and not at all the problem:

Arrogance is the problem.

We all want what's right—but we all think we know best!

Our vanity is cultivated and promoted. Vital differences are artificially widened and exploited.

Most media is centred around division; drama, to grab our attention.

Think about soaps, reality tv, even the news.

They depend on tension and conflict to keep you watching. We're encouraged to focus on our dissatisfaction with each other.

Too busy judging, rather than appreciating our differences.

Although conflict is natural and healthy and certainly doesn't need to end in division, much of it's childish, ignorant and unnecessary.

We're kind, compassionate and resourceful people. We're adaptable and persistent.

We could celebrate our wild differences. Enjoy them for the benefit of progress.

Our greater purpose isn't to battle **our** way of life against everyone else's, but to acknowledge what's obvious and universal: Not everyone values freedom the same.

Most would consider freedom as the ability to do as they wish.

But for some, freedom is being told what to do, and when to do it, because it relieves unmanageable stress.

Many see great financial wealth as freedom, whilst others regard money as an oppressive burden.

It could mean absolute security at the cost of all liberty, or unbridled opportunity and the thrill of uncertainty.

Freedom could be an impossible maths equation, or just a mindless brush stroke on fresh canvas.

The range of our humanity is endless. It's essential we're all different, and we accept our differences because power shifts in the hands of the people we disagree with.

SIMILARITIES

Beyond all these differences, though, are some similarities. Regardless of our values, beliefs and principles, we all share something in common:

FEAR.

Not millions of different fears: **one single fear.**

Whoever we are, whatever we think; every last one of us wants to live our own lives, and we all fear that someone's going to stop us.

The religious fear the non-believer will corrupt God's work, whilst the atheist fears the devout will hinder progress.

Those who vote for left wing politicians fear those who vote right wing may take away their rights. And vice versa.

The conspiracy denier fears the conspiracy theorist and the conspiracy theorist fears the conspiracy denier. Each afraid the other is a threat to the rest of us for not seeing the truth of the matter.

Everyone fears the dictator who seeks to abolish freedom. Just as powerful rulers fear a mass uprising.

We're all afraid that someone else's actions are going to prevent us living the way we want.

But these arguments aren't really fought between 'left' and 'right', or good against evil—but the afraid versus the afraid.

Our natural urge for self preservation leads us to overcompensate, and we express our fear as anger.

Our knee-jerk reaction is to "do it to them, before they do it to us!".

As we argue with loved ones, we embrace authoritarianism in service to our personal, favourite brand of bullshit.

We can't expect to achieve personal freedom if we're not prepared to secure it for everyone else.

And we're absolutely doomed if we hate people for being afraid, whilst being equally afraid for ourselves.

Is it a moral goal to demand how things should be?

Or would it be far easier—and righteous—to get very, VERY clear about a few simple things that should NEVER be.

Simple things the majority of us can agree with?

CHAPTER THREE

Three easy principles

Here is everything you need to understand if you wish to be free...

Brace yourself, this might get uncomfortable.

PRINCIPLE ONE:

Human rights do not exist

Most of us think we have a fundamental human right to freedom.

Many believe we have the right to water, the right to healthcare, or even the right to affordable housing and a 'living wage'.

Rights are appealing because they promise an easier life. We believe that without rights, life is a lawless, dangerous experience. Leaving us exposed to suffering and exploitation.

Rights are guaranteed entitlements. But what in life is guaranteed?

The sunrise?

It's very, VERY likely the sun will come up tomorrow.

But if you're being honest, you don't know if the sun will ever rise again, you certainly can't guarantee it.

You have no guaranteed entitlements, and nobody can guarantee anything for you.

The only thing you have any control over is your ability to choose how you respond to a world you can't control.

And even that's not guaranteed.

Human rights are nothing more than ideas designed to create a guarantee we can't deliver.

Such rights can be vague and ambiguous; open to interpretation. They can be edited and adjusted in perpetuity. They can be upheld forever, or abolished as soon as conceived. There is nothing permanent, secure or reliable about human rights.

I've seen no proof that rights have EVER existed.

And if rights don't exist, they can't be bestowed by God, described by a monarch, protected by some union or enshrined in any document.

You may hope we at least have the right to life.

We don't.

It's more accurate to say that we have the opportunity to live—and no one has the right to prevent us.

Because rights don't exist.

PRINCIPLE TWO:

There is no authority above you

Authority is considered to be the 'right' to determine, adjudicate, command or control.

But if rights don't exist, then nobody can possibly have the 'right' to command or control YOU.

If all we have is the ability to respond to reality; to a world outside our control: Then we can only command or control ourselves.

No intelligence, privilege or self belief gives anyone the right to command or control you.

There is no authority above you, regardless of your status.

No ritual or oath can change this, any more than dancing or whistling can.

Putting on a mask, wig, gown, or wearing a badge can't make any difference.

You are not required to explain yourself to anyone.

You're not obliged to follow orders or obey rules.

You're not a slave, you're the master.

You're nobody's master but your own.

Masters don't beg to be considered, plead or seek permission.

Masters don't gather to protest, wave placards or chant.

Masters don't circulate petitions asking to be taken seriously.

You can't assert yourself as a master if you doubt yourself.

Belief in yourself comes from accountability, and your willingness to take responsibility for doing the right thing, if not; accepting the consequences of doing the wrong thing.

There is no authority above you.

If no single individual has any authority over you—then neither does a group of people claiming so; be it government, police, military or street gang.

When people exert control over others, it's not authority; it's power.

PRINCIPLE THREE:

You're free to do anything

Stay with me...

If we agree that rights don't exist.

And there is no authority above us.

Then we must accept that nobody has the right or authority to harm anybody else's life, property or choices.

And every piece of legislation invented by man can be replaced by one single law.

A law which already exists naturally, and applies to every possible crime.

A law we all appreciate equally, and without question.

It can be understood by a child.

It's only 3 words : CAUSE NO HARM.

That's it. As long as you're not hurting anyone, you're free to do anything you want.

It applies to every living soul, regardless of job, money, strength, intelligence or mental state.

It applies to unfortunate accidents by kind caring people and it applies to psychopaths hell bent on destruction.

Harm includes death, injury, damage and loss.

Some things can't be included, such as emotional damage because we can't measure feelings in a way that applies to everyone. Feelings—like choices—are personal thoughts which are the responsibility of the individual alone, and no one else can be held accountable for them.

However, sustained psychological abuse can be evidenced by the actions of people, and the results can be evaluated as impact on real lives.

Being alive creates an unavoidable burden on your surroundings. But if we include harm to the environment, then you could never weed the garden, chop down a tree or build a house.

We don't have the authority to legislate how much impact each person is allotted.

But if I pollute a river, it'll lead to quantifiable harm to people and property.

Devastating the rainforests will have a measurable effect on the quality of life for the whole population; physical harm.

There'll always be grey area, but we can't create rules to prevent 'bad' things happening, unless we invent legislation which protects some individuals whilst persecuting others.

Such matters become subject to moral arbitration on a case by case basis. For example:

A majority will agree that animal cruelty is wrong, but it can't be absolutely defined as crime, due to its complex subjectivity.

Hunting for food is acceptable to many people, and to others, drinking milk is violence.

The authority to create legislation to determine who is allowed to do what does not exist.

But...

If you were to take your neighbours dog because he was beating it, a jury could decide if it were a moral rescue or criminal theft.

You may find yourself wondering how this applies to other circumstances.

You're invited to reason it out to a logical conclusion by holding to these three easy principles, and letting go of comfortable assumptions.

This shouldn't be too difficult, because beneath all the distracting bullshit we argue about—culture, politics, race, religion—we have our principles.

A deep understanding of what's right. It's not provided by church, school, television or the Internet.

You find it inside yourself. We call it empathy.

Empathy is the foundation of compassion and morality.

It's how we determine right from wrong.

We are more than capable of prioritising what we know to be right above our concern for the choices of others.

We don't have to agree with each other.

We don't have to like each other.

All we need do is **CAUSE NO HARM.**

No exceptions.

SUMMARY

There are two types of people:

A minority of idiots.

And everybody else.

Stop playing idiot games and humanity will prevail.

If you're not already a member of our community, get involved, and build the life you want...

automaticpeace.com