

"Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWollfe's Politics

The Urth list — 9 messages, 5 voices, 02 Apr 2009

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5393>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Son of Witz — 02 Apr 2009, 19:08

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."

It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it was

a

dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing,

Master."

"You were always the most careless of my boys," he told me, and fell silent.

A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy would occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."

"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes all governance. Now list the seven sorts."

"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline or other sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state. Attachment to a code legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only. Attachment to a greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law. Attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."

"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the highest?"

"The development is in the order given, Master," I said. "But I do not recall that you ever asked before which was highest?"

Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter than the coals of the fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"

"The last, Master?"

"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal?"

"Yes, Master."

"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to the Divine Entity?"

I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but if so, my mind was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its thought. Instead, I became profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky above my face in all its grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit, and to be presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as upon a woman, and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as admirable as crystal and as fluid as wine.

"Answer me, Severian."

"The first, if I have any."

"To the person of the monarch?"

"Yes, because there is no succession."

"The animal that rests beside you now would die for you. Of what kind is his attachment to you?"

"The first?"

.....
ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current situation?
Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.

"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance. Are the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a Divine Ruler...

You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus Myth, this idea

of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if that's right, but it's

something that seems to come up in various traditions. Anyway, While anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar rule, if it could be

proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming God's mandate.

anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best system jibe with

reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval' from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious right position (maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away democracy in favor

of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely ideal" when it hinges

upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm trying to understand how this

can be considered the highest state of governance in a practical, non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

brunians at brunians.org — 02 Apr 2009, 19:11 · in reply to Son of Witz

You'll thank me even more after you read them, and also embarrass yourself less when you choose to discuss these matters.

.

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."

It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it was

a

dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing, Master."

"You were always the most careless of my boys," he told me, and fell silent.

A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy would

occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."

"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes

all governance. Now list the seven sorts."

"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline or

other

sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state. Attachment to a

code

legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only.

Attachment

to a
greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law.
Attachment
to
an
abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies
giving
rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."
"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the
highest?"
"The development is in the order given, Master," I said. "But I do
not
recall
that you ever asked before which was highest?"
Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter than the
coals
of the
fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"
"The last, Master?"
"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the
body
of
electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other
elements,
largely ideal?"
"Yes, Master."
"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to the Divine
Entity?"
I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but if so, my
mind
was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its thought.
Instead,
I
became
profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky above my face
in
all
its
grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit, and to be
presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as upon a
woman,
and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as admirable as
crystal
and as fluid as wine.
"Answer me, Severian."
"The first, if I have any."
"To the person of the monarch?"
"Yes, because there is no succession."
"The animal that rests beside you now would die for you. Of what kind
is
his
attachment to you?"
"The first?"
.....

ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current situation?
Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.
"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance.
Are
the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a Divine Ruler...
You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus Myth, this idea
of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if that's right, but it's
something that seems to come up in various traditions. Anyway, While
anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar rule, if it could be
proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming God's mandate.
anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best system jibe
with
reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval' from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious right position
(maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away democracy in
favor
of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely ideal" when it
hinges
upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm trying to understand how
this
can be considered the highest state of governance in a practical,
non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

John Watkins — 02 Apr 2009, 19:12 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Is this called for? Son of Witz asked a sincere question.

On Thu, Apr 2, 2009 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
You'll thank me even more after you read them, and also embarrass yourself
less when you choose to discuss these matters.

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."
It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it was
a
dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing, Master."
"You were always the most careless of my boys," he told me, and fell silent.
A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy
would
occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."
"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes
all governance. Now list the seven sorts."
"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline or
other
sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state. Attachment to a
code

legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only.
Attachment
to a
greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law.
Attachment
to
an
abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies
giving
rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."
"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the
highest?"
"The development is in the order given, Master," I said. "But I do
not
recall
that you ever asked before which was highest?"
Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter than the
coals
of the
fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"
"The last, Master?"
"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the
body
of
electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other
elements,
largely ideal?"
"Yes, Master."
"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to the Divine
Entity?"
I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but if so, my
mind
was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its thought.
Instead,
I
became
profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky above my face
in
all
its
grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit, and to be
presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as upon a
woman,
and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as admirable as
crystal
and as fluid as wine.
"Answer me, Severian."
"The first, if I have any."
"To the person of the monarch?"
"Yes, because there is no succession."
"The animal that rests beside you now would die for you. Of what kind
is
his
attachment to you?"
"The first?"

.. ..

ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current situation?
Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.
"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance.
Are
the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a Divine Ruler...
You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus Myth, this idea
of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if that's right, but it's
something that seems to come up in various traditions. Anyway, While
anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar rule, if it could
be
proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming God's mandate.
anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best system jibe
with
reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval' from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious right position
(maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away democracy in
favor
of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely ideal" when it
hinges
upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm trying to understand how
this
can be considered the highest state of governance in a practical,
non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

Jordon Flato — 02 Apr 2009, 19:17 · in reply to John Watkins

For someone who continually tries to intimate that they maintain a civil level of discourse on these matters, you nearly always come off as horribly condescending, brunians, truly. I say this not to be rude, but to point out something that is patently obvious to most on this board, I think. It's something to examine, I think.

On Thu, Apr 2, 2009 at 12:12 PM, John Watkins <john.watkins04 at gmail.com> wrote:
Is this called for? Son of Witz asked a sincere question.

On Thu, Apr 2, 2009 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

You'll thank me even more after you read them, and also embarrass yourself less when you choose to discuss these matters.

.

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

.....
"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."
It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it was a dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing, Master."
"You were always the most careless of my boys," he told me, and fell silent.
A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy would

occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."
"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes all governance. Now list the seven sorts."
"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline or other sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state. Attachment to a code legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only. Attachment to a greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law. Attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."
"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the highest?"
"The development is in the order given, Master," I said. "But I do not recall that you ever asked before which was highest?"
Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter than the coals of the fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"
"The last, Master?"
"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal?"
"Yes, Master."
"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to the Divine Entity?"
I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but if so, my mind was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its thought. Instead, I became profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky above my face in all its grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit, and to be presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as upon a woman, and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as admirable as crystal and as fluid as wine.

"Answer me, Severian."

"The first, if I have any."

"To the person of the monarch?"

"Yes, because there is no succession."

"The animal that rests beside you now would die for you. Of what kind

is

his

attachment to you?"

"The first?"

|||||

ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current situation?

Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.

"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance.

Are

the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a Divine Ruler...

You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus Myth, this idea

of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if that's right, but it's

something that seems to come up in various traditions. Anyway, While

anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar rule, if it could

be

proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming God's mandate.

anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best system jibe with

reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval' from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious right position (maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away democracy in favor

of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely ideal" when it hinges

upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm trying to understand how this

can be considered the highest state of governance in a practical, non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

Fred Kiesche — 02 Apr 2009, 19:32 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Glad to see that we are once again at the level of "civil discourse".

F.P. Kiesche III

"Ah Mr. Gibbon, another damned, fat, square book. Always, scribble, scribble, scribble, eh?"
(The Duke of Gloucester, on being presented with Volume 2 of The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.) Blogging at The Lensman's Children and TexasBestGrok!

--- On Thu, 4/2/09, brunians at brunians.org <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

From: brunians at brunians.org <brunians at brunians.org>
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolllfe's Politics To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Thursday, April 2, 2009, 3:11 PM

You'll thank me even more after you read them, and also embarrass yourself less when you choose to discuss these matters.

.

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM
To: 'The Urth Mailing List'
Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

.....

"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."
It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it was a dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing, Master."
"You were always the most careless of my boys,"

he told me, and fell

silent.
A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy would occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."
"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes all governance. Now list the seven sorts."
"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline or other sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state.

Attachment to

a code legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only.
Attachment to a greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law.
Attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."
"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the highest?"
"The development is in the order given, Master,"

I said. "But I do

not
recall
that you ever asked before which was highest?'
Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter
than the
coals
of the
fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"
"The last, Master?"
"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as
including the
body
of
electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous
other
elements,
largely ideal?"
"Yes, Master."
"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to
the Divine
Entity?"
I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but
if so, my
mind
was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its
thought.
Instead,
I
became
profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky
above my face
in
all
its
grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit,
and to be
presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as
upon a
woman,
and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as
admirable as
crystal
and as fluid as wine.
"Answer me, Severian."
"The first, if I have any."
"To the person of the monarch?"
"Yes, because there is no succession."
"The animal that rests beside you now would die for
you. Of what kind
is
his
attachment to you?"
"The first?"

.....
ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current
situation?

Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.
"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance.

Are
the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a
Divine
Ruler...

You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus
Myth, this
idea
of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if
that's right, but
it's
something that seems to come up in various traditions.

Anyway, While

anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar
rule, if it could
be
proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming
God's mandate.
anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best
system jibe
with
reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval'

from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious
right position
(maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away
democracy in
favor
of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely
ideal" when it
hinges
upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm
trying to understand how
this
can be considered the highest state of governance in a
practical,
non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

brunians at brunians.org — 02 Apr 2009, 19:52 · in reply to John Watkins

And I am sincerely trying to help.

.

Is this called for? Son of Witz asked a sincere question.

On Thu, Apr 2, 2009 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

You'll thank me even more after you read them, and also embarrass yourself

less when you choose to discuss these matters.

.

Thanks for your help there, Brunians. priceless.

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 11:05 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"GeneWolfe's Politics

OK, reread it and read the other three.

.

I read The Prince a LONG time ago...

~witz

-----Original Message-----

From: brunians at brunians.org [mailto:brunians at brunians.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2009 10:48 AM

To: 'The Urth Mailing List'

Subject: Re: (urth) "Principlesofgovernaaance"Gene Wolfe's Politics

Witz: go read Plato's "Republic", Aristotle's "Politics" and Niccolo Machiavelli's two works "Discourses On The First Ten Books Of Titus Livius" and "The Prince".

This will give you the vocabulary that you currently lack for discussing this kind of thing.

.

refresher quote, questions below:

SHADOW XXXII Five Legs:

=====

"Severian. Name for me the seven principles of governance."

It was an effort for me to speak, but I managed (in my dream, if it

was

a

dream)to say, "I do not recall that we have studied such a thing, Master."

"You were always the most careless of my boys," he told me, and fell silent.

A foreboding grew on me; I sensed that if I did not reply, some tragedy would

occur. At last I began weakly, "Anarchy . . ."

"That is not governance, but the lack of it. I taught you that it precedes

all governance. Now list the seven sorts."

"Attachment to the person of the monarch. Attachment to a bloodline

or

other

sequence of succession. Attachment to the royal state. Attachment to

a

code

legitimizing the governing state. Attachment to the law only.

Attachment

to a

greater or lesser board of electors, as framers of the law.

Attachment

to

an

abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies

giving

rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal."

"Tolerable. Of these, which is the earliest form, and which the highest?"
"The development is in the order given, Master," I said. "But I do not recall that you ever asked before which was highest?"
Master Malrubius leaned forward, his eyes burning brighter than the coals of the fire. "Which is highest, Severian?"
"The last, Master?"
"You mean attachment to an abstraction conceived as including the body of electors, other bodies giving rise to them, and numerous other elements, largely ideal?"
"Yes, Master."
"Of what kind, Severian, is your own attachment to the Divine Entity?"
I said nothing. It may have been that I was thinking; but if so, my mind was too much filled with sleep to be conscious of its thought. Instead, I became profoundly aware of my physical surroundings. The sky above my face in all its grandeur seemed to have been made solely for my benefit, and to be presented for my inspection now. I lay upon the ground as upon a woman, and the very air that surrounded me seemed a thing as admirable as crystal and as fluid as wine.
"Answer me, Severian."
"The first, if I have any."
"To the person of the monarch?"
"Yes, because there is no succession."
"The animal that rests beside you now would die for you. Of what kind is his attachment to you?"
"The first?"

ok, is the last one meant to be a joke about our current situation?
Abstraction, largely ideal.

maybe some conservatives can help me out here.
"Attachment to the person of the monarch"

On one hand, I don't understand how "Attachment to" is governance.
Are
the people attached, or is the governance attached?

Another question this brings up for me. This notion of a Divine Ruler...
You get it in the Grail myths, and I suppose in the Jesus Myth, this idea of bringing back the Divine King. I'm not sure if that's right, but it's something that seems to come up in various traditions. Anyway, While anyone could sort of get behind letting God's Vicar rule, if it could be proven. Yet we've had plenty of crappy rulers claiming God's mandate. anyway, How can this idea of a Monarch that is the best system jibe with reality lacking an unambiguous 'seal of approval' from God?

Let me rephrase? This seems like a sort of religious right position (maybe I'm totally wrong) So, would anyone toss away democracy in favor of a monarch? How can this notion not be "largely ideal" when it hinges upon the character of a single person?

I'm not sure if I'm making this clear. I'm trying to understand how this can be considered the highest state of governance in a practical, non-ideal world.

just asking...

~Witz

brunians at brunians.org — 02 Apr 2009, 20:02 · in reply to Jordon Flato

For someone who continually tries to intimate that they maintain a civil level of discourse on these matters, you nearly always come off as horribly condescending, brunians, truly. I say this not to be rude, but to point out something that is patently obvious to most on this board, I think. It's something to examine, I think.

Yeah, it's true.

Apparently it has something to do with my neurological architecture: I have Asberger's

syndrome or some other form of high functioning autism. It gets in the way sometimes, sometimes I think it is sort of cool.

I am also plenty arrogant, make no mistake, and often have to remind myself that I know almost nothing and am frequently wrong.

What I don't do is call people names, threaten people, or posture hostile emotions at them - or if I do I acknowledge in advance that I am wrong to do so, and if you point out a specific instance when I have done so I will apologize. That's what I mean by maintaining a civil discourse, basically.

Socrates and Henry Mencken are among my literary heros. What can I say?

But enough about me.

.

Jordon Flato — 02 Apr 2009, 20:07 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

It's the arrogance and condescension that I'm talking about, not threatening or anything. It did seem to be something you aren't really intentionally throwing out there. Good to know you are self aware about it.

I think telling someone they are embarrassing themselves by trying to engage in a discourse isn't civil, that's all.

On Thu, Apr 2, 2009 at 1:02 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
For someone who continually tries to intimate that they maintain a civil level of discourse on these matters, you nearly always come off as horribly condescending, brunians, truly. I say this not to be rude, but to point out something that is patently obvious to most on this board, I think. It's something to examine, I think.

Yeah, it's true.

Apparently it has something to do with my neurological architecture: I have Asberger's syndrome or some other form of high functioning autism. It gets in the way sometimes, sometimes I think it is sort of cool.

I am also plenty arrogant, make no mistake, and often have to remind myself that I know almost nothing and am frequently wrong.

What I don't do is call people names, threaten people, or posture hostile emotions at them - or if I do I acknowledge in advance that I am wrong to do so, and if you point out a specific instance when I have done so I will apologize. That's what I mean by maintaining a civil discourse, basically.

Socrates and Henry Mencken are among my literary heros. What can I say?

But enough about me.

.

brunians at brunians.org — 02 Apr 2009, 20:14 · in reply to Jordon Flato

It's the arrogance and condescension that I'm talking about, not threatening or anything. It did seem to be something you aren't really intentionally throwing out there. Good to know you are self aware about it.

I think telling someone they are embarrassing themselves by trying to engage in a discourse isn't civil, that's all.

It's memorable. You've read Cellini's Autobiography?

All Cretans are liars.

-- Epimenides the Cretan

.