

SLIDE	NOTES
1	With an understanding now of the political primacy issues and various definitions of justice, in this module we investigate the issues at root of the conflict causing disunity in our current political environment, as well as our end-goal in politics.
2	<p>INTRINSICISM REVISITED</p> <p>There are those among us who claim that having diverse perspectives is desirable, and all of this political opposition we see around us is intrinsically good for society.</p> <p>OPPOSITION?</p> <p>Anim1: Quote The scripture that usually comes up is 2 Nephi 2:11 Q: Is opposition in "all things" intrinsically a good thing or a bad thing? You should recognize a faulty setup question by now. The real question to ask is: Q: What do you mean by opposition?</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Let's discuss Helaman 14:31 as an example of multiple meanings.</p> <p>Anim3: Know * There are a couple of philosophical words in this scripture that we need to unpack. Q: What branch does the word Know belong in?</p> <p>Anim4: Know = Epistemology Q: Is knowing the opposites of good and evil a good thing? Yes Q: Why?</p> <p>Anim5: So we can make a choice between two opposites. Q: What branch does the word Choose belong in? Choose = Ethics</p> <p>Anim7: In this context, Choosing and Doing are equivalent. * While <i>knowing</i> the opposites is good, <i>doing</i> the opposites is definitely not good. Why? Because the consequence of evil is death. * God did not create good or evil. Potential opposition in "all things" is just part of reality. But that doesn't mean opposition is intrinsically good, or that we should embrace opposition. * God provided the Atonement to overcome the pitfall of evil that is a part of reality, and he expects us to consistently choose the good side. Choosing one side means rejecting the other side. * So the end-goal we are shooting for is to eliminate <i>actual</i> opposition even though <i>potential</i> opposition will always be a part of reality. * Our goal then, is not to embrace opposition, but to do away with it, and unify.</p> <p>Anim4: DIVERSITY * There are those among us who argue "diversity" is an absolute, intrinsic, good. This is yet another example of the fallacy of intrinsicism. The real question to ask again is: Q: What do you mean by diversity? * Similar to our discussion on opposition, there are true and false examples of diversity in every branch. * In all philosophical branches, diversity always needs to be qualified...</p> <p>FOR EXAMPLE:</p> <p>METAPHYSICS</p> <p>Anim5: In metaphysics, biodiversity is a good thing. It is good to have all variety of life forms, each filling the measure of their creation, with mankind governing them all. * I am an animal lover, so this should probably say "Chicken, Beef, Pork"</p> <p>Anim6: Metaphysical diversity is not an absolute, intrinsic good though.</p>

* There are some species we are trying to put on the extinction list, not the endangered list.
 * Metaphysical diversity should not embrace plagues, parasites, etc. leading to human death. We are told that in the Millenium, thorns, thistles, noxious weeds, and certain death causing species will be eradicated.
Metaphysical diversity always needs to be qualified...

EPISTEMOLOGY

Anim7: In epistemology, knowledge of all of the diverse truths such as Math, Chemistry, Physics, are a good thing. Knowing and applying them makes our lives flourish.

Anim8: Epistemological diversity should not embrace beliefs that don't align with reality such as "flat earth belief", "holocaust denial", or postmodernists who claim that your truth can contradict my truth, but we can both be right in the name of diversity and inclusion.

* Contradiction cannot lead to human flourishing.
Epistemological diversity always needs to be qualified...

ETHICS

Anim9: In ethics, think of the flourishing lives we are told that the people living in the City of Enoch (Zion) were privileged to live, due to their good ethical choices.

Anim10: Think of the horrible lives we are told the people living in Sodom and Gomorrah we mired in due to their poor ethical choices. Ethical diversity should not embrace Sodom-like ethics.

Ethical diversity always needs to be qualified...

POLITICS

Anim11: In politics, the "Free Men" political party from the Book of Mormon have a clear set of political principles designed to help those in their society flourish.

Anim10: Political diversity should not tolerate "King Men" like political parties designed to subjugate and trample on the rights of their citizens.

* Any society that allows such political parties to have influence, are setting themselves up for death and destruction (as the Book of Mormon illustrates).

Political diversity always needs to be qualified...

AESTHETICS

Anim12: God's own mission statement claims that His work and **Glory** is to elevate all mankind, bringing us to Eternal Life with him. Consequently the values we celebrate in our art, music, and literature should be enlightening to mankind.

* Michealangelo's "Statue of David" is one such example of glorifying the human figure.

* I am glad that we don't all look alike, and each have diversity of appearance which accentuates our individuality.

* I like many different notes in my music in proper proportion. I like many colors in my paintings. I like many words in my literature. Diversity is a beautiful part of aesthetics.

Anim13: That doesn't mean diversity is an absolute good no matter what.

* Aesthetics should not include the celebration of depravity that denigrates humankind, via music, literature, pornography, etc. You can tell very quickly the state of a society by the aesthetics it celebrates.

Aethetical diversity always needs to be qualified...

* Diversity is not an absolute, intrinsic good. Like all values, it is contextual.

* Many today are treating diversity as the new "unconditional love". Anything goes "no matter what", because they say diversity is an intrinsic, absolute good.

3

UNITY

Understanding the contextual nature of opposition and diversity, helps cut through the confusion and direct us towards the goal of political unity.

Anim1: Quote President Brigham Young

Q: What did political diversity do for us in pre-mortality?

Anim2: Quote President Brigham Young also said:

* In politics our goal should be unity. In the end we should all be aligned on a single reality.

	<p>* Because there is only one reality, if there is opposition among us, that necessarily means that either one side or both sides are espousing incorrect principles.</p> <p>* In politics we are talking exclusively about unity on political primacy principles related to justice.</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Elder Orson Pratt further described the political union that exists in the eternities.</p> <p>Anim4: Quote Christ commands us to be unified (on correct principles).</p> <p>Q: So how do we go about becoming united, of one heart and mind?</p> <p>* Surely Christ is not directing us to "go along, to get along".</p> <p>* Oneness is also not an absolute, intrinsic good. Lucifer and his followers are one, but they are united on incorrect principles. Oneness is only good if we are united on correct principles.</p> <p>* There is no other <i>lasting</i> way <i>but</i> to unite on <i>correct</i> principles.</p> <p>* Correct principles govern.</p> <p>* Incorrect principles are ungovernable.</p> <p>Anim5: Quote Elder Oaks Unify (on correct principles):</p>
4	<p>Latter-day Saints Divided</p> <p>Q: Are Latter-day Saints united as to which definition of justice to follow?</p> <p>Anim1: Consider the following evidence unique to Latter-day Saints which seems to advocate for <i>all three</i> different definitions of justice:</p> <p>POSITIVE LAW</p> <p>From the Positive Law definition of Justice:</p> <p>Anim2: Quote Article of Faith 12</p> <p>Anim3: Quote Heber J. Grant (and other similar statements from Later-day Saint leaders)</p> <p>* Taken in isolation, these statements would seem to support the Positive Law definition of justice.</p> <p>Q: Are we then to teach our families to believe (as the Positivists do) that whatever role the government plays, it is the duty of all faithful Latter-day Saints to obey the law, no matter what?</p> <p>Q: Wouldn't this Positivist interpretation conflict with numerous other gospel teachings and scriptural rebellions in the Book of Mormon where they rebelled against wicked Kings of their day (such as King Noah)?</p> <p>Q: If there had been Latter-day Saints around at the time of the American Revolution, based on only these two quotes, would they have supported the American Revolution or been loyalists?</p> <p>* A misunderstanding of the 12th Article of Faith may lead many faithful Latter-day Saints to suppose that we are under an absolute duty to uphold all laws or governments no matter how brutal, ruthless or totalitarian they might be.</p> <p>* Obviously Alma and his followers were not adherents of the Positive Law Definition of justice when they rebelled against a wicked and tyrannical king Noah.</p> <p>* Obviously George Washington and the other founders of the American Revolution were not adherents of the Positive Law Definition of justice.</p> <p>SOCIAL GOOD</p> <p>From the Social Good definition of Justice:</p> <p>Anim4: Quote D&C 49:20</p> <p>Anim5: Quote D&C 104:16</p> <p>Anim6: Quote D&C 134:1</p> <p>Anim7: Quote President Brigham Young</p> <p>Q: Do these statements seem to support the Social Good definition of justice (with equality as the foundational principle)?</p> <p>Q: Are we then to teach our families to believe (as the Socialists do) that the 'proper role of government' is to promote social justice by redistributing wealth and ensuring that all the basic needs of our fellowman are met from cradle to grave no matter what?</p> <p>* Even many Latter-day Saints fall into the deceptive and seductive position of the Socialists who in the name of brotherly love, insist that the 'proper role of government' is to impose economic equality in the name of social justice.</p>

	<p>* We Latter-day Saints are aware of the plethora of scriptures and gospel teachings to remember the poor and the needy. As we will discover, the ends of Social Good are correct, but the means of government force are disastrous.</p> <p>NATURAL RIGHTS</p> <p>From the Natural Rights definition of Justice:</p> <p>Anim8: Quote D&C 42:42 Anim9: Quote D&C 134:2 Anim10: Quote D&C 135:5</p> <p>* Taken in isolation, these statements seem to support the Natural Law definition of justice.</p> <p>Q: Are we then to teach our families to believe (as the Naturalists) that the 'proper role of government' is to secure individual rights, even if this means the idle lacks bread?</p> <p>* Here we have all three theories, supported by scripture, showing that even our own scriptures can be played like a fiddle.</p> <p>* All of these seemingly conflicting quotes, show that we must have a complete philosophy and not rely solely on sound bites.</p> <p>* The ambiguity in our gospel teachings, comes about from not paying attention to the entire context (coherence) of ALL doctrinal statements.</p>
5	<p>SUMMARY OF DEFINITIONS</p> <p>The following summary of the three definitions of justice is critical to understanding what we might expect when trying to identify which definition we Latter-day Saints are doctrinally committed to.</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Otto Bird writes (read definition) Anim2: Quote Positive Law Theory Anim3: Quote The Social Good Theory Anim4: The Natural Rights Theory</p>
6	<p>Three-Tier Resolution</p> <p>Unifying in politics is not as difficult conceptually as it might first seem. The answer to resolving the conflict between these 3 theories comes down yet again to primacy.</p> <p>Anim1: Quote Mortimer Adler</p> <p>The "well ordered manner" that Adler is alluding to, implies a three tier primacy solution.</p> <p>Anim2: Review</p> <p>To see how the primacy of the Natural Rights definition of justice resolves the apparent conflict, let's review the 3 theories again and discuss the primacy between them.</p> <p>Anim3: Positivists</p> <p>* On Tier-3 we have the Positivists. * The Positivists declare that <i>legality</i> is the governing principle of justice * Whatever is legal is just.</p> <p>Anim4: Positivist Dependency</p> <p>* Positivists deny that there is any such thing as the social good or natural rights. They miss the hidden implied dependency that any law must provide a social good.</p> <p>Q: Otherwise why have a law that provides no good?</p> <p>Anim5: Socialists</p> <p>* On Tier-2 we have the Socialists. * The Socialists declare that <i>utility</i> is the governing principle of justice. That justice is the "greatest good provided to the greatest number minus the suffering of the minority".</p> <p>Anim6: Social Good Dependency</p> <p>* Socialists uphold social good and positive law, but deny that there are individual natural rights, that cannot be violated.</p>

Q: Otherwise what good is a system of government that tramples part of the population in order to protect the rest of the population? In the end that is just another form of gang rule.

Anim7: Naturalists

- * On Tier-1 we have the Naturalists
- * The Naturalists declare that inherent, individual, *natural rights* are the governing principle of justice.
- * That justice consists in rendering unto each person their rightful due within the larger society.

Anim8: Natural Rights Encompasses All Three Virtues

- * Notice that the three primary social virtues of the Positivists, Socialists, and Naturalists are all wrapped up, and part of the Natural Rights definition of justice.
- * By preaching Natural Rights, Latter-day Saints subscribe to all three social virtues.
- * The fact that all three of these social virtues are part of our gospel teachings and scriptures however, does not mean that we can pick and choose which theory of justice suits us best at the time. That would be mixed-premises at its worst.
- * The genius of the Natural Rights definition of justice is that it encompasses the elements of all three.
- * We Latter-day Saints are scripturally and doctrinally committed to the Natural Rights definition of justice.

The following simple phrase resolves the conflict of justice via the Natural Right definition.

Anim7: Quote Summary

- * Again, philosophical primacy in three-tier fashion clears up the fog, and makes the hidden assumptions visible.
- * This hidden complexity and primacy is the reason why we Latter-day Saints have struggled to come to a doctrinal consensus over the issue of what does or does not constitute the 'proper role of government.'
- * It is not about picking one definition. We get all three, just in a three part solution involving primacy. By staying true to the foundational principle of individual rights this ambiguity is cleared up, and we get the virtues of all three definitions.