

# Corruption - Binary Thinking - Prove You are Not A Criminal

Author: Jonathan Pearson

Version: 0

Date Started: 07/072020

Date First Version: 07/07/2020

Date Updated: 07/07/2020

Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Introduction .....	1
Framework .....	1
Population.....	2
Questions .....	2
Initial Conditions .....	2
Self reference.....	2
Initial Thoughts .....	2
Prove You are Not an Axe Murderer.....	2
References .....	3

## Introduction

**I was writing my latest letter to the judiciary and politicians when I remembered something about how I was treated by the Family Court – in particular how men are expected to prove themselves innocent of any possible crimes against children.**

Right now in Australia there is a virus which can kill people. States are closing borders, movements are being restricted by the Military and Police, People are being forcibly detained under house arrest without charge unless they prove themselves innocent by having a virus test, restrictions on movement are in place. All the features of a totalitarian state are being deployed by using the expression “unprecedented” – we live in “unprecedented” times – therefore any action, fine, law, rule the state wants to make is justified. Here they mean that lack any knowledge of history and have no real understanding of anything in the world – hence in their tiny minds – its unprecedented. The **ends justifies the means** becomes their weapon of choice.

This is closely related to hysteria, mobs, Totalitarianism, Fascism, Feminism and other extreme idiotologies.

## Framework

Nations, Law, Judiciary

## Population

Nation states. Individuals within Nations, men

## Questions

1. What is logic?
2. Why are some people required to prove themselves innocent?

## Initial Conditions

Groups, Nations, Law, Courts, Women, Men

## Self reference

All my models so far.

## Initial Thoughts

Logical thinking no longer exists – or if it does it has become corrupted.

## Prove You are Not an Axe Murderer

Binary Thinkers tend to see everything as either single (self) related or binary (Right/Wrong). They tend to deny all the things in between extremes on a continuum. They also lack basic logic skills.

If family Law courts in Australia the man has to prove himself innocent. This is done within the legislation as the best interests of the child and the need to consider violence – if there has been any ever and the likelihood of there being in the future. This means that rather than being tried for specific criminal charge - a man is considered to be a risk to children by default if there has been any violence – which is now defined as controlling, financial, harsh words, looks, arguments, etc – anything the women “feels” like saying so she can get money. There more she feels the more she is believed (this too is legislated).

Prove you are not an axe murderer!

i.e. they have no evidence but allege that you are an axe murderer unless you can prove that you are not. It is a personal attack by question.

The mistake many people make is by NOT LAUGHING AT THE INSANITY OF THE QUESTION.

As soon as you acknowledge the statement or try to defend yourself you have already lost the argument – because if you did not have anything to defend yourself from - why did you bother answering in the first place?

ME: “Look at all the people I have not killed with an axe.”

THEM: “But you do have an axe, don’t you or you could get one – how do we know you will not use it in the future and have not used it in the past?”

ME: "Look you stupid idiot don't you know anything about logic or legal principles and why they exist?"

THEM: "There's no need to get angry sir – you see your honour – he is angry – the sure sign of an axe murderer if I ever saw one. Let us take away the children and all his money – the children will never be safe in the future – he might commit a crime"

ME: "You misunderstand you dumb fool - I am not angry – it is merely an accurate assessment of your mental capabilities – you are an idiot and lack logic – more so sir – you are driven by your feelings and self-righteousness and are power mad."

THEM: "No sir - you know it is an offense to reflect on or question a magistrate, law officer, etc"

ME: "I am not offended – I pity your deep ignorance and persistence with abusing me for your own enjoyment. You are an insult to humanity itself – what are you - a child?"

And so on.

ME: "I Like Apples"

THEM: "So what you are saying is you hate oranges"

What is the opposite of Axe Murderer? EVERYTHING ELSE TO INFINITY other than Axe Murderer – or if you like – as much money as a lawyer can extract from a client before they kill themselves.

In Australian courts now – men are found guilty based on allegation – tried in absentia without knowing what they are accused of – given permanent orders made against them which can never be revoked and derided and abused if they dare to question what is going on.

The A.C.T. Magistrates court, legal community and Politicians enjoy being corrupt and lying – they do it all the time. The very extreme end of **opposite of the presumption of innocence. Any they double down and protect their lies and corruption.**

## References

1. **Australian Government Attorney-General's Department - Presumption of innocence**  
<https://www.ag.gov.au/rights-and-protections/human-rights-and-anti-discrimination/human-rights-scrutiny/public-sector-guidance-sheets/presumption-innocence>  
**The presumption of innocence imposes on the prosecution the burden of proving the charge and guarantees that no guilt can be presumed until the charge has been proved beyond reasonable doubt.**
2. **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> **Article 11.**(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be **presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial** at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed. **Article 12.**No

one shall be **subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation**. Everyone has the right to the **protection of the law against such interference or attacks**. **Article 13.**(1) Everyone has the right to **freedom of movement and residence** within the borders of each state.(2) Everyone has the **right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country**.

3. Association for Psychological Science - Under Pressure: Stress and Decision Making Barbara Isanski August 1, 2010 <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/under-pressure-stress-and-decision-making>
4. 50 Essays By **George Orwell** - **THE LION AND THE UNICORN: SOCIALISM AND THE ENGLISH GENIUS (1941)** <http://qutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300011h.html#part14> *The stagnation of the Empire in the between-war years affected everyone in England, but it had an especially direct effect upon two important sub-sections of the middle class. One was the military and imperialist middle class, generally nicknamed the Blimps, and the other the left-wing intelligentsia. These two seemingly hostile types, symbolic opposites—the half-pay colonel with his bull neck and **diminutive brain**, like a dinosaur, the highbrow with his domed forehead and stalk-like neck—are mentally linked together and constantly interact upon one another; in any case they are born to a considerable extent into the same families. Thirty years ago the Blimp class was already losing its vitality. The middle-class families celebrated by Kipling, the prolific lowbrow families whose sons officered the army and navy and swarmed over all the waste places of the earth from the Yukon to the Irrawaddy, were dwindling before 1914. The thing that had killed them was the telegraph. In a **narrowing world, more and more governed from Whitehall**, there was every year **less room for individual initiative**. Men like Clive, Nelson, Nicholson, Gordon would find no place for themselves in the modern British Empire. By 1920 nearly every inch of the colonial empire was in the grip of Whitehall. **Well-meaning, over-civilized men**, in dark suits and black felt hats, with neatly rolled umbrellas crooked over the left forearm, were imposing their **constipated view of life** on Malaya and Nigeria, Mombasa and Mandalay. The one-time empire builders were reduced to the status of clerks, buried deeper and deeper under mounds of paper and red tape. In the early twenties one could see, all over the Empire, the older officials, who had known more spacious days, writhing impotently under the changes that were happening. From that time onwards it has been next door to impossible to **induce young men of spirit to take any part in imperial administration**. And what was true of the official world was true also of the commercial. The **great monopoly companies swallowed up hosts of petty traders**. Instead of going out to trade adventurously in the Indies one went to an office stool in Bombay or Singapore. And life in Bombay or Singapore was actually duller and safer than life in London. Imperialist sentiment remained strong in the middle class, chiefly owing to family tradition, but the job of administering the Empire had ceased to appeal. Few able men went east of Suez if there was any way of avoiding it. But the general weakening of imperialism, and to some extent of the whole British morale, that took place during the nineteen-thirties, was partly the work of the **left-wing intelligentsia**, itself a **kind of growth that had sprouted from the stagnation of the Empire**. It should be noted that there is **now no intelligentsia that is not in some sense 'left'**. Perhaps the last right-wing intellectual was T. E. Lawrence. Since about 1930 everyone describable as an 'intellectual' has **lived in a state of chronic discontent with the existing order**. Necessarily so, because society as it was constituted had no room for him. In an Empire that was simply stagnant, neither being developed nor falling to pieces, and in an England ruled by people **whose chief asset was their stupidity, to be 'clever' was to be suspect**. If you had the kind of brain that could understand the poems of T. S. Eliot or the theories of Karl Marx, the higher-ups would see to it that you were kept out of any important job. The **intellectuals could find a function for themselves only in the literary reviews and the left-wing political parties**.*