

A Duty of Care

Contributed by Abdun Nur

Version 4 - 3rd March 2013 A Duty of Care

A duty of care is a reciprocal obligation as an inherent burden on every individual, which requires they adhere to a standard of reasonable care while performing any acts that could foreseeably harm others; this is an implicit responsibility held by individuals towards others. To seek relief of a harm inflicted by another, it must be a "reasonably foreseeable" result of the conduct of the one blamed. The State courts act as courts of the "corpse"; this is done to remove the duty of care and hold individuals extorted, unable to seek or establish relief of tort or dispute, in dichotomy to that is the court of the living. All courts as their true reason for existence have no other purpose than to arbitrate disputes between living inventive, premeditating soul (inventivum anima), and the desire to limit exercise of the inherent power of the individual and avoid the duty of care that is a reciprocal obligation and responsibility of every living inventive, premeditating soul (inventivum anima), is the true function of the fictions applied in the court of the corpse. The courts of the corpse claim it cannot "impose" unlimited liability and hold everyone liable for everyone else's problems, so there must be some reasonable limit to the duty of care, of course this is non-sense as the duty of care only applies to torts, and a tort or wrongful act, if no wrong is committed no dispute can established, you cannot seek relief from another for a wrong you inflict upon yourself. So the innate duty of care is not holding others liable for anything but wrongs they inflict upon other living souls, if you have a problem that is not the result of a failure in another's duty of care that is proven, or another form of wrongful act such as breaking a written agreement, it is not a tort. Officialism functions in partiality and in opposition to natural duty or affection. All public officers are held under an oath of that granted office to the granter, being either a corporate legal entity or the hierarchical head of a corporate legal entity, through whose authority they collect offerings, which is the function of all offices. An officer is one charged by a superior power, a power not derived by consent, but devolved on him by an authority with "quoad hoc" (meaning: in this regard; as far as this is concerned) in authoritative superiority, presumed if not rebutted. Authority means to originate creation, the author, and "city", meaning "the state or reality", the circumstances attributes; so the legal fiction of State creates the legal fiction of citizenship that holds the living inventive, premeditating soul (inventivum anima) as its agent, as a human (serf/slave) on a fictional ship of commerce, and the creator of a thing has control over its use, controlling its circumstances and attributes, they have authority of what they author. There is in fact no authority, it is a fiction imposed by those who act in office, any authority imposed is either consented to freely, consented to through ignorance or deception, or imposed against the consent of the victim. The authority of every office takes consent from the presumption that if you do not explicitly rebut their offer, claim, action, or demand you have consented by your silence. This reasoning is of course erroneous, but a reality at present due to the structure of the courts detailed here "Court System". The natural equitable duty of care is incumbent upon every living soul labelled in fictions man or woman, as an unalienable obligation, for example: if you witness a drowning individual and have it within your power to save them, but do not, you have failed in your natural reciprocal obligation and responsibility of a duty of care, so have committed an injury to the drowning soul, and relief can be sort of you directly if that negligence can be proven. Why? Because if you were the drowning man you would want help, and to deny the reciprocation of that demand wrongs the other. Through the duty of care a child in the womb is considered born whenever there is a question of safety or aid to the child, and has the same protection as any adult within arbitration of tort, so the inherent power and the reciprocal obligation and responsibility each has for those around them protects the child from formed fetus, when the organs have all begun development, which could be argued is around 12 weeks from conception, and treats the life as full and mature, to terminate a life within the womb once formed encroaches upon the child, additionally to intentionally poison, or damage the environment of the fetus encroaches on the child. Licenses versus a Duty of Care If a danger to others is present in any activity that demands a skill and knowledge base to master, like driving a car on a common use road, or flying a plane over a populated area, competence must be gained before that activity can be undertaken without danger to others, based upon your reciprocal obligation and responsibility of a duty of care to protect those around you from avoidable incompetence, however "Licensing" of drivers cannot be required of free people, because taking on the restrictions of a license requires the surrender of inherent power, an unalienable reciprocal obligation and responsibility, namely who is above me to grant me permission. The license is a fiction required by the fiction of public and the fiction of trustees who are performing the fiction of a public service and is not applicable to any living inventive, premeditating soul (inventivum anima), the highway traffic act does not apply to me as I am not involved in commerce for the fictional corporation of government, I can perform that function if I have a valid driver's license (as any agent of a government is granted the benefit of using the common use roads and must apply for permission of each living individual of each local community to use those road, that have been paid for by that community, and so they should be licensed, the license they grant themselves is not valid and even more invalid is any license they attempt to impose on free living inventive, premeditating soul (inventivum anima)), but unless specifically performing that function as an agent of a fiction I need no license and am not bound by any regulation of traffic acts to drive upon a common use road, for my actions in reciprocal responsibility I hold full liability, and I am bound by that duty of care, and the axioms of the land to establish competence in all activities that are a potential danger to those around me, binding upon me through a reciprocal obligation and responsibility. To establish a duty of care within a cooperative car assurance bond, being a cooperative based alternative to the corporate car insurance structure, allows those around you to identify you for any action that causes injury or loss, while protecting you from financial hardship, when binding yourself to a unilateral agreement of safe highway use, which could be as a prerequisite of the protection of cooperative car assurance, you are demonstrating practically your intention to act within a duty of care for those around you, and in the spirit of accountability you are identifying any vehicle driven by the assured with the unique bond number of that cooperative assurance protection. Example: If a car is driven after the driver had been drinking alcohol heavily, but it was driven without incident or demonstrating dangerous road use that

instilled fear in those around them, they have committed no actionable tort (wrongful act), as they have caused no injury to another tangible being, however they have failed in demonstrating a good manner of conduct, showing contempt for the safety of those around them, however only if there is a victim can relief be sort. The unilateral bond of the assurance cooperative does however give an option of recourse, in that the cooperative group can be informed of such dangerous actions, and the signed unilateral bond can be applied upon the drunkard within that collective, as detailed within the signed bond. In other words, the bond states you will not drive while drunk, and if you do, even without incident, then you bind yourself to a penalty as detailed with the bond. The act of being wilfully incompetent to drive would be viewed as a premeditated and wilful tort when inflicted upon another; the victim would receive full substantive relief with maximum relief awarded to any victim or recipient. We are each fully accountable for our actions, so if the heavily drunk driver caused the death of another, the substantive relief would be viewed as premeditated murder, as they drank with the intention of driving while severely impairing their ability to drive safely, from their own self-inflicted drunkenness, this utter disregard for the duty of care makes the act premeditated, and leaves them fully accountable for their actions. The choice of the individual to drive while incompetent is an internal process, free, and spontaneous it separates one free choice from another, and that free choice is manifest without compulsion, so constituting both premeditated intention and wilful contempt for those around them. Example: If a house is constructed that is unsafe and then sold without making its unsafe condition known before purchase to another, that is a tort, they are entitled to a duty of care in construction commensurate with diligent standards. By placing this home into the stream of trade, the builder or bonded cooperative group of builders owes a duty of care to those who will use the product, so as to render accountable all negligence in workmanship. Duty of care beyond reciprocation

• We have enslaved the rest of the animal creation and have treated our distant cousins in fur and features so badly that beyond doubt, if they were able to formulate a religion, they would depict the Devil in human form.

• William Ralph Inge We have a duty of care towards life itself, as we exist symbiotically within an eco-system, rights are a grant from a superior to an inferior, animals need only one right: the right not to be property, animals are unable to enter into a social written, witnessed agreement or make moral choices, and cannot seek relief in arbitration directly, for that reason cannot be regarded as possessors of rights that can be defended or established by them independently. All life is allodial, therefore no animal can be owned, only the labour invested in the animal has value the animal is the property of the Creator, the right of the animal not to endure the suffering of pain or distress from the hand of a soul that knows with empathy of the suffering inflicted, is unalienable and immutable to all animal life, we have an indisputable duty of care, as we exist in a higher conscious state.

• If you have men that will exclude any of the Creators creatures from the shelter of compassion and pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow man.

• Francis of Assisi The idea can be extended if one desired, beyond the inherent duty of care

• The time will come when men such as I will look upon the murder of animals as they now look on the murder of men.

• Leonardo Da Vinci It would be a tort to sell food to another that was proven to be poisonous, polluted, toxic or detrimental to the health of the buyer.

• If organic farming is the natural way, shouldn't organic produce just be called "produce" and make the pesky laden stuff take the burden of an adjective?

• Ymber Delecto Therefore to sell food containing excite-toxins like, monosodium glutamate, aspartame, saccharine, etc.; or genetically modified plants that contain unnatural elements such as almost all wheat, and GM corn, etc.; or commercially farmed milk when pasteurised and containing antibiotics, faeces, unnatural levels of hormones, and having all remaining value destroyed through pasteurisation; or any food containing harmful chemicals such as pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, unnatural toxic colourants, flavouring, preservatives, irradiation, etc.; or cooked using microwaves, cannot be sold without breaking the duty of care incumbent upon all. Duty of Care Trading Declaration Take care of yourself A duty of care is not a part of any fictional construct of social protection in the sense of an obligation of any other to take care of you in a practical sense; it is not the fiction of societies job, or the fiction of governments job, or the fiction of Wall Street's job, to "take care of you", that's your duty of care is protection from wrongful actions suffered, not an obligation for any other to provide for you.