

**PMS 2012**

I know that some people say the idea of Law of Nature or decent behavior known to all men is unsound because different civilizations and different ages have had quite different moralities. But they haven't. They have only had slightly different moralities. Just think what a quite different morality would mean. Think of a country where people were admired for running away in a battle, or where a man felt proud for double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might as well try to imagine a country where two and two made five. Men have differed as regards what people you ought to be unselfish to – whether it was your own family, or your fellow countrymen, or everymen. But they have always agreed that you ought not to put yourself first. Selfishness has never been admired. We believe in the Law of Nature. If we do not believe in the Law of Nature, why should we be so anxious to make excuses for not having behaved decently? The truth is, we believe in decency so much – we feel the Rule of Law pressing so much – that we can't bear to face the fact that we are breaking it, and consequently we try to shift the responsibility. For you notice that it is only for our bad behavior that we find all these explanations. We put our bad temper down to being tired or worries or hungry; we put our good temper to ourselves.

# Law of nature and human behavior

Law of nature varies from culture to culture and people to people. In fact, people are distinguished for the nature of selfishness and unselfishness in every aspect. All advocacy is for unselfishness; hence, selfishness is never praised. Every person encourages law of nature as it influences him for his good or bad doings. Resultantly, all excuses and cites are for his own attitude rather law. Thus, a person feels anxious due to his own ill-temper, while he hides his good-behavior for himself.