

The Law

It is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense. Each of us has the right to defend his person, his liberty and his property. If a person has the right to defend his person, liberty, and property it follows that a group of men or woman have the right to organize a common force to protect these rights constantly.

Since the principle of collective right and its reason for existence and its lawfulness, are based on individual right. The common force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose. Since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of an individual, then the common force for the same reason, cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups.

Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases contrary to the premise. We have the force to defend our own individual rights. Since no individual can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others, should it not follow that that the same principle also applies to common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual?

If this is true, than nothing can be more evident than this: **The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. This common force is to do only what individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect the persons, liberties and properties, and to maintain the right of each and to cause “*justice*” to reign over us all.**

Unfortunately, law by no means confines itself to its proper functions. When it has exceeded its proper functions, it has not done so merely in some inconsequential and debatable matter. The Law has gone further than this; it has acted in direction opposite to its purpose. The law has been used to destroy its own objectives. It has been applied to annihilate the justice that it was supposed to maintain. This is to limit and destroy the rights, which its real purpose was to respect. The law has placed the collective forces at the disposal of the unscrupulous, who wish, without risk, to exploit the person, liberty and property of others. It has converted plunder into a right, in order to protect plunder. It has turned lawful defense into a crime in order to punish lawful defense.

Men naturally rebel against the injustice of which they are victims. Thus, when plunder is organized by law for the profit of those who make the law, all the plundered classes try somehow to enter, by peaceful or revolutionary means, into the making of laws. According to their degree of enlightenment, these plundered classes may propose one of two entirely different purposes when they attempt to attain political power: Either they may wish to stop lawful plunder, or they may wish to share in it.

History

History has demonstrated that, the law of the land has not respected the individual rights of lawful defense, defense of his person, liberty, or property, and in particular, in the native communities. This injustice has been recognized and public opinion supports reconciliation. If one supports the fact that removal of these rights was in fact unlawful, then one could also perceive, if in fact that this reconciliation was again, the expropriation of another's individual property in order to, make right, the injustice, in so doing, it repeats the very injustice it is trying to reconcile. The principles in this case and in others, such as Leslie Budden's grandfather whom as a citizen, was discriminated against for his Japanese origin, continues to lead us to more injustice and into the present. This is not the problem with those of different race, I think I can say as a citizen that we are not fighting the issue of race; we are fighting the issue of injustice. Those that have the political power have the choice: either they stop lawful plunder, or they share in it.

Fisheries Management

The "Fisheries Act" provides a vehicle with the power to make laws contrary to the principles of law itself. It has given the Minister of Fisheries the power to make these laws under the premise that his responsibility is to protect fisheries resources and not to uphold the individual basic rights, inherent in our constitution and the basic law that protects them. This principle implies that fish have more rights than our citizens and that the Minister can replace the constitutional law, which protects the people's rights, in creating laws to protect the fish. It would also seem that it provides yet another possibility, the right to reallocate the property of one to another, and in so doing, violate the rights inherent in law itself.

In the process of setting up advisory boards and industry advisory associations the Minister has created accomplices to the basic injustices to the principles of law. He and they, share in the plunder. If the participants in an industry and Provincial governments, can change, or be party to changing laws which are contrary to the laws to protect the fundamental rights of its citizens, then it is plunder in the true sense of the word.

As I have said in previous writings, the establishing of Individual licenses and Quotas for a species and the criteria for this allocation is different in every case. If it can be determined that giving an individual a license or Quota based on their catch history, by removing the opportunity from another, that this may not violate the law, and might appear to be lawful. It would then seem that if in another instance, the catch history was not used and the historic catches in another species were taken away and given to everyone equally, that would be unlawful, as that would take the property from one to give to another. If however all species were divided up equally the principle of equal division would be lawful and the principle of catch history would not.

Under the **Integrated Fishing Plan** the criteria for distribution of species is a combination of many possibilities. First prior to the institution of this Plan, a mixture of Catch history, and or vessel length, and equal division, divided quota in some species, to only those that held a license for that species. Upon the institution of this Plan other species licenses were placed on a quota system under a number of different criteria. Each of these was different and in each case, distributing what could be considered the property of one, to another. The division of catch history of the vessel was also arbitrarily changed from vessel to licenses, some of which may have been sold and the purchaser now gets quota that he neither was aware he purchases, or the seller was aware he sold. Under this plan the responsibility to acquire species under the rules of the plan (Law?) requires someone to pay to the now owner of this quota, for the privilege of continuing to earn a living.

The fisheries resources are in fact a common property resource, meaning that they belong to the citizens of Canada. This means that giving the privilege or privatization of ownership to individuals or corporations is in violation of the basic principles of law again, as it takes away property from the public and gives it to private industry.

It is in consideration of this public ownership of the resource that issues such as the reconciliation of violations of native rights to the benefit of its “Other citizens”, should be paid by those citizens, and not by the injustice of expropriation of resources unlawfully from one group of citizens and given to another.

In order to enact change, this process of plundering, must be removed and the principles of law, to protect the rights of individuals be restored. This will have to start at the end and piece-by-piece rolled back to the beginning.

A good place to start is to send a strong message to the Government that we **do** want to protect our resources, but in a way that doesn't remove our rights under the law. It is essential to the very core of our society, to maintain these rights.

Lets start by saying; the Integrated Fishing Plan is in violation of the law. Lets tell the government that we do not want this plan. If you want this plan, in so doing you are giving your rights and your very soul to the control of those that have the power of injustice.

The alternative is collectively organizing our rights of a lawful defense. This is our Rights under **The Law**.

If anyone chooses to contact me directly my email address is gpdalum@shaw.ca

Gerald Dalum