
EOP SUMMARY OF EOP v WIP LAW:

EoP MILED Clerk legal certainty clarity working hypothesis summary of the legal social contract difference between Ecology of Peace (“EoP”) and Babylon War is Peace (“WiP”) law, courts, legal applications, activism and elections.

[1] EoP v WiP Law:

[1.1] EoP Scientific and Cultural [eop-scicultlaw] – aka Garden of Eden – law clearly, simply and unequivocally requires citizens to procreate and consume below ecological carrying capacity limits [eop-footprint]; and relate in terms of fully informed consenting agreements [ego-eco-literacy]; to avoid ecological overshoot and racial, religious, class and gender resource conflict.

[A] The Ecology of Peace Radical Honoursty Factual Reality [eop-rh-fr] conscious strategic goal for implementing EoP Scientific and Cultural law is an egalitarian responsible freedom [responsible-freedom] stable – no population & economic consumption growth above ecological carrying capacity limits – sustainable low tech family farm agrarian village and primitivist nomad society living in peace; with no palaces, prisons, mental institutions, homeless and unemployed, where rape and murder are so rare, they don’t have words for it.¹

[B] In Martin Luther / Sayyid Qutb terminology: EoP Law prohibits innocence for – procreation and consumption above ecological carrying capacity limits – sale indulgences Kufr juridical rulings.

[1.2] Babylon WiP law consciously or unconsciously, negligently or intentionally allows citizens to procreate and/or consume above ecological carrying capacity limits; resulting in ecological overshoot and racial, religious, class and gender resource conflict.

[A] The conscious or unconscious strategic goal of WiP law is a hierarchical slavery freedumb society where the military, legal, political, religious and legal elite profiteer of cheap – economic sexual and/or military – cannon fodder labour and homeless and unemployed misery of the

¹ Gimbutas noted the stable – no population & economic consumption growth – Steppe Aryan population: that a low tech agrarian village founded in 8000 BC was still a low tech agrarian village in 4000BC. This also allowed them to sustainably farm the land, and live in peace. There are no steppe Aryan palaces, no prisons, no mental institutions, no homeless and no unemployed. No harems; they didnt even have marriage, just as the Musou still today. Among whom, rape & murder are so rare they dont have words for it. – Day Brown: Proto Indo-European

masses; with plenty of racial, religious, class or gender resource conflict for the elite to parasitically profiteer from to build themselves military, religious, corporate and polegal palaces, cheap labour prisons and mental institutions slavery plantations, where rape and murder are so plentiful, WiP Only BDSM addicted to misery judges don't need to subscribe to porn channels, because they have reality rape and murder porn tv channels in their courts.²

[B] In Martin Luther / Sayyid Qutb terminology: Babylonian Kufr WiP Law socio-polegally and economically profit from innocence for – procreation and consumption above ecological carrying capacity limits – sale indulgences Kufr juridical rulings.

[2] EoP v WiP Courts:

- [2.1] An 'EoP Only' Court – generally in a national polegal system dominated by WiP law whose juridical transformation goals are to transform the judiciary into an EoP legal system – only accepts applications from individuals who are consciously – unconditional or conditional cooperator – members of the Ecology of Peace culture.
- [2.2] An unconscious Babylon 'WiP Only' court unconsciously accepts applications from individuals who are consciously or unconsciously members of EoP and Babylon WiP cultures.
- [2.3] A conscious Babylon 'WiP Only' court consciously only accepts applications from individuals who are consciously or unconsciously members of Babylon WiP cultures.
- [2.4] An unconscious EoP and WiP court accepts applications from all individuals irrespective of whether they are consciously or unconsciously members of Ecology of Peace or Babylon WiP cultures.
- [2.5] A conscious EoP and WiP court accepts applications from all individuals irrespective of whether they are consciously or unconsciously members of Ecology of Peace or Babylon WiP cultures; requires applicants, counsel and

² "Any EoP paralegal can tell you that in any Babylon WiP Only court room, Media publication or Citizen Assembly charity; all the Babylon WiP Only lawyers or editors do, before their – busdriver from Basingstoke – citizen jury/readers; is control the information flow the – caterer from Clapham – jurors/readers receive from their designated Babylon WiP Yum Yum Cannibal Fuck the Kids Future – aka pretend we give a fuck about racial, religious, class, gender, intergenerational resource conflict justice; while doing fuck all to cooperate to abolish the root procreation / consumption above ecological carrying capacity limit clauses of international law causes of all resource conflict – experts and stakeholders. Then Basingstoke / Clapham jurors/readers can provide the Babylon WiP Only lawyers, charities, and environmentalists with a 'democratic credibility rubber stamp' endorsement of their Babylon WiP Yum Yum Cannibal Fuck the Kids Future law solutions.

- 07 Oct 2019: LJ v Speaker: House of Commons: Affidavit: para.40, Afd: pp.15/18; LJvSHoC pp.26/88. Copy of LH v SHoC included in H 45/19: LJ v CRLRC negotiations. Filing Notice: 29 Oct 2019: 11 Sep - 18 Oct 2019: 17 Oct: EoP Re: XR v Met Police: PHain v Solicitors Reg Auth. Annex B

jury members to unambiguously clarify whether they are EoP or WiP culture accused / defendants, applicants / respondents, counsel and jury.

[3] EoP v WiP Activists:

[3.1] EoP Civil Disobedience – unconditional or conditional co-operator – Activist engages in non-violent or violent activism – generally in a national polegal system dominated by WiP law – that violates one or more national or international Babylon WiP legal statute; on behalf of implementing EoP Scientific and Cultural law [eop-scicultlaw] as national or international law.

[A] If tried in a Babylon WiP court, they are denied EoP necessity defence exposing difference between EoP and WiP law, tried in accordance to WiP law, and if convicted, sentenced according to WiP law.

[B] If tried in EoP and WiP court; they are allowed EoP necessity defence, tried in accordance with EoP and WiP conflict of cultural laws principles³; if their EoP evidence exposes scientific and/or cultural law

³ * Paul Meerts: Culture and International Law: “Although not often explicitly mentioned, culture is always at the centre of law and politics.”

* Ex parte Minister of Native Affairs: In re Yako v Beyi 1948 (1) SA 388 (A); at 397 the Appellate Division held that neither common nor customary law was prima facie applicable. Courts had to consider all the circumstances of a case, and, without any preconceived view about the applicability of one or other legal system, select the appropriate law on the basis of its inquiry. Schreiner J.A. said lifestyle of is a choice of law factor: “Aside from an express choice of laws all connecting factors with conflict of personal laws are designed to determine, in an objective manner, the cultural orientation of the parties. Because the laws involved are conceived in terms of culture the connecting factors must be conceived in like terms. The most direct access to a person’s cultural leanings would clearly be his or her lifestyle”.

* SALC, Sept 1999: Report on Conflicts of law: P.22: 1.58. The Constitution now provides an entitlement for invoking customary law in legal suits. Because ss 30 and 31 specifically guarantee an individual and a group's right to pursue a culture of choice, it could be argued that application of customary law has become a constitutional right. Previously, the state had assumed complete discretion in deciding whether and to what extent customary law should be recognized, an attitude typical of colonial thinking, for Africans were subject to whatever policies the conquering state chose to impose on them. Now, however, the state has a duty to allow people to participate in the culture they choose, implicit in this duty is a responsibility to uphold the institutions on which that culture is based.’

* SALC, June 1988: Report on Conflicts of Law 76: The Harmonization of the Common Law and the Indigenous Law states: “Differences in culture are always likely to generate differences in law with consequent conflicts of law ... The purpose of choice of law rules is to select the law that will do justice in the case. It is the court's power (and responsibility) to decide which law to apply, paying due regard to the parties' interests and their choice of legal system.” It also provides for the following principles governing choice of law disputes: (a) The nature of the conflict: where it is assumed that an individuals personal law is a matter of their cultural affiliation; (b) Parties may select the law to be applied; based upon objective and subjective reasonableness tests; (c) Nature and form of a prior transaction; if parties disagree on each others choice of applicable cultural law; (d) Subject matter and environment of a transaction; if deeper clarification about cultural orientation is required; (e) The litigants' cultural orientation; which can include the court taking notice of details as diverse as the parties' place of residence, occupation, religion, education, style of dress, eating and sleeping habits, use of bank accounts, preparation of wills and consultation with attorneys, communication style, etc; (f) Exemption from customary or common law; as justified by the principle that every person should be free to pursue a culture of choice, which implies that

errors in WiP law, the judge's ruling amends such scientific or cultural WiP law errors; if convicted they are sentenced in accordance with EoP Crimes of Aggression [crimes-of-aggression] sentencing guidelines.

[C] If tried in EoP Court, they are allowed EoP necessity defence, if their EoP evidence exposes scientific and/or cultural law errors in EoP scientific and cultural law, the judge's ruling amends such EoP law errors; if convicted they are sentenced in accordance with EoP Crimes of Aggression sentencing guidelines.

[3.2] Babylon WiP Civil Disobedience Activist engages in non-violent or violent activism presumably as a result of lack of ego/eco literacy character – generally in a national polegal system dominated by EoP law – that violates one or more national or international Ecology of Peace legal statute; on behalf of implementing Babylon WiP law as national or international law.

[A] If tried in EoP Scientific law court, they are allowed WiP scientific necessity defence, if (a) their WiP evidence exposes scientific law errors in EoP scientific law, the judge's ruling amends such EoP law errors; if (b) convicted for lack of ego/eco literacy character; they are sentenced in accordance with EoP Crimes of Aggression sentencing guidelines.

[B] If tried in EoP Cultural law court, they are allowed WiP cultural necessity defence, (i) if their WiP evidence exposes cultural law errors in EoP cultural law, the judge's ruling amends such EoP law errors; (ii) if convicted for lack of ego/eco literacy character; they are sentenced in accordance with EoP Crimes of Aggression sentencing guidelines.

[4] EoP v WiP Legal Applications:

[4.1] EoP culture legal applications advocate on behalf of [A] implementing EoP Scientific and Cultural law [eop-scicultlaw] as international law; and/or [B] if implemented as national or international law: enforcing EoP Scientific and Cultural law.

[4.2] Babylon WiP culture legal applications consciously or unconsciously, advocate on behalf of [A] implementing Babylon WiP law as national or international law; and/or [B] if implemented as national or international law: enforcing Babylon WiP law.

[5] EoP v WiP Elections or Referendums:

people may not be involuntarily bound by a system of personal law; and legal certainty: where an individual can unequivocally declare in advance of any litigation their personal law; (g) Unifying choice of law.

- [5.1] An EoP election or referendum is any local, regional, or national political election or referendum based upon EoP national or international law. Politicians and voters taking part in EoP elections and referendums are legally prohibited from covertly and/or overtly bribing each other by promising and/or demanding individual or corporate innocence for sale indulgences – legislated innocence from breeding/consumption crimes of aggression externalities – legislative welfare.
- [5.2] A Babylon WiP election or referendum is any local, regional, or national political election or referendum based upon Babylon WiP clauses of national or international law. Politicians and voters taking part in Babylon WiP elections and referendums consciously or unconsciously covertly and/or overtly bribe each other by promising and/or demanding individual or corporate innocence for sale indulgences – legislated innocence from breeding/consumption crimes of aggression externalities – legislative welfare.

DATED at this 02 November 2019, George, South Africa, Pale Blue Dot.



EoP MILED Clerk: EoP Oath⁴: 23 Sep 2017⁵: LJ⁶
Lara Johnson aka Andrea Muhrrteyn
16 Taaibos Ave, Heatherpark, George, 6529, RSA

⁴ <http://eop-nwo-sco.tygae.org.za/eop-axis-milnec-evac/eop-axis-oath/>

archive.is/Yv2t3

⁵ <http://eop-miled-clerk.tygae.org.za/2017/09/23-sep-iaea-dgamano/>

archive.fo/NrdRC

⁶ http://eop-axis-oath.tygae.org.za/pdf/za/17-09-19_WC-Grg_Johnstone-Lara.pdf