



CHAPTER 18 | Law and Justice

Law is the system of rules and regulations applicable between persons or organisations in civil or commercial matters or between persons and public authorities. Justice fairness, the principle of moral rightness; decency is not objective. Justice is subjective and based on personal, religious or political morality. The term justice from a legal perspective is in fact another word for revenge, but with a sauce of morality. Harmony and conflict are each other's opposites. A conflict usually originates from a difference of opinion. Opinion is a belief of conclusion held with confidence but not substantiated by positive knowledge or proof. An opinion is therefore also subjective. People can think differently about certain things. The opinion of one is not better or worse than the opinion of the other. As said before, moral superiority does not exist. After all, everyone looks at the subject from their own perspective. A difference of opinion about matters whose characteristics can be established objectively, i.e. empirically and factually, is not tenable for long. A wall is either horizontally bricked or not. A difference of opinion with the contractor about this cannot exist for long. Conflicts about a certain factual situation (an agreed result) can therefore be resolved reasonably easily through the intervention of one or more experts. There are also conflicts where the differences cannot be resolved in this way. This mainly concerns conflicts that originate from accusations made by one party against the other. Disputes between employer and employee concerning the functioning of the employee are a good example of this. But reproaches against parties who have to make a certain effort, such as lawyers, doctors, accountants and other service providers, also fall under this category. These conflicts can result in protracted disputes because the reproaches made by the parties to each other are subjective in nature and cannot easily be determined factually. In such cases, individuals have a tendency to keep on sticking to their own views. It testifies of wisdom if parties are prepared to come out of the trenches and reach an amicable settlement through discussions, with or without the help of a mediator. The truth usually lies somewhere in the middle. All parties would do well to understand that they have a joint responsibility for the situation that has arisen. In the first place because they have entered into a voluntary relationship with each other. The second reason is that any person with common sense is able to see in advance all the possible consequences of an upcoming relationship, be it in business or in private. In other words, most people are able to weigh the benefits, but also the risks, against each other. If the risk materialises at any point in time, then this should not come as a surprise. Of course, the parties can also appeal to a judicial or arbitral decision. This does, however, mean that control over the outcome of the conflict is relinquished. The reasons for letting it come this far usually originate from (again) the thinking and ego of (one of) the parties. One of the parties wants to 'be right' at the expense of the other and believes that they have convincing arguments for doing so, which the court will follow. This conviction is an expression of naivety and is mainly based on hope. When a third party is asked to give an opinion on a dispute, none of the parties have



any influence on the outcome. As much as they would like to. On your path to consciousness, conflicts can be seen as a message from the soul. They are experiences based on choices made in the past and the motives behind them. The purity of the motive is reflected in the nature and extent of the conflict a person is confronted with. A conflict with another person has an inner origin and gives you the opportunity to learn more about yourself.