

Matters before a Natural Law Court

Traditionally, law in the European tradition falls into two general categories: civil and criminal law. The former deals with disputes between individuals – often called “Tort” offenses – or issues of negligence which cause harm. Criminal law deals with acts of intentional harm to individuals but which, in larger sense, are offense against all people because they somehow threatens the community.

Arising as a defense against absolutism and state tyranny, the Natural Law traditionally has dealt with Criminal Law matters that Crown/state/government or Canon law courts refuse either to address, or do so in a restricted manner, including murder, rape, warfare, and other crimes against the community and humanity. But civil matters of personal disputes may also be brought into a Natural Law Court, which after all claims universal jurisdiction in and over all legal matters within a community and Nature. Indeed, because Natural Law is rooted in the jury system, what better forum can there be for settling of civil matters between individuals than a trial before one’s own neighbors?

For our purpose the major focus of litigation before our Natural Law Courts of Justice will be on crimes involving serious threats made against people, animals, communities, the environment and peace.

As in any Lawful system, the burden of proof in any such litigation brought before a Natural Law Court will be on the Plaintiffs – those bringing the lawsuit – and normal rules of evidence will apply. For example, allegations against a party cannot be made in court without there being a basis in provable facts, such as primary documentation that is certified by an independent party, or by producing eyewitnesses to the alleged crime.

Another crucial rule of evidence is the inadmissibility of hearsay evidence, as in “*no, I wasn’t there, but I heard...*”. This is especially relevant rule when it comes to the commission of serious crimes such as genocide, murder, rape.

In short, any allegation must be backed up with provable facts, and must be made by one who was a direct participant in or an eyewitness to the event.

For our purpose, it must be noted that in the case of especially, monstrous, corporate crimes committed by governments or other powers, such as wars of aggression, genocide, or human trafficking, normal rules of evidence are less stringently applied. This because of a realistic understanding that crimes committed by entire societies or regimes are of a different nature than crimes by isolated individuals. A different set of norms regarding intent and provable evidence applies.

In words of the American prosecutor at the Nuremberg Trials in 1946, Robert Jackson:

” No regime that seeks the extermination of entire groups of people generally retains written proof of their intent to commit this crime. Considering the murderous nature of the regime, there is no need, since

such extermination is not considered a crime. Nevertheless, even such a system seeks to fog and dissimulate the evidence, especially during wartime. The proof of crimes against humanity generally lies not in documents but in witness or survivors, in mass graves, and in the implied proof of the intent to commit these crimes contained in everyday and institutionalized laws, attitudes and norms of the murderous regime.”

Implied intent is a legal concept especially relevant and specific to litigation involving genocidal regimes, including governments and churches whose world view and laws consider other groups to be unworthy of life and equal rights, such as the churches and states that were tried and sentenced in the first case of the International Common Law Court of Justice concerning the genocide of indigenous peoples of Canada.

Ex: laws such as the :Indian act of Canada, which impose a different set of laws on a racially targeted group, or Roman Catholic: Crime Solicitations, which condones and facilitates the concealment of child rape within the church, indicates a clear implied intent to commit and abet criminal acts.

That is, unnecessary to prove the individual intent to harm children by Catholic priests, since under their own self-governing rules called Canon law, every priest is systematically required to harm children by aiding those who do so if he is to retain his job and ordination. The collective guilt of these clergy as a whole is implied and clear, just as it was concerning all of the servants of the Nazi regime.

Thus. While normal due process requires that the prosecutor prove that the accused committed an act and did so with deliberate intent, such an intent may also be assumed to exist by the larger context of a crime, especially when that crime is perpetrated by entire organization or regimes. Ascertaining the truth is always laborious, but ultimately the process is best guaranteed by a body of juries than single adjudicators. Natural Law juries and not individual judges are a better guard against abuse of rules of evidence just procedure in a courtroom.

Self-governing judges are notoriously prone to corruption and political manipulation, and when appointed by very governments under criminal investigation, are obviously unsuited to the task of rendering a fair judgement. In fact, under legal procedure, such state-appointed judges have no jurisdictional competence to rule on the criminality and guilt of their employees. Judges routinely waive just procedure and rules of evidence, and are authorized to do so by statute law. In Canada, "Crown" appointed judges even have the power to alter or destroy court records, silence one party in a dispute, and ignore due process altogether!

The whole point of establishing a jury-run Natural Law Court is to prevent such a manipulation of the Law and Justice by unaccountable parties or vested interests. It is not accidental that a founding father of American Republic, John Hancock, said in 1777:

” If we have not Courts that are established and maintained by the people, rather than by corruptible judges, then we will have no Republic. Our

*Constitution and our nation will rise or fall according to the independence of
our Courts”*



*” Canada and its churches, along with their sponsors in
London and Rome, committed a deliberate and massive
campaign of genocide against aboriginal children for over a
century”*

The Crown of England

*”Under Natural Law and
International Law such a criminal
regime has lost its right to govern or
expect allegiance from its citizens”.
From the verdict of the International*

*Common Law Court of Justice
Brussels, February 25, 2013.*

