

**New Years 2017  
with Archael Mary &  
Jesus Christ**

**Sheep May  
Safely Graze**

*To the Second Advent Church  
of My own,*



**Pope's Teaching on Catholic Schools 7**

**“Sleazy” Adam Smith &  
“Sleazy” John Locke**

**Typist:** The Pope's teaching will follow these excerpts. He used the word “sleazy” and this is a review of the United States how it became as its ideology a businessman.

George Washington explained that the corn laws was the reason why the US Constitution was written with having Congress, the President and military under him, the Supreme Court. It was a power that the English Parliament had that they tried to capture to become the new political power in the United States. The power of the corn laws was shown in the devastating Irish Famine that killed 200,000. The government is *economic*, not even political, for sure, not religious and does not care for the community.

### Irish Famine

The proximate cause of the Irish famine was potato blight, which ravaged potato crops throughout Europe during the 1840s. However, the impact in Ireland was disproportionate, as one third of the population was dependent on the potato for a range of ethnic, religious, political, social, and economic reasons, such as land



acquisition, absentee landlords, and the **Corn Laws**, which all contributed to the disaster to varying degrees.

So in these excerpts, what you will read is this paradigm shift or ideology that was of this *sleazy* history.

The self-interest of Adam Smith—is *sleazy*.

The natural rights of Locke and the Cromwell Parliament of England saying property ownership is the reason for having government—is *sleazy*.

They no longer recognized that the property ultimately belongs to God—is *sleazy*.

To not recognize our talent is from God—is *sleazy*.

The reason for government is to protect property--this is *sleazy*.

To me, the reason for government is justice among men. It is furthermore not justice of the tyrants or landowners, it is justice as divine justice, based on the laws of God to man.

George Washington asked Thomas Paine to have Benjamin Franklin put into the US Constitution the description of Providence, as he could not have won the war without Providence. This was not done. We are at that point now. Again.

Providence has to be the— God-over-men ideology or paradigm— or government before the Industrial Revolution. It cannot be seen already as merely a man-to-man power mongering and brokering government of Adam Smith's "self-interest" and John Locke's goal of protecting property.

What would happen? Canon Law would be returned to the Catholic Church as governance as the law is divine law that he lives by. The governance of the Catholic Church would be by men of god not by men of property.

The Catholic Schools teach the young to bring about the justice in the United States, as they are taught Canon Law which had been common law.

The Catholic schools are not factories to produce engineers and restaurant owners but the children learn God-over-men through the liturgy and ideology. The liturgy teaches them that God is the center of his life and not the Adam Smith and John Locke ideology of self-interest and political governance where life to be lived is the business of making money and polluting the air and water.

### The Lockean Paradigm and Paradox

The first and primary end of human law is to maintain and regulate the absolute rights of individuals. Locke's individualism was shortly reinforced by Smith's emphasis on man's self-reliance, his "constant effort to better his own condition," which if allowed to progress in a free, competitive environment, that would insure a good community. This belief was at the root of Smith's labor theory of value: "The property which every man has is his own labor, as it is the original foundation of all other property, so it is the most sacred and inviolable"

Locke's dictum that "The great and chief end. . . of Men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under Government, is the Preservation of their Property," became an article of faith for many of his contemporaries, and was one of the significant formulations exported to the colonies. Some one hundred years later, Madison echoed it in *The Federalist Papers* in these words: "The protection of these faculties [the diversity in the faculties of men from which the rights of property originate] is the first object of government.

It was as said, "a revolution of the rich against the poor," of aggressive individualism against medieval [sharing in community]; it was the same drive that would reach such hideous proportions in the Industrial Revolution of the next century for Locke's social philosophy—Locke intended that the able among economic men should be given immediate free rein.

The central difficulty with Locke's extreme individualism for us has come to be its possessive quality. . . . In his enthusiasm to escape medievalism, Locke developed a "conception of the individual as essentially the proprietor of his own person or capacities, owing nothing to society for them. Society becomes a lot of free equal individuals related to each other as proprietors of their own capacities and of what they acquired by their exercise." The poor, the deprived, the propertyless, the incapable, the lazy, and the shiftless were set aside. What Locke had done was to base his individualistic conception of property rights on natural right and natural law. It is instructive to examine how this was done. Locke starts with the medieval position that the earth and its fruits were given originally to mankind in common.

#### A Philosopher's *Sleazy* Logic

Locke said a man must own a piece of earth before it can be any good to him. Locke derives this right from the postulate that "every man has a property in his own person. This no body has any right to but himself. The labor of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his." A man obtains a right to property if he mixes his labor with it.

[He has] to justify this kind of appropriation, for, as Locke wrote, "If such a consent as that was necessary, man had starved, notwithstanding the plenty God had given him."

There were, however, limitations which Locke believed natural law imposed on the right to appropriate property:

First, one can own only so much as leaves “enough, and as good...in common for others.” This limitation is inherent in each man’s right to self-preservation. Second, “As much as any one can make use of to any advantage of life before it spoils; so much he may by his labor fix a Property in.” There is no justification for waste. Barter of the surplus product of one’s labor was, however, permitted by Locke within this limitation. Third, he limited the right to property to the amount a man can use with his own labor.

In so defining the natural right to property and its limitations, Locke was using primitive agrarian economy as his context. Simply stated, these limitations are open to many objections, some purely logical and others deriving from the political, social, and economic context in which Locke was writing. To meet such objections, Locke devised a number of modifications to his rules. The rule that one must leave “enough and as good in common for others” is clearly rendered inapplicable if population increases sufficiently rapidly in relation to available land. Hence Locke’s remark that anyone could exercise his right to property if he were to go to the “vacant places of America.”

In addition, Locke unearthed Pluto and supplied property with the attribute of liquidity. Noting that gold and silver do not spoil, he countenanced the “Invention of Money and the *tacit Agreement* of Men to put a value on it.” [In other words, the property had to go into money, stocks and bonds and “worshipped”.]

Furthermore, the accumulation of money is useful to “drive trade” and to serve as capital. But this modification of a second rule has troublesome consequences. Locke’s argument, “Now that it is possible to exchange any amount of produce for an asset which never spoils. it is neither unjust nor foolish to accumulate any amount of land in order to make it produce a surplus which can be converted to money and used as capital.”

In so justifying the capitalist appropriation of land and money, Locke recognized the inevitable inequality in the distribution of wealth that would follow from it, but wrote this off simply to “the necessity of affairs and the constitution of human society.” Note that this extended right to property and its uses has nothing to do with the community or the state; it derives simply from the natural purposes of men, from their natural rights, and from the “tacit agreement” which they have given to the use of money (an agreement which, it will be remembered, was hardly tacit in the Middle Ages). [Legislature becomes the “tacit agreement” what to do with the poor people.]

In effect, Locke’s work undermined the traditional view that labor and the ownership of property were social functions; in so doing, it legitimized the break between economic activity and its social and political relationships.

Locke: “Only in such a society can it be said, and accepted, that there is no reason why any man should claim superior rights. [Meaning that the poor man has talent and there is no obligation for government to see that he is always employed. Unemployment to Locke was due to laziness not that employment was a right in itself for government to regulate through the establishment of an economic pyramid.] For if men do not acknowledge such equality, they can claim unlimited superiority; claiming this, they

cannot be morally bound by any non-supernatural system of obligation.” [He says nobody is morally bound to God conscience.]

This condition was fulfilled in the original possessive market society, from its emergence as the dominant form in the seventeenth century until its zenith in the nineteenth, by the apparent inevitability of everyone’s subordination to the laws of the market. So long as everyone was subject to the determination of a competitive market, and so long as this apparently equal subordination of individuals to the determination of the market was accepted as rightful, or inevitable, by virtually everybody, there was a sufficient basis for rational obligation of all men to a political authority which could maintain and enforce the only possible orderly human relations, namely, market relations.

Another condition is that there be a cohesion of self-interests, [business power-brokers, lobbyists] among all those who have a voice in choosing the government, sufficient to offset the centrifugal forces of a possessive market society. This condition was fulfilled, in the heyday of the market society, by the fact that a political voice was restricted to a possessing class which had sufficient cohesion to decide periodically, without anarchy, who should have the sovereign power.

These conditions were crudely fulfilled in America until the end of the nineteenth century. Then they collapsed, because of the democratic franchise and the formation of interest groups (“working class”), which suppressed individualism and defined and gave expression to intolerable inequalities [as in the unions].

So we come to the dilemma of our society. We are organized around the assumptions and central institutions of possessive individualism. All our institutions are made legitimate by those assumptions, but the evolution and maturation of market society has produced changes in the nature and behavior of those institutions — business, government, interest groups—‘utility’— always a thinly disguised rationalization for avarice and venality and the uninhibited pursuit of self-interest.

It is not difficult to see how the Lockean paradigm evolved into a set of norms which identified success with the individualistic production of wealth and income. It was further bolstered in the United States [in spite of] the Protestant dictum that God’s blessing was reflected in success in the market place and by the Darwinian notion that it is the fit who survive.

In such a context, unemployment is failure, unwillingness to work an outrage, and sheer wealth, earned or unearned, a badge of distinction. In the market place, emphasis is placed on quantity of sales rather than on the utility of what is sold. Poetry and art are dubious pursuits unless they sell. The disposal and control of useless people is left to the judgment of the state as part of its function in protecting the climate for the individualistic pursuits of the propertied.

These Lockean tenets with their inherent paradox became the national ideology of America. Time and circumstance have distorted them, but even today they remain remarkably resilient.