

Carlsbad 1819

Like another Chouannerie

No right to your alternative facts

August 20, 2018 by Nulle Terre Sans Seigneur

Eliminating false dogmas produces in practice these two results correlative to the double aspect of truth. As human understanding was created to possess it, until it is found, it is debated in a restlessness and an anxiety whose stormy effects have been experienced by those who have been victims of doubt or of the conviction of having influenced the error. Lessing wrongly stated paradoxically that intellectual satisfaction lies in pursuing the truth and not in discovering it. Therefore, the destruction of false dogmas returns to human understanding the imponderable spiritual rest that flows from acquiescence to truth. But in what Science has as a norm, its transcendence is extraordinarily superior. I have said on another occasion that ideas lead the world in one of two ways: either positively guiding it towards its end when they are true, or negatively pushing it away from it when they are false. Under this aspect, to destroy false dogmas is to prevent misconceptions — presented in the disguise of Science — lest their causing convulsions in human society that dismantle it, leading it straight to catastrophe.

Let's say it once and for all and clearly. There is not, there can be no freedom in the intellectual operation but at the price of misfortune. The antithesis has poisoned the world, but it has been the most terrible testimony of its falsity. The objective truth, according to what has been said, is the measure of knowledge or subjective. If we possess the truth when there is adequacy or conformity between our understanding and the object, and the nature and laws that regulate it are imposed by God and not by our will, freedom, which is a quality of this last power, plays no role in the intellectual order. When the freedom of thought is proclaimed as a dogma of Philosophy, a contradiction is expressed; something like talking about a square circle.

And there is at the bottom of that fallacy that has dominated the world a rebellion and an absolute ignorance of the intellectual functions. If there is a Creator who legislated sovereignly over all things, it is not possible for man, creature as he is, to replace his Creator, neither in the promulgation of those laws, nor in the intellectual conception of them. His role is reduced to accepting them humbly and to conform the idea with reality. Only the non-existence of the Divinity would authorize man to consider himself the absolute master and lord of the created, to the point of pretending that it was what suited him or transformed into what he wanted. Those who proclaim freedom of thought, without realizing it, fall into that aberration; they are constituted as gods. Or at the opposite extreme, according to the condition of all errors. Because to attribute freedom to reason is to do it will; and in a single blow, deprive the man of guidance and blind the will.

Enunciating simply this consequence is to show the intellectual inanity of those who call themselves intellectuals, in front and against the Catholic Church; in front and against the Tradition. The freedom of thought, proclaimed by them, defended by them, praised by them as the stamp of honor of humanity, deprives them of the condition that without right, although with vanity, they make ostentatiously. If there is freedom of thought, there is no reason, nor therefore thought, nor consequently intellectuality. Why then have they monopolized the qualifier and filed appeals before the Court of Reason? This is one of the many things that this Court will demand in its day of narrow account.

— Victor Pradera, *Los falsos dogmas* (1932)

So, the thing to immediately point out here, is how much sense this intuitively makes. At least for myself, I ponder in retrospect how I could buy into all the mental gymnastics required to believe in absolute free speech when the traditional perspective is so well-ordered, right and obvious.

And because it's so obvious that letting people freely blabber falsehoods and obscenities is harmful, it is no surprise that this perspective will be independently rediscovered, and currently this would be in the form of the hunt against "fake news" and the promoters of "alternative facts."

Secularizing the argument, we would get:

1. There is an external observable reality that is independent of our senses. We are capable of discovering symbolic mappings that have a 1:1 or near-to-one correspondence with this reality.
2. A functioning democracy requires well-informed voters who have a correct perception of this reality, i.e. the facts.
3. Free speech is harmful when it distorts these facts, in the worst case it represents an attempt by men to systematically deny the mechanical laws of the universe.
4. Free speech must be constrained in the interests of a functioning democracy else there can be no rational basis for voters to discriminate between genuine progress and the machinations of special interests.

These conditions are not concerned with verification and falsification of any sort, so the "external observable reality" in question could be any view imposed by consensus or by minority rule, there only needs to be a belief that there is such a thing. Social constructionism is not in contradiction with this, it simply deals with higher level abstractions.

This entry was posted in [Liberalism](#), [Political philosophy](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

One thought on "No right to your alternative facts"

1. Daniel Gomes says:

[August 24, 2018 at 12:27 am](#)

The decadence of our age is spelled out when self-proclaimed fascists proclaim to be in favor of free speech.

[Reply](#)

[Website Built with WordPress.com](#).