

## PROCEDURE FROM A PRINCIPLE—PART II

Other errors follow on the confusion between *the natural* and *the voluntary*.

### *Society derives from Human Will*

The idea that men are social by a sort of contract is found in the thought of the Enlightenment thinker Rousseau (1712-78) who contended, against the Catholic Church's view, based on divine revelation and a sound grasp of reality (that man's nature is fundamentally flawed), that man was good by nature and only came to be corrupted by civilisation. This idea which gave impetus to the pseudo-religion called Freemasonry, not only misunderstood nature but elevated human will beyond its station. Men are social *by nature*, not because they will to socialise—though whether one should submit to the impulse in particular circumstances is a matter of will. Society is a *natural* institution whose impetus is implanted in man for the sake of his mental and physical health. But if you deny the implanter, it is inevitable that you will come to deny what is implanted. With loss of belief in God comes a rejection of *the natural* in favour of an influence no one denies, human will (*the voluntary*).

It will be said that this asserted rejection of nature cannot be true because we are all immersed in nature. But nature gets its essence from what is *formal* in it, not from what is material. (Matter can be anything : it is the formal that makes a thing be what it is.) No one rejects the material in nature. But the majority reject what is formal in it. The progress (regress !?!) noted in our fifth lesson applies here too. The order is—

GOD → NATURE → END

The rejection of God—

GOD → NATURE → END

quickly becomes this—

GOD → NATURE → END

and ends with this—

GOD → NATURE → END



*Jean Jacques Rousseau*

Reject God and you will reject the essence of his handmaid, nature, and, what derives from its essence, natural principle. If there is no natural principle which renders man a social being, it remains that his social inclination must be derived from human will.

There are further consequences.

#### *Error over the Source of Society's Authority*

There are three basic forms of government, *monarchy*, *oligarchy* and *democracy*—i.e., government by one man, by a group of men, or (theoretically) by the whole populace through representatives. Current *political correctness* maintains that, of these, democracy is the only acceptable form of government. Why? Well, one could hardly accept that a monarch gets his authority from the people he governs—for often he will order that which a majority do *not* want. Similarly with an oligarchy. With democracy, however, one may foster the illusion that the authority to govern comes from the people themselves.

No man gives himself authority. It is given him as existence and *quiddity* are given him. I did not bring myself into existence; I do not keep myself in existence; I did not choose to come into the world as man rather than monkey, donkey or turkey. When St Paul wrote "All authority on earth comes from God" (*Romans 13 : 1*) he was simply expressing natural principle. Now what is said of the individual must be said equally of society, for society is, after all, nothing but a collection of men.

The historical parochialism characteristic of the modern world leads its citizens to think themselves wiser than the generations who have preceded them. But the embrace of democracy over other forms of government is simply a consequence of their rejection of that on which their own nature and existence depend, Divine authority.

In societies like those of France and the United States of America established on Masonic protocols, the members think they are justified in claiming that their nation's authority derives from the people themselves. (It's a bit liking saying a man can pull himself up off the earth by his bootstraps.) God is reduced to a cypher, rendered lip service. In any country associated with the British Commonwealth of nations, a criminal prosecution is brought in the name of the Queen, as in *Regina v. Brown*, where the Queen stands in the place of the source of the state's authority, Almighty God. In the United States a similar prosecution is styled *The People v. Brown* !

#### *Error over the Education of Children*

Who has the right to educate children? Is it—  
the local council?  
the parents?  
the local public school?  
the local private school?  
the Catholic Church?

The issue is solved by a careful consideration of the relevant principle. Men and women were producing children long before there existed any such thing as local governments, schools, states or even the Catholic Church. Children are *natural* effects of the union of man and woman in marriage. To whom, then, do children belong? To their parents, upon whom the *natural* duty devolves not only

to nourish and protect them but to educate them. A child belongs to its parents until he or she has reached the level of maturity to be *sui juris*, literally 'of his own law', or 'a law to himself'.

Thus, the right to educate arises from nature, *the natural*, not from human will, *the voluntary*. Let us spell it out clearly. The following institutions *have no right* to educate children—

the local council,  
the local public school,  
the local private school,  
the Catholic Church.

The parents may decide to employ one of these entities to do the job for them, but it is *the parents' rights* the entity will be exercising, not a right of its own. The assertion that it is the state that has the right to educate children is grounded in Masonic protocols (which derive from the Protestant error), protocols based on rejection of God's authority in favour of man, a claim made by all governments that reject God's authority. The National Socialists of Nazi Germany, Communists in Russia, and governments whose perceptions are rooted in Masonic principle, all participate in the error. There are evils, injustices, that flow from this original error, the first of which is education funding.

#### *Funding Education*

Contrary to belief, there is no such thing as "free education". All education costs money and effort. The slogan "free education" derives from error promoted by those who rely on school systems "funded by" government which is grounded in the fallacy that government obtains its funds from some natural source freely available, rather than from the earnings of the country's citizens. (Note again here the confusion of *the natural* with *the voluntary*). Now, if parents have the right to educate their children, they are entitled not to be deprived of the means with which to educate them. In the modern setting this means they ought be exempt from taxes which deprive them of those means. Where the injustice rooted in the fallacy of "free education" operates, not only must parents who choose to educate their children as they choose (which is their right) pay for that education through their own earnings, they are compelled to pay, through their taxes, for the education of children of those who rely on the "free education" provided by government.

#### *Indoctrination*

One of the perils that attend the entrusting by parents of their child to a teacher is largely hidden. Every man's intellect is accompanied by the intellect's proper appetite, will, and no man makes choices except by his will. It follows that no teacher approaches the task of assisting in the education of his charges in a moral vacuum. He passes to his pupils something of his own world-view, his own philosophy. Thus, there is *no education without indoctrination*.

The doctrine so conveyed may be good, or evil. In most cases it will be a mix. In most schools the doctrine conveyed will be one endorsed by the movers of society passed on via public and social media. In the absence of an objective influence reflecting man's nobility and his ultimate end the doctrine will be derived from popular opinion. Such is the dearth of sound thinking in the modern world, indoctrination is bound to be informed by a blend of ideologies such as feminism, materialism, evolutionism, subjectivism and hedonism. Parents who appreciate this problem may think it worth the effort to educate their children themselves to save them from ingesting these false ideas.

---