

A Aristotle

This appendix introduces the concepts that need to be understood, before Theology (post-St Thomas Aquinas in particular), as well as the construction of any thesis, can be understood.

A.a Purpose & Scope

First, this appendix is nether an introduction to Aristotle and his works, nor a primer on Aristotle. However, due to the suppression of the entire subject (at worst) or the confused teaching of it (at best) in the “education” systems in occupied countries, young people may find it useful to be such. But this is not the intent. The intent is to overcome the obstacles that cause Aristotle, and particularly the use of his vehicles, which are common in medieval literature, to be misunderstood by modern readers, and therefore the precision and depth of the subject matter¹ that was written (in both medieval literature and the Catholic dogma related to the subject thesis), is lost.

These are the nuggets, the essential Aristotlian **vehicles** that must be understood, *before* approaching any of his works, without which neither his wonderful body of work (a corpus of over 30 volumes), nor the works of writers who use his vehicles such as St Thomas, can be understood. These are precisely the nuggets that the “education” systems suppress, the result of which is Aristotle, and most medieval works, are only superficially understood, and subsequently dismissed. To great shame. To great loss. To the purposeful success of the Modernists.

The nuggets in number are limited to that which is required for this paper (there are more, if the subject of Aristotle were to be introduced properly, for the lack of which forgiveness is begged).



¹ Yes, depth of the subject matter under discussion, not depth of Aristotle.



⁴ Not the thesis itself, but the construction thereof.

A.b The Giant

There is never enough that can be said about the great giant of the intellectual world, who stands apart from all others, or the fact that the entire body of Western Thought is founded on his work. This section does not attempt to provide either an introduction to the subject, or a biography⁵. This section merely asserts *some* of the important aspects of his work, in order to provide context and relevance for the rest of the appendix.

This writer introduced an essay that he wrote recently, thus:

Self on Aristotle's *De Anima* (On the Soul)

Aristotle approaches his subject logically and scientifically. His massive intellect, and his fundamental position in Western philosophy, can be understood, in part, by noting a colloquialism:

an intelligent man makes more distinctions than an ordinary one

He not only makes distinctions, but makes very fine distinctions, the purpose of which is realised only later, as one progresses through his work. His conception of the soul is rich; detailed; layered, and the qualities are interwoven. Further, he can transmit that detailed definition, with all its complexity. In order to do so, he provides the definition in progressive increments, some of them excruciatingly small, but each important to the progression. Each increment builds on and modulates the existing definition.

Of course the fine granularity of Aristotle's distinctions stand as evidence of the exceptionality his intellect. The point is, the reader is invited to make full use of the intellectual faculties that have been gifted to him, *each to his own measure*, and to engage in careful inspection; discernment; evaluation; and determination⁶. This is not a subject, or an exercise, for those who believe they evolved from apes.

Even the smallest introduction would be incomplete if it excluded this item. In 350 BC, Aristotle proved, scientifically (using Formal & Material Logic) the following. These are therefore objective truths, that can be readily proved:

- the existence of God, and particularly a single one, as creator of the universe, as the Cause of all things in nature
- the created universe was distinct from the Creator, and thus not a part of Him
- the soul, in close to one hundred layers of distinction, its immortality, and its purpose

It is no wonder that St Thomas Aquinas, probably the greatest scholar of Aristotle, uses his vehicles freely throughout the *Summa*, and therein refers to him as *The Philosopher*, thus setting him apart from all others, or *The Stagirite*, as if he were the only man of worth to come from that city..

5 For a good biography and an introduction, refer to the Catholic Encyclopædia. There are additionally several good introductions, which have to be carefully chosen from the mountain of bad ones. This is the age of misinformation. 99.6% of the information available on the internet is superficial garbage, a study in mediocrity, with no sense of objectivity (authority), devoid of history which gives context and meaning, heavily infused with Modernist propaganda.

6 As opposed to the abandonment or denial of the such gifts. As opposed to the Modernist use of such gifts, such as Denial of Facts; Argument by Exception; Talmudic or pharisaic thinking; Non-resolution; etc, which are sub-human, but elevated by trickery to "genius".

A.c FOCUS

What does 'right thinking' mean ?

Simply put, it is the difference between sanity and insanity.

Aristotle gave us the *laws* of right thinking. Without which philosophy; science; theology; etc, would not have been standardised; integrated; made coherent, and thus they would have lacked a reliable foundation. Therefore he is the father of Western thought, the founder of right thinking. His works are such that one could use the gift of the intellect that God gave each of us, to its full extent, and communicate with others effectively, instead of either denying the gift, or using it in a chaotic manner.

- Conversely, the enslavement of the intellect that Modernists are implementing requires that *right thinking* is removed from the faculties of men, in order to seduce and trick them into *wrong* thinking, into insanity. That is why the teaching of Aristotle is either suppressed or purposely confused in the syllabus.

The minimum assertions regarding Aristotle's work, that need to be understood here are:

- He gave us the **Laws of Thought**, or the definition of sanity. Thus any 'thinking' outside that is insanity; unnatural; sub-human; demented.
- Flowing from the *Laws of Thought*, he gave us **Formal Logic**, such that we could think logically and correctly, and thus form logical *conclusions* about subjects.
 - Each of which not only gave valid boundaries to philosophy; theology; science; etc, but [progressed versions of which] are in full use to this day.
- He gave us **Vehicles**⁷, which are advanced or complex concepts⁸, that progressed the understanding and communication of subjects even further, that students could use to progress their understanding of their own subject matter
- That formed the basis, the foundation for all thought thereafter, such as:
 - Philosophy, *how to think* about a subject,
 - such that the subject matter of the *thinking* itself could be treated properly
 - and therefore real *knowledge*, that does not change, could be accrued⁹
 - Theology, the first philosophy, which explored the *nature of existence*
 - Science, the second philosophy, which explored the *nature of things* in existence
 - which of course, evolved into separate sciences, and each of them into the practical vs the speculative

Repeating, this is an unworthy introduction to Aristotle, a small extraction of his work, grossly incomplete, the minimum required for the purpose of this paper.

7 There is no label in what passes for literature these dark days, that adequately identifies these articles. The articles are such that they carry one who employs them from one location of knowledge and understanding, to a further, more progressed location, about any subject matter that is under consideration. The label is my own.

8 Words, in contrast, being simple concepts.

9 That defines philosophy, the second grandest use of the intellect, as it stood for over two thousand years, until the Modernist era. Modernism, over the last one hundred and fifty years, has transformed philosophy into a depravity. Instead of how to think about a subject, people are now taught how to think like a bat; an idiot; a serial killer; a mass murderer; etc. Further, the purpose, has been removed, and thus philosophy has no purpose other than thinking itself, which without a purpose is mere fantasy. Thus the de facto evidenced purpose of Modern philosophy is to establish and validate depraved thinking. This paper is a return to pre-Modern philosophy, and thus to its derivatives.

Terminology 1

The terms used herein are classical, that which Aristotle and St Thomas use. This allows the reader to use this appendix as a technical adjunct, when reading the works of other pre-Modern authors.

Although it would assist to some degree when reading the work of post-Modern authors, that is not recommended¹⁰.

Terminology 2

In particular, the following words, and all their derivatives, **in addition to their contemporary English meaning**, have specific meaning in philosophy and theology.

Why ?

Because they relate directly to the Aristotlian and Thomist vehicles, and thus they recall the precision and depth of those concepts (the nuggets).

- substance substantial; substantially
- matter material; materially
- form formal; formally; formed
- composite composed; composition; component; compound
- actuality actual
- potentiality potential, potent
- causality cause
- identity identifies, identification

¹⁰ This is because the post-Modern (iniquity) bears no relation to the pre-Modern (truth), except to subvert it. Post-Modern textbooks are confused and superficial at best, and generally subversive. Using articles from both camps would break the Law of Non-Contradiction; the Law of Identity, and maintain one in precisely the confused state that the Modernists design.

A.1 Laws of Thought

What does 'right thinking' consist of?

This is the core definition of *right thinking*; the precepts of Western Thought (up to the Modernist era) and thus its foundation. It identifies the atomic articles (that which is demanded, and that which cannot be broken up) required for Formal Logic. It is also the precepts of pre-Modern philosophy, and thus of theology and science, in that it curtailed, restricted, and qualified thought such that it could progress, free of contaminating and hindering loose thought. This is the mindset of pre-Modern Western man, upon which the great civilisations of Europe were built¹¹.

It must be noted with gravity, that the Modernists gain their traction by setting their proposals outside these laws, in the realm of insanity. These Laws deem their efforts (to enslave humanity, which is their purpose) to be fantasies, with no grounding in reality.

Unsurprisingly, these laws underpin objective truth, the object of Pre-Modern philosophy; theology; and science. Subjective "truth"; relative "truth"; and relativism, can only be postulated outside these laws.

The Laws of Thought are also known as the Laws of Sanity, because they provide the tools to differentiate the sane from the insane, and anyone who doesn't willingly and totally submit to these laws is deemed insane. That is precisely why, in occupied countries, these Laws are no longer taught at secondary level, why Aristotle is suppressed, so that insanity can be taught as "thought", and "legal thought" can be fragmented and made self-contradictory.

There are famously Three Laws, all articulated by Aristotle in 350BC. A Fourth Law was published by others in the 13th and 17th centuries, and credited to them, but any student of Aristotle (ie. reading pre-Modern literature!) will know that that too, is Aristotle, and that the later writers have taken false credit.

The Four Laws of Thought are first given as definitions (terse, but required for referencability!), in two simple forms¹². Corollaries have been added for clarity. A short discussion of each follows. Admittedly, it is a light treatment:

1 Law of Identity

Whatever is, is

$$A = A$$

Corollary: it is not what it is not

$$\text{NOT } A = \text{NOT } (A)$$

2 Law of Non-contradiction

A thing cannot simultaneously be, and not be

$$A = \text{NOT } (\text{NOT } A)$$

Refer Corollary [1].

3 Law of Excluded Middle

A thing must either be, or not be

$$A = \{ A \mid (\text{NOT } A) \}$$

Refer Corollary [1]

4 Law of Sufficient Proof (or Sufficient Reason)

If a thing is, it can be proved why it is, by things outside itself

$$\text{IF } A \text{ THEN } B \text{ (} A \text{ implies } B \text{)}$$

Corollary: if it cannot be proved outside itself, it is false.

11 By virtue of historical facts, and the Laws of Thought, the "thought" of the Modernist era is not human thought, it is sub-human; fragmented; isolated; and can only be entertained in a contrived context in which the Laws of Thought and the 2,220 years of progress (350 BC to 1870), is denied. Therefore the entire Modern era, Modern "philosophy"; Modern "science"; etc, is schizophrenic, delusional.

Note also, that the Modernists have hijacked and taken credit for "western thought", and therefore "western civilisation", a fraud that is easily punctured. Eg. the progress of Western Thought, the great city states of Europe that were built during Christendom, came before the Modernists were hatched. Separately, they cannot take credit for something that they fundamentally deny. There is no end to their insanity.

They seek to replace history with propaganda through every form of media. In this regard, the fact that they have acquired ownership of every form of media in occupied countries cannot be overlooked.

12 The interested reader is directed to find full definitions (not wiki!) and to study them. Oregon State has good introductory articles on philosophy, the Internet Encyclopædia of Philosophy has more detailed articles. Neither are recommended, but merely identified as the better ones. Stanford and others are confused, Modernist.

A.1.1 Discussion 2, 3

The second and third laws will be discussed first. Aristotle and St Thomas considered **Law of Non-Contradiction** the most important of the Four Laws, because the others are dependent on it. It means a *thing* cannot be *one-thing* and *another-thing* at the same time. This concerns the *nature* of the thing, its *being*, and therefore its identity. The *nature* of a thing, its *being*, is exclusive. Therefore the definition:

A thing cannot *be* a thing and a *not-be* a thing at the same time

A thing can *be* only one thing

This naturally leads to, it demands, certainty about the *nature* of a thing, the removal of ambiguity. Truth and falsity are exclusive. Something is either exclusively *true* or exclusively *false*: the *maybe*; the *unknown*; the middle ground, must be eliminated. Therefore the **Law of Excluded Middle**, defined as:

A thing must either *be* a particular or *not-be* a particular

A thing can *be* only one particular, and certainly so

The Law of Non-Contradiction, supported by the Law of Excluded Middle, demands the **resolution** of any contradiction that may exist about a subject. The healthy mind, the undamaged intellect, upon determination that a contradiction exists about a subject, resolves it: one side of the contradiction, obviously that which is consistent with the extant truths in the mind, is accepted, the other side is eliminated.

The Law of Excluded Middle directly eliminates ambiguity. A proposal (predicate, thesis, etc) cannot be relied upon (subsequently used to form conclusions) unless it is unambiguous. Ambiguity means the atomic proposal itself has not been completely formed, it is malformed, invalid. Resolution of an ambiguous proposal or fragment results in two discrete fragments, each of which contradicts the other, and they are now ready for the Law of Non-Contradiction to be applied.

These two laws maintain the integrity of the intellect, it maintains sanity. Integrity means the various elements in the mind are consistent, and integrated with each other (any single truth is integrated with every other truth). The absence of integrity means the mind is fragmented, and the fragments contradict each other, or the fragments are each ambiguous, not even discrete fragments.

- Upon determination that a contradiction regarding a subject exists, if the resolution that is demanded by the Law of Non-Contradiction is delayed or dismissed, it leads to a tension in the mind. The tension of opposites: iniquity; insanity.
 - This non-resolution of contradiction damages the intellect.
- Worse, when this becomes a habit, a maintenance of contradiction, beyond toleration, it constitutes the establishment of unnatural and perverse Forms in the intellect. In precisely the same way that a venial sin that is tolerated leads to mortal sin.
 - This maintenance of contradiction is the hardening of a damaged intellect, a formally identified aspect of schizophrenia.

Therefore, the resolution of contradiction (ie. the submission to, and the exercise of, these two laws) is an absolute requirement for the sane intellect. It holds only that which is true, and rejects that which is false, it is integrated. The corollary is, of course, non-resolution of contradiction, holding truth and falsity at the same time: insanity; iniquity; dis-integration.

In simple terms, and there is no other way to put it:

- the mind that holds truth, and falsity (iniquity) as “truth”, is seriously damaged
- the mind that holds truth, and falsity (iniquity) without resolution of the contradiction, is seriously damaged
- the mind that holds truth, and falsity without resolution of the contradiction, habitually, is hardened in its damaged state

Example

- a person is either a Catholic or an heretic
- there is no middle ground
- if he is a Catholic, he cannot be an heretic
- if he is an heretic, he cannot be a Catholic

A.1.2 Discussion 1

The first law will now be discussed. Now that the *nature* of a thing, absent contradiction, absent ambiguity, is known with certainty, it can be properly identified. The identity too, must be non-contradictory, and unambiguous. A *thing*, either an object or a proposal, is what it is, and it is not what it is not. The label; the name; the identity, of a thing must be consistent with what it is. Therefore the definition of the **Law of Identity**:

Whatever [reality] is, it is

Whatever [the *nature of being* of a thing] is, it is

A thing is not what it is not.

Generally, a thing is introduced using its name, hence it is the first of the Four Laws.

- If it is named incorrectly, the subject is confused from the outset, the introduction. This may be accidental, or due to loose thinking.
 - If it is purposely named incorrectly, or the opposite of what it is, then it is not accidental but purposeful, and the purpose is sinister.
 - This is a device that frauds, heretics, and the hereditary enemies of Christ often use. It eliminates the treatment that the thing rightly deserves, and allows a treatment that is fraudulently obtained.

Example

- a person is either a Catholic or an heretic, a Catholic or a Modernist, there is no middle ground
 - the qualification concerns the nature, the being of the person
 - it is his identity
- Catholicism and heresy are enemies of each other, there is no middle ground, one cannot be a Catholic and an heretic at the same time. The qualification concerns the nature, the being of the person or organisation, its Identity.
- Catholicism and Modernism are enemies of each other, there is no middle ground, one cannot be a Catholic and a Modernist at the same time. The qualification concerns the nature, the being of the person or organisation, its Identity.