

Establishing and maintaining Natural Law Courts

The Natural Law's first principles and axiom establish its general legitimacy and Lawfulness. This valid system gives rise to courts with the power to protect the people as a whole by prosecuting and indicting any persons and institutions that threatens the community.

The mandate to establish such court is derived from the Sovereignty of the people as a whole, and not from any particular political system or government. Natural Law Courts are therefor universal, not constricted by customary borders or laws, and possess the jurisdictional competence to adjudicate any issue or grievance. Natural Law Courts are not subjects to and do not recognize any other legal or political authority, immunity or privilege, like those routinely claimed by heads of churches and states.

Enjoying universal jurisdiction because of its rootlessness in Nature-Creation, Natural Law Courts can be established in any country, place or community, and not only within nations with specific legal traditions.

Natural Law Courts are established when any number of men and women come together to judge a matter of concern to them and to their community. Political protests, "town hall gatherings" or Tribunals of conscience that unite people and give voice to their concerns are often the first step. Natural Law Courts are an expression of that voice.

The court itself is established by the direct will and vote of the Assembled people as a whole, who gather an assembly and elect a community jury of at least thirteen individuals. They also appoint a community prosecutor to conduct the case if needed, a presiding Adjudicator whose job is strictly advisory, a Sheriff and a group of peace officers to enforce summons, warrants and verdicts of the court. Additionally, the community may appoint local magistrates versed in the law known as justices of the peace (JP's or Peace Officer's), who traditionally have the power to summon juries and issue warrants. (*"the sovereign basis of Natural Law Courts"*, Appendix 1)

All of the participants in a Natural Law Court must present their own case in all of the court proceedings, since to allow another to "re-present" them would constitute a surrender of their natural rights and Sovereignty. This is very important and essential to grasp, comprehend and "innerstand". This applies both to the Plaintiff and Defendant involved in any matter before the court. There are, accordingly, no professional lawyer or permanent presiding judges in a Natural Law Court system.

There is no restriction on the power of a Natural Law Court to access any person, place, or thing, nor any limitation on the duration or rights of the court. The court and its magistrates can issue public summons that are binding to any individual, entity or institution, enforceable by the Sheriff, who has an unrestricted right to detain any person named in the summons and bring them to court.

The final verdict of the Natural Law Court Jury is final and not subject to appeal, simply because a reasonable non-coerced group of sovereign

individuals can come to the truth of any matter on the basis of the evidence alone, possessed with an inherent knowledge of right and wrong. The truth is not mutable. A defendant is either innocent or guilty; the truth is not subject to revision or reconsideration, since then its not true.

However, if it can be proven beyond any doubt that the court's verdict was made unlawfully, was unduly influenced, or occurred on the basis of incomplete or faulty evidence, a Natural Law fiduciary representative or a magistrate, can re-open and retry the case with normal Jury and court Officers.

In the same way, the sentence of the court is also final, and is enforced not only by the court Sheriff but by all individuals in the community. For the Natural Law arises from and is the direct responsibility of all people, as are all of its procedures. The verdict really is a declaration of the people that will govern themselves according to their own applicable Law and decisions.

Finally, upon issuing its final verdict and sentence, the Natural Law Court Jury is automatically concluded and its members are released from their duty. No court is maintained without the conscious consent and participation of the people themselves.

Again. There is no professional, permanent cast of either lawyers or judges in a Natural Law Court system, but rather elected and perhaps temporary court Officers.

...

Legal procedure and Court protocol

Natural Law, being derived natural justice, bases its Lawful procedures on the centrality of due process: the three-fold right of anyone to be notified of the charges being brought against him, to see the evidence in such a suit, and to be tried and judged before his own peers. No Lawful trial can proceed, and nor can a conviction be rendered if the accused has not been given these rights, and afforded the chance to freely defend himself in a court of Law. The self-evident axiom of Natural Law provides the Maxim: "Lack of fairness is lack of Law."

Maxim: (Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856): An established principle or proposition. A principle of Law universally admitted, as being just and consonant with reason.

Such rights are based on these fundamental self-evident axioms of the Natural Law:

1. It is presumed that the accused is innocent, not guilty.
2. The burden of proof of the accused's guilt rests not upon the defendant but the Plaintiff, who must convince a jury of the guilt of the accused beyond any reasonable doubt.
3. The accused cannot be detained without due process but must appear promptly before a court, according to the principle of, *Habeas Corpus*, which is Latin for "produce the body".
<https://thelawdictionary.org/habeas-corpus/>

Both sides in a dispute are given equal time to file their statements and evidence, make motions to the court, and respond to arguments. But to avoid "vexatious litigation" designed to simply harass or disrupt an adversary – which can drag out and impede justice and due process itself – the court normally sets a strict time limit on pre-trial proceedings, after which the trial commences.

The pre-trial period allows both sides to present their evidence and arguments to one another in order to seek a settlement prior to the court appearance. This presentation is usually referred to as :examination for discovery or Voir Dire ("to see and say") , where either party can demand any relevant evidence or documents from the other. If examination does not produce a settlement of differences, then the court is convened and a trial begins.

The general procedures and protocols of a Natural Law Court are summarized in the following outline, which must be followed by anyone seeking to accuse and try other parties.

Step One: Compiling the Case

A statement of claim must be produced by those bringing a case, known as the Plaintiffs. Their statement sets out in point form the basic facts of the dispute, the wrong being alleged and the relief or remedy being sought.

Next, the Plaintiff's statement of claim must be accompanied by supporting evidence: documents and testimonies proving their case beyond any reasonable doubt. This evidence must be duly sworn by those not party to the dispute in the form of witnessed statements, and it must consist of the original documents themselves, and not copies.

As well, anyone whose testimony is used in this body of evidence must be willing to come into court to testify and affirm their own statement.

Step two: Seeking the remedy of a Natural Law Court, filing a notice of claim of right

After gathering his case, a Plaintiff must then seek the aid of a Natural Law Court and its officers. Such a court can be brought into being by publishing a, "Notice of Claim of Right", which is a public declaration calling for the assistance of the community in the asserting of the Plaintiff's right under natural justice to have his case heard through the Natural Law Court, by way of a jury of neighbors and peers. Such a notice can be published in a local newspaper or simply notarized and posted in a prominent public location, like a town hall or library.

Step three: Forming a Natural Law Court

Within 24 hours of the issuing of such a Notice of Claim of Right, any thirteen individuals of a community can constitute themselves as a Natural Law Court and its Jury, and must then elect and appoint the following court Officers:

- a court Adjudicator, to advise and oversee the court
- a Public or community Prosecutor, to conduct the case, this person is normally the Plaintiff himself or someone he authorizes to advise but not represent him
- a Defense Counsel, to advise but not represent the accused
- a court Sheriff, either elected from community or delegated from among existing Peace Officers
- Bailiffs, a court Registrar, or clerks of the courts, (They are officials attached to the courts to assist the judges-Adjutocator's in their duties. They keep the minutes, writeout the judgments, orders, and other.) And court Reporter.

It is assumed that people with knowledge of the Natural Law and legal procedures will act in these capacities, and who submit an oath before serving in court, such as the Natural Law Claim.

And as mentioned, a Natural Law magistrate, a Natural Law Fiduciary Representative or a Sheriff may initiate this formation of a Natural Law Court of Justice.

Step four: Convening the Jury and court Officers, Oath of Office.

Ex. Upon the appointment of these court Officers, the Adjudicator will formally convene the court by taking and administering an oath. Ex :

” I (name) will faithfully perform my duties as an officer of this Natural Law Court of Justice according to the principles of Natural Law and due process, acting at all times with integrity, honesty and Lawfulness. I recognize that if I fail to consistently abide by this Oath I can be removed from my office. I make this public Oath freely, without coercion or ulterior motive, and without mental reservation”.

After taking this Oath, the Jury members, court Counselors, Sheriffs, Bailiffs and Reporter will then convene and receive instructions from the Adjudicator concerning the case. The Adjudicator is not a presiding Judge or Magistrate but an advisor to the court, and has no power to influence, direct or halt the actions or the decisions of the Jury or other court Officers, except in the case of a gross miscarriage of justice or negligence on the part of court Officers. Thus, the court is self-regulating and dependent on the mutual respect and governance of the court officers and the Jury.

Step five: Pretrial Conference

The Adjudicator brings together both parties in a pretrial conference to settle the case prior to a trial. If a settlement is not achieved, both parties must engage in a mandatory examination for discovery where the evidence and statements of both sides will be presented. After a period of not more than one week, this pretrial conference and the trial will commence.

Step six: Issuing a public summons

No individual or entity may be Lawfully summoned into Natural Law Court without first receiving a complete set of charges being brought against them and a formal :Notice to appear, or Writ of public summons. Such a summons outlines the exact time, date and address when and where the trial will commence.

The public summons is applied for by the Plaintiff through the court Registrar, clerks of the courts. The summons will be issued under the signature of the court Adjudicator and delivered to the defendant by the court Sheriff within 24 hours of its filing in the court registry by the Plaintiff.

The Sheriff must personally serve the Defendant, or post the summons in a public place and record the posting if the defendant avoids service. The

Defendant has seven days to appear in court from the date of service.

Step seven: The trial commences, opening arguments

After an introduction by the Adjudicator , the trial commences with opening arguments by first the Plaintiff or Prosecutor, and then the Defendant. The Adjudicator and both Counselors will then have the chance to question either parties for clarification, and to make motions to the court if it is apparent that the proceedings can be expedited.

Note: Step seven can still occur even if one side, usually the defendant, is not present in court and refuses to participate. Such a trial, being conducted in absentia, remains a legitimate legal procedure once the defendant is given opportunity to appear and respond to the charges and evidence against him. An "in absentia" trial will commence with the Plaintiff presenting his opening argument followed by his central case. The court appointed Defense Counsel will then be given the chance to argue on behalf of the absent Defendant, if that is the wish of the latter.

It is often the case that a non-response or non-appearance by the Defendant can result in the Adjudicator advising the Jury to declare a verdict in favor for the Plaintiff, on the ground that the Defendant has tactical agreed with the case against himself by not disputing the evidence or charges, and by making no attempt to appear and defend his own good name in public.

Step eight: The main process

Assuming the proceedings are not being conducted "in absentia" and the Defendant is present, the main process of the trial then commence with the Plaintiff's presentation of the details of his evidence and argument against the Defendant, who can then respond. The Plaintiff may then be assisted by the Community Prosecutor.

After his presentation, the Plaintiff is the cross-examined by the Defendant or his advising Counsel. Following cross examination, the Defendant present his case, with or without his advising Counselor, and in turn is cross-examined by the Plaintiff or the Community Prosecutor. There are usually no restrictions placed on the duration of the main proceedings.

Step nine: Closing arguments and summaries to the Jury and final advice to the Adjudicator.

After the main proceedings, the Adjudicator has the chance to further question both parties in order to give final advice to the Jury. The Plaintiff and the Defendant then have the right to give their summary argument to the court. The Adjudicator closes with any final comments from the Jury.

Step ten: The Jury retires to deliberate

The court is held in recess while the thirteen jury members retire to come to a unanimous verdict and a sentence, based on their appraisal of all evidence. There is no time restriction on their deliberations, and during that time, they are not allowed contact with anyone except the court Bailiff, who is their guard. The Jury's verdict and sentence must be consensual and unanimous.

Step eleven: The Jury issues its unanimous verdict and sentence

The Court is reconvened after the Jury has come to a verdict. If the Jurors are incomplete unanimity concerning the verdict, the defendant is automatically declared to be innocent. The Jury spokesman, the grand Jury coordinator-leader, chosen from among them by Vote, announces the verdict to the court, and based on that verdict, the final sentence is also declared by the Jury, or jointly with the Adjudicator.

Step twelve: The court adjourns and the sentence is enforced

Following the announcement of the verdict and sentence, the Adjudicator, the Judge, either frees the Defendant or affirms and authorizes the decision of the Jury in the name of the court, and instructs the Sheriff to enforce that sentence. The Adjudicator dismisses the Jury and concludes the trial proceedings. The complete record of the proceedings is a public document, accessible to anyone, and it can in no way be withheld, altered or compromised by the Adjudicator or any other party.

A note on Natural Law enforcement

It is understood that every able bodied individual is obligated and empowered by Natural Law to assist the court Sheriff and his deputies in enforcing the sentence of the court, including by ensuring the imprisonment of the guilty, the monitoring of his associates and the public seizure of the assets and property of the guilty and his agents, if such is the sentence of the court.

A note on appealing Natural Law Court decisions

Under the jurisdiction of Natural Law, in which every man and woman is born with an inherent grasp of right and wrong, truth and justice, it is understood that a Jury of thirteen individuals, when given the complete evidence and facts of a case, will arrive at a just and proper verdict.

The truth of what verdict must stand and is not subject to re-evaluate or dispute, except in the case of a gross dereliction of duty or non-consideration of evidence. Therefore the verdicts of Natural Law Court Juries are not subject to appeal or revision, since the truth is not mutable or re-form-able. If there is any doubt, the defendant shall be free from charge.

This solidity of a verdict is also required by the Natural Law jurisdiction and custom of stare decisis, meaning "the decision stands", whereby the precedent decision of previous court verdicts have binding authority. Without "stare decisis", the Law is subject to the whims and interference of others.

In the word of BLD: Blacks Law Dictionary, Ed 1-11.

"The doctrine of "stare decisis" states that lawful decisions are binding and shall not be reversed. 'The decision stands.' That is, once a court has entered its judgement upon an issue, it shall not reverse itself. This is in fact the foundation of legality in Natural Law and is one of the principal differences between Natural Law and all other regulations".

Convictions and verdicts

Every legal system operates according to its own worldview and essential purpose. In the case of Civil or Statute law, the contending interests of individuals waging war with one another in a courtroom define the process and aims of the court. This system serves whoever has the money or influence to present the most convicting case, usually before a single magistrate who is part of a self-governing and unaccountable judicial elite.

The Law, under this elite derived system, is a private weapon to wield against person or group over commercial interests, not an avenue of justice for all or of the common good. In Natural Law, contrarily, the court is defined not by contending individuals interests, but by the needs of the community as a whole, and by justice as defined by those who have suffered from the lack of it. A bedrock of moral affinity shapes how the Natural Law operates, according to a simple issue:

-Will this legal decision and precedent best serve the community as a whole, and those within it who are the most vulnerable or who have suffered or been victimized, or who may be?

Men and women have a natural tendency to resolve their differences and mediate disputes among themselves when not coerced and left to themselves to apply their own sense of right and wrong, true or false. Despite this, the State has under threat of force violently conditioned people to automatically deny their own judgement and defer to external authorities whenever they are in dispute or they seek justice. And therefor "relearning of freedom" is needed for Natural Law to become a functional part of life in society once again.

Fortunately, we have found that the very act of publicly declaring and establishing the supremacy of the people and their Natural Law has sparked that process of relearning freedom among growing numbers of people. Sparked, but not secured. For the greatest impediment to the efficacy of Natural Law Courts lies in the fear and doubts that seize individuals when they are presented with the power to be the Law, and not have the Law be done to them.

We have been taught that taking the Law into our own hands is a violation of civil order and tantamount to anarchy, in reality, for individuals to judge legal matters for themselves is the highest civic virtue and the cornerstone of true democracy, according to the Athenian lawmaker Solon (*born c. 630 bce—died c. 560 bce*).

The latter even believed that the individuals in a society should be fined or reprimanded when avoiding to defend controversy or their responsibility to be lawgivers. Law and justice, the rules of the game for how we interact with each other form the foundation of all societies.

At the heart of that personal responsibility for the Law is the capacity of individuals in a community to judge a Lawsuit for themselves as sworn jurors, and impose a verdict and sentence in such suit. The Jury system has always been the purest expression of the Natural Law and its capacity to empower the people themselves to defend traditional liberties and ascertain the truth of a matter.

To render the fair and reasonable verdict, anyone simply needs to know all the facts and evidence, and consider it all soberly, without threats, influence or coercion.

The more people who gather to determine the truth of a matter, the more likely they will come up to a just and truthful verdict. It tends to be the case that individual bias or prejudice, which is always present and undeniable within a jury, becomes through the jury process counterbalanced and absorbed into a broader collective truth imposed by the natural reason and fairness among jury members.

Enforcement

The big and thorny issue, of cause, is not whether men and women can come to a court verdict, but rather, how their decision can be enforced, and effective in their community.

This is especially an issue when the verdict is imposed against heads of church, State or corporations or even entire institutions, as in the February 25, 2013 verdict of the International Common Law Court of Justice (ICLCoJ) concerning genocide in Canada.

To use that as an example:

The moral weight of the verdict was clearly the strongest weapon in the arsenal of the court, and created the conditions for the enforcement of the verdict against the thirty officials of church and state named in the indictment.

For one thing, the February 25 verdict – which sentenced all the defendants to public banishment, twenty five years in prison and the loss of property and assets – directly helped depose not only Pope Benedict, Joseph Ratzinger but the most powerful Catholic cardinal in Rome: The Vatican secretary of State, Tarcisio Bertone, who also resigned while in office after the ICLCoJ verdict as pronounced.

Ratzinger and Bertone know about International Law, even if others don't. They clearly understood that the verdict of the ICLCoJ carries a recognized

legitimacy under the Law of Nations and the public right to form Tribunals of conscience when governments and Courts refuse to address a matter. And the Vatican also knows that the ICLCoJ verdict can be entered into other nation's courts and used for the issuing of arrest warrants against proven war criminals like church officers.

And so the resignation of these ostensibly "untouchable" church leaders in the spring of 2013 is simple proof of the power of independent, Natural Law Court verdicts. A court verdict, after all, is a binding order carrying with the full force of the Law, and whoever ignores or subverts such a verdict, and the court's orders arising from it, is guilty of an indictable crime. Any Individual in a community [citizen], in short, can assist in the arrest of such convicted entities as mentioned above.

Such enforcement of the Law by individuals in a society themselves is generally recognized in most countries, under the precedent known generic as a right of "citizen arrest". In Canada, in this example, under a law known as the citizen arrest and self defense act (2012), citizens can detain anyone who either commits a crime or is even suspected of having done so, or who possess a threat to their own or other's safety; like in our example, the child raping priest's.

This power of "citizen's arrest" has actually been broadened under a new Canadian law, from what it was previously.

http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/annualstatutes/2012_9/FullText.html

Of course, individuals in a society based on Natural Law share that right and the responsibility to participate in such an act. In theory, then the enforcement of Natural Law Court verdicts by any [citizen], member of a society, is not only legitimate and Lawful, but is guaranteed even under the laws of countries dominated by Civil, Statute law. But power, as we know, is not only about laws and theory, but ultimately involves naked force: the capacity of one group to impose its will upon another.

Hugh Grotius, a sixteen century pioneer of international law, said that legal principles acquired power only when backed by cannon fire. So besides its legal and moral weight, what "cannons" will back up and enforce the verdict in the example, with the International Common Law Court of Justice? Especially when the fire power of those the court are arresting and sentencing is apparently so much greater than the courts?

Another great pioneer, the Chinese general Sun Tzu, wrote millennia ago that any conflict, power is not ultimately what you have materially but rather psychologically; and the superior firepower of a much bigger enemy can always be negated with the right, unforeseen maneuvers.

These rulers indicted by the ICLCoJ are people garbed by the illusory robes of their offices, and they guarded by other men and women who, like the rulers themselves, are motivated primarily by fear. That fear is their greatest weakness, and can be easily exploited by even a small group of people.

The fact that laws guard the rich and the powerful is not as important as the reality that any fictional law rests upon its moral and legitimacy. Once such

legitimacy is weakened or gone, the laws and hard physical power of a state or church begin to crumble. Once public confidence in a ruler wanes, internal divisions appear in the ruling hierarchy, and usually a "palace coup" occurs and the regime falls.

We are witnessing precisely such development and such a collapse of legitimacy within the Roman Catholic church today, in the manner of events prior to the deposing of any dictatorship.

And so the short answer to the question, how do we enforce our verdicts in the face of the power of the receiver, is simply, we do as Sun Tzu teaches, and strike at the weakest, not strongest, part of that entity.

The weak point of any institution, especially a church, is its public image and its source of money. Threatens either of them and the entire institution must respond to the smallest of enemies. And this example proves that in practice. And the very fact of our smallness gives us a freedom and flexibility to strike at such big targets when and how we like: a power that is denied to big institutions.

A Natural Law verdict like the one of February 25, 2013, in the example by the ICLCoJ, wedge between the credibility of an institution like the Vatican and the rest of the world. By striking at that credibility, a weak link in the church's chain, we maneuvering around the strong points of that opponent and hitting them where they have no defense: the fact that as an organization, they officially protect and aid child rapists and human trafficking, and it was precisely through such a strategic maneuver that on August 4, 2013, the Vatican was declared a transnational criminal body under international law.

As such criminal body, the Vatican can now be legally disestablished, its officer's arrested, and its property and wealth seized, according to not only Natural Law, but to the law of nations. So while it isn't normally possible to immediately detain heads of states or corporations after a sentence is passed against them, such an arrest does follow naturally as their credibility and protection diminishes. Their overt power tends to crumble as the law and public condemnation works around their strong defenses and undermines them, like water flowing around a wall or a rock.

The point of any Natural Law verdict, after all, is not to target or imprison mere individuals, but to stop any threat to the helpless or to the community: to arrest such threats so they do not re-occur, primarily by ending the institutional source of those threats. And our means to do so is the moral weight of our evidence and verdicts combined with the capacity of many people to enforce those verdicts.

...

Natural Law Sheriffs and Peace Officers

That brings us to a key aspect of the court: its police arm, without which it cannot function.

The tradition of Sheriffs is an old one in the English speaking world: men or women appointed from local community to detain those harming others, bring them into town or "shire" courts for judgement, and enforce that court's sentence. In the United States of America, that tradition is still alive and embodied in locally elected sheriffs who are granted considerable power within their communities.

The role of the Sheriff is fourfold: to provide security for the court, to deliver court summonses and orders to appear, to detain and physically deliver to court those summoned who evade a court order, and to enforce the final sentence of the court, that include jailing and monitoring the guilty.

The Sheriff does not perform these duties alone, but with deputies and other agents he appoints to assist him. Such a "posse" is another performative term that actually refers to an important traditional custom of mobilizing all the able bodied men in a community to stop anyone who has committed a crime. The word "posse" comes from a Latin term *pro (toto) posse suo* meaning "to do the out most in ones power"/"to the extent of his power or ability".

According to one writers example:

"All persons who where the victims of a crime in Anglo-Saxon England were expected to raise their 'hue and cry' and apprehend the criminal, and upon hearing their cry, every able-bodied man in the community was expected to do the 'utmost in his power' [pro toto posse suo] to chase and apprehend to accused as a "posse"

"1215: The year of Magna Carta by J. Danzinger (2003)"

The custom of electing community Peace Officers like Sheriffs, in other words, arose from the belief that everybody in a community had the obligation to police and protect themselves and their children. The court Sheriff is thereby the servant of the people, taken from among them, answerable to and recallable by them, and not an external force over them which is a central issue in Natural Law, not to give away authority.

Part of the power of such a Sheriff is that he can deputize anyone to assist him, including other police officers and agents of the very institutions being named and tried in courts.

This is an especially important tactic and action during this, the early stages of development of our local courts, since it uses the very strength of a system we often find ourselves to oppose against.

To give an example:

"If a court summons or arrest warrent is to be delivered against a church or government official, the court Sheriff will first deliver a copy of it to the local existing police agency along with a deputizing notice placing those police under the jurisdiction of Natural Law.

As such, the police are then obligated to assist the Sheriff and must take the same oath of Law office as the Sheriff. If those issued such a notice deny or dispute it or refuse to take the oath, they are then ordered to stand down from their position and to not interfere with the Sheriff in his duties. If they agree with the notice, either directly or through their silence or non-interference, such police agencies are tactical abiding by Natural Law action, and the normal protection around criminals in high office is suddenly nullified. We should not underestimate the revolutionary consequences of such a nullification: mainly, that the shield around the powerful is suddenly gone.”

Such a remarkable encounter is in effect an enormous tug of war between contending legal systems: a battle of wills, played out in full public view as an enormous teaching moment. Our aim, with our work in establishing peoples court's in Natural Law, is to create and encourage such a creative confrontation and moral conflict at every level of society of official society, to establish Natural Law Jurisdiction.

This is the bigger and crucial point of such a confrontation between court Sheriff and civil law policemen: a clash that must be visible and televised to the world as it occurs. For this brings with it a chance for the people to learn directly that those policemen and soldiers who provide the muscle for the system are not exempt from the authority of Natural Law and must ultimately make a choice concerning who and what they serve. The moral and social impact of publicity posing such a question is inestimable.

*-We where there every day, trying to talk to the young soldiers about the killers they where defending. Nothing we said seemed to get through until the day we began reading out all the names of the people who where tortured to death. Then I saw one young National Guardsman start to wink back his tears,, And I new we would win!
Barbara Stelling, 1969*

On those occasions when this tactic has been tested in Canada and elsewhere, the result have always been the same: the police back off and do not interfere. Time and again, neither the RCMP nor the Vancouver police have interfered with protesters who peacefully occupied the churches responsible for the death of Indian children. On one occasion, a senior sergeant police officer even stated that if we served with a court Order, he would be duty bound to enforce such an Order and arrest those responsible.

Again, quoting Sun Tzu, to defeat an enemy one must know them, and such knowledge can only be gained through constant contact. As he says:

*”Provoke them to learn their responses. Prick them
to test their strength and weaknesses. Do not
outfight them, out think them”*

In Natural Law Peace Officers return power to the people by making them their own police authorities.

In so doing, they challenge the very basis of the status quo and its elite-based rule, by undermining those unaccountable “armed bodies of men” who

constitute the final and ultimate power of the State. The Natural Law, in short, is a seed of fundamental social and political transformation, not simply a weapon of self-defense for the oppressed.

On citizen's arrest

The right and necessity of individuals in a community (citizen) to detain suspected or actual criminals has long been recognized under both Civil and Natural Law.

For example, as mentioned, under a recent law in Canada, (the citizen's arrest and self defense act 82012), the right of citizen to perform arrests and detain suspects on their own has been broadened to include not only people caught endangering the community or harming others, but anyone suspected of crimes, including known offenders.

Under the sane Natural Law custom of, *pro toto posse* (see above) that empowers any group of adults to unite and stop those causing harm, the right of citizen's arrest is not restricted or negated by higher authority because of the recognition that any man or woman has the competence and obligation to see and directly halt wrongdoing in their community.

The procedure for performing a citizen's arrest is as follows:

1. One must first either witness a crime, or recognize a suspected criminal or known offender, or even have a reasonable suspicion that such person pose a danger to others. Such a suspicion must be based on probable cause and not simply a "feeling" or prejudice about someone.
2. One must then inform the suspect or offender that he or she is being placed under citizen arrest under the right of necessity to defend, which obligates the arrestee to detain the suspect or offender. The arresting party must state who they are and why they are exercising the power of arrest by stating the cause of action.
3. The offender or suspect must then be detained and held for trial in a Natural Law Court, if they turn out to have committed a crime and pose a danger to others. The amount of force used in the arrest must be a reasonable response to the suspect's behavior. Citizens can normally hand over those they have detained to a Natural Law Peace Officer or a Sheriff of the court. The arresting parties must be willing to appear in court and give a testimony concerning their actions. The crucial importance of the power of citizen's arrest is that it trains and empowers citizens to take responsibility for policing their communities and for the Law itself. It moves democracy from theory to action.

...

Natural Law - Law of Nature



Artist: Lisette Lindström, Finland. All rights reserved