

AUTHORITY
AND VIRTUE

THE RESURRECTION OF THE
AMERICAN CHRISTIAN
REPUBLIC

LARRY GLOTFELTY

Dedicated to the memory of my parents and sister

Animo et Fide - Courage and Faith

A N R A V A R N A

Copyright by the author / First printing January 2017

“Authority is exercised legitimately only when it seeks the common good of the group concerned and employs morally licit means to attain it.” The thoughts which follow are intended to adhere to this thought taken from Roman Catholic teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENTS +++++

PREFACE Page i

SECTION ONE- Often statements from our past included precisely used words to argue in favor of a limited government influenced by Christianity and against democratic excesses Page 1

SECTION TWO- To return to a limited government influenced by Christianity we require leaders who see the spiritual sense in all issues Page 8

SECTION THREE- The leader's authority establishes order, and order questions equality and regulates change Page 12

SECTION FOUR- Order struggles against nihilism and the harmful ways of governing it creates Page 14

SECTION FIVE- Order establishes hierarchy which supports the mores of a Christian society Page 23

SECTION SIX- Unrestricted freedom leads to an unrestricted democracy Page 26

SECTION SEVEN- Religion provides necessary restrictions for freedom and democracy Page 35

SECTION EIGHT- A true conservatism tied with traditionalism also provides necessary restrictions. Page 40

SECTION NINE- The identity found within a culture is another restriction Page 45

SECTION TEN- Identity and authority are needed to form a nation Page 50

SECTION ELEVEN- Obeying authority is required to learn what living fully means Page 54

SECTION TWELVE- Living fully means recognizing leadership in the family and in the nation Page 59

SECTION THIRTEEN- Living fully means regaining beauty and other positive cultural elements Page 65

SECTION FOURTEEN- The beauty of traditional culture will return when a traditional leader returns Page 75

SECTION FIFTEEN- A conservative restoration will restore the permanent things of which traditional culture consists Page 78

SECTION SIXTEEN- Traditional culture will overcome the various forms of ugliness Page 107

SECTION SEVENTEEN- Turn from the worldly and search for the true leader Page 116

SECTION EIGHTEEN- Turn from the worldly because the true leader will be a gift by the grace of God Page 120

PREFACE ++++

As would be expected the subject matter of the following pages follows generally the title and subtitle involved. *Authority and Virtue: The Resurrection of the American Christian Republic* is a proposal to move toward the religious-based limited government which marked much of our history. This would assist us in regaining the predominance of virtue which marked much of our history.

There is a tendency among some of us to glorify the “good old days” and wish for their return, and what I have written here can justifiably be accused of such glorification. Some people find a large amount of good in the past; others find little or no good in the past. The first group can be called traditionalists because in some amount they want to follow the good past. The second group can be called progressives because they want to progress to what they imagine will be better by abandoning much of the past. Because the word progressive has not until recently been widely used in American political affairs, I use the more common but synonymous term liberal.

The differences between those who turn to “the good old days” and those who turn from them is in one way a matter of preference. It is a matter of preference in the same sense as many other personal decisions: the choice of a particular product brand, a commitment to a particular diet or health style, or a decision between living in a rural or an urban environment. Preferences can be changed, but some more important preferences are difficult to change.

Beyond the level of preferences, disputes about the past and the future are increasingly considered a matter of truth. Where, for instance, the traditionalist will consider clearly defined roles in the family or in the larger society good, there are those who argue that the truth is that such defined roles were repressive and harmful. Hierarchy is a good commonly found in the past and should be continued say traditionalists; the truth is that hierarchy has no place in the diverse egalitarian society preferred by liberals. The list of such disagreements would be lengthy, but the important matter is that the two sides cannot agree on what is true. “What is truth?” Pilate famously asked.

Where it is possible to question even the factual truth of traditionalism, liberalism often utilizes that approach as well. How important was religion in the lives of those who put in place the foundations of the United States? Isn’t democratic the proper word to describe the foundations of the United States? After the passing of centuries, such questions can become difficult to answer.

The retention of the various truths of traditionalism has been made even more difficult by a number of evolutions in our time. Some of these have been drawn from deep in America’s history while others have been taken from the more recent convulsions of the 1960s and 1970s and the 16 year period of the Bush and Obama presidencies.

These evolutions can actually be reduced to a single word: counterculture. I will use the term culture often, attempting to tie it with authority, permanence, and even beauty. But the salient point is that the traditional culture has been for a considerable period pushed deeper into the margins.

From these margins, traditional culture now struggles against what are the accepted behaviors. The man who lives with a sense of propriety and masculinity, the woman who lives with a sense of propriety and femininity, the man and woman who commit permanently to each other and live their lives fully are all now outside what is expected.

Those who no longer fit these newly accepted behaviors must regain by some decision a place to fulfill their purpose. Initially this place is within them, and eventually it is more than that.

Asking for an opportunity to honor the good taken from the past is not an isolated, or one-of-a-kind opinion. There are countless Americans who are disappointed and even ashamed of what their country has become. These Americans will recognize and agree with much of what I have written here.

What may be a new thought to these Americans who truly want to conserve their traditions is the necessity of a leader, a source of authority represented by an individual. When the nation was forming its new government, the need for leadership was so clear and strong that a single state could provide four of the first five presidents as well as a number of other gifted leaders. Ability of that type has been discouraged for so long that it has been mostly lost.

One of the strongest motivations of our great founders was the desire to benefit not only themselves by forging a proper system but also to benefit generations not yet born. In very distinct contrast, there is no real concern for future Americans among what are now called political leaders. All leaders will be recognized for their accomplishments (if history treats them fairly), but among those only some will be concerned that such recognition be tied to a confirmation of virtue.

Only leaders who concern themselves with virtue will care about the generations not yet born. Only such leaders can provide the authority necessary to resurrect the American Christian republic.

And what must be done to resurrect a Christian republic? Can a message so simple that it is often associated with tent revivals overcome the enormous and entrenched obstacles erected by democracy, the modern, and the secular? It is not the message or the messenger but to whom it is delivered that answers that question.

We now all of us know – and even many Americans share this knowledge – what students of politics have of course always known, that the problems of ‘liberty and authority’ are not as simple as they have seemed to the majority in America.

Wyndham Lewis 1948 *America and Cosmic Man*

ONE ++++ Often statements from our past included precisely used words to argue in favor of a limited government influenced by Christianity and against democratic excesses

“Republics are created by virtue,” said a prominent Supreme Court Justice when the American republic was being challenged in the mid-1800s. In our time the character of a republic has certainly been lost, and some of us believe it is because virtue has been lost.

As a country we should return to the Christian republican pattern of government which was taken at our birth because that form was better for the American people than the subsequent pattern under which we have lived. By better I mean that Americans then were more of a people and we then prospered under God. Although it would be virtually impossible to convince the side which doubts such statements, this is what I firmly and honestly believe.

The government of the United States has taken two forms in its history. The first, a republic, lasted roughly until the Great Depression. The second, a democracy, has continued into our time. The difference between the two is that a republic is a government by law and a democracy is a government by men. (Men is the term which would have been used for much of our history, but obviously men and women are both currently involved and can claim responsibility for democratic behavior equally.) Obviously there were certain characteristics of a democracy present from the outset of the republic and continuing through some later presidents. The administrations of Jackson and Lincoln, for instance, require some sorting concerning republican and democratic parts. In contrast, there are very few characteristics of the republic present in our democratic time. Because the country is now a democracy, it prefers the yielding type of government by men rather than the unyielding type of government by law.

A difference between these two governmental forms, like another example I will offer later, especially involves the element of time. Republican change comes slowly, and democratic change comes quickly. This was demonstrated in the New Deal years and again in the 1960s when extreme

changes were quickly imposed. In some ways change has come quickly in the administrations of the last two presidents and more so under President Obama. When there is talk of “redefining the role of government,” it means change will follow the democratic form, and both parties have no reluctance in promising to redefine in order to achieve their goals.

There are understandably instances of conflict between law-centered and man-centered governing changes, those made carefully over time or changes made carelessly and quickly, but for most Americans they attract little attention. During the Obama presidency there have been numerous man-centered changes; these would have been described by the word scandals under different circumstances. While of course the Obama administration retains the full authority of government rule, these man-centered changes have solidified conflict along the many divisions present in American society.

One conflict, a very basic conflict, is the acceptance or rejection of authority. Our time is a period of general, and perhaps growing, opposition to authority and order. This has been the case for my entire adult life. To live in the free society which we prefer there is a requirement for a level of opposition to authority just as there is a need for change among us and change in the way in which we are governed. There must, however, be strict limits to this opposition and change.

Our attitudes toward the police are examples of our attitudes toward authority. The police are always part of the authority under which we live. In many societies, in the past and currently, the police are accessories to repression. Even in the United States the police are consistently accused of brutality and repression. While individual officers may abuse their responsibilities, Americans are protected by two aspects of our laws: the laws are limited and allow a maximum of individual freedom, and they are based on our religious beliefs and encourage considerate behavior toward others. When individual officers abuse their responsibilities, Americans rightfully expect the system will be held accountable.

Throughout our history we have shown an opposition to authority, but this opposition was also – until recently – clearly subject to restraint. This is shown in the largest sense by two of the more important events in our history. The war which eventually formed the United States was at least initially limited to securing only the rights granted to other British subjects; our concerns were the wrongs committed by Parliament not the ruling privileges of the monarchy. The war which formed for four years the Confederacy was restrained in that it was only a repetition of an attempt to withdraw from a political relationship; it did not question the authority of the Lincoln administration to govern the states of the North.

Part of the authority many Americans currently oppose is religious authority. The phrase “church and state” is seldom used to indicate that people are directed by religious, civil, and a blend of religious and civil authority, but the phrase can be accurately used in that manner.

In the United States as we move into the twenty-first century, the restraining influence of Christianity is being diluted in several ways. Often the men and women who influence or even rule us make it difficult for Christians to practice their faith; these men and women are in our legislatures, our courts, various agencies, schools at various levels, popular culture, and elsewhere.

Our religious beliefs are not yet forbidden for private purposes, but they are deeply discouraged in dealing in public matters. Following this, in some measure, are the preferences of those around us who no longer accept fully the morality and mores which were so unifying in the past.

The result of this dilution is most accurately described as America's movement away from God. We have turned away from God's authority.

In his poem "Choruses from 'The Rock,'" T.S. Eliot, an exceptionally important theorist and writer, offered some profound remarks concerning this dilution:

Why should men love the Church? Why should they love her laws?
She tells them of Life and Death, and of all they would forget.
She is tender, where they would be hard, and hard where they like to be soft.
She tells them of Evil and Sin, and other unpleasant facts.

Eliot said men collectively possessed certain kinds of knowledge but only certain kinds:

Knowledge of words, and ignorance of the Word.
All our knowledge brings us nearer to our ignorance.
But nearness to death no nearer to God.

Is it our country or our nation that is nearer to death?

+

In the following pages I will use numerous quotations, and the selection of certain sources raises an issue that may as well be dealt with at this early stage: why should one person's judgment be considered more worthy than someone else's? Thomas Jefferson's statement that "all men are created equal" is a common example of being selective in choosing certain ideas. Jefferson did, of course, create that phrase, but there is no doubt that even for him there were many qualifying considerations. Also since Jefferson's statement there have been many individuals who have deeply questioned what his phrase seemingly means. Consider also that supporters of equality will proudly repeat what Jefferson said on being equal but will completely disagree with his stands on nearly all other matters. There is also the issue that whatever precisely he meant it was nothing more than his opinion; common opinion at the time would have probably disagreed about equal creation; and there were no scientific studies then or now that affirm the concept of equal creation. Let us arbitrarily take a second and more recent figure: Francis Crick. Crick was the co-discoverer of the DNA molecule and was thought brilliant in biophysics, molecular biology, and neuroscience. For Crick to be regarded as a leader in these subjects would be understandable because he had studied these matters, eventually had great experience in them, and possessed the ability to comprehend them. With his exceptional scientific talents it is possible that he could have also

contributed or become a leader in other fields of science. In matters more distant from his strengths, however, should his judgments have been given any great weight? Crick could be described, for instance, not only as an atheist but even more, intolerant of the concept of Christianity. Should Francis Crick's opinions on religion have influenced others? If instead the issue was human differences, something somewhat closer to his studies than religion, should Crick's opinions, formed by his superior intelligence, have been taken seriously and influenced others?

To the extent that such questions can be answered, it can be said that we often depend on special sources to affirm the opinions we hold or nearly hold. Sources of a special nature can convert us to something that we have no strong feelings on or even something we previously disbelieved, but to convert us is more difficult than to affirm and therefore less likely to occur. The person who insists on the various forms of equality without exception and absolute individual rights – often understood in a very modern and limited way – will cite Thomas Jefferson, but there are many more rational and valid comments on human equality and rights. Jefferson's opinion on this is more likely to affirm beliefs than to convert someone.

Special sources are quoted to lend support for a certain position or statement. Many of these sources are from the past, sometimes from the distant past. Liberals might quarrel with the thought, but the use of quotations from these past sources is actually an endorsement of traditionalism. In any event to dismiss what Jefferson really felt on political subjects or what Crick really felt on science related subjects is difficult.

Conservatives of all types have for several centuries relied in just this way on the writings of Edmund Burke for support, and his statements could be used for support on many of the subjects dealt with here: democracy, equality, order, and tradition. Burke was Irish-born but a member for many years of the British House of Commons where he was known as a supporter of the religious rights of Catholics, an advocate for the American colonies, as well as being an opponent of the 1789 revolt in France. A review of a current study of Burke's politics, *Empire and Revolution*, described his commitment to limited democracy as "rooted in an overwhelmingly Christian view of political morality and civil society." Here are examples of Burke's statements on the four subjects just mentioned:

[I]n a democracy the majority of the citizens is capable of exercising the most cruel oppressions upon the minority whenever strong divisions prevail in that kind of polity, as often they must.

The levelers, therefore, only change and pervert the natural order of things; they load the edifice of society by setting up in the air what the solidity of the structure requires to be on the ground In this you think you are combatting prejudice, but you are at war with nature.

Society requires not only the passions of individuals should be subjected, but even in the mass and body, as well as in the individuals, the incli-

nations of men should frequently be thwarted, their will controlled
In this sense the restraints of men, as well as their liberties, are to be reckoned among their rights.

With them [the enemies of tradition] it is sufficient motive to destroy an old scheme of things because it is an old one They think that government may vary like the modes of dress, and with little effect.

If anything marks modern government it is responding to the popular trends in much the same way trends in clothing change, but opposed to this is the Christian view of history. In his 1951 essay the English historian Christopher Dawson strongly stated what Christians who oppose the trends of our day must believe:

For the Christian view of history is not merely a belief in the direction of history by divine providence, it is a belief in the intervention of God in the life of mankind by direct action at certain definite points in time and place. The doctrine of the Incarnation which is the central doctrine of the Christian faith is also the center of history.

+

In discussing the restoration of a Christian republic, my goal is to do this as directly and simply as possible, but this is difficult. The subject itself creates this difficulty because to tell about it is not like telling about someone's life or some event in history. Also, at one time Christianity and a republican form of government were very great influences on the lives of Americans, but during my lifetime those two influences have been enormously diminished. In our time secularism and a democratic form of government are very great influences, and because secularism and democracy are so dominant a discussion of a republic shaped by Christian beliefs is made to seem unnecessary.

In the following pages my intention is also to discuss the subjects of authority and virtue. It is my intention to do this as directly and simply as possible, but this is also difficult. The subjects create this difficulty because they are concepts and understanding them requires understanding other concepts. Some opinions would regard them not just as concepts but as outdated concepts.

Understanding as precisely as possible how a word is used often helps the reader in seeing what is meant by the author; the word authority is only one example of this. It therefore seems useful to give brief definitions of authority, virtue, and other more prominent terms as they are used in the following discussion:

Authority as noted by John C. Calhoun, the great ante-bellum southern leader, is allocated to all of us but in vastly different amounts. Calhoun argued that freedom must yield to order because “the existence of the race [the nation] is of greater moment [importance] than its improvement.” Accordingly then, authority is the setting in place of a rule and the restraint upon change initiated by an individual.

Beauty is a form of authority: a force that brings order. Beauty for the English philosopher Roger Scruton is what gives us a place in the world.

Conservatism is what results from five dispositions: the honorable, the moral, the orderly, the skeptical, and that which prefers liberty. This list is from an introduction to a collection of conservative essays by Europeans; these same dispositions would apply to American conservatism and the conservatism beyond only politics.

Courage defined by Thomas Carlyle, the nineteenth century British writer, was the “unconscious superiority to fear.” In a comment appropriate to democracy, Thomas Jefferson said that “one man with courage is a majority.”

Culture is a way of living which is shared among a people. This statement leads to the necessity of understanding the term people.

Decadence is a collective lack of meaning for life.

Democracy is the rule of men rather than the rule of law. Democracy in its current fashion is the opponent of authority. Democracy should be a forming by a people of their own destiny; if it is not this then it is not true democracy.

Freedom is the manifestation of identity in an individual or group sense.

A hero is someone who is willing to forfeit some part of what he or she possesses in order to change what harm otherwise would happen to others.

Hierarchy is the mechanism which responds to inequality.

Identity is one of the bases of culture. Other bases include freedom and religion.

Liberalism is the belief that society and even all aspects of human nature can be permanently transformed.

To emphasize the point made in defining prejudice it is worth quoting even a communist author, Anatole France, who said that “morality is the sum of the prejudices of the community.”

Mores are the religious or ethical parts of culture.

Nihilism is a utopian approach whose meaning can be seen in the Latin *nihil* meaning nothing: nothing in laws or institutions is acceptable.

Organic is what is naturally best. Just as in organic farming, certain combined characteristics of the soil cannot be improved: an organic society cannot be improved beyond what constitutes its highest nature.

A people is a culture sharing group, most importantly sharing mores.

Permanent things are what are denied by revolutionary change. These things are drawn from the conservative dispositions previously listed. These things pass on the traditional knowledge of what constitutes transcendence.

Kenneth Minogue, a British educator and author, wrote that “politics is the activity by which the framework of human life is sustained; it is not life itself.” This definition has the advantage of emphasizing the secondary role of politics or government. Only a framework is needed, and politics need be nothing more than what supports that.

Prejudice is a form of instinctive morality, although in a modern sense prejudice is often considered behavior removed from morality.

A propositional nation is a misrepresentation concerning the collective since any nation exists entirely separate from the ideology or propositions that govern it.

A republic is a system founded on public virtue which in turn is founded on private virtue.

Traditionalism is a nation’s overall ordering of force. It is a nation’s decision as to what deserves continuance.

Treason is someone’s voluntary isolation from and harm to their own kind. (This definition is loosely taken from *The New Meaning of Treason*.)

With virtue again we are talking of a disposition: the disposition to do what is right. There are, of course, differing beliefs individually and culturally as to what is right. Despite this, virtue can be defined as the restriction of vice, the winning of the spirit over the flesh.

Some other terms are defined to some degree in the text or follow very much the standard definitions for their usage. Among these terms are home, leader, modern, ochlocracy, and truth.

Very likely the brief defining comments on democracy and republic do not indicate the basic faults of democracy. Churchill is often credited with the comment that “democracy is the worst form of government except for all the others.” But why should it be considered the worst at all? Later there will be more comments on the weakness of the democratic system as well, but due to the importance of any such criticism it is also useful to raise the issue at this early point.

The list of democratic faults is long, but two faults are obviously of increasing influence. A majority can carry the law in a direction which benefits everyone, but a majority can also carry the law in a direction which benefits only a narrow group and harms the country as a whole. Following on this generally recognized fact, a majority can amend mistakes it has made by listening to and learning from the minority; but often the minority is not allowed any influence.

The prominent historian Bernard Bailyn gave in a few sentences the dominant attitudes of the founders concerning the scope of governing:

[P]ower is evil, a necessity perhaps but an evil necessity; that it is infinitely corrupting; and that it must be controlled ... written constitutions; the separation of powers; bill of rights; limitations on executives, on legislatures, and courts; restrictions on the right to coerce and wage war – all express the profound distrust of power.

Not everyone involved in joining the 13 states together agreed completely with such a statement, but democratic was not a popular label.

TWO ++++ To return to a limited government influenced by Christianity we require leaders who see the spiritual sense in all issues

In addition to these terms, I am presenting separately, defining, and discussing three more: butskellism, distributism, and pelagianism. This separation is because the three are so obscure that probably they don't deserve equal billing with the other terms, but they are still worth knowing about.

Butskellism is the realization that when heroes are absent in our society those who direct us can be labeled differently but the direction in which we are led remains the same. In Britain in the 1950s, the group supposedly opposing expansion of government to the level of socialism was led by a man named Butler; the group committed to installing socialism in every facet of British life was led by a man named Gaitskell. The two men's names were combined to indicate that it made absolutely no difference who formally controlled government policies because the result would be the same. The United States has certainly had over the years more than its share of butskellism in that the imposition of the liberal and secular has continued. The most publicized conservatives are doing virtually nothing to preserve tradition because they no longer know what to conserve. A rather childish way, perhaps, of phrasing this is "there has to be a there there." What is the there that conservatives are obligated to protect? The group that is to shove liberalism to the side has instead been shaped by liberalism. The usual mode of operations for the political conservatives is to oppose weakly, compromise, compromise again, and then assume the same position that was initially opposed. During the last several generations literally hundreds of these regressions have occurred on issues of all types.

The second term distributism is a religious based economic system that stresses the fairness and justice of a certain kind of ownership. Another way of putting this is that it values the stability of property and the smallness of scale. It is somewhat tied to Catholicism by two Papal encyclicals and its promotion by two influential British Catholics of the early twentieth century: Hilaire Belloc and G.K. Chesterton.

Distributism is different from other economic systems in that it considers itself as a restoration of the way of life before modern (eighteenth or nineteenth century) economics. This difference is its concern with the spiritual life, where obviously modern economics is not concerned with such matters. Economic order should be based "on human needs and values of body, mind, and soul, not on mammon," is how one supporter put it in a 1935 speech. Thomas Carlyle was not involved with distributism but wrote about the mammon gospel, saying that society had forgotten that cash payment "is not the sole relation of human beings," that there should be personal involvement that goes beyond our minimal obligations.

Britain's industrialization and the reaction to it began early (the poet Blake wrote about its dark Satanic mills in 1804), but when the problems of industrial development later became apparent in the United States a modified distributism was one proposed response. Leading this proposed response was a group called the Southern Agrarians. Put simply they believed "that the culture of the soil is the best and most sensitive of vocations, and therefore it should have economic preference." Accordingly agricultural work should increase, which has been, for better or for worse, the reverse of what has happened.

If the intentions of distributist and agrarian thought were an increase in small farming, more local and family businesses, or the ownership of land and permanent homes it failed; but that was not what they fully intended. To focus on the Southern Agrarians, they believed that the antebellum South had found a balance that contributed to an exceptional way of living. This way

increased character, order, stability, and the appreciation of beauty in their environment. This exceptional way of living attempted to maintain if not different things at least things in a different way. There was no intention of reproducing all the earlier circumstances but just to acknowledge “a more vivid livingness” (using D.H. Lawrence’s phrase) and find ways to regain that. Their outlook was similar to the advice given by the religious writer C.S. Lewis:

We all want progress, but if you’re on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn, and walking back to the right road; in that case the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive.

Since the Agrarians represented a group effort (and men of great ability and intellect), they achieved some measure of recognition. A few of the original group dropped by the liberal wayside, but these were more than compensated for by the ones who became more committed to their cause. Important essays, histories, novels, and poetry were the result. Of course the Agrarians’ writing efforts were only a small part of our literature, but there has been some influence carried down from the 1930s until our time. Various stripes of conservatives are still willing to make mention of the distributists’ economics and particularly that of the Southern Agrarians. Often the mentions, whatever their source, regard such approaches as earnest and intelligent but unrealistic in their own time period – and completely so now. Even at the university where the Agrarians’ ideas were formed, the school has for many years shared the leftism and secularism prevalent throughout the rest of higher education.

Overlooked ideas may not be hampered by their attachment to the past but rather by their not being framed as a continuity. This is understandable because what was of the past was generally challenging and difficult; Americans, in contrast to this, now expect their lives to continue to become easier and don’t especially want to hear about or be concerned with the past. When workers of the past failed in what they were expected to accomplish, it was more easily judged because it was more physical in measurement. In our time we do less physical work and the failures are more difficult to judge because the standards are consistently more subjective. Liberalism is part of this: the large public sector is less responsive to standards and efficiencies than any other group, and the public sector nearly always expands under the pressure of liberalism.

The third term Pelagianism is the belief we can choose good, that is we can avoid evil, without the help of God. Pelagianism questions the concept of sin.

In our tradition sin is simply a violation of the authority of God. It is difficult for Christians to understand but many people refuse to accept the whole concept of sin. The abusive and terrible events of everyday life are to the minds of many people just something that happens.

Historically, even within the strands of Christianity, those who believe in mankind’s permanent violation of God’s authority have faced opposition. Using historical figures, those who believed in original sin can be represented by Saint Augustine and those who offered another judgment by Pelagius, a fourth century ascetic. Augustine explained the subject in depth, and subsequently it was formalized as doctrine at the Council of Trent. Pelagians, in contrast, believed

that human nature is untainted by original – or ancestral – sin. The beliefs of Pelagius were condemned and he was excommunicated, but opposition to the belief that the fixed past continues in our lives was never eliminated. The Protestant Reformation felt obligated to reaffirm mankind is by nature sinful and that such a natural situation can only be struggled against; closer to our time G.K. Chesterton responded from the Catholic side to the controversy by saying that original sin was the most obvious, or easily understood, of all Christian doctrines.

Just as the church leaders had to respond to the Pelagian belief long after it was first condemned, a variation of it continues even into our time. Although liberalism in its different forms generally is thought to be derived from the Enlightenment, the revolution in France of 1789, and similar events, to join it with Pelagian thought is not difficult. This can be done because both the ancient Pelagians and the modern liberals assure us that they are moving us toward an ideal world. Of course there are constant incidents of progress: our abilities and knowledge in certain subjects do increase. The ideal of a promised utopian world, however, remains far beyond anyone's grasp. The twenty-first century world offers in different measures just what has marked all of history: environmental destruction, fanaticism, inhumanity, plagues, poverty, slavery, starvation, and war.

For what I am calling the modern Pelagians God is merely something projected, a product of the human mind that is meaningful to some but meaningless to others. Right and wrong becomes determined by the individual. The individual divines “by conscience.” The Pelagians of our time are the drivers for progress and freedom in all matters including the determination of right and wrong.

Do progress and freedom – such subjects of deep veneration in the modern age – need to be forced upon us? Do progress and freedom – such supports of group morality in the democratic age – need to be forced upon us?

The source of the adage that “government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force” is uncertain, but the message is accurate. At some point both the modern Augustinian and the modern Pelagian turn to force in an attempt to correct mankind's imperfections. Their commitments and actions are different because their understandings of human failure remain different. Basically they do not agree as to how to define sins, or which ones to treat most seriously, or even if sins and laws should be related.

Closing this section I would say that even though these three terms seem obscure they do reinforce my central idea. That idea is that until we have leaders who understand economic and material issues in a spiritual sense, and, in fact, see all issues in that way there will be no true progress or freedom.

THREE ++++ The leader's authority establishes order, and order questions equality and regulates change

After just listing a number of definitions, I will point out that the definition of authority alone is sufficient to show what a blessing it is. First of all, an authority is an accepted source of knowledge. A second and closely related meaning, and the one predominantly used here, is the power to decide or give direction. Where would we be if we had no expert to turn to or no ability to choose a solution to what confronts us? According to the first meaning then an authority is an expert or specialist; for our purposes the second meaning is the power to provide freedom for the person involved or for others. These definitions are completed by knowing that the origin of the word authority is tied to the word augur which means the talent for seeing the future.

An extremely important characteristic of authority but one which is often overlooked is that it is possessed by all of us but in vastly different amounts. We all have authority to choose for ourselves or direct others in some measure, but the varying limits which are involved are clear demonstrations of inequality. This inequality of authority is shown in many ways but is particularly easily shown in the treatment of children. A child lacks the ability to decide properly among choices, and instead decisions are made for the child by others. Children have less understanding of the future, even the immediate future, in large part because they lack knowledge of the past that is gained by experience.

Not only is a child an example of someone lacking authority, a child is also someone lacking freedom. The family actively denies freedom to the child, and this is how children in our culture have always been treated. Different cultures, even current world cultures, have varied in their treatment of children, and perhaps eventually our approaches will be changed, as so much has recently changed.

In our culture, as in others, increasing maturity slowly brings to the child an increased level of authority over his or her affairs. This re-evaluation of responsibility is somewhat similar to the evolving changes in a republican form of government.

Some children, especially as they approach becoming an adult, will not tolerate the slowness of such increased freedom. The parable of the prodigal son is an example of this. This young man would not wait for the freedom his inheritance would have brought him. He demanded and received the material reward that would have normally been given years later; he abused his freedom and eventually returned to his father's house destroyed by the poor choice that he had made.

The parable of a disobedient and thoughtless son tells us that we are all damaged by the rejection of true and pure authority. The prodigal son rejected several things: the blessing of his family and the authority of his spiritual father.

The story of this disobedience illustrates two of the permanent conditions of mankind: inequality and inability to avoid sin (or one demonstration of what is called original sin). The absence of equality and the dominance of sin were as common many centuries ago when this

parable was first told as they are now. Conceivably there are now certain new efforts to claim equality and slightly new variations of sinfulness, but permanence is permanence. In the parable the younger brother abandoned his parents and even his nation into which he was born to surrender to his sin; the older brother, of course, was not without sin (for instance he was envious of the generous forgiveness given when his younger brother returned), but there was no equality in their behaviors. The older brother obeyed parental authority and was respected for his conduct.

The inequality that is to many such a concern – even though it cannot be overcome – and our sinful nature work against authority and in tandem have produced much of the strife of our world. Slavery and other forms of abuse based on economic systems, for instance, have been the result of these two permanent conditions.

+

One of the greatest forms of inequality imaginable – and one that remains obvious to certain groups even in our time – is the freedom to do right or the freedom to do wrong. Simply put, these groups do not judge as equal what they consider correct behavior and what they consider incorrect behavior, or what they consider righteous behavior or sinful behavior.

As part of the diversity that surrounds us, we could note the different attitudes toward right and wrong conduct concerning many subjects; marriage is one of the clearest examples of such different attitudes. In this country differing groups have taken varying approaches based on their backgrounds, economic classes, and other factors. Surveys of other countries find polygyny (a man with multiple wives) the most common form of marriage based on the number of cultures studied; polyandry (a woman with multiple husbands) exists but is rare; roughly one in six cultures, although they represent the largest populations, is monogamous; group marriages effectively no longer exist but were practiced in communes throughout history and some fairly recently. In third world countries it is not unusual for female children to be abused in various ways and marry by the age of 15, or even younger. Moslem women can be forced into marriage by their fathers. Thousands of women are killed in disputes over dowries each year. Traditional Americans would reject all of these practices except monogamy, but the groups that do accept them would offer reasons for their behavior. An important consideration for us to note is that the Americans who do not subscribe to our traditional values on marriage not only seek to have their behaviors accepted but are also probably more tolerant of these different attitudes.

Marriage, because of its association with the family, is a useful example in at least one other way: as another illustration of inequality. It is inconceivable that a marriage with multiple wives sharing one husband or one consisting of an adolescent female and much older husband is the same as a marriage between one man and one woman sharing many common traits including age. When circumstances are different, the situations are unequal in some way. A family in which one of the parents is absent is different from that of a two-parent family; studies and common experience have shown many problems result from one-parent households. Particularly bold critics point out that liberalism receives support from one-parent households and in turn supports them

through government relief programs. What is important to note is that these same critics are allowed to find fault with women willing to bear children without husbands, but the system as whole is beyond criticism.

Opposite forms of important behavior that have now been made equal are examples that the system is beyond criticism. The unwed mothers and their children supported by public funds were once considered a drain on those who paid for their needs; now it is much more likely that excuses will be made for the mothers and there will be an emphasis on the unfairness of subjecting any children to poverty. As women of this type, their children, and the circumstances of their support become more common they become more accepted. The supported families become the equal of families who assume responsibility for themselves. At some tipping point the supported families become dominant over the responsible families.

We are told by those who control the discourse that even though one behavior has always been considered better than another, the behaviors are actually of equal merit. Sometimes sooner and other times later the defense of traditional behavior is portrayed by those who control the discourse as not only less acceptable but also morally wrong.

Regarding changing standards and authority, where there is no authority there is no restraint upon change. If the rules of a game are not enforced then the players are free to make their own rules.

FOUR ++++ Order struggles against nihilism and the harmful ways of governing it creates

Any discussion of authority could branch off into discussions of several related subjects, and order is perhaps the most important of these. Authority establishes order, and order not only regulates change but also questions equality. Another way of stating this and also combining the two functions, is to say that true order sustains inequality where it should exist. As for the adjective true, its usage will be briefly mentioned somewhat later.

The word order has a long list of meanings. As nouns and verbs there are several dozen definitions. When these are mentioned one after another, the complexity of the word becomes apparent. In addition to many mathematical and architectural applications, the common definitions of order involve a judicial or military command, a methodical arrangement, a general obedience to the law, a monastic group, a rite of sacrament, or a form of church service.

One more definition of order, particularly important in this discussion, is when something functions properly it is said to be in working order. If someone were to find a rifle which had been lost for a long period, then tried to fire the rifle, and it functioned perfectly then we could say that the rifle was in working order. Working order means that all the parts necessary to make it function as a rifle are still in place. For this example it is important to realize that all of the parts included for the weapon cannot be considered equal. Some, for instance, could be replaced only by a skilled smith, while other parts could be replaced much more easily. Some, for instance, could be taken and used from another type of rifle while other parts could not.

The inequality of the rifle's parts is similar to the ordered inequality of society's parts. Society's design initially included many parts that have changed over time. Even important examples of this would be too numerous to mention, but one change in the areas of economics and employment is farming. In the 1930s a Southern Agrarian historian Frank Owsley described small scale farming as an important contributor to personal freedom and proper government; although the farmer still retains some independence, small farming has certainly diminished as a cultural influence or an influence on government.

It is order that should – and often does – determine cultural changes, but order does not exist in a vacuum. Order regulates by accepting or rejecting change, but some amount of change is imposed by forces opposed to legitimate order. Just as there is freedom to do right and freedom to do wrong, there is change of a constructive kind that is usually marked by its gradual nature and change of a destructive kind that is usually marked by sudden imposition.

Just as there are many actions that display restraint and deliberation by all that are involved, there are many actions that are marked by a lack of discipline or thought. When it comes to maintaining true freedom, now restraint and deliberation have been largely replaced. The Pelagians of our time have replaced them with promises that their type of change is the only hope for the future. As the sociologist Robert Nisbet wrote concerning the values of the past and the future:

A sense of the past is far more basic to the maintenance of freedom than hope for the future. The former is concrete and real; the latter is necessarily amorphous and more easily guided by those who can manipulate human actions and beliefs.

Nisbet also wrote that there could be no mistake greater than that of counterposing freedom and authority. Freedom, he continued, can be canceled out by coercion, but freedom, in any sense that is positive, is inseparable from the structure of authority – of rules, norms, and roles – which alone can give the stamp of character to the free mind.

+

Restraint and deliberation among us have been replaced. For some time many important changes have been imposed by forces opposed to legitimate order. They were the subject of an exceptional essay by Robert Nisbet five decades ago entitled “The Nemesis of Authority.” At that time Nisbet felt that “revolt against authority has reached a higher point than in any other period in the West since perhaps the final years of the Roman Empire.” His period had become “a revolt against all ordinary, traditional authorities.”

As a prominent college instructor, it was natural for Nisbet to call attention to the attacks on authority in language, high culture, and education. There was, in his opinion, a societal trend toward a repudiation for any richness in language. Culturally, disorder had become the highest

creative necessity for the artist or the intellectual. Colleges and universities were in many cases openly marked by a contempt for the curriculum to the extent that knowledge for its own sake became debased.

These attacks on higher culture, very common in the university environment during that period, were in only a brief time joined by attacks on the wider national culture. To older Americans who lived through the periods before and after the 1960s and 1970s the change is almost beyond description. This is especially true for traditionalists or conservatives, but for others as well.

For what Nisbet experienced he used the expression the nemesis of authority. The word nemesis is from Greek mythology meaning a spirit of retribution against those who are considered arrogant (another explanation is retribution against those who have received undeserved good fortune). It is often thought that nemesis is an opponent, but the meaning is more than that; it is an opponent who cannot be overcome. For a conservative like Robert Nisbet to view America in this way is certainly understandable: America the democratic fortress that had helped win two world wars and became the pre-eminent economic power was being undermined by misuse of the fundamentals of her own culture: such honored fundamentals as freedom of speech and democracy in a wider sense. The goal of this undermining seemed to be to overwhelm conventional civility:

And when such power comes to America, if it comes, it will not seem like power at all to a great many people, including large numbers of intellectuals, and perhaps especially of the young. It will be tonic, exhilarating, crusade-like, communal, even redemptive.

This power will even be redemptive, and so it (the liberalism of our time) continues to become. Its assumed redemptive character may have various parts, but one overriding part is that those who have formed and sustained America must now seek to be redeemed for their failures in regard to eliminating ills such as inequality, poverty, and social injustice. This atonement can be made by transferring authority to any of those who have not yet exercised it. The demand for this change is currently being made by groups and organizations representing the weaker classes, as well as the government at several levels. Remember government is not reason or eloquence but force.

Authority, the liberals' redemptive change, and force were combined in a 2014 speech by the man who then headed the education department of the federal government. For the first time in the country's history, how the central government expected the states to discipline students in their public schools was outlined. His argument was that students were suspended too often and should be removed from their classrooms only for violence or other equally serious matters; harsh punishments for being disruptive, profane, or disrespectful should be reconsidered. His opinion was that differing suspension rates such as South Carolina's 12 percent and North Dakota's two percent were examples of the abuse of authority:

[S]tudents in South Carolina are not six times more likely than their peers in North Dakota to pose serious disciplinary problems.... That huge disparity is not caused by differences in children; it's caused by differences in training, professional development, and discipline policies. It is adult behavior that needs to change.

An instance like this makes clear how imposed rules (and their enforcement) can be shaped, or managed, to erode traditional values.

+

When Robert Nisbet wrote that his period's destruction was moving toward a power capable of the complete disintegration of the concept of authority that was in some sense the beginning, and when the federal government decided the amount of school punishment was the fault of the schools that was the present. Considering the roots of the various secular changes go back nearly a century and show a steady growth through the various parts of society, anyone who opposes such challenges to traditional positions of authority would benefit from understanding their sources.

Over the course of the past several generations a number of important sources have undermined authority, but one which few Americans are familiar with is a form of neo-Marxist interdisciplinary social theory known as the Frankfurt School. Although few Americans are familiar with the group's leading contributors such as Adorno, Fromm, Habermas, Honneth, or Marcuse, these men have exercised enormous influence in this country.

The Frankfurt School's studies combine Freudian psychoanalysis with Marxian analysis to form a criticism of the main elements of Western culture and economics. Among the elements of culture it criticizes are authority, biological matters such as heredity, Christianity, the family, morality and sexual restraint, and patriotism. It can be thought of as Marxism moving away from purely economic terms to broader cultural terms. Herbert Marcuse labeled the intention of his group as a cultural revolution:

One can rightfully speak of a cultural revolution, since the protest is directed toward the whole cultural establishment, including the morality of the existing society.

Marcuse was certainly one of the most important of this group, and his essay "Repressive Tolerance" told us a great deal about their entire school of thought whether their subject was epistemology, existential philosophy, sociology, or any of their other concerns. Herbert Marcuse supported what he called liberating tolerance as a way of interacting and opposed what he labeled repressive tolerance. If all opinions can be heard, as in the behaviors of many democracies, then

this is normally considered fairness; but for Marcuse if supporters of traditional positions have any advantages that make the retention of their views much more likely than there is an absence of fairness and this should be called repressive tolerance, and it must be replaced by liberating tolerance:

Liberating tolerance, then, would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left. As to the scope of this tolerance and intolerance: it would extend to the stage of action as well as of discussions and propaganda, of deed as well as word.

The failure of Marxism in economics meant that other mass groups were needed such as those based on what could be termed broadly cultural issues. To Marcuse these needed groups were the victims – anyone who could claim to be disadvantaged compared to those around them. American society in the 1960s, which Marcuse condemned as a “tyranny of the majority,” could only be overthrown by the sustained (violent if necessary) efforts of these victims, “minorities intolerant, militantly intolerant and disobedient to the rules of behavior which tolerate destruction and suppression [by authority].”

The most clearly remembered group supporting the militantly intolerant during that period was the Weather Underground, an offshoot of another extreme leftist group. The Weather Underground placed explosives in buildings of the military, police, and other government departments. The group’s scope, expressed in its statement of purpose, was exceptionally clear:

We need a revolutionary communist party in order to lead the struggle, give coherence and direction to the fight, seize power, and build a new society.

Their commitment to what must objectively be called violence was stated repeatedly:

Revolutionary war will be complicated and protracted. It includes mass struggle and clandestine struggle, peaceful and violent, political and economic, cultural and military, where all forms are developed in harmony with armed struggle.

Just as Marcuse attempted to redefine tolerance, the extremists of that time attempted to justify their lawlessness by redefining violence. One Weather Underground member who had been taught by Marcuse illustrated an exceptional approach to violence:

We felt that doing nothing in a period of repressive violence is itself a form of violence. That’s the point that I think is the hardest for people to understand. If you sit in your house, live your white life and go to

your white job, and allow the country that you live in to murder people and commit genocide, and you sit there and you don't do anything about it that's violence.

+

There are without question rebuttals to the beliefs of the Weather Underground or the entire political left for that matter. A source of those types of rebuttals was an exceptionally discerning writer of the era when extremism was being brought to America: Eric Hoffer. Earlier in one of Hoffer's first books, he had made the observation that extremists still did not know that you cannot build utopia without using terror, and that before long terror was all that was left.

Hoffer for most of his life worked as a longshoreman unloading cargo ships and was therefore exactly the type of worker that the various leftists at one point expected to influence. This never happened with Hoffer because he embraced order and the political left instead tried to distort order into its opposite: coercion. According to Hoffer any social order which can function "well with a minimum of leadership will be an anathema to the intellectual." To the political left only the intellectual, and of course only a certain type of intellectual, would bring the social rule that they wanted.

The differing and representative (of what could be called traditional and anti-traditional) judgments of Hoffer and liberalism can be applied to various matters including the more general subject of nihilism. Nihilism is a difficult to understand philosophical term covering a number of areas but is of some use here. The clearest meaning for this discussion is that nihilism is the total rejection of established laws and institutions. Such rejection leads, at least in some instances, to terrorism – as seen periodically in the United States since at least the 1960s – and the decline toward periods of anarchy. Resentment and the desire for revenge are among the strongest of nihilistic emotions.

Instances where some measure of nihilism, even in our own time, has replaced justice are not unusual. Obvious instances of this are where laws which were previously considered important are not actually repealed but simply are no longer enforced. Two higher level examples of this are the failure to enforce certain drug laws and the failure to enforce certain immigration laws. On a more everyday level, for various reasons there are failures of authorities to become involved with what are considered less serious crimes, especially in urban areas. Liberalism has been responsible for these suspensions. Liberalism would generally consider these changes as expansions of individual rights, but true conservatives would consider these changes as failures of justice.

Justice is a familiar term but it can also be examined beyond its usually accepted meaning. Justice in a legal sense is the administration of deserved punishment or reward. Justice in a legal sense must be collective and administered collectively. Justice is what is established, and unless an established law is properly changed it must remain and be considered a just law. Idioms such as "bring to justice" or to "do justice to something" are generally known phrases, but realizing that

justice is a synonym for righteousness suggests a religious aspect. In such a special sense justice is not collective but is more a moral quality which inclines the individual to give to others exactly and with mercy what rightfully belongs to them.

+

When nihilism increases disorder increases, and in America this disorder has resulted in three harmful forms of ruling. Those are ochlocracy, oligarchy, and tyranny.

Roger Scruton wrote that those men and women who reject traditionalism can delegitimize any existing institution and will find imperceptible the distinction between a law aimed at establishing justice and a law aimed at establishing power. In any form of ruling others there is always a conflict between what achieves justice and what is only a way of increasing power. This is present in all three harmful forms, but in a democracy such as the modern United States the conflict is often between justice and something else; democratic power is often dependent only on numbers, and there are always individuals who can manipulate the human actions and beliefs of those around them. The result of this is mob rule, although such a term should be used reluctantly. In any event it's worth noting recent experiences have shown those who ruled through the support of mobs were in the end destroyed by those same mobs.

D.H. Lawrence observed that every man has a mob self and also an individual self in varying proportions. This seems an accurate observation, and apparently there is currently less hesitancy to display the mob self.

What constitutes the mob and its behavior? There is the element of time: such behavior is often spontaneous. When it is spontaneous, someone joining a mob would have given joining little thought. In many instances the mob is misled, or misinformed in some other sense. Nearly always the behavior of the mob is destructive. Terms such as "lynch mob" or "mob justice" are linked to this irrational and lawless behavior, and individuals might often later regret their involvement.

The spontaneous and changeable character is one consideration of what differentiates an arbitrary act of power, such as that of a mob, from justice. The knowledge that leads to justice is almost by definition obtained slowly. The unhurried orderliness of a court room is an example of this. It bears repeating that a significant contrast between a republic and a democracy is also the element of time.

To call justice a conservative concept may be troubling to some, but, to repeat, any established law must be considered just and worth being obeyed and conserved until it is properly repealed. The novelist Walter Scott commented on the people's response to the authority of the law roughly two centuries ago:

The only unerring test of every old establishment is the *effect* it has actually produced; for that must be held to be good from whence good is derived. The people have by degrees molded their habit to

the law they are compelled to obey; for some of its imperfections remedies have been found, to others they have had to reconcile themselves.

According to Scott the people have had to discreetly and soberly wait to amend their laws until they have heard the possibilities put forth by those he called visionaries, and also they must have been exposed to what he called the various causes. Just like a jury, and completely unlike a mob, they must be deliberative, using all their accumulated knowledge.

Commonly justice has two aspects: a legal aspect and an aspect of social policy, but the conflicts between the proper and improper exist in both. The scales which are always associated with justice demonstrate how carefully the opposing sides of any of these conflicts must be balanced.

The action of the mob, the failure to obey and conserve just laws, is more formally called an ochlocracy. To identify ochlocracy as a poor system of government is understandable. Useful institutions can be kept by an ochlocracy, but they can also be abolished without a second thought. The past and the mob are incompatible; there is a strong dislike for the past because its structure represses the changes that the mob demands. Quality and the mob are likewise incompatible; there is a strong dislike for the gifted because the gifted are capable of questioning the changes that the mob demands.

America's descent into an ochlocratic form has by definition included change, and one of the most significant changes has been the makeup of the ochlocracy itself. For a long period of time in other countries, the mass, the basis of the mob, consisted of workers. These were usually the poor, laboring in agriculture or industry. The same could be said for the United States where trade unions were particularly influential in manufacturing or mining. Marxism was for a century or more the most prominent approach for dealing with the mass; it drew upon the conflict between laborers as producers and the means of production. Marxism or communism in America never extended much beyond limited support in urban areas and some involvement in the extremism of colleges and universities. At the time the Weathermen were most committed to their communist violence, two more important groups had been formed: the larger political left and the racial minorities. These groups have since evolved into what could be called the social justice left and the increased categories of minorities led by the surging number of Hispanics.

The most significant aspect of this change in the numbers and nature of the left is that the proponents of the traditional values have been routed, as any objective observer would note. Whether they can regroup and hold some ground at some point is something yet to be decided.

Although few Americans would regard their type of government as determined by an unthinking mob, more would recognize the harm inflicted by the second form of rule: oligarchy. An oligarchy is nearly the opposite of an ochlocracy; it is regulation or management by an arbitrarily selected small group. A recent oligarchy in a foreign example was in Russia; after its abandonment of communism it allowed a small group of businessmen to control the country's

enormous resources. Studies of oligarchy in the United States claim that the wealthy and business interests largely determine government policies. These studies are often correct but are not especially useful because they lack specifics or what acceptable responses can be made, and despite the materialism of the United States its oligarchy is not strictly limited to those who manage or dominate through wealth.

The issue of oligarchy is an ongoing one. James Burnham, who will be mentioned later, dealt with the oligarchy with which we struggle when it was just being formed during the era of Franklin Roosevelt.

The third form of harmful rule is tyranny, and several weeks after the 2014 elections there was one more clear and important demonstration of tyranny in the United States: the intervention of President Barack Obama defending illegal immigration. After pleading perhaps 20 times or more that he could not make arbitrary changes to existing laws and after waiting a number of years, the president announced that he was extending protections from deportations and offering chances for work permits to a large but uncertain number of immigrants who were in the country illegally. The president, as the highest office to be given the responsibility to “faithfully execute” the laws of the country, argued that he could use “prosecutorial discretion” to enact these extreme changes.

A line in President Obama’s speech, in this case promoting immigration changes, showed one of his larger concerns and one of the goals that he has worked for not only in his political offices but throughout his adult life:

It [immigration] has shaped our character as a people with limitless possibilities – a people not trapped by our past, but able to remake ourselves as we choose.

It is hardly surprising that Barack Obama wants to be free of the past and remake what he has always looked down upon. It is hardly surprising that Barack Obama would be accused of not loving this country, the same one that raised him so quickly through the political ranks, but rather that anyone (considering his behavior and rhetoric) would doubt that accusation. If the term people is to mean anything at all, it must refer, at least in part, to the past and is not something that can easily be remade. Once again, the traditional position is contradicted by the liberal line: the abolishing of traditional hierarchies and giving to an easily changed people the equality of results which is promised in our time. And this is very much the Obama line as well. To repeat, justice is what is established by law, and unless properly changed it must remain and be considered a just law.

In what may have been an attempt to lessen the criticism of his rewriting of immigration enforcement, President Obama claimed that members of Congress who disagreed with his policy could still reform immigration by passing a bill with what he considered the required provisions. Obviously the president considered a necessary provision of such a congressional proposal the status reversal of an overwhelming number of illegal immigrants; if a proposal from Congress did

not include this it would not be reform by his standards. But a president cannot compel the legislative branch to pass new bills that he prefers by refusing to enforce already existing laws. A precision of meaning is a fundamental of law, and a result of nihilism has always been the collapse of such meaning. This needed precision was shown in a way when the president's immigration policy was blocked several weeks later by the ruling of a federal judge, which in turn led to appeal responses by the administration ending, as would be expected, in the Supreme Court. That court's decision upheld the ruling of the federal judge and thus voided what the president had attempted, but it did not fully resolve the controversy because of the lack of the full nine justices.

It may seem odd to comment on this recent controversy concerning the proper structure of the American government by using the words of an eighteenth century British politician, but if we return to Edmund Burke there is complete accuracy and relevance to what he said. To make government doesn't require any great wisdom: locate a capital for the concern and teach obedience to those who are ruled by its laws. To give freedom is even easier: simply lessen the strictness or enforcement of the laws. But to form a free government that blends the opposite elements of restraint and freedom "in one consistent work, requires much thought, deep reflection, a sagacious, powerful, and combining mind." An arbitrary lessening of the necessary enforcement of the laws does not sustain a government of free men and women. Chances are that it will achieve the very opposite.

FIVE ++++ Order establishes hierarchy which supports the mores of Christian society

The discussion of the necessary enforcement of the laws, and rules as well, is really a discussion of hierarchy. Hierarchy is a very natural subject in which to believe. The most progressive warden does not let the criminals rule the jail, or the most progressive doctor does not let the patients rule the asylum. There has always been a pattern of who decides what is done; and this is the important characteristic of hierarchy: the child listens to the parent; the student listens to the teacher; the priest listens to the bishop. In the hierarchy of economics, the director of the company may earn as much as a thousand times what a worker in the company will earn because the director is at the top of the hierarchy and the worker isn't. Such a difference may seem unfair, but it is natural to believe the company's head requires abilities and has responsibilities that justify some inequality and that a salary is only a way of measuring these abilities and responsibilities.

Hierarchy is the mechanism which responds to inequality. Even a standard definition is, basically, any situation involving ranking or sorting.

To give an unusual example, even the angels have been considered unequal and ranked. Michael, an archangel, is perhaps higher than all other angels. Thomas Aquinas believed that there were three spheres and each contained three orders: there were nine ranks of angels.

Among mankind this bestowed authority, the absence of equality and the need for ranking, was memorably described by D.H. Lawrence:

Everything in the world is relative to everything else. And every living thing is related to every other living thing.
But creation moves in cycles, and in degrees. There is a higher and lower in the cycles of creation, and great and less in the degrees of life.
Each thing that attains to purity in its own cycle of existence is pure and is itself and, in its purity, is beyond compare.
But in relation to other things, it is either higher or lower, of greater or less degree.

Lawrence was always an outcast with his novels, essays, and attempts at painting, but he had no need to conceal his beliefs because in his time there was more tolerance for many things. Although he used only the terms man and men, he described human difference clearly in this statement:

Among men, the difference in *being* is infinite. And it is a difference in degree as well as in kind. One man *is*, in himself, more, more alive, more of a man than another. One man has greater being, a purer manhood, a more vivid livingness. The difference is infinite.

This purity and vivid living nature is the result of natural inequality and is achieved through the discovery, or development to completion, of a personal identity. When this has been achieved the man or woman can assume a place in the hierarchy. They are free to be themselves, to express their beliefs, and to live out their days.

+

Hierarchy is based on difference in both purity and positions. There is the progression toward purity and a position resulting from that progression. The child is different from the parent; the student is different from the teacher; the priest is different from the bishop. These are examples of positions; we recognize their differences and do not expect as much from one as from the other. The child, the student, and the priest in this example are inferior hierarchically, but also we know that the child can eventually become a parent, the student can eventually become a teacher, and the priest can eventually become a bishop. A purity can be reached, and the positions can be changed. These can occur, but their occurrence is often not easily done.

In regard to hierarchy what we must understand is the way in which a competent man or woman would rationally approach a problem. We should not retreat to the modern way of saying a child might be harmed by the parents' normal authority, or that education must respond solely to the students' demands, or that the church must be more tolerant.

The modern way, however, prevails. There is authority, on which hierarchy is built, and there is an anti-authority mass in defiance of this natural structure. In any situation where an ounce

of liberty exists, there is always a struggle between the two opposing sides. The natural gifts of daring, intelligence, moral and physical strength, and so on which contribute to hierarchy are sacrificed when the modern world wins the struggle. These gifts are sacrificed to equality.

One response to the type of world demanding these sacrifices to equality was a longer essay written by T.S. Eliot in 1939 titled “The Idea of a Christian Society.” The author saw his British environment “wormeaten with Liberalism” by which he meant one that diminishes energy rather than accumulating it and relaxes daily life rather than fortifying it. Suffering is the result because liberalism is so nihilistic and Christianity currently lacks the strength to control society. The essay’s central proposal was to replace the old with a new three-part social structure of a Christian State (the administrators of the people), a Christian Community (the people), and a Community of Christians (the teaching class). Christianity would be found in each of these parts, but in different measures:

Among the men of state, you would have a minimum, conscious conformity of behavior. In the Christian Community that they ruled, the Christian faith would be ingrained, but it requires, as a minimum, only a largely unconscious behavior; and it is only from the much smaller number of conscious human beings, the Community of Christians, that one would expect a conscious Christian life at its highest social level.

It is the last of these parts that would provide the ethical leadership and be the educators. Eliot defined this education, which could actually represent his overall intention:

In a Christian society education must be religious, not in the sense that it will be administered by ecclesiastics, still less in the sense that it will exercise pressure, or attempt to instruct everyone in theology, but in the sense that its aims will be directed by a Christian philosophy of faith.

Eliot’s proposal for a Christian society showed no direct results. His principles were not to be forced upon anyone, but he had hoped that Britons would eventually be won over by the efforts of something like the Community of Christians. There was no practical plan to persuade the people of his proposal however, and in a period when the country had been badly damaged by the war Britain turned more away from the faith than toward it. Even if democracy had also been badly damaged, Eliot never had the opportunity to help build its replacement.

The turning away from Christianity has continued; in fact, much of our religion has become virtually identical to political liberalism. The evolution of the mainline Protestant churches, and in a slightly different fashion Roman Catholicism, has drifted directly away from the traditional responsibilities and toward the passing social issues. The autonomy and worldly fulfillment of the individual is currently the goal of the evolved church. The evolved church has no wrathful God,

no reply to personal sin, and no sacrificial and resurrected God. Individuals are no longer especially concerned with church condemnation, and the church seldom condemns. Since the past purpose of the church to instruct and lead its members in faithful behavior has been abandoned, those in, as well as those outside the church, no longer are sheltered by it. Since some shelter or sharing is required by definition, shelter and sharing are provided by expanded government in the form of the liberal social state. The church seldom condemns but the liberal social state never condemns the liberal alternative to morality that now predominates. The results of failed individual efforts at autonomy and worldly fulfillment are the work done daily by hundreds of thousands of government employees.

The church's loss shown by its disproportionate concern for predominantly worldly matters such as global warming or the unfairness of market economics is political liberalism's gain. The church's influence on the basics of morality falls, and political liberalism's influence rises. One instance of this is that American colleges now provide the equivalent of chaplains to counsel agnostic or atheistic students. Our true and moral foundations have been eroded.

Morality, one of the church's deepest concerns, shares the same Latin root with another important but seldom used word: mores. Mores are the fundamental moral guides of a people, not really the guides of an individual but instead of an identifiable group.

An early (mid-1800s) and important observer of our nation was the European historian Alexis de Tocqueville, and his judgment on the source of our capabilities supporting democracy is worth noting:

It is their mores, then, that make the Americans ... capable of maintaining the rule of democracy; and it is mores again that make the various Anglo-American democracies more or less orderly and prosperous.

Along with this Tocqueville rejected the Enlightenment's contention that democratic freedom was formed in a state of nature:

For the Americans the ideas of Christianity and liberty are so completely mingled that it is almost impossible to conceive of one without the other; it is not a question with them of sterile beliefs bequeathed by the past.

SIX ++++ Unrestricted freedom leads to unrestricted democracy

Authority's related subjects of order and hierarchy have been mentioned, but now its most important relative, freedom, will be discussed. A specific kind, democratic freedom, actually will be discussed.

Tocqueville in his study of America found the beginning stages of a democracy, but that is not at all the form which the founders of the nation had intended. Nearly all of these men expressed

anti-democratic outlooks and some were completely against democratic rule which they believed was little more than an invitation to coercive violence. This can be said of Jefferson and his predominantly southern followers such as Madison, as well as northerners such as Fisher Ames and John Adams. The man who became the nation's second president had very strong feelings about the right to vote and the power it should carry:

Democracy soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There has never been a democracy that did not commit suicide.

Mark the first and last words of that statement.

Adams is useful in studying the types of government because he carefully formed such opinions, comparable in some ways to Edmund Burke. Adams, as a younger man, concisely gave his opinions in *Thoughts on Government*. In that pamphlet he advocated a bicameral legislature, the second house to be selected from the first. He also advocated a governor limited to a one-year term and chosen by the legislature as well as the appointment of an independent judiciary. Adams wanted a limited government, one "of laws not men."

These preferences for strictly limited government by John Adams remained constant even though he studied the practices of many countries and read the opinions of many classical authorities. Adams recognized mankind's two permanent conditions that were mentioned earlier: original sin and inequality. The various restraints of education, laws, and religion had to be maximized or all gave way before the passions of mankind (to use his expression "as a whale goes through a net"). As for equals among men, such a thing was impossible:

Nature ... has ordained that no two objects shall be perfectly alike, and that no two creatures perfectly equal. Although, among men all are subject by nature to equal laws of morality, and in society have a right to equal laws for their government, yet no two men are perfectly equal in person, property, understanding, activity, and virtue, or even can be made so by any power less than that which created them.

Adams rejected a centralized, and ultimately abusive, democratic government. Carefully and accurately using the term nation, he urged instead the natural positioning of authority like that of the mother and father over their children:

If after all the pains of 'collecting all authority into one center,' that center is to be the nation, we shall remain exactly where we began, and no collection of authority at all will be made. The nation will be the authority, and the authority the nation.

In other words, the authority represented in the measure of an entire nation would be only a sheltering of the type of authority found within the family.

+

The thoughts and approaches of John Adams were lost or driven away a considerable time ago, so we are left to decide if the United States is on the right or wrong path. Only one path will be taken, and as it stands now that will depend entirely on what the majority decides. When the rights of responsible minorities are not honored is it reasonable to call such a situation a tyranny of the majority?

Concern for a majority tyranny is as old as the ancient Greeks. In their ideal, the largest group, the workers, did not govern; instead government was left to the select, the guardians. As the Greeks said, when change occurs from more restrictive forms to a democracy there is also a change from honoring necessary desires to yielding to unnecessary desires.

The stability of the Roman republic could not be maintained when the select, the patricians, were replaced by the largest group, the plebs. When eventually the republic could not satisfy the demands of the plebs, it collapsed into various kinds of dictatorships.

In this country, exactly like John Adams, the founders, possibly without exception, wanted a republic ruled by law not a democracy ruled by men. Alexander Hamilton, for instance, was among the first to use the word mobocracy to describe democratic abuses.

One section of Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, the classic study of our government's evolution, is titled "The Tyranny of the Majority" where he identified a potential failure in that evolution:

[T]he main evil of the present democratic institutions of the United States does not arise ... from their weakness, but from their irresistible strength. I am not so much alarmed at the excessive liberty which reigns in that country as at the inadequate securities which one finds against tyranny. I do not say that there is a frequent use of tyranny in America at the present day; but I maintain there is no sure barrier against it.

Somewhat later Thomas Carlyle, one of history's harshest critics of democracy, also used the word mobocracy. Concerning democracy he said that he didn't believe the ignorance of individuals could be transformed into collective wisdom.

In his 1949 book *Genius and Mobocracy* America's most famous architect Frank Lloyd Wright carried the word mobocracy into the middle of the twentieth century. He said that the enlarged form of government had led to a "demoralization of the creative instinct." He continued that the basis of beneficial democracy is teaching men or allowing them "to know themselves." (Forming an identity would be another way of expressing this.) Wright's judgments were probably based on the expansions of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations when democracy took the

pattern that has persisted into our time. Imposed direction from Washington, regulation, an ideological leftist judiciary, make work programs, and welfare at record levels were the standard issue from the 1930s to the present. There has been little change in all of this despite the elections of numerous presidents and congresses that were supposedly more committed to conservatism and traditionalism.

When Franklin Roosevelt discussed his many welfare programs he described them as temporary, but now there are scores of absolutely permanent federal welfare agencies (in addition to those of the states and private charities which often receive public funds). The dispensing of food is one of several everyday functions for which the government has taken responsibility; there are between 15 and 20 federal agencies – each individually directed and financed – to distribute food to what are considered the needy. The phrase “bread and circuses” comes to mind because other federal departments provide circuses (although not literally).

The conservative columnist Joseph Sobran, observing how some Americans were recipients of support and others were sources of support, gave a very instructive definition of modern politics. He said that “politics is the conspiracy of the unproductive but organized against the productive but unorganized.” This is certainly accurate if the unorganized portion is considered a group that lacks direction and any real understanding of their condition.

The unproductive portion, which Sobran mentioned is organized (from outside their group, of course) but lacks discipline, ideals, standards, and the ability to contribute. This distinction edges over in some measure into all such groups whether categorized by class, location, race, or something else. The members feel comfortable only within the group with whom they identify and often see the productive portion around them as a distinct enemy. They consistently support only those within their group. The group becomes the means of demanding as a matter of right what others have earned only through ability and perseverance.

Because neither the unproductive nor their organizers grasp the importance of tradition and history, the restraint learned from the past is absent. This disconnect means there are no important lessons to be learned from previous generations, and each new day is simply another day to perfect the utopia of the following day. The virtues of gratitude, obedience, and reverence are completely absent. In these circumstances there is only the demand for immediate gratification and no concern for long-term consequences.

Previously the child was described as having less understanding of the future and lacking the ability to decide according to reason; the unproductive portion – or underclass – shares this description and can also be considered as a spoiled child. A spoiled child has constant demands, and they are constant because the previous demands have been so often met.

The men and women who make up the underclass have very little interest in authority and seldom are concerned with virtue. Their disrespect for authority (especially those sources of authority which are meant to help them) and their absence of concern for virtue are basically a repetition of the same point. They live in the closed circumstances of the underclass which surrounds them.

Those who claim to lead the underclass go well beyond not responding to its weaknesses; the existence of these leaders requires that the conditions of the underclass remain the same often

from generation to generation. Eric Hoffer understood this longstanding problem and said that power corrupts the few, while weakness corrupts the many and that “the resentment of the weak does not spring from any injustice done to them but from the sense of their inadequacy and impotence.”

+

Speaking of a spoiled child, many Americans are indifferent to or even part of what has traditionally been considered immoral behavior; and they (like the spoiled child) bear a great deal of the responsibility for such conduct, but the country’s various leaders (like the parents of the spoiled child) bear even a larger responsibility. These are the leaders in the conventional current sense of the word and reach from athletes, other celebrities, educators, pastors, and local officials to the highest appointed and elected public figures.

For nearly a century, the leadership to which Americans have turned has failed them in various ways including not setting examples of virtue to follow. One way is certainly the emphasis placed on materialism and economics instead of a complete consideration of the country’s needs. When President Roosevelt in his 1932 presidential nomination speech promised a “more equitable opportunity to share the distribution of material wealth,” a substantial step was taken toward forced redistribution. Many years later following his re-election, President Obama explicitly made the same promise.

D.H. Lawrence noted the complete tie between political promises, materialism, and the lack of meaning in democracies:

And the more I see of democracy the more I dislike it. It just brings everything down to a vulgar level of wages and prices, electric light and water closets, and nothing else. You *never* knew anything so nothing. Nichts, Nullus, Niente.

In his quotation Lawrence wasn’t referring to the United States but about democracy in general. When he later moved to America he had even more reason for complaints.

The foundation of a just government is hardly materialism; it is, instead, morality. An exceptionally clear example – a demonstration in the failed sense – of this was a conversation a number of years ago between a group opposing abortion and John Tunney, one of California’s senators at the time. The conversation began by the senator being asked if he would steal, and his reply was no. When asked if others should steal, again he said no because there were laws against stealing. If the laws were repealed, would he still oppose stealing? The senator replied it would no longer be a crime, but when asked if he would be against it he replied:

I think I would certainly be against it. I don’t like thievery, but if there were no law against it it would not be a crime.
Would you try to pass one?

If there was no law against thievery?

Yes.

I think I probably would, yes.

Well, there you are, pointing out to us an instance of your legislating your personal attitude.

Senator Tunney then closed the discussion on a law opposing stealing by saying that “if the great majority of people in my state thought that thievery was perfectly all right, I am not sure I would support such a law.” John Tunney, one of America’s more prominent politicians at the time, said in this theoretical conversation that if the majority of the people believed stealing was permissible he would go along with that belief.

+

Where behavior is determined by a statistical majority it naturally disturbs the political right, but, in fact, it disturbs the various stripes of leftism as well. You will remember Herbert Marcuse wanting to overthrow the “tyranny of the majority.” When election results don’t meet their expectations, liberals begin to talk about a “spoils system” fostered by democracy. This spoils system concerns them only when there is a rejection of the type of authority and identity favored by the political left.

In an earlier period a book titled *The Tyranny of the Majority* would have been authored by someone criticizing democracy for pushing change and equality. Thomas Carlyle could have turned out something strongly worded and of great length. D.H. Lawrence, if he had not felt obligated to also spend time detailing the continual conflict between male and female, could have done the same.

In our time it is not surprising a book titled *The Tyranny of the Majority* was authored by someone criticizing democracy for not pushing change and equality ever further. In 1994 a prominent law professor used that title in offering a collection of essays questioning the fairness of elections where minorities seldom, or even never, overcame the statistical margin of the majority.

The foremost recommendation among those essays was the use of cumulative voting. Cumulative voting is a system intended to promote more proportional representation than the customary method and has been occasionally imposed by courts to help the election of candidates from groups who had patterns of failure in the usual system. There are variations of cumulative voting, but basically it allows voters in elections where more than one position is filled (such as city councils) to cast more than one vote for a particular candidate. When minority group voters do this uniformly, the chances of election for the candidate favored by that group are increased, and in the group’s opinion the process becomes more democratic.

Although it was somewhat prominent for a time, a collection of essays such as this is very unlikely to be used and discussed as more permanent sources have been. In contrast to this, Tocqueville’s examination of America, for example, has maintained a great deal of relevance and

influence for nearly two centuries. While not as successful as Tocqueville's work, the same can be said for *The American Democrat* by the prominent novelist James Fenimore Cooper. Tocqueville and Cooper can still speak to us, even after this long period of time. Why is this? It is because their studies of American life were exceptionally accurate and directed only toward the one culture of their time; and what remains of that culture and even what disputes and undermines that culture can still find foundations for their judgments in those writings.

Currently the slogan "tyranny of the majority" is used more often to favor minorities who believe that they are treated unfairly. And currently there seems to be a great deal done to accommodate their demands concerning this alleged lack of fairness. When the statistical majority becomes more jumbled by demography and other transformations, what phrases and slogans there will be and what accommodations will be made are questions that can't now be answered.

+

We are unquestionably in the time when the wide assortment of minority groups are advancing. Opinions such as those pushed by the extreme left have surely cumulatively had their way. But there must be a constant indoctrination of this ideology in order for it to continue its domination. Continuation is very difficult because so much of this ideology goes against common sense as well as a sense of tradition. When the leftist indoctrination loosens, then the traditional will raise its handsome head.

The twenty-first century is so far anti-traditional; the twentieth was a transition to the anti-traditional; the nineteenth century provided many voices for traditionalism concerning government, public affairs, and social attitudes. History sometimes shows such patterns. Circumstances that seem permanent can change quickly: centuries-old empires can collapse suddenly; conversions to different religions can occur unexpectedly; the horrors of war can erase a long established past.

Of the worthy traditional voices of the nineteenth century, two of the most prominent were Alexis de Tocqueville and James Fenimore Cooper. Both were conservative by nature, although Tocqueville's attachment to personal liberty is now often emphasized. Both were from prominent families and possessed wealth by inheritance or marriage, and these circumstances probably contributed to their conservatism considering the characteristics of the period.

Their lives and careers were roughly overlapping. Tocqueville was born in 1805; Cooper was born in 1789. Both died comparatively young: Tocqueville in his early fifties and Cooper in his early sixties. Both lived on two continents: Tocqueville toured the United States for several years studying prisons, and Cooper lived in Paris for seven years. Both were successful writers: *Democracy in America* remains often quoted and taught at the university level, while Cooper was considered the first true American novelist with over 30 lengthy novels mostly concerning sailors or frontiersmen.

The subjects of democracy and equality were concerns for both these men, and their

opinions on the subjects were basically in agreement. Tocqueville wanted to show others how American democracy could be properly restricted and equality put to use. Cooper also wrote (in *The American Democrat*) that democracy was an obstacle to tyranny and there were certain benefits in equality. They were, however, also critical of democracy and equality on a number of grounds.

As previously mentioned Tocqueville wrote of potential American tyranny, and Cooper was equally concerned about such potential behavior. What restrained the individual and the government at the time were intermediate institutions. For Tocqueville these were particularly American mores including those taken from religion and the local institutions which they fostered. One of the longest chapters of *The American Democrat* called “On the Private Duties of Stations” also touched on the need for moderating individual and governmental power.

The early American leaders who ran toward a republic but ran from a democracy naturally led to the opinions of Tocqueville and Cooper; the prevalent shared opinion was that democracies have trouble supplying the long-term approaches. This is very similar to my description of the mob given earlier: its prominent characteristic is being spontaneous; there is no interest in deliberation. But the time involved in deliberation is necessary for both the individual and the collective to use their identities, and significantly it can be time going into the future but also time taken from the past. Democracy in the United States is currently for many, especially any of the closely bonded groups, very much a demand for everything “here and now.”

One way of describing the dilemma of any democratic system is to say it is a confrontation between the side for permanence (taking the best of the past in order to offer the best for the present or the future) and the side which finds no support in the past or present and therefore has no respect for the future. In *The True Believer* Eric Hoffer described the strength of this disruptive or even destructive portion:

The reason the inferior elements of a nation can exert marked influence on its course is that they are wholly without reverence toward the present or the future. They see their lives and the present spoiled beyond remedy and they are ready to waste and wreck both, hence their willingness to chaos and anarchy.

+

The dominance of democracy has been established probably since the post-World War II period, and after several decades the 1989 essay “The End of History” made the assumption that “what we may be witnessing is ... the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government.” The twenty-first century – frankly, in a very distorted sense – is democratic; the twentieth was a transition to democracy; the nineteenth century provided a number of voices for the anti-democratic.

The convenience of again citing them is only one reason to use Tocqueville and Cooper as

the chosen voices for a continued discussion of the anti-democratic. In the books I mentioned, Tocqueville devoted nearly 800 pages to evaluating democracy; Cooper was less specific and devoted about 200.

Tocqueville found democratic characteristics increasing in an American nation designed originally as a republic; Cooper would have been pleased to have kept basically the republic as it had served him and his ancestors. Among the criticisms that have always been associated with democracy are its suppression of anything superior, the faults of relying entirely on public opinion, and the unfair demands for economic leveling. Tocqueville and Cooper touched on all these points.

On the subject of the suppression of anything superior, Tocqueville felt that Americans did not fear but also did not appreciate superior talents. He felt that the indirectly selected members of the Senate were the country's only collection of talent and leadership and the directly elected members of the House of Representatives were of a much lower ability. James Fenimore Cooper expressed his opinion as openly as possible saying that "the tendency of democracies is, in all things, to mediocrity."

The two agreed on the faults of public opinion. Tocqueville wrote of the difficulty of dissenting opinions:

It will always be extremely difficult to believe what the bulk of the people reject or to profess what they condemn.

Cooper wrote of errors in forming opinions:

Democracies are liable to popular impulses, which necessarily arising from imperfect information, often work injustice from good intentions.

On the subject of economic leveling, one simple but important thing Tocqueville wrote is that in countries where the poor have the power of making laws there will be no concern for how much the government spends. Although not all poor, about half of all Americans, according to recent studies, pay no income taxes and therefore are probably less concerned about public spending.

In the brief chapter on property in *The American Democrat*, Cooper wrote that "as property is the base of all civilization, its existence and security are indispensable to social improvement." He observed that in sharing groups, such as communes, there is no tendency to go beyond the "wants of life" to the less necessary things. Political privileges given to property holders should be limited because they are sometimes harmful, but generally "property is desirable as the ground work of moral independence." Late in Cooper's life his values about property were tested when renters in New York state disputed their obligations to the owners. Although he was not personally affected, Cooper felt that the favorable government response to the renters was dishonest and dishonorable.

SEVEN ++++ Religion provides necessary restrictions for freedom and democracy

The issues most closely related to democracy are freedom and equality, and Tocqueville and Cooper spent considerable efforts on these subjects. In their statements the element of restraint was usually emphasized. True conservatives of all types including traditionalists have always recognized restraint. This is one justification for their claim that the term ideology is inaccurate when applied to their beliefs: even their approach to government avoids the unrestrained nature generally associated with ideology.

In *Democracy in America* we read about excesses and the need for restrictions:

Freedom cannot, therefore, form the distinguishing characteristic of democratic ages. The peculiar and preponderant fact that marks those ages is the equality of condition: the ruling passion of men in those periods is love of equality.

That political freedom in its excesses may compromise the tranquility, the property, [and] the lives of individuals is obvious even to the narrow and unthinking minds.

It was never assumed in the United States that the citizen of a free country has the right to do whatever he pleases: on the contrary, more social obligations were there imposed upon him than anywhere else. No idea was ever entertained of attacking the principle or contesting the rights of society; but the exercise of its authority was divided, in order that the office might be powerful and officer insignificant.

In *The American Democrat* we again read about the need for restraints:

Perfect and absolute liberty is as incompatible with the existence of society as equality of condition.

Although it is true, that no genuine liberty can exist without being based on popular authority in the last resort, it is equally true that it cannot exist when this is based without many restraints on the power of the mass.

All equality of civil rights is never absolute, neither is equality of political rights ever absolute.

The very existence of government, at all, infers inequality.

+

In light of those comments on freedom and equality, the matter of the tyranny of the majority requires a few brief references. Again, as in other instances, Tocqueville and Cooper were in agreement concerning what the European author labeled “democratic despotism.”

Tocqueville connected the majority and power:

A majority taken collectively is only an individual whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another individual who is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should not a majority be liable to the same reproach?

I believe that it is easier to establish an absolute and despotic government among a people in which the conditions of society are equal than among any other; and I think that if such a government were once established among such a people, it would not only oppress men, but would eventually strip each of them of several qualities of humanity. Despotism, therefore, appears to me peculiarly dreaded in democratic times. On the other hand ... to base freedom upon aristocratic privilege will fail; that all who attempt to draw and retain authority within a single class will fail.

The majority has absolute power both to make and to watch over their [laws'] execution; and as it has equal authority over those who are in power and the community at large, it considers public officers as its passive agents and readily confides to them the task of carrying out its designs.

Cooper argued that the majority should “not rule in settling fundamental laws.” In order to be fair, fundamental laws had to be the result of checks and balances. Cooper observed that the majority should always be restrained:

It ought to be impressed on every man's mind in letters of brass 'That in a democracy the public has no power that is not expressly conceded by the institutions, and that this power, moreover, is only to be used under the forms prescribed by the constitution.'

+

Four years before his death James Fenimore Cooper finished *The Crater*, a novel that also expressed his opinions on the strength of a Christian republic and the weakness of a corrupted democracy. The story tells of a shipwreck; the survivor lives through primitive farming, his wife back in England hires a ship which ultimately finds and rescues him; the couple (along with others) build a settlement on the island but are eventually driven away; when he returns he finds an earthquake has destroyed the settlement.

For the community Cooper wrote about there was a period of blessings and also a period of curses. The blessings extended through the creation of a prosperous unified community. The society considered itself just because its laws corresponded to divine law. The curses began when a differing group came into the settlement. This group was what Cooper called demagogues, men who were distorters and manipulators. They quickly learned that although the community adhered strictly to the governing constitution, amendment could be made to the constitution. Eventually enough support was gained from the people for amendment; the new group gained control and removed from office the man who had founded the settlement and contributed so much to it.

+

The most proper restraint of freedom is religion. Religion, of course, provides restraints to the individual directly but can also restrain in a collective sense. Tocqueville and Cooper, religious men especially as they grew older, supported a role for religious beliefs in the public place. In *Democracy in America* we read of religion's place in the maturing nation:

Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must be regarded as the first of their political institutions.... They hold it indispensable to the maintenance of republican institutions.

Tocqueville said that men needed dogmatic beliefs, something settled and established to tide them over; and of all the kinds "the most desirable" to him were religion's dogmatic beliefs.

In the first paragraph of *The American Democrat* we read Cooper's opinion of the law:

These laws, though varying with circumstances, possess a common character, being formed on that consciousness of right, which God bestowed in order that man may judge between good and evil.

The relationship of God and mankind was spelled out in the ending of *The Crater*:

Let those who would substitute the voice of the created for that of the Creator, who shout 'the people, the people, the people' instead of hymning the praises of their God, who vainly imagine that the masses are sufficient for all things, remember their insignificance and tremble.

In our time there are people demanding a morality that is diverse, inclusive, and does not discriminate. The newest morality demands respect and depends on individualism. There is in this always progress – but actually toward a reduced standard. The newest morality is the form of progress as identified by liberalism, and this morality is only a liberal morality.

Tocqueville and Cooper saw a need for morality among the people, but not in any way this type. They sought instead a set of knowable and permanent truths.

+

Throughout all of our history we have known of permanent moral truths, and we have also learned that when they are not incorporated into our societies what the results will be. The Roman historian Livy wrote of the final evolution of this:

Then as the standard of morality gradually lowers, let him follow the decay of the national character, observing how at first it slowly sinks, then slips downward more and more rapidly, and finally begins to plunge into the headlong ruin, until it reaches these days, in which we can bear neither our diseases nor their remedies.

Sources such as Tocqueville and Cooper elaborated such truths concerning morality. Tocqueville sought these truths to correct the path his country took in 1789. Cooper did not seek to correct the path taken when the American republic was formed but rather to keep faith with it.

Cooper felt the concept of original meaning applied to the Constitution even to the point of allowing the individual states rights which we don't now associate with our freedoms:

There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent a state or any particular state from possessing an established religion, from putting the press under the control of censors, from laying restrictions and penalties on the rights of speech, or from imposing most of the political and civil restraints on the citizen that are imposed under any other form of government.

Justice Joseph Story, whose quote that “republics are created by virtue” was used earlier, partially defined original meaning at about the time of Tocqueville's and Cooper's writings. He said that the Constitution was framed and adopted by the people of the United States and was “obligatory” on the people until it was altered, amended, or abolished legally by the people.

The laws of our country, such as the division between the responsibilities of the states and the responsibilities of the central government, have been made complex, but the concept of original meaning is rather simple: the Constitution should be understood in exactly the same way it would

have been understood by a typical person on the day it was written. An illustration of this was the reform allowing 18-year-olds to vote; there was not simply a law arbitrarily passed or even a presidential order to that effect, instead after a full debate as to whether such age limits should be set at the state or federal level the issue was resolved to be at the latter by the constitutional change of the Twenty-Sixth Amendment.

Such properly carried out reforms as lowering the voting age are repudiations of liberalism's interpretations of the Constitution as a "living document." Such interpretations argue that changed times or perhaps changed circumstances allow complete changes in the law, bypassing the required procedures and often only needing a single subjective decision by a court of appointed judges.

+

Judicial tyranny by the living document approach and other means is becoming more apparent. Legislation by state legislatures or even Congress (both of which usually contain a large percentage of men and woman trained in the law) or by statewide referenda prepared by legal counsel is often overturned despite in many instances being reviewed and approved by lower courts.

The first paragraph of a 2014 Associated Press item gives an example of this dominance:

Arizona's authority to confront its illegal immigration woes was again reigned in Wednesday when a federal appeals court threw out a 2006 voter-approved law denying bail to people in the country illegally who are charged with certain crimes.

In this instance it took many years until some court was found to nullify what had been considered a needed legal reform. The Associated Press story went on to report that "the courts have slowly dismantled other laws that sought to draw local police into immigration enforcement."

Another example of judicial dominance was the recent chain of decisions undermining the rights of states to control fraudulent voting. The courts consider such state laws improper because of their racially discriminatory nature and also unnecessary because of the few cases of abuse which have been prosecuted.

Judicial review has a history of roughly two centuries in this country and criticism of judicial review has the same long history. Thomas Jefferson said:

The Constitution is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary which they may twist and shape into any form they please.

Among the most harmful of these judicial twistings and shapings were the Supreme Court

decisions removing Christianity from the public square. Bibles, other Christian sources, crosses, invocations, and prayers have all been banned. Since a country will have direction from some source and since Christianity has been forced from its rightful place, secular humanism has become America's moral standard.

Jefferson also said that each of the three branches of government is "independent of the others and has an equal right to decide for itself what is the meaning of the Constitution." This follows what is written in the Constitution itself in Article Three Section Two granting appellate jurisdiction to the Court "with such exceptions and regulations as Congress shall make."

Experience with judicial abuse for at least the past 60 years has shown a glaring weakness of our system. There is no meaningful conflict of ideas represented in Washington in any of the branches or in most state governments. When there is adherence to political form, Americans are forced to accept a liberalism with its committed and demanding sides and also a liberalism with its indifferent and accommodating sides currently referred to as conservatism. Robert Lewis Dabney, a prominent nineteenth century minister, recognized this weakness:

American conservatism is merely the shadow that follows Radicalism as it moves forward toward perdition. It remains behind it, but never retards it, and always advances near its leader Its impotency is not hard, indeed, to explain. It is worthless because it is the conservatism of expediency only, and not sturdy principle.

EIGHT ++++ A true conservatism tied with traditionalism also provides necessary restrictions

As stated earlier understanding a word's usage precisely is often helpful to the reader, and conservatism is one of those words since the term is applied so widely for such different purposes. Even in political matters conservatism often gets misplaced, perhaps intentionally, on the left to right placement. There are many Americans who feel that they are not responsible for the country's deeper troubles because they are politically conservative and have opposed to some degree much of what they believe has caused those troubles. There are also many conservative Americans who fully grasp the country's real situation and are deeply discouraged by their inability to change the system around them.

A definition provided by Mark Twain, probably primarily intending to display his wit and certainly not intending to praise conservatism, said that "conservatism is the blind and fear-filled worship of dead radicals." Interpreted in a certain way by a conservative, this is not as deep a cut as was intended. To be somewhat blind to the faults of a line of thought or an individual aligned

with that thought is not unusual; it is only human nature. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, displayed the fault of tolerating slavery in some measure, but such a fact does not keep most of us from appreciating his enormous accomplishments. As for fear-filled any religious commitment includes fear of God, and while regard for the heroic man or woman is not at all the same, still fear is often involved in our feelings toward them. Worship is a strong word but if it suggests only to pay honor then it is accurate enough. As for the dead, true conservatives emphatically believe that we have a union with the past generations and also, of course, with the future generations. Lastly, radical can be a favorable description; although it can mean fanatical, the word can also mean basic, essential, or complete. A radical, among other meanings, is the person who goes to the root of the issue or problem.

An easily understood, often repeated, and correct definition of conservative was provided in *Rationalism in Politics* by the English philosopher Michael Oakeshott:

To be conservative, then is to prefer the familiar to the unknown, to prefer the tried to the untried, fact to mystery, the actual to the possible, the limited to the unbounded, the near to the distant, the sufficient to the superabundant, the convenient to the perfect, present laughter to utopian bliss.

Among that list are several contrasts that deserve comment. The familiar is what we have learned, and we have learned it from the experience of the past. The familiar is what has been tried. The actual will never be the unbounded. Less crowded areas are consistently more conservative because there remains an attachment to the scale that surrounds them. How much better off everyone would be in preferring the sufficient to the demands that mark our time.

A more current Englishman who followed Oakeshott's path is Roger Scruton, the author of many works adding in some way to the meaning of conservatism. Early in his career, in fact over 30 years ago, Scruton defined conservatism in terms that demonstrated its ties to traditionalism:

[It is] the political outlook which springs from a desire to conserve existing things, held to be either good in themselves, or better than the likely alternatives, or at least safe, familiar, and the objects of trust and affection.

In a recent essay Scruton reaffirmed those words saying that the conservative understands that "we have collectively inherited good things that we must strive to keep." Among those good things are our system of laws, public spirit, security of property, family structure, and religion.

+

If what Oakeshott and Scruton labeled conservatism is so aligned with traditionalism, what can be said of traditionalism? The most obvious statement on tradition is that it is from the past. The good things given in the preceding paragraph are all anchored in the past: they are the results of traditionalism. The historians Will and Ariel Durant wrote that “out of every hundred new ideas 99 or more will probably be inferior to the traditional responses they propose to replace.” What one person or clique should abolish the customs and practices that have proven themselves? Laws are built on earlier laws; civil and appropriate behavior is developed; ownership is guaranteed over time; the family and religion continue from generation to generation.

Scruton made this judgment on the family and the reinforcement of authority:

The view of society as requiring forms of allegiance and a recognition of authority, both of which transcend the operation of any contractual bonds, is a view not of this or that community, but of the essence of civil life. It is this transcendent bond that constitutes society, and which is misrepresented by the liberal theories of contract and consent. Moreover, one particular tradition, which both embodies a transcendent bond, and also reinforces social allegiance, has survived all the upheavals of recent history. This is the tradition of family life.

That the family is the pivot on which our society must turn is an important matter that will be discussed somewhat later.

Several meanings may be attached to traditionalism as it relates to the issues at hand, but a concise definition would be what is taken from the past to sustain the present and to build the future. This follows closely the essentials of a people listed by the French writer Ernest Renan:

To have common glories of the past, a common will in the present, having done great things together and wanting to do new ones.

Julius Evola, a once prominent but now largely excluded author who fully accepted the traditionalist label and would have also agreed with Renan’s comment, gave a fuller definition:

Tradition is neither servile conformity to what has been nor a sluggish perpetuation of the past into the present. Tradition, in its essence, is something metaphysical and dynamic: it is an overall ordering of force in the service of principles that have the chrism of superior legitimacy. This force acts through institutions, laws, and social order that may even display a remarkable variety and diversity.

From that lengthy quotation, the key phrase is that tradition is the overall ordering of force.

Liberals are much less attracted to the past and such ordering and are much less willing to use it because they tend to emphasize the wrongs that were committed in the past. The reply to this is to admit that wrongs are found in all societies' histories at some point, but since such parts of history cannot, or at least should not, be used to sustain the present culture such matters are not part of the present or the future. The wrongs of the past should not be forgotten, of course, but they must be studied and recognized for what they were. Such studies are part of living in a free society. Closed societies are unable to constructively examine their histories and suffer as a result. (A democratic society can be a closed society where dissenting truths are suppressed; the abuse of authority can result in a closed society.)

A primary need for understanding our ties to the past is when liberalism and secularism in their various forms try to separate the mores of America from the religious tradition of America. This separation is like cutting a tree from its roots; there will be a period where the tree will retain its life and its coloring but only until its vitality is drained completely; then the tree will wither and die. In a similar way a country can go on drawing from the mores of its past but only until that source of strength is drained.

What are political conservatives doing to keep the tree alive? What are they doing to keep the tree of tradition from being cut? Today's political conservatives are doing virtually nothing to preserve tradition because they no longer know what to conserve.

The conserving acts of the individual or the collective should be directed toward the country's fundamental problems. Violence is constant: each year there are hundreds of thousands of sexual assaults, cases of domestic abuse, and abortions. Black men have killed on average well over 4,000 other black men annually over a period of many years. More than 100 million Americans live in households receiving welfare benefits of some type, and the unemployed numbered about 15 million early in the Obama administration but dropped toward the end of his eight year term. Substance abuse involves over 20 million Americans. Needless spending on the military industrial complex continues generation after generation. About 7,000 American soldiers died in Iraq and Afghanistan with more than 50,000 wounded. The approval rating of President Obama fell from nearly 70 percent to 40 percent during his second term. The nominating process for president has been ineffective in recent elections in offering the best candidates and has been criticized as unfair by both Democratic and Republican officials. Congressional approval is consistently less than half that of the president. For the past half-century, the federal budget has been balanced, on average, one of every ten years. Generally 30 percent or less say yes when the Gallup Poll asks if they are satisfied with the way things are going in America. (The lowest was seven percent in 2009; at the time of the 2016 political conventions the figure was 17 percent.)

What process is used to find a leader to attack these fundamental problems? It is a very poor process where the candidate with the greatest financial backing – virtually none of which comes from everyday Americans – has very good odds of election. This has been a pattern probably since John Kennedy defeated Richard Nixon. One prominent Republican candidate began his 2016 presidential campaign by meeting in the 26 room penthouse residence of a “banker” where the guests each paid a minimum of \$100,000 to attend. The campaign of the runner-up on the

Democratic primary side in that election raised well over 200 million dollars, but still considerably less than his opponent. The apparent bonding of campaign spending with campaign obligations extends to any significant election. In the 2014 Senate campaigns, spending in the small state of Kentucky exceeded 50 million dollars, and about half that amount was spent in the even smaller New Hampshire. Elections for local offices have shown the same excessive spending; for example, in the small city of Newark, New Jersey the four most recent mayoral campaigns each cost a total of between ten and 13 million dollars. (The annual salary for Newark's mayor is \$130,000.) There is clearly a roll for successful men and women in public life, but it has virtually nothing to do with contributing financially to this candidate or that. In our time these contributors are hollow – as T.S. Eliot used the word. And the supported or bought politicians are even more hollow; they cannot be leaders; political figures show no independence regarding change, or hardly anything else, because they are consistently concerned with virtually nothing beyond their own circumstances.

Change is both a necessity to address fundamental problems and a form of conservatism. Conservative change must be evolutionary in a particular way. To illustrate such change Edmund Burke used another example involving a tree: the shedding of a tree's leaves in autumn is something natural and to imagine that they could be gathered and reattached is foolish, but when the leaves are permanently lost for some reason the tree will no longer sustain itself.

Besides Eliot's hollow men there is another term to apply here; the prophet Jeremiah used the term "dumb dogs," and that – with a few honorable exceptions – describes prominent conservatives in politics, journalism, and so on. This seemingly unkind expression was used to describe the ones who saw danger but refused to bark to warn anyone. Like these dogs many conservatives are perfectly willing to take a safe approach and thus avoid criticism by their opponents. As it is now there is an avoidance of certain vital subjects and thus an avoidance of telling the truth, which is a good reason to avoid the dumb dogs of conservatism.

Jeremiah's history may contain a lesson for certain self-labeled conservatives of our time. Jeremiah said his country must obey the rules of the past or be plundered and destroyed. Others also claiming to be prophets called Jeremiah a traitor and sought his death. Jeremiah was persecuted for his beliefs, but in the end what he said would happen did happen.

Truthfulness about conservatism and tradition is difficult to spread in our time because liberalism's advantages are so enormous. To again mention the court system, it was not until 1947 in the case of *Everson v. the Board of Education* that members of the Supreme Court questioned the right of states to give certain privileges to certain religious groups. In the *Everson* case, one justice took the extreme, for the time, position that the Constitution forbids every kind of public support for any religion. Later judicial rulings began using the now common phrase "a separation of church and state." Various states have continued to dispute this doctrine; a few years ago North Carolina's legislature introduced a resolution declaring that it had a right to designate an official religion. This was in response to court restrictions forbidding the use of any Christian prayer to open a meeting of a government agency or gathering. It should be noted that when the Constitution was approved North Carolina, as well as several of its bordering states both to the north and the south, had exactly what was forbidden roughly 150 years later (churches established by state laws).

It should also be noted that only a few years ago the opening of a meeting of a school board, a town council, or a commissioners' meeting with a Christian prayer would have provoked little or no controversy; it would have doubtlessly been considered well within the rights of freedom of speech.

NINE ++++ The identity found within a culture is another restriction

The reason for liberalism's enormous cultural advantages are obvious; they have been made due to overwhelming resources and superiority in numbers in areas of great influence. For instance if a presidential election were confined to the faculties of the 50 leading universities, the most liberal candidate would be guaranteed to win by an enormous margin; in the Obama-Romney election, of those employed by Harvard University who contributed financially to a candidate 555 of 585 gave to Barack Obama, and this extreme response has been common. A survey conducted periodically found that in a recent school year liberal and far left professors made up 63 percent of the polled university faculties while conservative and far right were 12 percent. In addition to this liberalism in higher education, nearly 200 celebrities (many in the film or music industries) endorsed the Obama re-election. Again using presidential elections as a measure of liberalism, journalists (whether in print or some other format) according to surveys have supported Democratic candidates in all recent elections by one-sided margins that were far removed from the overall vote. For decades critics have said that universities have abandoned being centers of education and have become instead centers of indoctrination, and this same indoctrination extends into films, music, and the various forms of journalism. Because of these advantages liberalism has won many victories against conservative and traditional values.

But because liberalism has not secured a complete victory, even after decades, the culture wars show no signs of ending. The widespread removal of the Confederate flag and the continuing attacks on much of American history are examples of this. Incidents at universities where students aggressively confront authority figures, often over matters as secondary as Halloween costumes, are additional examples.

+

The now longstanding and seemingly permanent divisions between current groups in the United States make it difficult to recognize how for many generations Americans were guided by the principle of creating one out of many. Newcomers, almost entirely Europeans, arrived in a new world that was so much different than the old. Their lives often included learning English, finding work and building homes, having children and educating them, and putting in place churches in

which to give thanks. At some point they overcame their difficulties and became very much like the older Americans around them; they were assimilated; or in other words, they generally accepted the culture into which they had moved.

At a later point the definition of culture by T.S. Eliot and his attitudes toward it will be examined, but the more current traditionalist writer James Kalb also provided a sound definition of culture:

A culture is a way of living, a system of habit and attitude, an orientation toward life and the world that is shared and basically taken for granted within a community. It arises naturally when people live together, since we are social beings who need common habits and understandings to live together happily and productively.

But eventually instead of one, as Kalb's statement implies, there was little effort at keeping one, and instead there were many. In our time the cultural divisions are wider than in the country's past, and there is little effort at removing them because the involved groups clearly prefer to keep the divisions and be sheltered by them and identify with them.

The assimilation of the pre-1960s period required adopting habits and understandings to minimize friction between groups, but when there are other preferences friction or conflict is the usual result. James Kalb considered this friction as a deep social problem:

A culture war arises when such [shared] habits and understandings break down, so that people constantly offend each other, points of contention cannot be negotiated, the limits of toleration are reached, and the society ends up in what amounts to a low level civil war.

Some more traditional conservative observers considered dealing with the culture wars as critical to the nation as the earlier dealing with the cold war had been. They used the expression "a war for the soul of America." These two descriptions are revealing because they are so strongly made: the first thought a culture war was a civil war of sorts, and the second thought the culture wars were best understood by using a very deep and emotional religious expression.

The continuing acts of Moslem terrorism are extreme, but logically extreme, examples of cultural conflict. These attacks from 9-11 on in the United States as well as the violence in a chain of European countries have shown how we as a people have surrendered our right to defend ourselves. Even someone who headed the British government for ten years and of course continued its push toward liberal and secular ideas said following the Brussels, Belgium (2016) attack that "flabby liberalism" is helping terrorists because those who should be responsible for security feel too "guilty" to tackle the spread of extremism. He said many politicians are now unwilling to take on this threat because they fear being seen as intolerant of other cultures.

+

As Kalb's definition noted culture can be something very large such as an entire way of life or something smaller such as habits and attitudes, but large or small culture is a possession shared by the people. If even some parts of culture are not shared widely by nearly all individuals, then there will not be one people even though everyone shares the same country, or even if there is a sharing of the same neighborhoods and streets.

Always an ambiguous term, what is meant by the concept of the people? As mentioned in the earlier quote by Ernest Renan to define a people there is definitely a tying together of the past, the present, and the future; but Americans do not have the deep pasts of others such as the peoples of Europe.

As a substitute of sorts for a people, there is the whole concept of a propositional nation, where anyone who lives within the borders of the United States and nominally accepts certain fundamentals is an American. These basics for our time consistently include Jefferson's phrases of created equal and inalienable rights. However when we specify that the source of all our law is removed from such ideas as created equality and specially applied rights, the propositional nation becomes more difficult to justify. When the Constitution, the source of all our law, was accepted many states gave certain rights not to everyone but only to property holders, restricted all governing to males, and enslaved an entire race. The document created by Jefferson, the primary basis for the propositional nation, was never comparable to the Constitution, and this undermines the claim that from the beginning America embraced such an idea. The drift then becomes that the proposition nation is based on what America has become, but what the country has become is just a current set of political preferences which eventually may change into something very different. Another cause to dispute the concept of a propositional nation – and the accompanying perhaps more important claim of American exceptionalism – is that there is a considerable collection of governments over the surface of the globe with high living standards based on rights, safeguards, and mechanisms that are comparable to the United States. These countries and nations are mostly European but would include some outlying democracies such as Japan. Additionally the broad range of influential political groups in other countries seem more representative than America's limited choices.

The promotion of the propositional nation should be questioned as historically inaccurate and so should the issue of diversity. The United States does not have a history of seeking or even endorsing diversity. When diversity is presented as part of the American tradition, the presentation is often made by political liberals, probably to undermine the worth of real traditionalism.

Concerning the matter of difference or diversity in this country, there is a revealing brief remembrance told by the novelist Kurt Vonnegut:

I went to the University of Chicago for a while after the Second World War. I was a student in the Department of Anthropology. At the time they were teaching that there was absolutely no difference between anybody. They may be teaching that still.

Another thing they taught was that no one was ridiculous, bad, or disgusting. Shortly before my father died he said to me, ‘You know – you never wrote a story with a villain it.’

I told him that was one of the things I learned in college after the war.

+

After observing that America is now concerned more with diversity than the traditional approach to being a people, it becomes necessary to turn elsewhere to understand the concept of a people. It is also necessary to consider eventually two related terms: identity and nation.

By simple definition a people is a group with a common culture. Since culture is involved, the definition could be made more explicit by mentioning habits, history, language, religion, and other considerations. Taking religion as a standard, Iranians can, for example, be regarded as a people because over 99 percent of Iranians are Moslems. The country is officially known as the Islamic Republic of Iran, and 90 percent of Iranians associate with the Shiite sect.

Even outside the Moslem world – the subdivisions of which we are forced to hear of on a daily basis – there are many distinct peoples with their own cultures; the Welsh are a notable example. The union of Wales and England is now approaching five centuries, but the Welsh have retained in some measure their separateness. The partial retention of the Welsh language and also the topography which limits population have contributed to retaining the Welsh identity. Keeping in mind this ability of a small unified area to retain its identity and even consider eventual separation from something larger, a comment by Eric Hoffer concerning the scale of a nation is relevant here:

There is perhaps some hope to be derived from the fact that in most instances where an attempt to realize an ideal society gave birth to the ugliness and violence of a prolonged active mass movement the experiment was made on a vast scale and with a heterogeneous population [Perhaps] when the attempt to realize an ideal society is undertaken by a small nation with a more or less homogeneous population it can proceed and succeed.

What Hoffer was also pointing out is that for the United States in its current form to move toward a better social arrangement is difficult simply because of its large size and lack of homogeneity.

The creation of Hoffer’s ideal, or at least better, society would first require a situation which could best be described as organic. Organic, as a social term, is difficult to clarify. Organic can be applied when the people – the entire body who constitute a community – is the subject in the same sense as when the term subject is used in grammar: the one performing the action. The quality of being organic is lost when the people is the object in the same sense as when the term object is used in grammar: the one acted upon.

D.H. Lawrence tied organic to some other necessary thing:

Men are free when they belong to a living, organic, believing community active in fulfilling some unfulfilled, perhaps unrealized purpose.

The organic community is where men and women can use freedom to find their identities, and the act of fully finding these identities (to the extent that is possible) will make these men and women truly free. Among current examples of such thinking is even the writing of a prominent liberal author who uses the term tribe to describe those who gain by having “a strong instinct to belong to small groups defined by clear purpose and understanding.”

Identity will have many facets, and the best men and women will form their identities on the best purpose and most important understanding. Religion should be first, and there are so many other sources that their naming is unnecessary. One facet of identity that might often be placed directly behind religion is nationality. By most accounts there are now 196 countries in the world; the number of nations is not necessarily the same; it is probably larger.

+

What is freedom and is it enormously complex? Yes, of course, because freedom manifests itself in many ways every day in our lives directly and in the decisions of others that affect our lives. In contradiction to this, freedom is so simple that it can be reduced to a single word, just as God can be reduced to a single word: agape.

In the case of freedom, the single word to which it can be reduced is our recent subject of identity. Identity, put simply, is understanding and being your own self individually but then being able to voluntarily join with others. When a person realizes his or her identity (or even moves significantly toward this goal), freedom is the result. When a nation lives within its identity, those who make up the nation are free in a different, larger sense. Even the most completely captive nations throughout history did not fully lose their freedom until the identities that they had possessed were lost.

Permanency is achieved by extending individual identity to the collective. However, the collective is greater than its parts of individual identity, and this is most true when the individual identity is taken predominantly from religion, the freedom which should be permanent, or to a lesser extent any of the various positive freedoms. The fact is now often overlooked but for much of our existence there have been hardships to acquiring or keeping religious freedom. Where this freedom was acquired, often a separate area (and other considerations such as a separate education) and a separate government were required to maintain it. Freedoms of various kinds have been lost when these separations were allowed to be taken away.

The critics concerned by this loss of separation say that a clearly defined collective cultural identity must be restored as a vital principle of government. These critics believe that just as ideology dictated the twentieth century, identity will dictate the twenty-first. Consistently more politically aware than Americans, Europeans have taken the lead in this line of thought which is known by various names but most often identitarianism.

On what would an American form of identitarianism be based? To quote a character's line from the war novel *How Red the Rose*: "There is a fierceness in the blood that can bind you up with a long community of life." The word fierceness is seldom used; it is derived from the Latin *ferus* meaning wild. The wild is natural, and the freedoms found in nature and in nations are both individual and collective. The identity of the man and of the woman under this approach would be naturally bound together with those around them, with their past generations, and importantly with the generations to come.

In the collective, what is beyond a single man or woman, this identity is a shared memory which would be the basis of our identitarianism. Many things are shared with the formation of such an identity. Memories, as bases of order, can be shared on many levels.

C.S. Lewis in his role as a Christian apologist made a profound point about the value of the past, the material of which memories consist, in a 1939 sermon:

We need intimate knowledge of the past. Not that the past has any magic about it, but because we cannot study the future, and yet need something to set against the present, to remind us that the basic assumptions have been quite different in different periods and much which seems certain to the uneducated is merely temporary fashion.

So much of what is around us should only be temporary, like a passing illness or a passing storm. Identity can, for nearly all of us, only be formed from the past, and authority as a source of personal knowledge must also draw from the past.

TEN ++++ Identity and authority are needed to form a nation

Before going any further with the related subjects of identity and nation, it is useful to note the division within the one predominant entity which is clearly involved with much of what has been mentioned on order, hierarchy, and tradition: the Roman Catholic Church. This involvement encompasses not only issues of theology but involvement with more commonplace topics as well. Among such topics have been the giving to remarried men and women of communion as well as the Christian response to non-marital relationships. Of course the church's foundational responses concerning these matters were clearly set very early in its teachings and scriptural sources; there are, however, seemingly many Catholics who follow more or less the line that "if the church does not listen to the world, the world will not listen to the church." In response to this, Ross Douthat, a prominent author concerned with religious matters, basically wrote that the Roman Catholic Church is not like the political parties that rule America in that it cannot change its policies and principles at will. As a foundation of Christianity, such a denomination cannot necessarily change even when Catholicism's leader or the majority of bishops feel that a more lenient policy or indulgent principle is desirable:

The issue is that Catholics are traditionally supposed to believe ... that the authority of the church is not just arbitrary, not just a party line that we're supposed to adapt ourselves to ... but an authority that is vindicated in its own fidelity to the New Testament, the earthly church, the creeds and the entire deposit of faith.

In other words authority can be arbitrary or it can be something completely different. Wyndham Lewis said that the beauty which intelligent individuals recognized in authority is in its abstract nature and that fact made the recognition more difficult. It is not that Catholicism cannot change its teachings, but rather what has gone before must be strictly honored as a boundary. In each case of boundary change, conclusive proof must be provided that the new policy or principle is continuous with what the Roman Catholic Church has always taught, even centuries ago. Anything at odds with or beyond the previous boundaries must be carefully screened through the church's hierarchy.

Bounded by precedent is the Catholic approach, and if it had been left to voices such as Tocqueville and Cooper Americans would have followed exactly that approach. Not only the Constitution but the rights of Englishmen for which the American Revolution was fought, and even earlier precedents about governing from both Europe and America would have drawn the necessary boundaries. (Of course, the judgments of these two men were not uncommon, the same beliefs were voiced by nearly all the prominent leaders of the period.)

A method of this use of boundaries is for the man or woman of our time to ask themselves how their parents or grandparents would have felt about a particular issue. If the facts concerning the issue have changed significantly – for instance, if new objective evidence has been revealed – then the judgments of previous generations should be regarded in a new way. If there is not such evidence then the judgments of previous generations – the traditions of the past – should not be the final word but should provide substantial guidance.

This is a form of what John Hibben, a clergyman and president of Princeton University from 1912 to 1932, called prejudice. Prejudice is surely one of the most hated words of our time and is now synonymous with bias, bigotry, and discrimination; but that was not always the case. Hibben asked is prejudice always unreasonable; is it always the “counterfeit of true judgment?” His answer was no: it may not be unreasonable, but rather only unreasoned. We accept the opinions of others such as our parents or those who are particularly knowledgeable about certain matters; at other times we often form conclusions by reason, but while we continue to hold these conclusions we forget the reasoning process which was originally involved; when any of these things occur our judgments are along the lines of prejudice. Also we are sometimes forced to decide something so quickly that there is no time at all for reasoning, and we again depend on what could be called prejudice. Prejudice can be simply relying on experience in one way or another. Lastly, when reason is distracted by selfishness or other harmful considerations it may be a saving grace, or as John Hibben phrased it a form of “instinctive morality,” to apply prejudice rather than reason.

What is taken from the past, in the sense of earlier generations or heritage, is only one potential personal influence; there are many other sources of identity that can be seen readily in studying the life experiences of others, perhaps especially celebrities. No matter what branch of celebrity is involved, often there is a need to cultivate a certain image; the modern term for image seems to be brand. Barack Obama may illustrate a number of other these sources, but he has also taken a great deal from his heritage. Obama had numerous choices for forming his identity and subsequently his image or brand. He could have created an identity using both his parents, but this was difficult because of the enormous differences between his parents. He could have identified as an Indonesian since he spent some of his formative years there with his mother and his step-father who was Indonesian. By his college years, he had lived in such varied places that he could have thought of himself as without a clear identity of country or race. He could have identified as a Moslem, the religion of his father and step-father. The choice that he finally made was to emphasize his African heritage taken from his father despite having a very limited relationship with him. His father was married in Kenya, yet came to the United States and apparently committed bigamy in marrying Barack Obama's 19-year-old mother. After their marriage ended in divorce, he married another American and returned to Africa where after a failed career as a government economist and serious personal troubles he died at the age of 46. Like a significant number of young men, Barack Obama had difficult emotional problems and became immersed in drug abuse, which in his case lasted several years. It is not difficult to associate such problems with the muddled background in which he was raised. Meeting Barack Obama for the first time in 1988, his half-brother Mark Ndesundjo was surprised by what he perceived to be Obama's rejection of Western culture; this seems to be part of the attitude that Obama had formed as a teenager and in his early twenties. When many years later, well into his second term, he visited Africa, Obama continued to emphasize his African heritage, even describing himself as the first "Kenyan-American" president.

The influence of the country in which we mature or the nation to which we feel we belong is normally strong, so it may be worthwhile to cite the important difference between a country and a nation. Immigrants can cross over a country's borders and after living there for a period become, in some measure, a part of that country. The Syrians, for instance, driven by the self-destruction of their own land and flooding into Germany may eventually somewhat assimilate despite large cultural differences with the German people. There are even circumstances where the immigrant who over time accepts and enriches the surrounding original culture may properly be called a patriot. A patriot is someone who has a deep commitment to a single country; a nationalist, on the other hand, has a deep commitment to a single nation. How does a country differ from a nation? A nation involves birth and a permanent relationship. The word nation is similar in appearance and meaning to words such as native and nativity, and a nationalist must feel a strong sense of being within an extended family with other members, or even all members, of what is considered the nation.

I recently came across a columnist's mention of a short story titled "The Man Without a Country," a piece of writing I probably hadn't thought of since I read it as a student in about 1957

(the columnist said she first read it in 1947). It is powerful enough that even after many decades its plot is easily remembered. A naval officer in America in the early 1800s is found, perhaps wrongly, guilty of treason; he is upset by the verdict and shouts a curse against the United States and that he never wants to hear anything of the United States again; the trial judge responds by honoring the man's demand and sentences him to be kept aboard naval vessels for the remainder of his life without ever touching American soil, or having any source of information about the country, or even mention of its name. The columnist included that the story about the officer and his punishment is not part of the modern, changed curriculum; the larger theme was that extreme changes now occur very quickly.

Another point to be taken from the story of this man totally exiled from the United States is that at that time in our history he was more without a nation than without a country. A country is different from a nation because a country is purely a political creation. The United States has evolved into a country with many groups and many group differences. There are a number of different peoples within the United States, as there are also several different cultures.

The nature of California in our time is helpful as a demonstration of the difference between a country and a nation. If California were to secede from the United States but were to govern itself under the system it now uses, it should be thought of as a country. However, if a group of Californians all of Hispanic descent were to secede and govern themselves under Hispanic influences what would be formed would best be considered a nation.

Another demonstration of the difference between a country and a nation was Barack Obama's statement when he visited an American mosque in the last year of his presidency. He said that the concerns about the Moslem religion which he called Islamophobia "tears at the fabric of our nation." For accuracy's sake the word country would have been a better choice because the American nation with its ties to Christianity should by all means be concerned with Islam.

To complete this thought, a distinct group living within a country is often called a people. When a people secure their own living area, they may be called a nation; and their living area is also called a nation. (This sentence could be rewritten to use people in the singular: when a people secures its own living area, it may be called a nation; and its living area)

+

A type of summary of my thoughts can be given now by returning to a central issue I raised at the end of the first section: what's wrong with democracy? Supporters of our current kind of government ask this; in asking they are suggesting that there is nothing wrong with it. To the extent there is anything wrong the correction for them is absolutely even more democracy. To the extent there is anything wrong the problem for them is absolutely the outdated opinions of long deceased males such as Burke, Cooper, Jefferson, Tocqueville, and so on have not been completely erased.

Instead of using the adjective outdated to describe the judgments of the various critics of unrestricted democracy, I would use the adjective fulfilled. The criticisms of Burke, Cooper, Jefferson, Tocqueville, and so on have been completely fulfilled.

American democracy has without question moved toward at least three of the characteristics which these critics had anticipated; an obsession with equality, a failure to plan for the future, and a tyranny of the majority. There are numerous illustrations of these three characteristics, but a more effective way to comment might be to make a truly conservative or traditional general statement on each.

Democracy has been reduced to an obsession with equality and nothing more. While its defenders might quarrel with calling it an obsession, they surely would insist equality must be present in all aspects of our lives. And in fact it is equality of results that these democrats prefer.

Democratic equality has also lessened planning for the future because the importance of success or failure has been diminished. The importance of individual success or failure has been diminished by the public handouts politicians have offered in payment for their political careers. On a larger scale, the United States moves from one crisis to another largely because the men and women responsible for the country are concerned with nothing beyond their personal material (or worldly) success.

The men and women responsible for directing the country depend in an electoral sense on the support of the majority and therefore the support of the majority determines right and wrong – to the modern mind. The lessons of the past and the special talents of the present have no real influence.

ELEVEN ++++ Obeying authority is required to learn what living fully means

The preceding few pages have argued that a national identity is a cumulative form of personal identities. In other words the community of memory is extended to the community.

What makes this extension possible is a category of learning, and if we begin by defining learning an extremely good definition is by C.S. Lewis: education – the passing of learning to others – is just “old birds teaching young birds to fly.” We, the old birds, cannot teach more than we know, and the first obligation is to teach what is most important. What is most important and most natural must be what is given first.

This simple but significant comment by Lewis is lost to many because our commitment to formal education comes to mind first of all. Americans invest enormously in the amount of time spent and finances spent in formal education. Costs for elementary and secondary education in the United States approached 700 billion dollars in 2015. College and university costs consistently require deep student debt by the time of graduation; a student’s expenses for the highest priced schools currently exceed \$60,000 per year; graduate degrees are necessary to enter some professions.

On the other hand, some students never finish high school. Anyone lacking the minimal learning provided at this level faces enormous difficulties.

Beyond formal education, or what could be called book knowledge, there is a second type of learning: life knowledge. So in our preparation for living it is better, even necessary, to master both book knowledge and life knowledge.

Book knowledge is an appropriate term because in our earlier periods intellect was sometimes measured by the number of books which had been completely mastered. In a Thomas Hardy novel, the central figure begins by studying a single book and then moves on, probably slowly, to others. This is not enormously different than the Great Books curriculum still used by several respected American colleges.

Beyond the Great Books type of study, book knowledge no longer means what it did in the past. It now means more a preparation for a career. While sociologists have read sociology texts, journalists have read a series of journalism texts, and so on. Those who work with their hands are more exposed to training manuals or instruction from experienced workers, but for our purposes this could be called book knowledge as well.

Although once educationally dominant, liberal arts programs, a larger relative of the Great Books studies, have been enormously reduced. Ideally this educational type was a form of book knowledge that offered, in some amount, life knowledge. The concept was that throughout history some man or woman had illuminated a life issue so well that it was not only an answer for a particular instance or time but fundamentally for all times. While many statements from the past are obviously wrong when judged by twenty-first century knowledge, the voices of the past do represent gained knowledge. Also it could be said that these voices represent, at least in many cases, the voices of traditionalism.

The liberal arts bring order to the “litter of ideas” said John Henry Newman, a writer in various forms and a famous convert to Catholicism. Newman noted the purposes of education in *The Idea of the University*:

It is education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them.

In a way what John Henry Newman was expressing is that education is a development and demonstration of personal identity. Knowledge is required for such development and remains linked to our identities throughout our lives.

An area of knowledge which has been always first in order is the understanding of good and evil. What is evil? It is not something that necessarily follows the current majority perceptions of right and wrong. Among other things evil is resistance to life. To explain this there is a behavior from what are called the deadly sins: the sin of sloth. A Catholic catechism explains sloth as a failure to accept that all we do requires effort, and these efforts are the means of our salvation. The slothful person is unwilling to struggle and instead resists what life really involves.

When the sin of failing to struggle is multiplied society becomes slothful: society becomes

decadent. The learning is available, but when a society fails to extend in a natural manner this knowledge it must be considered decadent. From our European past, there were so many figures who were the opposite of decadent and so filled with the spirit of knowledge that it had to spill forth; it was such original and certain learning that anyone involved with it felt compelled to face any challenge or suffer any punishment. There have been so many who have had to face life or death situations. These great figures generated hatred in their day, and in many cases the hatred continues to our time.

An important sign of decadence is the hatred of great men and women. Class conflict and group differences have been part of this, but there has been more involved.

Just as individuals have moments of weakness so do cultures and civilizations. Physical and spiritual strength do not coincide. Physical health may bring spiritual indifference; physical weakness may bring spiritual commitment. Wealth and worldly success may bring spiritual indifference to an individual or a society; poverty and failure (by worldly measure) may bring spiritual commitment to an individual or to a society.

A continuing subject for writers has been the weakness or strength we display while struggling through our lives. The author Henry James used the word battle and said evil “is insolent and strong” while goodness is “very apt to be weak.” But the struggle of life, according to James, is something we cannot forget, deny, or dispense with.

We are, to use a common phrase, “in the river of life.” A great river is alive in many ways, and like life it changes constantly. Catch the flowing water in your hand. It will never be the same water flowing in that river again; in a year, or a thousand years, the water will never be the same.

The word life also brings to mind the phrase “tree of life.” Life like a tree must be rooted and grow and expand from those roots. Your life is rooted in your parents and their parents, whether you prefer to recognize it or not. “Dear bought and clear, a thousand years our fathers’ title runs,” Kipling famously wrote. Ten thousand years it will run if it is the will of God.

So even in our complexities, it is possible to see our lives represented by something simpler such as pieces of the environment such as rivers or trees. The true conservation is a form of a larger appreciation, as it attempts to preserve what is needed. Roger Scruton united this preservation with conservatism:

Conservatism ... means the maintenance of social ecology. It is true that individual freedom is part of that ecology, since without it organisms can't adapt. But freedom is not the only goal of politics. Conservatism and conservation are two aspects of a single long-term policy, which is that of husbanding resources and ensuring their renewal.

+

Living completely is responding to the voice of life that guides each of us concerning our changes and our rootedness. This voice is intuitive but not solely so. Intuition is part of the personality and varies accordingly among individuals and groups. Our source of guidance is also what was called blood knowledge by D.H. Lawrence: he said that it was superior to brain knowledge. Living completely requires the recognition of blood knowledge, the gift of generation after generation.

Living completely includes accepting the wisdom passed by the generations. This wisdom is ultimately structured in the hierarchy of the Creator and created. Living completely is journeying along this path of hierarchy daily. It is our great pilgrimage. In a larger sense it is putting in place the foundation of any successful society. There is no exaggeration in the statement that the stronger the family is the stronger the nation is also. There were never truer words spoken than when John Adams said that the foundations of national morality must be laid in the family. The traditionalist philosopher George Santayana called the family “one of nature’s masterpieces.” Santayana continued in his 1905 work *The Life of Reason* to describe the family of his period:

It would be hard to conceive a system of instinct ... where the constituents should represent or support one another better.
The family being the earliest and closest society into which men [and women] may enter, it assumes the primary functions which all society can exercise.

The term family needs no explanation. A family is a mother, a father, and their children. It may even be extended to include relatives and may benefit from such an extension. Despite the various corruptions of our time, the unity of parents and children will always remain the basis of a healthy society. Because of personal shortcomings this unity is not always complete, but it should be.

Everything that surrounds the family should work for its success. Despite our times there occasionally is still talk of the sacredness of the family and its role as the ultimate authority when dealing with everyday life.

The ideology of the left has attempted to destroy the unity and permanency natural to the family. A woman considered for a position at the beginning of the Obama administration was the perfect illustration of this. Years before, this woman filed legal papers to force the public to pay for abortions. She argued that when an abortion was denied and a pregnancy continued it was a form of involuntary servitude and violated the Thirteenth Amendment, the amendment banning slavery. In various ways what a Christian society would struggle against is precisely such thinking.

For supporters of the family there is nothing better than to be considered pro-life, but ideally pro-life would be extended to creating and supporting a culture where life is completely lived. If you wonder what prevents this type of living in our time and in a materialistically rich society, the answer may be that such a goal cannot be attained unless we are in a position to obey. To obey seems difficult for the modern man and woman.

Traditionally the measure of being pro-life is related to the structure of the family. One

important aspect of this was measured when an organization surveyed to determine the percentage of children living with two parents in various countries during the period beginning in 2000 and extending for 12 years. Surprisingly, perhaps, the two highest countries were Jordan and Israel at 94 and 92 percent. They were followed by Egypt and the two highest rated European countries Italy and Poland. The United States at 69 percent of children living with both parents trailed impoverished countries such as Peru and Ethiopia. Three African nations were at the bottom of the survey: Uganda, Kenya, and South Africa. South Africa's dire circumstances are shown by the fact that 21 percent of children there were not living with any parent. Looking at the full survey, it is clear that advanced living standards and material wealth do not, in the least, ensure that children will be raised by both a mother and a father.

It is very possible that this absence of natural parenting is an important part of why obeying in any sense has become so out of the ordinary. Few children seem to obey what they are told as they did in previous generations. The extremes of this are the hundreds of public school teachers and staff who are attacked or threatened with violence daily in American schools. In regard to obeying laws, if Americans were law abiding there would be no need for the various security systems in schools, the multitude of police, the demonstrations and armed attacks against the police, the common nature of rioting, and the country's prison industry would not have between two and three million inmates.

Perhaps even something as extreme as the response of soldiers to their orders has also changed, but everyone knows that the military can only exist with exceptionally strict discipline. This is a discipline based closely on unity, which is to some degree individual identity commonly held. The military's unity has been openly attacked by the political left since at least the Vietnam War era, a time when some leading liberals formed their own opinions, and recently those attacks using the platform of equal rights have intensified. Except to advance their own very narrow interests, the left has no use at all for the American military. Others, however, appreciate it deeply. This attitude toward those who protect us is a real political litmus test. Support for the military as a form of patriotism is surely difficult for liberals who see a country stained with inequality, injustice, racism, and so on.

In regard to the role of the military, the truth is that through the shedding of blood in war countries have been created and sustained. The United States is one of these many countries. Joseph de Maistre, a true conservative from a period of great conflict, put bloodshed and this world in perspective:

The whole earth, continually steeped in blood, is nothing but an immense altar on which every living thing must be sacrificed without end, without restraint, without respite until the consummation of the world.

The worst that can be said about a military is that it defends only a country instead of a nation, and certainly as the United States has changed the vast efforts and use of resources by the

military defend only a country. A nation, something dependent on birth and tradition, absolutely has the contempt of the left.

Respect for parents is also based on birth and tradition, and in the 1960s the American left went so far as to teach to young men and women hatred for their parents. While it may be rare for children to hate their parents, the continuation into our time of many forms of disrespect is still very apparent.

The obligations between children and parents are something both must obey. They are among the clearest examples of what can be called the permanent things.

TWELVE ++++ Living fully means recognizing leadership in the family and in the nation

Now let's note the statements of three prominent men on the weaknesses of our society, a topic of importance to this point:

[A] secular society that has no end beyond its own satisfaction is a monstrosity – a cancerous growth that will ultimately destroy itself.

By destroying traditional social habits of people, by dissolving their mutual collective consciousness into individual constituents, by licensing the opinion of the most foolish, by substituting instruction for education, by encouraging cleverness rather than wisdom, the upstart rather than the qualified, by fostering a notion of getting on to which the alternative is a hopeless apathy, liberalism can prepare the way for that which is its own negation: the artificial, mechanized or brutalized control which is a desperate remedy for its chaos.

Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned.

Christopher Dawson, who was mentioned in the opening pages, is the source of the first quote. Dawson wrote about two dozen books, and in these he often argued for a cultural rather than the accepted national conception of history. He taught that “the Christian is bound to believe there is a spiritual purpose in history.”

T.S. Eliot was mentioned concerning culture, and he is the source of the second quotation. Best known for the poem “The Waste Land,” a modernist form of the Holy Grail legend, he also is remembered for the play “Murder in the Cathedral” concerning the death of Thomas Becket.

Eliot was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

The poet, playwright, and essayist William Butler Yeats is the source of the third quotation (from the poem “The Second Coming”). Much of his reverence for tradition was drawn from the Celtic mythology and folklore that he learned in his formative years. Celtic themes were used in his early poetry; his later poetry was of a different type: direct, sparse, and personal. In later years he applied his thoughts to politics and for a number of years was an appointed senator in the upper house of the Irish legislature. Like Eliot, Yeats was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

One thing to emphasize is that Dawson, Eliot, and Yeats were not just men putting words on paper; they were leaders of their peoples. And what they said applied to other related peoples as well.

Because of the time we are in we think of leaders almost solely as political figures, but often leadership is in the wider culture – the religious part especially. Dawson, Eliot, and Yeats were far from politicians but instead leaders in culture.

To avoid the cultural destruction about which the three men warned there is one clear response; some men and women must be honestly selected and then tell others what must be done; and some men and women must obey what they are told by these honestly selected leaders. Of course this is very much the opposite of what we are led to believe is the democratic process, but writing in the 1920s D.H. Lawrence said that the next relationship had to be a relationship of everyone within a group conceived in a “spirit of unfathomable trust and responsibility, service and leadership, obedience and pure authority.” There will always be a reluctance to accept authority, but as destruction becomes more widespread authority will become increasingly a shelter shared by both the weak and the strong. Yeats wrote that the soldier takes pride in saluting his captain, and earlier the British writer Thomas Carlyle used the phrase “captainless soldiers” as meaning chaos.

The soldier’s place has been allotted as far back as Plato’s *Republic*, a nation made of philosopher guides, warriors, and workers. The medieval world had those who contributed by prayer, by blood, or by work. The modern world, because it is modern, is not so well divided.

In the structure of which Yeats and Carlyle spoke, there is pride in carrying out given orders; not everyone, however, can adapt to the soldier’s discipline. Devotion to this type of strictness can never be common. While most of us seek order, both in our personal life and beyond, when the focus becomes increasing order through extreme self-control the attraction is lost.

Perhaps most of us want only to go about our personal day-to-day living, have little interference by authorities, but allow the authorities to be responsible for what is truly necessary. This has become more difficult because of the complexity of our time, and we are often skeptical of those who are supposed to provide some service to us. We are especially skeptical about politics: D.H. Lawrence commented on the foolishness of expecting democratic politics – often referred to as the world’s second oldest profession – to be idealistic:

Politics – what are they? Just another extra-large commercial wrangle over buying and selling – nothing else. Very good to have a wrangle. Let us have the buying and selling well done. But *ideal!* Politics ideal!

Lawrence – like Dawson, Eliot, and Yeats – was committed to authority and leadership. Several of his novels included themes of the charismatic leader. Lawrence also for many years sought to lead a group of writers and intellectuals into a settlement where they could be separate from “a world of war and squalor.” He gave this settlement the odd name Rananim; Lawrence talked about it again and again but it never came about.

+

Different sides of the political spectrum say that in some form Americans avoid authority and display a skepticism which leads to less confidence in government and less confidence in what they are told. This skepticism also leads to less involvement with others, less belief in the electoral process, and less reliance on co-operation.

Surprisingly, even some liberals attribute these difficulties to diversity – as well as other causes. If the conclusions on this subject by liberal Harvard professor Robert Putnam, for example, were reduced to three words they would be diversity destroys trust.

Under different circumstances the trust that supports authority can be maintained, as it was in the past. Where dealings are restricted to the family relatives, for example, trust has always been comparatively high.

If the natural unity of the family could be duplicated in the extended family then the lack of discipline, the lack of certain forms of confidence, as well as the lack of co-operation could be contained. Among other things the strength of person’s identity makes such a duplication difficult.

In our history, however, there have been many forms of what is basically the extended family. In earlier times each town, village, or small city was, at least in part, an extended family. Even later immigrants such as the Norwegians or Swedes who settled in the Midwest or the Slavic and Welsh groups who came to the United States as miners stayed within their groups in many ways. This was probably seen most easily in the matter of religion. Religion still allows for the extended family among recent immigrants from non-European areas as well as other smaller denominations such as the Amish and Mennonites. Even if there is a personal conflict between certain Amish, they are still more likely to deal with each other than go outside their church group. Such bonds are not widely understood because the Amish are not part of the mainstream, do not actively seek converts, and have a limited church hierarchy.

If there is to be a movement toward the reacceptance of hierarchy there must be a necessary first step: recognition of the importance of the father. The father, in the ideal sense, needs to have only two characteristics: an understanding of life to pass on to his family, and also an awareness of the sacredness of being a father. It is not what a father does that is of importance, but what he is. He must be filled with life, and that is impossible if he is not filled with spiritual life.

Thomas Carlyle is best known for his study of the hero, but in line with these references to the family Carlyle's concept of the hero also included deep respect for his father:

He was born and brought up the poorest, by his own right hand [hard work] he had become wealthy, as he accounted wealth, and in all ways plentifully supplied. He saw his children grow up around him to guard him and do him honor; he had [ultimately] a hearty respect from all; could look forward from the verge of this Earth, rich and increased in goods, into an Everlasting Country where through the immeasurable Deeps shone a solemn somber hope.

+

Another variation of the subject of the hero with which Thomas Carlyle is tied is that the great man (or woman, although none was included in his listings) has an enormous influence on world events. He memorably phrased it: "No great man lives in vain. The history of the world is but the biography of great men."

Carlyle admitted that even the definition of great has been ceaselessly disputed. The winning side almost without exception decides what history is, particularly in the most extreme instances. Can someone responsible for tremendous suffering be considered great? This is just one question that can be raised concerning historic greatness.

The various traits of heroes differ and are influenced by several factors. There has been, needless to say, a long line of American heroes. Some of these have been favored in history, but others who have sacrificed and accomplished as much have been condemned when the patterns of history have changed.

The selection of heroes is a more serious matter than it might seem. For one thing different groups in our country do not apply the same standards in their selection of the heroic.

Noting these differences in what is considered heroic leads to a few sentences of explanation. When a soldier is cited for heroism, it does not imply that everything the soldier did from the time the uniform was first put on was heroic. Instead, in one instance the soldier did the work of a hero. To honor someone does not suggest that all aspects of the person's life were heroic. There is a fine and subjective line to be drawn. In examining the hero's life, a failure or a flaw can be overlooked or they can be magnified. Even what is considered a failure or flaw can change over time.

From the long line of American heroes to select a single example is difficult for numerous reasons. It is, of course, time consuming even to form complete opinions on a large number of historic figures to determine if they have been treated justly by the historians. One outstanding biography of the person selected here as an example of the heroic runs to six full volumes, but if we do not know this man rather fully we will not understand, for instance, what he meant when he wrote the following or how we should apply it in our time:

And what country can preserve its liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? What are a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be freshened from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.

The time was that school students would have read those rousing lines concerning the heroic as part of their overall exposure to the Founding Fathers and to understand why blood must sometimes be shed. The war to gain independence lasted within a few days of eight years and cost approximately 25,000 American lives. By 1812 another war with Britain began and lasted several years with thousands of American lives lost. These were only rehearsals for the great fraternal war that saw Americans killing each other: over 600,000 men died and over 400,000 were wounded. The southern region of our country did not recover substantially for several generations; the leading historian James Ford Rhodes wrote that the imposed reconstruction of the South was “government by the most ignorant and vicious part of the population for the vulgar, materialistic, brutal benefit of the governing set.” Americans were decisive elements in the world wars; we subsequently fought two major wars against communism with extensive loss of life; we fought a series of wars related to balance in some way and against terrorism. Considering the headlines we read concerning violence between groups, it seems the wars of the world have become in our time even more savage, and that the United States with all its supposed democratic power and wisdom cannot lessen this savagery. Instead some observers, including even Americans, say that the United States is now addicted to war.

+

Why should Thomas Jefferson be considered heroic? It is not because he opposed slavery, but in his time to assume such a stand was heroic. It is not because he discussed with honesty what in our time is censored, although for one of us to use such candor might be heroic.

If this country or any portion of it is to be saved from its wasted condition there must be an honest renewal. This would be simply a renewal led by capable and honest men and women. They would not be infallible, but they would be honest. They would understand that everything essential and great has only emerged and been kept when we have had basics – down to the homes we are raised in – rooted in tradition. They would understand the necessities of that tradition.

It was Thomas Jefferson who helped keep us on that necessary path and has given us, even in our troubled time, the promise of renewal. This was his act of heroism.

Russell Kirk, a leading teacher of conservatism in twentieth century America, spelled out the Jeffersonian principles in a 1941 journal article:

We must have slow but democratic decisions, sound local government, diffusion of property-owning, taxation as direct as possible, preservation of civil liberties, payment of debts by the generation incurring them,

prevention of the rise of class antipathies, a stable and extensive agriculture, as little governing by the government as practicable, and, above all, stimulation of self-reliance.

Those were excellent recommendations in Jefferson's time; they remained excellent in Kirk's time; and they remain excellent recommendations for our time.

Adding to those ideals (and perhaps repeating several by using somewhat different wording) would include:

We must educate to develop our greatest talents.

We must never become complacent about our individual and collective freedoms.

We must remain a nation of evolved laws from permanent sources.

We must govern by a traditional structure and avoid pure democracy.

We must govern for the independent and virtuous.

Perhaps the last of those ideals is the most important. In the conflict and lack of unity which we now experience, we have ignored the independent and virtuous.

Regrettably, we have done terribly with all these ideals. For instance, how many light years is what is called same sex marriage from a nation of evolved laws from permanent sources? What was Jefferson's attitude toward homosexuality? It wasn't tolerant. He urged laws to castrate male homosexuals and to mutilate the faces of lesbians by cutting a hole in the nose cartilage. These were punishments that he considered necessary to protect society.

+

Since the ideal of beauty is a subject to be mentioned in the following pages, it might be noted that the historian Henry Adams (a descendant of the two presidents) said that Thomas Jefferson "reveled" in what was beautiful. Revel is an unusual word: it means to take extreme pleasure in something. The pleasure may even be loud and boisterous. The extreme appreciation of beauty is also unusual; it may be a characteristic of leadership.

There is, as was said a few paragraphs previously, disagreement about the recognition of a hero. Some Americans do not join in honoring Jefferson; when recently a college instructor visited Monticello she wrote that whitewashing slavery is not only dishonest "but also allows for a disconnect between the horrors of slavery and the current entrenchment of inequality." This woman probably found no beauty at Monticello. She and many others do not consider Thomas Jefferson heroic. To cite a more recent figure, many people considered the death of Antonin Scalia a great loss because of his heroic stands on crucial issues, but many others clearly did not consider him a hero. At a time when a device can be successfully landed on a comet an unimaginable distance away from the Earth, it is difficult to relate to Charles Lindbergh being hailed as a hero for flying across the Atlantic Ocean alone. But Lindbergh was considered heroic in an exceptional sense and

was for a period called the most famous man in the world. However when Lindbergh asked that America maintain neutrality (before the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred) he quickly lost his hero status; the people turned against him and even against his wife who shared his support for neutrality; the Roosevelt administration even refused his request to serve in the military during the subsequent war and portrayed him as a traitor.

An important matter when we look at our past is to ask how the United States at its birth produced so many exceptional leaders like Jefferson. A partial reply would be that the circumstances required greatness, and the small number that always form the tip of the hierarchy responded accordingly. Another partial reply would be that in Jefferson's period, leaders were selected in a more direct and personal manner.

THIRTEEN ++++ Living fully means regaining beauty and other positive cultural elements

In our time it may be difficult to link talk of the heroic with the subject of poetry, but the hero has in the past always been an important subject material for poets entertaining and educating their peoples. Much of this link between the hero and poetry has been lost, and it has been said that poetry has changed so completely that now poets only write for other poets to read. It is as if the older type of poetry has become extinct. Some part of this change involves an agenda and calling what certain people write poetry just to manufacture a sort of intellectual façade. It's not unusual for prominent poets in our time to also write books intended for children, and telling the difference between their poetry and their children's literature is difficult.

In my earlier draft I gave some examples of modern poetry that I considered poetic failures, but such examples seem unnecessary. If you hear glowing reports for a particular current poet go online or to a bookstore and read a few of the poems. Chances are they will not be impressive. If an example of something being infinite were needed, bad poetry could absolutely be used as an illustration.

There is not much in such promoted poetic attempts to remind anyone of the great writers who used their languages with exceptional precision and conveyed in such beautiful almost miraculous forms their messages. The miraculous form is involved in the definition of poetry: the best use of the best words to convey the best message. Samuel Taylor Coleridge said that poetry has a logic as severe as that of science.

Very few younger people have any interest in using the best words for any purpose. An English study said that teenagers use a vocabulary of only about 800 words. The patterns of young people's conversations are more filled with slang and obscenity than ever. There is also the use of meaningless words and phrases, and this pattern carries over to their more formal efforts at speaking or writing.

Perhaps overall maturity is needed to appreciate poetry because the best poetry has no choice but to be closely bound with the permanent things. The important and controversial California writer Robinson Jeffers said that “poetry is bound to concern itself chiefly with the permanent aspects of life.”

Unlike the experience of students now or even a generation or so back, at one point learning to recite lines of poetry was very much a part of elementary and secondary education. Exposure to great national poets such as Poe or Frost was considered necessary. After learning these standards, the poems were so completely memorized that they could be repeated many years later. It appears that memorization is hardly a part of education anymore. One reason for this is probably that not all students have the same ability to memorize, which calls attention to their overall inequality of ability.

+

The loss of traditional poetry, or poetry as a whole depending on how it is considered, has been a loss to conservatism. To say the highest poetry is conservative politically and conservative in its themes is an overstatement, but there is some agreement that the three most influential poets of the twentieth century in the English language were Thomas Stearns Eliot, Ezra Loomis Pound, and William Butler Yeats. Those three men went beyond conservatism to consistently being labeled reactionaries. Even though they personally deeply valued the traditional, their poetic style transitioned away from the traditional form toward the now universal approach to poetry. Eliot, Pound, and Yeats – in varying amounts – accepted this transformation. They did not compromise their quality, but they did not adhere to the old forms.

Other men and women who had sufficient talent that they did not need to surrender their usual quality were also a part of this transformation in other areas of culture: architecture, art, music, and fiction writing. The novel has not yet reached the overall degeneracy of poetry; novelists are not writing only for other novelists to read, but when an overly promoted songwriter is awarded the Nobel Prize for literature it is difficult to imagine who will be the designated masters of our time. The state of fiction is far from the time when a leading British author claimed that the novel was a greater invention than Galileo’s telescope.

What has replaced poetry after its dominance for hundreds of years? Whether the lyrics of popular songs have replaced poetry someone else will have to decide, but lyrics are learned by people who bother with little else. Lyrics beyond the simplicity of nearly all popular songs are not too far below some lesser efforts in poetry.

A part of this poetic transformation has been the diminished interest in beauty. Beauty will always have a place on the level of individual appearance and in a wider sense with a remnant, but much of the interest in finding what is beautiful has been lost.

Roger Scruton has written and spoken considerably on beauty and has provided a solid overview of the matter. Seemingly his most important point is that for about 200 years up to the 1930s when educated and thoughtful people were asked the aim of art, music, or poetry their answers were connected to beauty, but from that date until now the aim of those parts of culture

has been to disturb or shock. The poetic forms, which formerly led to beauty, now are a cult of ugliness perhaps best demonstrated by the offensive nature of much of popular music. These are the musicians who are concerned only with their own pleasures, and they very seldom possess creativity, skills, or style. They refuse to be judged and therefore naturally refuse to judge others. They, along with many who dominate popular culture, reject any attempt to tie beauty to the sacred with its two primary emotions of joy and sorrow. Instead the modern artists, musicians, and poets prefer to be a part of a meaningless and unordered culture.

In the past even transitional writers such as Eliot, Pound, or Yeats were insistent on seeking order and beauty. Four brief but near perfect lines set at a Georgian style mansion in western Ireland known as Lissadell demonstrate the force of beauty:

The light of evening, Lissadell,
Great windows open to the south,
Two girls in silk kimonos, both
Beautiful, one a gazelle.

+

If we are concerned with beauty, of the three reactionary writers we must turn to William Butler Yeats. In his long writing experience, he found many sources of beauty: the young woman who was as comely and graceful as a gazelle, the landscapes of his nation, the swans on Irish lakes, or the stone tower he had rebuilt as a family home. Famous are the lines about a small island that he considered a perfect retreat from the world where midnight glimmers, noon glows, and the evening is filled with linnets' wings. Much in the opposite direction, his most memorable phrase was perhaps "a terrible beauty is born" referring to the bloodshed of the Irish attack on the British who were then ruling Ireland. Often beauty, in one form or another, was his subject.

One example, out of many, of Yeats using the best words to convey the best message and a poem with a certain type of beauty is "The Fiddler of Dooney." Included in a collection of 1899, it has but 20 lines and a hundred or so words. It tells of the fiddler and two priests, who are his brother and a cousin; the fiddler claims that they will all enter Heaven, but that he will go first and be recognized by everyone because during his lifetime he brought such honest pleasure to those around him:

For the good are always merry,
Save by an evil chance,
And the merry love the fiddle,
And the merry love to dance.

And when the folks there spy me,
They will all come up to me
With 'Here is the fiddler of Dooney!'
And dance like a wave of the sea.

Like most or all of us the cards he was dealt did not fall perfectly into place for Yeats. It may be a record of sorts that he proposed marriage to a woman three times and then to her daughter, and both women refused his proposals. Much of his life was spent as an unattached and poor guest in the mansions or country houses of his upper-class patrons. He wanted to end that by marriage and financial stability. By the end he had fulfilled his ambitions and passed on to his nation his son and daughter.

In addition to this fulfilling personal part of his life, Yeats also passed on certain teachings on social issues. Unfortunately, these were not gathered into a single source of his political ideas and such related matters. They could have been gathered together because his judgments were consistent, but that period of war and disruption in Ireland was not conducive to free speech. In any event his poetry is still with us, and his rants, as he might have termed them, have not yet been erased completely.

It is no exaggeration to say that without the literary works of this highly gifted man there would have been no independent Ireland as it evolved. One of his leading biographers united Yeats with his nation with this description:

His best known poetry defines for many people the Irish identity ...
[and] his own discovery of his voice is often neatly paralleled with
his country's discovery of independence.

Although now being weakened by many of the same troubles that mark other democracies, his nation's shared memory and cultural unity were soundly influenced by his years of writing. As always a handful of patriots provided the needed foundations. There would be no greater blessing than to have an American equivalent of Yeats among us as we face our coming struggles: a man of high culture to renew a great nation.

+

How can culture and beauty renew a people? You should realize that those two words don't ensure goodness or anything positive. A culture can be harmful; beauty can be abused. A culture can be evil; beauty can be used for evil. If, however, culture and beauty are positive, they can be used as Yeats intended for them to be used among the Irish. The heritage that William Butler Yeats did so much to reinforce gave the people a shared memory of their past, urged them to cast off the form of rule that had been forced upon them, and suggested the future form of self-rule that they should seek. The beauty of the poetry of Yeats or beauty in any of its manifestations – great or

small – provides patterns, differentiations, and directions. The recognition of true beauty will always lift us up. This ultimate beauty is our Christian faith. This ultimate beauty is the meaning of the law as related in Deuteronomy 6:5, a demand for a complete commitment. This ultimate beauty should be a primary part of our individual and collective identities and is an absolute necessity for living fully.

A few approaches of Yeats do not carry over to our country and our time, but there remains great wisdom in his basic judgments. For example, if you question the very decency of our political figures remember Yeats said politicians “tell their lies by rote,” by habit without any thought. What better metaphor could be found than that politics is “a dirty piece of orange peel in the corner of the stairs?” Drawing from personal experience, he found that the false equality on which the democratic process was based was unchangeable, but contemptible. He condemned, in fact hated, “a little greasy huxtering nation groping for a half-pence in a greasy till.” A governed society founded on economics alone would be a prison, but instead it should be made or formed like a cathedral for “the glory of God and the soul.” This great man of letters may not have been a witnessing Christian, but how moving this single comment is that our society should be formed like a cathedral. For hundreds of years, the European countries had been described that way. For the most recent generation the European countries have dropped into an abyss of agnosticism, atheism, cowardice, defeatism, distortion, idolatry, increased sin, materialism, nihilism, and treason. The cathedral desperately needs to be strengthened or built again fresh from the ground level.

Yeats strongly felt that the family must fulfill its created purpose and produce a new, strong, and capable generation. The disbeliever, the dishonest, the impure, the incapable, the indifferent, the loser, the servile, the traitor, and the weak are no longer good enough. “Base-born products of base beds” are no longer good enough.

Learn how many capable men and women there are to draw from and shape the governing system accordingly. Public order can only be formed and persist under the direction of the educated (here Yeats did not mean merely graduates of this school or that) and able individuals. Never turn to false equality. Never resort to just counting heads. Never fall to the lowest common denominator. Never overestimate the character of public figures. Never bow to what represents just the current majority. Never ignore tradition. The individual wants certainty and wants to know what contributions are expected. There is resistance to sacrifices that are demanded of us, but that is because they are sacrifices for all the wrong things and the asking is done in all the wrong ways.

William Butler Yeats envisioned a worthy society as being built on the One, the Few, and the Many. The One, the leader, leads only the Few, who identify with the state because of their personal talents and perhaps their personal wealth. Yeats would have probably agreed that the One and the Few form the conservative element in their environment; they conserve what has been formed by the family and the extended family; they also conserve the political wealth, something of significantly lesser value. The lives of the Many are private, meaning largely removed from public involvement. Those who choose privacy are not part of the governing; they are freed from this obligation, and they want to be freed from it. In the United States the Many are represented by

the roughly half who pay no income taxes and the large numbers who choose not to participate in elections. Of course among the Many conservatism is also solidly represented. This deeply natural conservatism has been weakened by constant pushes but remains solid among southerners, the mountain and plains westerners, and the northerners who, we were told by the Obama campaign, still cling to their guns and to their religion.

+

The society advocated by Yeats was a society of very unequal parts. Despite his efforts Ireland never realized, or came close to realizing, the balance that he thought best. At the same time Yeats was closing out his life's work, the 1930s, the United States was a vastly different place than it is currently, but it was at this time that our country also turned away, dramatically away, from what Yeats supported. Instead of looking for higher standards, we began to run to the lowest levels. Another phrasing of the same thought is that the decadence of the country increased. Decadence could be defined as a time when society lacks any meaning. Meaning is destroyed by the diminishing of the influences of the One and the Few and allowing the Many to dominate. In its extreme form decadence is given "room to destroy" to use a recent phrase coined by an American politician. That is destroy what other have built. Base blood has then driven out better blood.

Writing at the very edge of the disaster of World War II (an advance to barbarism is what one important British historian termed it), Yeats felt that generations to come had for their task the rebuilding of authority, the restoration of discipline, and the recovery of liberty from its errors. The adjective true should be added to each of those nouns: true authority, true discipline, and true liberty. To accomplish this rebuilding remains our obligation as well. And the thoughts of D.H. Lawrence almost a hundred years ago are helpful and effectively capture the experience and attitudes of Yeats:

It is no use trying merely to modify the present forms. The whole great form of our era will have to go. And nothing will send it down but the shoots of life springing up and slowly bursting the foundations. And one can do nothing but fight tooth and nail to defend the new shoots of life from being crushed out, and let them grow. We can't make life. We can but fight for the life that grows in us.

D.H. Lawrence, it appears, shared a great and exceptional advantage with William Butler Yeats. This strength, for lack of a better word, was described in one of the Irish poet's collections of essays:

One day when I was 23 or 24 this sentence seemed to form in my head without willing it, much as sentences from when we are half asleep: 'Hammer your thoughts into unity.' For days I could think of nothing

else and for years I tested all I did by that sentence. I had three interests: interest in a form of literature, in a form of philosophy, and a belief in nationality. None of these seemed to have anything to do with the other, but gradually love of literature and my belief in nationality came together. Then for years I said to myself these two had nothing to do with my form of philosophy, but I had only to be sincere and keep from constraining one by the other and they would become of one interest. Now all three ... are a discrete expression of a single conviction.

It is, of course, difficult to speak of a single conviction for a man like Yeats, but his thought that “society is the struggle of two forces not transparent to reason – the family and the individual” was something of great importance to him. All the various issues which have been raised here were stirred together in the identity of Yeats, and his family – from at least the generation of his grandparents to his children – very strongly helped form his identity.

William Butler Yeats is an imperfect champion for our needed renewal. He was greatly talented and studied his subjects carefully, but he was someone with many failings. Why should we expect anything else? For instance, his burial was in a Christian cemetery (his paternal grandfather was rector at the nearby church years before), but Yeats worshipped other things and lived without professing Christianity.

Yeats worshipped other earthly things, but at least there was unity to his thoughts and support for the people whom he considered his own was an important part of those thoughts. This is best captured in his comment from near the end of his life about what he considered the two eternities “that of race and of the soul.” Also when he spoke of the holy land instead of Judea, he meant his own homeland which was most holy when it was most beautiful. His beautiful image of religion was not the resurrection but portraits of parents and their children. Goodness comes from “the struggle to found and preserve the family, and it is the family which gives to their children what will make their land holy.”

It is somewhat strange to modern thinking that the same person who found such sacredness in the family also believed that violence was integral to the beauty of this holiness. Ireland in his lifetime had seen a great deal of violence, and the full image of it was not heroic. The Easter Rising of 1916 against British control was destructive but accomplished little in a military sense. Between the two Irish sides, thousands were lost in the war that followed independence. The tactics of those who opposed the provisional Irish government included the assassination of government officials, the destruction of factories and railways, and the burning of more prominent homes including those of Protestant landowners. Even Yeats and his family were threatened by this senseless destruction while living in rural Galway. Yet Yeats spoke not only of the need for patriots but also of a strong rule to direct those patriots:

If human violence is not embodied in our institutions the young will not give them their affection, nor the young and old their loyalty. A government is legitimate because some instinct has compelled us to give it the right to take life in defense of its laws and shores.

Such a harsh statement alone makes it clear how Yeats felt about force, and, if we study carefully, we can understand when he thought force could be justly applied. All, or nearly all, governments will use force to defend their shores or borders even to the point of sacrificing and taking lives. The same is true for disruptions within a country; lives may be lost. The same is true when the nation is threatened on an individual basis: two instances of this may be in response to rape or murder. An effective and worthwhile government would not “promise this or that measure but a discipline, a way of life.”

With study we can understand what Yeats meant for himself and his time, but what role should force be assigned in our own time? The violence he supported in a theoretical way was not to introduce the new but to protect the old. *And it was not to preserve all the old.* As did the earlier Irishman Edmund Burke, Yeats sought to affirm what can be called tradition.

+

We must learn from the past and a lesson from this teacher is that the axis of tradition is clearly the family. For Yeats the family was an important center for custom and ceremony, and he asked how but through those two forms can innocence and beauty come? Innocence here means what is present from the beginning, and beauty means the orientation toward permanent beauty. Any definition of permanent beauty would be difficult, but it would likely have some element of original purity. To select one category such as art, an example is the sculpture of the human body as it carried down from ancient Greece to Europe of the 1930s. With the prevalence of abstract expressionism, cubism, kinetic art, minimal art, post-minimalism, surrealism and all the other fads and frauds of the art world, we can hardly understand the role that real art held for so long.

Frankly, the family's role has declined so sharply that it is another thing that we can hardly understand. We can't appreciate what it meant to a man of his time, but certainly now more than anything else the family and the extended family must be defended. The thought of the European philosopher Martin Heidegger is a good fit here. First we must dwell: we must develop our identity on a personal or family level. Then we must build: we must expand our identity to what is immediately outside the family. Lastly, when we are secure in our full identity we can share and coexist with others in a limited way.

When it comes to sharing responsibility for a country among widely different groups, why is that likely or even guaranteed to fail? Its chance of failure is increased because only the dominant group can form or secure its collective identity. The others, in nearly every instance, never move beyond envying the dominant group. Do you remember your elementary science? No two objects

can occupy the same space at the same time. That is only another way of explaining why so many societies committed to equality of results between groups – and by extension to each and every member of those groups – fail. To predict what will happen in regard to the identity issue during the projected evolution toward America’s complete demographic change is nearly impossible, but values will continue to move based on the values of tradition.

A significant reason this country has drifted away from its republican roots is that it has become a completely diverse society. A diverse society cannot be as unified as a monocultural one. The less variation in a country, especially one as large as the United States, the less rules (or laws) are needed to keep order. Culture is something that effectively enforces rules, but where there is more than one culture there is without exception a conflict between cultures and a conflict as to which rules (or laws) should be made and enforced.

The pattern of diversity is the same whether in the United States, the countries of western Europe, or elsewhere: society becomes more tolerant or indifferent; the decision making influence of culture declines; an expanding government assumes a greater decision making influence. In forming what should be cultural boundaries, government is less effective and subsequently disorder increases in the forms of corruption, crime, educational failure, and so on.

Tying together the subjects of identity and diversity, culture can aid in forming a positive collective identity, but, almost needless to say, government which is dependent on only enforcing numerical majorities cannot. The result is the chances of a successful society are dramatically reduced. To use Heidegger’s statement, there is an inability to expand our identity and therefore coexisting with others is made much more difficult. Violence, violence by the police in response, areas of brutality, and very high incarceration rates are among the results of this change from cultural dominance to governmental dominance.

Concerning the subject of violence, other writers and intellectuals of the period did not generally share the political views of Yeats, but they did not shy away from violence. The British writer E.M. Forster, politically liberal and during World War I a conscientious objector, conceded that “all society rests on force,” and that force was “the ultimate reality on this earth.” The larger intellectual set believed in violence in the form of communism. So violence was used, often without any restraint, to achieve economic ends. Political liberals and political conservatives too were concerned with economic ends. The liberals wanted to take property by force if necessary; the conservatives wanted to protect property by force if necessary. A person such as William Butler Yeats went beyond such standards.

What really concerned Yeats – and should deeply concern us – is a form of treason. In Dante’s *Inferno* the lowest most punitive part of hell is the ninth circle. A great frozen lake Cocytus is there, and it is a place of complete misery and complete hopelessness. The first ring of the ninth circle is reserved for those who betrayed their kin. How the politicians of our time would swell the population of this ring. The only defense these politicians could offer would be their ignorance of what kinship is. The second ring of the ninth circle is reserved for those who betray their nation. Again, the public figures who dominate America would swell the population of this ring. As Yeats

would have understood it, the second is nothing more than an extension of the previous ring. The last ring, the lowest of the ninth circle, is reserved for the greatest traitors of all time. There Judas Iscariot passes his eternity. It is tempting to wonder who has joined with the tortured Judas in recent years.

What would Yeats think of his Ireland giving up on winning the loyalty of its immigrants and instead paying them to return to their original countries? What would Yeats think of what has happened to his country, to Europe, and to America in the 75 years or so since his death? Despite economic cycles Dublin's status is now comparable to some of the richest cities in the world. It is also where people from very distant lands crowd already crowded streets. They help to swell an already swollen city and help spread industrial blight and modern blight over the Georgian beauty present when Yeats lived there. Nearly all of Dublin's magnificent old buildings were there for him: Trinity College, the Customs House, the cathedrals were there, but now industrialism and modernism have damaged Dublin as they have damaged the rest of the world.

A closing thought concerning this great European writer and nationalist can be put in the form of a fable. This is one version of a commonly told fable from an unknown source:

There once was a scorpion and a tortoise, and they were thrown into each other's company. They were different in a number of ways; there was no reason to pretend that they were the same; and to say they were equal without specifying in what respects would have been a serious misstatement. The truth of the matter is the line of the story. The scorpion was very much the predator of the two but could not swim. The tortoise, on the other hand, did not bother other animals and swam very well. The two progressed on their journey until they came to a river. Understanding his limitations the scorpion proposed that he crawl on the tortoise's back and be carried across the water. "You will sting me and I will die," was the natural response of the tortoise who feared getting too close to the scorpion. "Nothing could be more irrational than that. If I were to sting you then you would surely die, but I would also die because we would both sink to the bottom," countered the scorpion. They agreed that was the reasonable way to look at the situation, and based on this the tortoise agreed to swim and carry his companion. Half way across the scorpion stung the poor trusting tortoise. "But we agreed for you to sting me would be the death of both of us. We agreed on what is rational," cried the dying victim with his last breath. "Rationality has nothing to do with it. Stinging is my nature," replied the scorpion as the two sank beneath the water.

Yeats was far removed from the usual Irish and filled with eccentricities in his behavior, but it seems that he was a good judge of human nature. He could not have written as he did without understanding the full range of the men and women with whom he dealt. He understood that imagining the crowd would behave rationally represented something no one should expect.

Human nature represented by the crowd has always been present in America. Alexis de Tocqueville and James Fenimore Cooper warned about the crowd, about the mob, and about the threat posed by the tyranny of the majority; and now the crowd's power has increased dramatically; we see it every day pushing, demanding, and ever escalating their demands. Class conflicts have diminished as have religious quarrels among Christians, but even more basic causes for permanent

conflicts remain and seemingly will never be abolished. These seemingly permanent conflicts have, as would be reasonably expected, carried over into the group politics of our democratic system, and subsequently certain racial groups, language groups, or religious groups cast their ballots uniformly and predictably.

In 1924 Yeats said that he did not share in the belief the world was growing better and better and called such optimism the “opium dream.” He argued that the responsibility facing his people was instead “the building up of authority, the restoration of discipline, the discovery of a life sufficiently heroic to live without the opium dream.”

FOURTEEN ++++ The beauty of traditional culture will return when a traditional leader returns

Modern democracy works on the basis of numbers and progress for the future, but democracy is dependent on numbers and nothing else and its progress can never be guaranteed. Obtaining a majority has so far sustained our “opium dream,” but that provides no guarantee.

The only saving part of democracy is not the dreamed future; the author Herman Melville said that the saving part of democracy is our past. Our responsibility is to protect the saving part against very steep odds, and to do this we will need very much the opposite of politicians “who tell their lies by rote.”

At the beginning of the Obama years, Noam Chomsky, a political leftist and extremist, likened the United States to Germany before the rise of national socialism. He said that the United States is “very lucky that no honest and charismatic figure has appeared and if this were to happen this country would be in real trouble.” According to Chomsky, in Germany in the 1930s an enemy was created to account for the series of crises faced by the Germans, and in this country the created enemies will be illegal immigrants and blacks. He foresees that the United States will duplicate the Germany which has been considered one of the most brutal and evil countries in history. Such predictions have no basis and show little more than a deep hatred for all this country has stood for; Noam Chomsky’s comments were made for his own purposes, but actually nothing would suit us better than an honest and charismatic figure to return us to the greatness of a Christian republic.

Keeping in mind the two parts, the dreamed future and the selection of a leader, neither the Many nor the One has a role to play. The Many would act as the crowd or mob ultimately ending with a tyranny, and the One could directly become the tyrant. The Few after they have been awakened to their conditions have always been responsible for retaining or resurrecting authority.

Consider some of the opinions of two Englishmen: Thomas Carlyle looked for his leader in the nineteenth century and D.H. Lawrence in the twentieth. What direction did they give for this mostly new century?

Chomsky appropriately mentioned honesty; honesty concerned Carlyle and Lawrence and concerns anyone seeking leadership. Thomas Carlyle used the term sincerity and found that it was

purely spiritual and so completely inborn it simply existed and nothing more. In other words in Carlyle's opinion sincerity is natural and probably was included in the phrase D.H. Lawrence used at various times "of the blood." And Lawrence continued this opinion by adding that what our blood feels, and believes, and says is always true.

Another leadership concern is balance. The phrasing may be courage and thought (from Carlyle) or fierceness and shelter (from Lawrence), but it is this balance that helps determine greatness. It is this balance that clearly helps identify the leader.

A different sense of balance, this time the balance between love and power, determines if a leader is benign or malign. Where there is an absence of love, the emotion that predominates is actually fear; those who govern fear those over whom they have worldly power. There is also the balance of feminine and masculine, another determinant of leadership.

The ability to build authority requires many traits, but when honesty and balance are shown we must turn toward such a figure. "Hero worship is the deepest root of all," in the judgment of Carlyle. "Give homage and allegiance to a hero, and you yourself become heroic," claimed Lawrence.

+

Those few directions from Carlyle and Lawrence are all we need because the battle of numbers has a less abstract application. That application is simply how to assure a numerical majority for traditional values.

First find a leader, but there is one overwhelming point to realize about any such figure: as long as discourse is set by the other side, as long as the various stripes of liberalism are setting the rules for discussion, there will be a never-ending attempt to discredit this man or woman. The leader will be accused of being corrupt, immoral, incapable, racist and variations on racism, as well as countless other faults.

This distorting approach by liberalism to any dissidence is an important reason why the leadership of traditionalism remains so very stunted. At least since the 1960s – to cite that disastrous period again – certain judgments, no matter how factual or how moderate, have been effectively banned. Often this dissidence is nothing more than an appeal by a leader to a group's most natural feelings, and certainly a true leader is obligated to develop and direct exactly such natural feelings.

Any strong traditional leader should ignore liberalism's criticisms and instead be concerned only with developing and directing the tactics necessary to defend the family and the traditional beliefs of the family. Guided by two parents, traditional families should be large and receive leadership and support from those around them. Decisions should be made where protection should be provided and defiance toward harmful change initiated.

Another aspect of leadership is, as Eliot said in his writing on a Christian society's eventual separation from a larger society, that leaders should have a conformity with Christian beliefs and behavior. This is a minimal standard, but it is difficult to judge the depth of faith of men and

women from a distance. Despite this difficulty, it is true as Carlyle said: “a man’s religion is the chief fact about him,” and by religion Carlyle meant the man’s deepest inner thoughts concerning his relationship to what is universal.

A separation of Christians has not yet occurred, but there continues to be a separation of natural groups with natural borders. In Europe, for instance, there was talk several decades ago of a Europe of a hundred flags: a comparatively small continent with many natural divisions of self-rule. There has been a general fulfillment of this, and Scotland is one of the more recent examples. Although Scotland voted against independence in a divisive referendum in 2014, the pro-independence Scottish National Party in the following parliamentary election saw an overwhelming increase in its influence. A following step was the Scots strong vote to remain in the European Union (62 percent) despite the vote of Great Britain to withdraw. Occurrences such as these keep the eventuality of Scottish independence very much a possibility.

Even animals have natural borders or boundaries. Many wild American animals will be found in certain parts of the country but will seldom or never be seen in other areas. Writing about Mexico D.H. Lawrence told an interesting myth about boundaries. According to mythology, in the beginning the earth was periodically disrupted, and when this occurred each time the power to rule was given to a different group of animals. At one point the birds were the earth’s rulers; they were led by parrots, the most handsomely colored and intelligent of the birds. But then the earth was again disrupted, and the birds were replaced by larger animals and eventually mankind became dominant. What happened to the parrots? They moved from the ground to the branches of the high trees, and from there they looked down on the life below. The handsome and intelligent parrots did not disappear; they only took up their natural position.

The country with natural boundaries contains one group secure in its identity, and there are no other groups motivated by envy. Again, two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. In a country without natural boundaries, increasing numbers of other groups will mean envy, and an ever increasing envy. If these competing groups are less capable than the dominant group decline is certain (as a result of the numerical increase of a less talented group or groups). If among these emerging competing groups are more capable groups, the country will still face the conflict generated when the previously dominant group is dispossessed of some or all of its authority.

Before attempting to outline some choices for the future, a few references to the current status of the United States are useful. Published for the first time in 2014, *The Kennan Diaries* included this passage on America’s condition or position:

America is hardly a national conception anymore.... The overflow from the entire world has seeped into a great territory and has drowned out the heritage of my fathers. There it lies now, this human overflow ...waiting stupidly for the advent of catastrophe.

These are the words of George Kennan, a recognized author and often considered the architect of American foreign policy toward communism after World War II. What is surprising about this

particular quotation, other than Kennan's uncompromising opinion and blunt manner, is that this is an entry made in 1933. The eight decades since illustrate that conditions can change slowly, but we know from our experiences that they can also be changed in a very brief time. Traditions can change slowly, but we know from our experiences that they can also be changed in a very brief time. Laws can change slowly, but we know from our experiences they can also be changed in a very brief time.

One factor that can exact change in a very brief time and has surely transformed the national conception, to use Kennan's term, is the role of the federal court system, and especially the Supreme Court. As mentioned previously, it seems that the court system has the choice of being either the defender of the original meaning of our legal foundation as Justice Joseph Story advocated or the "mere thing of wax" which Thomas Jefferson warned against.

Anyone should be able to see that court decisions are not a part of the balanced powers intended for our republic. If a law is passed which the president opposes, a presidential veto can be invoked. If congress opposes the president's response in sufficient numbers, it can override the veto. If the Supreme Court vetoes a law by declaring it unconstitutional, there is no viable response by either of the other two branches. (Constitutional amendments for deeply controversial and important issues are currently nearly impossible, and few Constitutional amendments on any level of importance are passed. The last amendment, which concerned the rather minor subject of delaying congressional pay, dates back to 1992.)

Anyone should be able to see that the arbitrary and extreme court decisions that have marked the last several decades – Roe, Obergefell, and many others – have been the final destructive blow to traditional culture. To correct such arbitrary and extreme behavior will be the obvious concern of the traditional leader.

FIFTEEN +++++ A conservative restoration will restore the permanent things of which traditional culture consists

A system of federal courts that effectively creates laws instead of offering interpretations of them is only one aspect of the tyranny of the majority which destroys traditionalism, and the best response to this destruction is a sorting of the One and the Many by a conservative restoration. Perhaps you believe that you understand the term conservative restoration, but chances are that you don't. Conservative is such a solid forceful word that it deserves use in an aggressive sense. You will not now find an aggressive application of a conservative restoration in American politics. Such an approach was primarily German and can be partially defined by three brief comments:

[It is] a restoration of all those elementary laws and values without which man loses his ties with nature and God and without which he is incapable of building up a true order. In the place of equality there will be inherent standards, in the place of social consciousness a just integration into the

hierarchical society, in the place of mechanical election an organic elite, in the place of bureaucratic leveling the inner responsibility of genuine self-government, in the place of mass prosperity the rights of a proud people.

Conservatism seeks to build up a nation's values both by conserving traditional values as far as these possess the power of growth and by assimilating all new values which increase a nation's vitality.

Every actual democracy rests on the principle not only are equals equal, but unequals will not be treated equally. Democracy requires, therefore, first homogeneity and second ... eradication of heterogeneity.

These are statements of three twentieth century Germans. If you haven't heard American conservative leaders make similar comments, it is doubtlessly because our labeled conservatives are not trying to lead in the same direction.

It is difficult for Americans to appreciate or even understand what is being advocated in these three statements because we look much more to particular political figures or particular political groups, and all too often there is no depth or even truth to the individual politicians or their promoters. With the ever more distinct separation among Americans, much of which cannot be lessened, such abstractions as national character or right to existence will have a difficult time being understood by everyone.

Until there is a restoration of the laws and values that served us so well, and until the Few and the Many accept their responsibilities and recognize the One, what we have this very day will continue. That will be the only type of continuity we will have.

There was a revealing example of laws and values recently involving a political figure in England. This man, a leading candidate in London's mayoral election (although not the ultimate winner), urged shoplifters be given more severe punishment if they stole from small neighborhood shops than if they stole from large stores. Variations on this attitude are not confined to politicians or to England. To hear someone say that Wal-Mart will never be hurt by taking a few items without paying, or that Macy's will never be hurt by a few shoplifted items is not difficult to imagine.

If such attitudes toward laws and values are not changed and we do not change completely the acceptance of our responsibilities, then we will fit more than ever the description that Robinson Jeffers used for the United States: a perishing republic. After speaking of the decay of the republic, he continued with a warning and a poetic piece of advice for his children: "I would have them keep their distance from the thickening center." One advantage we have is that the thickening center is easier to recognize than when Jeffers wrote that line, at least for those who are not part of it.

+

Those who are not part of the thickening center value freedom, but perhaps in a special sense. The law books of a law library are one way of expressing this kind of freedom, because what is listed in those books often defines freedom by listing the restrictions placed on it.

Freedom in an important way is the struggle against restrictions. An infant cries when its legs or arms are restricted and freedom of movement is lost. This is only one natural and simple demonstration of what freedom can mean, but freedom must go beyond such a natural impulse. For the infant's own good restrictions might be necessary and our behavior, for our own good or for the good of those around us, will be restrained by the laws that we sanction.

A comment by Edmund Burke offers a significant explanation of the relationship between freedom (he used the word liberty) and restriction:

The extreme of liberty (which is its abstract perfection, but its real fault) obtains nowhere, nor ought to obtain anywhere, because extremes, as we all know, in every point which relates to our duties or our satisfactions in life, are destructive both to virtue and enjoyment. Liberty, too, must be limited to be possessed. The degree of restraint is impossible in any case to settle precisely. But it ought to be a constant aim of every wise public counsel to find out ... how little, not how much, of this restraint the community can subsist, for liberty is a good to be improved not an evil to be lessened.

True conservatives of various kinds who ignore much of what passes as conservatism in these modern times see the modern world as a place where the restriction of caution has been abandoned. They are certain that there has been destruction brought about by the modern rush to extreme liberty.

A complement to Burke's thought on the subject is from John Stuart Mill, someone whose outlook generally contrasted with Burke's. Mill's comment is on slavery, an inequality that nearly all societies had at some point and one that is still present although usually overlooked. Slavery is considered a severe and intolerable form of restriction:

A slave, properly so called, is a being who has not learned to help himself. He is no doubt one step above a savage. He has not the first lesson of political science to acquire. He has learned to obey. But what he obeys is only a direct command. It is a characteristic of a born slave to be incapable of conforming their behavior to the rule of law.

Another contribution concerning freedom and restriction from another British source is from a poem by D.H. Lawrence:

The human will is free, ultimately, to choose one of two things; either to

stay connected with the tree of life, and submit the human will to the flush of ... the tree; or else to sever the connection, to become self-centered, self-willed.

Here we have voices from three centuries. These voices say that freedom must be limited because each one of us is limited.

+

Freedom is a struggle against restraints, but freedom also requires restraints. As was stated previously there have always been two types of freedom: freedom to do what is right and freedom to do what is wrong. Thomas Carlyle put it this way in “Shooting Niagara,” his last great reactionary pamphlet:

That a good man be ‘free’ as we call it, be permitted to unfold himself in works of goodness and nobleness is surely a blessing to him, immense and indispensable; – to him and all those about him. But that a bad man be ‘free’ – permitted to unfold himself in *his* particular way, is contrariwise the fatallest curse you could inflict on him; curse and nothing else to him and all his neighbors.

Just as understanding the role of restraint in freedom is important, it is also important to understand when conservatism is most needed. While always needed as a balance, conservatism is most needed when societies that have a great deal worth conserving are most in danger of losing what their ancestors had worked so hard to accumulate. These inheritances must be found and then conserved. When there is the least restraint of freedom is when inheritances are most endangered. Surely, nearly all Americans can see around us in this world the absences of restraint that strain against our inheritances.

An everyday example of these inheritances, at least indirectly, is the family farm. The family owned farm, now something almost forgotten, was once an inheritance given, or a tradition conserved, from one generation to the next. Such a continuity allowed men and women to easily identify with their kin and the land of their kin.

With this reference to land, the somewhat more relevant idea of place can be raised. Place in one way means a piece of land, at least in an older or colloquial sense; it suggests acreage probably for farming, a house as a center point, and a history that has formed an association with a specific family name. Tocqueville writing of place dealt with a largely different meaning: a person’s line of work, class, or religion. Place in Tocqueville’s time period was significant in both of these senses because the physical place was a small, highly reciprocal community.

Place – except for a remnant, as usual – has very unfortunately been lost. A portion of that

loss, for example, is that now only about one in every hundred Americans works the land; a figure much lower than only a few generations ago. Despite the sharp decrease in small scale farming, it is still possible to imagine the family farm regaining some part of its past influence. Identifying with the soil has to be an effort at conservatism; if conservatism increases that form of identity might increase also.

For the present, however, few Americans earn their living from the land, and only a few Americans identify with anything on a smaller communal scale. Instead identification centers on some form of popular culture and often even in this form culture's least important aspects. The figures from popular culture are rewarded in obscene (using either of the definitions: disgusting, or offensive to morality) amounts where these celebrities can be paid as much for a few days as skilled vital workers earn in their entire careers.

The most permanent base of conservatism is fundamentally away from popular culture (as it stands now) and is found most often in the family. The comments of the playwright Stark Young expressed this thought in a particularly moving way:

As for the notion in general of kin and family, in some men the source of so much proud and tender emotion, it goes back to one of the oldest racial instincts and is rooted in the most human poetry of the imagination. A man's thoughts of his mother, loving him before he was born, thinking of her own mother ... of his father's hopes for him, and what his father as a young man felt And if, then, he loves his father and mother, how can he not love those who brought them into the world and loved them, and those yet farther back, this line of hopes and struggles and love.

The love of family and of the land and the many abstractions involved with that love are customarily called patriotism, although that is not quite the most accurate word. Another word nationalism is the love for the larger family and the land which that family claims as their own. There is currently no American nation, and therefore the word patriotism is substituted. In the strictest definition, patriotism from the Latin origin means more a matter of identifying through a specific country. An American patriot would believe in the country's exceptional nature, the superiority of democracy, and the pre-eminence of the economic system of the United States. A nationalist in the United States, or any other country, would be more concerned with the identity of both the individual and the group. Patriotism, and especially nationalism, are consistently questioned and condemned by liberalism.

There will, of course, always be degrees of patriotism, but it must be a pervasive emotion in order to be what it should be. If a country is divided between those who defend it with complete and permanent loyalty and those who do not, the patriot will be denigrated as an extremist by those who question such permanence. We see this almost constantly in our time.

Making a list of what seems to add permanence among us is not especially difficult. Central parts of the American experience such as freedom and patriotism, attachment to our land on different levels, and attachment to our families are examples of permanent things. Traits such as earnestness, fidelity, honor, and steadfastness are examples of permanent things.

What would be recognized as the most permanent thing? It is not as simple as the favorable traits just mentioned. There may be many things in a scientific sense that are extremely permanent. It would take an especially talented scientist to evaluate all that, but in the common opinion human nature is something extremely permanent. "In Adam's fall, we sinned all," American children read in their seventeenth century textbooks. There have been many recent efforts to push the subject of sin as part of human nature away from our thoughts. To do so seems a daily obligation for certain promoters. They may have been successful in pushing sin to some corner where it is difficult to see, but in that corner it remains.

Human nature is the beginning half of the permanent things, and the second, very necessary, half is the moral order to control human nature. And although the permanent things will always be kept at least by some remnant, when the moral order is strong so is permanence. There is widespread admission that in our time the moral order is weak and the permanent things are mocked.

This mockery and parts of human nature have done much damage, but the permanent life, of course, continues. Actually for us to continue our efforts for this type of life is a debt owed to our parents, and the generations before them; and it is a debt owed to our children, and the generations after them.

In many cases our struggle against the mockery of permanency is a spiritual debt. That debt is paid by covering and feeding the roots that are necessary for life. Historically the men and women who did the most to keep these roots are now considered heroes and saints, but few of us will ever claim those titles.

Another thing to recognize is that in deep spiritual matters inequality will never be eliminated. On an enormously less important level, inequality will never be eliminated in the affairs of this world. The liberal would dispute the possibility of permanent inequality because the ideology, or really the religion, of liberalism is directed almost solely against the many demonstrations of inequality. Liberalism could be called the church of the disparate impact because so much of its concern and commitment is focused on why some group is poorer, or suffers more from crime, or some other of the many parts of social justice as they perceive social justice.

Beyond demanding equality, liberalism also demands the choices of individuals be made only by individuals. What choice is made – as long as it is politically correct – matters very little to liberalism but only that it be made without restraint. The liberal only sometimes turns to the restraint by the government and never to the restraint by the church. Liberalism and the church will occasionally accommodate each other, but this should be difficult when many of the traditional

concepts of right and wrong are erased in the liberal mind. Furthermore, the cultures of liberalism never try to conserve what is obviously good among us but rather are much more concerned with imposing changes to achieve their utopian world.

The permanent things are the opposite of the utopian: they are what lead to the natural end of mankind, which is a community only striving for virtue and well-being. According to T.S. Eliot, who is given credit for originating the term, the permanent things are those characteristics in our humanity that give us our nature and separate us from all the other creations of God. They are the close relatives of traditionalism properly defined: what is taken from the past to sustain the present and build the future.

What influences the elements of permanence, which include natural fulfillment, virtue, and well-being? There are many cultural influences, certainly, and the family at its best is the strongest cause. The family at its worst, on the other hand, can easily destroy any attachment to the permanent things.

+

The disruption of the permanent things is the work of the modern. The word work suggests what is continuing, an everyday, ongoing occurrence, and the word modern perhaps avoids some amount of controversy because there is the common thought that anything modern is merely the opposite of anything permanent. The modern now glories in the elimination of permanent things and refuses to recognize any choice other than the one made individually. Feminism, as a very clear example of the modern, illustrates how the modern generally has no room for accommodation:

A just future would be one without gender. In its social structures and practices, one's sex would have no more relevance than one's eye color or the length of one's toes.

Because of modern attitudes toward gender as demonstrated in the above representative quotation, the established family is consistently rejected. The undermining of the father's authority is the most important part of this, but there are other parts to the program as well. There are basic roles in the customary family, and their abolition, of course, has been the program's foremost goal. These roles although they have changed for the time being have not been permanently eliminated. If we require a rooted, stable family and society, these family roles cannot be weakened or become simply a choice made only by the individual.

Along with its interference with the family structure, the modern extends into nearly every aspect of our existence, and democratic politics is partially the result. Editorial cartoons used to portray conservatives as club-carrying cave men dressed in animal skins but that is no longer

necessary. One modern side believes that the invisible hand of economics will bring about our natural end, and the other modern side believes the helpful hand of government will bring about our natural end. There is virtually no refuge for anyone who refuses these beliefs or seeks other beliefs.

In attempting refusal of the modern, the permanent things can rely on properly understood tradition. G.K. Chesterton spoke of the importance of ancestry:

Tradition means giving votes to the most obscure of all classes, our ancestors. It is the democracy of the dead All democrats object to men being disqualified by accident of birth [born into the classes or races which are victims of discrimination]; tradition objects to them being disqualified by the accident of their death.

When conservatism adheres to the time-tested principles of tradition it can be relied upon. Our lives should be subject to change, but only organic change. Returning again to Edmund Burke, a very good way to understand organic is by Burke's illustration of a tree shedding its leaves in autumn. No one need dictate the shedding; no one can prevent the shedding. It is a change approved by nature because it is necessary. Only when conservatism is stretched to its first principles like this can it be considered reliable; when it is not so stretched it mimics the family's destruction of permanency.

As a summary statement, it can be said that the vitality of the permanent things is that they pass on the traditional knowledge of what constitutes transcendence. To find a better description of the permanent things would be difficult.

If the permanent things are the inherited customs, mores, and principles that sustain a humane approach and keep the civil essentials for later generations, what would be the result of their loss? Their continued diminution would be a form of decadence, a falling into the inferior, an acceptance of baseness. The ultimate result of such disruption in the United States eventually would be genocide. The severing of a towering mature tree's roots will not end its life overnight, but when those roots no longer bring sustenance to the tree, when they no longer provide what is vital, then death will be the result. When the roots and the support are removed, the grounding is removed. It is worth noting that grounding in another sense means what facts are used to determine the truth, just as a person seeking to determine an identity must place that seeking on solid ground.

The term genocide applied to such a loss in permanency is not an exaggeration. We have a narrow image of genocide as a part of warfare. Even after the massive destruction of life caused by World War II, there have been extreme cases of genocide numerous times that follow this warfare image. (To give an idea of the scope of these cases, one fourth of the country's eight million people died in the communist takeover of Cambodia; more currently the Syrian civil war has cost about 500,000 lives in the first several years with no resolution in sight). These cases are one form of genocide, but the man who coined the expression expanded on its definition:

Generally speaking genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accompanied by mass killing of all members of a nationality The objectives of such a plan [genocide] would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of personal security, liberty, health,[and] dignity.

It is worth noting that this comparatively brief citation includes the words nation, national, or nationality; the word country or any words related to it are not used.

Our ongoing genocide is real, and the overriding fact is that it is self-imposed: an act of suicide. It has not been the strength of our adversaries (although they have been many, both open and hidden) that has brought us to this point but our own weaknesses.

A nation does not normally pull itself down, at least in the way the United States has been pulled down over the last few generations. A nation may be pulled down by an enemy, and such an enemy can be external or internal. A nation may be crushed despite its resistance. A nation does not normally pull itself down.

What are those weaknesses that have pulled down what looks from a distance to be such a powerful country? A disrespect for the concept of the rule of law, sometimes even by those in pursuit of “social justice,” comes to mind first of all. Roger Scruton finds social justice as something “that has little or nothing to do with right ... or retribution, and which is effectively detached from the actions and responsibilities of individuals.” Social justice often is not what is actually established but rather a progression of demands toward equality of results.

The weaknesses related to pursuing social justice are consistently a progression of demands toward nihilism since the individual and, more likely, the group demanding justice may always refuse to recognize even progress toward fairness. The circumstances recently have drifted so far downward that Thomas Sowell, a long-time observer of democracy, gave this warning:

You cannot take any people ... and exempt them from requirements of civilization without ruinous consequences to them and society at large.

The dates to be assigned to a genocidal period are difficult to fix, and the date when a genocide can be considered complete is even more difficult (assuming it is not a physical genocide simply killing off a particular group). The disappearance of the Soviet Union was not precisely genocidal, but the term “death of the USSR” suggests that the change was in some way at least as extreme as a genocide. The point to be made is that in 1970 a Russian dissident author predicted that by 1984 (perhaps to tie into Orwell’s novel on dictatorial government) the Soviet Union would collapse. According to the writer, the union which included so many diverse peoples was to collapse due to an external military threat and also internal social and group conflicts. Virtually no one took this prediction seriously, but it proved to be exceptionally accurate.

+

Similar to this prediction of Russian decline, American conservatives have been concerned with what they perceive as America's decline even before the disruptions of the 1960s, and one of the first and most prominent of these was James Burnham, a political commentator who became a conservative after an affiliation with communism. After several terms of Roosevelt's New Deal, Burnham wrote *The Managerial Revolution* arguing that through the manipulations of this period actual law had been weakened and the idea of limited government had been lost. To say the least, he was not the type who wrote about American exceptionalism and looked forward to democracy being spread to every corner of the world. About 20 years later Burnham wrote another, perhaps even more permanent, book *Suicide of the West*, subtitled "An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism."

Burnham accused liberalism of being the means of "Western contraction and withdraw" (where the adjective Western refers to Europe and America). He spoke of liberalism's commitment to equality, guilt, and universalism – exactly what liberalism stands for even now. He wrote of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual factors for contraction this way:

Under these circumstances we shall not be straining the metaphor [the will to survive] too much by speaking of the West's contraction as 'suicide' – or 'potential suicide' or 'suicidal tendency.'

This suicidal tendency has progressed to the level of bringing extreme changes that were completely unimaginable only a few decades ago. The decisive point is that Americans of today simply do not possess the same moral character as their parents or earlier generations did. The one nation, under God, and indivisible of the past has become the irreligious and probably permanently divided country of the present. I realize that these last two statements would be disputed by some, but I firmly believe that this deterioration has taken place and can be rationally observed.

The central issue is, of course, religious faith, and we can return to Tocqueville for why he thought Americans valued their religious faith in a worldly sense. It is very similar to other quotes, but it is one of the more important insights from *Democracy in America*:

I do not know whether all Americans have a sincere faith in their religion – for who can search the human heart? – but I am certain that they hold it to be indispensable for the maintenance of republican institutions. This opinion ... belongs to the whole nation and every rank of society.

Christopher Dawson in his *Enquiries into Religion and Culture*, one of his earlier works, added his personal and more general observation to what Tocqueville wrote:

The central conviction which has dominated my mind ever since I began

to write is the conviction that the society or culture that has lost its spiritual roots is a dying culture, however prosperous it may appear externally. Consequently, the problem of social survival is not only a political or an economic problem; it is above all things religious, since it is in religion that the ultimate spiritual roots both of society and the individual are to be found.

The physical is what is left when the spiritual is taken away, and the physical alone is not enough to provide sustenance.

+

In addition to his writings, Christopher Dawson's life can contribute to an understanding of permanent things including family and tradition. Actually the same can be said for many of the sources I have used: Carlyle, Eliot, Lawrence, Yeats, and perhaps others. Like a good many children maturing in England (at least during that time), Dawson felt the immense age of his surroundings and that there was a great "continuity of the present with the remote past" in his environment. He grew up in the same house his mother had grown up in and was exposed to many of the same relatives and other people his mother had known from her childhood. After leaving this environment, he received his education at Oxford, Britain's oldest university and a source – at that time – of deep traditionalism. Then as a historian he studied and wrote about the lessons of the past for roughly 40 years.

I earlier grouped Dawson with Eliot and Yeats, and the three men are accurately called traditionalists. They agreed on the family and tradition; naturally they varied somewhat on some other matters. Dawson and Eliot were more in agreement on religion. Eliot and Yeats seemed more in agreement on violence for instance. It would have been fascinating to have had the three of them together to discuss the problems of the world.

The world's problems have not changed all that much over time, and particularly since their time. When considering the larger pictures involved, there are only variations. One particularly divisive variation involving the subject of authority which has been an ongoing issue for several years is usually labeled police violence. A university professor, perhaps unintentionally, touched the core of this problem by making the commonsense remark that "police follow orders and laws." If the police are performing their proper function following orders and laws is exactly what they should be doing. If the police are told to arrest individuals for comparatively minor matters, and since we through our system of government and courts have judged these behaviors illegal then such arrests should be made even if they require violence and even if they involve protests afterwards. The point cannot be repeated too often that justice is what is established, and unless the established law is properly changed it must remain and be considered a just law. Police should be disciplined or prosecuted when they abuse the trust placed in them or their authority, but they do without question possess legitimate authority. Legitimate authority should never be overlooked, forgotten, or given less than full support. The full support given Dallas by nearly all

segments of Americans after the 2016 shooting of 12 police officers is a recent example of this.

When legitimate authority does not exist for whatever reason and the usual forms of security do not exist, violence as an act of legitimate individual defense often occurs. On the other hand, the everyday violence to which we are exposed is more an extreme violation of legitimate authority.

Americans live with so much of this violation that we build up an immunity to dealing with it. Only in exceptional cases, such as when the act of violence is recorded by a camera, do we show more interest. We have accepted these brutalities to the extent that we have a poor sense of the real scope of violent crime. Assaults and robberies account for over 90 percent of reported violent crime, rapes seven percent, and homicides one percent. If the average statistics for the entire United States were adjusted for a group of 100,000 there would be one violent crime each day. This is misleading, however, because the rates vary widely; the state with the highest murder rate, for example, was nine times that of lowest in the most recent year. Crime in urban areas greatly exceeds crime in rural areas. Urban crime is so rampant that a number of American cities have to be considered when for some reason the most violent city is singled out: Baltimore, Camden in New Jersey, Chicago, Detroit, or New Orleans; all have been thought of recently as fitting that description. And the most frightening aspect of this is that surges in such violence cannot be predicted or controlled; although Baltimore had many homicides in 2014, it equaled that total in 2015 by the month of August and averaged nearly one murder per day for the year; this is an example of just one surge and also an example of the inability of the legal authorities to contain it.

Americans live with so much violent crime that we often are not even told of cases of extreme cruelty. Here is a summary of a recent example that is so commonplace it was nothing more than an item for local reporting for a few days in the St. Louis area:

A six-year-old child was recovering from heart surgery and was taken for an outing to a nearby park by his family. Someone driving by stopped to talk with the boy's father and traffic backed up. The conversation ended, but the delay angered someone forced to wait. When the boy's family left the park, a vehicle followed theirs and the driver began firing into the family's vehicle. The six-year-old was killed and two others were wounded.

In this example of senseless violence, the child's parents also had a handgun and attempted to defend their family; violence can be an act of defense. There have been comparatively rare but troubling breakdowns in government provided protection on a large scale over the past few decades. The tenth year after hurricane Katrina brought renewed interest in that disaster including remembrances of the lawlessness and savagery: a leading government official at the time said his workers were serving under "conditions of urban warfare." Earlier comparable incidents included the 1992 Los Angeles riots which resulted in considerable bloodshed and destruction as well as 11,000 arrests, and in 1967 when there were more than 150 riots including many in major cities throughout America. Any of these circumstances required individuals to protect themselves as best

they could.

On even a larger scale, violence has also changed and formed governments so consistently that it would be difficult to identify the countries which have not experienced such formation. Many communist governments were formed by enormous loss of life including countries which still identify with communism such as China, Cuba, and Vietnam. The Iranian revolt of 1979 was considered especially important, and violence has determined the form of many other Moslem countries. Haiti became independent by violence only a few years after the United States was formed and has had many changes through violence since then. Violence has been so pervasive in some areas that the governing authority has collapsed; the country of Somalia is said to have had no functioning government since its civil war of 1991. As a result of this particular instance of anarchy there are over 100,000 persons of Somali ethnicity in both Canada and Britain and nearly that many in the United States.

Great Britain and the United States have also been formed by violence. British bloodshed is, in this sense, in the past: a dynastic war sporadically fought from 1455 to 1487 and a ruler killed in 1645 are examples. Violence has formed political freedom in the United States; the 1781 Battle of Yorktown was a part of independence being gained, and the 1862 Battle of Yorktown was a part of independence being lost.

Even today even democracies should not be too indifferent to the threat of violence. A study found that between 2000 and 2015 there were about 25 countries that abandoned democracy, many because of violence. What was described as free, fair, and multi-party competition was either degraded or completely displaced.

A continuing controversy that Americans associate with both violence and the rights often granted under a democracy is the right to own firearms. Especially in rural areas, there has been a constant belief that under certain conditions, despite longstanding and permanent guarantees, that particular types of weapons would be taken from their owners. These concerns are kept alive by incidents such as Barack Obama praising Australia's restrictive program which resulted in the Australian government gathering in more than 600,000 weapons and his attempt to impose by presidential ruling additional firearms restrictions in his final year in office.

+

A belief such as the coming seizure of legally owned weapons continues because a large portion of the American people understands that no matter which group controls Congress or who works from the Oval Office the behavior or character of the central government changes hardly at all. Problems are virtually never solved; there is seldom even an attempt to solve them. Only the judicial branch (surely the least democratic branch) can bring change quickly, if it chooses. (Change and problem solving are obviously not the same.)

Although it has attracted attention and responses, one problem that has not been solved (to the extent that a solution is possible) is poverty. Since the New Deal there has been a continual effort to lessen the differences between the poor and wealthier Americans, but it is difficult to

imagine that poor people are really the concern of those in charge of the country. Mitt Romney was regarded as exceptionally wealthy when he ran for the presidency, but when his possessions were totaled up not only was he generally considered less wealthy than previous presidents such as Franklin Roosevelt or John Kennedy but also less wealthy than such candidates as Al Gore and John Kerry. To list just one more name Hillary Clinton was paid 14 million dollars for writing one book about her service in the Obama administration, and she received as much as \$300,000 for each of her speeches to groups and schools before she declared herself a presidential candidate; it is very difficult to imagine her understanding poverty or her concern for its effects.

Leadership for a people can co-exist with personal wealth, but in a democratic form of government that virtually never happens. Using terms from William Butler Yeats for those who govern and are governed, the One, the Few, and the Many, wealth is best left in the hands of the Few. For the One, the leader, to disavow materialistic concerns goes back to the ancient Greeks, at least in the form of the Platonic guardians. The Few can, if they understand their obligations, use their material resources to build what is good. This is altruism, or more simply kindness. The Few have generally been kind to those around them, as have the Many. Nearly all American households annually make some contribution to charity, often through their religion; in a typical year Americans give to various forms of charity an amount roughly equal to the nominal GDP of a small prosperous country such as Denmark.

Even with the generosity of the Few and to a lesser extent the Many the gap of poverty remains entrenched in the United States. According to government figures, homeless Americans totaled about 600,000 on any given date – in other words, a number of people equaling one of the country's larger cities. About one of three Americans currently receives some form of welfare benefits, and about one of six has difficulty in providing sufficient food. Besides their normal locations, food banks have now even been placed in several thousand public school buildings. Meals are routinely provided without charge for children by public schools even beyond the school schedule: over weekends and during the summer months for instance. Some cities such as Baltimore now provide free meals to all public school students without any restrictions. In contrast to this, the annual list of the 400 wealthiest Americans compiled for the current year excluded more than 100 billionaires because their wealth was below the starting figure for the 400.

It is not that the enormously wealthy do not deserve their wealth if it was honestly gained, but the failure to understand need and wealth is the absence of an organic solution. There may be other explanations, but they seem to be seldom made.

How is the word organic used in this sense dealing with economics? An excellent definition is provided by a paper issued by Ashbourne College of London. Society is a living, but fragile, thing where the whole is more than just the individual parts:

[S]ociety has an 'organic' character, in the sense that it exhibits features that are normally associated with living organisms.... In this view, societies are complex networks of relationships that ultimately exist to maintain the whole, the whole being more important than its parts. In that sense, society differs from a machine, which is just a collection of parts.

+

If a society can accurately be gauged as organic and that characteristic is diminished and eventually lost, the result will be, sooner or later, a loss of authority and the society's decadence. This has been one concern of many of the individuals (authorities) cited here, those from the past and a few from our own troubled times.

Revolt or even reform can undermine legitimate authority, and one function of authority is to oppose this by sustaining the organic aspects of governing and being governed. Authority could stand many explainers of its functions (because they are currently so misunderstood), but a very worthwhile one is Thomas Carlyle.

In the previous section dealing with the extended family and society, mention was made of Thomas Carlyle's father James, and in the study *Carlyle and the Search for Authority* we read of the sense of authority – as well as the religious spirit – provided by James Carlyle:

He also participates in and affirms the hierarchical order through which the transcendental authority of religion is transmitted into the polity. Within the family, James Carlyle is the head, a natural aristocrat and communal patriarch who pays his men 'handsomely and with overplus,' and he in turn defers to the Scottish gentry because they are the 'true rulers of the people.' These hierarchical gradations of authority ordain and sustain a stable and just order.

Thomas Carlyle, like many of us, regarded his father as a source of authority in a personal sense, but Carlyle also examined authority primarily in the workings of the greatest leaders: heroes. In Carlyle's terms the hero was someone capable of at least significantly contributing to creating a new social order. The most obvious figures capable of such creation were those who were worshipped – in a very full sense, not in any way a diluted sense – and those who governed – in a very full sense, not in any way a diluted sense. The first was obviously "a kind of God," but Carlyle used the same phrase to describe the second as well.

The heroes of Carlyle were those with inner force, and outer force, and a combination of the two. The men of inner force were "men of letters" such as Dante and Shakespeare; the men of outer force were the subjects of writing such as Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon. But there is a mix, an interaction, among all heroes; their categories are dependent on each other, although not equally dependent.

The people, the Many (for Yeats), obey the divinity because they believe, but ultimately they only obey the monarch because of compulsion through "the weight of force." A monarch is not only a sole ruler (as the derivation of the word implies) but very often an absolute ruler.

If we are to obey the monarch as the hero, we must first identify who is the hero. (Someone

who rules, democratically or absolutely, may be heroic or may be quite the opposite.) Is there some set of clear standards for this? No, Carlyle has to admit that it is a “fearful business” of having your “Able-man to *seek* and not knowing what manner to proceed about it.”

The truth – and it settles very much on inequality – is that identifying the hero, just as identifying what is organic, is a subjective choice. The term prejudice should be considered for this choosing. Only some are interested in finding the heroic or the organic, and only some are capable of finding the heroic or the organic.

+

Something which is diminished in our time although really an important part of personal identity is the sense of place that is called home. Thomas Carlyle was born in a stone house built by his stone mason father, and it is apparent that he associated the solid nature of his house with the solid nature of the man. Although he lived his last 50 years on the outskirts of London, there are two strangely named Scottish towns important to Carlyle as homes: Ecclefechan, his birthplace, and Craigenputtock where he lived on his wife’s inherited property.

America’s versions of Ecclefechan and Craigenputtock were of much greater importance only a few generations ago. Small towns covered the enormous American landscape, and there were few means to travel the great distances into cities or to other sections of the country. The ability to travel, to be joined together, and be directed by distant influences has increased recently in nearly unbelievable ways, and this has created what are often considered benefits, such as increased personal freedom for example.

There is little mention made of the costs of modern changes away from small towns and toward connecting large distances. One significant cost is the lessening of a meaningful type of diversity: in the United States, where for instance it is 2,600 miles directly from Boston to Los Angeles, there were always significant and beneficial sectional differences. A few generations ago there were noticeable differences between the states of the old Confederacy and the rest of the country, even parts that were not great distances away. The culture of California, the Golden State, was considered very different than the other areas of the country. In our time nearly all that diversity has been lost. Like the reduced unity of the family, the benefits drawn from a small town environment have been largely diminished. Things as seemingly secondary as hotels, restaurants, retailers, and services that are chains and are similar or even identical throughout the country have lessened true diversity. Many factors have diminished sectional differences to the point where many Americans prefer their complete elimination.

Another change that in itself is normally completely tied to diversity is the demographic shift of the United States in the last half century or so. When there is such an immediate transformation, even if there are benefits, serious problems will also result. The special difficulty in this instance is that at least until the 2016 presidential election campaign there has been a very complete censoring of the discussion of these problems.

Obviously an obstacle for the immigrants (the nearly sole reason for the demographic shift) of this recent period is to identify with the United States, the large, new, and often very different place in which they live. Under the proper circumstances the concept of place has a strong unifying ability, but when occasionally we are told that “we are all Americans” that means we are one part of roughly 320 million parts, a fraction so small as to be completely meaningless. In the small town America of the past, identification with each other was simply not a problem.

On any scale the identity achieved through a sense of place and a sense of heritage only evolves. Roger Scruton wrote about this evolution in the responsibility which we must feel toward our parents:

This sense of obligation is [founded] in respect, honor, or (as the Romans called it) piety. To neglect my parents in old age is not an act of injustice but an act of impiety. And we see that the behavior of children toward their parents cannot be understood unless we admit this ability to recognize a bond that is ‘transcendent.’

Scruton continued that the home’s transcendence can be transferred to the extended family and the nation, and when this bond’s transcendence is recognized then the necessary authority is accepted.

+

Place and heritage are fulfilled through patriotism or a commitment to the nation for the purpose of protecting us and our families on various levels – perhaps most of all for our children as they become the next generation. This is at least a part of Scruton’s transcendence. The primary obligation of each generation is to secure the future of their children.

In the case of the United States the future’s security lies in a return to the past. We have forgotten much of the past; some conservatives have called ours “a present tense culture,” and others have used the term “age of amnesia” to describe our inability to appreciate our heritage. In any event, we must re-learn many lessons. This is along the lines of a surprising comment by C.S. Lewis concerning the return to true Christianity:

I sometimes wonder whether we shall not have to re-convert men to real Paganism as a preliminary to converting them to Christianity.

Americans because they value the past and have the resources often restore various older worn items to their original condition. Antiques, art works, books, and buildings are only a few of the things that are restored. The restoration of the flag associated with the national anthem took seven years and many millions of dollars. The restorations of buildings at Deerfield, Massachusetts or Williamsburg, Virginia represent very large efforts at restoring the past. In restoring buildings sometimes the costs will be multiplied in order to regain their original characteristics, but if there

were permanent values included in the originals they deserve the special efforts to regain those values. Sometimes an intermediate step, as was mentioned by Lewis, is necessary before a full restoration is possible.

Hopefully, it is not too great a stretch to tie the restoration of a building that has been poorly kept to the restoration of a republic that has been poorly kept. The original buildings of Deerfield or Williamsburg were not just something thrown together; instead, especially for the more important pieces, they were intended to have permanent value; but in these two examples their value before restoration had been diminished by indifference. To maintain anything as it ages requires certain things to be done. As America has become larger, less homogenous, more democratic, and worldlier, the maintenance has not been done. The words of D.H. Lawrence are a good fit here:

Men fight for liberty and win it with hard knocks. Their children, brought up easy, let it slip away again, poor fools, and the grand-children are once more slaves.

America's fight for liberty was not only a conflict with the English in the 1700s; such a fight continued until the children inherited what their fathers had worked so hard for; and now it is almost time to speak of the grand-children.

As mentioned earlier a conservative restoration is one response to our grand-children's fate. Such a restoration promises among other things an assimilation of useful values, the predominance of restricted freedom, the return of balanced and republican government, and an assurance of the permanent things including an attachment to hierarchy.

Another closely related response is a return to the religious roots on which the nation was founded. Such a restoration would be a demonstration of conservatism in its best sense in that it would be conserving what is of greatest importance.

+

Roger Scruton wrote in one of his more recent explications of conservatism:

Conservatism is not in the business of correcting human nature or shaping it according to some conception of the ideal rational chooser. It attempts to understand how societies work, and to make the space required for them to work successfully. Its starting point is the deep psychology of the human person.

In other words, conservatism understands the concepts of original sin and inequality and provides the limits for the person to respond. Conservatism does not go beyond that. If the human has one part each of body, mind, and soul, conservatism's greatest concern should be for the personal

response to the soul, and even then only to the limit of creating space for this response.

No matter what form conservatism takes, we must realize that a drawing of the best from the past will be a distinctly difficult affair. One difficulty is leadership.

There were many leaders in the past because the times required many leaders and the people realized that; none of those leaders of the past, however, would begin to recognize the country that they created and sustained as it is now. Looking at the same matter in reverse, hardly any of today's Americans grasp the nature of our founders, and hardly any care. Americans, by and large, in our time think of the political leaders who gained our freedom as a nation and brought life to a republic as simply earlier versions of the politicians who now preside over our perishing republic. There seems to be a small segment for whom history is almost an obsession and a much larger segment who has no commitment to it at all.

There is no grasp of the basic change in nature from the first presidencies to the current ochlocratic efforts. The important Virginia delegation to the Philadelphia Convention jointly proposed a detailed plan for the new nation that among other things suggested that the presidency include some measure of group decision. In the early months of the republic the four members of the Cabinet actually voted concerning presidential policy. The modern presidency, including that of Barack Obama, and the central government in general have little resemblance to any of the first 30 presidents (with a few possible exceptions on certain issues); until the Great Depression the United States had a much less democratic form than what has been there since. The thirtieth president governed under the slogan "a return to normalcy," and normalcy consisted largely of less control by the central government, lower taxes, and overall stability.

The United States developed for considerably over a century without three aspects of administration that now seem without controversy and are even considered necessary: the direct election of senators, the use of a federal income tax, and the Federal Reserve Board's control of monetary policy. Oddly these all center on the year 1913. While one house of Congress had always been sent to Washington through direct elections, the other (whose members serve three times as long) had until the Seventeenth Amendment been chosen by the individual state legislatures. The federal income tax was used briefly during the War Between the States; a later attempt in the 1890s was overruled; it was then implemented permanently by the Sixteenth Amendment. The Federal Reserve Board was put in place by law with the enormous powers of supervising banking and regulating the money supply. Through this supervision and regulation, banking and overall financial consistency was to be guaranteed. Less than 20 years after this came the country's most destructive economic crash which was ended only by the industrialization necessary for America's entry into World War II. It is aspects such as these that have moved America away from its original republican, conservative nature by greatly increasing the dominance of government.

Joseph Sobran in an exceptional essay titled "How Tyranny Came to America" termed the country's devolved, current government "Post-Constitutional." The Constitution lists 18 specific legislative powers of Congress, but nearly all large familiar federal programs are not included among the 18 and therefore are unconstitutional. Like any other properly prepared legal document, its provisions cannot be changed by any method other than through the accepted amending process.

The court system has not accepted this and has instead encouraged the growth of the federal government through its activism. The courts have also repeatedly ruled against the states and thereby undermined their rights. The Ninth Amendment concerning rights “retained by the people” or the Tenth Amendment which mentions what is delegated to the states and again to the people should be at the core of the law but instead are practically censored. Sobran closed his essay by citing the need for a return to Constitutional rule in the same way as when Tocqueville specified that “the attributes of the federal government were carefully defined, and all that was not included among them was declared to remain to the governments of the individual states.”

+

Concerning American government, conservatism is limited government. Politically the one word conservatism is defined by the two words limited and government. There is really no need to go any further, but to list a few comments may clarify even such a simple statement. One reason conservatives support the enforcement of laws common to limited government is because being a nation of laws is considered as following in the English tradition, and this means that conservatism supports some restrictions primarily because they are currently part of our system of laws. Drug use restrictions would be an example of this. If the government did not intrude in many ways on the rights of individuals, families, religious groups, and so on, conservatives might choose to restrict drug abuse outside of laws, or at least laws originating in Washington. Such “what if” statements are, however, difficult to justify because many things have to occur for statements of that type to be useful.

Restrictions on certain drugs are instances of fairly and beneficially limiting freedom whether done by the government or in some other fashion. The prohibition of certain drugs has evolved to a situation similar to the alcohol prohibition of the past: drug restriction still generally retains the support of the laws but is widely violated with those providing what is illegal using violence to gain financially. (This illegality is subject to partial or even complete change rapidly imposed by the democratic and modern approach to such important matters.) In the prohibition era there was widespread violation of the laws concerning alcohol, but there was also considerable reduction in the use of alcohol when it was illegal and perhaps afterwards. This shows that to some extent the law supplemented individual restraint, and if this reduced use was beneficial generally then prohibition must be credited with contributing to this benefit. Government working for the public safety can be a legitimate extension of the will of the people. Especially in a homogeneous setting, there is no need in many instances for governmental policies to be at odds with the will of the majority when properly considered.

Political conservatives in this country have traditionally believed in states’ rights as a form of limited government. In the middle years of the twentieth century states’ rights were associated with laws requiring racial segregation, and as that practice fell out of use so did the concept of laws varying by state or region (and the role of the local homogeneity was diminished). That the large field of education, for instance, had always been primarily the concern of local and state

governments and not the central government in Washington mattered not at all. Particularly, the courts began dictating from a federal level to the states in virtually every area of administration. In summary, those courts – separated from the local and state level – took the behavior and standards of the most liberal states and forced all the country’s other areas to copy that behavior and adhere to those standards. These methods brought extreme changes such as ending segregation by law – although not ultimately segregation by fact. The new roles of the judiciary, like the changes of 1913, were regressions from republicanism and conservatism.

Strong judicial involvement is often incorrectly thought of as the protection for our various rights. One of our leading law professors says students entering his class on civil liberties are fully convinced judicial activism is necessary to preserve or expand civil liberties. This professor responds that none of the founders, even those who accepted judicial review, believed it was central or even significant in limiting governmental power.

Besides judicial review, which has been vastly changed from what was considered its original position, there are according to longstanding interpretation three obvious structural constraints:

Central government powers are delegated and enumerated and therefore limited.
(These are the 18 legislative powers cited by Sobran.)
There is a division of powers between the central authority and the various states.
There is the separation of powers between the three branches of government.

Since all states have an office of governor, a legislature, and a court system particularly the third of these constraints applies at the state level as well. These constraints are sometimes referred to as the “Madisonian system” because they have attempted to protect the minority from majority abuse since the forming of the republic.

In closing this subject, there is no statement from Madison that better shows his opinion of the republican form of government to which he contributed so much than his lines about angels:

What is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.

If one person achieved the sinless nature attributed to angels, and if we were all equal then none of us would be sinful and none of us would need to be governed. But we are not angels. There are original sin and inequality and the discord they breed.

+

The need for returning to a government in the form of a republic, perhaps called conser-

vative or perhaps called Christian, is shown by many issues but probably most clearly by the issue of abortion. Drawing from the very clear English common law, America at its founding uniformly took a strict approach of banning abortion from the time a child would normally move within its mother's body: the time at which a child possessed life according to eighteenth century knowledge. James Wilson, an original member of the Supreme Court, is the founder most often quoted on this matter. In his "Of Natural Rights of Individuals," Wilson wrote clearly about the protection the unborn child deserved:

[H]uman life, from its commencement to its close, is protected by the common law. In the contemplation of the law, life begins when the infant is first able to stir in the womb. By law, life is protected not only from immediate destruction, but from every degree of actual violence.

Maine became the first state to move beyond the requirement for stirring in the womb when it decided to protect all unborn children. A level of strictness was kept until the 1930s when abortion became entangled with the women's rights movement; hundreds of thousands of abortions were performed annually by that time. 1967 was a crucial year for accepting what was then termed "justifiable" abortions because the now familiar exceptions of physical and mental health of the mother, fetal abnormality, and rape or incest were more commonly used and accepted legally. However even directly before the Supreme Court's imposition of abortion, 30 diverse states considered abortion illegal: northeastern states such as Connecticut, Maine, and Vermont; the entire midwestern belt as well as some southern, western, and southwestern states. After abortion was imposed, there were several unsuccessful attempts to legally overturn the decision.

The last dozen or so Gallup Polls have shown opinion evenly divided between support for and opposition to abortion. The percentages supporting abortion under all circumstances or opposing it under all circumstances are less equally divided, but there are considerable numbers on both sides. The political divide is particularly clear with Democrats supporting and Republicans opposing at rates nearing 70 percent.

If there is one criticism of democracy that I would emphasize it is that vital issues and discussions of a deeply moral nature should never be decided by a simple majority opinion. There is morality and immorality, and immorality should never be given the strength of being imposed by temporary preferences.

+

Some more prominent people have discussed various ways of protecting judgments which dissent from imposed majority opinions. One of these was George Kennan in *Around the Cragged Hill* where he tied protections to smaller levels of government:

[E]xcessive size in a country results unavoidably in a diminished sensitivity

of its laws and regulations to the particular needs ... of individual localities and communities. The tendency in great countries is to take recourse to sweeping solutions, applying across the board to all elements of the population.

Kennan suggested a division of the country into what he termed constituent republics; large states such as Texas and Alaska by themselves, other natural divisions such as a republic of the New England states, and also separate governments for America's three largest cities. According to Kennan nothing is more greatly feared in governmental theory than any effort to create systems that are efficient, logical, uncomplicated, and vast in scope. While George Kennan had great influence in diplomacy, he conceded that his suggestion for division (since it could involve secession) was unlikely to be implemented.

Suggestions for gaining freedom by smaller levels of government have a historic pattern. How did Thomas Jefferson, for example, imagine the final division of the United States? He envisioned a country broken into what he called cantons (small areas with small populations). These cantons would have had significant political responsibilities and would have been part of one of the three countries Jefferson envisioned as covering what is now the United States: one country extending inward from the Atlantic coast, another extending inward from the Pacific coast, and a third formed on both sides of the Mississippi River. Considering the limitations to communication and transportation for the first century or so of our history as a republic, more compact countries were a natural preference.

The individual states were earlier in our history the responses to this preference for smallness in land size but even more so in population. Following the War Between the States the populations of states such as Delaware, Maine, and West Virginia ranged from about 100,000 to about 600,000. Therefore the two senators even in the largest of the three (Maine) would have represented a much smaller constituency than is usual in our time. These three states have a common thread historically other than their demographics: each was a product of secession; for instance the western counties of Virginia withdrew from that state and in 1863 were admitted as the thirty-fifth state of the Union.

Even though voluntary secession formed Delaware, Maine, and West Virginia as well as others, barring an exceptional set of circumstances, changing the form of the United States to create something smaller and more responsive is difficult to imagine. Even procedural changes involving comparatively lesser matters have proven difficult to initiate and implement.

Any proposal such as Kennan's for smaller constituent republics within the current borders of the United States would offer some benefits. A limited government with current or redrawn borders could offer benefits, but first it must be put in place and then maintained. American history has shown us that to be put in place is by far the easier of the two. The Articles of Confederation were put in place and lasted only seven years; they possessed nearly no central authority. Some prominent Americans, such as Patrick Henry, were reluctant to surrender the form of local rule the Articles provided. Our central government began with a much simpler form than what has evolved since the growth of the 1930s. The first cabinet, for instance, had secretaries of state, treasury, and

war as well as an attorney-general; the current cabinet has 15 cabinet members plus eight cabinet level officers. (This is only one easily understood example of Washington's expansion. Another more important one is the central government's spending as a percentage of GDP; immediately before the decade of the 1930s spending was about four percent; recently it has been approaching 25 percent.) Limited government carried over well up to Andrew Jackson, the seventh president and beyond, but by Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth, the term limited government had lost much of its application. Following the great economic development after the War Between the States, which of course excluded the South, the central government's role increased, and increased again with the previously mentioned changes of 1913. By the time of the New Deal, President Roosevelt could boast that "in 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper." He went on to say that in other hands such power would "provide shackles for the liberties of the people." This statement was quoted in *The American Story* by perhaps the foremost critic of the Roosevelt presidency, author and journalist Garet Garrett. Garrett found fault with the extreme expansion of government economic policy and the foreign involvements leading up to World War II. In a chapter appropriately titled "The Red Snake," he pointed out that the president's most committed supporters had quickly found their role:

In his second campaign (1936) the Democratic Party began to split. The defection of its conservative elements, however, was more than made good by the running together of all radicals in his support. No president had ever catered to this radical vote before.

The trend that at this point had been set was as Garrett and countless others later observed "the blessings of the welfare state were more important than liberty." This was applicable to the class receiving those benefits and the class administering them. Extremism gained even more strength in the 1960s and 1970s pushing America even further away from permanence.

This entire period (from Roosevelt's many years in office to the present day) saw limited government no longer maintained, overwhelmed by various changes but partially simply by the numbers involved. Between 1950 (in the term of President Truman, the successor to Franklin Roosevelt) and 2010, the country's population more than doubled; and continuing that pattern in the 15 years from 2015 to 2030 the numbers are predicted to increase from 319 million to 361 million. That amounts to adding the current populations of Florida, Georgia, and the two Carolinas to the country in less than two decades. This future will be due to the children of recent immigrants and the additional flow of immigrants.

The nation formed by the voluntary union of 13 sovereign states was limited and conservative in that it kept in place so much of what had proven good in the long period of British rule. A number of years after "the world was turned upside down" by the final military defeat of the British, Alexander Hamilton, an advocate of movement toward a strong central government, found few differences in how the country was administered:

There have been no changes in the laws, no one's interests have been interfered with, everyone remains in his place, and all that is altered is the seat of government has changed.

This lack of change was the result of a mixed system, a system of checks and balances, and – as advocated by Madison, John Adams, and many other founders – avoidance of a complete democracy. In this system the president represented authority and roughly the One; the upper house of Congress represented the Few; the lower house of Congress represented, in its way, the Many. The judiciary was to act as a balance wheel in some measure.

It is precisely to such a system of conservatism we should return with whatever measures could be devised to strictly and permanently maintain balance among the branches and limit the scope of government. Also if this were the character of the central authority, then surely the state and local governments would also thrive as they did in the past.

Such a restoration of balance would be the initial step toward many true reforms that would then occur outside of government involvement. Our culture and our community should have more of our concern and support than any government, especially the corrupt, distant, inefficient, and enormous rule of Washington.

Fulfilling its crucial part of culture and community would then be the family. As Yeats was quoted earlier “the struggle to found and preserve the family” is the source of goodness among us. It is often said that government's first obligation – or even its only obligation – is to protect the individual from harm; when that statement is applied to the family it become increasingly true.

One reason that current families are weak is because the cultural pattern of marriage is weak. The marriage rate is the lowest since almost a hundred years ago. Births to unmarried white women were about seven percent of the total of white births in 1970 and 29 percent 40 years later. A 2008 European study found nearly nine of ten males thought using Internet pornography was acceptable, and a comparable and more recent figure is that three of four American men between the ages of 18 and 30 watch pornography at least once a month. Possibly these statistics identify the most serious problems of marriage, but most importantly we should also attempt to understand the causes of these problems. A very crucial family related problem was described by Christopher Dawson in a 1933 essay, and it is a problem that has only grown enormously since:

As in the decline of the ancient world, the family is steadily losing its form and its social significance, and the state absorbs more and more of the life of its members. The functions which were formerly fulfilled by the head of the family are now being taken over by the state, which educates the children and takes responsibility for their maintenance and health. The father no longer holds a vital position in the family.

+

The family must teach several needed behaviors. If sacrifice, for instance, is not learned within the family it is unlikely to be learned at all. The very same can be said for virtue.

Virtue is nearly as unknown in our time as some of the obscure words such as nihilism, ochlocracy, or Pelagian which were used earlier. For someone very old, the meaning of virtue might be primarily associated with female innocence. It is strange that actually the origin of the word is related to manliness or being virile. Is one form of virtue for women to be feminine without abusing that characteristic, and the same for men, being masculine without abusing masculinity?

The difficulty in now displaying one aspect of virtue was noted by the conservative writer Bruce Frohnen:

Our society's latent virtue is often difficult to detect because it is obscured and weakened by a rampant egalitarianism that confuses equality of material conditions with freedom and justice, that sees the proper goal of politics and life itself as the pursuit not of happiness in a good life, but material well-being in a *comfortable* life.

Does liberalism, the driver for egalitarianism, concern itself with virtue? If liberalism does it is very low on a very long list. The liberal consistently finds responsibility for wrongdoing outside the person committing the wrong; the conservative consistently finds responsibility for wrongdoing as a choice made by the person committing the wrong. When a people lack inner authority, direction, identity, and security, the role of liberal government increases and at some point – often rather quickly – freedom is lost; where a virtuous people have comparatively few troubles, the role of government remains small. According to Frohnen conservatism is proud to associate with virtue:

Virtue is, in fact, the very basis of conservative political philosophy. The conservative, far from defending whatever happens to be old, recognizes that societies are good only if and to the extent that they promote right conduct.

James Madison understood that to believe politicians could bring fulfillment to a people without virtue was an unrealistic (chimerical) belief:

Is there no virtue among us? If there be not, we are in a wretched situation. No theoretical checks – no form of government can render us secure. To suppose any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without any virtue in the people is a chimerical idea.

Roughly 200 years later Cardinal Robert Sarah, addressing a gathering of American Catholics in 2016, commented on the somewhat new version of what opposes virtue:

All manner of immorality is not only accepted and tolerated today in advanced societies, but even promoted as a social good. The result is hostility to Christians, and increasingly religious persecution.

Cardinal Sarah went on to describe the United States as being built originally on a “set of moral claims about God.”

When the subject of virtue is woven into the discussion, it should be apparent that there is a clear bond between religious belief and behavior and a governmental restoration whether it be labeled conservative, religious, or traditional. Surely in our time, even some self-labeled conservatives would prefer nearly anyone in the White House, or in Congress, or part of the courts than a devout Christian willing to demonstrate even the most benevolent parts of that faith. In response to such an opinion, it is worth repeating the comment of John Adams that “only a moral and religious people” could be governed under the republican system that he had helped create and that the system was wholly inadequate for any other type of participants.

Christopher Dawson (in “The Christian View of History”), while surrounded by the isms and turmoil preceding the even greater turmoil of World War II, supplied a realistic summary of the advantage of Christian thought:

It is true that the church has no immediate solution to offer in competition with those of secular ideologies. On the other hand, the Christian solution is the only one which gives full weight to the unknown and unpredictable element in history; whereas the secular ideologies, which attempt to eliminate this element and which almost invariably take an optimistic view of the immediate future, are inevitably disconcerted and disillusioned by the emergence of this unknown factor at the point at which they thought that it had been finally balanced.

When Dawson wrote those lines communism, among other forms of dictatorships, was supposedly working its miracles. American intellectuals could visit the Soviet Union of the time and announce that they had “seen the future and it works.” Now the remaining adherents of that future are isolated in a few impoverished corners of the world, waiting for someone to lift them from their many mistakes. Historians studied what motivated communism, and now they study what led it to slaughter so many innocent thousands to maintain itself. The great Russian leader Solzhenitsyn said that after he had studied for nearly 50 years communist Russia’s disasters, and although he had written so much about what was involved, he could do no better than to repeat what he had been told as a child by many older Russians: “Men have forgotten God, that’s why all this happened.”

American intellectuals have nearly all moved on from communism; but one characteristic of it has been left behind: a culture of atheism. A portion of the most intelligent men and women of our time can be considered some part of this disposition.

The Catholic writer George Weigel clarified what opposes atheism:

Rather, history is driven, over the long haul, by culture – by what men and women honor, cherish, and worship; by what societies deem to be true and good and noble ... by what individuals and societies are willing to stake their lives on.

As part of a religious response, John Dalberg Acton's comment concerning liberty is a good starting point. Acton was a nineteenth century European historian and writer. He considered government the adversary of religion: the two were always struggling, with government always willing to diminish the rules and restraints that it did not originate:

It [government] recognizes liberty only in the individual because it is only in the individual that liberty can be separated from authority Under its sway, therefore, man may profess his own religion more or less freely, but his religion is not free to administer its own laws. In other words, religious profession is free, but where ecclesiastical authority is restricted religious liberty is virtually denied.

Acton believed that liberty is a question of morals rather than politics and that “the common vice of democracy is disregard for morality.” The abuse of power is always accompanied by corruption of morality; that issue certainly carries into our time. Acton was an admirer of Edmund Burke and agreed with Burke that religion is the basis of civil society.

Perhaps phrases such as “out of many one,” “a new order of the ages,” or “one nation under God” seem insufficient to make a deep argument or to influence how society is governed, but each of these phrases carries an important message. The last phrase would have had the overwhelming support of Acton and Burke as well as many Americans of our time.

There are in our divided time even disputes about how completely the early American republic was “under God.” Those who doubt our Christian heritage concede that some founders were openly Christian but insist others, such as Jefferson, were not.

Those who question our Christian tradition cannot avoid recognizing the religious nature of Plymouth and other New England colonies in part because of the overall Pilgrim background, but Virginia, for instance, was allegedly founded for economic gain and was without a strong religious aspect. From its very beginnings, in fact, Virginia had a Christian orientation that sounds impossible to modern ears. To impose authority on the new settlement, Deputy-Governor Thomas Dale issued the “Virginia Articles, Laws, and Orders,” or more commonly Dale's Code. Its opening line stated that since the British monarch had in Britain a principal care of true religion and reverence to God therefore his servants, such as Dale, must also work for the glory of God. The first clause of the code required that “almighty God be duly and daily served” by all Virginians praying and gathering for worship. The second and third clauses concerned sacrilege and blasphemy. The sixth clause required attending worship twice daily – with harsh penalties for those

who failed to do so. Other parts of the code were Biblical in nature and included severe punishments.

Thomas Jefferson is currently presented as opposing Christianity and supporting certain restrictions on religion, however his leading biographer Dumas Malone wrote that Jefferson held strong beliefs but generally kept them privately. As a means of measure, Malone compared his subject's convictions to the more open faith of John Adams:

[H]is views on religion were almost as harmonious with those of [John] Adams as his political views with Madison. Eventually, for the benefit of his friend [Adams] he stated at considerable length his reasons for believing in God [T]he God that he and Adams adored was the 'Creator and benevolent governor of the world.' To his mind it was impossible to view the Universe without perceiving in it a designing and guiding hand. He did not need revelation: to him the evidence was irresistible.

As a political figure, Jefferson had been the object of slander on other issues and that may have influenced his lack of openness on his spiritual beliefs. Malone added several points in an attempt to show his subject's agreement with Christianity:

Jefferson spoke of reuniting with his wife and daughter in the hereafter.
He sought to guide his life by the ethical teachings of Jesus.
He drew plans for a nearby Episcopal church that was consecrated only a few weeks before his death.

The most remembered slander on Jefferson's name was the Sally Hemings affair, but whether it was an affair in the sexual sense is to the objective observer unresolved. Hemings was a light-skinned enslaved woman, to use the now preferred term, at Monticello who had at least six children. To conform to the modern positions on such subjects, it was consistently said these children (or perhaps only some of them) were fathered by Thomas Jefferson. Since this was not admitted at the time and subsequently denied by those closest to Jefferson, the truth remained unknown and eventually when DNA testing became available it was decided to use that method to reach a conclusion. Since Jefferson had no male heir to provide DNA it was taken from other Jefferson relatives and compared to descendants from the Hemings group. The testing found that the first born son of Sally Hemings was not fathered by Thomas Jefferson, but that her last son was fathered by "some Jefferson." This could have been Thomas Jefferson, but it also could have been his brother Randolph or any of Randolph's five sons.

The larger issue of the affair is how well it fits with democracy generally. The initial accusation made in 1802 was made for political purposes by a particularly controversial journalist.

At that time there was no accusation that could have been more harmful to Jefferson's public career, and since it was impossible to refute it was repeated even up to our time, particularly in novels. In democratic fashion if something is repeated often enough and accepted by enough people it becomes the truth even though the actual truth cannot be known.

In regard to Virginia's overall background, the eminent historian Daniel Boorstin regarded early Virginia not removed from religion but instead as a standard for the contribution of religion in a governing republic. He felt that the "fabric of Virginia society was held together by ancient durable threads of religion." The moderation of the Virginian church, Boorstin believed, was a historical gift from the compromise of the English Establishment. The church's moderation carried over to the legislature according to Boorstin.

Dale's Code, Virginia's moderate overall character, and Jefferson's acceptance of at least much of Christianity serve as proofs of our overall religious past. We must know of this past, but we must also understand what has weakened so completely our attachment to the various permanent things.

SIXTEEN ++++ Traditional culture will overcome the various forms of ugliness

Although it wasn't always that way, the world we live in seems to be concerned with the gains of the world and nothing else. Parents, of course, should provide completely for their children. Hard work, of course, should be rewarded appropriately. Even necessities such as clothing and housing are better for us if they are special in some way. All these things and many others are worldly, but they are also good. However it seems Americans, wealthy, or poor, or in between, are seldom satisfied with what they have or really grateful for what they have. There is nothing more discouraging (uglier would be an alternative word) to some portion of us than to witness the gluttonous confusion of black Friday sales and Christmas shopping which erases nearly all the true meaning of the day. This November and December shopping has increased from somewhat over 400 billion dollars 15 years ago to an even more astounding 650 billion dollars in 2016.

The world we live in seems to be a world of economics where there is our method, the American economy, which controls loosely or closely, and something somewhat different, the socialist economy, which controls closely or completely. This has been the case for roughly a century, and for decades economics provided the commonly cited basis for the two sides of world conflict.

The economics system of distributism was discussed earlier, but at most it could be an influence on one of the two larger systems. How that aspect of our lives will develop is difficult to say, but the goal should certainly be a humane economy – a phrase favored by true conservatives.

+

Several very prominent economic systems have faded over the past several generations. On a different scale the modern world around us does not at all value much of what had been valued even in the recent past. Hard physical work, for instance, is no longer thought of favorably. American companies have undermined even the opportunity for blue-collar work by exporting jobs in order to lower labor costs and maximize profits.

If the standards of work for Americans were different in the past, morality was also judged differently: both had more fixed measurements. In the past measuring the moral success or failure of anyone was by a stricter assessment. If a man made mistakes, saw those mistakes, and decided “to turn his life around” then he was credited for his reform; that is if he really reformed. The same was true for women. For generations of Americans a reputation for honesty and other Christian traits was their most important possession. When a person disgraced himself or herself, if their reputation was ruined, their lives became very troubled. Considering this in another way if a man, for instance, married and remained married, had a family and provided for them, and treated those around him with respect his reputation was secure. He was considered a “pillar of the community,” and what a strange sounding phrase that is to modern ears.

Obviously the entire issue of family was central to establishing an individual’s reputation. The behavioral pattern of the children, the treatment of the parents, and the relationship of various generations were all important for those directly involved, but also for the community to use as standards. Some families were admired and others weren’t; there was no grading on the curve.

Older people particularly recognize the extreme changes that have occurred in marriage and the family structure, but it is hard to use statistics to explain such changes, or declines actually. For example, the largest consideration now is not divorce because according to government studies nearly half the couples begin their lives together without bothering with marriage. Divorce is less of an issue because the formality of marriage is less of an issue.

A 2015 *Washington Post* article described what seemed to be the long-term trend in child-bearing and marriage:

Although marriage in the United States remains strong among the college educated, in the poor and working classes marriage rates have fallen precipitously and divorce rates are high. Single parenthood is becoming the norm, as are serial relationships and fragile complex families of step-siblings and half-siblings. Half of the births to young women are now outside marriage.

The article primarily concerned a liberal supporter of marriage, and it included her description of the political divide on the subject. Conservatives or traditionalists blame the decline of marriage on culture and say that culture must be restored in order to restore marriage. Liberals say that the economy is to blame and that rather than try to restore marriage, it is better to accept family diversity and provide better education, jobs, wages, and support for single parents in order to

alleviate poverty for such families. This paraphrasing of this liberal woman's opinion very directly follows the outlook of the two sides: traditionalists want to return to a morality based culture to diminish problems, and liberals have no interest in that but rather want to accept the behavior of what they regard as diverse families and respond by increasing government programs. These have been the attitudes of the two sides for decades with no likelihood of any compromise being made.

Like the abandonment of marriage, the dominance of pornography among us is another extreme and from a Christian standpoint harmful change. Earlier the figure was cited of a 90 percent approval by a polling sample of men for using Internet pornography, which is surely a statistic that suggests its dominance. Studies have increasingly shown that no gender or age group remains unaffected by pornography's influence. Its revenue world-wide is huge; it compares to the world's leading technology companies.

In 1928 D.H. Lawrence, an author I repeatedly quote on subjects such as democracy, human differences, inequality, and the political meaning of organic, wrote his most famous novel which eventually took the title *Lady Chatterley's Lover*; the book was banned in Lawrence's Great Britain and also in a series of other countries. Because of what was judged the vulgar language and the obscene subject matter the novel was not allowed to be sold in the United States until 1959. At that point a federal judge, establishing as law a recently proposed standard, found that the work had "redeeming social or literary value" and there was no reason to exclude it. Lawrence wanted the story published and sold or he would not have written it, but at the same time he considered sexuality as something serious and even spiritual in nature. Even though he still gave importance to the belief that male and female were "made in God's image," his novel became the first step down into the mire where we now wallow. T.S. Eliot's severe assessment blamed Lawrence's upbringing for his controversial attitudes:

Like most people who do not know what orthodoxy is, he hated it
The point is that Lawrence started life wholly free from any restriction of tradition or institution, that he had no guidance except the Inner Light, the most untrustworthy and deceitful guide that ever offered itself to wondering humanity.

Acceptance of what was previously considered obscene was certainly to the Christian, and often to common opinion, a step down, but to the ideological liberal it was only the recognition of another right. As the federal judge said, Lawrence's novel had a "redeeming" worth; redeeming means to have the ability to counterbalance some defect or fault, so based on this definition the judge ruled that society was not just obligated to tolerate such writing but past censorship had been a social mistake. Later court decisions also applied the formula of "redeeming" value, but eventually the importance of being "redeeming" became unnecessary and was practically discarded. To control pornographic material became difficult, and since it wasn't controlled or prohibited it became for the liberal something to be accepted and protected.

Roger Scruton has written on many subjects related to pornography such as beauty (pornography's opposite) and sexuality and refers to pornographic material as poison:

The astonishing thing, indeed, is that the American opinion formers have to be *persuaded* of the damage pornography is inflicting. They have to be confronted with the overwhelming body of research, well known to the psychological community and in any case no more than common sense, which shows that porn is addictive, destructive of sexual confidence, undermining of sexual relations, and promoting of an abusive and objectified view of women.

As for beauty, the creation of sexual objects completely removed from anything personal destroys all concerns for anything of higher quality.

By accepting pornography in any measure we are tolerating something that while it has always existed has also always been in opposition to our customs and instincts. An obvious first step up from the mire is to move toward life by strengthening our commitment to marriage, to the family, and to everything that gives real meaning to life.

+

Pornography despite its ugliness has been accepted by and large, and a large portion of us must tolerate another form of ugliness: our environment. In the United States examples of this are the worn out industrial areas of the Rust Belt, but also, in the judgment of many Americans, the modern architecture that predominates throughout our country and many others as well. Roger Scruton described the movement toward this destructive form of modernity:

One by one the modernists took over the schools of architecture and extinguished in each of them the light of traditional knowledge. Students of architecture were no longer to learn about the property of natural materials, about the grammar of moldings and ornaments, about the discipline of orders, or the nature of light and shade.

There is a school of architects responsible for what Scruton described and what is called the international style stretching from the Depression years to the present, but the European architect Corbusier is an appropriate representative of this approach. Corbusier (the professional name he assumed) began his career of modern building about 1920 and worked until his death in 1965. Concrete was his primary material; his structures were often set off the ground on concrete pillars; the interior floor space was generally open; gardens sometimes covered his buildings' flat roofs. He described his buildings as "machines for living."

Although only a few of Corbusier's larger designs were completed (an example was the city of Chandigarh in northern India), several of his individual buildings were considered very influential, including his last project: a church at Firminy, France. An approving article from a German publication offered this description of the building:

A kind of pointed tower with rounded edges. A cube with a cylinder jut, chimney-like, from the slanted roof of the building resembles the cooling tower of a nuclear reactor or the raised platform of a submarine.

But why not a church that looks like a church? Isn't that what nearly everyone would want? Here in contrast, is an English writer's brief description of a feature of one of England's still magnificent cathedrals:

Take the cloisters of Gloucester Cathedral where great beauty is created by the beautiful fan vaulting that was developed in the 1300s by the masons. These were completed no later than 1412, and their beauty still transcends and mystifies us. We stand fascinated before it. It provides a spiritual experience in itself.

Corbusier's works have survived, to a degree, 50 years, but they will not last 600; any approval of them will probably continue to diminish because things have already progressed to where there is no shock value to a drab concrete church that looks like the raised platform of a submarine. When the modern architects lose their shock value, everything has been lost because harmony and balance were obviously never there.

The result of all this is that the modern architects by their abilities or their preferences have helped immensely to destroy the communal identity and to weaken individual identity, especially as it matures. Since they have avoided beauty, they have avoided the discipline and restraint that beauty has always required.

+

Two individual behaviors which share something with modern architecture (itself a part of modern art) are the defacing of buildings with graffiti and the disfiguring of the body in various ways. (Obviously not everyone considers these things defacing or disfiguring.) Graffiti, street art, tattooing, and piercing share at least one characteristic: disorder. There is disorder involved because the subject, whether a structure or a body, has a certain given pattern or order and that order has been arbitrarily changed.

The issues of various types of body deforming and graffiti are issues of identity. Time was that an anchor tattoo was displayed to show a sailing background, but tattooing as a fashion was rare. Now it is not especially unusual for much of a person's body to be covered with tattooing. The inked images range from obscene, to racist, to pointless. Graffiti images fall into that same range. Both generally seem to be failed attempts at self-expression.

A typical comment favoring graffiti is one from a New York writer:

[T]he surfaces that were being defaced were very Northern European and

dank and dower And I began to look at the social meaning of this. It allowed groups to cohere, forming teams.

By forming teams the author may very well mean promoting this new against the old which had been valued so highly for so long. In our time it was only natural that galleries and museums would rather quickly consider anything beyond graffiti's simplest scrawls as a new art form. Also it was only natural that the promoted celebrities would want to own the somewhat more evolved form called street art – also called guerilla art.

Not all guerilla artists follow exactly the pattern of Jean-Michel Basquiat, but his life is not out of line with the pattern of that art form. With no formal art training and a high school dropout as well, Basquiat first displayed his painting on subway walls and subway cars. By the age of 20, he had gained the support of Warhol and other forms of recognition. He staged his first exhibition in an abandoned massage parlor, but eventually his works were shown in major American and European art museums. Basquiat did not have a long period of fame; he died at the age of 27 of a heroin overdose. His paintings were very primitive, often with bold colors, and often with words, numbers, and diagrams randomly added. He was also involved with music, and now his art works are collected by prominent musicians and others who can afford the overwhelmingly high prices they bring.

Supporters of graffiti for the body in the various forms of body modification say that they are expressing their individualism. Attempts at individuality may be a factor, but at the same time tattoos, piercing, and so on show a certain conformity. Beyond tattooing, extreme body modification can include something as aberrant as having horns implanted on the head to resemble some type of beast or having the tongue split to resemble a serpent.

The type of graffiti that now commonly marks public places dates back only to roughly the late 1960s or the early 1970s, and the fashion of marking or changing the body is even more recent. It almost goes without saying adolescents or other young people are more involved with both than any other group.

James Kalb offered this judgment about young people and their behavior in a period where standards have very deliberately been altered:

Under such circumstances children no longer have settled patterns of normal attitudes and behavior to grow into. Each must make up his own, taking his cues from peer pressure, pop culture, the strongest impulse, or the cleverest seducer. The body loses meaning, so young people become alienated from it, and express this alienation through tattoos, piercings, eating disorders, physical self-harm, and promiscuity.

There is tragically little or nothing to guide most of the young's efforts at understanding their identity. The struggle to preserve (in a general sense) the family has been nearly eliminated.

What is done to buildings or bodies may seem minor and also beyond our ability to change

(like many other concerns), but these behaviors also represent disruptions to our culture. But can't such things be parts of constructive changes to our culture? No, because their intention is not to add to but rather to take away. One of the twentieth century's most famous architects was said to be able to design a complex building in an hour. Does that suggest something permanent? Graffiti seldom expresses anything positive, and regardless of what it expresses it still by definition is vandalism. As Roger Scruton says, those who deface the property of others are declaring their membership in something but something unstructured and temporary. Tattoos also lack permanency in a certain way; they are often chosen without real thought and certainly without thought of whether they will be wanted as a permanent change to the person's body.

+

As a summary of sorts and before adding a few more thoughts, it may be useful to set down the wants or goals of traditionalism, or the goals of a restored or resurrected Christian republic. Those are basically the same because as far as our tradition goes the nation had been until the previously mentioned date of roughly 1930 governed by Christian authority indirectly applied in pursuit of restricted freedom. And to speak of a truly conservative restoration in our case as well as others is not vastly different than a restoration based on a religious direction. In 1951 while England was still far from recovered from the destruction and massive efforts of the war, Winston Churchill addressing his British Conservative Party gave an example of this restoration: listing the many things his group should stand for, the very first on his list was "to uphold the Christian religion and resist all attacks upon it," then other policies included defending the form of government, providing security against aggression, and on down to the usual economic concerns. As with nearly all politicians there is a necessity to question personal beliefs: Churchill was often considered an agnostic, but again to measure most public figures in regard to their faith is difficult.

Along with strengthening marriage and the family, there is the goal of continuing to the next generation our heritage. Quoting Roger Scruton one last time, there is the matter of passing on what is so vital in an organic sense:

The primitive societies studied by the great anthropologists were organic communities, bound in kinship and sustained through myths and rituals devoted to celebrating the idea of the tribe. In such communities, the dead and the unborn were present among the living Birth, marriage, and death were collective, not merely individual experiences.

Beyond what Scruton tied to the organic, these wants or goals would include:

A society which would be accurately described as law-governed
A society which would be accurately described as pro-life

A structure which would promote equal opportunity but not demand equal results
A structure which would recognize true religious freedom.

As mentioned before what is now called religious freedom still allows everyone a private or personal faith but doesn't allow any faith-based standards to influence public policy. In *T.S. Eliot's Social Criticism* we read of Eliot's opinion on the traditional roles of church and state:

The rational policy of the State was obedience to the natural law, but the Church was in addition subject to revelation. Thus the State's jurisdiction was over a different area from that of the Church, but its authority was God-derived. A superior responsibility was given to the Church, that of bringing individuals to the end of enjoying full knowledge of God. The State's task included support of this function of the Church.

In line with Eliot's judgment, the goal that would ultimately serve our religious remnant would be the formation of a strongly led governing structure assuming traditional governing functions: providing shelter to the believer, to the believing family, and to the believing community.

Such a restored shelter would be a worldly manifestation of complete beauty. It would be a spiritual manifestation of beauty in a worldly setting.

+

Restoration of our shelter might follow many paths, but here the chosen or examined paths are primarily the best characteristics of America's past and secondarily the convictions of T.S. Eliot expressed mostly in *The Idea of a Christian Society*. To know the meanings of just a few things such as these will be sufficient direction, at least for some.

The strengths of religion in America from the foundings of the various settlements until fairly recently were commented on by the leaders of the various periods and by the historians who were not reluctant to bind church and state. America's most important decisions – abolition, attitudes toward war, and true social justice for instance – were influenced by religion. Such influence is absolutely a far cry from the diminished impact Christianity can currently claim: a recent poll found that among Americans born after 1980 only 57 percent even identify as Christians.

Eliot is just one source to help form correctly our thoughts about Christian influence and responsibility. His writings are not blueprints, merely ideas. He did not endorse particular political figures, and even his endorsements of political approaches were cautious. As a general statement, it can be said that he favored a people guided by Christian principles and opposed liberalism and democratic excesses.

One thing Eliot warned about was Christians being reduced to only a tolerated minority (perhaps almost to the level of Christians in countries like Iraq and Syria until their conditions

enormously worsened). What Eliot warned of has been largely realized in various countries including his own. According to a prominent British legislative group's report from a few years ago, Christians in Britain "face problems living out their faith" due to a series of recently imposed changes. This report listed numerous instances of interference with religious freedoms including legal responses to Christians who posted scripture verses at their businesses or refused to rent to unmarried couples. Even more clearly a two-year study of religion in public life completed in 2015 was reported widely under the headline "Britain is no longer a Christian country" and urged that even the country's most traditional communal life be "systematically de-Christianized."

Eliot offered another warning of sorts regarding behavior and its rewards which applied not only to his country then but currently to perhaps every country holding a Christian heritage:

We must recognize that a Christian Britain demands sacrifice from all – sacrifice of mean, petty, and selfish desires; and what we stand to gain by it is ... a change and perfection of our present desire and will.

Along those same lines, he stressed throughout his writing that everyone was "somehow responsible for the kind of society in which we live."

Responsibility in a Christian society would be found in "a unified religious-social code of behavior." As Eliot put it in the closing lines of his essay:

We need to know how to see the world as the Christian Fathers saw it: and the purpose of reascending to these origins is that we should be able to return with greater spiritual knowledge to our own situation.

Thomas Stearns Eliot wanted an environment to serve both the immediate and the eventual Christian fulfillment. He phrased it in these terms:

[T]he Christian can be satisfied with nothing less than a Christian organization of society – which is not the same thing as a society consisting of devout Christians. It would be a society in which the natural end of man – virtue and well-being in the community – is acknowledged for all, and the supernatural end – beatitude – for those who have eyes to see it.

Eliot added to his earlier discussion of a Christian society with a longer essay *Notes towards the Definition of Culture* in 1948, which again was not specific on its subject of culture but only promised statements contributing to a definition. His essay offered that culture is what "makes life worth living" and that culture is "*the whole way of life* of a people."

According to Eliot our individual culture is largely formed by the family and the faith that we find in our society, even though that faith is incomplete:

The primary channel of transmission of culture is the family; no man wholly escapes from the kind, or wholly surpasses the degree of culture which he acquired from his early childhood.

It is in Christianity that our arts have developed; it is in Christianity that the laws of Europe have – until recently – been rooted. It is against a background of Christianity that all thought has significance.

An individual European may not believe that the Christian Faith is true, and yet what he says, and makes, and does, will spring out of his heritage of Christian culture.

SEVENTEEN +++++ Turn from the worldly and search for the true leader

If the natural end of individuals expressed through their community is virtue (as Eliot said), what can lead us to that end? The leader to lead us is the obvious answer.

Finding a leader is an obvious need, but not something accomplished in an offhand manner. The leader can be found only by men and women who are themselves superior in some way. Without elaborating, this is not as restrictive as it may initially sound.

And, in fact, there would be a need not just for a leader but for many leaders. These would be the promoters of beauty, courage, knowledge, worship, and so on.

These leaders would fulfill their fate by overcoming what others could not. Why do some have a special destiny for overcoming? According to Eliot such matters simply cannot be understood:

But this is an election which cannot be explained, a burden and a responsibility rather than a reason for self-glorification. It merely happens to one man and not to others, to have the gifts necessary in some profound crisis, but he can take no credit to himself for the gifts and responsibilities assigned to him.

Perhaps because the role mentioned by Eliot is so difficult to deal with, those looking for a leader also have a difficult time. The religious figure, political figure, or leader in some other area who is embraced by one person is often completely and emphatically rejected by someone else. There have always been false prophets; the apostle Paul said that “men will rise up, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after themselves.” The false prophets of the political world,

the demagogues, have only to win the support of the democratic majority to gain power and advance their agenda, an agenda indifferent or harmful to those outside their circle. James Fenimore Cooper defined the demagogue as a “leader of the rabble” who advanced a personal interest by pretending a devotion to the people. How many politicians could be excluded using this definition?

In our perishing republic the false prophets and those who mislead and manipulate make finding a true leader even more difficult, but to counter this D.H. Lawrence offered sound advice concerning identity, leadership, and our obligation:

This is our job, then, our uncommon sense: to recognize the spark of nobleness inside us, and let it make us. To recognize the spark of *noblesse* in one another, and add our sparks together, to a flame. And to recognize the men who have stars, not mere sparks of nobility in their souls, and to choose these for leaders.

As was said in the section initially dealing with freedom, when an individual realizes his or her identity freedom is the result. What Lawrence called the spark of nobleness is some part of our identity. As we develop that identity, we develop our freedom and seek something more. For this world we seek the persons with stars in their souls to protect our freedom and even to blend it with others.

But first we must form our own identity. Personal identities then eventually form a national identity, and if we want a national identity to reflect our faith then we must conform our own identity to our faith. Another way of putting this is from C.S. Lewis:

It is since Christians have begun thinking less of the other world that they have become so ineffective in this one. Aim at heaven and you get the earth thrown in; aim at earth and you get neither.

The worldly diversions seem to keep us from aiming at heaven, and Lawrence observed that the early Christian Romans showed the way by not attending the theaters and other gatherings on which the pagan Romans put so much emphasis:

They [the Christian Romans] disliked physical luxury, all the pleasure of the body became hateful to them, for they had too much of such gratification. Their spirits wanted to be free.

A statement such as Lawrence’s reminds us that the wealthy we now see so strongly promoted would be well served to abandon many of their luxuries and save their concerns for other more lasting matters. All of us would be well served to abandon much of popular culture.

It is difficult to understand, but a common belief is that the current popular culture, which obviously often violates Christian standards, does not contribute to increased sin. Traditionalists believe that past and different cultures have lifted morals and that current popular culture lowers morals. Even such a mild statement is strongly rejected by many, or perhaps most, of those around us.

Lewis makes a further point concerning morality: it is made up of three parts but only one draws modern attention. Morality is “fair play and harmony between individuals.” Morality is “harmonizing the things inside each individual.” Morality is knowing “the general purpose of human life as a whole.” According to Lewis, moderns nearly always think of the first; modern society is moral when there is no conflict between individuals, groups, or even countries. It is natural to begin with this form of honesty, kindness, and such because those things have been uniformly considered favorably. When the second part, morality inside the individual is ignored those same supporters of the first part will find many ways to commit wrongs against others. Then lastly there is the matter of how the world is understood, life’s general purpose. The Christian faith asserts that everyone will live forever, and this is either true or false. Lewis makes the point that if a person lives 70 years, for example, the country in which he lives is more important, but despite our need to fulfill the earthly life that has been given to us, when the individual actually lives forever the circumstances of a country or worldly things which may be considered even larger are of much less importance.

+

The ancient and beautiful university environment in which C.S. Lewis spent much of his life was far from the continuing developments of the secular world of today (Lewis died in 1963), and we see what he could only anticipate. The secularists, who are now forming so much of what surrounds us, have always relied on their sense of the scientific and rational for arguments and for the morality that they follow.

An illustration of this modern “evidence based reasoning” supposedly adding to the world’s morality is the theme of a more recent book *The Moral Arc*, which is subtitled “How Science and Reason Lead Humanity toward Truth, Justice, and Freedom.” The author’s conclusion is that the existence of women’s rights, children’s rights, homosexual rights, and now even animal rights all point to the fact that we are living in what may be the most moral period in our history. For the traditionalist, the author’s inclusion of children’s rights without giving full consideration to the inhumanity of abortion largely destroys the worth of his opinions.

Even in this “evidence based reasoning,” however, there is at least one opinion with which the religious conservative should find agreement:

If your moral campaign depends exclusively on the power of the state
[governmental power] then when those powers change hands, those hands,

those in charge can just as easily change the law. To make morals stick, you have to change people's thinking.

From the normalcy of our thirtieth president to our time power has changed. America has become more democratic, more abusive toward other countries, and more indifferent or even hostile to the needs of the people who are most necessary for its very existence.

Despite all the "evidence based reasoning" in the world, as G.K. Chesterton said, it is not true that the idea of right and wrong changes. He said that the concentration on a certain sort of right or the relative toleration of a certain sort of wrong changes. For instance, mediaeval society tolerated ruthless punishments, and modern society tolerates the irresponsibility of finance and corporations:

But mediaeval men did not think mercy a bad thing. A modern man does not think dishonesty a good thing [V]irtue is virtue and vice is vice in all ages for all people, except for a few lunatics.

It is interesting to examine the contrast between the original quotation which includes the phrase "the moral arc" and what Chesterton said about the permanency of right and wrong. Theodore Parker, a nineteenth century Unitarian minister and abolitionist, is the source of the arc quote:

I do not pretend to understand the moral universe; the arc is a long one, my eye reaches but a little ways; I cannot calculate the curve and complete the figure by the experience of sight; I can divine it by conscience. And from what I see I am sure it bends toward justice.

Parker eventually abandoned any religious orthodoxy, and it is hard to find justice in his helping to supply weapons for the senseless violence known as "bleeding Kansas" or writing that a slave has "a natural right" to murder anyone who seeks to prevent the slave's freedom.

+

Earlier mention was made of the word true, as in true conservative or true authority, but at this point it seems worthwhile to note how difficult truth can be to agree on. That finding truth is often difficult can be seen in phrases such as "the hard truth of the matter" or "wrestling with the truth."

Something can be objectively true and still not result in agreement as to its truth. A simple personal example would be a husband and wife quarreling over who spent most of their income. A basic accounting for a period of time would objectively reveal the answer, but the disagreement could easily continue. What if the wife spent a large amount years before? What if some expensive

item was bought by the husband but was used by both of them? An outsider could objectively decide who spent the larger share, but that may not resolve the argument. Both the husband and the wife might feel truth was on their side.

There is an expression, probably patterned after the expression “poetic license,” describing the difference in what Americans believe and the honest and conventional facts: “poetic truth.” It is the result of being told over and over again the same liberal agenda by what have always been considered important and reliable sources. Take some of the most important issues for this country, study them in detail from solid and diverse authorities, and decide how much of public opinion will not be based on facts. Nearly all these issues will show liberal bias. To take Americans away from all the poetic truths that they have accepted will be difficult but also a good measurement of any true leader.

EIGHTEEN ++++ Turn from the worldly because the true leader will be a gift by the grace of God

If circumstances were different, change might be initiated through the acceptance of a written contract among a certain people determining the nature of a new order. An early American example of this would be the Mayflower Compact. Its beginning lines stating that the efforts of this group of settlers would be undertaken “for the glory of God and the Christian faith” demonstrate how far removed we are from our past. In the current process such a contract would at most be a rule generating a ruler or an order generating the person responsible for establishing order. We currently have parts for a new order, but they remain unassembled. So we must instead find the man or woman to move us toward the rule fitting our identity.

If therefore the first requirement for restoration of an American Christian republic is a leader, what characteristics should the leader possess? What characteristic should be foremost? Obviously the answer to that is a man or woman of faith. What would be the value of characteristics I have mentioned before such as honesty or balance; what would be the value of intelligence, courage, or ethics? Should the leader (as opposed to the many leaders required by a large advanced society) be male or female?

Before discussing any of those characteristics, another often considered social trait should be mentioned: physical appearance. The subject of attractiveness has always been relevant in a very general sense and has become even more so with continual cosmetic advances. This is true in many countries; for example Korean women are much more likely than even Americans to have cosmetic surgery; many, perhaps most, young Nigerian women use skin lightening creams; the Brazilians have a saying that “beauty opens doors” which reflects not only their deep attachment to physical appearance but the accepted judgment of perhaps all cultures. This commitment to attractiveness leads to what a prominent American psychologist termed the “halo effect.” The halo effect can be an exaggeration of any attribute such as diligence or enthusiasm, but since such traits require more time to evaluate a more likely halo effect is something more obvious. Put in a few

words, the halo effect is “what has beauty is good.” The physically attractive person is considered to have favorable characteristics without the judging that would normally be involved in forming those opinions.

An individual’s attractive appearance may be beneficial in many cases such as receiving more lenient sentences in trial proceedings, but one of the most certain is in democratic politics. One study found that subjects who were shown facial photographs of Senate candidates were able to predict the winner in nearly 70 percent of the elections. Another study, which was conducted in Europe, found children, some as young as five-years-old, could predict election winners without any basis other than brief exposure to a facial photograph. (These children apparently thought the faces of some candidates suggested someone more approachable or intelligent.)

In contrast to this preference for attractiveness or certain physical characteristics, dictators or leaders of movements, that is organizations moving toward a stated goal, have generally not been imposing physically. The European dictators who emerged before and after World War II were generally not handsome men; the same can be said for prominent Asian leaders; Gandhi, for instance, was an example with his smallness and poor facial features. The leader of a prominent group founded in the 1930s which sought to solve issues through “moral re-armament” is another example of an advancement achieved without an imposing appearance. The group’s success according to a recent study was not the result of personal charisma but rather the leader’s spirituality and ideas;

[Because] his faith was not expressed in particularly sophisticated or scholarly language was probably one reason why the ‘Christian intelligentsia’ sometimes found it hard to embrace him. Yet the relative simplicity ... concealed a lively mind that was very responsive to the world around him.

+

What is the importance of intelligence to the leader? A rather automatic response is that intelligence is of great importance, but there have been some instances where the lives of apparent geniuses (some of whom could be considered leaders) were very troubled and disappointing.

Stories such as the development of a child prodigy gifted in language, mathematics, music, or some other subject graduating from a highly ranked university at a young age but never accomplishing the imagined goals are not too unusual. A well-known case of the failed child prodigy was the chess champion of the 1970s who established his exceptional talent in his early teens, became the first American to win the world chess championship, and a short time later withdrew from competitive chess for nearly 20 years. He lived a life filled with controversy, disappointment, and comparative poverty.

In contrast to such occasional stories of failure, there is a roster of the greatest figures in world history coupled with high intelligence. In 1926 a study titled *Early Mental Traits of Three*

Hundred Geniuses assigned intelligence scores for a list of historic subjects from between 1450 and 1850. Among this group the German writer Goethe, the German mathematician Leibniz, the Dutch jurist Grotius, and the English churchman Wolsey were rated highest. The first American on the list was John Quincy Adams. (If intelligence and leadership are to be linked, it should be noted Adams was more successful as a diplomat than as a president for one term.) Four American founders were rather high on the list with identical scores: John Adams, Franklin, Jefferson, and Madison.

The political scientist Charles Murray provided something similar by identifying and rating geniuses, a listing of about 4,000 innovators in the arts and sciences from before Christ to 1950, in his survey *Human Accomplishment*. Murray assigned a score of 100 to the highest achieving person in each category that he ranked; for example Edison scored 100 in the technology category, and other creative individuals were scored accordingly. In the category of Western Art, for instance, Michelangelo was given 100; according to Murray, Picasso was rated second; Raphael was third; the list of 20 continued down to Gauguin who was given a score of 38. Other categories included Western literature, music, and philosophy; sciences such as biology, chemistry, medicine, physics; and various types of Asian literature.

For our purposes there are two points to be emphasized when mentioning the highly intelligent individuals who did not fulfill their promise. First, these men and women regardless of their accomplishments were living demonstrations of inequality; their mental abilities separated them from nearly everyone. Secondly, they may have been less attracted to any spiritual aspect of life and that may have contributed to their failures.

For our purposes there are two points to be emphasized when mentioning the studies of geniuses. Such sources show, and only partially, the enormous talent of the past and suggest that to exclude, even partially, or forget the results of this talent is a serious mistake. To include and remember the results of this talent is a foundation of traditionalism. The second point is that the modern – whatever its contribution to us – is also a continuation of the past. To use Michelangelo and Picasso again as an example, although their art work is completely different they are part of a continuation.

Which of our leaders, specifically presidents, were given special levels of intelligence? It is difficult to evaluate the more recent ones (using Richard Nixon as the end for evaluation perhaps). To evaluate at all the 44 men who have led the country is difficult; how intelligent was Abraham Lincoln, someone who received perhaps less than a year of schooling but yet composed the Gettysburg Address, among his other intellectual achievements? An agreed upon ranking of the highest five in regard to intellect might include John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Theodore Roosevelt, and Wilson. The high consensus rankings of these presidents suggest a rough correlation between intelligence and the presidential form of leadership.

Yet it seems, to use the adjectives just mentioned, that a lively responsive mind is all that is needed. The leaders of the United States (mostly but not exclusively the political leaders) have taken us in some very poor directions that reason and high intelligence, or simple common sense,

should have easily avoided. One of the many instances of poor directions is the constant over-spending: the national debt is currently beyond 19 trillion dollars and increasing; each taxpayer's share is beyond \$150,000. The presidents' ability to extend this debt distorts any fair evaluation of their ability to manage the country; it is like evaluating the management of a large company that has overwhelming indebtedness and is not held accountable for it.

+

Courage is another trait always useful for leaders, but to distinguish two primary types of courage is necessary. There is physical courage and there is also courage that does not usually involve physical risk, such as speaking about some controversial topic. The second type can be called the "courage of convictions," but that term is used less often in our time.

Since emperors no longer lead their legions into battle and our presidents don't forsake their comforts to wage war, physical courage is something less needed by the American democracy. Recently the country has not been especially enthusiastic about electing a president who has shown physical courage. John Kennedy did serve in combat, due in part to competition with his brother Joseph; the president's heroism involved helping his crew when the boat he commanded was rammed by a Japanese ship. Lyndon Johnson was awarded a medal for bravery for a bombing mission. In both these cases the self-promotion was apparent. The elder George Bush was a naval pilot in World War II with over 50 combat missions. Other recent presidents have served in non-combat military roles. There is no reason to mention Barack Obama in connection with this kind of courage; his primary tie to the military was ordering the bombing of at least seven countries during his two terms in office: Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Pakistan, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen.

The courage shown by Thomas Carlyle's selected heroes was both the physical kind of battle and the "courage of convictions." Carlyle defined courage as the "unconscious superiority to fear." Courage might have been to Carlyle the most important trait of all because the "first duty for a man is still that of subduing fear."

Apparently, virtually none of our current political figures can subdue their fear. One of their most obvious fears is losing their places at the political trough.

The importance of courage involves collective issues only in shared behaviors, but it is of much greater importance in Carlyle's phrase "first duty." An often quoted comment by C.S. Lewis helps explain what Carlyle meant:

Courage is not simply one of the virtues but the form of every virtue
at the testing point, which means at the point of its highest reality.

What Lewis said could have several interpretations, but for our purposes it suggests to live the life that we should requires courage to accept and reject certain choices. It takes courage not to claim something that is not really ours, not to mislead others when we could gain in some way by doing so, not to envy the possessions of others, and so on. Courage is what enables us to decide to avoid

many sinful entanglements.

One last point, courage, like freedom, can be good or bad. That is probably a seldom considered point, but at the same time not difficult to understand. Much of warfare, for instance, involves courage, but even acts of great courage can contribute to dishonorable ends. To control this there have always been efforts to set rules of war, but they have easily and often been broken by the extreme conditions of such conflicts.

Another positive trait loyalty, like courage or freedom, can be good or bad. That is probably a seldom considered point, but at the same time not difficult to understand. There is certainly loyalty to many good things: the good family, the good culture, the good country. Loyalties such as these can be a form of prejudice for good. And with or without prejudice, there have always been some men and women who have been loyal to what is morally wrong – at least when the morally wrong was stronger in a worldly sense. The one gift we have been given to help us properly use our courage, freedom, and loyalty (as well as other behaviors of which we should be proud) was noted by James Kalb:

Since we can neither simply rest content with what there is nor demonstrate what is better, we must rely on faith. Faith is our connection to what exceeds the limits of thought, as St. Paul says, it is ‘the evidence of things not seen.’ While we cannot comprehend faith, we need it to comprehend anything.

C.S. Lewis was, after his earlier atheism, certainly a man of faith; in his book *Mere Christianity* he discussed the rules of right and wrong that were once called the Law of Nature:

This law was called the Law of Nature because people thought that everyone knew it by nature and did not need to be taught it.... But taking the race as a whole, they thought that the human idea of decent behavior was obvious to everyone. And I believe they were right.

He added that some people say that the idea of the Law of Nature is unsound because different civilizations and different ages have had different moralities. Lewis said this was not true. Their differing moralities “never amounted to anything like a total difference.”

It is true that much of the behavior which Christians would call righteous or virtuous has been found among non-Christians. Matthew 7:12 matches the Roman saying that “men were brought into existence ... that they might do one another good.” Another example is the matching of Matthew 15:4 to the Hindu rule:

Your father is an image of the Lord of Creation, your mother an image of the Earth. For him who fails to honor them, every work of piety is in vain.

But history has shown that the idea of virtuous behavior was not always obvious to everyone. Infanticide is an extreme example of this. The Carthaginians were particularly known for their sacrifice of children in worshipping their gods. The Greeks did not have this practice, but their unhealthy children were abandoned and left to die. Even in somewhere as separated as Australia, the aborigines practiced infanticide. The early cultures of China and India often eliminated female children, and they continue this practice in our time. In Europe and the European derived countries there are now marginal suggestions accepting infanticide or punishing it less severely than other murders. Abortion, which is considered infanticide by many, was not an open part of behavior when Lewis wrote about decency in 1952.

At least in the beginning, any collective standard for right and wrong is most often founded on the authority of a revealed religion. Revelation as a theological concept means knowledge imparted from something that transcends ordinary human abilities; put somewhat more directly, revelation means God's disclosure of His will to His people. An act of revelation that applies here is obviously the Ten Commandments:

The commandments were so influential at the nation's founding that all but one of the original states included them as part of their civil and criminal laws. Writing to his son, John Quincy Adams noted their importance:

The law given from Sinai was a civil and municipal as well as a moral and religious code: it contained many statutes of universal application – laws essential to man in society.

Madison wrote that far from depending on the power of government for the future the dependence was put in something much greater:

We have staked the future of all our political institutions ... upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the ten commandments of God.

The facts are obvious that appeals such as Madison's are no longer made by more than a remnant of those involved with government. Imagine an environment of individuals governing, controlling, or sustaining themselves. But there is a portion, a remnant, which has always done that and continues in our time. This is a living form of traditionalism.

Another revelation and another guide for individual behavior is Christ's eight blessings cited in the Sermon on the Mount. There is nothing unusual in the following comment of a current English clergyman, but it does show the value of what is involved:

In other words, if you want to understand the Beatitudes then look at Jesus. If you want to understand Jesus look at the Beatitudes. The whole

of Jesus's life and teaching was lived and spoken according to the kingdom values of the Beatitudes.

There also have been other foundations for our individual and collective behaviors, and some were outside our Christian traditions. Christian teachings, however, have given guidance to more Americans than any other source. Nearly all problems which confront us can be addressed from the guidance provided by those traditions.

+

Of the leadership characteristics mentioned, some discussion has been given to all but the last: should our leader be male or female. Certainly any deeper evaluation of women's attitudes and special abilities would be complicated, but some generalities are apparent.

About one of ten countries in the world is led by a woman. Until recently the percentage would have been much lower. The countries of northern Europe have been supportive of women; Germany and Britain are for the moment the most important of those countries led by females. Other areas, including Africa and Latin America, currently have several female leaders.

Following the use of lists dealing with intelligence, an overview of feminine leadership can be seen from the survey of the 25 most powerful women of the past century compiled in 2010 by *Time*. Any relatively knowledgeable college student would recognize most, but not all, the names given; Jane Adams, Corazon Aquino, and several other are not especially well known. Among those considered powerful were a few scientists, two American singers, and several women known primarily for their liberalism.

Under current conditions and considered simply on the basis of gender, American women are not attracted to limited government; they disproportionately favor payment and relief programs and are more supportive of abortion. These commitments and an overall preference for liberal policies compared to men are consistently indicated by polls. A majority of women have supported the Democratic presidential candidate in every instance since the Clinton election of 1992.

Conservative or traditionalist women would be more concerned with issues such as defense of the family, religious liberty, or life's sanctity. In America today conservatism and traditionalism, including the women who hold those values, have lost the majority on many social matters. However the values of conservatism and traditionalism cannot be called the permanent things if we don't believe they will be regained in some fashion.

+

The path of regaining permanence will be difficult; it is even difficult to imagine such reform. Before any rebirth of the positive there has to be an understanding of the negative or decadence and what indicates its development. This has probably been without exception the case throughout history. Polybius recognized the decadence of Rome, and it is a pattern that closely follows the evolution of the modern world:

All things are subject to decay and change. When a state, after having passed with safety through many and great dangers, arrives at the highest degree of power, and possesses an entire and undisputed sovereignty, it is manifest that the long continuance of prosperity must give birth to costly and luxurious manners And as those evils are continually increased ... change will be completed by the people when the avarice of some is found to injure and oppress them, and the ambition of others swells their vanity and poisons them with flattering hopes. For then, being inflamed with rage and following only the dictates of their passions, they no longer will submit to any control, or be contented with an equal share of the administration in conjunction with their rules; but will draw to themselves the entire sovereignty and supreme direction of all affairs. When this is done, the government will assume indeed the fairest of all names, that of a free, and popular state; but will in truth be the greatest of all evils, the government of the multitude.

The most accurate terms to describe government of the multitude, the cause and subject of our difficult reform, is to return to the terms used by William Butler Yeats: the Many, the Few, and the One. There will never be any completion for these three, but their roles will always be assumed to some degree. They are now being poorly assumed. What Polybius wrote so long ago is true today, the Many direct affairs – in a way. In another way they direct nothing, instead the Few direct all affairs by buying off in some way those around them. The Few, who are always motivated by self-interest and especially in our time, have only limited concern for the Many. The One is in our time the part that has strayed furthest from completion. Simply put the One is not the best servant, as should be the case, but instead the worst.

A recent incident showing what poor servants we now have was not anything which generated special attention; it was the response of President Obama’s press secretary to a question concerning discrimination in a state law. Supporters of the law said it was very similar to a federal law passed in the 1990s. The reply of the press secretary (speaking against the state law) showed the contempt liberalism has for any use of tradition:

If you have to go back two decades to try to justify something you are doing today, it may raise some questions about the wisdom of what you are doing.

According to this statement, opposition to the proposed state law was not that as a federal law it had resulted in discrimination, but that it was tied in some way to the past. Shouldn’t we be progressing toward something better rather than being tied to the past? This is what liberalism constantly asks.

The traditionalist understands that this is precisely what is to be faced and realizes that the authority needed cannot be found in the current “hollow men” who rule over us. An affirmation of

the authority of faith is instead both an assertion of what is within the individual and what is within the community of faith. A classic from Christian literature titled *The End of the Modern World* told us the ultimate result of this authority:

We know now that the modern world is coming to an end [A]t the same time the unbeliever will emerge from the fogs of secularism. He will cease to reap benefits from the values and forces developed by the very Revelation he denies [T]he world to come will be filled with animosity and danger, but it will be a world open and clean.

If something beyond the modern world does come, it may be open and clean, but that is under our current conditions very difficult to be sure of. What we must be sure of is our response to the challenges, very great and even small, for our sake but even more for the generations which follow us.

There is a great deal that now attracts our attention but shouldn't attract it nearly so much. What we as Christians consider should be considered within our Christian beliefs. And if certain things don't seem to fit with that belief system, chances are those things are of no importance or aren't meant for us.

The truly lesser parts of this life attract a great deal of attention around us, and, at the same time, we as Christians are pushed toward accepting as wrong much of what our parents and earlier generations were certain was right. A single sentence from a book from several years ago titled *What We Can't Not Know* describes this distortion:

We are passing through an eerie phase of history in which the things that everyone really knows are treated as unheard of doctrines, a time in which the elements of common decency are themselves attacked as indecent.

This distortion of what we have always regarded as natural and good shows how liberalism is incompatible with any standard of virtue. Instead liberalism demands that all naturalness and goodness must be relative and even religion must never be solid but ever willing to accommodate.

Neutrality toward this distortion is not an option; the options are acceptance or rejection, and rejection of the distorted modern world means withdrawal from nearly everything around us. Under the best of circumstances the individual decision to leave the mainstream means gathering more closely with a community of Christians in one form or another.

And other than to return to a strongly led Christian republic what would this gathering include? When T.S. Eliot was confronted with this same question in the 1930s when the forms of government taken by Germany, Italy, and Russia were all surging forward, he wrote that the democratic form (in England and elsewhere) had been watered down to nothing and needed a new order:

A real democracy is always a restricted democracy, and can only flourish with some limitation by hereditary rights and responsibilities The modern [or current] question as popularly put is : ‘democracy is dead what is to replace it?’ where as it should be: ‘the frame of democracy has been destroyed; how can we, out of the materials at hand, build a new structure in which democracy can live?’

Even including the talk of a structure of the One, the Many, and the Few, the rights which were clearly given to us as Americans originally, and thought of now as democratic rights, would in a Christian community be preserved with honor.

Rather like not changing in the last years of life, there is no need to change in these last few lines, so the last few lines will continue the message I have attempted to convey and can be allotted to two statements by Thomas Carlyle. The first concerns mankind and time:

[T]his little life-boat of an Earth with its noisy crew of Mankind, and all their troubled History, will one day have vanished; faded like a cloud-speck from the azure of the All! What then is man! What then is man! He endures but for an hour, and is crushed before the moth [is crushed]. Yet in the being and in the working of a faithful man is there already (as all faith, from the beginning, gives assurance) a something that pertains not to this wild death-element of Time; that triumphs over Time and *is*, and will be when Time shall be no more.

Each Christian knows more clearly than any other thing this promise of triumph over time.

Carlyle’s second statement quoted indirectly is brief and concerns authority: “[F]or all authority is *mystic* and comes ‘by the grace of God.’” The word origin of mystic refers to learning what is spiritual: in other words, all authority should be learning what is spiritual. And all authority, like all good things, comes by the grace of God.

SOURCES +++++

Of the writers I have cited, the two I have most read are D.H. Lawrence and Roger Scruton. Lawrence's works remain relevant even though they were written a century ago. His most controversial novel was recently adapted by the BBC, and a recent play concerning his early life was well received. The works most disapproved by liberal critics are probably *Kangaroo* and *The Plumed Serpent*, two novels dwelling on Lawrence's "blood knowledge." Scruton's published works total about 50 and range from formal philosophy, to discussions of conservatism, to more or less everyday matters. Anything by Scruton is worth trying.

Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* and Cooper's *The American Democrat* are classics. The classic definition of a classic is by Charles Sainte-Beuve who said such an item has "continuance and consistence" and produces "unity and tradition." Continuance, consistence, unity and tradition what a fine group of words.

Older material is often more difficult to absorb. Thomas Carlyle's style and in a different way Edmund Burke's style would illustrate that. Cooper's novel *The Crater* reads off rather easily, but not everyone has an interest in early nineteenth century fiction.

Virtually all older writings are available in some form these days. A difficult to find but valuable 1,400 page source by Lawrence titled *Phoenix* is an example of that.

Twentieth century authors carry over better than most earlier writers. The considerations of C.S. Lewis attract wide readership, and *Mere Christianity* is often called his most effective writing. The religious considerations of T.S. Eliot are present in his poetry and plays as well as the essays mentioned concerning a Christian society, but understanding them requires at the least patient reading.

Especially with the increased controversy concerning heritage, writers from the South from the first half of the twentieth century deserve attention. Richard Weaver did well with essays. Other agrarian leaders such as Allen Tate and Donald Davidson also deserve recognition.

Much of my understanding of the convictions of W.B. Yeats was derived from *Yeats and Politics in the 1930s*. Often such objective and detailed studies of cultural figures are the best way to learn of the political stands of such men and women.

Except for Scruton current writers who influenced my thoughts on the subjects of authority, virtue, and the Christian republic are more difficult to list. It hard to anticipate how certain writers will be judged until time has passed and conditions have improved or worsened.

POSTSCRIPT ++++

Hopefully the material in the preceding pages will carry over as a more permanent statement, but considering its exceptional nature the presidential election of 2016 illustrates both the most important immediate and the most important ongoing concern about the basic nature of democracy. That concern is the country's extremely permanent political division which is in turn only a rather open demonstration of the less openly recognized everyday divisions of the country.

In this election political division followed long established patterns. Democrats carried nearly all electoral votes directly north of the Potomac except Pennsylvania; two states in the midwest; Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico; the Pacific coast states and Hawaii. The Republican states were also clearly defined: the South except Virginia, and the entire rest of the country except the six scattered states, the northern, and the Pacific coast states.

In this election bloc voting, in a racial sense, also followed long established patterns. Black Americans again supported the Democrats at over 90 percent, providing in places such as Philadelphia what had to be offset in the remainder of the state and contributing to insurmountable leads in places such as Chicago. By giving roughly 70 percent of their vote to the Democratic candidate, Hispanics also strongly influenced states such as Florida and North Carolina and in some sense provided the margin of winning in Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico. Texas, a state where a border belt of largely Hispanic counties consistently vote very strongly Democrat, could switch permanently to the Democratic column soon because of the constant growth of Hispanics.

In contrast to these voting patterns and others which seldom merit comment, a particular voting group was repeatedly singled out, including a brief intemperate post-election essay by one of the country's most famous authors titled "Mourning for Whiteness." This essay began by saying "Americanness" is whiteness and that "all immigrants to the United States know (and knew) that if they wanted to become real, authentic Americans" they must make their loyalty to their native country secondary "in order to emphasize their whiteness." But this is, according to the writer, being rapidly eroded by the numbers of America's people of color. Responding to this erosion, white Americans are "(1) abandoning their sense of human dignity and (2) risking the appearance of cowardice." The author's two specific, but unnamed examples, of this cowardice are the bombing in Birmingham, Alabama and the church murders in Charleston, South Carolina. (These dreadful incidents occurred more than 50 years apart, in 1963 and 2015.) There are other general examples listed such as being "willing to shoot black children in the street." Also rather than face-to-face confrontations, these cowards are training their guns on the unarmed and the innocent who are running away. Such personal abasement is difficult for white people; they "risk contempt, and to be reviled by the mature, the sophisticated, and the strong." What is surely worst of all is how such cowardice has been formalized when so "many Americans have flocked to a political platform that supports ... violence against the defenseless." These are the thoughts of Toni Morrison, someone who has been consistently honored and rewarded throughout her long life by the same American environment that she has consistently criticized.

With many states repeating their electoral pasts, the 2016 result was decided by the change made by Pennsylvania (and additionally Michigan and Wisconsin), and this was the change which concerned liberals: the voting of working class whites. As Barack Obama said when he first ran for the presidency, “You go into these small towns in Pennsylvania and ... the jobs have been gone for 25 years and nothing’s replaced them.” The election was then, in some measure, an attempt at radically reforming government to restore the conditions that had been so rewarding to our workers in the past.

Should white Americans, including the working class, be condemned for their behavior? White backing of the Republican ticket ran at 58 percent overall, somewhat more in rural areas and probably somewhat less in urban areas. While such a figure represents a solid support, it is far from the uniformity of the various minorities. This fact did not keep Morrison and liberalism from finding fault. “Angry white vote” was an often used phrase. “The Rage of White, Christian America” from the opinion pages of the *New York Times* was representative of liberal denunciation. A fact worth noting is that there are many white Americans who favor liberalism and diversity; for instance Portland, Oregon’s support for Hillary Clinton was the same as the white portion of its population (76 percent).

Something that went beyond liberal polemics and offered a more profound comment on voting in general was a recent article in *The Claremont Review of Books* by John Marini:

[W]hat is central to politics and elections is the elevation of the status of personal and group identity to something approaching a new kind of civil religion. Individual social behavior, once dependent on traditional morality and understood in terms of traditional virtues and vices, has become almost indefensible... Public figures have come to be judged not as morally culpable individuals, but by the moral standing established by their group identity.

Virtue has become distorted because many of the great achievements of the past are now considered by the left as forms of exploitation, and the virtue of restoring greatness is regarded as simply furthering the exploitation of some parts of the divided society. Because society lacks a common ground, candidates cannot appeal to a common good. Marini argues that political figures are no longer judged by traditional virtues including honesty and honor because such characteristics have become only individual subjective preferences. The good as the old, which is the foundation of conservatism, has become indefensible. This has been the cultural transformation given the country without the consent of the American people, and the very controversial election of 2016 was possibly a chance or a last chance to reverse what has been imposed.

The terms chance or last chance are accurate because of the numbers, best called democratic numbers, involved. Liberalism and the welfare state continue to have the deference of the various rapidly increasing groups which have set themselves apart.

Our cities are only four percent of the land surface but contain between 60 and 70 percent of the population. Baltimore, Memphis, and New Orleans are among the numerous cities that have large black majorities; Detroit is the most extreme demographically of any American city. San

Antonio is perhaps surprisingly the country's seventh largest city and is roughly two-thirds Hispanic. America's three largest cities (Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York) are now only about one-third white, or non-Hispanic white to use the modern and acceptable term.

There is material advancement in urban areas, but it is not the result of their demographics or their political approaches; instead it is the result of their almost natural advantages. These fundamental advantages can be understood by the single word proximity, the nearness of needed things. This nearness of what is needed among other things often attracts the most capable men and women from other parts of the country or even immigrant families. Also cities have certain economic strengths: over time they have benefitted from cumulative investments and can in many instances make up for a loss of manufacturing with service jobs.

An important division in this country follows largely the urban and rural divide. This could somewhat more precisely be termed the urban and the other. The other is represented accurately enough in the phrase "fly over country." And of course the enmity between groups doesn't follow strictly the boundaries of cities and counties, so even within the urban setting there are everyday instances of hostility.

An article written by a British university instructor about his relocation to the United States can provide a closing statement on this hostility. For some reason this highly successful man in his early sixties decided to leave his native England and accept a teaching position in America. Possessions, including 380 boxes of books, were packed and shipped; a home was purchased and renovated; the new teaching duties were begun. There was no problem with the home situated in an enclave distinct from what was around it; he described it as "a small grid of brick row-houses like a spruced up version of the East End of London." He described his work-place as a "world renowned" university, so there seemed no problem there. But around him in his urban environment he saw "very large areas of poverty, and a hideously high level of serious drug use and violence."

These discouraging and alarming issues bother everyone, of course, but for someone with leftist attitudes who had just committed to living in the United States his response was surprising:

[T]he same longstanding and deep seated problems remain as they have always been, and they show up everywhere – at the checkout, at the gas station, at traffic lights. It's not open warfare but it's certainly latent conflict.

The same inherent problems remain everywhere. In one of the most prosperous states in the country, no politician has been able to overcome these obstacles or even bring some amount of order to them.

Since the poem I quoted earlier "The Second Coming" was written in a period of division and violence what can it tell us about all this? The sides are lined up ready for conflict; there is even now no democratic center only the opposing sides; the center does not hold and there is a falling apart. Pure and unmixed anarchy has not yet been loosed. The blood-dimmed tide has not yet been loosed; it is still latent. But when anarchy and the tide are loosed, the ceremony of innocence (to use one of the most beautiful phrases from Yeats) will be not just be damaged, or damaged badly, but will be overwhelmed.

THESE PAGES ARE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WHAT FORM OF GOVERNMENT WOULD BEST SERVE AMERICA'S RELIGIOUS REMNANT. THE ANSWER TO THAT, IN THE OPINION OF THE AUTHOR, IS A STRONGLY LED STRUCTURE ASSUMING THE TRADITIONAL GOVERNING FUNCTIONS: PROVIDING SHELTER TO THE BELIEVER, TO THE BELIEVING FAMILY, AND TO THE BELIEVING COMMUNITY.

++++

++++