

## ~The Principles of Unalienable Human Rights~

The Universe exists on the basis of two things; the nature of its parts, and the relationships between them. That is true not only of the physical universe but also of the human universe. Both universes are very complex, but the human universe is the most complex of the two because of the integration of so many divergent and even opposing parts. Humans are the confluence of completely unrelated elements and those elements are usually in competition with each other.

Those elements include the physical and all of its multiple elements, the psychological, the emotional, the esthetic, the spiritual, the moral, and the inter-relationship between them.

That comprises the nature of humankind, but then there's the further complication of the relationship between not just the parts but between other humans with like and unlike constitutions, whether those differences be those of gender, culture & tradition, intellect, talent & ability, or religion.

The study of the nature of the parts of humankind is an entire universe in itself, but it's closely inter-related to the universe of how humans relate and associate with others. Let's examine the nature of the latter.

The nature of the relationship between human beings is based on the existence of certain invisible but immutable principles which are describable as Human Rights. We generally think of them as the rights of Life, Liberty, Property, and the Pursuit of Happiness. But Human Rights can be classified and differentiated by two separate but closely connected categories, which are Survival Rights, and Civil Rights.

Survival rights are those necessary for not just the survival of the individual and his family, but for the survival rights of nations. The nature of the relationships of humankind involves more than just the relationship between individuals but also between individuals and the authority that governs their group, as well as the relationships between individual groups or nations. The princi-

ples that apply between individuals also apply between nations, just on a different scale. Those principles are based on Human Rights and are codified as and known as the Law of Nations.

Some relationships are based solely on agreements via treaties, but others are fundamental and require no agreement because they are unalienable, -all nations possess certain rights which other nations have no right to abrogate or violate. But let's focus on the rights of individuals.

Survival rights begin with the right to live, followed by the right of self-defense. If your right to live is threatened, then you have a right to protect and defend yourself. Government has no moral authority to grant nor deny you that right. It only has the right to rule as to how you exercise that right. It's responsible to protect the right of others to live and not suffer unjustified physical harm or denial of the ability to survive.

Integral to the right to live is the right to obtain that which is necessary for survival, and at the center of that issue is water, and access to it. It will be the foremost area of conflict and shortage in the coming decades because so much of survival is dependent on it.

While individuals and nations possess the right to the water on their own land, if their water is the only source for those outside their land, then a conflict will exist between the Right to Own Property (including water supplies), and The Right to Survive.

The Right to Own Property is divisible into two classifications. One includes the type of property needed for survival, and the other includes the type of property needed in the pursuit of happiness. Survival-supporting property includes the things needed to obtain sustenance and protection against the elements, as well as equipment for protection against enemies, whether animal or human.

The primary elements needed for survival which no man or government has a right to deny one the right to own, are land, the tools needed to exploit it, and domestic animals which supply multiple items vital for survival. When the State

owns restricted land which the people need for survival, then the State is in conflict with their fundamental right of survival.

When survival is not an issue then the next right in the priority list is the Right to Belong. That begins with every child's right to belong to its mother and her right for her child to be hers. That's closely followed by the rights of the mother to belong to her husband, and the husband & father "to have & to hold", as belonging to him, his wife and child.

Some States in history have not unequivocally recognized that right, including Sparta, -which removed any newborn that was not normal and perfect and left it out in the wilds to die. That was due to the priority of insuring the survival of the State by avoiding any drag on the society. It's said that the only Spartans who had the privilege of having their names carved on their grave markers were men who died in battle, and women who died in childbirth. Those women were revered as having given everything towards the creation of a new citizen of the State.

The right to belong also applies to marriage and engagement relationships. Without that right the human race would not exist as we know it. It's based on human love and human need which are elements involved in survival and the pursuit of happiness. Without the bond between parents and children, or parent-substitutes and the young, infants cannot develop into psychologically, and emotionally healthy beings, -whether human or mammal, but instead will die or devolve into a feral state without self-awareness or conscience.

The right to belong does not end at the individual family/relationship level but extends to the group into which one is born. Families do not exist in a vacuum, -not in the human realm, nor in the realm of social animals. They exist within a group and the group is usually a natural group, whether it be a flock, a pride, a herd, a clan, a tribe, or a nation.

"Melting Pot" groups are never natural groups and they only can exist because of the express policy of inclusion maintained by an eclectic society through its laws. All societies and nations

possess the right to foster (for practical or philosophical reasons) an unnatural society which accepts, or tolerates to a large degree, persons who are not natural members because they are of a foreign race, ethnicity, tradition, culture, language, and/or religion.

While there is no natural connection between such peoples, other than their humanity, the Right of Belonging, as applied at the group level, is the basis of the principle of natural membership and determines who constitutes a tribe or nation.

All creatures possess a natural membership in the group into which they are born. It's almost unnatural to call their membership a "right" because it's even more fundamental than a right. It instead involves the two elements of the fundamental structure of the universe, including both the element of the nature of the parts and the element of the relationship between them.

Just as the relationship between parents and their children is a natural relationship, so also is the relationship between members of any natural group. Their connection is natural in the societal and national sense based on what they have in common.

Being a natural group member results solely from being born to group members. Geography and boundaries have no connection to it. Boundaries do not create natural groups, rather, natural groups create boundaries.

The Principle of Group Membership is the web matrix which binds all natural members of a society or nation together. Some who are not natural members but wish to join a group to which they were not born can be woven into the matrix via a natural-izing process.

Then both they and their children are accepted as equal members. Although they cannot be entrusted to assume the power of the Chief, their children can be entrusted because they were born to group members even though their membership was not natural but merely via naturalization.

Fascist, Communist, autocratic and monarchical dictators have always perverted the right of natural membership and distorted it into meaning

that the people are the natural members of the State -the entity which possesses superior natural rights. So under the perverse principle that the state is the legitimate owner of superior and uncontested natural rights, its power is limited by few bounds or principles.

Regardless of whether or not the dictators that run the state acknowledge the natural rights of its members, nevertheless, those rights exist as part of the fundamental fabric of the human universe and any philosophy that opposes them will eventually fall to the sheer force of the desire of most humans to enjoy the benefits of liberty, even if that evolution toward freedom takes generations or centuries.

While that is true in regard to philosophies that justify oppression, it is not true in regard to religions that do so. Religions are more powerful, and like the “Stockholm syndrome” new members of a people and nation can become brain-washed from a young age into not thinking for themselves but surrendering to the power of unquestionable “divine authority”.

The conclusion to be drawn is; since individuals cannot survive and prosper unless they possess certain unalienable rights, so societies and nations must defend those rights because they’re the basis of the derivative rights of the state to survive, defend itself, and seek to prosper.

It all boils down to the matter of how man is made. Is he made with individual equal rights, or is he made with unequal rights, -or with no rights whatsoever? And how does the power-elite club view the rights of the many? Are the rights of the many subservient to, or are they superior to the rights of the powerful few?

With human nature being what it is, and with power being a corrupting force, history has undeniably proven that as the central elite class gain in power, the people’s rights diminished in direct proportion. The longer they accept the substitution of State authority in place of their individual and collective rights,

the closer they become to being unaware that they even possess certain unalienable rights.

That is the slippery slope that we are in the middle of thanks to a cadre of liberal, leftist, progressive, socialist oligarchs that have been working diligently for 100 years to undermine, erase, nullified, abrogate, and supersede the natural rights of individuals. They are convinced that the masses are born with saddles on their backs and that they, the masters, are qualified, justified, destined, and obligated to ride them (for their own good of course).

Unfortunately they’ve slowly but very successfully implemented their unconstitutional agendas and the way that they’ve succeeded was by simply ignoring the Constitution of the United States and its Amendments.

But that can only take them so far and then they are up against the wall of the Supreme Court, -but only if it’s willing to accept cases involving actions that oppose the overthrow of constitutional principles by Congress, the executive branch, or smaller government bodies.

But simply appearing before the court is no guarantee that the Constitution will be upheld by at least five of the nine justices. Justices with an affinity toward state power over and against the rights of individuals’ unalienable rights can rule however they want and they have to answer to no man at all. They are above the law because they can determine what the law is. They are the ultimate “deciders” and they possess more authority than all of the rest of the government combined.

Consequently, the man elected President has a similar kind of power in that he’s the one to select who sits on the Supreme Court bench for life. That’s the broadest power that he wields and it will grow in time to be a legacy of constitutional fidelity or of constitutional treason by one or more appointees who follow or ignore the Constitution and the unalienable rights upon which our republic was founded.

by a.r. nash march 2012 <http://h2ooflife.com>