

The Linacre Quarterly

Volume 72 | Number 4

Article 6

November 2005

Democracy and Abortion

Monte Harris Liebman

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Liebman, Monte Harris (2005) "Democracy and Abortion," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 72 : No. 4 , Article 6.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol72/iss4/6>

Democracy and Abortion

by

Monte Harris Liebman, M.D.

The author is president of the board of Eyewitness for Life, a pro-life organization in Wisconsin, and serves with the Pregnancy Health Line, Walworth County, Wisconsin.

...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(Constitution of the United States, 14th Amendment)

This statement is every individual's assurance that government is bound to protect the right of the individual to "due process" and "equal protection" of the laws even if mob or majority rule should want to do otherwise. This amendment is what upholds the rights of the individual against the might of the majority. It reveals the greatest principle and intent of our nation: to respect the rights of the individual. It matches the strength of the masses with their own government's duty to protect every person under its rule from injustice, vigilantes, and disordered rule. It is the great equalizer that brings balance and order into the democratic system of self rule. Under this amendment every person has a right to orderly adjudication before the individual's "life, liberty, or property" can be altered by force.

From July 9, 1868, when the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified, until January 22, 1973, when the United States Supreme Court ruled that the fetus was not a "person," the law supported the preborn's right to life. Abortion on demand was illegal in most of the United States. *Roe v. Wade* brought down the protection of these laws and made abortion legal throughout the entire period of gestation (pregnancy), though it allowed the States to prohibit abortion after viability (the point at which the fetal child can survive outside of the womb), with the exceptions of when the health or life of the mother were in jeopardy.

Thus, any preborn human life is now the one general exception to the government's mandate to protect the rights of individuals under its jurisdiction and apply the intended benefits of the Constitution to the

nation's "Posterity", as asserted in the Preamble of the Constitution. The preborn is presently treated as a non-entity and denied "due process" and "equal protection of the laws" when it comes to abortion. Paradoxically, the preborn's aborted parts may be preserved and used for research to benefit someone else's life; however, the living and developing preborn has no effective standing before the law. His or her existence or right to life is not a factor that can impede the mother's right to obtain an abortion and donate the fetal parts to research. Research that results in the death of an embryo, under the present law, cannot be impeded either. The preborn is not defined as a person. It is viewed as a non-entity unless it is spoken for by the mother. *Thus, the preborn can LOSE ITS LIFE without adjudication, and those responsible for the abortion or research have no accountability to anyone, not even the preborn child's father.*

In advocating the right to privacy of the woman, the Supreme Court removed any control over her obtaining an abortion. While the court maintains that the unborn is not a "person," it did not take the next step to determine if it is a human life.

We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins.

— Supreme Court, *Roe v. Wade*, January 22, 1973

This disclaimer, however, did not prevent the court from asserting the viewpoint that whatever it is that is growing and developing in the womb is only "potential life" when it reaches viability (approximately 24 weeks of age), though in fact the preborn is actual, animate life from its very inception.

With regard to the State's important and legitimate interest in potential life, the compelling point is viability.

— Supreme Court, *Roe v. Wade*, January 22, 1973

Based on its own rhetorical lexicon and educated misbeliefs, the court concluded the preborn was "potential life," not actual life; and it acted arbitrarily and lifted the preborn's 14th amendment protection. It never considered that life conceived by a woman could never be non-human or that what is conceived and developing is never inanimate. A rational conclusion of these considerations would not support the court's view that when human life begins is not known or that new life is only "potential life." Not only is the earliest form of the human body scientifically identifiable as human, but it has all of the characteristics of animated, actual life — growth, reproduction, irritability or response, movement, metabolism and communication, plus the intelligence that

governs and vitalizes these observable, orderly activities. In addition, all scientific evidence of the very first cell, the zygote, identifies these signs of life and innate intelligence. In vitro fertilization itself leaves no doubt as to what happens when the sperm and egg are successfully brought into contact – *A new human life is begun!*

In its decision, then, the Supreme Court made the most critical and fundamental error that can undermine an entire democratic system: *It failed to determine fact before making the decision!*

Both the law and majority rule in a democratic system are dependent on fact for relevant governance. Where fact cannot be determined, opinion based on precedent or an innate sense of justice may be valid, but such is *not the case in Roe v. Wade*. The essential facts are clear.

Roe v. Wade went against the historical precedent of over 100 years of accepted and duly legislated anti-abortion laws in the United States, and it violated that innate sense of justice expressed in the United States *Declaration of Independence* that declared:

... that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

Basing its decision on a contrived, protected right to privacy, the court gave women the right to abortion. Because it never decided by fact or even stated opinion when human life begins, it never weighed the right to life of new human life against the right to privacy of the mother. In fact the court never raised the question to the abortion advocates of where they would be if they had been aborted. They surely would not be testifying and pleading before the court. That question would have had a lasting benefit to their assessment of the reality of what they were starting.

It is easy to assign untold death knells to others not even yet conceived, but it is not so easy to walk down the road of history that follows and not feel responsible for the 40 million arbitrary abortions for which the advocates successfully lobbied, demonstrated and argued before the court. And for what reason?

Had the new lives asked to be conceived or aborted? Were they found guilty of a capital offense? Were they responsible for the cavalier sexual behavior of their breeders and were they responsible for the bittersweet sexual education and practices that generated their parents' thoughtless sexual acting out? They couldn't even speak for themselves and people attempting to be their protecting guardians were prohibited from doing so. Who are the "they" in this paragraph? We do not know them, do we? They are not alive among us, but we know their spirit. There can be no

triumphant celebration for the grotesque wrong that uprooted them from their safe havens.

One of the main forces for establishing anti-abortion laws in the United States was the country's medical association's acceptance of the *Report on Criminal Abortion* submitted to the American Medical Association, May 1859, wherein it affirmed that the unborn is human and alive. On May 3, 1859, the American Medical Association adopted a resolution that condemned "the act of producing abortion, at every stage of gestation, except as necessary for preserving the life of either mother or child" and urged legislatures to strengthen laws against abortion (see Appendix). Since the very question of whether the preborn is human or alive was so ardently asserted in 1859, before the 20th century court hearing *Roe v. Wade* overturned all prior state laws and legalized the indiscriminate and unrestrained right to abortion, it should have bound itself to determine – **beyond any reasonable doubt** – that the preborn is not human or alive. It did not do so in 1973. It is all too obvious that with 20th century technology today (including successful in vitro fertilization) it could not possibly find the beginning of new human life to be "not human and not alive." Reconstructed definitions may seem to bring clarity through an artificial rhetorical device, but the false enlightenment it brings never alters the camouflaged reality. Bones do not wilt before the smoke clears in the sunlight.

The court's decision in the case of *Roe v. Wade* opened wide the door to a freedom to kill another human life with impunity and without restraint. As an outgrowth of this decision, even the efforts of fathers to save their children are thwarted. Not only is abortion without legal restraints, but responsible, full and fair, informed consent **is not required**. Official booklets describing and picturing the fertilized egg (zygote) and the subsequent embryo and fetal developments are available. The State of Wisconsin's booklet, *Information About Fetal Development, Childbirth and Abortion* (1986), does state that "Cellular development begins on the day of fertilization." This is correct, but what it does not make clear is the fact that this "cellular development" means that *fertilization marks the beginning of new human life that is alive*. Without these facts, the requirement to provide material for a valid informed consent is not satisfied. Is this important? Aside from the fact that such a statement reflects the truth about the earliest beginning of human life, it unveils reality. It leaves no doubt for the naïve what abortion does, what human-embryo-stem-cell-research will do and what is truly at stake in choosing these lethal acts.

Under *Roe v. Wade*, educated consent, in and of itself, does not deter access to an abortion or interfere with the exercise of the aberrant right to obtain an abortion. Without accountability, adequate information and just

laws, the freedom to kill nascent human life is not only without restraint, but is assisted through governmental approbation and complicit assistance. The freedom to act out without regard for the consequences to another human life is not responsible freedom. It is anarchy, the antithesis of democracy and the lethal foe of civil life!

Freedom negates and destroys itself and becomes a factor leading to the destruction of others when it no longer recognizes and respects its essential link with the truth.

– Pope John Paul II, *The Gospel of Life*, Section 19

Abortion is a contradiction to democracy. For this reason, nations and states, as well as the people who love democracy, have an urgent and vital interest in banning abortion as a private and public right. Like the newly conceived human living out its destiny, the integrity and life of a viable democracy also depend on fact, accountability and the mandate to respect every human life. The fate of the preborn and democracy ride in the same ship and depend on the same fundamental principle – THE RIGHT TO LIFE!

Appendix

Report on Criminal Abortion

(Submitted by American Medical Association Committee on Criminal Abortion at the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the AMA held in Louisville, Kentucky, in May, 1859. Pursuant to this report, the American Medical Association, on May 3, 1859, unanimously adopted the resolution prepared by the committee, which resolution condemned “the act of producing abortion, at every period of gestation, except as necessary for preserving the life of either mother or child” and urged the legislatures of the various states to strengthen the laws against abortion and the various State Medical Societies to promote such changes in the law.)

The Committee appointed in May, 1857, to investigate the subject of criminal abortion, with a view to its general suppression, have attended to the duty assigned them, and would present the following report:

The heinous guilt of criminal abortion, however viewed by the community, is everywhere acknowledged by medical men.

Its frequency – among all classes of society, rich and poor, single and married – most physicians have been led to suspect, very many, from their own experience of its deplorable results, have known. Were any doubt, however, entertained upon this point, it is at once removed by comparisons

of the present with our past rates of increase in population, the size of our families, the statistics of our foetal deaths, by themselves considered, and relatively to the births and to the general mortality. The evidence from these sources is too constant and too overwhelming to be explained on the ground that pregnancies are merely prevented; or on any supposition than that of fearfully extended crime.

The causes of this general demoralization are manifest. There are three of them, however, and they are the most important, with which the medical profession have especially to do.

The first of these causes is a widespread popular ignorance of the true character of the crime – a belief even among mothers themselves that the foetus is not alive till after the period of quickening.

The second of the agents alluded to is the fact that the profession themselves are frequently supposed careless of foetal life; not that its respectable members are ever knowingly or intentionally accessory to the unjustifiable commission of abortion, but that they are thought at times to omit precautions or measures that might prevent the occurrence of so unfortunate an event.

The third reason of the frightful extent of this crime is found in the grave defects of our laws, both common and statute, as regards the independent and actual existence of the child before birth, as a living being. These errors which are sufficient in most instances to prevent conviction, are based, and only based upon mistaken and exploded medical dogmas. With strange inconsistency, the law fully acknowledges the foetus in utero and its inherent rights for civil purposes while personally and as criminally affected, it fails to recognize it and to its life and it denies all protection.

Abundant proof upon each of these points has been prepared by the Committee, and is elsewhere being published to the profession; but as the statements now made are almost axiomatic, such recapitulation would be here wearisome and unnecessary.

Our duty is plain. If, by any act, we can effect aught to wards the suppression of this crime, it must be done. In questions of abstract right, the medical profession do not acknowledge such words as expediency, time service (cowardice).

We are the physical guardians of women, we, alone, thus far, of their offspring. The case is here of life or death – the life or death of thousands – and it depends, almost wholly, upon ourselves.

As a profession we are unanimous in our condemnation of the crime. Mere resolutions to this effect, and nothing more, are therefore useless, evasive, cruel.

If to want of knowledge on a medical point, the slaughter of countless children now steadily perpetrated in our midst, is to be attributed,

it is our duty as physicians, and as good and true men, both publicly and privately, and by every means in our power, to enlighten this ignorance.

If we have ever been thought negligent of the sanctity of foetal life, the means of correcting the error are before us. If we have ever been so in deed, there are materials, and there is good occasion for the establishment of an obstetric code; which, rigorously kept to the standard of our attainments in knowledge, and generally accepted by the profession, would tend to prevent such unnecessary and unjustifiable destruction of human life.

If the tenets of the law, here unscientific, unjust, inhuman, can be bettered – as citizens, and to the best of our ability we should seek this end. If the evidence upon this point is especially of a medical character, it is our duty to proffer our aid, and in so important a matter to urge it. But if, as it is also true, these great, fundamental and fatal faults of the laws are owing to doctrinal errors of the profession in a former age, it devolves upon us, by every bond we hold sacred, by our reverence for the fathers, in medicine, by our love for our race, and by our responsibility as accountable beings, to see these errors removed and their grievous results abated.

In accordance, therefore, with the facts in the case, the Committee would advise that this body, representing, as it does, the physicians of the land, publicly express its abhorrence of the unnatural and now rapidly increasing crime of abortion; that it avow its true nature, as no simple offence against public morality and decency, no mere misdemeanor, no attempt upon the life of the mother, but the wanton and murderous destruction of her child; and that while it would in no wise transcend its legitimate province or invade the precincts of the law, the Association recommend, by memorial, to the governors and legislatures of the several states, and, as representing the federal district, to the President and Congress, a careful examination and revision of the statutory and of so much of the common law, as relates to this crime. For we hold it to be “a thing deserving all hate and detestation, that a man in his very original, while he is framed, while he is enlived, should be put to death under the very hands and in the shop, of Nature.”

In the belief that we have expressed the unanimous opinion of the Association, our report is respectfully submitted.

Horatio R. Storer, of Massachusetts
Hugh L. Hodge, of Pennsylvania
A. Lopez, of Alabama
William Henry Brisbane,
of Wisconsin

Thomas W. Blatchford, of New York
Edward H. Barton, of South Carolina
Charles A. Pope, of Missouri
A.J. Semmes, of District of Columbia

Toward a Theory Of the Autonomous Family

by

Allan Carlson, Ph.D.

*The author is president of the Howard Center
for Family, Religion and Society, in Rockford, IL.*

Author's note: Nearly a decade ago, I was invited to write an essay on the nature of the "fully traditional family." The following is a new version of that effort. Rather than a description of the current American social system, it might be seen as a vision of an alternate reality: one that might have existed before, one that may exist in some places today, and one that could exist again.

Traditionalist society rests on submission to the Divine spirit and will. Its members find these manifested in human nature and in the order of Creation. All social constructs strive for harmony with Divine intent.

The First Societal Bond: Marriage

Civil society builds on marriage, the first and most crucial social bond. Marriage holds these distinctions for it is natural and self-renewing, rooted in the mutual attraction of man to woman and woman to man, both of whom feel their incompleteness when existing alone. They come together, of necessity, so that the human species might endure. Most cultures place marriage at or near the center of elaborate religious ritual, but the marital institution can be found even among animist societies, testifying to its universality.

In this sense, marriage is a true anarchist institution.¹ It exists prior to other human bonds, be they clan, village, city, state, or nation, and it has the endless capacity for renewal, even in periods of persecution, social

decline, or moral degradation. In the modern age, each new marriage is an affirmation of life, love (real or potential), and continuity against the darkness which threatens to overwhelm the human spirit. Every new marriage is an act of rebellion against ambitious political and ideological powers that would reduce human activity to their purposes. And each marriage contains within it the power of biological reproduction, a throw of the genetic dice that brings to life new beings, unique and unpredictable in their details.

Marriage bears a special power, as well. Equal in dignity before their Creator, man and woman each hold special gifts, profound and powerful differences in thought, action, and skills. This complementarity transforms their union into something far greater than the sum of its parts.

At the same time, marriage forms the foundation on which humans build other social bonds. Marriage is, at one level, a covenant between two individuals, a man and a woman who agree to give each other mutual care, respect, and protection, and who open their future to the life issuing from their sexual union. Marriage can fulfill this role, and function properly, only when the bond is normatively indissoluble. Without that mutual promise, the efforts toward forming "one flesh" of man and woman remain tentative. The marital partners, out of fear for the future, will withhold some part of their investment of time and energy into the marriage. The promise of indissolubility alone encourages the man and woman to negotiate their way through the great differences between them in mind and body and to bring some resolution to their common life. Incompleteness in the promise operates as would a crack in the foundation of a great edifice, spreading with the passage of time.²

Each marriage is also a covenant between the couple and their kin. In marriage, two families merge in a manner that perpetuates and invigorates both. Even in the denatured societies of the modern West, family members will travel great distances to attend the wedding of a cousin, nephew, or niece, still recognizing through residual instinct the importance of both the promise and the event to their own identity and continuity.

More broadly, marriage is the solution to human society's universal dependency problem. Every community must resolve the same issues: who will care for the very young, the very old, the weak, and the infirm? How shall the rewards given to productive adults be shared with those who are not or cannot be productive? In the natural human order, these tasks fall on kin networks where spouses care for each other "in sickness or in health," where parents nurture, train, and protect their offspring until they are able to create marriages of their own; where the aged enjoy care, purpose, and respect around the hearth of their grown children; and where kin insure that no family member falls through the family's safety net. Acceptance of

these duties passes from generation to generation, as each child views the treatment bestowed by his parents on his grandparents, great aunts and uncles, and so on. These observations teach children, as well, the duty and necessity of begetting their own children, so that the chain of obligation within a family might not be broken.

Marriage is also a covenant between the couple and the broader community. Procreation within marriage offers the best promise of new community members who will be supported and trained by parents without being a charge on others and who will grow into responsible adults able to contribute to the community's well-being. Predictably, children reared within marriage will be healthier, brighter, harder working, and more honest, dutiful, and cooperative than those raised in other ways. They will be more likely to acquire useful skills and knowledge and less likely to slide into violent, abusive, or self-destructive behaviors. As such, each marriage represents the renewal of a community through the promise of responsible new members to come, which is why every healthy human society invests so much ceremony and rhetoric in the event and why an array of informal pressures strive to hold the marriage together. These are symbols to the husband and wife of the solemn importance that this event holds to neighbors beyond their intimate relationship and kin. Humans instinctively understand that the strength of their community is dependent, in the end, on the strength of their marriages. If the marital institution weakens – or worse, if it is politicized and subordinated to ideology – then the social pathologies of suicide, crime, abuse, poor health, and crippling dependency surely follow. If continued over several generations, these pathologies born from the decay of wedlock will consume the community itself.

The Second Natural Bond: The Household

Marriage, in turn, creates a new household. When gathered together, these form the second institutional tier in natural social life and the one on which all political life is built. The household will normally encompass the wedded man and woman, their children, and aged or unmarried kin. Successful households are the natural reservoir of liberty. They aim at autonomy or independence, enabling their members to resist oppression, survive economic, social, and political turbulence, and renew the world after troubles have passed. Complete households have the power to shelter, feed, clothe, and protect their members in the absence of both state and corporate largesse. Such independence from outside agency is the true mark of liberty, making possible in turn the self-government of communities. Households functionally dependent on wages, benefits, and services provided by outside agency or state have surrendered some of their natural liberty and have accepted a kind of dependency indistinguishable at its

roots from servanthood. Independence requires that responsible adults in a household be able to forego these forms of support, if necessary, and still be able to insure the survival of themselves and other household members.

The basic human need for functional independence in food, clothing, and shelter dictates the eternal importance both of a household's bond to the land and of husbandry skills. Autonomy requires, at the least, the capacity to produce a regular supply of food and the ability to preserve a substantial share of this bounty for consumption during the adverse seasons. The keeping of grazing and meat-producing animals adds further to the independence of households and their ability to survive wars, famines, stock market crashes, depression, inflation, and bad government. In arable climates, intensive cultivation of even a few acres of land can provide the necessary bounty that delivers such autonomy; five to 20 acres of soil and timber offer an independence more sure and complete.

Accordingly, traditionalist society views land, particularly arable land, as different in kind from other commodities. The most critical of social, political, and economic tasks becomes the appropriate partition, distribution, and use of the land, where ownership is spread as widely as possible, and where freedom of use is conditioned by a responsible stewardship toward future generations. Both of these principles dictate the need for active measures to forestall the complete industrialization of agriculture. This event would sharply reduce the number of persons in contact with the soil, undermine a political structure of ordered liberty, and bring the deterioration of soil and people.

Attachment to growing things and to the soil also brings the human spirit into synchronization with the rhythm of the seasons and the beauty of the natural world. It means contact with the wind, rain, and the living fertility of the soil. Familiarity with domesticated animals, a defining feature of civilized human life from the beginning, also delivers a natural wisdom unobtainable in any other way.

The Power of Household Production

Together with land, the autonomous household also needs control over the means of production. The industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, dependent on balky power sources such as flowing water and the steam engine, gave a monopoly on power to centralized factories and stimulated the "great divorce" of work from home. This shattered the traditional order of the family farm and village. The 20th century, however, delivered successive waves of new technologies which have potentially returned "power," in both senses of that word, to the household economy. Innovations included electric generators and motors, the internal combustion engine, and the photovoltaic cell. Each of these allows the household to apply power to productive work in the homestead. The

household computer is another valuable tool once confined to large central work units, but now available for decentralized use. Where the competitive advantage in the 19th century clearly lay with the industrial factory, the homestead has improved prospects at the dawn of the 21st century. Remaining apparent disadvantages often derive from marketing and distributive manipulations that distort real price, or from the corruption of the marketplace by powerful interests.³

Rejecting an extreme division of labor, traditional society also focuses on generalized skill and the well-rounded human life. It celebrates and rewards craftsmanship, the creative application of human intellect to the fashioning of useful devices. It encourages self-sufficiency.

Young people should learn the basic skills of husbandry and housewifery: carpentry, gardening, the preparation and preservation of food, fabric and clothing production. Every household also needs to be equipped with ownership of basic tools: the implements needed to grow food; the utensils to process and store produce; the hand and power tools necessary to build and repair shelter and to make clothing; and the transportation vehicles, communication devices, and information storage and processing units necessary to engage in the world of commerce. Whenever possible, householders should employ devices they can comprehend, assemble, and repair themselves. Again whenever possible, the sources of power should be renewable and independent of outside suppliers, giving further security to the household, particularly in times of emergency and crisis.

Each household also requires an authority structure, where all family members defer to the wisdom of elders and where children defer to the guidance of parents. In the healthy civic order, all other loyalties are subordinated to or mediated through this household structure.

A central function of the household is the education of children, for which parents, supplemented by extended kin, are responsible. The household bears the obligation and natural authority to transmit to children the spiritual doctrines and beliefs of the family, the customs and folkways by which the household lives, the practical skills necessary for the later creation and sustenance of new households, and the knowledge required for successful engagement in the world of commerce. While outside agencies, such as apprenticeships and parent-controlled schools, may be usefully employed for part of these tasks, those households fail which abdicate the bulk of them to others. The education of children, properly engaged, must be home-centered, where parents impart their visions, values, virtues, and skills to the new generation.

Relative to the world, each household exists as a small collective, organized on the principle of altruism. The members of a household share with each other on the basis of love and altruism without any accounting of

individual gain or loss. Under some circumstances, this same principle of justice may extend to other kin, or even to small communities, where the generosity and altruism can be tempered by a practical knowledge of individual character and the discipline which a tight-knit community can bring to bear on its members. This form of small scale organization may exact a price through the loss of efficiency, but it more than recovers this cost through the emotional rewards that household and community life bring.

The Third Societal Bond: The Community

Indeed, the village, town, tribe, or neighborhood forms the next layer of order. A broad society of households allows for the diversification and specialization of skills within a context of general competence and an expectation of fair exchange. Such collectives operate best when bonded by other affections: a common religious faith; a shared ethnicity; a binding sense of history; the intermingling of a relatively small number of kin groups. Within such communities, the individual internalizes restraints on behavior and ambition, recognizing the threat posed by any form of abrupt innovation. In this level of civic order, children receive a kind of communal rearing, where the sharp edges or peculiarities found in each household can be tempered. Such close community also offers the only effective protection of individuals from pathologies within households, allowing social intervention to occur without threatening the normative pattern of family living. The town, tribe, or neighborhood imparts to the young the duties which constitute membership in a community and models of behavior and rectitude beyond those found in one's immediate household. Public actions are guided most commonly by custom and convention with formal law generally aimed at the regulation of the stranger. When deviance from community norms occurs, informal and non-aggressive measures such as shunning are normally effective in restoring order and bringing the wayward back into harmony with the community.

Leadership at this level of society emerges spontaneously, as persons living in close proximity to each other come to recognize the character strengths and weaknesses of their neighbors, and accept the guidance and wisdom of persons who ably practice both self- and household-governance. They give deference, as well, to the experience of age, a kind of public memory that carries a record of past successes and errors. This natural leadership may be formalized through councils of elders or trustees, or it may be left informal. In either case, the leaders accept the great responsibility of protecting their neighbors from internal or external threats that would subvert the bonds of community. Organized community militias, composed of men who study "the arts of war," provide defense

against open aggression or gross challenges to public safety. The more complex dangers lie in alien ideologies and technologies that would strike at the heart of healthy community life. Community leaders properly judge such ideologies and technologies, and seek to prohibit or restrict those which would damage the basis of community life.

Commerce occurs between households through markets. Communities rely on sentiments of common humanity to soften the rough edges of competition, to insure principles of fair exchange, and to preserve the household basis of the economy. Communities strive to forestall a complete industrialization of human economic and social life. The labor of family members, including that of children, normally occurs within the family enterprise. Some family enterprises grow larger without losing their family character. When employment outside the household develops, customary arrangements control the corrosive effects of competitive wages by limiting such labor to only one household member and by expecting a family-oriented wage in return.

Social life at this level also depends on the attachment of individuals to the landscape in which they grow, live, and act, and to the flora and fauna of their native place. Actions such as walking, fishing, hunting, and gardening secure this bond, creating affection for the physical and biological environment which has, in a way, also given life to the individual. This grounding in a small niche of the natural world is vital to the full development of the human personality and necessary to the attachments which define and hold households and communities together. Deep affection for a place is normally the product of growing up there, whether it be the flat grasslands of an Illinois prairie or the soaring mountains and canyons of Utah. Persons without this sense of native place are left incomplete. They often become perpetual nomads, given to grand visions and ideological constructs designed to fill the emptiness in their hearts.

The Fourth Societal Bond: The State

The next tier of society is the state. It exists to protect households, villages, and their members from external threat and to mediate disputes between households and communities that cannot be resolved at a lower level. Having no fixed metaphysic, the structure of the state can vary from place to place and circumstance to circumstance. The sole guiding principle is the limitation of its power. Natural authority resides in households and communities, where it is conditioned by innate human affections. These entities cede to the state only the minimum authority necessary to keep foreign armies and other alien pressures at bay. Constitutional arrangements need insure, as far as possible, that most

authority remains in local and household hands, that powers granted to the state remain strictly circumscribed, and that leaders of the state be persons of character and self-restraint. Full citizenship in the state is granted to those who fulfill certain obligations: participation in the common defense through membership in the militia; maintenance of personal independence through a productive homestead; ownership of home, land, and tools; marriage, procreation, and acknowledgement of responsibility for the next generation; and acceptance by one's neighbors.

Traditionalist families have existed within monarchies, oligarchies, and republics. Monarchical organization has the important symbolic claim of providing leadership of a society of households by a family household. Oligarchies and republics have the ability to draw from a wider pool of talent and virtue. Republics resting on widely distributed small property constitute true democracy. All three forms of traditionalist governance rely on the body of property owners committed to constitutional duty.

The great danger posed by the state is its propensity to become an end in itself, exercising authority not ceded by the foundational social units, but rather claimed as right. Working to destroy the traditionalist order, this rogue state will assert power to "protect" individuals from the rooted authority of households and communities. It will build "state schools" to impart a state morality. It will create artificial "rights" that bludgeon traditional authority. At its most perverse, this wayward state will set wife against husband, husband against wife, children against parents, and household against household. Aggrandizing its own power, this state will weaken the institution of marriage; subsidize illegitimacy and divorce; seize the dependency functions of care for the young, the old, and the infirm; transfer the concept of "autonomy" from the household to the individual; and invert the meaning of liberty, casting it as the gift of the state. Such actions destroy natural society and erect in its place an order where all individuals become wards of Leviathan. An order of free men becomes a "client society," where bureaucrats minister to the needs of "citizen subjects." Such arrangements invariably bring economic and social decline, since they rest on abstract or imaginary "rights" that are divorced from a sense of duty and from the authentic human affections toward kin and neighbors. Moreover, human "needs" cast under the rubric of "rights" have no real endpoint, and the effort to meet them through social agency will ultimately consume the wealth of a people.

The Broadest Societal Bond: The Nation

The last social tier is the nation. It rests on commonalities that transcend households, communities, and states, among them religious belief, a common morality, language, a shared history, a common

ecosystem, inherited folkways, and blood. The consciousness of nationhood may wax or wane, encouraged at times by rallying voices who remind a people of "their common destiny," discouraged at other times by voices urging "universal brotherhood" or the creation of transnational "empire," or even forgotten during periods of social and political chaos.

"Nation" and "state" are never found in perfect unity. The vagaries of history, jealousy, and chance prevent such an ordering. Yet danger lies in even an incomplete merging of these two social tiers, for such a bond inevitably augments the state's claims against households and communities, by appealing to "the needs of the nation" in a quest for taxes, conscripts, and territory. A sense of nationhood, while necessary to a complete or full social life, is properly mediated through the foundational tiers of state, community, and household. Any attempt by large numbers of individuals to swear first loyalty to the nation, or by the nation to sweep aside the social structures lying between it and the individual, must bring in its wake another form of crisis.

The Unbridled Factor

The wild card in human social relations is the corporation, seen here as an artificial, voluntary union of persons toward some common end. This purpose may be religious (as in a Medieval monastic corporation), economic (as in the modern multinational corporation), or intellectual (as in an academy of sciences). The common characteristic of the corporation is the manner in which it transcends the natural social constructs of family household, community, state, and nation by claiming the direct and primal loyalty of individuals. Persons joining the corporation weaken, or even abandon, their bonds to the tiers of a traditionalist order, accepting a new master.

So understood, corporations appear to have existed in most historical ages. Whether its task be missionary conversion to a faith or the production and sale of a commodity, the corporation is part of the human experience. It serves as an agent of change, disrupting inherited ways, and reordering the context in which natural society operates. Where natural society tends toward stability, each corporation represents a push for instability, for what Joseph Schumpeter called "creative destruction."⁴ Conflict between these social visions is inevitable. If the challenge by the corporation is too great, the result can be the distortion or destruction of traditional social life. At the same time, though, the corporation can indirectly help renew natural society, by providing a positive response to challenges. While traditional society can suppress corporate-induced change to the point of stagnation and decline, natural society can also tame or humanize the explosive force of innovation, turning it to constructive ends. The great test facing any age

is to find a workable balance between the satisfactions of continuity through community and the disruptions spawned by corporate-driven change.

The nihilist foes of society understand that ordered liberty rests on this pyramid of relationships: a submission to the sacred; the creation of marriages which flow into households; and the formation of households into communities, states, and nations. While ready to twist or subvert any of these tiers of society, they probably vent their greatest fury against the Divine source of life and the institution of marriage, for it is on these two pillars that all else rests. Accordingly, defense of the sacred canopy and of the marital covenant becomes the moral and political imperative for a traditionalist order. When they thrive, all else tends to follow, and human existence knows a certain joy and peace.

References

1. From G.K. Chesterton, *The Superstition of Divorce*, Chapter V; in *Collected Works, Volume IV* (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1987): 252:61.
2. See: Louis de Bonald, *On Divorce*, Nicolas Davidson Ed. (New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publishers, 1992).
3. From : Ralph Borsodi, *Prosperity and Security : A Study in Realistic Economics* (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1938).
4. See: Joseph A Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947).