

The Highest and Lowest

The Urth list — 4 messages, 4 voices, 06 Apr 2009

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5397>

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.

Ashley Crill — 06 Apr 2009, 07:19

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...

~WitzHere is how I understand Malrubius' teaching: The list of governments can be viewed as a circle where Monarchy is both the highest form of government and the lowest. Monarchy is highest when the monarch is good, it is lowest when the monarch is bad. Monarchy derives its character from the character of the monarch. This does mesh well with a "religious right" viewpoint, as you noted. A monarch appointed by the Divine would be a definitely good monarch. To my mind, a society ruled by an unselfish monarch who cares for the interest of his subjects has a lot of advantages over a democracy where politicians with unsavory motives pit one segment of the populace against another.

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Apr 2009, 07:54 · in reply to Ashley Crill

~WitzHere is how I understand Malrubius' teaching: The list of governments can be viewed as a circle where Monarchy is both the highest form of government and the lowest. Monarchy is highest when the monarch is good, it is lowest when the monarch is bad. Monarchy derives its character from the character of the monarch. This does mesh well with a "religious right" viewpoint, as you noted. A monarch appointed by the Divine would be a definitely good monarch.

If, and only if, what the Divine had in mind for that country would be perceived as good by its inhabitants.

If THAT Divine was up to something more ambiguous, well.....

.

Bob Miller — 06 Apr 2009, 11:10 · in reply to Ashley Crill

To my mind, a society ruled by an unselfish monarch who cares for the interest of his subjects has a lot of advantages over a democracy where politicians with unsavory motives pit one segment of the populace against another.

The probable subsumption of competence riding with good faith seems to me to be unwarranted. I truly believe the US's current mess is partly due to ideologues believing the nonsense they enacted/enforced. Due to the nature of this list I don't think an example is apropos. Rediscover Hotmail?: Now available on your iPhone or BlackBerry Check it out.

Stanislaus B. — 06 Apr 2009, 18:15 · in reply to Bob Miller

An HTML attachment was scrubbed...

URL: <<http://lists.urth.net/pipermail/urth-urth.net/attachments/20090406/8d8d03ba/attachment-0001.htm>>