

## **+E0003 - The Choice**

**Welcome to The Choice - I'm curt doolittle - this is Episode 3 - A Q&A: Catholicism, Trifunctionalism, and Natural Law.**

Questions.

- - -"My very serious questions, I think, are these:

1. Why doesn't Propertarianism promote Christianity?
2. How does Propertarianism account for the dignity of the human person by virtue of their potential for relationship with God versus their potential for advancing civilization?
3. I don't think Christianity is argued in the same way as any other faiths (moral baiting), like I tried to say, it is the unique and unrepeatable Christian response to suffering and relationship that really converts and 'saves souls'.
4. Christianity civilized the West and not the other way around. I don't understand the idea that early Christianity was another religion of warfare from within. Christianity was spread by its own blood, not the blood of others.
5. The Church was always meant to lead the state, not compete with it. Like I said, the latter was embedded in the former (even when it deviated from its philosophy in

practice)." - - -

Great Questions. Thank you.

To start off with, It is difficult to transition between Theological, Philosophical, and Legal-Scientific thought. This is because the 'tests' (theological obedience, philosophical choice, and legal-scientific decidability in matters of conflict) in each system of thought vary from wisdom to choice to necessity.

To think in terms of law and science means eliminating what is false and irreciprocal so only the true and reciprocal (good) remain. But the law does not determine the good - Only what is false and irreciprocal. The people must choose individually, by groups, by church, or by state what good they prefer. The court does not. This forces cooperation and exchange, and by consequence creates the civil society we all want OTHERS to create for us - even if we all want that society to bias in our favor. But the court is a purely via-negativa institution.

So while the theological world attempts to sculpt with clay, the legal-scientific world attempts to carve away stone. This difference between the positive and negative is a difficult transition for the faithful, just as the reverse is a difficult transition for the legal-scientific.

The difference between spiritual (emotional, imaginary,

and intuited) and material (intellectual, actionable, and observable) is well understood in the philosophical literature as the difference between experience and action. Experience and observation overlap but the Positive information from Experience, and the Negative information from Action are not the same. There is more 'felt' with experience than is observed. Both Faith and Science depend upon this difference. Faith to say 'there is more to life than the material', and law-Science 'there is means of settling conflict by the observable and material'.

Lastly, there is a difference between P-law (the natural law of sovereignty and reciprocity within the limits of proportionality) and my opinion. I have opinion. The law consists of what amount to 'proofs' of decidability under tests of sovereignty reciprocity and proportionality.

So don't confuse the law with my opinion.

---"Why *doesn't* Propertarianism promote Christianity?"--

That's not true. Law doesn't promote it prohibits. Science doesn't promote it explains. We explain why Jesus' teachings were true and an innovation. We state it in scientific terms. Christianity is compatible with natural law, extends natural law, and contributes to high trust commercial society with middle class majority ethics. As such Propertarianism makes other religions illegal because they are not compatible with natural law and Jesus' extension of natural law. So we don't necessarily promote Christianity we prohibit competitors. We do not

consider practicing heathen (love of nature and ancestors), pagan (love of heroes and archetypes), and christian (love of god) together as incompatible. We understand this as the evolution of religion from familial, to tribal to cultural to political - which is the evidence of the evolution of religion.

There are three sets of laws that God has shown us with evidence of his hand. The laws of nature, the natural law of reciprocity, and the evolutionary law of transcendence. Fundamentalist (literalist) Christianity is not compatible with Laws of Nature (science), and because of this, incompatible with the evolutionary law of Transcendence. The laws of nature are evidence of god's hand. So wherever religion is incompatible with God's hand then the men who wrote that religion erred. I seek to solve the problem of the incompatibility of religion with the evidence of God's hand. This leads one to the conclusion that the deists are right and jesus was right and the jews and muslims and church doctrinists were wrong - but wrong only because they were doing the best they could with the primitive knowledge of god's hand they had at the time.

The basics underlying christian faith (god, soul, jesus teachings, ten commandments as property rights, and devotion) are all compatible with the evidence of god's hand, in one way or another. And that doctrine does succeed in causing the faithful to \*behave\* in accordance with god's hand.

**--"How does Propertarianism account for the dignity of the human person by virtue of their potential for relationship with God versus their potential for advancing civilization?"---**

We say it in scientific terms: if you demonstrate by your actions that you follow the evidence of god's hand, and do not act counter to the evidence of gods hand then you are due dignity and respect - just as those who do not, do not deserve dignity and respect. However, your experience is not observable, only your actions. How you believe and feel is not observable and decidable by other than your actions. If you do not treat others as jesus would demand, then you are not christian regardless of what you feel and believe.

This means that if you hallucinate some fantasy that you are uniquely gifted with understanding jesus and god, it doesn't matter what you think if others observe your display word and deed and they are not. This is the danger of 'personal relationship with jesus and god'. Are you in fact a disciple of jesus or just another psychopath trying to find an excuse to act selfishly toward others?

There are many christians who use christianity as a means of doing nothing at all because others are not conforming to their demands. This is the ultimate selfishness, ultimate deceit, ultimately unchristian denial of jesus's teaching, and ultimate heresy. These people are not christian. They are evil in christian garb.

There are hundreds of christian sects and all that they share is some point on the spectrum between priority for the tyrannical god of the old testament semites that jesus tried to reform, and the loving god evident in jesus' behavior and teaching. Your faith is in your mind. But your behavior exists in this world with the rest of us and is observable. So in this sense, Propertarianism (God's natural law of sovereignty and reciprocity within the limits of proportionality) only judges your actions because no law can judge your mind, and each of us is notoriously bad at judging our own minds.

**---"1. I don't think Christianity is argued in the same way as any other faiths (moral baiting), like I tried to say, it is the unique and unrepeatable Christian response to suffering and relationship that really converts and 'saves souls'."---**

As an example, the presumption that man's soul needs saving is the creation of a false debt. You will live a better life, cause those around you to live a better life, by following the teachings of jesus, and thereby insulating yourself and others from the animal impulses within us all. If you do so you will save your soul from emotional suffering in this world and the next. To save yourself from physical suffering requires more than saving yourself from emotional suffering. That is where science, technology, and medicine provide what faith does not.

**---"2. Christianity civilized the West and not the other way around. I don't understand the idea that early**

**Christianity was another religion of warfare from within. Christianity was spread by its own blood, not the blood of others."---**

Why did christianity(a jewish heresy) spread among europeans, rabbinical judaism among jews, and islam (a christian heresy) among arabs and non-europeans?

Because of what these people were beforehand. It is simply not true that other than a tiny minority accepted christianity willingly. This is church mythos. In all cases it was imposed upon them by leaders who found political value in it, a useful tool for political control of people, and a literate administrative class in the priesthood to do so.

even during the high middle ages the documentary record looks a lot like "political correctness" is practiced today: the common people gave lip service, the urban people went along, and the upper classes virtue signaled, with a minority of purists truly devoted to the faith just like today. Those who write write history. Fortunately we have a lot of documentation from outside of the church and the writings of these people are decidedly 'medieval', right up until the enlightenment.

**---"3. The Church was always meant to lead the state, not compete with it. Like I said, the latter was embedded in the former (even when it deviated from its philosophy in practice)."**---

The church was forcibly imposed on europe by the greeks after they defeated rome and reconquered it, closed the schools, killed or outcast the philosophers, and destroyed

the arts, temples, literature, and knowledge of the greco-roman civilization. The purpose of the church was to prevent the restoration of roman (european) aristocracy.

Some monks in the north, particularly ireland, worked to save what little knowledge remained in europe. Some middle easterners saved the work of some of the greeks and romans. Then destroyed the rest with the muslim conquest.

The problem was that the church was far more corrupt than the state it sought to replace. So after the institution of the church we had the monastic movement to defend the people from the church, then the protestant reformation to defend people from the church. The renaissance reformation and scientific revolution to escape the corruption of the church.

Jesus was a gift from god. He was the only christian. American Evangelical Protestantism the closest religion to the one Jesus imagined, and the church as a political institution the farthest thing from the one he would have imagined. So the church failed in the early medieval period. It failed in the igh medieval period. It was punished in the restoration of european civilization. And in the 19th Century it failed again in response to discoveries of science. And it has been destroyed by the marxist-postmodernist-feminist revolution against both christianity and aristocracy. And it wasn't until the middle of the 20th that protestant evangelicals finally cast off the corruption of the church, and returned christianity to a religion of the people, by the people, in imitation of jesus



christ. I have seen evangelical preachers take christianity even closer to its roots by teaching christianity as an intuitive more emotional close relation to our ancient religion of stoicism, and our scientific understanding of cognitive behavioral therapy.

My view of christianity is an attempt to use jesus teachings to create an institution of governance and oppression, where jesus was trying to lift poor ignorant people out of tribalism, so that they were not a permanent underclass taken advantage of by usurers and tyrants, by loving each other as the greatest resistance movement against tyranny whether familial, tribal, national, or imperial in human history.

So I am personally hostile to 'Church-ianity' but I consider myself a christian who seeks to follow the teachings of jesus christ: "Love thy neighbor".

I am not sure anything else is required. There are five principles buried in christian teaching. Every one of them is reducible to "love thy neighbor and thy conscience shall be free." That's it.

=====

**—"Thank you Curt for your in-depth responses. I think my opinions here are generally representative of intellectual Catholicism today and throughout history, so finding reconciliation in our views is important. Not**

**to say that I am the one to do that, but I do want to do what I can. I personally need to have some more clarity about Propertarianism, before I can comfortably sell it to the Catholics and Christians in my circles. That doesn't require us to entirely agree, just to be clear about the greater or lesser significance of our differences."**—

Two quick points to anchor the conversation before I respond.

It's not going to take one of us to reconcile differences in western civilization, it's going to take a LOT of us searching for some compromise that satisfies if not pleases enough of us to save our civilization regardless of our differences.

Propertarianism is a brand name that we use for our strictly constructed version of natural law. Natural law is as old as western man, was discussed by Aristotle, by Catholic scholastics, by the enlightenment, and through the 19th century before being undermined by the postwar French, Jewish, and Russian, and now muslim attack on western civilization.

As for agreeing I'm pretty desperate to make that happen.

But, all we must agree on is the following:

- The west has always practiced trifunctionalism: A

division of leadership between Military, Law, and Priesthood. Our success is in part due to the continuous equilibrium produced by Our military Generals, our Legal Jurists, and our Religious Priests (with competition by the philosophers against all of us).

- We have practiced Heathen (hearth, nature), Pagan (Heroes, Archetypes), and Christian (Savior and Saints) Religions. Just as some of us favor military or law or priesthood, some of us favor Heroes (military), Hearth (law), and Christian (religion) - and we differ only in the priority by which we pay our debts to Heroes, Nature, and God, Prophet, and Saints. To claim otherwise is to engage in irreciprocity. In other words, there is no religious exemption for war. And there is no heathen or pagan exemption from christian love.

- We resolve our differences by the laws of nature, the natural law of man, the christian law of love, and the evolutionary law of transcendence.

- Christian charity must be demonstrated by the individual not devolved to others or to the state as a means of the individual escaping his christian obligations that his salvation come at his cost.

- Christian satisfaction like free market profits, may never be obtained at the expense of kin, nation, and civilization. (i.e.: immigration.)

That's as far as the laws requirements extend. That's it.

**—"If we are talking about rebuilding Western Civ. we need more than the negative precepts, we need an overarching religious orientation as well. We need to know what we are moving towards (the positive) as well as what we are trying to prevent (the negative). The positive Truth of our ultimate destiny has to be the leader in order to give discernment to the meaning and usefulness of those negative truths of law and science. "—**

Agreed, but in legal tradition "my name is Caesar" so to speak, and as caesar, I only resolve disputes, so I only do law and war - the negative. I only know what we may not do. Anything that does not make war or violate the law is good. It is up to the faithful to determine which of the infinite goods they choose. My only religious concern is to preserve all three religious traditions since intellectual, normative, and formal religion are demanded by our people. There is non need for unity in 'going forward' or in 'good' other than those stated above.

**—"Christianity is a logical axiom, the very first principle, not a separate realm of experience. This was an essential element of our original American experiment, however subdued in the documents and the persons."—**

Axioms are arbitrarily made up. Laws are discovered as extend in the universe. So that statement doesn't mean what you think it does.

That said, you're positing is a christian argument that every other faction would disagree with. It's a bias. And it isn't true. As a member of the founding families, and the son of puritans, I am well aware of the history of the country and the shifting nature of religion between the different regions of the country. And the classes that populated the different regions of the country. The middle class English and dutch, the agrarian germans, and the underclass scotts irish still practice their ancestral distribution of attention between faith reason and science.

The settlers were puritans - anti church and anti-aristocracy, and the founders were deists and sons of the enlightenment, and the founders saw the church as 'something the common people needed'.

This is a paternal understanding of religion not an experiential one. Otherwise Jefferson would not have written the Jefferson bible, as the philosophy of jesus, and not as a work of mysticism. For a deist, jesus is a philosopher that stands besides Archimedes, Aristotle, plato, Epicurus, - all aristocratic religions - with Jesus providing a solution for the poor that was more respectable, and more suitable to their independence, than the hedonistic license the poor were granted as slaves during pagan festivals. Where pagan festivals were in fact means of keeping the underclasses in their place, christianity gave them peerage. Unfortunately, the east, in jewish tradition of using the female conflict strategy,

worked to make christianity a religion of conquest by undermining, with which to destroy the aristocracy rather than for the poor to join it in peerage.

So, today, we have scientists, traditionalists, deists, and the faithful, and the only thing they need to share is the laws of nature, the natural law of man, christian love, and the evolutionary law of transcendence. We do not need to act as a herd - monopoly makes a people weak - we need to satisfy the needs of the different groups of people who feel, experience, imagine, and think, in emotional, intuitionistic, rational, traditional (habitual), and scientific (empirical) terms. We are no longer a continent of illiterate underclasses. our people cover the spectrum. The law mediates markets. The law requires the four laws I stated. Then each group can work together and toward those ends.

Those laws are the only laws we can see evident in the hand of god. They cannot be false. In the choice between the words of men, and the hand of god, it is the hand of god that does not err. Laws of nature, natural law, christian love, and evolutionary law.

It is a crime to require others obey gods laws on your terms just as much as it is a crime for others to ask you to obey gods laws on theirs. If we all obey those laws, the means by which we explain to ourselves why we do, is immaterial unless you violate one of gods laws, the natural law, by demand for irreciprocity - that others adapt to your method.

**—"I am familiar (though somewhat removed of late) with the historical conversation about the overlap and distinction between philosophy and theology."—**

Platonic Philosophy, or literary philosophy, denies the supernatural and replaces it with idealism - abstractions, like triangles and squares are abstractions. Theology does not use abstractions but fictional characters, archetypes and parables. Both philosophy and theology rely on scriptural or textual interpretation and internal consistency and if possible non contradiction. Science relies on action, observation and external correspondence instead of internal consistency of linguistic statements, or the internal consistency of sets of myths and parables. In simple terms, it is easiest to understand and incorporate narratives, harder to use reason and non contradiction, and much harder to use experimentation, action, observation, and tests of correspondence. So this means that social ideas are better conveyed by emotional and parable means at an early age; argument in young adulthood by textual means; and experimentation in adulthood when one has underlying knowledge, the time, and the resources to conduct those experiments. So we can increase precision from parable, to reason, to empiricism if possible, and we can gracefully fall back from empiricism, reason, to parable if we lack sufficient information.

**—"There are different views, but the Catholic position**

**is essentially one of illumination. Reason and science are illuminated (expanded and telescoped) by Faith in Christ. At the same time, there is an absolute necessity to Faith that doesn't exist for reason and science, as in the case of the intellectually handicapped who can still have a relationship with the Absolute. I can't get onboard with a philosophical system that doesn't give these people a place to exist and contribute in this world."**—

Sure. I would say this differently because I am a scientist: that without faith that Jesus' teachings will produce the means and ends we believe they do, that other information may be misunderstood and what we learn from those things is very likely to violate Jesus' teachings and his demand for Christian love. So, that's the empirical vs experiential description of the same phenomenon. And it has to be. It is absolutely impossible for some of us to feel what the faithful do, just as it is absolutely impossible for the faithful to tolerate what they cannot feel. We cannot ask each other to adopt our different forms of sense-blindness. And that is what the faithful as well as the atheists try to do: demand others adhere to their version of sense-blindness.

I want Christianity as a whole, as a set of sects, restored as the state religion because without that we have learned that other religions undermine our trifunctional religion, law, and military from within using false religions, false promises, and violations of evolutionary law, natural law and Christian love.



I just also want to restore the right to celebrate our heathen religions. As far as I can tell the roman and greek religions are lost to us. The Celtic, germanic, nordic, baltic, slavic and finnic are not. These religions restore war and nature (the material world). And if we don't do that, christianity will die as well. Since it is dying rather rapidly at the moment, and Catholicism fastest of all. In other words I agree with the need for religion, I agree with the need for a positive aspiration, I disagree that it is or ever was possible for an advanced civilization to fail to supply the philosophy and strategy in any religion suitable to the needs of the people.

Next I sort of want to rub your nose in something. What strategy does monotheistic religion use? It doesn't use 'where are we going'. Instead it uses 'I won't go along, and I will undermine'. This is the female strategy of demand for her satisfaction in exchange for sex affection and care. This is the strategy of the christian religion. Co

**—"I do not know what the idea of evolutionary transcendence means? Is this like the theory of emergentism? Where is evolution transcending to exactly? I'm not convinced that deism and archetype/ancestor religions aren't incompatible with Christianity; the former faiths would have to be understood as mere psychological preferences and not propositions of objective truth."**—

Well, I can't help you there. The faithful can conflate truth and faith, but the rest of us understand that truth is independent of faith.

If instead, you mean that christ was correct in that we should all of us seek to imitate him and his teachings by the extension of familial love to extended kin, then yes - scientifically that is the optimum means of human cooperation - the optimum solution to the prisoner's dilemma of producing cooperation and trust.

So if you mean, jesus teachings are true, and that metaphorically christian - church - dogma is true if we place that demand for christian love above all other demands - then yes, that's true.

If you mean, as do the fundamentalists, that the Bible is literally true rather than parables - that's simply contrary to the variation in the testaments and the record of history.

It's not possible for scientific christians, traditional-normative christians, philosophical christians to conflate wisdom with truth as do theological christians. It's just not possible. That's why christianity is splitting into fundamentalists and secularists - just as I predicted - with fundamentalists returning Christianity to what Jesus intended as a folk religion independent of bureaucratic institutions.

This means that christianity has come full circle, and that we are seeing the last generation of churchianity, and that all that will remain is fundamentalist christianity as invented by american protestants.

It doesn't matter what I think. It matters what people do. It matters what is possible given what people do. And there is nothing that can stop this change. Because only a certain percentage of people will do it.

A government has to provide means to satisfy the needs of all people in a kin group, not just fundamentalists - especially when the evidence of fundamentalist civilizations is worse than democratic socialist secular civilizations.

My job is the law: to create a market between the sects of european religions, whether christian, pagan, heathen , traditional, or secular.

—"The doctrine of Original Sin is our only fortification against idolatry of whatever kind. The need for salvation is not a false debt, it is an obvious truth. Like you said, we need some insulation from animal instinct and that is what is meant by the battle between flesh (original man) and spirit (man reborn) in the NT. The redemption and rebirth begins with an acknowledgement of concupiscence or Original Sin, the acknowledgement that we are not yet good or true enough. Its not mere personal/psychological sin either because we know that we are social beings and can't be truly and finally free until each and every human

person is free with us. “—

Well, so lets talk some truth here.

First, the human brain evolves in two directions: the female, experiential and empathic, and the male, operational(action) and analytic. Each of us whether male or female in sex, develops a set of intuitions somewhere on that spectrum of male to female.

Secondly, as we develop, our brain evolved from back to front: from senses, to physical to social, to rational, to calculating, and if trained, to computing. So some of us are naturally more emotional, more physical, more social, more rational, or more empirical.

Thirdly, our brain is divided into two primary networks and one into multiple subnetworks. One of these networks controls whether we spend our time feeling, daydreaming, imagining, thinking, or reasoning. The other switches between identifying new episodes of memory and saving them by rehearsing them over and over again.

Fourth, between these three developmental axes, each of us finds a 'resting place' that we consider 'normal' or 'at rest' and in that place we experience a slightly different reality that is a mixture of masculine-political-and-physical-operational (the left longitudinal bias), feminine-interpersonal-and-emotional-empathic (the right and lateral bias). And this state of experience is how we assume others experience the world. Over time we sort to

communication, associate and cooperate with people who experience similar worlds with similar means of interpreting and judging the world.

Fifth, some of us develop better internal construction than others - the brain is a bit like a symphony and if anything gets out of tune, the music of experience starts sounding a little off, and eventually is just incomprehensible chaos. We call this intelligence, but that's an abstraction. Some of us for genetic, utero, developmental, and experiential reasons. This produces different need for degrees of rules from the very simple to the very abstract.

Sixth, some of us experience comfortable easy lives of health, good family, good friends, good circumstances, and no traumas, and some the opposite. So this produces different needs for different methods of mindfulness. The failure of religion, the failure to produce training in say, stoicism or cognitive behavioral therapy, and the decline of our family society economy government, and civilization are increasing demand for mindfulness and so demand is increasing but religion simply doesn't work except for a minority of the population.

So it's simply false that your intuition is universal. The evidence is that it isn't. The evidence even during the high Middle Ages is that it wasn't. It certainly wasn't during the enlightenment and it certainly isn't now. What you mean is you and those like you need this frame of

reference because it is the most effective means of grasping and living in the world you developed to sense, perceive, comprehend and act in.

We know why. We know that once people are exposed to markets for different paradigms that suit their mental experiences of the world, that they choose paradigms that are most advantageous to them and they choose to associate, cooperate, friend, marry, reside with, work with, and socialize with people who share those paradigms.

What you are asking for is that the world conform to you, not that you cooperate with christian love with others regardless of their paradigms and systems of understanding and experience. So to demand others satisfy you at their expense is a violation of christian law and violation of natural law.

**—"We need God because we know we aren't God and because God is necessary for existence. We need Jesus because we need that invitation to a loving relationship at an absolute level that only He can offer (through the gateway of God's Incarnation as one of us). We need the Christian Church in order to share that freedom with the world and protect it through time (by means of an unbroken tradition and leadership)."**—

Gods, Demigods, heroes, prophets, saints and

archetypes serve as the most intuitive method of comparison and calculation that is available to humans. Everything other than empathy, sympathy, and imitation is more demanding and requires more training than empathy sympathy, and imitation of archetypes.

To say we need god is clearly false. Those people like you need God. Others don't. (I do. I talk to my god every day.) The world is full of people who do not use or need god and are good people for the whole of their lives. There are billions who think the very idea is childish and live good lives every day. Muslim fundamentalists think they are good people and they are the most evil people on earth today - the most anti-civilizational force on the planet that every single civilization is fighting off just like we have been for 1400 years. But they have faith in their god and their religion - and that religion has done nothing but try to exterminate christianity - and every other religion- at every opportunity

Many of us, most of us, have that feeling of christ's or god's love without the need for external justification of it. Some of us are in families so full of love that the idea of needing more is incomprehensible.

And, like the Founding Fathers, one can just as easily rely on deism - the anthropomorphization of natural laws, the traditional law of sovereignty and reciprocity, noblesse oblige - the christian mandate to the aristocracy, and LOYALTY to christian commoners and the priesthood that cares for them, because we are already valuable in the

sexual, social, economic, political marketplace and need no substitute for that success. This is why christian ethics remain constant across the intellectual spectrum, and why faith remains constant across the intellectual spectrum, but the expression of that faith varies from unquestioning devotion, to questioning devotion, to ritual recitation because they believe it is good for them and others, to some sort of deism or spiritualism, and a purely scientific understanding that christianity is the optimum religion for converting poor people into good citizens in a civil society.

So, again, my job is the law, not faith. Faith and the good are up to you. Falsehood and Decidability are up to math, science, and law. The law cannot adjudicate differences of faith stated by man. It can only adjudicate differences the words and deeds of may by the evidence of gods hand, that we observe in physical, natural, christian, and evolutionary laws.

To stay on-message, I work for caesar - I resolve disputes so that people can move forward. That is the job of the law. The faithful, rational, and empirical may choose to argue what is best in whatever terms they wish. The job of the law is not to assert the positive. Nor is it to impose a singular positive frame for human experience. it is to prohibit the use of ignorance, error, bias, deceit, fraud, coercion, harm, and violence so that the faithful, the rational, and the empirical can cooperate by trade on those commons they share - not create a monopoly at the expense of the cognitive frame of others.



The faith is one player in the triumvirate of Military, Law, and Faith.

- There is no place for law in war, nor in faith - only in disputes between them.

- There is no place for faith in law or war - only in our consolation after them.

- There is no place for war, in law or faith - only in our defense of them.

This is our civilization. This has always been our civilization. For five thousand years. The jewish postwar attempt to create a state monopoly by abusing the law, ending the balance between military, law, and faith, is the cause of our failure to adapt to modernity preserving that relationship. And any christian attempt to repeat the actions of the postwar jews using the church is just as evil, as a military or legal monopoly.

And if you try to state otherwise you are the enemy of our people.

So. Trifunctionalism: War, Law, Faith. We Specialize.

And the market between us maintains our excellence.

Our excellence is in our ability to rapidly adapt to all change, sieze every opportunity, and invent every opportunity possible.

=====

I'm going to respond to questions from two people.

## THE BEAUTIFUL FEMININE VISION OF CHRISTIANS - AND HOW TO RESTORE IT TO THE MASCULINE

---"Hi Curt... I haven't done the deep dive into Propertarianism yet, but have watched a number of video's through John Mark's Youtube. I am more of a Theocracy based, Freedom to do good, Republic oriented person. But from what I have seen thus far... The proposed expression of Propertarianism can run in harmony with these ideals. Thanks for thinking outside the traditional boxes, and inside a practical and diverse people filled world!"--- George Reninger

Thanks. And thanks for being one of the few people that understands the difference between the freedom to do good (faith), and the constraint on doing bad (law). -hugs.

---"Thank you for the Affirmation Curt... I have a vision in me, to see the establishment of an Alliance, Like NATO, but among Individuals, Communities & Nations globally (Including Armies) that Covenantally affirm their alignment with the ONE God, His TWO Values of loving God & Neighbor, as well as His TEN governing Commandments regarding ownership affirmations,

boundaries & related reciprocities. This could form a "Life, Liberty & Property Grounded" Commonwealth of Nations!"---George Reninger

This is a beautiful vision.

It's a beautiful vision until you travel the world and meet people with influence, wealth, political, and military power, who have very different visions that are completely hostile to yours. The faithful like women, by design, live in an echo chamber - even when they travel the world.

I never, ever, ever, make the mistake that 'community of faith' scales beyond those who know one another personally. Just as female cognition fails beyond those who know one another personally, just as male cognition succeeds largely beyond those who know one another personally.

This goal of harmony is the same reason women fail in politics. It is why the church always failed as a political system, and why neither jews nor islam can produce a political system but why the jews remain dependent upon host populations just as females upon males. And why the muslims cannot organize anything beyond a family, or family business, a government other than tribal despots, or a military capable of other than small group acts of terrorism. The family, neighborhood, local church community, and village does not scale. Gods, evolution of us, divided the female and male cognition for reasons.

Because for every man like you that seeks consensus, peace and harmony - there are men like me who seek power, to bend man, beast, animal, plant, world and universe to our will.

And the moment people like you are marginally successful with your vision, the men like me in competing cultures, states, empires, and civilizations will conquer you for your folly. This ever has been and every will be.

Because God left us with these rules: the laws of nature, the natural law of man, the christian law of love, and the evolutionary law of transcendence.

There is no steady state. No condition of eternal peace. The faithful like the woman, seeks steady state free of competition. And steady state means you are just a human herd - food for the Red Queen of evolution, because you have forgotten, and denied, that God gave us the evolutionary law of transcendence, and set us in competition with one another, so that those of use who defied that law would be eradicated by those that obey that law.

In fact, I would make the rather obvious argument that the abrahamic faiths exist for the sole purpose of denying God's laws of transcendence - which is why jews accomplished noting until integrated into Aristotelian Empiricism of Europeans, and the muslims consumed and destroyed every civilization of the ancient world - and are now threatening to destroy ours.

Because christians like the female, share this violation of God's Law of Evolutionary Transcendence.

This denial of one of the four sets of god's laws is why christianity is failing among the educated classes and is devolving into a folk religion and has lost its chances - possibly forever - as a political religion.

Christianity will either adapt to the necessity of Trifunctionalism: the competitive compatibility between the military, the judicial, and the faith, or it will continue to be the cause of its decline, because it is too selfish to obey one of god's laws: the organized use of violence by the militia, to defend the faith, it's people, and the law that together are the only people on this earth who have transcended man out of superstition, ignorance, hard labor, poverty, starvation, disease, suffering, and the chaos of a natural world that has given us but twelve thousand years of respite, but otherwise has sought to exterminate us with regularity.

Love does not conquer all. Love serves only integrate the conquered into loving one another in conformity of gods laws revealed by god's hand - not scripture written by men. The unconquered are the enemy of our people, of our god, of god's law of transcendence, and as a consequence of mankind, and our destiny to sit at the hand of the father of us all.

Alice Says:

This is just a personal little thought-trail, but I thought it may add something. Love is capable of conquering all in the close-knit feminine realm. All in terms of self and self-development, in terms of family, and in terms of immediate community (assuming reciprocity of that love is granted). On the larger scales love must be replaced with respect, and respect itself is much harsher in judgement than love. Both enemies and friends must be respected, perceived in alignment with their proper place, and treated accordingly.

Next Cole asks the following questions:

....